Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Exterior Modernism: Evelyn Waugh and Cinema

YUEXI LIU

How to cite:

LIU, YUEXI (2017) Exterior Modernism: Evelyn Waugh and Cinema. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/12047/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

Thesis abstract

Contributing to the dynamic debates in current modernist scholarship, particularly concerning the so-called interregnum between high modernism and postmodernism, exterior modernism refers to the work of a group of younger writers, such as Evelyn Waugh, Ernest Hemingway, Henry Green, Christopher Isherwood, Anthony Powell, Elizabeth Bowen, and Patrick Hamilton, whose departure from high modernism took the form of an 'outward turn' privileging exteriority over the interiority of consciousness through foregrounding talk and drawing on cinema, comedy, and satire. Relating their work to other exterior modernists, I focus mainly on Waugh by way of exemplification, considering his oeuvre, non-fiction as well as fiction. This thesis is the first book-length systematic study of Waugh's relationship with cinema; such a relationship is crucial to the emergence and development of his exterior modernism. To illuminate Waugh's exteriority, I develop an interdisciplinary framework, informed primarily by distributed cognition. Chapter One discusses Waugh's first short story, 'The Balance' (1926), and his last comic novel, *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* (1957), to demonstrate a movement of circularity in Waugh's fiction. Part One compares 'The Balance' with Woolf's *Jacob's Room* (1922), arguing that both writers turned to cinema in search of their unique literary voices. Part Two examines *Pinfold*'s successful rewriting of the early story by playing with the mind while remaining outside through dissociation. While Chapter Two reads *Decline and Fall* (1928) – Waugh's debut novel that established his exterior modernism – as the novelistic equivalent to a Chaplin silent film, Chapter Three regards Waugh's experimentation with talk in *Vile Bodies* (1930) – a group novel preoccupied with the group mind – as resonating with the coming of sound to cinema. Concentrating on *Brideshead Revisited* (1945), a heritage novel, and its afterlives in heritage film and television, Chapter Four investigates exterior modernism at mid-century, which solves the problem of interiority with a distributed sense of affectivity.

Exterior Modernism: Evelyn Waugh and Cinema

Yuexi Liu

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English Studies

Durham University

2016

Table of Contents

Statement of copyright iii

Acknowledgements iv

Introduction Exterior Modernism: The Outward Turn 1

Chapter One 'In my beginning is my end': 'The Balance' and *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* 15

Part One Finding the Voice through Cinema: Woolf's *Jacob's Room* and Waugh's 'The Balance' 15

Jacob's Room and the Cinema Eye 18

'The Balance' and the Cinematic Method 24

Part Two The Sense of an Ending: *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* 32

The Circular Ending 33

Pinfold *as the Ending* 34

Pinfold*'s Ending* 40

Dissociation and Trauma: The Extended Mind as Radio 43

Dissociation 45

'The Box' 49

Trauma 56

The Cinematic Mind 58

Radio versus Cinema 59

Cinematic Pinfold 63

Chapter Two Cinema, Comedy, and Satire: *Decline and Fall* as a Chaplinesque Silent Film 69

'GO TO THE CINEMA and risk the headache': Waugh's Apprenticeship in Cinema and His Oxford Novel 70

Waugh on Chaplin: The Transition 71

University Cinema Culture in the Twenties 76

The Scarlet Woman 83

Laughter and Satire: The Birth of Comedy 89

'IT IS MEANT TO BE FUNNY': The Comic Body 92

Exterior Modernist Satire 99

Chapter Three Talk Fiction and the Group Mind: *Vile Bodies* as the Group Novel ... 113

The 'young men of 1922' 115

Talk Fiction and the Talkies 120
The Group Mind: Identity and Anxiety 137
The Group in the 'Era of Crowds' 140
The Party 145
The War 159
The Strike 167
Chapter Four Waugh's Heritage: *Brideshead Revisited* and Adaptation 176
Apophrades: High Modernism Revisited 177
The Heritage Novel: Objects and Emotions 187
The Fountain: Human Comedies and Tragedies 192
The Chapel: Divine Grace 198
Sebastian and His Teddy Bear 203
Heritage and Heritage-making: Adapting *Brideshead Revisited* 217
Literary Adaptation: Waugh versus Greene 219
Granada Brideshead*, Nostalgia, and Heritage* 227
Bibliography 236

Statement of copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Patricia Waugh and Dr John Nash, for their guidance, encouragement, and kindness. I am particularly grateful to Pat, who indulged and expanded my obsession with the mind. I was, and still am, constantly awed by her wide-ranging interests, encyclopedic knowledge, and abundant energy.

I am also grateful to my annual reviewers, Dr Marina MacKay and Dr Abbie Garrington, who provided me with fresh perspectives.

I am lucky to have made many friends, who are, as often, my mentors. Karen O'Brien has helped me in many ways since I first came to the UK to pursue my MA. Avishek Parui has encouraged and inspired me. Carissa Foo, Ayesha Siddiqa, and Mengmeng Yan (in alphabetical order!) have been great colleagues and friends. Special thanks are reserved for Liyuan (Marian) Ma and Joanna Rzepa, who read chapters of my thesis and offered invaluable feedback.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents and Marcin – certainly the most literary engineer I know! – for their love, support, and patience. It is also in memory of my grandmother, who did not manage to wait for me to come home.

Introduction

Exterior Modernism: The Outward Turn

> 'I regard writing not as investigation of character, but as an exercise in the use of language, and with this I am obsessed. I have no psychological interest. It is drama, speech, and events that interest me.'[1]

Evelyn Waugh's emphasis on external perspectives rather than a preoccupation with interiority or with consciousness as an interior flow or inner dialogue marked his fiction as distinct from that of his modernist precursors working in the novel genre, such as James Joyce and Virginia Woolf. His preoccupation with speech – rather than with inner speech, or verbal thought – in particular, was, however, shared by many writers of his immediate generation.[2] The idea of the novel as dialogic, however, would be developed in the thirties by the Russian Formalist Mikhail Bakhtin who viewed as definitive of the novel as a genre the existence of 'a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized.'[3] He argues that '[a]uthorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia [*raznorečie*] can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (always more or less dialogized).'[4] For Bakhtin, the dialogic breaks down the hard and fast distinction between inner and outer for inner speech is the dialogic interiorisation or mediation of external dialogue, talk that begins and exists in the world. Waugh and other younger novelists such as Ernest Hemingway,

---

[1] Julian Jebb, 'Evelyn Waugh, The Art of Fiction, No. 30', *The Paris Review*, 30 (1963), last accessed 8 December 2016, <https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4537/evelyn-waugh-the-art-of-fiction-no-30-evelyn-waugh>. This passage appears in almost all penguin editions of Waugh novels except *Brideshead Revisited* as a general introduction to the author.

[2] For Lev Vygotsky, '[t]he primary function of speech is communication, social intercourse.' In *Thought and Language* (1934), Vygotsky argues that as children grow, their egocentric speech is internalised into verbal thought: 'egocentric speech represents a transition from speech for others to speech for oneself. It already has the function of inner speech, but remains similar to social speech in its expression.' Notably, inner speech is not only silent but abbreviated: 'inner speech must be regarded, not as speech minus sound, but as an entirely separate speech function. Its main characteristic trait is its peculiar syntax. Compared with external speech, inner speech appears disconnected and incomplete.' Lev Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, ed. and trans. by Eugenia Hanfmann, Gertrude Vakar, and Alex Kozulin (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012), pp. 7, 249.

[3] M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by Michael Holquist and trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Taxes Press, 2011), p. 262.

[4] Ibid., p. 263.

Henry Green, Christopher Isherwood, and Anthony Powell turned from the inside to the outside in bringing the same intensity of experiment to their novels through their experimentation with exteriorised dialogic fiction.[5] Their fiction can therefore be viewed as a variety of *talk* fiction. More importantly, in its preoccupation with intersubjectivity, talk fiction accentuates miscommunication as much as communication, the breakdown of communication, and in that sense constitutes something beyond the familiar term 'the "novel of conversation"', an expression used by Waugh himself to describe the fiction of Ronald Firbank, a novelist he greatly admired.[6] The talk of the Bright Young People, for example, is communication and therefore talk, but it is egocentric talk where the structure of address is more inclusive of an addressee mirroring the assumptions of the addressor; not surprisingly, they themselves are considered infantile and narcissistic.

Exterior modernism is term I am using to refer to the work of a group of younger writers, such as Evelyn Waugh, Ernest Hemingway, Henry Green, Christopher Isherwood, Anthony Powell, Elizabeth Bowen, and Patrick Hamilton, whose departure from high modernism took the form of an 'outward turn' privileging exteriority over the interiority of consciousness by foregrounding talk and drawing particularly on cinema, comedy, and satire.[7] Notably, this group is not merely a

[5] Bakhtin exemplifies this with reference to Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* (1877), showing how inner speech is 'transmitted in a way regulated by the author' (p. 319). What is referred to by Bakhtin as 'a character's quasi-direct discourse' and 'a hybrid form' (p. 319) can be understood as free indirect discourse. The translators, Emerson and Holquist, explain in the glossary that, for Bakhtin, dialogue 'may be external (between two different people) or internal (between an earlier and a later self)', and they point to Jurij Lotman's *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (1977) for a distinction between these two types of dialogue (p. 427).

[6] Evelyn Waugh, 'Ronald Firbank', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 56-59 (p. 58).

[7] Coincidentally, Thomas Davis also uses the term 'the outward turn' but in a different context. In 'Late Modernism' (2012), it refers to the turn from 'the so-called "introverted novels"' of the high modernists to the late modernists in the thirties 'plot[ting] modernism more firmly in the social and political sphere.' Thomas S. Davis, 'Late Modernism: British Literature at Midcentury', *Literature Compass*, 9/4 (2012), 326-37 (p. 328). In *The Extinct Scene* (2016), 'late modernism's outward turn' is understood as 'the form of attention it gives to the temporalities, spaces, surface appearances, textures, and rhythms of everyday life'. Thomas S. Davis, *The Extinct Scene: Late Modernism and Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), p. 2.
Rejecting the conception of modern literature as 'a psychological turn inward', Joshua Gang argues that 'behaviourism comprised a central force in the development of transnational modernism and criticism.' Joshua Gang, 'Behaviourism and Literary Modernity, 1913-2009' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2012), p. 1. Gang's 'Outward Turns' (p. 1) therefore resembles my formal, cognitive 'outward turn' more than Davis's political 'outward turn'. Although many of the writers under discussion, such as Samuel Beckett and Djuna Barnes, are regarded as late modernists (and, for me, exterior modernists), Gang does not engage with, or even mention, late modernism. Interwar exterior modernist fiction tends to eschew interiority and even

critical construction: although the exterior modernists never formally aligned themselves as a movement, they were loosely connected, either through the similar circles in which they moved, or through acknowledged and unacknowledged influence, but also in their mutual rivalry. Their shared concerns – social, cultural, and political, as well as formal – indicate interrelatedness but in no way suggest coherence among these writers or their work. While including reference to others in this group – Green, Isherwood, and Powell in particular – this study, by way of exemplification, focuses mainly on the writing of Waugh situated within this broader conceptual/historical context. Waugh's oeuvre, spanning five decades between the twenties and the sixties was witness to – and, as often, participated in – the shifts of literary style from high modernism to the so-called void between (high) modernism and postmodernism which is now emerging as a distinctive field of enquiry under the broad umbrella term 'late modernism', and even to the beginning of postmodernism.

In situating Waugh as an exterior modernist, this study is also the first book-length systematic investigation into the relationship between Waugh and cinema in the context of modernism, taking into consideration both his fiction (lesser-known short stories as well as novels) and non-fiction (particularly journalism, which requires critical attention). The argument is that Waugh's emergence as an exterior modernist owes much to his ongoing and important relationship with cinema. In order to explore how and why Waugh appropriates cinematic technique and insights into his fiction, I develop a framework for understanding his particular version of 'exteriority' by drawing on the interdisciplinary framework of cognitive literary studies, the distributed or extended mind in particular.

The Extended Mind

Waugh's exclusion from, or obscure positioning within, modernism may ultimately be referred to the longstanding view of the modernist novel as 'inward looking'. Recently, drawing on cognitive science and narratology, critics such as Patricia Waugh and David Herman have challenged this idea of a predominantly introspective modernism, or a modernism viewed as entirely preoccupied with

drifts towards a behaviourist position, but the exterior modernists, unlike the behaviourists, neither deny the existence of consciousness nor view emotion as response.

interiority and 'stream of consciousness'. This current and somewhat belated deconstruction of the myth of the inward turn that draws on recent narrative, phenomenological, and cognitive theories, also opens up an interesting space that further allows the development of a view of Waugh, with his exaggeratedly externalised style, as having a more solid relation with the acknowledged canonical moderns than previously acknowledged and, most importantly, that gives him a formal affiliation than the shared tendency to cultural pessimism that links Waugh with Eliot, Lewis, Lawrence, and Pound.

In 'Thinking in Literature' (2011), Patricia Waugh argues that '[e]ngaging with the more enactive model of mind current among cognitive neuroscientists helps to dislodge the disabling myth of modernism as the performance of a solipsistic mind, an "inward turn" expressive of a purely private self.'[8] For her,

> [t]he Jamesian image of mind as open to and adapted for the negotiation of social transactions and survival in a changing world – mind as embodied, purposive as well as unconsciously driven, orienting itself to its environments through affect and feeling, sensory response and reflection and in constant dialogue with its environment, including other minds, as well as itself – has perhaps been obscured by an over-enthusiastic critical fascination with the Freudian model.[9]

Waugh therefore suggests an account of the modernist mind that 'draws on James as well as Freud and even learns from contemporary neuroscience about modes of cognition that are somehow intuited by the great modernist writers.'[10]

Also rethinking and rejecting the 'inward turn', Herman argues that 'modernist narratives can both be illuminated by and help illuminate postcognitivist accounts of the mind as inextricably embedded in contexts for action and interaction. Particularly relevant, in this connection are enactivist frameworks'.[11] Herman proposes to 'replace the internal-external scale with a continuum stretching between, at one pole, a tight coupling between an intelligent agent and that agent's surrounding environment, and, at the other pole, a looser coupling between agent and environment.'[12]

---

[8] Patricia Waugh, 'Thinking in Literature: Modernism and Contemporary Neuroscience', in *The Legacies of Modernism: Historicising Postwar and Contemporary Fiction*, ed. by David James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 75-95 (p. 76).

[9] Ibid., p. 85.

[10] Ibid.

[11] David Herman, '1880-1945: Re-minding Modernism', in *The Emergence of Mind: Representation of Consciousness in Narrative Discourse in English*, ed. by David Herman (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), pp. 243-72 (p. 249).

[12] Ibid.

Like Waugh and Herman, I employ distributed cognition, particularly the extended mind, as a key framework for my thesis.[13] Rather than the high modernists, I focus on what I am calling the exterior modernists, whose representation of the interior, affect as well as thought, leans towards the pole of 'a tight coupling' between the self and the world on Herman's continuum. In *Cognition in the Wild* (1995), Edward Hutchins attempts to

> put cognition back into the social and cultural world […] to show that human cognition is not just influenced by culture and society, but that it is in a very fundamental sense a cultural and social process. To do this I will move the boundaries of the cognitive unit of analysis out beyond the skin of the individual person and treat the navigation team as a cognitive and computational system.[14]

Viewing cognition as socially distributed, Hutchins acknowledges that the mind is not contained in the brain, a position shared by Andy Clark and David Chalmers who first established fully the thesis of the 'extended mind'. In their seminal essay, 'The Extended Mind' (1998), Clark and Chalmers advocate 'an *active externalism*, based on the active role of the environment in driving cognitive processes.'[15] They therefore emphasise 'a *coupled system*', or the interaction between the human organism (the mind) and the external entity (the world).[16] By way of exemplification, they create a character called Otto, who, due to Alzheimer's disease, has to carry with him everywhere a notebook in which he writes down new information so that he is able to consult and retrieve old information as the need arises: 'For Otto, his notebook plays the role usually played by a biological memory.'[17] In other words, Otto's notebook, an external technology incorporated into his cognitive system, extends his mind. The extended mind can be regarded as a more radical mode of distributed cognition than the embedded, enactive, or embodied mind.

Prior to the availability of concepts such as those of the extended mind and social and distributed cognition, the tendency has been to regard exterior modernism, particularly in the interwar era, as not only eschewing interiority, but even embracing

---

[13] Cognitive literary studies is an emerging field. See Lisa Zunshine, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Literary Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Mark J. Bruhn and Donald R. Wehrs, eds, *Cognition, Literature and History* (New York: Routledge, 2014); and Isabel Jaén and Julien Jacques Simon, eds, *Cognitive Literary Studies: Current Themes and New Directions* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2013).

[14] Edward Hutchins, *Cognition in the Wild* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996), p. xiv.

[15] Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers, 'The Extended Mind', in *The Extended Mind*, ed. by Richard Menary (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2010), pp. 27-42 (p. 27).

[16] Ibid., p. 29.

[17] Ibid., p. 33.

behaviourism, particularly with writers such as Lewis.[18] But within the terms of a more distributed model of cognition, human cognition emerges and remains fundamentally, perhaps, social, before it is private and introspective so that what we think of as thinking includes perception, feeling, communicating, remembering, sense-making, reflection, and introspection. This involves negotiating the world and other minds through the mediation and uses of tools, objects, and technologies and is therefore fundamentally anti-Cartesian: minds and bodies, environments and brains, are all part of the mind conceived of as distributed. So in this view, much exterior modernist fiction, particularly at mid-century, is complicated by interiority and therefore lends itself to a reading informed by a model of distributed or extended cognition rather than that of behaviourist or reductively externalist models of mind that tend to reduce character to mechanic response.[19]

Modernisms and Cinema

Exterior modernism engages with and contributes to the vibrant debates in current modernist scholarship, particularly the so-called 'New Modernist Studies'. Introducing their edited collection *Bad Modernisms* (2006), Douglas Mao and Rebecca Walkowitz identify 'at least two significant enterprises: one that reconsiders the definitions, locations, and producers of "modernism" and another that applies new approaches and methodologies to "modernist" works.'[20] Updating the new developments in 'The New Modernist Studies' (2008), Mao and Walkowitz observe:

> In addition to these temporal and spatial expansions, there has been what we are calling here a vertical one, in which once quite sharp boundaries between high art and popular forms of culture have been reconsidered; in which canons have been critiqued and reconfigured; in which works by members of marginalized social groups have been encountered with fresh eyes and ears; and in which scholarly inquiry has increasingly extended to matters of production, dissemination, and reception.[21]

---

[18] Paul Scott Stanfield argues that Lewis 'both wants to destroy the assumptions of behaviourist psychology and knows he has committed himself to complicity with them.' Paul Scott Stanfield, '"This Implacable Doctrine": Behaviourism in Wyndham Lewis's "Snooty Baronet"', *Twentieth-Century Literature*, 47/2 (2001), 241-67 (pp. 243-44).

[19] Waugh did not deny the existence of interiority. At the beginning of his career, especially in *Decline and Fall*, he eschewed thought and feeling because he did not know how to incorporate them into his outside method. With novels such as *Brideshead* and *Pinfold*, he finally found ways to exteriorise the interior.

[20] Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, 'Introduction: Modernisms Bad and New', in *Bad Modernisms* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 1-17 (p. 1).

[21] Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, 'The New Modernist Studies', *PMLA*, 123/3 (2008),

Tyrus Miller's seminal *Late Modernism* (1999) is generally believed to have opened up the discussion of modernism through re-examining the trajectory of modernism viewed from the perspective of its ending and decline and foregrounding thereby previously marginalised or neglected writers who might be regarded as the second generation of modernists. Miller places late modernist writing:

> in the early-twentieth-century context of shifting hierarchies within the arts, intensive development of the mass media, and traumatic events of social and political history–historical trends that were incipient for high modernist writers, yet not so ineluctably part of the 'weather' as they would become during the 1930s. These developments opened new fault lines in both individual and collective experience […] late modernists laid the foundations for this dangerous way of dwelling.[22]

Waugh, oddly enough, is absent from Miller's list of late modernists – his exemplary writers are Wyndham Lewis, Djuna Barnes, Samuel Beckett, and Mina Loy – but Waugh, nevertheless, inhabited the same political and social environment as they did.[23] As I will argue, exterior modernism is offered here precisely because the term offers a new way of framing modernism rather than a tendency, as in Miller, to adopt the established definitions but to open out into an argument that is essentially a version of 'late style'.

Since Miller's intervention, and particularly in the last five years, there has been a proliferation of modernisms, such as Susan McCabe's *Cinematic Modernism* (2005), Mao and Walkowitz's edited collection *Bad Modernisms* (2006), Kristin Bluemel's edited collection *Intermodernism* (2009), Jessica Burstein's *Cold Modernism* (2012), Abbie Garrington's *Haptic Modernism* (2013), Beci Carver's *Granular Modernism* (2014), and David Bradshaw, Laura Marcus, and Rebecca Roach's edited collection *Moving Modernisms* (2016). None of the studies mentioned except *Granular Modernism* and Patricia Waugh's 'Precarious Voices: Moderns, Moods, and Moving Epochs' in *Moving Modernisms* is concerned with the

---

737-48 (pp. 737-38).

[22] Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction and the Art between the World Wars* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1999), p. 24.

[23] Although Waugh's status as a modernist often needs defending, scholars are becoming increasingly comfortable situating him in the context of a specifically *late* modernism. Waugh has appeared as an exemplary late modernist figure in several recent publications. Marina MacKay, '"Doing Business with Totalitaria": British Late Modernism and the Politics of Reputation', *ELH*, 73/3 (2006), 729-53; Marius Hentea, 'Late Modernist Debuts: Publishing and Professionalizing Young Novelists in 1920s Britain', *Book History*, 14/1 (2011), 167-86; and Ashley Maher, '"Swastika Arms of Passage Leading to Nothing": Late Modernism and the "New" Britain', *ELH*, 80/1 (2013), 251-85.

group of novelists whom I regard as the exterior modernists.[24] *Granular Modernism*, however, only discusses Waugh's *Decline and Fall* (1928) and *Vile Bodies* (1930) and Green's *Blindness* (1926) and *Party Going* (1939).[25] Since Patricia Waugh's essay aims to theorise the mid-century, it does not analyse individual works in great detail.[26] So there is an urgent need – and my thesis hopes to meet such a need – to (re)consider and (re)discover this group of writers in the light of recent developments in modernist studies and also to theorise their writing in order to initiate a new field of enquiry.

The relationship between modernism and cinema has become a distinct research area over the past decade, with important works appearing by Laura Marcus, David Trotter, and Andrew Shail. In *The Tenth Muse* (2007), '[i]ntertwining two major strands of research – the exploration of discourse about the cinema and the cinema's presence in literary texts', Marcus 'shows how issues central to an understanding of cinema (including questions of time, repetition, movement, emotion, vision, sound, and silence) are threaded through both kinds of writing, and explores the ways in which discursive and fictional writings overlap.'[27] Examining 'parallel histories' in *Cinema and Modernism* (2007), Trotter aims 'to substitute for the model of an exchange of transferable techniques the model of parallelism.'[28] Shail in *The Cinema and the Origins of Literary Modernism* (2012) proposes to acknowledge 'the appearance of cinema and its attendant institutions as a major cause for the

[24] Most of the exterior modernists, and, in fact, most of the writers of Waugh's generation, are included in the extensive list of intermodernists at the end of Bluemel's book; Isherwood, however, is a glaring omission. One of *Intermodernism*'s problems lies in its ambitious and undiscriminating inclusivity. Kristin Bluemel, 'Appendix: Who are the Intermodernists?', in *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain*, ed. by Kristin Bluemel (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp. 208-24. For Bluemel, intermodernism's 'three defining features [are] cultural features (intermodernists typically represent working-class and working middle-class cultures); political features (intermodernists are often politically radical, "radically eccentric"); and literary features (intermodernists are committed to non-canonical, even "middlebrow" or "mass" genres).' According to such a definition, Waugh, for example, can hardly be considered an intermodernist. Kristin Bluemel, 'Introduction: What is Intermodernism?', in *Intermodernism*, pp. 1-17 (p. 1).

[25] *Granular Modernism* does not focus on the so-called gap between high modernism and postmodernism. Similar to *Intermodernism*, it is perhaps overly ambitious to include early (Conrad), high (Eliot), and late (Gerhardie, Waugh, Green, and Beckett) modernist figures and cover both fiction and poetry.

[26] See Waugh's discussion of *Party Going*. Patricia Waugh, 'Precarious Voices: Moderns, Moods, and Moving Epochs', in *Moving Modernisms: Motion, Technology, and Modernity*, ed. by David Bradshaw, Laura Marcus, and Rebecca Roach (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 191-213 (pp. 207-09).

[27] Laura Marcus, *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 2.

[28] David Trotter, *Cinema and Modernism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 3.

emergence of modernism in literature in the United Kingdom.'[29] Primarily concerned with high modernism, Marcus, Trotter in *Cinema and Modernism*, and Shail, however, overlook the relationship between cinema and late modernism.[30] I will argue that while the high modernists treated cinema primarily as a toolkit, particularly in relation to ways of seeing (see Chapter One Part One), the exterior modernists recognised cinema's narrativity and made it their method, and that sound cinema in particular contributed greatly to exterior modernism (see Chapter Three).

Concentrating on literary works published in Britain between 1927 and 1939, Trotter's *Literature in the First Media Age* (2013) has moved the discussion forward and can therefore be seen as a sequel to his 2007 book. Although considering writers such as Waugh, Lewis, Green, Graham Greene, Hamilton, and Isherwood, Trotter's more recent study does not engage closely with the debate surrounding late modernism:

> The meta-attitude thus provoked in literature was a prototype of what we would now call cool. Writers presented the slack in the connective systems that had begun to put in place a new global order by developing versions of techno-primitivism, or by imagining an informal sociability that could under other circumstances have become the basis for formal political solidarity, or, sometimes, just by going slow (the detour through parergon). This performative slackness cannot simply be regarded as late Modernist.[31]

But I would argue that this 'cool', similar to Burstein's 'cold', and 'performative slackness' are precisely features of exterior modernism. Nor does Trotter focus on cinema, though the brief analysis of sound cinema extends that of the silent Chaplin in *Cinema and Modernism*. Discussing 'talkativeness' based on what he calls 'the collective novel' by writers with a political leaning to the left, Trotter argues that sound cinema 'created an opportunity to imagine a particular kind of talk as a moral and political value, and to incorporate it into a social logic of space: an understanding of coexistence, of cross-class cooperation, of community, even.'[32] In

---

[29] Andrew Shail, *The Cinema and the Origins of Literary Modernism* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), p. 1.

[30] Marcus's recent collection of her essays, *Dreams of Modernity* (2014), expands the scope of *The Tenth Muse* by introducing psychoanalysis to the discussion of literature and cinema. Chronologically, Marcus looks back to 'the prehistory of modernism in the late nineteenth century', the year 1895 in particular (a significant year to both cinema and Freud). Laura Marcus, *Dreams of Modernity: Psychoanalysis, Literature, Cinema* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 1. See also Laura Marcus and Ankhi Mukherjee, eds, *A Concise Companion to Psychoanalysis, Literature, and Culture* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

[31] David Trotter, *Literature in the First Media Age: Britain Between the Wars* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), pp. 273-74.

[32] Ibid., p. 200.

overemphasising a harmonious sociability, however, Trotter tends to romanticise the portrayal of the masses and their cinemagoing in such works as *Living* (1929), 'a more telling precedent for the collective novel than *Ulysses* or *Mrs Dalloway*.'[33] Green was, in fact, ambiguous about both, and he experimented with a different kind of talkativeness, no less inspired or endorsed by the talkies, and a different kind of collectiveness, the self-regarding 'set' of the upper-middle-classes in *Party Going*, for example, which, for this commentator is both a talk novel and a group novel though hardly satisfying Trotter's preferred criteria (see Chapter Three). Moreover, the sense of community is not intrinsic simply to sound films but is more pervasively generated in the unique space of the cinema.

Waugh, Modernisms, Cinema

Waugh serves as a prime example of an examination, and a theorisation, of exterior modernism because not only is he a key representative of this group in his technical experiments, interest in cinema, and approach to mind and character, he is also its most vocal proponent of ideas concerning the relations between generations, old and new, literary or otherwise. This concern with the characteristics of his own moment, the particular shaping of the ethos and sensibility of his generation is evidently a preoccupation dating back as early as his school editorials and early career journalism and reviews, with the (not so hidden) agenda to promote his own generation, or rather group, and its literary style. Like other exterior modernists and, more generally, other writers of his generation, Waugh had a complex relationship with high modernism. The processes whereby writers affiliate themselves or become affiliated with particular groups or movements are notoriously complex in any case.

Yet there has been little close exploration of the terms and expression of this complicated relationship. George McCartney's seminal *Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition*, originally published in 1987 and reissued in 2004, remains the only monograph exploring Waugh's relationship with modernism. McCartney argues that Waugh parodied high modernism and, like Lewis, 'developed an alternate modernism.'[34] His new introduction to the 2004 edition reiterates that Waugh 'had

[33] Ibid., p. 203.
[34] George McCartney, *Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2004), p. 6.

consciously constructed an alternative modernism, one that took full account of the radical changes that were transforming so much of Western culture in the twentieth century.'[35] But the book, reissued but not updated, does not acknowledge late modernism, which, once engaged, might have helped to provide a fuller account of Waugh's version of modernism. Moreover, seen in the late modernist context, the relationship between Lewis's modernism and that of Waugh's could have been made explicit: not only are both different from high modernism, they are themselves very similar. Comparing and linking the many alternative modernisms has been my first step towards theorising exterior modernism. Similarly, Marina MacKay and Lyndsey Stonebridge's important essay collection *British Fiction After Modernism* (2007) focuses on many exterior modernists but neglects Waugh, who is rarely mentioned. However, MacKay's *Modernism and World War II* (2007) and 'Modernist Nostalgia/Nostalgia for Modernism' (2013) discuss Waugh in detail. But for MacKay, modernism is still understood as high modernism. In proposing a modified version of exterior modernism, my thesis challenges high modernism as the only or dominant mode of modernism.

Waugh's interest in cinema and employment of cinematic techniques in his writing have received much attention though most critics treat Waugh's borrowing from the techniques of cinema as merely a footnote to his fiction. In the first full-length study of Waugh's craft, Frederick Stopp notices 'the wandering film camera [which] picks up snatches of dialogue from one person or group after another':

> There are, in fact, at least two men at work on one Waugh novel. One turns out authenticated sequences of dialogue or literary pastiche linked with narrative comment, the other is in charge of cutting and continuity. The first Waugh, who delivers the film, has a sensitive ear for tone and modulation of speech, and a penchant for caricature; the second Mr Waugh, who is responsible for the *montage*, has an eye for a contrast, and a tendency to burlesque.[36]

Although Richard Jacobs here refers to *Vile Bodies* (1930), a novel that is '*Through the Looking-Glass* […] crossed with *The Waste Land*', his remark is true of Waugh's fiction in general: 'The montage and cutting techniques […], much commented on, are a response as much to Eliot as they are to cinema.'[37] Robert Murray Davis's

[35] Ibid., p. x.
[36] Frederick J. Stopp, *Evelyn Waugh: Portrait of an Artist* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1958), pp. 73, 184-85.
[37] Richard Jacobs, 'Introduction', in Evelyn Waugh, *Vile Bodies* (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. ix-xxxiv

Mischief in the Sun: The Making and Unmaking of The Loved One (1999) is the only book-length, albeit short, study of Waugh in relation to cinema. Drawing on archival materials, particularly Waugh's memorandum to MGM concerning its proposed film adaptation of *Brideshead Revisited* (1945) and the studio's correspondence with the Production Code Administration, it is concerned with the history of cinema in the late forties in the US. Considering both cinematic techniques and history, my thesis, for the first time, examines comprehensively how Waugh, like many other exterior modernists, made cinema over into his method of writing.

Waugh as an Exterior Modernist

This thesis attempts therefore to theorise a group of younger novelists' alternatives to the high modernism of their precursors by developing a concept of exterior modernism, informed by recent work on distributed cognition, that accentuates exteriority both through being 'cool' or 'cold' and eschewing thought and feeling, particularly in their interwar fiction, and through showing how the mind, viewed in its socially oriented engagement with the world as distributed through that world or coupled with it, rather than locked away in introspective disengagement. The exterior modernists adopt what Lewis called 'the outside method', but in ways that I will show owe much to their understanding of social cognition through engagement with techniques and modes drawn from cinema, comedy, satire, and talk.[38]

The organisation of and selection of texts for this thesis has followed the focus on exploring Waugh's exteriority and the variety of ways in which his engagement with cinema manifested itself in his fiction. For example, *A Handful of Dust* (1934) may better represent the thirties than *Vile Bodies*, but the latter was not only composed and published during the conversion to sound in cinema but also immediately engaged with it, so *Vile Bodies* has been selected as one of my key texts for study. I hope my discussions of *Party Going* in Chapter Three in conjunction with *Vile Bodies* and later of *Work Suspended* (1939), as well as references to *A Handful of Dust* and *Scoop* (1938), can provide a fuller picture of the decade from this perspective. The war trilogy *Sword of Honour* (1965) had to be omitted on the grounds of its scope, its uniqueness as a war text, and its resemblance to *Brideshead*

(p. xv).

[38] Wyndham Lewis, *Satire and Fiction* (Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1970), p. 47.

as an exemplification of exterior modernism at mid-century, the complexity of which I attempt to illustrate through an examination instead of *Brideshead* and *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* (1957) (see Chapter Four and Chapter One Part Two).[39]

Chapter One considers Waugh's first short story, 'The Balance' (1925, published in 1926), and his last comic novel, *Pinfold* to suggest a movement of circularity not only in Waugh's individual works but also in his oeuvre. Part One compares 'The Balance' with Woolf's *Jacob's Room* (1922), arguing that both the exterior and high modernists turned to cinema in search of their own literary voices. Part Two reads *Pinfold* as a successful rewriting of 'The Balance' in that the later novel rekindles the concerns in the early story with the inside and outside methods and surpasses the stylistically unstable story by playing with the mind while remaining outside. This is achieved through dissociation: suffering from auditory verbal hallucinations, Pinfold disowns his own thoughts which then return to him as external voices.

While Chapter Two regards Waugh's debut novel, *Decline and Fall*, as the novelistic equivalent to a Chaplin silent film, Chapter Three discusses his second novel, *Vile Bodies*, a talk novel, in relation to the coming of sound to cinema. *Decline and Fall* firmly established Waugh's exterior modernism with the outside method which is particularly informed by cinema, comedy, and satire. Waugh's apprenticeship in novel writing is closely associated with his apprenticeship in cinema as an undergraduate at Oxford, both reviewing and making (silent) films. Waugh admired Chaplin as an artist, and the comic and satiric *Decline and Fall* can be seen as an acknowledgement of Chaplin's influence on him. The novel might be viewed as 'Chaplinesque' both formally and thematically. In the tradition of Greek comedy and the commedia dell'arte, the novel's comedy derives from the body – embodiment and disembodiment – and action. Revealing the inner through the exaggeration of outer signs and signals, such as the actors' gesticulations and chiaroscuro lighting, German expressionist cinema might be cited as another influence on the novel. Moreover, for Waugh and Chaplin (in his feature-length comic films), comedy is inseparable from, and interdependent on, satire: while satire gives meaning and depth to comedy, comedy, in turn, enhances satire, as laughter is a powerful weapon. Both Waugh and Chaplin fiercely satirised the modern times and

[39] *Sword of Honour* and *Put Out More Flags*, an interesting pair, along with other exterior modernists' war and post-war fiction, merit an in-depth investigation, which will be the focus of my future research.

its tendency to turn human into machine.

By contrast, *Vile Bodies* accentuates talk, or external dialogue, which is a hallmark of exterior modernism. It is no coincidence that the group of exterior modernists' experimentation with talk in fiction occurred concurrently with the conversion to sound in cinema. The talkies contributed to the emergence of a variety of talk fiction, particularly by Waugh, Green, Powell, and Isherwood, and promoted the younger writers by offering them work as screenwriters. Moreover, these talk novels can also be viewed as group novels, preoccupied with the group – as opposed to the crowd – and its mind, reflected in inconsequential talk, in a society on the brink of change, brought about by mass movements, particularly the 1926 General Strike, and the imminent war. The mind of the group members is characterised, within the group, by the desire for acceptance and fear of assimilation and, confronted by the crowd, by the unanimous thinking about the containment of the masses and preservation of itself. At its best, the group mind facilitates inclusivity and flexibility; at its worst, it hardens into the exclusivity and rigidity of the 'set'.

Chapter Four regards *Brideshead*, preoccupied with nostalgia and written in evocative language, as a heritage novel, which lends itself to the epic 1981 Granada television drama made in the context of heritage film and television. The mood of the eighties, also dominated by nostalgia, for lost Imperial glory and lost beauty, found its ultimate expression in *Brideshead*. But the novel, perhaps less obviously, is concerned with another kind of heritage too, that of high modernism at the mid-century. Not only revisiting the twenties, it seems also to attempt to evoke its literary style. *Brideshead* can be described as Waugh's most interior novel, not so much because of its accommodation of psychological depth in individual character as for its exploration of depth of feeling more generally in relation to the mood of an era and the cultural constituents of nostalgia. With a distributed sense of affectivity that emphasises the collaboration between objects and emotions, *Brideshead*, complicated by an interiority previously eschewed, can still therefore, and perhaps surprisingly, be considered an exterior modernist work.

Chapter One
'In my beginning is my end'[1]: 'The Balance' and *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*

Part One
Finding the Voice through Cinema:
Woolf's *Jacob's Room* and Waugh's 'The Balance'

For critics of twentieth-century literature, Woolf and Waugh make an odd couple. There is no evidence of any explicit dialogue between the two. Indeed it is not clear whether Woolf commented on Waugh or even read him, though Waugh, a novelist of the next generation, did read Woolf. On Monday 28 September 1925, Waugh wrote in his diary: 'Claud lent me a novel by Virginia Woolf which I refuse to believe is good.'[2] *Mrs Dalloway*, published in May 1925, was likely to have been the novel due to the proximity of its publication to the date and plausibly given Waugh's comments, because his first fictional piece, a short story entitled 'The Balance', completed in late August of the same year appeared the polar opposite of Woolf's novel.[3] If J. P. Stern's middle-distance realism is taken as a reference point, both Woolf and Waugh depart from it in seeking their distinctive voices: Woolf, to appropriate a cinematic argot, in close-up, in an emphasis on interior modernism, Waugh in long shot, which might be considered an exterior modernism.[4]

Chapter One Part One compares two pivotal texts in both writers' careers, Woolf's *Jacob's Room* (1922) and Waugh's little-known story 'The Balance' (1925, published in 1926), to explore two different versions of modernism and therefore challenge the perception of interior modernism as the dominant form of modernism.

---

[1] T. S. Eliot, *Four Quartets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), p. 21.

[2] Evelyn Waugh, *The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Michael Davie (London: Phoenix, 2009), p. 237. Claud Cockburn was Waugh's cousin.

[3] Ibid., pp. 229-30.

[4] J. P. Stern's middle distance is the 'balance between inner and outer', or 'the distance the narrator keeps from his characters', which, he argues, 'will vary according to the realist's particular purpose and conveyed meaning'. J. P. Stern, *On Realsim* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), p. 114. *Jacob's Room* and 'The Balance' oscillate between inner and outer because Woolf and Waugh were searching for their authorial voices; their next works, *Mrs Dalloway* and *Decline and Fall*, see them owning confidently their own voices.

Moreover, the intersection of these two writers in the early twenties reveals Woolf at her most exterior and Waugh at his most interior and thus problematises the conceptual framework within which they are often situated. I examine their respective work through a consideration of cinema, which played an essential role in both writers' search for their own voices: however ambiguous Woolf's attitude towards cinema was, her writing style was unequivocally cinematic; Waugh, confident in his knowledge of cinema, incorporated the medium to help forge his unique style. But Woolf took advantage of cinema differently from Waugh; while cinema became Waugh's method, Woolf seemed to be only interested in the camera eye.

The texts under review mark an important stage in both writers' quest for an original voice. Woolf wrote in her diary on 26 July 1922: 'There's no doubt in my mind that I have found out how to begin (at 40) to say something in my own voice.'[5] T. S. Eliot also commented on the originality of Woolf's third novel, *Jacob's Room*: 'she had freed herself from any compromise between the traditional novel and her original gift'.[6] According to Frank Kermode, this freedom was what Eliot himself sought in *The Waste Land* (1922).[7] Interestingly, Waugh's 'The Balance' had been rejected by the Hogarth Press and various other publishers before it was eventually included by his brother in Chapman & Hall's *Georgian Stories* (1926). In this short story, the struggling yet confident young writer can also be said to have found his own voice, if a very different one from that of Woolf's.

What both Woolf and Waugh sought and found, however, was a writing style distinct from that of their immediate precursors. With her proclamation that 'on or about December 1910 human character changed', Woolf set the Georgians, her own generation, in opposition to those of the Edwardians: Wells, Bennett, and Galsworthy.[8] Up against what she still saw as a realism grounded in the mode of 'materialism', she famously called for a new kind of voice in modern fiction, one that might explore the 'dark places of psychology'.[9] Waugh, with an equally keen, if not keener, idea of the positioning of his own generation vis–à–vis immediate

[5] Virginia Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Anne Oliver Bell, 5 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1977-84), II (1978), p. 186.
[6] Frank Kermode, 'Biographical Preface', in *Virginia Woolf: Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. vii-x (p. x).
[7] Ibid.
[8] Woolf, 'Character in Fiction', in *Selected Essays*, pp. 37-54 (p. 38).
[9] Woolf, 'Modern Fiction', in *Selected Essays*, pp. 6-12 (p. 11).

precursors, was also beginning to experiment in his own, equally singular fashion, with language, dialogue, characterisation, and technique. More than Woolf, however, Waugh decidedly found his dissenting voice through the challenge of the new art of cinema.

Both departing from what Stern terms the middle distance 'at which realism portrays and preserves persons and their world in their time-bound, relative integrity', Woolf and Waugh would eventually go opposite ways: while Woolf held her material close up, Waugh observed through the long shot.[10] Paradoxically, *Jacob's Room*, in which Woolf claims to have found her 'voice', is replete with multiple externalised perspectives, action, and dialogue, and is the least interiorised and the most impressionistic of Woolf's novels, compared to her middle experimental writing from 1925 to 1931 with their further development of her 'tunnelling technique', varieties of interior monologue, free indirect discourse, expressionism, and soliloquy.[11] Even more paradoxical, perhaps, is the fact that 'The Balance', contrary to the recognised profiles of these two writers, is arguably one of the most psychologically interiorised pieces that Waugh ever published.

The fact that Woolf – regarded as the central English modernist writer of fiction – and Waugh – marginalised in relation to the accepted modernist canon – were experimenting at approximately the same time, but in completely different directions and in the years most representative of high modernism, problematises dominant constructions of modernism as axiomatically concerned in fiction with psychological depth, interiorisation, and the flight from plot and external action. Examining Waugh and Woolf in relation to their own writerly projects challenges the periodisation of modernism and thus allows greater critical attention to be paid to Waugh and to other writers who have been marginalised by and excluded from the modernist canon. Both Woolf and Waugh may be viewed as equally modern: if we accept Patricia Waugh and David Herman's arguments for a more distributed representation of mind in modernism, Woolf's greater interiorisation and Waugh's evident exteriorisation become points on a continuum rather than distant views across a divide.

[10] Stern, p. 126.
[11] Woolf, *Diaries II*, pp. 263, 272.

Jacob's Room and the Cinema Eye

Woolf's literary experimentation begins with the Cubist experiment in multi-perspectivism of *Jacob's Room*. Despite her reputation as an interiorised novelist, multi-perspectivism, impressionist sketching, dialogue, and action abound in this novel, so much so that they appear to endow it with what might be regarded as a cinematic style. As early as 1932, in the first book-length study of Woolf's writing, Winifred Holtby commented on 'the cinematograph technique' of *Jacob's Room*:

> Almost any page in the book could be transferred straight on to a film. The story deals mainly with the external evidence of emotions, even thoughts and memories assuming pictorial quality. Sometimes, it is true, the action passes to that confused twilight which dwells within the mind; but for the most part it is indicated by the changing positions and gestures of the characters. […] It is a picture-maker's novel.[12]

In *The Tenth Muse*, Marcus traces the history of Woolf and cinema through her analysis of individual novels in chronological order from *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs Dalloway*, *To the Lighthouse* (1927), to *The Years* (1937), drawing on Woolf's critical writing on cinema and situating Woolf in the context of her contemporary literary and cinematic culture. What fascinates Marcus is Woolf's 'address to and engagement with some of the central dimensions of the film medium and its conceptualization: questions of beauty and aesthetics; absence and presence; film historiography and the "evolution" of cinema; stasis and movement; motion and emotion; space and time; the realms of eye and ear; private consciousness and the "voice-over" of public discourses.'[13]

While Marcus still operates in a similar vein to what Trotter terms 'argument by analogy', Trotter, instead, proposes 'the model of parallelism': 'Some early film-makers shared with some writers of the period a conviction both that the instrumentality of the new recording media had made it possible for the first time to present (as well as to record) *existence as such*; and that the superabundant generative power of this instrumentality […] put in doubt the very idea of existence as such.'[14] Compared with Marcus's comprehensive investigation, Trotter's short analysis focuses on the interaction of presence and absence, asserting that Woolf's

---

[12] Winifred Holtby, *Virginia Woolf: A Critical Memoir* (Chicago: Academy Press, 1978), p. 117.
[13] Laura Marcus, *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 178.
[14] Trotter, *Cinema*, pp. 1, 3-4.

reflections on cinema – 'The Cinema' (1926) was written at the same time as the 'Time Passes' section of *To the Lighthouse* – enabled her to 'imagine constitutive absence in *To the Lighthouse*, as she had not been able to in *Mrs Dalloway*'.[15] Trotter's parallel histories shed light on cinema and modernism from a different angle. However, examining the ways in which cinema contributed to Woolf's and Waugh's finding of their authorial voices – though to different degrees – I argue that an exploration of their cinematic techniques is particularly illuminating.

Woolf's technique of multi-perspectival impressionist sketching might be imagined as the existence and movement of a camera throughout *Jacob's Room*. This camera pans, and each character is first illuminated and brought into focus, and then quickly obscured and abandoned:

> Florinda was sick.
>
> Mrs Durant, sleepless as usual, scored a mark by the side of certain lines in the *Inferno*.
>
> Clara slept buried in her pillows; on her dressing-table dishevelled roses and a pair of long white gloves.[16]

The large gaps between each short one-sentence paragraph – double spacing between the first two paragraphs cited, and triple spacing between the second and the last and between these three paragraphs as a whole and both preceding and following texts – are clearly Woolf's stylistic design for visual effects. Like an island, the montage is not only distanced but also seems completely detached from the rest of the text.[17] This foregrounding of a formal design creates a sense of defamiliarisation that, in turn, prolongs the time of perception and draws attention to the innovative technique. The novel displays self-reference certainly, but formal self-reference should be differentiated from mental introspection: in blurring the distinctiveness of formal, logical, and existential meanings of an inward turn as a mode of self-reference, Woolf is read simply as psychological and Waugh as behaviourist. The reality is

---

[15] Ibid., p. 12.

[16] *JB*, p. 103.

[17] For Sergei Eisenstein, 'the cinema is able, more than any other art, to disclose the process that goes on microscopically in all other arts./ The minimum "distortable" fragment of nature is the shot; ingenuity in its combinations is montage.' Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essay in Film Theory*, ed. and trans. by Jay Leyda (London: Dennis Dobson, 1963), p. 5.

more complex and decidedly less binary.

Woolf borrowed the montage technique from cinema not only to juxtapose but also to connect. In the following two paragraphs, two cameras are working at the same time – one is following every move of Jacob, the protagonist, the main storyline, with whom the reader is momentarily invited to identify and through whose eyes to see; the other is tracing Fanny Elmer and Nick Braham, one of the many minor storylines, which helps to achieve Woolf's vision of a panoramic view of life and interconnected lives – to show how Jacob finally comes to meet Fanny and Nick at the appointed time and place: what is happening on Jacob's way, what, in the meantime and in contrast, Fanny and Nick are doing, and, all the more importantly, the three lives and two storylines eventually converge at the Empire. This preoccupation with mapping the gendered and cultural geographies displayed in *Jacob's Room* will be fully realised in her next novel, *Mrs Dalloway*. Jacob, Fanny, and Nick walking the street of the metropolitan capital, which delineates the fluidity of life, anticipates the numerous city walks made not only by Mrs Dalloway but also by Peter Walsh, Richard and Elizabeth Dalloway. The action-packed, exquisitely choreographed, lean, straightforward, energetic, and somewhat journalistic style recalls Waugh, if not Hemingway, rather than the exuberant, lyrical, elusive, fluid, and meditative style expected of Woolf: 'Fanny Elmer took down her cloak from the hook. Nick Bramham unpinned his drawing and rolled it under his arm. They turned out the lights and set off down the street holding on their way through all the people, motor cars, omnibuses, carts until they reached Leicester Square, five minutes before Jacob reached it'.[18]

Interestingly, what ensues resembles a cinemagoing experience. Although not acquired and rebuilt by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer as a cinema until the late twenties, the Empire at Leicester Square, in Jacob's time, was a theatre that showed live performances, including ballet, with short films at intervals.[19] Fanny falls in love with Jacob – meeting him for the first time – in such a cinema/theatre environment:

> he was still awkward, only Fanny thought : 'What a beautiful voice!' She thought how little he said yet how firm it was. She thought how young men are dignified and aloof, and how unconscious they are, and how quietly one might sit beside Jacob and look at him. And how childlike he would be, come in tired of an evening, and how majestic; a

[18] *JB*, p. 159.

[19] 'Heritage', *Empire Cinemas*, last accessed 3 August 2016, < http://www.empirecinemas.co.uk/about_us/heritage/c47/t5>.

> little overbearing perhaps; 'But I wouldn't give way,' she thought.[20]

Like many cinemagoers, traditionally the female in particular, Fanny dreams and fantasises, admiring Jacob in the 'smoke hung about him' – 'And for ever the beauty of young men seems to be set in smoke' – and imagining a life with him.[21] The darkened (movie) theatre seems conducive to such 'irrational passion'.[22]

While the novel, as a whole, is a play of multiple perspectives, Woolf also played with the actual individual perspectives by oscillating between long shot and close-up. The middle distance that has been marked as the territory of realism seems to be carefully avoided. First the reader is given a long shot of the 'white Cornish cottages [that] are built on the edge of the cliff' and of the tourists observing and commenting on Mrs Pascoe: 'Look – she has to draw her water from a well in the garden.'[23] Then a closer look of the old woman is made available: 'Her face was assuredly not soft, sensual, or lecherous, but hard, wise, wholesome rather, signifying in a room full of sophisticated people the flesh and blood of life.'[24] Without glasses, the tourists cannot see Mrs Pascoe's face; they can only see her withdraw into her cottage. Therefore, they decide to move on. This alternation of perspective continues. Mrs Durrant calls for Mrs Pascoe, who then appears, and they are in conversation. Twenty yards away on a carriage, Curnow, Mrs Pascoe's nephew, sees

> his mistress go into the cottage; come out again; and pass, talking energetically to judge by the movements of her hands, round the vegetable plot in front of the cottage. […] Both women surveyed a bush. Mrs Durrant stooped and picked a sprig from it. Next she pointed (her movements were peremptory; she held herself very upright) at the potatoes. They had the blight. […] The boy Curnow *knew* that Mrs Durrant was saying that it is perfectly simple; you mix the powder in a gallon of water; 'I have done it with my own hands in my own garden,' Mrs Durrant was saying.[25]

To say Curnow knows is inaccurate; it is from his observation that he infers what Mrs Durrant is saying. Within the same sentence, by the direct speech of what Mrs Durrant says next, he is proved to have guessed correctly. The semicolon which momentarily separates the guess from the result does not create a sense of suspense.

---

[20] *JB*, p. 160.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid. If they are seeing a film, interestingly, Fanny does not dream about the stars on the screen; it is because she treats Jacob as someone as unattainable as a film star, if not a god.
[23] Ibid., p. 68.
[24] Ibid., pp. 69-70.
[25] Ibid., pp. 71-72. Italics mine.

The confirmation so eagerly offered gives the illusion that observation will eventually lead to the truth. The different types of observation, mediated, in the case of a long shot, and unmediated, in a close-up, mirror the multiple perspectives provided by all those people surrounding Jacob with regard to his identity. Surely close observation is not always allowed. The fact that much of the descriptive observation of Jacob himself is mediated goes some way in explaining the unknowability of the mysterious protagonist. Even if close observation is provided, it is still difficult to know the truth, which is always inferred, never directly told. However seamless Curnow's guess and Mrs Durrant's action are, the assumptions about Jacob are never confirmed or denied by Jacob himself. Obtaining the truth only through observation and inference can therefore be unreliable and misleading.

So Woolf's style as she found her 'voice' was also not a little shaped by the experience of the cinematic, despite the fact that Woolf's professed attitude towards cinema in her essays and reviews of this time, was, at worst, contemptuous and, at best, ambiguous. In her 1918 *TLS* review of Compton Mackenzie's *The Early Life and Adventures of Sylvia Scarlett* (1918), she denounced it as 'The "Movie" Novel': 'No, it is not a book of adventures; it is a book of cinema.'[26] In 'The Cinema', her only full essay on cinema, Woolf, aware of the possibilities of cinema, was unsure about its future: 'How all this is to be attempted, much less achieved, no one at the moment can tell us'.[27] She was, however, critical of the relation between cinema and literature, film adaptations of novels in particular: 'The cinema fell upon its prey with immense rapacity, and to the moment largely subsists upon the body of its unfortunate victim. But the results are disastrous to both. The alliance is unnatural. Eye and brain are torn asunder ruthlessly as they try vainly to work in couples.'[28] Privileging interiority in fiction and probing into the mind of her characters, Woolf's fierce protest against the union of literature and cinema, and against cinema in general, which fails to go beneath the surface and thus only appeals to the eye, is perhaps not hard to understand.

The disconnection between eye and brain is particularly interesting: 'The eye licks it all up instantaneously, and the brain, agreeably titillated, settles down to

[26] Virginia Woolf, 'The "Movie" Novel', in *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Andrew McNeillie and Stuart Nelson Clarke, 5 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1986-94), II (1987), pp. 288-91 (p. 291).
[27] Virginia Woolf, 'The Cinema', in *Collected Essays*, ed. by Leonard Woolf, 4 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1966-67), II (1966), pp. 268-72. (p. 272).
[28] Ibid., p. 269.

watch things happening without bestirring itself to think.'[29] Woolf seemed to suggest that the inevitable split in attention that cinema requires between a Gestalt-oriented or spatialised grasp of the moving pictures on the screen and a more inward narrative sense of temporality is something that is too much of a challenge for perceptual consciousness, too much of a challenge to its capacity for integration. It is not hard therefore to see what she also suggested in this essay – that cinema is like watching one's life scroll past with oneself left out of the picture: 'We see life as it is when we have no part in it.'[30] In some ways that was exactly the effect which fascinated Waugh and perhaps fascinated Woolf more than she knew. In 'Street Haunting: A London Adventure' (1927), Woolf reflected, in a similar vein – even expressed in similar language – on the activity of seeing while one is walking, another kind of seeing in motion, with 'a central oyster of perceptiveness, an enormous eye': 'But, after all, we are only gliding smoothly on the surface. The eye is not a miner, not a diver, not a seeker after buried treasure. It floats us smoothly down a stream, resting, pausing, the brain sleeps perhaps as it looks.'[31]

Warning cinemateurs to avoid what in experience must only be 'accessible to words and to words alone,' Woolf, however, found opportunities for the specifically cinematic in that 'if so much of our thinking and feeling is connected with seeing, some residue of visual emotion which is of no use either to painter or poet' might therefore remain for this new art form.[32] Cinema may not have depth, but the art of seeing is greatly enhanced by the camera eye. Cinema's potential lies in its ability to realise fantasies that cannot be achieved by words, words alone:

> The most fantastic contrasts could be flashed before us with a speed which the writer can only toil after in vain; the dream architecture of arches and battlements, of cascades falling and fountains rising, which sometimes visits us in sleep or shapes itself in half-darkened rooms, could be realized before our waking eyes. No fantasy could be too far-fetched or insubstantial. The past could be unrolled, distances annihilated, and the gulfs which dislocate novels […] could by the sameness of the background, by the repetition of some scene, be smoothed away.[33]

As I have shown, despite her critical relation to cinema, unconsciously perhaps Woolf imbibed lessons from it and transferred them to a prose medium in *Jacob's Room*. So Woolf had a certain fascination with cinema, ambivalent certainly, but

[29] Ibid., p. 268.
[30] Ibid., p. 269.
[31] Woolf, 'Street Haunting: A London Adventure', in *Selected Essays*, pp. 177-87 (p. 178).
[32] Woolf, 'The Cinema', p. 271.
[33] Ibid., p. 272.

perhaps exerting more pressure on the discovery of her 'voice' than might have been apparent to her, without claiming a kind of outright disavowal. However, if Woolf's style can be argued to be at least in part cinematic, it is evidently not entirely executed at a fully conscious level. Conversely, Waugh's relation to the cinematic was evidently intentional, purposeful, and regarded by him as intrinsic to what would eventually emerge as his singular modernist 'voice' as manifested in and after 'The Balance'.

'The Balance' and the Cinematic Method

Shortly after the publication of *Vile Bodies*, Waugh reviewed Lewis's *Satire and Fiction* (1930). He regarded it as 'an intensely interesting and amusing book […] particularly the observations about the "Outside and Inside" method of fiction.'[34] Lewis labelled 'the *Inside*-method' inept – in his opinion, 'many books written during the last few years [i.e. the twenties] have been peculiarly inept.'[35] He pointed out 'the dark WITHIN of the Unconscious' by criticising Joyce's *Ulysses* and D. H. Lawrence and stated in various ways that '[t]he ossature is my favourite part of a living animal organism, not its intestines.'[36] Picking up this allusion to inside and outside, Waugh had had a similar debate with himself.

Well aware of the literary culture of the twenties, Waugh witnessed and engaged with it as it was in the making. He disapproved of 'the inside method' at that time and experimented with 'the outside method'. In 'Felix Culpa' (1948), his review of Graham Greene's *The Heart of the Matter* (1948), Waugh declared: 'The artist, however aloof he holds himself, is always and specially the creature of the *Zeitgeist*; however formally antique his tastes, he is in spite of himself in the advance guard.'[37] The elite and avant-garde cultural *Zeitgeist* of Waugh's formative years was dominated by the high modernism of the twenties; Waugh, a young artist in his twenties, was unmistakably avant-garde. Yet his attitude towards the modernism of Woolf and Joyce was complicated, which lends uniqueness to Waugh's craft.

McCartney argues that '[a]t every turn, his writing pays parodic tribute to modernist art and literature. Although he deplored many of the movement's aims, he

[34] Waugh, 'Satire and Fiction', in *EAR*, p. 102.
[35] Lewis, *Satire and Fiction*, p. 47.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Waugh, 'Felix Culpa', in *EAR*, pp. 360-65 (p. 360).

nevertheless admired its methods, borrowing them freely whenever it suited his purpose to do so.'[38] For McCartney, Waugh's modernism lies in 'his playful handling of Nietzschean and Bergsonian themes, his ironic reworking of Bauhaus and Futurist theories, or his borrowings from film technique'.[39] Parody is not neutral: it is a form of complex homage and critique, a way of negotiating closeness and distance, influence and the desire for individual voice. According to Linda Hutcheon, parody,

> in its ironic 'trans-contextualization' and inversion, is repetition with difference. A critical distance is implied between the backgrounded text being parodied and the new incorporating work, a distance usually signalled by irony. But this irony can be playful as well as belittling; it can be critically constructive as well as destructive. The pleasure of parody's irony comes not from humour in particular but from the degree of engagement of the reader in the intertextual 'bouncing' (to use E. M. Forster's famous term) between complicity and distance.[40]

Parody is a mode of the self-referential without being an 'inward turn': it helps us to remember that the so-called 'inward turn' is to form and language and other texts and not simply to consciousness and its representation. Self-reference as a concept means more than introspection: it is a way of understanding language, form, representation as modes of autopoeisis or self-generation and it is a marked aspect of the linguistic self-referentiality of the modernist text. In parody, for example, the text borrows from but self-reflexively turns back towards in order to displace established constructs and to break out of tired conventions. Modernist fiction is thus more than the turning inwards that is seen to characterise the so-called psychological novel and this is what both Waugh and Woolf grasped in their related but unique ways. Marina MacKay states that Waugh and his generation of novelists who came immediately after Woolf and Joyce took modernism too seriously to simply imitate it.[41] However, it is more likely that they wished not to take modernism so seriously that they had to copy or overtly reject their precursors as if in some grand heretical gesture. Waugh, like Woolf, had no wish simply to delve introspectively into the self and

---

[38] McCartney, pp. 6-7.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), p. 32.

[41] Quoted from MacKay's keynote speech given at the 'Efface the Trace!': Modernism and Influence Conference at Durham University in 2013. MacKay regards Waugh, like Anthony Powell, as one of high modernism's 'untimely admirers'. Marina MacKay, 'Modernist Nostalgia/Nostalgia for Modernism: Anthony Powell and Evelyn Waugh', in *Modernism and Nostalgia: Bodies, Location, Aesthetics*, ed. by Tammy Clewell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 237-251 (p. 237).

consciousness and equally no desire to return to the middle-distance Realism of the Edwardians and the Victorian novel. Waugh chose the long shot, the other end of the middle distance spectrum from Woolf's close-up. But the very form of his story 'The Balance', where his experimentation began, also reveals that he saw the choice as possibilities on a continuum and not a two part logical either/or.

'The Balance' is a rather clichéd story: after Adam, the protagonist, who is in love with Imogen, one of the Bright Young People, is rejected by her, he attempts suicide but fails. What makes it stand out is its style, or rather its range of heterogeneous styles. 'The Balance', divided into four distinctive parts, is indeed a strange piece. The short 'INTRODUCTION' – the title of each part is written in capitals perhaps to echo the captions of the silent film shown in the second part – consists mainly of dialogue. 'CIRCUMSTANCES', the bulk of the story, recounts a silent film peppered with comments made by two servant girls and a young man with a Cambridge accent in the cinema. 'CONCLUSION' allows a psychological depth that is rare in Waugh's fiction. 'CONTINUATION' returns to the careless and outrageous world of the Bright Young People at the outset of the story, but it is an observation from an outsider, the mother of one of the set.

In 'CIRCUMSTANCES', a silent film is expected to be *read* with the aid of captions, descriptions of dialogue and action and comments from the audiences as well as the writer: 'The conversations in the film are deduced by the experienced picture-goer from the gestures of the actors; only those parts which appear in capitals are actual "captions".'[42] Unlike Woolf in *Jacob's Room*, Waugh broke the myth of the assumed verificationist power of rational inference, by explicitly showing its inaccuracy and unreliability. But both of them saw that the mind is not so easily available to be read or represented in fiction. In Adam's drawing class, only because 'he stands for some time glaring at the model without drawing a line', Ada concludes that Adam is in love with the model; '*[b]ut for once Ada's explanation is wrong* – and then [Adam] begins sketching in the main lines of the pose.'[43] What is inferred, not told, sometimes turns out to be far from the truth, and the truth itself hovers uneasily on the horizons of inference, induction, and deduction.

'CIRCUMSTANCES' occasionally reads like a script with technical directions:

---

[42] Waugh, 'The Balance', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 3-38 (p. 4).
[43] Ibid., p. 10.

Close up: the heroine.
Close up: the hero asleep.
Fade out.[44]

That is not simply one close-up followed by another; as Imogen and Adam are not physically together, the two close-ups juxtapose together to create a montage. 'Fade out' provides a sense of an ending – the end of a day and the end of the ill-starred courtship.

The film ends with Adam taking his own life by drinking poison. The implication is that an individual's suffering means nothing to other people; interior cogitation like one's sensory awareness and experience of the world is not only unknowable, but mostly does not even concern or interest others, those exterior to oneself who are similarly alone in their own private worlds. Having left the cinema, the audiences go about their usual business. The working class girls expect a comedy so that they can laugh and relax; a tragedy is not appreciated.[45] 'CONCLUSION', the afterlife of the film outside the cinema, is, in fact, the real life for Adam. People tend to identify themselves with cinemagoers and therefore observe others as unreal lives from films or plays; however, they fail to realise that others are only as real as they themselves.

The uniqueness of 'The Balance' lies in the penultimate part entitled 'CONCLUSION'. The silent film in the previous part concludes with Adam alone in his hotel room after midnight, drinking poison. 'Then moved by some odd instinct he turns out the light and curls himself up under the coverlet.'[46] In this part, when the next morning comes, Adam miraculously awakens from his death: 'He cogitated: therefore he was',[47] a clear parody of Descartes and another self-referential motif that alerts us to Waugh's preoccupation with the question of solipsism, of how one can approach, understand, grasp the mind of another, and the paradoxes of introspection that position the seeker of selfhood as ever outside the prison of his or her own consciousness. The short 'CONCLUSION' is further divided into three sections. Section I is sandwiched between 'the tea grew cold upon the chamber cupboard', a sentence which also appears precisely in the middle.[48] The repetition

[44] Ibid., p. 6.
[45] Ibid., p. 30.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid., p. 31.
[48] Ibid., 30, 31, 32.

and the exactitude of the timing parody some of the canonical high modernist works. Prufrock, for example: 'In the room the women come and go/ Talking of Michelangelo.'[49] The tea, usually appreciated for its sobering effect, is here turned into something soporific. Or is it meant to be a contrast? Like Prufrock, Adam is so busy cogitating and ruminating, or rather in his case, perhaps hallucinating under the residual effect of the poison that the tea, supposedly helpful to bring him back to his right mind, is left alone, turning cold 'slowly and imperceptibly'.[50]

In marked contrast to the earlier externalised superficiality of the cinematic, the reader is invited into Adam's mind, which at once recalls and analyses what has happened last night: 'as the image of the taste began to bulk larger in his field of consciousness, as though with the sudden breaking down of some intervening barrier another memory swept in on him blotting out all else with its intensity.'[51] In displaying Adam's mind at work, one strange thing happens: that is the visualisation of taste. This displacement perhaps parodies Proust and also explicitly alludes to Freud, teasing the reader to supply some Freudian depth.[52]

After Adam comes back to life, the first phase he experiences is 'detachment', which is followed by 'one of methodical investigation':

> Almost simultaneously with his acceptance of his continued existence had come the conception of pain – vaguely at first as of a melody played by another to which his senses were only fitfully attentive, but gradually taking shape as the tangible objects about him gained in reality, until at length it appeared as a concrete thing, external but intimately attached to himself. Like the pursuit of quicksilver with a spoon, Adam was able to chase it about *the walls of his consciousness* until at length he drove it into a corner in which he could examine it at his leisure.[53]

Pain is the philosopher's favourite exemplar for the problem of other minds. The pain which is driven by Adam to the corner of his consciousness is the effect of the trauma that will haunt him and continually seek expression, resurfacing when least expected.

The story is strange: it is almost Waugh's manifesto for why he chose externality over inwardness, the psychoanalytic in particular. Eschewing then dominant 'Death of the Author' criticism, Martin Stannard has no reservation in observing that 'The

---

[49] T. S. Eliot, 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock', in *The Waste Land and Other Poems* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), pp. 3-8 (pp. 3, 4).
[50] 'Balance', p. 32.
[51] Ibid., p. 31.
[52] The story contains a few allusions to Freud. '[Adam] remembered as in a nightmare' (p. 31). Later, Adam sees '[a] small child [passing] him sucking her thumb in Freudian ecstasy' (p. 35).
[53] Ibid., p.33-34. Italics mine.

Balance' 'represents an effort to rationalise [Waugh's] disordered life through artistic expression'.[54] Stannard foregrounds the question of style: Waugh 'became a serious writer as much interested in stylistic innovation as Joyce or Gertrude Stein. He was even concerned with the identical aesthetic problem of developing a new form of literary expression which banished the author's intrusive voice.'[55] Waugh distanced himself from his real-life problems not only through fictionalisation as a broad defence strategy, but also through a specific kind of fiction which orients itself towards exteriority rather than the introspective. However, it remains debatable whether he attempted to limit the presence of the author in the text as a specifically verbal presence. In his most stylistically experimental work, *Vile Bodies*, the occasional appearances of the author in the forms of asides or parentheses provide disproportionately crucial information. Waugh managed to achieve authorial distance through taking on the role of the commentator of his own work.

In Section III of 'The Balance', Adam engages in a philosophical discussion with 'the reflection'. Waugh makes it explicit that the balance which Adam struggles to achieve is that between life and death, or between appetite and reason, and that the conclusion is that 'in the end circumstance decides.'[56] Moreover, there seems to be another balance: Waugh's own precarious stance between the new and the old, modernism and realism, a young artist beginning to develop his own voice in a balance which may be broadly understood as suspended between the exterior and the interior. In this story, he offered both, equally, but divided, and no conclusion was drawn.

Waugh set cinema against the novel; having examined what cinema could do in terms of exteriority, he immediately showed what the novel could achieve in exploring the mind. That such a diversity of styles appeared in one short story indicated the young writer's ambition; or rather, he was examining all the possibilities and groping to find his own voice. Having tried out the philosophical and interior modernist style in the third part of 'The Balance', he decided against it. For someone who was obsessed with the idea of generation and prided himself, professedly at least, on not only championing but actually being the Other, it is perhaps hardly surprising that Waugh would choose to steer away from the

[54] Martin Stannard, *Evelyn Waugh: The Early Years, 1903-1939* (New York: Norton, 1986), p. 116.
[55] Ibid., p. 118.
[56] 'Balance', p. 36.

established preoccupations of modernism as he saw them and of a *Zeitgeist* fascinated with Freud, Bergson, and early dynamic psychology, and waywardly instead set his mind to create something new that was inextricably caught up therefore in the need for anchorage in versions of the old, of tradition, ritual, the past, even as that would come to be written through an ideologically declinist frame.

In 'The Balance', Waugh explored cinema as a method; at the same time, he ridiculed cinema itself as a form of culture, if not altogether the working-class cinemagoers in search of pleasure and distraction. Acutely aware of cinema's power of narration, he, however, could not reconcile that cinema perhaps brought down the divide between high and low culture. Like Woolf, Waugh had reservations about the potential for the marriage of literature and cinema. The experiment that Waugh had started in 'The Balance' and further explored in his first novel, *Decline and Fall*, culminates in his second, *Vile Bodies*. No longer wavering between the exterior and the interior, Waugh had discovered his voice through the incorporation of cinematic techniques fully into fiction in order to achieve a defamiliarising exteriority that was now in no need of a deconstructively pitched alternative interiority to achieve its effects. His characters, whether or not the Bright Young People, are sketched as caricatures, flat, comic, dramatic, and mysterious.

There was a fundamental difference in what the cinema meant to Woolf and Waugh. Woolf dismissed cinema as only for the eye, but Waugh proved it to be a powerful narrative method that was more than visual. For Woolf, who was always fascinated by the art of seeing, it was only the camera eye that attracted her to cinema. She learned from the film techniques of spatial montage and applied it to her own writing largely to juxtapose anomalous entities, drawing the reader's attention to normally excluded perspectives, to the perceptions of the marginalised Other, such as Septimus Smith and the dwarf in 'Street Haunting'.[57] By contrast, what brought Waugh to cinema was the detachment that it was, as a method, able to offer. Paradoxically, while the cinema provided a tool for Woolf to look out, it helped Waugh to look in, though from a distance, to deal with the pain and suffering in his personal life, and to ultimately reconcile himself with himself. More than autobiographical, it suggested a stylistic interest in interiority at this early stage of his style. From an epistemological point of view, although both Woolf and Waugh

[57] For Woolf, however, to see not 'beauty pure and uncomposed' but 'their more obscure angles and relationships', one must 'halt'. Woolf, 'Street Haunting', p. 179.

believed in the unknowability of others' minds, their reactions were in other ways the converse of each other – while Woolf kept exploring and attempted to unravel the mystery of the human mind, Waugh considered its inner workings to be an impossible self-referential mystery, a potential infinite regress that leads to madness; Waugh gave up understanding the mind through any kind of introspective act. He contented himself with the surface; the responsibility of soul searching was a task left for the reader.

Part Two

The Sense of an Ending: *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*

Waugh's last comic novel *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold: A Conversational Piece* (1957) is concerned with the writer-protagonist's experience of hearing voices, whose nature is almost always mocking and abusive.[1] Pinfold hears myriad voices consistently targeting him, and attributes their source to 'The Box', which bears a resemblance to some of the medical devices of the time, and also to the radio.[2] The novel ends with the ageing protagonist, who constantly compares himself to King Lear, having fought valiantly against his imaginary enemies alone, emerging triumphant. Pinfold might be seen as a comic anti-hero, but he is likely to elicit sympathies.[3]

In Part One, I have argued how Waugh, as a young writer, attempted to strike a balance between the inner and the outer but eventually decided against the high modernism of his precursors and began to develop his own exterior modernism. In this section of the chapter, I will jump ahead to the end of Waugh's career in order to illustrate a movement of circularity, a characteristic process of bending back and returning, of viewing the temporal as also cyclical that is evident throughout Waugh's career. Indeed, I would argue that this tendency might serve to challenge the prevalent and all too convenient view of rupture, the existence of an early and later divide in his oeuvre, that is the more common understanding of his career. More than simply carrying a few uncanny allusions to 'The Balance', *Pinfold* rekindles and intensifies the debate begun in the short story concerning the inside method, adopted by his high modernist precursors, and the outside method, advocated by many writers of his generation, such as Green, Isherwood, and Powell, and so it successfully rewrites the story. The middle-aged novelist was so much more confident in his outside method than the artist as a young man that he was able to play with the mind without being concerned with getting inside it. The interior is exteriorised through dissociation. Pinfold's is an extended mind that works like a radio: he broadcasts his thoughts back to himself as external voices and then he

[1] *Pinfold* was Waugh's penultimate novel. His very last was *Unconditional Surrender* (1961), which was collated with *Men at Arms* (1952) and *Officer and Gentleman* (1955), revised and published as the war trilogy *Sword of Honour* in 1965, a year before Waugh's death.

[2] Evelyn Waugh, *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold: A Conversation Piece* (London: Penguin, 2006), p. 7.

[3] Sympathy was precisely what Waugh intended. See *Pinfold*'s dedication. Ibid., p. 3.

receives the messages and communicates with them. Exterior modernist, Waugh's last comic novel is therefore more radical and experimental than generally acknowledged. By defending the style choice of his youth, Waugh, with *Pinfold*, resisted the temptation of high modernism, to which he was uncomfortably close in his mid-career with fiction such as *Work Suspended*, *Put Out More Flags*, and *Brideshead Revisited*. This return to a more experimental, younger self can be considered to be the ultimate triumph of the novelist.

A wireless story, *Pinfold* explores the two functions of radio: radio as a form of communication and radio as a form of broadcasting; and radio as communication precedes radio as broadcasting.[4] Since his insanity is caused by the breakdown of communication both with the outside world and within himself, Pinfold makes desperate efforts to return to radio as communication. Waugh paradoxically took advantage of the medium without acknowledging it. Compared to cinema, his choice of radio as a model for his method may be accidental or even unconscious. For Pinfold and its creator, while radio confuses the mind, cinema helps to rationalise and make sense of the world. If, as Marshall McLuhan puts it, 'the medium is the message', cinema is the message for Waugh.[5] To contrast the two media, I examine the 1960 BBC radio dramatisation of *Pinfold*. Moreover, I argue that the novel is as much cinematic, or visual, as it is radio, or aural. *Pinfold*'s parody of *King Lear* (1606) helps Pinfold, and also Waugh, to overcome his writer's block, which is inextricably linked with the trauma of war; more significantly, it also contributes to the novel's visuality.

The Circular Ending

Pinfold was composed near the end of Waugh's writing career and life. Waugh was then undergoing a personal crisis, as traumatic experiences in his past were rekindled

[4] My distinction of the two kinds of radio is built on Trotter's 'distinction between the representational and connective uses of media', but instead of 'enlisting broadcast radio on the side of telephony and cinema on the side of literature', I see broadcast radio as representational rather than connective. Trotter, *First Media Age*, p. 169.

[5] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), p. 7. 'This is merely to say that the personal and social consequences of any medium – that is, of any extension of ourselves – result from the new scale that is introduced into our affairs by each extension of ourselves, or by any new technology' (p. 7). And 'the "message" of any medium or technology is the change of scale or pace or pattern that it introduces into human affairs' (p. 8).

by the sea change in the present: it can be summed up as old age and an acute sense of mortality. In his biographical account of the creation of *Pinfold*, James Lynch observes that 'Waugh shows an increased consciousness of criticism, a growing protectiveness of his privacy, an increasing concern about poor health, and the prospect of failing powers. These anxieties are aggravated all the more by new concern for his financial future.'[6] Repeatedly expressing his death wish to his daughter Margaret, the novelist seemed to be aware of his own imminent ending and impatiently anticipated it.[7] Waugh's revisiting the concern and style of his youth was therefore very likely to be a conscious choice rather than a coincidence. *Pinfold* as the ending and the ending of *Pinfold* play an essential role as a sense-making tool for the reader to evaluate Waugh's oeuvre as well as this specific novel.[8]

Pinfold *as the Ending*

Pinfold as the ending of Waugh's career reveals that the ending is in the beginning. Throughout his writing life, Waugh battled between the inside and outside methods and occasionally strayed into depth of psychology. Although disagreeing on the exact turning point, most critics agree that there *existed* a turning point in the middle of the novelist's career, and that it coincided with the Second World War, at which Waugh completely broke away from his earlier fiction without looking back.

In *Evelyn Waugh: Portrait of an Artist* (1958), the first book-length study of Waugh, Frederick Stopp observes that *Work Suspended*, 'The Forerunner of a New Style', has 'an importance out of all proportion to their length. The plot is not, as in

---

[6] James J. Lynch, 'Evelyn Waugh During the Pinfold Years', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 32/4 (1986), 543-59 (p. 545).

[7] 'The Waugh Trilogy: Part 3 An Englishman's Home', *Arena*, BBC Two England, 20 April 1987.

[8] In his seminal study *The Sense of an Ending* (1967), Frank Kermode establishes a connection between apocalypse and fictions through time and argues that 'the end is immanent rather than imminent'. Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 101.
Further developing Kermode's sense of an ending in his *Reading for the Plot* (1984), Peter Brooks defines plot as 'the logic and dynamic of narrative, and narrative itself a form of understanding and explanation', and he regards plots as not simply organising but also intentional structures, 'goal-orientated and forward-moving'. Quoting Benjamin, Propp, Kermode, and Sartre, Brooks argues 'for the necessary retrospectivity of narrative: that only the end can finally determine meaning, close the sentence as a signifying totality.' Brooks draws on Freud's death instinct: 'If the motor of narrative is desire, totalizing, building ever-larger units of meaning, the ultimate determinants of meaning lie *at the end*, and narrative desire is ultimately, inexorably, desire *for* the end.' Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 10, 12, 22, 52.

the entertainments, primarily farcical or burlesque; the central figure neither an innocent nor a bounder, but capable of development; the story is told in the first person.' [9] Malcolm Bradbury's *Evelyn Waugh* (1964) can be said to have consolidated the binary view of 'The Early Novels' and 'The Later Novels'; for Bradbury, too, *Work Suspended* marks the beginning of a new phase.[10] In *The Picturesque Prison* (1982), Jeffrey Heath remarks that 'It marks a complete about-face in Waugh's fictional method, towards subjectivity, realism, rounded characterization, first-person narration, and a highly metaphorical and interpretive style. […] Through the remarkable new persona of the maturing man, it dramatizes Waugh's revised view of himself as a serious artist in a serious world.'[11] Heath, however, does not see *Work Suspended* as a successful attempt at a new style and argues that the problem lies in the fact that Waugh was not ready: 'But the shortcomings of his unfinished novel are rectified in *Brideshead Revisited*, towards which *Work Suspended* looks in many ways.'[12] Similarly, in *The Ironic World of Evelyn Waugh* (1992), Frederick Beaty identifies *Work Suspended* as the turning point: Waugh 'evidently realized not only the limitations of his usual detached stance and of his spare, crisp style but also the need for a more positive orientation. To advance his fiction beyond the confines of its previous form, he apparently decided to become more profoundly involved, even at the risk of exposing aspects of his own life'.[13] Comparing the unfinished novel with its successor, Beaty also argues that '*Brideshead Revisited*, though obviously a reshaping of seminal material from *Work Suspended*, is markedly superior to its forerunner.'[14] Ann Pasternak Slater disagrees with Heath or Beaty, stating that *Work Suspended* 'is the progenitor of *Brideshead*, and, had its composition not been broken off by the war, all the signs are that it would have been the better novel.'[15] Not surprisingly, *Brideshead* is also often regarded as the watershed of Waugh's career. According to James Carens, in *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh* (1966), *Brideshead*, 'less a satire than a romance, marks

[9] Stopp, p. 101.
[10] Malcolm Bradbury, *Evelyn Waugh* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964), pp. 34, 76.
[11] Jeffrey Heath, *The Picturesque Prison: Evelyn Waugh and His Writing* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982), p. 139.
[12] Ibid., p. 150.
[13] Frederick L. Beaty, *The Ironic World of Evelyn Waugh: A Study of Eight Novels* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992), p. 131
[14] Ibid., p. 145.
[15] Pasternak Slater, 'Introduction', in *Complete Short Stories*, pp. xi-xliii (p. xxxi).

the first accomplishment of the second stage of Evelyn Waugh's career.'[16]

In addition to *Work Suspended* and *Brideshead*, other novels are considered to be Waugh's new point of departure. In *Work Suspended*, Stannard argues, Waugh 'had effectively acknowledged that this new world demanded a new prose style. […] he was still uncertain whether he could complete the structure of a novel in this richer style, invading the thoughts and feelings of his characters.'[17] Stannard therefore offers *Put Out More Flags*, the only complete novel between the two more obvious choices:

> it maintained the flickering images and rapid cinematic 'cutting' of the earlier work, but it had also retreated towards the use of an omniscient, intrusive narrator offering extended scenic description and character analysis. Waugh was partially abandoning his technique of conveying the narrative principally through dialogue, and was experimenting with an earlier form of modernism: impressionism, Henry James's 'point of view'.[18]

Studying Waugh's manuscripts, Robert Murray Davis even pushes back the beginning of the novelist's transition to *Scoop*: 'Most of Waugh's readers probably noticed nothing new in *Scoop*, but Waugh was contemplating more radical departures from his early method that were not to be fully realized until six years after *Scoop* was published.'[19] *Work Suspended* is undoubtedly the full realisation of the transition to which Davis alludes, for it was 'clearly an attempt to write a major work, and in this fragment Waugh introduced what were for him major technical innovations.'[20] Moreover, it 'can be seen as a preparation for *Brideshead Revisited*, not only in point of view but also in style and pace. In both books the pace is slow because the style is figurative, ornate, allusive, and analytical; the central character is less concerned with action than with understanding what has happened.'[21]

Critics emphasise so much a turning point which divides Waugh's career into the early and the later that they overlook a larger vision in Waugh's fiction found in his employment of circularity. Both *Work Suspended* and *Brideshead* are manifestly distinct from Waugh's earlier fiction in that they attempt to revisit high modernism and its inner method: with its first-person narrator, evocative language, and poignant

---

[16] James F. Carens, *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1966), p. 98.
[17] Martin Stannard, *Evelyn Waugh: No Abiding City, 1939-1966* (London: Flamingo, 1993), p. 41.
[18] Ibid., pp. 59-60.
[19] Robert Murray Davis, *Evelyn Waugh, Writer* (Norman, Ok: Pilgrim Press Books, 1981), p. 105.
[20] Ibid., p. 108.
[21] Ibid., p. 109.

nostalgia, *Brideshead* is often described as Proustian. Instead of this rupture or dichotomised division of his writing career, I propose a movement of circularity, which is crucial to understanding not only the movement of Waugh's complete body of work but also his individual novels.

Circularity is prominent at the level of Waugh's overall fictional creation. Revisiting his interwar works, *Pinfold*, Waugh's penultimate novel, bears uncanny resemblances to his first short story, 'The Balance'. In fact, it might be argued that *Pinfold* rewrites the earlier work. As in the story, tea, usually undrunk and cold, also appears in *Pinfold* as a recurring motif.[22] Soon after he arrives on board the SS. *Caliban* and in his cabin, Pinfold notices that '[o]n the shelf at his side a cup of tea, already quite cold, slopped in its saucer, and beside it, stained with split tea, was the ship's passenger list. He found himself entered as *Mr G. Penfold*'.[23] The writer-protagonist welcomes the incognito as a protection of his privacy, but later a play with his name – Peinfeld, suggesting he is Jewish – is exploited by the imaginary hooligans to attack him. The tea motif of the story is further explored in the novel through its association with the steward, who awakens Pinfold with a cup of tea every morning. Pinfold's failure to communicate with the steward epitomises a complete breakdown of communication, which essentially leads to his auditory hallucinations.

Pinfold's communication with the steward, for example, is, at best, a parody of conversation, for no information is exchanged; between them, there is no understanding, let alone communication. Having overheard a mutiny against the Captain triggered by the treatment of a seaman whose body is entangled in 'some kind of web of metal', Pinfold decides to elicit more information from the steward:

> He was awakened by the coloured cabin steward bringing him tea.
> 'Very disagreeable business that last night,' said Mr Pinfold.
> 'Yes, sir.'
> 'How is the poor fellow?'
> 'Eight o'clock, sir.'
> 'Have they managed to get into touch with a ship to take him off?'
> 'Yes, sir. Breakfast eight-thirty, sir.'
> Mr Pinfold drank his tea. He felt disinclined to get up. The intercommunication system was silent. He picked up his book and began to read. Then with a click the voices

[22] In 'The Balance', the tea is not drunk by the protagonist, who wakes up from his attempted suicide by poisoning. With the monotonous and soporific repetition of the sentence 'the tea grew cold upon the chamber cupboard', the tea becomes a motif, which is here evoked in *Pinfold*. 'Balance', pp. 30, 31, 32.

[23] *Pinfold*, p. 27.

began again.[24]

The lack of communication mystifies Pinfold's voice-hearing experience and largely confirms his suspicion that something is indeed wrong, so wrong that any discussion, even mention, of it must be avoided. Even with its sobering and calming effects, the cup of tea that Pinfold finally drinks is unable to bring back his peace of mind. Rather, it excites his mind into such a hyperactive state that it works fanatically but in a completely wrong way. More than an indicator of the clock time and reality in contrast to the human time – as Pinfold with his seriously disturbed mind experiences it – and hallucinations, the cups of tea and encounters with the steward, which occur each morning at precisely the same time, mark the stages of the rapid deterioration of Pinfold's sanity. Near the tipping point, the daily routine almost becomes a direct trigger of Pinfold's hallucinations: 'Silence fell on the headquarters. Mr Pinfold returned to his bunk, lay down and slept until the steward came in with his tea. Angel spoke to him at once.'[25]

The link between *Pinfold* and 'The Balance' is also made explicit by the experience of free fall. The novel reiterates the balance between inside and outside that the short story struggles to keep. Waugh's own war-time parachute training accident is fictionalised in *Pinfold*, as well as in *Unconditional Surrender* (1961), the final volume of his war trilogy. The fall, which breaks Pinfold's leg, is, however, 'treasured as the most serene and exalted experience of his life the moment of liberation when he regained consciousness after the shock of the slipstream.'[26] In marked contrast to its duration of fifteen seconds, the incident is described retrospectively in minute detail; time is thus stretched to its limit. Human consciousness perhaps always works literally in a split second, here only heightened by a near-death experience, which enables even more acute awareness of one's own mind. While Pinfold is hanging in the air, time also seems to be suspended, only to be rushed on by others' movements. There is a clear distinction and juxtaposition between the inner, Pinfold as the calm centre – 'the sole inhabitant of a private, delicious universe' – and the outer, the chaotic bustle swirling around him.[27] Despite what he believes to be absolute isolation, Pinfold is not oblivious of 'other

[24] Ibid., pp. 39, 40.
[25] Ibid., p. 114.
[26] Ibid., p. 119.
[27] Ibid., p. 120.

parachutes all round him holding other swaying bodies' and 'an instructor on the ground bawling advice through a loudspeaker'.[28] Moreover, Pinfold has to interact with the environment: Pinfold falling, the ground leaping at him, Pinfold landing on the ground, people shouting, and Pinfold feeling the physical pain as the result of the impact.

Pinfold's fall recalls Adam's in 'The Balance', also a past event evoked by a present sensation. McCartney regards both falls as positive experiences, or more specifically, 'the rewards of detachment.'[29] But surely the two falls are different from each other in context and result. Adam associates his failed suicide attempt with a fall in his childhood and regards 'these periods between his fall and the dismayed advent of help from below, as the first promptings towards that struggle for detachment in which he had, not without almost frantic endeavour, finally acknowledged defeat in the bedroom of the Oxford hotel.'[30] Having just left the *Caliban* in the belief that he has finally escaped his tormenters, Pinfold is reminded of his fall into a 'moment of solitude' and therefore feels 'barely less ecstatic.'[31] Pinfold is, however, not alone: he rather enjoys Mr Murdoch's company, a mysterious passenger who also disembarks at Port Said. The voices soon return, but Pinfold's 'struggle for detachment', unlike Adam's, will be a triumph. While the young and inexperienced Adam fails to deal with the pain and suffering (from unrequited love) and acknowledges his defeat, the middle-aged and more experienced Pinfold manages, though not without great efforts, to overcome the excruciating pain inflicted upon him by his own mind, traumatised particularly by the war, and claims ultimate victory. Pinfold is no Adam, just as the well-established and widely published writer is no longer the young novelist who, torn between the opposed literary influences of the twenties, sought honestly his own voice. Waugh's return to the interior at the end of his career, and also of his life for that matter, may be viewed as less nostalgia on his part, and more a masterful execution of something seemingly out of his reach in the past. In *Pinfold*, Waugh solved the dilemma of his youth and achieved – albeit in extreme form – the externalisation of interiority. Pinfold's mind is played out as if it were a film on the screen. That *Pinfold* is a superior work to 'The Balance' can be seen as the triumph of the older writer, who

[28] Ibid., p. 119.
[29] McCartney, p. 165.
[30] 'Balance', p. 33.
[31] *Pinfold*, p. 120.

has undergone a transformation and become a master of his craft.

Moreover, the aged voice-hearing Pinfold, who battles bravely against the demons in his own mind, mirrors the young unloved Adam in the nightmarish 'CONCLUSION' in 'The Balance', engaging 'half-consciously' and philosophically in a conversation with his own reflection in the river after his failed suicide about the balance between life and death or, according to Adam himself, 'the balance of appetite and reason'.[32] For Waugh, it seems that one can only understand one's own mind by splitting it in two (as in 'The Balance') or multiple (as in *Pinfold*) parts and then externalising one or more parts to create a debate between the inside and the outside. Replacing the reflection in the story, the voices in *Pinfold* serve the same purpose. However, the difference is that while the benign reflection consoles Adam and brings him back to his reason, the menacing voices terrify Pinfold and drive him insane.

Pinfold*'s Ending*

At the level of the individual work, Waugh's own sense of ending also lies in circularity, for most of his novels share a preoccupation with circular narrative. *Decline and Fall*, his first novel, is an exemplary case. The beginning of the novel sees Paul Pennyfeather in his third year at Scone College reading for the Church; after his adventures of being sent down for indecent behaviour, teaching in a school in North Wales, joining high society, almost marrying a society lady, trafficking white slaves, being imprisoned, and finally faking his own death, at the end of the novel, Paul, under a new identity, returns to Scone to read for the Church. Breaking the loop does not disprove the significance of the circular vision; rather, as a demonstration of its serious consequences, it emphasises the role of circularity as the formal and thematic unity without which the novelistic world would collapse. The harrowing ending of *A Handful of Dust* spells a sense of doom precisely because it breaks the circle: Tony Last is forsaken in the jungle, reading and rereading Dickens to his sinister captor, while distant relatives move into Hetton Abbey, his family seat, and become its new masters. Interestingly, Waugh wrote an alternative ending to the novel by special request, which appeared in the serialised version: 'The entire

[32] 'Balance', pp. 35, 36.

Brazilian incident is thus omitted. Tony Last leaves London on the breakdown of his wife's arrangements for divorce, and goes on a prolonged and leisurely cruise.'[33] And, in the end, he returns home to his wife the next winter.

Pinfold also has a circular narrative. The ending, entitled 'Pinfold Regained', sees the protagonist returning home and writing for the first time since he turns fifty, not to resume working on the unfinished novel but to start a new one, because 'more urgent business first, a hamper to be unpacked of fresh, rich experiences – perishable goods':

The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold
A Conversation Piece
Chapter One
Portrait of the Artist in Middle-age[34]

This self-referential ending brings the reader back to the beginning of the novel which has just been read. This is the structure of the self-begetting novel most emphatically perhaps associated with the high modernism of Proust.

Such an ending is not only circular but also metafictional, a movement of textual self-reference where language turns back on itself, questioning its ontological status, a movement that is allegedly borrowed from Muriel Spark's debut novel, *The Comforters* (1957), which also deals metafictionally with the writer-protagonist's auditory hallucinations based on the novelist's own experience. If metafiction is defined by Patricia Waugh in her 1984 seminal study as 'fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality', *Pinfold*, a writer's-block novel that reflects on and lays bare the creative process of writing, can surely be regarded as a variety of metafiction, albeit more oblique than Spark's novel, for example.[35]

Having established a reputation as a poet, Spark was then still a novice to the novel; *The Comforters*, in fact, recorded her double conversion to Catholicism and to the novel genre and helped her to find her own novelistic voice. In 'My Conversion' (1961), Spark explained: 'I think it was the religious upheaval and the fact I had been

[33] Waugh, 'By Special Request: An Alternative Ending to *A Handful of Dust*', in *Complete Short Stories*, pp. 147-54 (p. 147).
[34] *Pinfold*, p. 132.
[35] Patricia Waugh, *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 2.

trying to write and couldn't manage it. I was living in very poor circumstances and I was a bit undernourished as well. I suppose it all combined to give me my breakdown.'[36] *The Comforters* is, however, not about her illness but about hearing voices and, more significantly, how this extraordinary experience contributes to her craft: 'suddenly I found I could write, things were taking shape as if there had been a complete reorganization of my mind.'[37] Spark associated her novel writing with her religion and claimed all her best work came after her religious conversion: 'I find I speak far more with my own voice as a Catholic.'[38]

The link between Waugh and Spark is more than that they are both Catholic-convert novelists. Waugh could not have been more familiar with Spark's first novel: he had read it before it was published and, when it came out, reviewed it for *The Spectator*.[39] Chronologically, *The Comforters* came out a few months before *Pinfold*. Spark explained in her autobiography, *Curriculum Vitae*, that although her novel was not published until February 1957, it had been completed in late 1955.[40] Spark also specified that Waugh's novel was published in the summer of 1957. Her precision with and emphasis on the correct chronological order of the composition as well as publication of the two novels with similar concerns subtly and tactfully denies any borrowing from the more established writer. In her 2005 interview with Robert Hosmer, however, Spark openly dismissed *Pinfold*'s influence on *The Comforters* by revealing: 'The funny thing was that somebody sent [*The Comforters*] to Evelyn Waugh and he was in the middle of *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*, and he said himself he couldn't see how he could end his book. When he saw mine, he saw how he could end it by making this the book within the book.'[41]

Although Spark's claim is difficult to verify and the reason for Waugh's omission of his learning the craft of novel writing from a younger and much lesser-known writer remains a mystery (Waugh did not even comment on the ending

---

[36] Muriel Spark, 'My Conversion', in *Critical Essays on Muriel Spark*, ed. by Joseph Hynes (New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1992), pp. 24-28 (p. 25).

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., p. 26.

[39] Having acknowledged the novel's originality and its achievement as a first novel, Waugh immediately added that 'I do not think that it is totally successful.' Waugh, 'Something Fresh', in *EAR*, pp. 518-19 (p. 518).

[40] Muriel Spark, *Curriculum Vitae: A Volume of Autobiography* (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 2009), p. 207.

[41] Robert Hosmer, 'An Interview with Dame Muriel Spark', *Salmagundi*, 146/147 (2005), 127-58 (p. 141).

of *The Comforters* in his review), the manuscripts of *Pinfold* suggest that its metafictional ending in the published version is likely to have been inspired by Spark's work rather than an originally intended conception. Not only is the ending heavily revised, its circular feature does not appear until a very late stage. Davis notes that Waugh rewrote the last two pages in late January 1957 'as serial rights were being offered […] moved from Pinfold's sense of triumph even in mortality to his decision to write and then to the emphatic and circular closing words of the novel's title page'.[42] 'And that,' Davis concludes, 'as far as Waugh was concerned, was the end not only of the novel but of the experience.'[43] Due to its circular ending, the novel, however, does not seem to end: the definitive 'The End' in both the first draft and the typescript is purposefully omitted in the published novel.[44]

Dissociation and Trauma: The Extended Mind as Radio

If Waugh did borrow the self-reflexive *nouveau roman*-like ending from Spark, then also at fifty but unlike his fictional counterpart Pinfold, he was definitely not 'too old a dog to learn new tricks.'[45] However, the ending was not the only new trick the ageing, if not prematurely aged, novelist might have learned; a more significant new trick was his borrowing from radio, a medium he detested: *Pinfold* can be considered to be radio writing. With the help of radio, Waugh was capable of dealing with the mind while remaining outside, achieving in *Pinfold* what he could not in 'The Balance'.

Paradoxically, a great deal of wires exist in this novel about the wireless; the novel seems entangled in wires: the copper wire which entangles the body of a seaman (in Pinfold's hallucinated mind), the wiring system that brings Pinfold BBC programmes and much more which he suspects somehow remains after the ship is retired from military service during the Second World War and now used for civilian purposes, the wire on board which enables Pinfold to send telegraphs home, the 'lanes of barbed wire' on Pinfold's road to Cairo, and the 'irksome bonds' of Pinfold's parachute and the old soldier ending up 'lying on grass entangled in cords'

[42] Davis, *Writer*, p. 294.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Waugh's manuscripts quoted in Davis. Ibid., pp. 293, 294.
[45] *Pinfold*, p. 10.

as a result of a training accident (in Pinfold's memory).[46] Disentangling these wires, the reader can discover two kinds of wireless: wireless as a means of communication (wartime communication and telegraph) and wireless as a means of broadcasting, usually in the form of entertainment (music, drama, and talks from the BBC); as noted earlier, wireless as communication comes before wireless as broadcasting.

Pinfold's mental problem, or his madness, results from a distinct lack of communication. Ironically, the novel is subtitled *A Conversation Piece*. Pinfold's ordeal originates from his conversation with the voices, because other forms of communication are either unavailable (Pinfold is travelling alone) or ineffective (the steward cannot understand him). The voices start as soon as Pinfold embarks on the *Caliban* and is left alone:

> 'It can't be too quiet for me,' said Mr Pinfold [to Glover, his neighbour].
> He took rather formal leave of Glover and at once forgot him until, reaching his cabin, he found added to its other noises the strains of a jazz band.[47]

Davis associates Pinfold's communication problem with his insanity: 'Pinfold's isolation and inability to communicate are at least symptoms if not actual causes of his problem, and only when he is able to communicate, first by cable, then by letter, and finally by direct discourse, is he able to quell the voices that beset him. Like his public personality, the vision of solitude is a prison.'[48] In spite of his apparent wish to keep to himself, Pinfold is seen throughout the novel desperately trying to communicate with others. He is certainly not incapable of communication. Without any human company, Pinfold makes up in his mind all sorts of characters, such as Goneril, Angel, and Margaret, capable of interaction with real people, such as Captain Steerforth and Mr Murdoch, and he thereby conjures up action and drama: a mutiny, a murder, an international incident, and so on. More importantly, like the writer-protagonist Caroline in *The Comforters*, Pinfold also writes himself into his imagination and becomes a character in his own novel. The failed communication with the steward cannot connect Pinfold with reality so, completely helpless, he continues to participate in the creation of his confused mind. Pinfold's condition seems to improve a great deal as soon as he leaves the *Caliban*. The rapture Pinfold experiences is partly due to the fact that he believes that Angel, still on board the

[46] Ibid., pp. 119, 120.
[47] Ibid., p. 30.
[48] Ibid., p. 293.

ship, is unable to torture him any longer and partly due to the human companionship Mr Murdoch offers at last. Comparing the *Pinfold* manuscript and the published novel, Davis argues that '[t]he introduction of Murdoch gives the respite a point beyond coincidence. Pinfold had envied the other's solitude, but only in his company is he temporarily freed from the voices.'[49]

Both transmitter and receiver, Pinfold's mind works like a radio, but a radio for communication rather than for broadcasting. It first projects its own thoughts in the air and then captures their signals as if they came from an external source. Pinfold attributes his voice-hearing experience to drug poisoning, or his adding pills prescribed by his doctor 'to his bromide and chloral and Crème de Menthe, his wine and gin and brandy, and to a new sleeping-draught which his doctor, ignorant of the existence of his other bottle, also supplied.'[50] At the same time, he surely exhibits signs of dissociation.

Dissociation

Dissociative disorders are characterised in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5* (2013) by 'a disruption of and/or discontinuity in the normal integration of consciousness, memory, identity, emotion, perception, body representation, motor control, and behavior.'[51] In 'The Neuro-Psychoses of Defence' (1894), Freud disagreed with Pierre Janet, who had earlier coined the term dissociation: 'According to the theory of Janet […] the splitting of consciousness is a primary feature of the mental change in hysteria. It is based on an innate weakness of the capacity for psychical synthesis, on the narrowness of the "field of consciousness (*champ de la conscience*)" which in the form of a psychical stigma, is evidence of the degeneracy of hysterical individuals.'[52] For Freud, '*the splitting of the content of consciousness is the result of an act of will on the part of the patient*'.[53] The motive is identified by Freud as defence:

[49] Davis, *Writer*, p. 292.
[50] *Pinfold*, p. 19.
[51] *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5* (Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association, 2013), p. 291.
[52] Sigmund Freud, 'The Neuro-Psychoses of Defence', trans. by J. Rickman, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. by James Strachey, 24 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-74), III (1962), pp. 41-68 (p. 46).
[53] Ibid.

> For these patients whom I have analysed had enjoyed good mental health up to the time at which *an occurrence of incompatibility took place in their ideational life* – that is to say, until their ego was faced by an experience, an idea, or a feeling which aroused such a distressing affect that the subject decided to forget about it because he had no confidence in his power to resolve the contradiction between the incompatible idea and his ego by means of thought-activity.[54]

Dissociative disorders include dissociative identity disorder (DID), dissociative amnesia, depersonalisation/derealisation disorder, and others.[55] Pinfold, more specifically, appears to suffer from what would now be diagnosed as DID, formerly known as multiple personality disorder (MPD), which is characterised by 'a) the presence of two or more distinct personality states or an experience of possession and b) recurrent episodes of amnesia.'[56]

Matthew Hugh Erdelyi observes that 'not-thinking/repressing/dissociating/cognitively avoiding/leaving to itself/warding off some to-be-remembered material for whatever reason – psychological poverty, defense, experimental exigencies, or what have you – can result in amnesia.'[57] Pinfold's subsequent ordeal is foreshadowed at the outset by two alarming incidents of memory failure concerning a tomb in a church near Lychpole and a present that he has received: 'His memory 'began to play him tricks. He did not grow forgetful. He remembered everything in clear detail but he remembered it wrong.'[58] The magnificent 'recumbent figure of the mid-sixteenth century in gilded bronze' – in Pinfold's description to his visitors – turns out to be made of 'coloured alabaster. They laughed, he laughed, but he was shocked.'[59] Similarly, for a gift from a like-minded collector friend – the 'wash-hand stand of the greatest elaboration designed by an English architect of the 1860s' – Pinfold insists on a missing 'prominent, highly ornamental, copper tap in the centre, forming the climax of the

[54] Ibid., p. 47. Both George E. Vaillant and Mardi J. Horowitz also regard dissociation as a defence mechanism. George E. Vaillant, 'Repression in College Men Followed for Half a Century', in *Repression and Dissociation: Implications for Personality Theory, Psychopathology, and Health*, ed. by Jerome L. Singer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 259-73 (p. 262). Mardi J. Horowitz quoted in Mardi J. Horowitz, Henry C. Markman, Charles H. Stinson, Bram Fridhandler, and Jess H. Ghannam, 'A Classification Theory of Defense', in *Repression and Dissociation*, pp. 61-84 (p. 80).

[55] *DSM-5*, p. 291.

[56] Ibid., p. 292.

[57] Matthew Hugh Erdelyi, 'Repression, Reconstruction, and Defense: History and Integration of the Psychoanalytic and Experimental Frameworks', in *Repression and Dissociation*, pp. 1-31 (p. 11).

[58] *Pinfold*, p. 17.

[59] Ibid.

design', which does not exist.[60] Only with hindsight is Pinfold able to relate these two trivial mistakes to his later ordeal on board the *Caliban*.

Another symptom of what might now be diagnosed as DID is hearing voices, or auditory verbal hallucinations. In Pinfold's case, he divides himself and plays many distinctive voices, or roles, as if he were staging a play within his mind. By splitting his consciousness and disowning some of his thoughts, the middle-aged writer-protagonist, paranoid, traumatised by war, and concerned about old age, mortality, and his dwindling creative power, can at least detach himself from, if not deal with, his problems. His dissociation, however, deprives him of the control of his own thoughts and therefore leaves him vulnerable and exposed to their attacks. Pinfold's thoughts, now externalised as voices, indeed turn against him, and it is with himself that he must now begin to battle.

In *Awakening the Dreamer* (2006), Philip Bromberg further explores dissociation, trauma, and the clinical process begun in his *Standing in the Spaces* (1998). For Bromberg, 'dissociation is not only a mental process but also a mental structure that exists in everyone […] a structure that hypnoidally sequesters certain self-states and limits their communication with one another as a proactive defense against the repetition of what has already happened [trauma in particular].'[61] Bromberg argues that dissociation, however, becomes detrimental when '[w]hat was formerly a fluid and creative dialectic between self-states through the normal process of dissociation is slowly replaced by a rigid Balkanization of the various aspects of self.'[62] To reunite and reintegrate isolated self-states, Bromberg suggests awakening the dreamer, hence the title:

> The 'dreamer' refers to a self-state with which people are most familiar during sleep when it emerges as part of the dissociative phenomena we call dreams. However, because the dissociative gap between a sleep state and a waking state is as permeable as the space gap between any two states, I have found that the dreamer can enter that gap and participate in the cocreation of new relational meaning.[63]

Pinfold externalises his mind to keep at bay his own and others' scrutiny of the contents of his mind as well as his own memory of traumatic experiences: externalisation is also a kind of disownership and perhaps fascinating to a writer in

[60] Ibid., p. 18.
[61] Philip M. Bromberg, *Awakening the Dreamer: Clinical Journeys* (New York and Hove: Taylor & Francis, 2011), p. 6.
[62] Ibid., p. 5.
[63] Ibid., p. 20.

its nearness to the creation of character. Nor is anyone allowed to enter Pinfold's dream – in fact, it is unsure whether he dreams at all – because he seems to be always awake, living in a waking nightmare: 'Since he finished his sleeping-draught Mr Pinfold had seldom had more than an hour at a time of uneasy dozing.'[64] Nevertheless, the voices stop as soon as he falls asleep and return immediately after he awakens. Only sleep seems to afford Pinfold some peace of mind; yet he is constantly woken up by the steward who serves him tea.

Interestingly, Pinfold's dissociation, his repetition of what he conjures up inside his mind as if it were external with an independent existence in reality, sheds light on the relation between madness and creativity. *Pinfold*, a writer's block novel, certainly reflects on writing. The novel lays bare the creative process: Pinfold's auditory hallucinations parallel the operation of a writer's mind. He repeats what Angel says to him the same way that a writer puts down on paper or types out (in the case of Caroline in *The Comforters*, who repeats after a typing ghost) the sentence he or she has formulated in the mind. Writing, like dreaming and dream telling, is also a dissociative activity, albeit a controlled or semi-controlled one.[65] It is the writer's creative use of dissociation to access both the different self-states of one's own mind and others' minds to imagine and construct a world parallel to the primary world that is experienced as 'real'. Normally, in the process of creation, not only are different self-states and minds brought into dialogue with each other, they also build a relation with the outside world. But this process is precarious: writers are as often interested in the dysfunctional mind, the mind of dissociated self-states incapable of intercommunication. Jorge Luis Borges's parable 'Borges and I' famously depicts a rather eerie splitting of the self, which culminates in the last sentence: 'I do not know which of us has written this page.'[66] Similarly, Pinfold mixes the reality of the world of his imagination with the reality of the world outside. Having shortened his journey

[64] *Pinfold*, p. 112.

[65] Bromberg thus describes a case: 'the patient's felt need to tell a dream was more and more clearly understood as expressing the same thing that the dream itself would have expressed had he indeed arrived with one. A voice from a dissociated part of the patient's self was ready to be heard, but the patient was not quite ready to acknowledge it as "me"' (p. 31). Cecily de Monchaux argues that 'dream telling is a dissociated action itself, and the content of what is told is experienced as such by the teller – as different from the content of day thinking, and in sanity, not to be confused with it.' Cecily de Monchaux, 'Dreaming and the Organizing Function of the Ego', in *The Dream Discourse Today*, ed. by Sara Flanders (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 195-212 (p. 203).

[66] Jorge Luis Borges, 'Borges and I', in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. by Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby, preface by André Maurois (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), pp. 282-83 (p. 283).

and returned to his wife, he is here conversing with her and, at the same time, hearing voices. This is a prime example of the split consciousness; paradoxically, it is also a moment of linking two self-states to achieve reintegration:

> 'I may as well tell you the truth,' said Angel. 'We never were in that ship. We worked the whole thing from the studio in England.'
>
> 'They must be working the whole thing from a studio in England,' said Mr Pinfold.
>
> 'My poor darling,' said Mrs Pinfold, 'no one's "worked" anything. You're imagining it all. […] There just isn't any sort of invention by the Gestapo or the BBC or the Existentialists or the psychoanalysts – nothing at all, the least like what you think.'
>
> […]
>
> 'You mean that everything I've heard said, I've been saying to myself? It's hardly conceivable.'[67]

Pinfold remains doubtful, but he begins to accept the ownership of his thoughts.

'The Box'

Pinfold dramatises the working of the mind, dissociation in particular, with the help of an apparatus called 'The Box', which

> looked like a makeshift wireless-set. According to the Bruiser [who owns one] and other devotees The Box exercised diagnostic and therapeutic powers. Some part of a sick man or animal – a hair, a drop of blood preferably – was brought to The Box, whose guardian would then 'tune in' to the 'Life-Waves' of the patient, discern the origin of the malady and prescribe treatment.[68]

But what exactly is the Box? The real-life Pinfold wrote about the Box in his (perhaps all too) frequent letters home during his eventful journey and genuinely believed its threat to be real. On 8 February 1954 from Cairo, Waugh wrote to his wife, Laura: 'I found myself the victim of an experiment in telepathy which made me think I really was going crazy. […] It has made me more credulous about Tanker's box.'[69] Mark Amory's note on Tanker – the nickname of Diana Oldridge, a neighbour – illuminates the mystery of the Box: 'she believed in "the black box", a contraption which was supposed to cure both men and beasts from a distance if a sample of blood or hair were submitted. Many successes were reported.'[70] Many of Waugh's discussions of the Box find their way in the novel.[71]

---

[67] *Pinfold*, pp. 128-29.
[68] Ibid., p. 7.
[69] Evelyn Waugh, *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Mary Amory (London: Phoenix, 2009), p. 475.
[70] Ibid., p. 476.
[71] See also, *Letters*, pp. 477, 478, 618.

According to both fictional and non-fictional accounts, Pinfold's Box may refer to Wilhelm Reich's Orgone Accumulator. The controversial Austrian-born psychoanalyst, who discovered what he called orgone energy in the 1930s, invented the orgone box to trap and accumulate what he believed to be the basic life force, characterised as 'universal and primordial' by himself but as 'a psychotic delusion' by others.[72] Orgone is collected for therapeutic use: 'You could sit inside the boxes and feel them tingle as the orgone energy penetrated your body. [Reich] advertised and sold them, claiming they could cure everything from the common cold to cancer.'[73] Reich's orgone is generally dismissed as pseudoscience: 'a useless fiction with faulty basic premises, thin partial theory and unsubstantiated application results. It was quickly discredited and cast away.'[74] The theory behind the orgone accumulator fits that of Pinfold' Box, but the size does not. The wireless set has never been bulky enough to hold a person inside it.

An earlier device called the dynomizer, invented by the American doctor Albert Abrams at the beginning of the twentieth century, is probably closer to the description of the Box in *Pinfold* than Reich's orgone accumulator. The machine had enjoyed great popularity before being denounced by the American Medical Association as a heath fraud shortly after the death of its inventor in 1924. The dynamizer, together with the ocillocalst, another invention by Abrams, turned out to be 'nothing more than a jumble of wires and other useless components described by physicist Robert Millikan as the type "a ten-year-old would build to fool an eight-year-old."'[75] With terms such as 'radiogeodiagnosis' and 'telediagnosis', Abrams certainly took advantage of the burgeoning radio technology at that time.[76] Defending the existence of brain waves, he also drew an analogy between wireless telegraphy and the subliminal mind, or telepathy.[77] He explained: 'In wireless telegraphy when electro-magnetic waves are set in motion by electrical energy,

---

[72] Robert Blumenfeld, *Tools and Techniques for Character Interpretation: A Handbook of Psychology for Actors, Writers, and Directors* (New Jersey: Limelight Editions, 2006) p. 136.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Kenneth S. Isaacs, 'Searching for Science in Psychoanalysis', *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 29/3 (1999), 235-52 (p. 240).
[75] Michael Farquhar, *A Treasury of Deception: Liars, Misleaders, Hoodwinkers and the Extraordinary True Stories of History's Greatest Hoaxes, Fakes and Frauds* (New York: Penguin, 2005), p. 134.
[76] Albert Abrams, *New Concepts in Diagnosis and Treatment: Physico-clinical Medicine, the Practical Application of the Electronic Theory in the Interpretation and Treatment of Disease* (San Francisco, CA: Philopolis Press, 1916), p. 307.
[77] Ibid., p. 276.

TUNING is necessary so that the wave vibrations may be adjusted to affect the receiver.'[78] Claiming that a 'specific thought is energy of a definite wave length', Abrams argued that human thoughts could be measured in the same way: 'With the sphygmobiometer, it is also possible to demonstrate the specificity of brain waves (psychovibratory effects).'[79] Abrams's box, based on Electronic Reactions of Abrams, or ERA, was claimed to be able to diagnose almost any diseases by a blood test (even of dry blood) and cure them by vibrations. Abrams executed electronic reactions at his 'Physico-Clinical Laboratory' with blood samples sent in from around the world:

> A few drops of blood taken from a patient and allowed to dry in a slide or white paper will, when radioactive energy (radiant electricity or electricity in vibration) is conducted to the CD, PD, S and SP areas, yield the characteristic splanchnic areas of dullness. This holds for all diseases. In disease the dried blood yields a reaction for months. […] The blood specimen is placed in a special contrivance (dynamizer) and its energy is conducted to the reagent […][80]

To prove the success of his electronic diagnosis, Abrams included at the end of his *New Concepts in Diagnosis and Treatment* (1916) 'A Few References to the Visceral Reflexes of Abrams by other Investigators', or rather quite a few testimonials from numerous renowned medical journals and practitioners from all over the world. An author, White (no first name is given), was quoted as writing in the November 1914 issue of *American Journal of Clinical Medicine*: 'To be able to diagnose at the very beginning, tuberculosis, carcinoma, syphilis, pus formation, and so on, and not have to rely upon doubtful laboratory methods, is almost beyond comprehension or belief.'[81] In addition to the ability to diagnose diseases, Abrams's box could allegedly determine the patient's sex or even religion.[82] Moreover, Abrams invented another machine, the so-called oscilloclast, to cure the diseases diagnosed by the dymonizer: 'This was accomplished simply by setting the oscilloclast to the frequency of the disease and blasting it away, the way sound vibrations shatter a wine glass.'[83]

Stopp, whose study of Waugh came out only a year after the publication of

[78] Ibid., p. 246.
[79] Ibid., pp. 247, 246.
[80] Albert Abrams, *New Concepts in Diagnosis and Treatment: Physico-clinical Medicine, the Practical Application of the Electronic Theory in the Interpretation and Treatment of Disease* (Pomeroy, WA: Health Research, 1977), pp. 355-56.
[81] Abrams, 1916, p. 324.
[82] Farquhar, p. 135.
[83] Ibid.

Pinfold, however, took Pinfold's Box literally as 'the BBC Box'.[84] As a wireless novel, *Pinfold* lays bare the workings of radio, 'radio-shacking' – to borrow the coinage from Aaron Jaffe – instead of blackboxing.[85] Bruno Latour explains that blackboxing is 'an expression from the sociology of science that refers to the way scientific and technical work is made invisible by its own success. When a machine runs efficiently, when a matter of fact is settled, one need focus only on its inputs and outputs and not on its internal complexity. Thus paradoxically, the more science and technology succeed, the more opaque and obscure they become.'[86] To counter blackboxing, 'which treats input and output as already reified and aestheticized surface phenomena at the exterior interface,' Jaffe proposes radio-shacking, which instead 'insists on the messy, work-network of the transient insides: inner workings, flux bodies, modifying components, selecting input, and programming output. To radio-shack means to touch the workings of an application with a specific communicative ambition.'[87] By the fifties when *Pinfold* was composed, radio, whose presence 'so fundamentally marked the decades of the 1920s and 1930s', had already been taken for granted, or blackboxed.[88] Somewhat like Beckett, Waugh in *Pinfold* reconsidered radio as an apparatus, or radio-shacked.[89]

Pinfold's madness is primarily caused by the breakdown of communication. To the middle-aged Pinfold, radio has become radio as broadcasting, especially as entertainment, but one person's entertainment, an interview programme for example, can be another's ordeal. Interviewed, or rather questioned and manipulated, by Angel and other BBC crew and finally broadcast, Pinfold fears that his life-waves have been measured by the BBC box and that because of the nature of *broad*casting, he is exposed to the criticism of anyone who tunes in. Steven Connor's concept of 'the dissociated voice' in *Dumbstruck* (2000) is pertinent here: 'my voice is not something that I merely have, or even something that I, if only in part, am. Rather, it

---

[84] Stopp, p. 222.

[85] Aaron Jaffe, 'Inventing the Radio Cosmopolitan: Vernacular Modernism at a Standstill', in *Broadcasting Modernism*, ed. by Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle and Jane Lewty (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009), pp. 11-30 (p. 16).

[86] Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 304.

[87] Jaffe, p. 17.

[88] Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty, 'Introduction: Signing On', in *Broadcasting Modernism*, pp. 1-7 (p. 2).

[89] See Steve Connor, 'I Switch Off: Beckett and the Ordeals of Radio', in *Broadcasting Modernism*, pp. 274-93.

is something that I do. A voice is not a condition, nor yet an attribute, but an event. It is less something that exists than something which occurs.'[90] This, however, contradicts Pinfold's understanding of voice. If 'giving voice is the process which simultaneously produces articulate sound, and produces myself, as a self-producing being', Pinfold believes that the voice he produces is part of himself which he owns.[91] But his voice, now, paradoxically, at once *in* the BBC box and *out* there in the world, is out of his control, as much as the part of the self that he externalises as the voices produced and then disavowed by his mind. Listening to his voice on the radio, dissociated and disembodied, which mirrors his *own* voice – 'His voice came to him strangely old and fruity' – is a self-splitting experience, one that triggers his auditory hallucinations.[92]

Throughout the novel, Pinfold attempts to communicate, or more precisely, to own and control his own voice by making coherent his disturbing experiences in order to articulate, reality-test, and understand them, and to return to the time when radio is still radio as communication. Jaffe juxtaposes the interior and the exterior of radio, which resembles very much the inside and outside of the mind. Pinfold's dissociated mind works as a radio, first transmitting his thoughts ('programming output') and then receiving them ('selecting input'). If Pinfold's mind is a radio, hearing voices is a radio-shacking experience which opens the black box by externalising the consciousness and thus displays the inner working of the mind. In that sense, Pinfold's Box is actually his own mind. Not contained inside his brain, Pinfold's is an extended mind. But it is not a healthy extended mind: it is frenzied and dissociated. Although Pinfold attributes his ordeal to the Box, it is really his mind that torments him. Humphrey Carpenter suggests that Philip Toynbee, reviewing *Pinfold*, 'seemed to be hinting, the hallucinations were aspects of his own personality, and the real persecutor was none other than himself.'[93] Carpenter then elaborates: 'This is the point which Freud emphasizes constantly in his writings on paranoid schizophrenia, the condition into which Waugh was precipitated during his

[90] Steven Connor, *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 3, 4.
[91] Ibid., p. 3.
[92] *Pinfold*, p. 15.
[93] Humphrey Carpenter, *The Brideshead Generation: Evelyn Waugh and His Friends* (London: Faber and Faber, 2008), p. 442.

Pinfold experience.'[94] Looking out instead of looking in, Pinfold is afraid of his own mind, of what he is about to find inside his own mind if he chances to look in.

Be it Reich's orgone accumulator, Abrams's dynomizer, simply 'the BBC Box', or even his own mind, Pinfold's Box illustrates the relation between wireless and psychoanalysis linked by telepathy. First hearing about the device, while Mr Pinfold was 'sceptical' but at the same time concerned, Mrs Pinfold 'thought there must be something in it, because it had been tried, with her knowledge, on Lady Fawdle-Upton's nettle-rash and immediate relief had followed':

> 'It's all suggestion,' said young Mrs Graves-Upton.
> […]
> 'No. It's simply a matter of measuring the Life-Waves,' said Mrs Pinfold.
> 'An extremely dangerous device in the wrong hands,' said Mr Pinfold.
> […]
> 'I should have thought this Box counted as sorcery,' Mr Pinfold said to his wife when they were alone.[95]

Pinfold finds the Box particularly menacing because he fears being psychoanalysed: what he painstakingly guards is his privacy but, more importantly, his true, inner self as opposed to his outer, assumed public persona. Worse still, with the wireless technology, the Box apparently can psychoanalyse him even at a long distance, so there is no way to escape.

It is pertinent here to introduce Pinfold's creator and his real-life public row with J. B. Priestley with regard to his persona, which was triggered by the fellow writer's review of *Pinfold*, entitled 'What Was Wrong With *Pinfold*' (1957), in the *New Statesman*. Having made a general observation of the novel being 'far below [Waugh's] usual level of creation and invention', Priestley follows with a detailed psychoanalysis of its protagonist: 'For the benefit of Jungians, it may be added that both the Shadow and the Anima are busily engaged in these spectral intrigues [i.e. the voices Pinfold hears].'[96] Priestley identifies Pinfold's problem as his inadequate persona – 'the drinks hinted at it; the dope more than suggested it; the voices proved it' – understood fundamentally as his identity crisis, evident in the splitting of the self: 'He is an author pretending to be a Catholic landed gentleman.'[97] Priestley even coins the word '*Pinfolding*' to refer to 'the artist elaborately pretending not to

[94] Ibid.
[95] *Pinfold*, pp. 7, 8.
[96] J. B. Priestley, 'What Was Wrong With Pinfold', in *Pinfold*, pp. 156-59 (pp. 156, 157).
[97] Ibid., p. 157.

be an artist', which he argues is 'an old trick here in England, thanks to our aristocratic tradition and our public suspicion of intellect and arts.'[98]

Touched to the quick, Waugh responded in *The Spectator* with a vehement personal attack on his reviewer entitled 'Anything Wrong with Priestley?' (1957): 'I say, Priestley old man, are you sure you are feeling all right? Any voices? I mean to say!'[99] Despite Priestley's overemphasised disclaimer at the outset that 'it is not Mr Waugh but Gilbert Pinfold who is the subject of this essay',[100] Waugh took it personally and was particularly offended by Priestley's warning – 'He is not concerned to help me with my writing, as he is so well qualified to do, but to admonish me about the state of my soul, a subject on which I cannot allow him complete mastership. […] he proclaims in prophetic tones, and with the added authority of some tags from Jung, that I shall soon go permanently off my rocker.'[101] Although Waugh was not generally regarded as particularly kind or magnanimous, this public outburst was rather out of character. Taking fiction as reality and defending himself (when he was not directly targeted) by aggressively attacking the other, Waugh, unequivocally identifying himself with his fictional counterpart Pinfold, almost seemed to acknowledge the truth of Priestley's analysis. Readers/viewers who are familiar with the public image Waugh carefully created, nurtured, and projected in his *Face to Face* interview, his television debut (the tweed, the cigar, the rehearsed antagonism, and the affected nonchalance), can judge for themselves.

To psychoanalyse Pinfold, to unmask him, to strip him of his pretentions as a writer playing the role of a country gentleman: 'He was neither a scholar nor a regular soldier; the part for which he cast himself was a combination of eccentric don and testy colonel and he acted it strenuously', the Box can be seen as a polygraph.[102] Pinfold's, Waugh's too, aversion to Freud derives from his fear of being revealed as a fraud: 'Angel seemed to believe that anyone sufficiently eminent to be interviewed by him must have something to hide, must be an imposter whom it was his business to trap and expose'.[103] Pinfold's obsession with his privacy and overprotection of it,

---

[98] Ibid., p. 159.
[99] Waugh, 'Anything Wrong with Priestley?', in *EAR*, pp. 527-29 (p. 528).
[100] Priestley, p. 156.
[101] Waugh, 'Priestley', p. 527.
[102] *Pinfold*, p. 10.
[103] Ibid., p. 14.

paradoxically, point to his secret desires and anxiety and put him under scrutiny, if not directly on the couch. What he takes care to hide is to be exposed. Pinfold's worst fear comes true, when he believes the Box does somehow end up in the wrong hands and that it is being employed to relentlessly measure his life-waves and psychoanalyse him at a distance.

Trauma

Dissociation is closely associated with trauma, for it is 'frequently found in the aftermath of trauma, and many of the symptoms, including embarrassment and confusion about the symptoms or a desire to hide them, are influenced by the proximity to trauma.'[104] In their edited volume *Psychosis, Trauma and Dissociation* (2008), Andrew Moskowitz, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy consider dissociation 'a potentially mediating factor between trauma and psychosis', and they observe that post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is 'increasingly viewed as a form of dissociative disorder'.[105] In *The Dissociative Mind* (2005), Elizabeth Howell proposes to define trauma as 'the "event(s) that cause dissociation." Thinking of trauma this way, in terms of its effect, puts the focus on the splits and fissures in the psyche rather than solely on the external event.'[106]

Pinfold's dissociation is caused by trauma in his life. The BBC interview with Angel is a traumatic event that directly triggers his dissociation.[107] Pinfold obsessively replays the interview in his mind and relives it:

> He had definitely not liked them and they left an unpleasant memory which grew sharper in the weeks before the record was broadcast. […] It seemed to him that an attempt had been made against his privacy and he was not sure how effectively he had defended it. He strained to remember his precise words and his memory supplied various

[104] *DSM-5*, p. 291.

[105] Andrew Moskowitz, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy, 'Introduction', in *Psychosis, Trauma and Dissociation: Emerging Perspectives on Severe Psychopathology*, ed. by Andrew Moskowitz, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), pp. 1-6 (pp. 3, 2).

[106] Elizabeth F. Howell, *The Dissociative Mind* (New York and Hove: Routledge, 2005), p. ix. This point is reiterated in Elizabeth Howell, 'From Hysteria to Chronic Relational Trauma Disorder: The History of Borderline Personality Disorder and its Links with Dissociation and Psychosis', in *Psychosis, Trauma and Dissociation*, pp. 105-15 (p. 109). See also Elizabeth F. Howell and Sheldon Itzkowitz ed., *The Dissociative Mind in Psychoanalysis: Understanding and Working with Trauma* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).

[107] Pinfold's radio interview is a fictional account of Waugh's own by Stephen Black, recorded at his home and broadcast in *Personal Call* on the Overseas Service on 29 September 1953. For Waugh, it was Black who 'set Pinfold on the run' (*Letters*, p. 618).

> distorted versions. Finally the evening came when the performance was made public. […] 'They tried to make an ass of me,' he said. 'I don't think they succeeded.'[108]

The 'various distorted versions' are rehearsals for a similar episode later in his hallucinations. Inside his cabin, Pinfold hears a BBC talk programme in which the host June Cumberleigh asks Jimmy Lance, a well-known Bohemian whom Pinfold believes has a bad influence on her, to show his collection of letters from celebrities:

> 'And do you count [Pinfold] among the celebrities or the dim people, Jimmy?'
> 'A celebrity.'
> 'Do you?' said June. 'I think he's a dreadfully dim little man.'
> 'Well, what's the dim little man got to say?'
> 'It is so badly written I can't read it.'
> Enormous amusement in the audience.[109]

The audience here plays a similar role to that of the chorus in classical Greek drama. Pinfold's eerie experience resembles a nightmare, but he is awake. Although Jimmy's profession is not specified, he is very likely to be a literary critic. For Pinfold, who suffers from writer's block and worries about old age and his diminishing creative power, the fear of being unable to write or writing badly and, as a result, receiving damning reviews is therefore not unfounded.

But *Pinfold* is concerned with an even more significant trauma: that is the trauma of war. The novel contains many references to the Second World War. As it was written not long after the war and in the middle of the composition of what would become the war trilogy, not only did Waugh and his contemporary readers have a living memory of the war, they probably were still traumatised by it. Waugh certainly projected his trauma on to his protagonist. Pinfold regards the voices as torture from the outset, but increasingly he speaks of them and the operation of the Box in military terms:

> Angel had in his headquarters an electric instrument which showed Mr Pinfold's precise state of consciousness. It consists, Mr Pinfold surmised, of a glass tube containing two parallel lines of red light which continually drew together or moved apart like telegraph wires seen from a train. They approached one another as he grew drowsy and, when he fell asleep, crossed. A duty officer followed their fluctuations.[110]

Pinfold considers himself being closely watched by Angel and his team, paradoxically, at a distance; moreover, they carry out experiments on him allegedly to treat his insanity. Because the Box seems to work only when Pinfold is asleep,

---

[108] *Pinfold*, p. 15.
[109] Ibid., p. 69.
[110] Ibid., p. 112.

Pinfold, who suffers from severe insomnia, has to be hypnotised, the same way Freud psychoanalysed his patients to cure them. Based on research made by Swiss scientists, they attempt to hypnotise Pinfold by playing a record of 'the roar and clang of machinery.'

> 'You bloody fools,' he cried in exasperation, '*I'm* not a factory worker. You're driving me mad.'
>
> […] Angel came on his round of inspection.
>
> 'Gilbert not asleep yet? Let me see the log. "*0312 hours. You bloody fools, I'm not a factory worker.*" Well nor he is. "*You're driving me mad.*" I believe we are. Turn off that record. Give him something rural.'[111]

Pinfold is subject to Angel's experiment as a captured soldier tortured by an enemy in the war.[112] Pinfold's long letter to his wife not only makes the link with the war and torture explicit but also indicates the depth of his trauma:

> *The Germans at the end of the war were developing this Box for the examination of prisoners. The Russian have preferred it. They don't need any of the old physical means of persuasion. They can see into the minds of the most obdurate. The Existentialists in Paris first started using if for psycho-analysing people who would not voluntarily submit to treatment. They break the patient's nerve by acting all sorts of violent scenes which he thinks are really happening. They confuse him until he doesn't distinguish between natural sounds and those they induce. They make all kinds of preposterous accusations against him. Then when they get him in a receptive mood they start on their psycho-analysis.*[113]

Convinced that he has seen through Angel and his party, Pinfold feels in control again. Playing the part of 'a testy colonel' now, '[h]e felt himself master of the field: caught unawares, with unfamiliar barbarous weapons, treacherously ambushed when, as it were, he was under the cover of the Red Cross, he had rallied and routed the enemy.'[114] The image Pinfold chooses for himself is King Lear with a happy ending.

The Cinematic Mind

From the outset of his writing career, Waugh was acutely aware of the power of new media and he took advantage of them; he was part of a generation that belonged to – what David Trotter terms – the 'first media age':

---

[111] Ibid., p. 113.

[112] Writing in the fifties, Waugh had in mind not only the Second World War but also the Cold War. Pinfold's imaginary torture resembles very much James Bond's torture by Le Chiffre in Ian Fleming's debut Cold War spy fiction, *Casino Royale* (1953). Ian Fleming, *Casino Royale* (London: Vintage, 2012), pp. 143-52.

[113] *Pinfold*, pp. 114-15.

[114] Ibid., pp. 10, 116.

> Communications technology is an attitude before it is a machine or a set of codes. It is an idea about the prosthetic enhancement of our capacity to communicate. The writers who first woke up to this fact were not postwar, postmodern, or post-anything else. Some of the best of them lived and wrote in the British Isles in the period between the world wars. […] One reason to conceive of the period between the world wars as the first media age is the evolution at that time of a widespread awareness of the multiple coexistence of mass media.[115]

'The Balance' not only transplants the cinematic form but also incorporates the cinematic techniques which Waugh obtained from being an avid cinemagoer and film reviewer, and from his own film-making experience at Oxford. Not only at this stage but also throughout his career, cinema, not radio, would be the inspiration for Waugh's method. In marked contrast to the dissociated mind, which operates like a radio, the cinematic mind with its detachment is conceived to be the sane option.

Radio versus Cinema

Fascinated by cinema, Waugh, in fact, sustained a relentless aversion to radio. The novelist abhorred radio as a form of broadcasting, in particular entertainment programmes such as Jazz music and talks. Fictionally, almost two decades before his indictment of radio in *Pinfold*, Waugh ridiculed the medium itself and the most powerful establishment behind it in 'The Sympathetic Passenger' (1939). The short story begins with Mr James, 'a mild-tempted person – in all matters, it might be said, except one; he abominated the wireless', escaping home, as Mrs James and Agnes, possibly a cook, tune in to different stations and 'radio music burst from every window of his house'.[116] For Mr James, 'in his middle fifties', the wireless is a 'violation of his privacy': 'It was not merely that it gave him no pleasure; it gave active pain, and, in the course of years, he had come to regard the invention as being directed deliberately against himself, a conspiracy of his enemies to disturb and embitter what should have been the placid last years of his life.'[117]

On his way to the station to collect a parcel, Mr James gives a lift to a stranger, who starts talking passionately about his hatred of the 'diabolical' wireless.[118] The

[115] Trotter, *First Media Age*, p. 2.
[116] Waugh, 'The Sympathetic Passenger', in *Complete Short Stories*, pp. 221-24 (p. 221). To listen to his BBC interview by Angel, 'Mr Pinfold had the cook's wireless carried into the drawing-room' (*Pinfold*, p. 15).
[117] Ibid.
[118] Ibid., p. 222.

harmless conversation quickly takes a sinister turn as the 'sympathetic passenger' turns out to be a madman, who believes that the wireless is 'put here by the devil to destroy us […] It causes cancer, tuberculosis, infantile paralysis, and the common cold', and he reveals his plan of assassinating 'the Director-General of the BBC. I shall kill them *all*.'[119] Clearly, the BBC is here being mocked. The madman is determined to have his revenge because:

> 'They have tried to kill me with headaches. But I was too clever for them. Did you know that the B.B.C. has its own secret police, its own prisons, its own torture chambers?'
> 'I have long suspected it.'[120]

The passenger becomes violently murderous towards Mr James when he fails to catch up with a car, whose driver, a girl, is listening to jazz music from the wireless. Mr James manages to escape eventually but he is so shocked by the madman's disproportionate hatred of the wireless that he seems to be converted at the end of this thriller story when he, having returned home, asks his wife "[n]ot [to] switch off radio. Like it. Homely."[121]

In both the story and *Pinfold*, radio as a form of entertainment is depicted as something diabolical, which has the power to possess. Ironically, *Pinfold* was made into a radio drama by the BBC. Adapted and produced by Michael Bakewell, starring Ralph Michael as Pinfold, it was first broadcast on the Third Programme on 7 June 1960, heralding Waugh's *Face to Face* interview, first broadcast on 26 June 1960.[122] Tracing Waugh's relationship with the BBC from the late twenties until his death, Winnifred M. Bogaards notes that 'A memo of 31 March 1960 indicates the script by Bakewell is set to go, Waugh to have final approval, for a fee of £250. Waugh did approve the script'.[123] No published personal writings of Waugh record his

---

[119] Ibid., pp. 222, 223.
[120] Ibid., p. 223.
[121] Ibid., p. 224.
[122] Heath, *Prison*, p. 285. John Freeman, the interviewer of the *Face to Face*, was no less difficult than Stephan Black and attempted to psychoanalyse the writer. Waugh wrote about the experience in his letter to Nancy Mitford on 21 June 1960: 'Last week I was driven by poverty to the humiliating experience of appearing on the television. The man who asked the questions simply couldn't believe I had had a happy childhood. "Surely you suffered from the lack of a sister?"' *Letters*, p. 617. Similarly, in the most recent biography, Philip Eade contradicts Waugh's account of his happy childhood to argue for an unhappy childhood primarily due to his position as a second son: 'from an early age he occasionally felt both alienated and unloved, excluded above all from the extraordinary gooey bond between his father, the publisher and critic Arthur Waugh, and his elder brother Alec'. Philip Eade, *Evelyn Waugh: A Life Revisited* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2016), p. 1.
[123] Winnifred M. Bogaards, 'Evelyn Waugh and the BBC', in *Evelyn Waugh: New Directions*, ed. by

comments on the BBC radio dramatisation of *Pinfold*, which received 'enthusiastic reviews', because, as Stannard explains, 'Waugh refused to listen to it'.[124] According to Stannard, the BBC probably meant the radio adaptation and Waugh's television interview to coincide for good publicity: 'Audience and programme-makers alike now waited eagerly for the next confrontation. It was, Burnett announced, a "major scoop".'[125] Despite his professed hostility towards radio, based primarily on his gender and class bias, Waugh had no objection to employing it as a publicity tool himself.[126]

It is interesting to see, or rather listen to, not only how Waugh's novel is adapted by an institution he constantly derided into a medium he overtly detested, but also how the experience of voice hearing is transported from the novelistic back to the purely auditory medium. The BBC radio *Pinfold* is a faithful adaptation; although the novel is short, it is surprising that both the story and the plot remain intact. Overall, it is a good adaptation, not because of its faithfulness to Waugh's novel but because of its contribution to its resonance when read alongside. What is unique about the radio version is its playing with sound – the diegetic and non-diegetic music and voices at different levels – which is impossible in the medium of the novel. Even though radio as a medium may not be the message – at least not intended by Waugh, whose medium capable of conveying his message is cinema – it unarguably enhances the message.

The radio drama concretises the three-eight rhythm the bright young people use to torture Pinfold, and the songs they sing to hurl abuses at him.[127] While the former sounds tribal, ritualistic, savage, and somewhat like 'a confused roaring', the latter is rather melodic and catchy for all its malice.[128] The background music creates an eerie environment that echoes the mysterious world of Pinfold's hallucinated mind. The use of special sound effects also contributes to the dramatisation. Fade-in and

---

Alain Blayac (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 85-111 (pp. 106-7).

[124] Stannard, *NAC*, p. 430.

[125] Ibid., pp. 430-31. Huge Burnett was the producer of *Face to Face*.

[126] Waugh associated radio with the female and the working-class. In 'The Sympathetic Passenger', Mr and Mrs James's opposing attitudes to radio are purposefully contrasted. Mrs James's enjoyment of radio aligns her with their cook, Agnes. 'The wireless, for Mrs. James, was a link with the clean pavements and bright shop windows, a communion with millions of fellow beings.' Mr James 'brood with growing resentment on the vulgarity of womankind.' Waugh, 'Passenger', p. 221. Bogaards confirms that Waugh saw radio as entertainment for the masses but had no scruples about approaching the BBC when he needed publicity for his work or, simply, money. Bogaards, pp. 90-91.

[127] *Pinfold*, pp. 37-38, 55-58.

[128] Evelyn Waugh, *Decline and Fall* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 9.

fade-out function sometimes as ellipses and at other times as indicators of the comings and goings of the disembodied voices in Pinfold's mind as well as the *real* characters, foregrounding some and backgrounding others. A microphone seems to shuttle smoothly between different sets and connect them, but all have existence beyond the microphone, which is only captured by it intermittently. Echoes are employed to denote ellipses in the text. When Margaret is taking leave of Pinfold after he realises that she is a mere creation of his mind, her words are repeated in faint echoes: '"… I don't exist, Gilbert. There isn't any me, anywhere at all… but I do love you, Gilbert. I don't exist but I do love… Goodbye… Love…" and her voice too trailed away, sank to a whisper, a sigh, the rustle of a pillow; then was silent.'[129]

Taking full advantage of its medium, the opening of the radio drama is an exemplary adaptation. A narrator reads out verbatim the opening paragraph and the first sentence of the second paragraph of the novel to introduce Pinfold to the listener, disappears and never returns. What follows then is the BBC interview with Angel, the recording of which, narrated in the novel,[130] is acted out in the radio version, which prompted such a comment in *Radio Times* (3 June 1960): 'old BBC hands… got a great deal of masochistic pleasure out of the opening episode… when Pinfold is interviewed… for a Frankly Speaking type of programme.'[131] Questions about his writing, his tastes, the country, politics, and his conversion to Catholicism are fired at Pinfold one after another at a dazzling speed. Through the questions and answers, the portrait, more precisely caricature, of the middle-aged artist, described by a third-person narrator in the novel, is sketched out. Moreover, the encounter with the interviewers, shown as aggressive and ferocious, justifies Pinfold's trauma and foreshadows his dissociation.

The radio *Pinfold* sets voices at different levels interacting with each other: Pinfold's voice, the voices he hears, his thoughts commenting on the voices, the narrator's voice, and the voices of the real characters, actors' comments through their performance. At the very end, rendering the charged moment when Pinfold declares his triumph over the voices and congratulates himself on having 'endured a great deal and, unaided, [emerging] the victor', Ralph Michael pauses before the words

[129] *Pinfold*, p. 129.
[130] 'They questioned Mr Pinfold about his tastes and habits.' Ibid., p. 14.
[131] 'Adapted from Waugh' quoted in Stannard, *NAC*, p. 430.

'the victor' and adds a laugh after it.[132] The laugh is his acting and also his comment. Adaptation can be viewed as a way of reading, and, like any kind of reading, it involves interpreting and commenting by making explicit some particular aspects of the so-called source text.

There are, however, also losses in the process of transporting *Pinfold* from novel to radio. The change of medium shifts the perspective. While the text is unmistakably filtered through the lens of the protagonist and the voices therefore come clearly from Pinfold's dissociated mind, in the radio play the source of the voices is sometimes not as easily identified due to the lack of an apparent unifying, controlling single point of view: as Pinfold's voice is submerged in the voices of others, he becomes merely a character like any other. Despite some indicators, usually the same eerie non-diegetic music preceding the voice-hearing episodes, Pinfold seems to lose his authority. On the other hand, this blurring of the real and the imaginary – both within the fictional – offers the listener an opportunity to experience the confusion which torments the dissociated Pinfold. Moreover, the radio adaptation does not acknowledge the novel's intertextuality, which is crucial in that *Pinfold* parodies *King Lear* as its protagonist compares himself to the tragic hero; indeed much of the comedy of the novel derives from this parody. Focusing entirely on the auditory, the radio version also fails to address the latent yet significant visual aspect of the text. Other losses include Pinfold's persona, which is central to his ordeal but omitted in the radio drama, and the listener's sympathy, for Pinfold's pompous voice makes it difficult to sympathise with him.

In spite of writing a wireless story, Waugh certainly preferred cinema to radio as a medium. Drawing on McLuhan's distinction between the literate man as 'visual, individualistic, and detached' and the preliterate as 'aural, communal, and involved', McCartney interprets the novelist's preference for the eye to the ear as such: 'Waugh generally associated barbarism with noise and civilisation with vision. This was a natural corollary of his dialectic of Dionysus and Apollo, the gods of music and light respectively. So it is not surprising to discover that much of his organizational strategy springs from an inherent tension between ear and eye.'[133]

Cinematic Pinfold

[132] *Pinfold*, p. 131.
[133] McCartney, pp. 160-61, 155.

McCartney argues that '[t]he hallucinations that hound [Pinfold] to and over the precipice of madness are exclusively aural. Their lack of any visual dimension is precisely why he finds it so difficult to quell them.'[134] Although *Pinfold* certainly juxtaposes what McCartney calls 'the wisdom of the eye' with the 'confused roaring',[135] it is inaccurate to say that Pinfold's hallucinations are 'exclusively aural' because he matches each voice heard with an image. Pinfold here attempts to find out the identities of the hooligans who abuse him:

> he thought he had noticed [Fosker] in the lounge after dinner, amusing the girls, tall, very young, shabby, shady, vivacious bohemian, with long hair, a moustache and the beginning of side-whiskers. There was something in him of the dissolute law students and government clerks of mid-Victorian fiction. Something too of the young men who had now and then crossed his path during the war – the sort of subaltern who was disliked in his regiment and got himself posted to SOE. […] The image of him, however, remained sharp cut as a cameo. The second, dominant young man was a voice only; rather a pleasant well-bred voice for all its vile utterances.[136]

Not only is Pinfold able to describe Fosker's appearance in detail, he also gives his tormentor a personality by comparing him to Dickensian characters and real soldiers (another reference to the war). Interestingly, Pinfold's embodiment of the voices resembles characterisation in fiction writing. Fosker is what E. M. Forster terms a 'round' character; by contrast, the other young man, who remains a voice and is sketched as a type, is a 'flat' one.[137]

Pinfold is, on the one hand, unarguably aural; Mr Pinfold's hearing is extraordinarily sensitive to the extent that it can seem as if he were blindfolded. In fact, he projects an image of himself as someone groping in the dark alone literally and figuratively for much of the novel. On the other hand, there is always a visual dimension to it. To reason and to understand, Pinfold distrusts his hearing but relies on his sight. From the outset, Pinfold is thus portrayed: 'his mind like a cinema camera trucked furiously forward to confront the offending object close-up with glaring lens; with the eyes of a drill sergeant inspecting an awkward squad, bulging with wrath that was half-facetious, and with half-simulated incredulity'.[138] In such a way, Pinfold confronts and inspects the voices in his mind's eye; his auditory

[134] Ibid., p. 158.
[135] Ibid., p. 155.
[136] *Pinfold*, p. 55.
[137] E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London: Penguin, 2005), p. 73. It was originally published in 1927.
[138] *Pinfold*, p. 10.

hallucinations are thus made highly visual.

In addition to the references to cinema in the novel, what is keenly felt is the presence of a moving camera and thus an implied director, who, though enjoying an omniscient view, divulges in a controlled and even manipulative manner. For Stannard, Waugh's hallucinations can be seen as 'cutting-room snippets edited out of the film of his life. […] his unconscious flashed up scene after scene of shameful embarrassment he thought he had destroyed.'[139] That is also true of Pinfold's hallucinations. Moreover, suffering from persecution mania, Pinfold suspects that Angel, his chief tormentor, places him under continual surveillance. In an age that precedes the widespread use, or misuse, of CCTV cameras, a team of observers have to be mobilised and coordinated.[140] The reader is introduced to several panning cameras and rapid bouts of cross-cutting:

> 'Gilbert has sat down at his table… He's reading the menu… He's ordering wine… He's ordered a plate of cold ham.'
> When he moved he was passed on to relays of observers.
> 'Gilbert coming up to main deck. Take over, B.'
> 'OK A. Gilbert now approaching door on port side, going out to deck. Take over, C.'
> […]
> Later it transpired that about half the passengers had been recruited by Angel for observation duties.[141]

Pinfold hears his tormentors and *sees* them. Surveillance on such a disproportionate scale which only happens in the mind of the observed and is well orchestrated by none other than himself may seem ludicrous to the reader. For the protagonist, however, who is allowed neither the detachment from nor the awareness of the reality of his state of mind, what he experiences is what he believes to be true.

The novel's visuality lies not only in its cinematic techniques but also in its intertextuality. The interplay between the characters inside Pinfold's mind and real people who exist outside it is at its most intense when he returns to London. He converses with his wife intermittently due to the persistent interruption by a chorus of voices in his head racing against each other to confuse and discredit him:

> 'How you hate her, Gilbert! How she bores you!' said Goneril.

---

[139] Stannard, *NAC*, p. 349.

[140] In *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), Orwell, however, imagined an instrument called the telescreen for mass surveillance: 'there was no way of shutting it off completely'; '[t]he telescreen received and transmitted sinutanously.' George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. 4, 5. For Pinfold, Angel and his party resemble the Thought Police.

[141] *Pinfold*, p. 108.

> ‘Don’t believe a word she says,’ said Angel.
> ‘She’s very pretty,’ Margaret conceded, ‘and very kind. But she is not good enough for you. I suppose you think I’m jealous. Well, I am.’
> ‘I’m sorry to be so uncommunicative,’ said Mr Pinfold. ‘You see these abominable people keep talking to me.’
> ‘Most distracting,’ said Mrs Pinfold.[142]

The clash between imagination and reality is so visual that Goneril, Angel, and Margaret can almost be seen as hovering above Pinfold’s shoulder participating in the conversation. The reader can *see* these disembodied voices also because Pinfold maps them on to the well-known characters in *King Lear*. During the composition of *Pinfold*, Waugh was rereading *Lear* and contemplating the possibility of a cinematic adaptation. He wrote to Ann Fleming on 25 February 1956: ‘Laura and I went through blizzards to Bristol to see Mrs Kennedy [as Cordelia] in *King Lear*. She was awfully bad and King Lear’s sufferings seemed no sharper than mine. But, I say, what a film *Lear* would make! The only Shakespeare play obviously designed for the Cinema’.[143] Richard Jacobs suggests that Pinfold ‘may be read as the film of *Lear* as written/played by Keaton or Chaplin, or a composite Laurel/Hardy; the kind of role that Waugh enjoyed assuming.’[144]

Lear, as a parallel text, underpins and dramatises *Pinfold*. The two major female voices Pinfold hears are immediately given the names of two of Lear’s daughters. Pinfold overhears an unfair trial of a wounded seaman and his subsequent murder by the Captain and his mistress:

> ‘Tie him to the chair,’ said the leman, and Mr Pinfold at once thought of *King Lear*: ‘Bind fast his corky arms.’ Who said that? Goneril? Regan? Perhaps neither of them. Cornwall? It was a man’s voice, surely? in the play. But it was the voice of the woman, or what passed as a woman, here. Addict of nicknames as he was, Mr Pinfold there and then dubbed her ‘Goneril’.[145]

Later, Pinfold introduces another character, Margaret, ‘the kind nurse’, whom he compares to ‘a sort of Cordelia’.[146] After the voices are matched with images and put in place, it gradually crystallises that Pinfold considers himself to be Lear. Pinfold shares Lear’s madness, as well as his age: ‘[Pinfold] was possessed from outside himself with atavistic panic. “O let me not be mad, not mad, sweet heaven,”

---

[142] Ibid., p. 127-28.
[143] *Letters*, p. 530.
[144] Richard Jacobs, ‘Introduction’, in *Pinfold*, pp. vii-xliii (p. xxxvi). Jacobs’s choice of actor for the role of Pinfold/Lear is not surprising in the light of Beckett’s twenty-minute *Film* (1965) starring Buster Keaton, which is concerned with spectacle, perception, and paranoia.
[145] Ibid., p. 47.
[146] Ibid., p. 50.

he cried.'[147] The comic hero says the tragic Lear's lines to express his own sense of helplessness and fear of the loss of the ability to reason. In 'King Lear: The Mirror Cracked' (2004), Sally-Anne Ennis examines Lear's dissociation: 'Couple [devaluation and emptiness] with the falling away of support, death of peers, and failing health, and it suggests old age may well exacerbate known personality disorders or latent ones. For Lear it brings his target problem harshly in front of his face: "I do not know how to cope with any disturbance to my omnipotent reflection."'[148] That is also true of Pinfold.

In *Thinking with Literature* (2016), Terence Cave views Gloucester's imaginary fall as a comic parody of Lear's fall, metaphorically out of power and into madness: 'the standard tragic plot of a fall that remains heroic (perhaps culminating in a Stoic suicide, an act of ultimate self-mastery) is supplanted by its pathetic inverse: a failed suicide, an old man tricked, a figure that stumbles and falls over. Above all, it is supplanted by a simulated fall.'[149] Pinfold parodies Lear in that the anti-hero in his hallucinations attempts to be a hero. Being senile and losing control, the old soldier, however, dreams of being heroic again, as he has been in the war. Playing the role of Lear, Pinfold literally fights against Goneril. In his hallucinated mind, not only is he being watched, his mind is also being read. The novel is essentially a writer's refusal to be read like a book, or a character. So, by way of counterattack, the writer-protagonist resorts to reading, reading a *bad* book out loud badly: 'Mr Pinfold tormented them in his turn by making gibberish of the text, reading alternate lines, alternate words, reading backwards, until they pleaded for a respite. Hour after hour Mr Pinfold remorselessly read on.'[150] This is indeed some comic relief. Like cinema, comedy also helps to achieve detachment. The many references to *Lear* add action and drama and therefore a visual layer to the novel. Well aware of the theatricality of his ordeal, Pinfold sometimes stands back to think and measure his experiences as a

---

[147] Ibid., p. 81. William Shakespeare, *King Lear* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 144.

[148] Sally-Anne Ennis, 'King Lear: The Mirror Cracked', in *Cognitive Analytic Therapy and Later Life: A New Perspective on Old Age*, ed. by Jason Hepple and Laura Sutton (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 109-32 (p. 123). Hepple and Sutton note that '[l]ater life is seen as a testing part of development where not only do old dilemmas, reciprocal roles and idealisations resurface, but where also an individual can face, for the first time, terrifying threats to the integrity of the self.' Hepple and Sutton, 'Introduction', pp. xv-xvi (p. xvi).

[149] Terence Cave, *Thinking with Literature: Towards a Cognitive Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 108. Cave understands Lear's fall as 'both a prototypical metaphor and a recurring plot across "Western" narrative' and mentions Waugh's *Decline and Fall* in passing (pp. 125-26).

[150] *Pinfold*, p. 117.

detached spectator of a play or film, which perhaps also can be seen as a sign of his dissociation. Playing the role of a critic, Pinfold finds the hooligans' performance distasteful: 'Had it appeared behind foodlights on a real stage, Mr Pinfold would have condemned it as grossly overplayed.'[151]

[151] Ibid., p. 55.

Chapter Two
Cinema, Comedy, and Satire:
Decline and Fall as a Chaplinesque Silent Film

Decline and Fall (1928), Evelyn Waugh's debut novel, is a satirical comedy in which the young writer further experimented in the cinematic fashion that he had begun to explore in 'The Balance'. Confident in his knowledge of cinema, silent in particular, Waugh borrowed its technique liberally to benefit his fictional writing. This first novel successfully established his exterior modernism by the outside method, to which cinema, comedy, and satire are essential.

A year before the publication of *Decline and Fall*, *The Jazz Singer* (1927) marked the birth of sound cinema. Charlie Chaplin, the icon of the silent era, however, continued to make silent films until 1940. Chaplin's initial resistance to the 'talking pictures' may not simply have been an inability to keep pace with and adapt to new technology; like Waugh, he genuinely regarded the silent cinema as a form of art in its own right. Promoting *City Lights* (1931) when the sound revolution prevailed in Hollywood, Chaplin thus explained his rejection of the talkies: 'It is axiomatic that true drama must be universal in its appeal […] and I believe the medium of presentation should also be a universal rather than a restricted one.'[1] As '[a]ction is more generally understood than words', he believed that '[p]antomime lies at the base of any form of drama.'[2]

Comparing Waugh's and Chaplin's methods and drawing on the resemblances between the young writer's first novel and the actor-director's silent films, I read Waugh's *Decline and Fall* as the written equivalent of a Chaplinesque silent film.[3] I begin by situating Waugh's composition of the novel in the historical context of an emerging yet vibrant university student cinema culture in the early twenties. If *Hamlet*, Waugh insisted, is 'the greatest undergraduate tragedy', then his own *Decline and Fall* might be regarded as an undergraduate novel, an Oxford novel, specifically.[4] This novel, about the unlikely adventure of a quiet and passive

[1] Charlie Chaplin, 'A Rejection of the Talkies', in *Focus on Chaplin*, ed. by Donald W. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 63-65 (p. 63).
[2] Ibid., 64.
[3] See Hart Crane, 'Chaplinesque', in *The Complete Poems and Selected Letters and Prose of Hart Crane*, ed. by Brom Weber (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 11.
[4] Waugh, 'Wittenberg and Oxford: "A Little More than Kin and A Less than Kind"', in *EAR*, pp. 15-16

undergraduate at an obscure college at a thinly disguised Oxford, is particularly informed by the author's apprenticeship in cinema – both reviewing and film-making – as an Oxford student.

I then examine how cinema, comedy, and satire are used as ingredients to create Waugh's unique blend of exterior modernism. The comedy of *Decline and Fall*, which can be traced back to Greek comedy and the commedia dell'arte, relies heavily on the body, often a grotesque one. The novel certainly plays with embodiment and disembodiment. Similarly, Chaplin's emphasis on pantomime situates his silent comedies in the tradition of the commedia dell'arte. The Little Tramp is a character type more than a round character even in the feature-length films from *The Kid* (1921) to *Modern Times* (1936). Like the stock characters of the commedia dell'arte, the Tramp is immediately identifiable by his body, or body parts, and movement, particularly his singular walk.[5]

Comedy aims to elicit laughter, one of the most violent bodily experiences. In both Waugh and Chaplin, laughter and comedy are often closely associated with satire, and they are interdependent. While satire lends depth to comedy, comedy enhances satire; laughter is a weapon to satirise. Both Waugh and Chaplin satirised the establishment and authority – the Bollinger Club, the college dons, the public school, and Society in Waugh, and the police and the bourgeoisie in Chaplin – although not necessarily without the wish to belong to them. More significantly, through satire, both fiercely attacked the modern age, epitomised by the machine. In *Decline and Fall*, Otto Silenus and his King's Thursday are the worst offenders. Chaplin's last silent film, *Modern Times*, is no less scathing in its indictment of automatism inflicted upon the human.

'GO TO THE CINEMA and risk the headache':[6]
Waugh's Apprenticeship in Cinema and His Oxford Novel

(p. 15). Waugh even claimed that 'the whole significance of the play is that it is an undergraduate play' (ibid.).

[5] The Tramp is also characterised by anything related to his body, such as his toothbrush moustache, his small bowler hat and oversized shoes, and his tight jacket and baggy trousers, all of which become integral parts of his body.

[6] *Letters*, p. 8.

Arguably, the genesis of *Decline and Fall* is intrinsically linked with Waugh's early experience with and training – albeit amateur – in cinema, ranging from his early cinemagoing, his undergraduate film reviews for the *Isis*, his practical experience of making films and acting with a group of Oxford friends, and the overall cinema culture prevalent at Oxford and Cambridge in the early twenties. Waugh's first novel is certainly more than simply a nod to Chaplin's behaviourist slapstick comedy, on which the young novelist drew to develop his outside method. Exploring psychology and emotion through the stylised setting – the employment of chiaroscuro in particular – and exaggerated gesticulation, German expressionist cinema, of which Chaplin's feature-length silent films can be viewed as a comic version, also evidently influenced *Decline and Fall*.

Waugh on Chaplin: The Transition

For Waugh and his generation, writing in the shadow of high modernism, cinema is hardly ever the 'cinema of attractions', a term Tom Gunning has invented to refer to the cinema from its birth in 1895 to about 1906, which is characterised by 'this harnessing of visibility, this act of showing and exhibition'.[7] While Gunning's date of 1906 demarcates the narrating cinema from the recording cinema, Shail identifies the year 1911 as cinema's 'second birth' because it marks the transition from 'The Cinematograph' to 'The Pictures', or 'the emergence of a distinct institution cinema'.[8] That Shail's choice of 1911 as a watershed for cinema recalls Woolf's 1910 – December 1910 to be precise – for high modernism, when 'human character changed', is perhaps no coincidence.[9] If cinema indeed experienced a second birth in 1911, which was not only a critical hindsight but 'also clear to contemporaries', there existed a generational difference in the experience of cinema between high and exterior modernists.[10] Not only did Joyce start seeing films in Rome in 1907,[11] he founded the Volta Cinema, Ireland's first dedicated cinema, on Mary Street in Dublin

[7] Tom Gunning, 'The Cinema of Attraction[s]: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant-Garde', in *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, ed. by Wanda Strauven (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), pp. 381-88 (p. 381).
[8] Shail, pp. 32, 1, 33.
[9] Woolf, 'Character in Fiction', p. 38.
[10] Shail, p. 32.
[11] Ibid., p. 35.

on 20 December 1909,[12] preceding Shail's 1911, as well as Waugh's first recorded visit to the cinema on 22 December 1919 in his diary: 'After tea Alec, Barbara, and I went to the cinema but had a poor show.'[13] That could not have been his first encounter with cinema; the summer of 1920, however, saw frequent cinemagoing. In August 1920, Waugh spent a lot of time with Barbara, Alec Waugh's first wife, shopping, having tea, and going to the cinema and the music hall.[14] For the Waughs, cinemagoing was a family activity. By January 1921, Waugh was so confident about his understanding of the new medium that, in a letter to Dudley Carew giving advice on writing, he urged his Lancing friend to '[t]ry and bring home thoughts by actions and incidents. Don't make everything said. This is the inestimable value of the Cinema to novelists (don't scoff at this as a cheap epigram it is really very true). […] MAKE THINGS HAPPEN. Have a murder in every chapter if you like but do do something. GO TO THE CINEMA and risk the headache.'[15]

Although Waugh often recorded the titles of the plays he saw in his diary, the titles of the films were usually omitted, with a few exceptions. Waugh mentioned attending a 'private view of the film version of *Little Dorritt* [*sic*]' with his mother and Barbara on 24 August 1920, and he thus described his experience with literary adaptation: 'Very bad. Dickens always seems so fantastic and grotesque on the cinema with all his doddering old men and semi-imbeciles. The plot too seemed peculiarly inconsequent and insipid.'[16]

A more constant exception was Chaplin, whom Waugh followed throughout his life and greatly admired. Considering his habitual low opinion of adaptations, Waugh's appreciation of Chaplin may have derived from the film-maker's original screenplays. Seen from the perspective of all that can be gleaned from his published personal writings, Waugh's views of cinema underwent a significant change, which mirrored the development of Chaplin's art. Waugh's earliest comment on Chaplin can be found in his diary entry of Monday 22 August 1921, which recorded Waugh's seeing *The Kid* (1921) with his parents: 'I confess I was disappointed with it. It was too self-conscious and sentimental. The part I liked best was that in which he was most like his older knockabout films. He did one splendid fight with a brick which

[12] Gordon Bowker, *James Joyce: A Biography* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011), p. 191.
[13] *Diaries*, p. 46.
[14] Ibid., pp. 98-102.
[15] *Letters*, p. 8.
[16] *Diaries*, p. 102.

cheered me a lot.'[17] On Monday 14 September 1925, Waugh wrote in his diary that he went 'to a distressing film by Charles Chaplin which was being presented for the first time to an enormous crowd at the Tivoli. I hated it.'[18] The film in question was *The Gold Rush* (1925).[19] His diary of Saturday 31 January 1931 was jotted down in fragmented, journalistic English: 'Went to Indian cinema with commercial traveller. Old Charlie in transition stage Keystone – *Coldrush*. Polishes his nails before meals. Food stolen. Eats grass with salt and pepper and delicacy, rinses fingers. In the end handsome lover turns up and Charlie goes off. Followed Indian film; fairy story; very ornamental.'[20] Waugh's account of the Indian film, however interesting, is another story. No Chaplin film of the title, *Coldrush*, however, can be identified now. It may have been *The Gold Rush*, the film Waugh professedly hated, here misquoted in haste. But the synopsis sketched out does not match the plot of *The Gold Rush* (its most memorable scene is starving Charlie eating his cooked shoe and laces with relish); nor is the well-known film, released in 1925 by United Artists, a Keystone production. Despite its affinity to *The Gold Rush*, there perhaps had been a film *Coldrush*; only it did not manage to survive. Films from the silent era are ephemeral objects because almost all of them were made on the cellulose nitrate stock, and, as a fragile, combustible, unstable, and highly-flammable substance that decomposes by giving off a toxic gas and turning into a sticky glue and eventually dust, 'Nitrate won't wait'.[21]

What is more interesting than the elusive, or lost, film itself is Waugh's remark, 'Old Charlie in transition stage Keystone', literally (Chaplin in 1913 and 1914) or metonymically (Chaplin's early slapstick comedy up to *The Kid*) Keystone. Waugh perceived cinema's development towards narrative complexity. According to various critics, early cinema underwent a number of significant transitions: for Gunning, the development from 'cinema of attractions' to cinema of narration; for Shail, cinema's 'metamorphosis from a technology to a distinct medium with its own characteristic image-regime', or from sharing cultural spaces with other media, the music hall for

[17] Ibid., p. 141.
[18] Ibid., p. 232.
[19] 'Mr Chaplin's New Film: *The Gold Rush* at The Tivoli' (*The Times*, 15 September 1925, p. 10), *The Times Digital Archive*, accessed 14 July 2016 <http://gale.cengage.co.uk/times.aspx/>.
[20] *Diaries*, p. 368.
[21] Paolo Cherchi Usai, *Silent Cinema: An Introduction* (London: BFI Publishing, 2000), p. 12.

example, to occupying its own dedicated space, the cinema.[22] In addition, I would particularly draw attention to the transition of the dominant film form from short, the two reelers in particular, to feature-length films. Considering the interrelationship between cinema and fiction, cinema's maturation from a pure visual spectacle to a medium with a full capacity for storytelling is no less fundamental than the later transition from silent to sound cinema (the concern of my next chapter). It is cinema with its narrativity that enters into as driver of and influence on the realm of literature and therefore enables this new(er) medium to compare and compete with previous media.

The 1906 Australian film *The Story of the Kelly Gang* was inscribed on the UNESCO Memory of the World Register in 2007 as the first full-length narrative feature film in the world.[23] The year 1906 was crucial for Gunning because '[i]nvestigation of the films copyrighted in the U.S. shows that actuality films outnumbered fictional films until 1906.'[24] The nineteen teens, an important era for Shail, saw the establishment of the feature film as the dominant form; G. W. Griffith, due to his 'increasingly sophisticated use of editing, narrative, and continuity techniques', is regarded as a major contributor.[25] 1921 was recorded as the most prolific year of American feature film production: while the search result of the online American Film Institute Catalog of Feature Films shows 683 releases,[26] the number offered by *Empire Magazine* is 854.[27] For Chaplin, 1921 marked the birth of his first feature film, *The Kid*: cinema was now fully narrative for him rather than simply something packed with action. Ironically, cinema as action-packed and headache-inducing was how Waugh understood cinema in the same year, passionately expressed in his letter to Carew. Although he detected something 'self-conscious and sentimental' in *The Kid* when it was first released (and resisted it), the novelist failed to realise the changes brought about by the feature film until he

---

[22] Shail, p. 33.

[23] 'The Story of the Kelly Gang (1906)', *UNESCO Memory of the World Register*, last accessed 15 July 2016, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/flagship-project-activities/memory-of-the-world/register/>.

[24] Gunning, 'Attraction[s]', p. 381.

[25] Annette Kuhn and Guy Westwell, *A Dictionary of Film Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 376.

[26] *AFI Catalog of Feature Films*, last accessed 15 July 2016, <http://www.afi.com/members/catalog/>.

[27] Ian Freer, ed., *Empire Movie Miscellany: Instant Film Buff Status Guaranteed* (London: Virgin Books, 2007), p. 37.

commented on Chaplin's transition ten years later. However original, Chaplin perhaps cannot be described as avant-garde or innovative, for there seems to be a sense of belatedness in his art: it took him a decade more than his contemporaries to fully explore cinema's narrative power and over a decade to convert to sound cinema.

As many silent films from the nineteen tens onwards show, silent cinema is also able to *narrate*, albeit in a different way from sound cinema. The longer running time affords and encourages a fuller and more complex narration. In the twenties, Chaplin moved away from slapstick and arrived at a combination of comedy and tragedy and therefore allowed for a much wider and more nuanced range of emotions, including, though not restricted to, those classical emotions of pity and fear. The two pillars of Aristotle's theory of tragedy are epitomised by the hilarious yet heart-rending boxing scene in *City Lights*, considered by some critics to be Chaplin's greatest film because it 'had all the heart, and more, of *The Gold Rush*.'[28] Reviewing the film for *New York Herald Tribune*, Richard Watts Jr rightly observed that '"Charlot" is at last completely and valiantly the combination of the heroic and the hilarious he has been, in the past, able to portray only at moments.'[29]

A year after the publication of *Decline and Fall*, a period of personal turmoil caused by his first wife's desertion perhaps enabled Waugh to appreciate the tragic, or even the sentimental, side of the Tramp. In his letter to Henry Green in December 1929, Waugh related himself to the on-screen Chaplin: 'I was getting into a sort of Charlie Chaplinish Pagliacci attitude to myself as the man with a tragedy in his life and a tender smile for children.'[30] In his review of Chaplin's 1947 film *Monsieur Verdoux*, entitled 'The Man Hollywood Hates' (1947), Waugh hailed Chaplin's genius – 'only now reaching maturity, one of the great actors of all time' – and eulogised the film which received damning reviews in America – 'without qualification the finest piece of acting and dramatic construction I have ever seen.'[31] Waugh thus defended the actor-director, and, by doing so, fiercely attacked Hollywood. A complete departure from the Tramp character type, *Monsieur Verdoux* is more of a tragedy than a comedy, to the point where the comic elements, so

[28] Gerald D. McDonald, Michael Conway, and Mark Ricci, *The Films of Charlie Chaplin* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1965), p. 194.
[29] Richard Watts Jr quoted in McDonald, Conway, and Ricci. Ibid., p. 195.
[30] *Letters,* p. 51.
[31] Waugh, 'The Man Hollywood Hates', in *EAR*, pp. 337-39 (p. 338).

contrived and laboured, are incongruous in tone with the rest of the film.[32] Whatever comedy the film contains, is drowned in Verdoux's dark cynicism and anguish. In addition to a wider range and more subtle and nuanced portrayal of emotions, Chaplin made another effort to achieve narrative complexity by the employment of satire, which not only added to his comedy but also lent it meaning and depth.

University Cinema Culture in the Twenties

Quick to capture Chaplin's metamorphosis, the young novelist in the years leading up to *Decline and Fall*, however, clearly preferred the slapstick Keystone Chaplin to Chaplin of the twenties. There seems to exist an obstinate belatedness in Waugh as much as in Chaplin. In *Granular Modernism* (2014), Beci Carver argues that the difference between writers such as Proust, Joyce, and Woolf and the 'Granular Modernists', such as Waugh, Green, and William Gerhardie, is that the latter 'reveal time's "insignificance" rather than its "significance". Their novels are anti-significant, which is to say that they thin time down.'[33] Carver then offers a study of 'Oxonian futility', noting a link in *Decline and Fall*

> between the absence of self-discipline and 'the enervation of the will'. This paradox by which Paul's openness to experience paralyses him is the means by which the novel's 'moments' become 'thin'. Nothing matters because nothing that Paul does can be an action. To exercise his will is to forego volition. Agency dissolves itself. This is what it means to waste time.[34]

Paul's passivity has attracted much critical attention. Although he perhaps does not act, if action is narrowly understood in relation to agency, Paul is forced to react to the many things that happen to him. A great deal of action can be said to occur in this rather physical comedy. Waugh's novel does not foreground the significance of time in the way which the high modernist works do by minutely recording everything as it is happening and every sensation as it is being experienced so as to make every moment count. *Decline and Fall* is time*less* though rather than deliberately trivialising time.

Time might seem to be depicted as wasted and insignificant in some of Waugh's

[32] Think of the scene when Monsieur Verdoux, the bluebeard, courts a potential victim excessively in a house which he convinces her to buy and then falls out of the window.
[33] Beci Carver, *Granular Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 65.
[34] Ibid., pp. 63, 73.

early fiction; the novelist himself, however, wasted no time at Oxford. Except that he did not attempt to study modern history, for which he received a scholarship, Waugh was preoccupied at Oxford, actively involving in writing, both university journalism and literary production (not uncommon for his peers), drawing, and cinema, particularly towards the end of his time at university. His apprenticeship in cinema, in particular, seems to have generated 'The Balance', a story literally concerned with and representing the cinematic, and his first novel, *Decline and Fall*. Notably, Waugh's film activities, ranging from cinemagoing and film reviewing to making and acting, should be situated in the contemporary undergraduate cinema culture, which he not only participated but also pioneered.

Donat Gallagher labels the period between November 1917 and October 1928, which encompasses his Lancing and Oxford journalism and other works until the publication of *Decline and Fall*, as Waugh's 'First Steps', and summarises that 'for most of this period writing of any sort was less important to Waugh than drawing, and that fiction was more important to him than non-fiction.'[35] Gallagher rightly points out that art meant more than literature to Waugh at that time. Pasternak Slater observes: 'Until well after he left Oxford his ambitions were to be an artist rather than a writer.'[36] However, Gallagher's comment on the balance between fiction and non-fiction is questionable. Until the publication of his first novel, non-fiction had played a more significant role to Waugh than fiction. His first major publication was a biography of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, which grew out of a 'slim volume (25 pages)', entitled *P. R. B.*, accepted by Gerald Duckworth in 1927.[37] Other than the first chapters of a novel called *The Temple at Thatch*, which were discarded and burned due to Harold Acton's criticism,[38] 'The Balance', and a few short stories in *The Cherwell*, *The Isis*, and the short-lived *The Oxford Broom*, founded by Acton, Waugh did not write much fiction. By contrast, his school and university journalistic pieces were more noticeable and had a bigger impact. When he claimed in the diary on 2 April 1921 that 'I feel that I must write prose or burst', Waugh could not have had

[35] Gallagher, pp. 1, 3. Similarly, Davis sees Waugh's early writings as his apprenticeship. Robert Murray Davis, *Evelyn Waugh, Apprentice: The Early Writings, 1910-1927* (Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1985).

[36] Pasternak Slater, 'Introduction', p. xi.

[37] Stannard, *TEY*, p. 135.

[38] 'Too English for my exotic taste […] Too much nid-nodding over port.' Harold Acton quoted in Evelyn Waugh, *A Little Learning: The First Volume of an Autobiography* (London: Penguin, 2010), p. 228.

the distinction between fiction and non-fiction in mind; he was then frustrated by his attempt to write poetry: 'I am doing badly. I have only done about half a dozen verses and most of them are complete balls. I find myself forced into the most hideous rhymes.'[39]

The first half of 1924 saw Waugh working as sub-editor, film critic, and Union reporter for the term-time weekly Oxford undergraduate publication, the *Isis*, 'registered at the G. P. O. as a newspaper.'[40] He was not the only film critic on the *Isis*. 'Seen in the Dark', the column dedicated to film reviews, usually contained two pieces from different reviewers for two cinemas in Oxford, the Super Cinema (on Magdalen Street) and the George Street Cinema; typically two films were discussed in each review. Occasionally films screened in a cinema outside Oxford would receive the critical attention of an *Isis* reviewer: Arthur Tandy, signed almost always as A. T., once ventured out to Headington New Cinema for the German film *Destiny* (*Der Müde Tod*, 1921) and highly recommended both the film and the cinema.[41] Waugh reviewed exclusively the films shown in the Super Cinema, which, when he started in January, was a newcomer compared to its rival on George Street whose weekly full-page advertisement – in contrast to the competitor's quarter-sized advertisement – read: 'Always the best and latest Films; Full Orchestra.'[42] Cinemagoing in the early twenties was an unfamiliar experience for the twenty-first-century audience primarily because of the presence of live music, sometimes even a full orchestra, in the cinema. Cinema was therefore never completely silent. Seeing a film in Waugh's youth resembled the experience of going to the opera, except that, being more accessible, cinema entertained a more diverse audience.

Although the film reviews in the *Isis* could not compete with the Union reports or theatre reviews in scale or significance, they attested to the vibrant student cinema culture not only at Oxford but also at Cambridge. In fact, Cambridge was the first one of the two universities to have a cinema club, namely Cambridge University Kinema Club.[43] The Editor of *The Isis* therefore called for a similar club at Oxford

---

[39] *Diaries*, p. 129.
[40] *The Isis*, 645 (23 January 1924), i.
[41] Arthur Tandy, 'Headington New Cinema', *The Isis*, 657 (28 May 1924), 26.
[42] *Isis*, 645 (1924), iv.
[43] In his autobiography *Lions and Shadows* (1938), Christopher Isherwood, an exterior modernist, mentioned his membership of the Club and claimed that he was 'a born film fan.' He also told his

in June 1924: 'The attempts of the Labour Club and the Hypocrites in this direction prove the need of such an institution.'[44] One such attempt referred to was *666*, in which Waugh acted for the Labour Social Club and whose script was perhaps also written by him: 'The film has apparently been lost [since the late 1960s] and may not have been screened for well over twice as long as that'.[45] Peter A. Le Neve Foster, Producer and Business Manager (late Hon. Secretary and Vice-President, C. U. Kinema Club), was contacted to advise Oxford on the foundation of its own cinema club. Foster shared the experience in a letter, which was published in full in the *Isis*. Their Club was founded in October 1923. At the beginning they invited lectures, but in Lent Term 1924 they 'produced a picture', starring several people at Oxford.[46] Forster suggested that Oxford should 'get in with the Trade and keep there (not forgetting […] your local picture palace managers […])'.[47] Moreover, Forster revealed the industry's, or his own, contempt for the so-called 'Film Schools', remarking that '[n]o one can get a job in a studio if he is known to have been to one of these institutions.'[48] Instead, Forster spoke highly of Amateur Film Clubs and cited himself as an example of how a member's prospects of securing a career in cinema were raised by their involvement in amateur film-making.

The dedicated film columns in the *Isis* and the amateur film activities of university societies demonstrate the vibrant cinema culture among undergraduate students in the early twenties, which not only helps to explain the enormous influence that cinema has on Waugh's generation of writers, not least Green, Graham Greene, Powell, and Isherwood, but also reveals cinema as a cultural force that greatly contributes to the transformation of literature in the modernist period. If cinema brings about literary modernism, as Shail argues, then cinema with its variety – silent and sound, short and feature, drama and documentary – generates different versions of literary modernism: for Waugh, I argue, cinema gives birth to exterior modernism.

---

experience of acting as an extra in a film produced by George Pearson: 'Needless to say, it was cut out of the finished picture.' Christopher Isherwood, *Lions and Shadows: An Education in the Twenties* (London: Vintage, 2013), pp. 60, 62.

[44] Arthur Tandy, 'A University Cinema Club: How They are Doing it at Cambridge', *The Isis*, 659 (11 June 1924), 15.

[45] Simon Whitechapel, 'Adam and Evelyn: "The Balance", *The Temple at Thatch*, and *666'*, *Evelyn Waugh Newsletter and Studies*, 33/2 (2002), 1-9 (pp. 7-8).

[46] Tandy, 'A University Cinema Club', 15.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

German expressionist cinema is of particular interest to a discussion of interior and exterior modernisms because it is both interior and exterior. Frequently cast in the form of a psychological thriller, it often portrays interiority through the exterior method and explores psychology, states of madness, fear, and anxiety through often exaggerated renditions of their manifest behaviour as well as contextualising and ramifying the effect of the behaviour through highly stylised sets. In his study of German cinema between the wars, entitled *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (1947), Siegfried Kracauer observed: 'Inner life manifests itself in various elements and conglomerations of external life, especially in those almost imperceptible surface data which form an essential part of screen treatment. In recording the visible world – whether current reality or an imaginary universe – films therefore provide clues to hidden mental processes.'[49]

Unlike his earlier slapstick short films, Chaplin's feather-length silent films are not only exterior but also interior, due to their narrative – psychological and emotional specifically – complexity, reflected by outward behaviour; they can be seen as comic exemplars of expressionist cinema.[50] *Decline and Fall*, too, is comic and expressionist. None of Waugh's interwar novels is particularly concerned with such interiority as consciousness and emotion; in fact, the young writer prided himself on his outside method, which enabled his fiction to appear to be devoid of thought and feeling. Offering outward signs, his novels, then, leave the burden of mind-reading to the reader.

It is difficult of course to identify with complete accuracy the extent to which Waugh was familiar with German expressionist cinema, for he rarely recorded the titles of the films he saw. His seven film reviews for the *Isis* in early 1924 cannot

[49] Siegfried Kracauer, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966), p. 7.

[50] Interestingly, Waugh's experiment with exterior modernism corresponded to behaviourist psychology in the interwar era. John B. Watson, the founder of behaviourism, proposed to treat psychology as 'a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. Its theoretical goal is the prediction and control of behaviour. Introspection forms no essential part of its methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of consciousness.' John B. Watson, 'Psychology as the Behaviourist Views It', *Psychological Review*, 20/2 (1913), 158-77 (p. 158). Behaviour can be observed: '*saying* is doing – that is, *behaving*. Speaking overtly or to ourselves (thinking) is just as objective a type of behavior as baseball'; and it is described in terms of 'stimulus' and 'response'. John B. Watson, *Behaviourism* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1931), p. 6. For Watson, 'the most complicated of adult habits are explicable in terms of chains of simple conditioned responses.' John B. Watson, 'Behaviourism: A Psychology Based on Reflex-action', *Philosophy*, 1/4 (1926), 454-66 (p. 456).

shed any light because all the films reviewed were either American or British.[51] But he certainly knew them well enough to be able to make fun of German expressionist cinema, and perhaps the Cambridge University Kinema Club as well, in 'The Balance'. A technical error in the middle of the film which makes it 'obscure – after the manner of the more modern Continental studios' due to poor cinematography or temporary problems with the screening is interpreted by '*a voice with a Cambridge accent from the more expensive seats*' as '*Expressionismus*'.[52] Waugh's knowledge of German expressionist cinema can, to some extent, be constructed by the accounts of his peers. A. T. reviewed Fritz Lang's *Destiny* and spoke highly of German cinema generally: 'this is something which they don't make in England or America either. I don't know whether its brains or intelligence, but with "Caligari," "The Street," and "Destiny" (I have not yet seen "Siegfried") the cinema can at last claim its oft-urged recognition as art. Perhaps the note of symbolism is a trifle too insistent in German productions, but in "Destiny" it helps all the way.'[53] In the same number was Waugh's Union report. He was therefore likely to have read the review, even if he had not seen *Destiny* or any other German expressionist films.

In Chapter One Part One, I have shown the interesting conjunction of Woolf's and Waugh's writing careers in the early twenties and examined the ways in which both started from cinema but took it to opposite directions. Indeed, both writers selected from cinema what they found useful and emphasised and further developed either its interior or exterior aspect in their literary creation. Waugh seized the exterior side of cinema – action in particular – evident in Chaplin's silent films, and employed it as a method to advance his literary purposes: comedy and satire, both of which require detachment, be it visual, emotional, or critical. Since the interiority, or the meaning, is not made explicit, the reader then has to infer from the outward behaviour. Seeking interiority in cinema and being largely disappointed by the unbridgeable divide between eye and brain, or image and thought, Woolf, paradoxically, discovered that the potential of cinema, promised by German expressionist cinema, lay in its ability to convey emotion, through on-screen symbols, more adequately than other kinds of art. In 'The Cinema', the novelist recorded her

[51] There were *The Merry-go Round* (23 January), an adaptation of an Ibanez novel (30 January), *Robin Hood* and *The Little Milliner* (6 February), *Pagliacci* (14 February), *If Winter Comes* (20 February), *Woman to Woman* (27 February), and *The Four Houseman* (5 March).
[52] 'Balance', p. 5.
[53] Tandy, 'Headington New Cinema', 26.

experience of seeing *The Cabinet of Dr Caligari* (1920). What fascinated her was not the film itself but

> a shadow shaped like a tadpole suddenly appeared at one corner of the screen. It swelled to an immense size, quivered, bulged, and sank back again into nonentity. For a moment it seemed to embody some monstrous diseased imagination of the lunatic's brain. For a moment it seemed as if thought could be conveyed by shape more effectively than by words. The monstrous quivering tadpole seemed to be fear itself, and not the statement 'I am afraid'. In fact, the shadow was accidental and the effect unintentional. But […] the cinema has within its grasp innumerable symbols for emotions that have so far failed to find expression.[54]

This visualisation of emotion, the exteriorisation of interiority in general, is precisely Waugh's outside method learned from cinema, particularly Chaplin's narrative (rather than purely physical) comedy. Perhaps less consciously, Waugh was also influenced by German expressionist cinema – as suggested in the example given by Woolf – acknowledged to be an exemplary model for the portrayal of the inner, not least fear and anxiety, through the outer and the elicitation of the same emotions among the audience.[55] What Woolf claimed to be her own contingent viewing experience may well be intrinsic to the cinematic medium, in which the character's mind, or heart, is read through the audience's art of seeing.

Woolf was likely to have seen *Dr Caligari* at the London Film Society screening on 14 March 1926, and some other films shown by the Society as well.[56] The link of the Bloomsbury Group with the Film Society in particular and with cinema in general is evident in

> the involvement of several Bloomsbury group members in the London-based Film Society, founded by Ivor Montagu and actor Hugh Miller in October 1925 (Roger Fry and John Maynard Keynes were amongst the founding members), the involvement of *Nation and Athenaeum* in announcing and reviewing Film Society events while under the literary editorship of Leonard Woolf, the publication by the Hogarth Press of Eric Walter White's early work of film theory, *Parnassus to Let: An Essay About Rhythm in Films* (1928) […][57]

Similarly, but on a smaller scale, Waugh and his fellow undergraduate students participated in the vibrant university cinema culture also through societies and with as much enthusiasm.

---

[54] Woolf, 'The Cinema', p. 270. Woolf's preoccupation with the 'tadpole' recalls her earlier story 'The Mark on the Wall' (1917). Virginia Woolf, 'The Mark on the Wall', in *Selected Short Stories*, ed. by Sandra Kemp (London: Penguin, 1993), pp. 53-60.

[55] For Kracauer, German interwar films can be described as '[m]acabre, sinister, morbid' (p. 3).

[56] George Amberg, ed., *The Film Society Programmes 1925-1939* (New York: Arno Press, 1972), p. 23. Marcus, *The Tenth Muse*, p. 118. Trotter, *Cinema*, p. 167.

[57] Shail, p. 5.

The Scarlet Woman

The first number of *The Isis* in the new academic year commencing October 1924 reiterated the urgent need for the establishment of O. U. Film Club, but it seemed to have failed to notice that during that summer a group of Oxford recent graduates had been making a film called *The Scarlet Woman: An Ecclesiastical Melodrama*.[58] Having come down with a Third in June, Waugh engaged himself with writing, directing, and acting in *Scarlet*, an amateur film. On 1 September 1924, Waugh explained in his diary the 'enormous gap' since 21 July and recounted his film-making experience in unfavourable terms, chiefly complaining about the high cost and the 'badness' of the unfinished film.[59] Waugh attributed the incomplete status of the film 'to the desertion of Elmley', but at the same time confessed that 'I feel no enthusiasm to finish it.'[60] Discussing Elsa Lanchester, the female lead who went on to have a successful career in film, in his 1930 *Daily Mail* article 'My Favourite Film Star', Waugh wrote: 'I produced her first film. It was taken on a half-size camera. […] It was a film of incredible complexity of plot, acted for the most part on Hampstead Heath. […] I have still a feeling of parental pride about her.'[61] Looking back years later, Waugh, however, gave a modest and disinterested account of the making of *Scarlet* in *A Little Learning*: 'Terence produced a cinema film using our garden for most of the scenes. The story was a fantasy of the attempts of Sligger Urquhart to convert the king to Roman Catholicism. Elmley, John Suntro and I were the leading actors.'[62] Waugh's modesty contrasted significantly with some critics' exaggeration of the role he played in making the film. Carpenter goes so far as to dismiss Greenidge's contribution and allow Waugh to take full credit: 'Greenidge did little more than provide encouragement and help with what was essentially Waugh's own creation.'[63] The efforts of Greenidge and others, however, should be acknowledged. After all, Greenidge, who took over from Waugh as the film critic of the *Isis*, would later have a career as an actor, and John Sutro was to

[58] *The Isis*, 661 (5 October 1924), 3.
[59] *Diaries*, p. 178.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Waugh, 'Star', p. 69.
[62] *ALL*, p. 209.
[63] Carpenter, p. 137.

become a film producer.

Waugh's evocation of the memory of making *Scarlet* two years before his death seems in particular to foreground the memory of his father, the man who published and liked Dickens and took little care to hide his preference for his eldest son. Nearing the end of his life, Waugh perhaps longed for a reconciliation that was long overdue. His recollection of his father enjoying not only the filming in his house but also viewing it afterwards, revealed a tender, even sentimental, moment, which was rare in Waugh, particularly in his relationship with his father:

> My father fully appreciated the fun of our venture, so much like the private theatricals of his own youth; he delighted to find the cast at his table and when the film was shown him took particular satisfaction in recognising his possessions. […] But as the leaves fell and the winter brought its attacks of asthma and bronchitis, gloom settled in the house. He had lately acquired a wireless set, and contrary to modern domestic conventions, it was he who always wished to hear it, I to turn it off.[64]

Underneath the matter-of-fact facade lies a sense of anguish, sadness, and perhaps regret. As if it was too heavy to bear, Waugh soon changed his subject and never mentioned the film again.

Relatively obscure today, *Scarlet*, however, boasts a long viewing history, despite being amateur, or simply bad. Charles Linck's 1969 article describes in detail the premiere of this homemade film:

> The first showing was in December, 1925 at the Oxford University Dramatic Society with musical accompaniment by Lennox Berkeley; Evelyn Waugh was not present, having "far too many other interests to allow him to concentrate on film-work," but John Fernald, the President of the OUDS, gave the film a rave notice in the Isis. He appreciated the mad caricaturing, John Sutro's versatile face, and the technique of representing persons by "favorite sport", i.e., "the Papal whiskey," "the royal gin," "the Romish cognac," and "the academic vodka."[65]

After its public debut, it was not infrequently screened in private at reunions of the Railway Club, to which most of the group involved in the film belonged. Greene was reputed to have seen it privately in late 1961. The film was shown to the actors of the Royal Shakespeare Company, Greenidge's then colleagues, three times (on 28 August 1964, in November 1965, and on Guy Fawkes Day 1966). The BBC (an abridged version on 10 September 1964) and Granada (parts of the film in mid-1966) broadcast it and each made a new copy. Encouraged by Greenidge, who 'wanted to

---

[64] *ALL*, pp. 209-10.

[65] Charles E. Linck, Jr., 'Waugh-Greenidge Film – *The Scarlet Woman*', *Evelyn Waugh Newsletter*, 3/ 2 (1969), 1-7 (p. 1).

have some United States' publicity', the film was first shown in the United States on 2 November 1968 'to an appreciative audience at the SCMLA meeting in San Antonio, Texas.'[66] According to Linck, four copies of *Scarlet* existed.[67]

Greenidge suggested that 'this silent film tends to skit D. W. Griffith's silents. The action is episodic narrative with sudden shifts of scene, but it is generally pre-Eisenstein in technique.'[68] *Scarlet* is badly made. Camerawork is shaky and main characters are frequently outside the frame, with only half of the body inside or the top of the head missing. The acting is amateur: conscious of being filmed, the actors often look directly at the camera or even actively seek the attention of the camera. The editing – if it is 'pre-Eisenstein in technique', it contains scarcely any editing – is poor, and about a minute of the film is repeated.

All those may be seen as trivial errors, but the failure to grasp and take advantage of the rules of narration in *silent* cinema, indicative of a lack of understanding of the medium, is more serious and fundamental. Actors talk incessantly to each other despite the fact that their mouthing fails to contribute to the narrative even if the audience could lip-read. *Scarlet*'s reliance on written words for narration is exposed by its excessively long intertitles, which sometimes fill the entire frame and last about twelve seconds. When Father Murphy reveals to Beatrice, the Scarlet Woman, Rome's plot of converting England to Catholicism, an intertitle of nine lines which runs eighteen seconds is used:

> "My child, because I love you, I
> will tell what I should not tell.
> Today is the 24th of August, …
> Saint Bartholomew's Day, …
> and tonight, as once before, all
> the leading Protestants of the
> country, and you are one of them,
> are to be cut down without
> remorse or pity."[69]

It is certainly too long and too literary for an intertitle. Moreover, it may not even be entirely necessary. Father Murphy's love for Beatrice is well established by his behaviour: he persistently chases after the damsel in distress, finds her on the brink

[66] Ibid., pp. 1-2.
[67] Ibid., p. 2.
[68] Ibid.
[69] *The Scarlet Woman: An Ecclesiastical Melodrama*, dir. by Terence Greenidge (1924). It is made available to the public by the British Film Institute courtesy of Mrs A. Richardson at its various Mediatheques in the UK.

of committing suicide by throwing herself into the river, runs from the top-right background of the screen downhill to the centre-left foreground (shot from a fixed camera), and finally saves her life. As I have shown, Chaplin views pantomime as the foundation of any form of drama; for silent cinema, pantomime is certainly crucial. With her neurotically exaggerated gesticulations and her eyes on the verge of popping out, Beatrice, played by Elsa Lanchester, is melodramatic indeed, but it indicates that the actress not only understands the medium but also takes full advantage of it. Compared with the one-liner exclamatory intertitles common for silent films, Father Murphy's revelations, both of his love for Beatrice and of the plot, are verbose. Unlike his declaration of love, his explanation of St Bartholomew Day contributes to the story, but it could have been treated with more economy.

The reliance on the intertitles rather than pantomime for narration betrays the scriptwriter's, in this case Waugh's, lack of understanding of the medium more than that of the director, editor, or actors. Cinema, silent in particular, and the novel do not tell stories in the same way. Waugh, however, lifted the novelistic – the intertitles are unmistakably reminiscent of the comic and ironic style of his journalism and short stories at that time – and planted it straight into cinematic practice. For him, cinema and fiction enjoy an unbalanced relationship: the cinematic only serves the purpose of the novelistic. Instead of illustrating the silent film analogous to book illustrations, the intertiles, or words, seem to create a narrative that is illustrated by the images in the film.[70] Therefore, 'The Balance', a cinematic story, seems more successful than *Scarlet*, a novelistic film.

The significance of *Scarlet*, then, lies not in the film itself but in the light it sheds on Waugh's search for his literary voice as he started to write. In spite of his shy smile at the beginning of the film, which reveals his inexperience, Waugh's overall performance is rather impressive. Interestingly, he plays two roles: the fair Dean of Balliol, with a white wig and a sinister smile, making advances to the Prince of Wales, and the dark Lord Borrowington, 'A PENNILESS PEER, MASTER OF THE PRINCE'S REVELS', with black hair and a beard, in a dapper black morning

[70] Kamilla Elliott draws an analogy between two 'hybrid arts' to challenge visual/verbal categorisations: 'While illustrated novels and intertitled silent films offer ample support for traditional verbal/visual differentiations, they defy their universality at points where words take on properties conventionally associated with images and where images take on properties conventionally associated with words.' Kamilla Elliott, *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 16.

suit and a top hat, dubiously walking about town in search of entertainment for the Prince.[71] However contrasting they are physically, the Dean and the Lord serve as each other's double. It shows Waugh's fascination with multiple personality, persona, and disguise. Doubles, or doppelgängers, abound in Chaplin's films, exemplified by the unnamed Jewish barber and the dictator Adenoid Hynkel as the on-screen pair and Chaplin and Hitler as the real-life pair in *The Great Dictator* (1940). Chaplin, however, had started developing the idea of doubles with his slapstick two-reelers. In the mirror scene in *The Floorwalker* (1916), the Tramp encounters the floorwalker of the department store, played by Lloyd Bacon, who has just robbed the safe and knocked down the manager. Looking alike, except that the Tramp holds a stick while the floorwalker holds a bag, the two imitate each other to comic effect. Alan Bilton quotes Freud's 'the uncanny' to interpret Chaplin's doubles: 'Chaplin can be said to inhabit an uncanny, animistic universe, filled as it is with possessed objects, moving parts and a string of strangely disconcerting doppelgangers.'[72] If the Dean of Balliol/ Lord Borrowington pair only alludes to Chaplin, Waugh's mannerisms in his acting show clear signs of influence from Chaplin. As the Dean, Waugh smugly holds the lapels of his suit, a gesture which immediately recalls the Tramp. As Lord Borrowington, while he is talking to Beatrice, his fingers are tapping on his top hat deftly and playfully, a borrowing that needs no reference.

The Temple at Thatch, the unfinished and discarded novel which could have been Waugh's Oxford novel, like Green's *Blindness*, was germinated during a period of intense, to the point of excessive and mindless, cinemagoing, while Waugh served as the film critic of the *Isis*. The young novelist learning to write seems to have gone to the cinema momentarily to escape from his frustration at the difficulty of writing. In a letter to Carew dated May 1924, Waugh described *The Temple* as a novel 'all about magic and madness'.[73] Its composition, which began on 20 July 1924, coincided with the making of *Scarlet*.[74] Forty years later in *A Little Learning*, Waugh recalled that the novel 'concerned an undergraduate who inherited a property of which nothing was left except an eighteenth-century classical folly where he set

[71] *Scarlet Woman*.
[72] Alan Bilton, *Silent Film Comedy and American Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 92.
[73] Waugh quoted in Selina Hastings, *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1994), p. 114.
[74] *Diaries*, p. 178.

up house and, I think, practised black magic.'[75] Notably, *The Temple* was a cinematic story and eventually found its way into 'The Balance': 'I am making the first chapter a cinema film […] and have been writing furiously ever since. I honestly think that it is going to be rather good.'[76] More evident in 'The Balance' but also in *The Temple*, cinema pointed the way out for the young novelist who had difficulty writing. Paradoxically, the early unconscious, escapist cinemagoing contributed to Waugh's fictional writing in tremendous and unexpected ways; cinema was gradually employed by him as a narrative method.

More significantly, Waugh's film-making experience has an evident influence on *Decline and Fall*. As no credit is given before (or after) the main body of the film, characters in *Scarlet* are introduced one by one when they appear for the first time. The entrance of a new character is followed by an intertitle that contains a description of a line or two, including the name and role of the character, the name of the actor, and occasionally a sketch caricaturing the character, which is to become one of Waugh's hallmarks. A minor character is introduced as

> Smeaton Welks, footman at
> the Palace, a man of in-
> credibly vicious disposition,
> but a zealous upholder of
> Evangelical principles.
> Played by SIBBALD MALCOLM.[77]

In *Decline and Fall*, characters enter in a similar way. The Chapter titles, like the intertitles of a silent film, are telling: Part One Chapter III 'Captain Grimes', Chapter IV 'Prendergast', Chapter VII 'Philbrick', and Chapter XI 'Philbrick – continued'.[78] The three characters are individually called on to the stage; interestingly, all three seek confidence in Paul, the newcomer, in t ête-à-t êtes reported in direct speech. Captain Grimes reveals to Paul his drinking problem – '"I don't believe I was ever meant by Nature to be a schoolmaster. […] that's been my trouble, temperament and sex"' – and his confidence in, and Waugh's tongue-in-cheek ridicule of, the English public school system:

---

[75] *ALL*, p. 223.
[76] Waugh quoted in Paula Byrne, *Mad World: Evelyn Waugh and the Secrets of Brideshead* (London: Harper Press, 2009), pp. 79-80.
[77] *Scarlet Woman*.
[78] Places, such as Llanabba Castle, the title of Part One Chapter II, and King's Thursday, the title of Part Two Chapter I, are also treated as characters in the novel.

> ‘There’s a blessed equity in the English social,’ said Grimes, ‘that ensures the public-school man against starvation. One goes through four or five years of perfect hell at an age when life is bound to be hell, anyway, and after that the social system never lets one down.’[79]

Mr Prendergast, the schoolmaster who is not respected by the boys because of his wig, also confides in Paul, but about his religious doubts, which lead to his resignation as a parish priest and land him in Llanabba.

In ‘Philbrick’, the butler tells Paul that he is Sir Solomon Philbrick, a diamond robber who later settles down and owns a pub and a picture house. In ‘Philbrick – continued’, however, it turns out that Philbrick tells disparate versions of his life to all three masters, who compare notes and discover that he is an imposter:

> ‘[…] You see Philbrick is really Sir Solomon Philbrick, the shipowner.’
> ‘The novelist, you mean,’ said Grimes.
> ‘The retired burglar,’ said Paul.[80]

Studying the manuscript of *Decline and Fall*, Davis notes that Philbrick is made as important as Grimes and Prendergast by Waugh’s revision: ‘Before a series of lengthy insertions, Philbrick is a minor figure’.[81]

Although the speed of movement in Waugh’s first novel is not as giddy as that in *Vile Bodies*, the numerous chapters in this short novel certainly indicate fragmentation, also a high modernist technique, to capture modernity. The crosscutting in *Decline and Fall* can be said to be anticipated by the rapid changes of location in *Scarlet*. Crosscutting, or parallel editing, in which the point of view switches alternately between related (usually simultaneous) actions in different locations is often employed to create tension and suspense. In the Prelude, on the brink of the inevitable confrontation between Paul Pennyfeather and the Bollinger Club, the suspense is prolonged by a digression into a long paragraph of the protagonist’s biography.

Laughter and Satire: The Birth of Comedy

If modernism, as critically constructed in the fifties and consolidated in the eighties, was marked by the thesis of the inward turn, the critical turn of the twenty-first

[79] *D&F*, p. 28.
[80] Ibid., p. 90.
[81] Davis, *Writer*, p. 42.

century has moved towards recognition of and preoccupation with what I call 'the outward turn', a more pervasive turn towards the outside, which encompasses Steven Connor's 'the thingly turn'.[82] The outward turn, which begins to emerge in the foreground of modernist discussion at the beginning of the twenty-first century was, in fact, initiated in the late nineteen nineties, when philosophers of mind began to explore distributed cognition, an 'E' turn understood as cognition being embedded, extended, embodied, and/or enactive. This followed the immense attention given by cognitive scientists to Clark and Chalmers's extended mind hypothesis that coincided with the moment when literary critics also began to reconsider modernism, Miller's *Late Modernism* in particular, by rediscovering marginalised and overlooked modernist works which had been excluded from a canon formerly dominated by a reading of high modernist works as primarily exploring 'the dark places of psychology'.[83] Exterior modernism certainly contributes to this outward turn in the current theoretical debate.

In the late twenties, making it new, again, Waugh and his generation decidedly experimented with the outside method. Studying the manuscript of *Decline and Fall*, both Heath and Davis comment on Waugh's deletion of 'Paul's Meditations', an unfinished chapter which follows 'Stone Walls Do Not a Prison Make':

> /1. Who Am I? /
>
> […] What do I mean when I say that I am Paul Pennyfeather? A chain of consequences so obscurely connected and of such (distant)/ remote / origins that it is impossible to trace what I mean. Here I am called D.4.12. That means that for twenty-two hours out of twenty-four I can be found in the twelfth cell of the fourth landing of Block D. D.4.12 is the creature of order and purpose. Paul Pennyfeather is the creature of chaos.
> […]
>
> 2. Why Am I Here?[84]

Both critics deem the deletion significant and attempt an explanation. For Heath, 'Waugh must have sensed that such explicit (and rather banal) philosophizing could only damage a satiric technique founded on the tonalities of innuendo and reticence. The passage is valuable as a gloss but has no place in the novel.'[85] Davis largely agrees with Heath: 'the content and tone are uncharacteristic, for Paul has never

[82] Steven Connor, 'Thinking Things', *Textual Practice*, 24/1 (2010), 1-20 (p. 1).
[83] Woolf, 'Modern Fiction', p. 11.
[84] Waugh's manuscript of *D&F* quoted in Davis, *Writer*, pp. 47-48.
[85] Jeffrey M. Heath, 'Waugh's *Decline and Fall* in Manuscript', *English Studies*, 55/6 (1974), 523-30 (p. 529).

before displayed introspective, let alone philosophical tendencies.'[86] However, Davis questions the value of the passage: 'Undoubtedly the novel deals with the problem of identity, but it does so in social and largely negative terms.'[87]

Both rightly point out that 'Paul's Meditations' has no place in *Decline and Fall* stylistically, but it should not be denied that Waugh's first novel does philosophise. It can be said to be Bergsonian; after all, Waugh was, as recorded in his diary on 26 August 1925, 'reading a little Bergson'.[88] Indeed the protagonist in the published novel does not bear the burden of philosophy or introspection because Waugh rejected psychological structuralism.[89] The philosopher, albeit ridiculed, is the elusive Otto Silenus, the architect hired by Margot to improve, or rather, ruin, King's Thursday. Waugh's tendency towards philosophising was evident in his other early works, from the conversation between Adam and the Reflection in 'The Balance' to the differentiation of the cars of Being and the cars of Becoming in *Vile Bodies*. The passages in the manuscript can be revised for economy but they do not have to be deleted altogether. I argue that Waugh refrained from philosophising here because 'Paul's Meditations', too much involved with the interior and reminiscent of the stream of consciousness of the high modernists, hinder the young novelist's ambition of creating exterior modernism, a new style which emphasises the outside. This important deletion can therefore be viewed as Waugh's self-censorship, similar to his denunciation of *Brideshead* years later in the preface to the revised edition. More than the exuberant language and unbounded nostalgia, the novel's closeness to the literary style of his immediate precursors creates uneasiness for Waugh in mid-career.

One might suggest therefore, from the evidence offered above, that *Decline and Fall* marks the successful establishment of Waugh's literary voice, achieved through the outside method, whose three pillars are cinema, comedy, and satire.

---

[86] Davis, *Writer*, p. 48.
[87] Ibid.
[88] *Diaries*, p. 230.
[89] Introspection is the primary method of the structuralist psychology of Wilhelm Wundt and Edward Bradford Titchener. Christian Beenfeldt, *The Philosophical Background and Scientific Legacy of E. B. Titchener's Psychology: Understanding Introspectionism* (Cham and New York: Springer, 2013), p. 29.

Comedy is certainly crucial to Waugh's exterior modernism. He made it explicit and, in doing so, encouraged such a reading that *Decline and Fall* 'IS MEANT TO BE FUNNY.'[90] The young novelist, however, had scruples about writing comedy, which was, has always been since Aristotle, and still is, regarded as a low literary form in contrast to tragedy. Robert Garnett notes that '[f]earing, however, that it might be damaging for a serious man of letters, or art critic, or whatever he might become, to have a comic novel in his canon, Waugh considered publishing it (Alex Waugh recalled) under a pen name.'[91] Garnett regards *Decline and Fall* as the pinnacle of Waugh's comic power and nothing more:

> Much of the 'meaning' of *Decline and Fall* lies simply in its deployment of language to achieve comic effect. In this first novel, Waugh achieved a concentration of comic style that he never really surpassed; *Decline and Fall* has no broad artistic ambitions or thematic motives to divert him from comic play or to persuade him to defer immediate effects for larger purposes.[92]

Comedy is an essential method of Waugh's and a hallmark of his art, evident in the satires and also in the works written during and after the Second World War – even in *Sword of Honour* – although the latter are not meant to be funny. So the determination of what might be Waugh's funniest novel is rather affected by the critic's personal preference. Despite the fact that Waugh may have (deliberately) misled his reader by his comment, *Decline and Fall* is much more complex and ambitious than a light comedy. Moreover, Waugh's comedy depends not only on language but also on action, both of which interest him. In his first novel, the comedy, analogous to Chaplin's silent films, can be said to be more physical than verbal, and it oscillates between embodiment and disembodiment.

Composing *Decline and Fall*, Waugh must have had Greek comedy on his mind. Professor Otto Silenus alludes to Silenus in Greek mythology, '[a]n aged woodland deity, one of the sileni, who was entrusted with the education of Dionysus. He is depicted either as dignified and musical, or as an old drunkard.'[93] The anarchic

---

[90] Waugh quoted in Robert R. Garnett, *From Grimes to Brideshead: The Early Novels of Evelyn Waugh* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1990), p. 39.
[91] Ibid., p. 38.
[92] Ibid., p. 39.
[93] 'Silenus', *Oxford Dictionaries Online*, last accessed 19 July 2016, < http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/Silenus>.

energy of Dionysus certainly finds its way into Waugh's novel. Although neither Dionysus, the God of wine, music, and drama, nor Otto Silenus is portrayed as particularly grotesque, the comedy of *Decline and Fall*, a novel firmly situated in the comic tradition from Greek comedy to the commedia dell'arte, relies on the body, usually in its most grotesque form. Aristotle saw art as imitation: 'Epic poetry and the composition of tragedy, as well as comedy and the arts of dithyrambic poetry and (for the most part) of music for pipe or lyre, are all (taken together) *imitations*.'[94] And as a low form, comedy, according to Aristotle, imitates 'inferior people – not, however, with respect to every kind of defect: the laughable is a species of what is disgraceful. The laughable is an error or disgrace that does not involve pain or destruction; for example, a comic mask is ugly and distorted, but does not involve pain.'[95] Were pain involved, comedy would soon turn into tragedy, which, like epic poetry, is a dignified form because of its imitation of 'admirable people'.[96]

Grotesque, and often also deformed, bodies abound in *Decline and Fall*, which therefore might be considered a mode of Aristotelian comedy. The grotesque and the comic are indeed often associated. Characters such as Dr Fagan with his 'hairy' hands and fingers 'crooked like claws',[97] Captain Grimes with his wooden leg,[98] and Prendergast with his wig are comic before they even say or do anything; their sheer presence is comic, as if they are intrinsically so. An interesting omission is a description of the physical appearance of Philbrick, the butler, who is memorable for his diamond tie-pin. But the 1968 film adaptation fleshes him out in a grotesque form, with two front teeth missing and Eric Campbell eyebrows.[99]

Grotesquerie and deformity are most aptly portrayed in the members of the Llanabba Silver Band, who perform at the school sports. Their arrival is thus described in the manuscript: 'Ten men of an aspect of unparalleled villainy were approaching from the drive. Some were lame, some stunted, all more or less deformed'.[100] By contrast, the published version changes the description of deformity from explicit to suggestive. Heath argues that Waugh was made to revise

---

[94] Aristotle, *Poetics* (London: Penguin, 1996), p. 3.
[95] Ibid., p. 9.
[96] Ibid.
[97] *D&F*, p. 18.
[98] In Dickens, characters with wooden legs, Silas Wegg in *Our Mutual Friend* (1865), for example, are also presented as comic.
[99] *Decline and Fall… of a Birdwatcher*, dir. by John Krish (Ivan Foxwell Productions, 1968).
[100] Waugh's manuscript of *D&F* quoted in Heath, 'Manuscript', p. 525.

because the editors at Chapman and Hall found the original passage offensive. Nonetheless, the spectacle of the band resembles a circus or a freak show:

> Ten men of revolting appearance were approaching from the drive. They were low of brow, crafty of eye, and crooked of limb. They advanced huddled together with the loping tread of wolves, peering about them furtively as they came, as though in constant terror of ambush; they slavered at their moths, which hung loosely over their receding chins, while each clutched under his ape-like arm a burden of curious and unaccountable shape. On seeing the Doctor they halted and edged back, those behind squinting and moulting over their companions' shoulders.[101]

Seeing 'these extraordinary-looking people', Philbrick threatens to shoot the '[l]oonies' and Dr Fagan simply denies their existence.[102] These people, described as beasts, uttering 'a baying and growling and yapping as of the jungle at moonrise', are meant to be funny.[103] But the boundary between the comic and the tragic is often transgressed: it is easy to laugh at gargoyles and masks but hard to laugh at embodied gargoyles and masks without feeling any pity. Like the band members, the Tramp, though not grotesque, is a social outcast with a funny body; his physical uniqueness, or strangeness, both his appearance (his signature moustache) and action (his distinctive walk with a stick), is often preyed upon as a spectacle. As Chaplin further developed the Tramp character in the feature films, comedy became increasingly entangled with tragedy until little space was left for it in a later work such as *Monsieur Verdoux*. In Waugh's novel, however, the band members are soon disembodied and what sympathy the reader may have for them is submerged in Dr Fagan's stereotypical and opinionated ridicule of the 'Welsh character'.[104]

Decline and Fall draws not only on Greek comedy but also on the commedia dell'arte, an art form which also inspired Chaplin. The commedia dell'arte 'usually refers to organized professional companies, a few of them famous internationally as well as in Italy, that performed mainly improvised drama beginning in the mid-sixteenth century.'[105] The dramatis personae of the commedia dell'arte include masters, servants, and lovers, the first two types of which are masked. Since they are *stock* characters and represented by the fixed half masks, to perform, for the actors,

---

[101] *D&F*, p. 64.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid., p. 65.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Robert Henke, *Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell'Arte* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 6. However, 'the professional actors quite often performed scripted plays', and '[a]n extensive "culture" of the commedia dell'arte existed adjacent to the famous organized companies' (ibid.).

is to embody those masks with their voice, body, and emotion which match the distinctive shapes and energies of the characters. Each character, masked or unmasked, is represented by one distinctive body part, the position of which, in relation to the body, also reveals the social standing of that character.[106] Therefore, an actor portrays a certain character by accentuating the corresponding body part. Unlike pantomime or silent cinema, the commedia dell'arte characters speak, but they speak Gromalot, an emotionally charged nonsensical babble. As the troupes travel outside Italy to nearby countries such as France and Spain, the language they use has to be universal for the audience to understand the gist of it, if not the actual words.[107] So, for the actor to tell a story, language is not as essential as the physicality of the character. The characters in Waugh's novel resemble those stock characters in the commedia dell'arte, although it is hard to find a single exact corresponding character in the commedia dell'arte to each of the characters in *Decline and Fall* because Waugh's characters, however flat and cartoonlike, are a mixture of those types, yet within the three broader categories. While Dr Fagan, Grimes, and Prendergast are the masters, Philbrick is the servant. Paul is best described as the lover, the second actor (the well-educated son of the middle-class doctor or pantelone); Margot can be said to also be the lover, but the first actress, older, more shrewd and violent, like Lady Macbeth.

In *Decline and Fall*, parallel to (grotesque) embodiment, runs an equally strong tendency towards disembodiment. The comic characters bear a strong resemblance to the gargoyles everywhere to be seen on the buildings in Oxford.[108] Frozen in stone, each gargoyle, like the full mask in Greek comedy and the half mask in the commedia dell'arte, represents only one emotion and is, in turn, represented by it. So

---

[106] So Magnifico is represented by his head, first actress and actor (aristocrats) their shoulders, both the Doctor and Pantelone, meant to be a pair, their bellies (with the former's out and the latter's in), and then the servant pair to mirror the master pair, Harlequino and Brighella their hips (the former's is open while the latter's is closed), the Captain the knees, and lastly, at the very bottom, Zanni the nose and the feet (a nose that often meets the feet). 'The World of Commedia dell'Arte', *National Theatre Discover*, last accessed 19 July 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h_0TAXWt8hY>. Peter Jordan observes that 'Magnifica and Zanni are the earliest recorded masked characters from the Commedia Dell'Arte and as such they can lay claim to being, respectively, the Master and Servant archetypes from which all other such characters ultimately descend.' Peter Jordan, *The Venetian Origins of the Commedia dell'Arte* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), p. 25. For the structure and fluidity of the character system in the commedia dell'arte, see also Henke, pp. 15-30.

[107] 'Commedia dell'Arte: Language', *National Theatre Discover*, last accessed 19 July 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gTs9xWJcgg>.

[108] The scholastic agency through which Paul becomes a schoolmaster at Llanabba is called Church and Gargoyle.

are many characters in Waugh's fiction memorable for a certain idiosyncrasy. This metonymy, one body part used to substitute for the whole body, illustrates the art historian Wilhelm Worringer's notion of abstraction in his *Abstraction and Empathy* (1908), a major influence on expressionism.[109] Worringer argues: 'Whereas the precondition for the urge to empathy is a happy pantheistic relationship of confidence between man and the phenomena of the external world, the urge to abstraction is the outcome of a great inner unrest inspired in man by the phenomena of the outside world'.[110] And Worringer 'attribute[s] all aesthetic enjoyment – and perhaps even every aspect of the human sensation of happiness' – to the impulse of self-alienation as its most profound and ultimate essence.'[111]

Disembodiment is not only in abstraction, or sketching out a character with the emphasis only on one prominent trait; it is also evident in the delight in violence, which is shared by Waugh's comic novels and silent comic films, particularly Keystone Chaplin. Raymond Durgnat observes that Chaplin's films 'abound in satire directed, bitterly, at pity and pathos. […] Maybe this sadism is, by implication, excused by his pathos, but it's also true that Charlie's pathos enables him to be easily the cruellest of Sennett's comedians'.[112] If violence in silent film comedies does not seem to bear any consequences, violence in *Decline and Fall* kills.[113] In Waugh's novel, even a minor incidence of a comic tendency can easily snowball into something of deadly consequences. Having been accidentally shot by the starting pistol on the sports day, little Lord Tangent is taken off the field, completely unaware of the fate awaiting him yet ironically successfully predicting it: '"Am I going to die?" said Tangent, his mouth full of cake.'[114] He never reappears in person, but he is later mentioned in idle conversations as being amputated and eventually dead. Most disconcertingly, no one seems affected, let alone shocked, by the tragedy, or the violent turn of a comic mishap; nor does anyone show pity. This exemplifies the dark

[109] Neil H. Donahue, 'Introduction: Art History or "Sublime Hysteria"?', in *Invisible Cathedrals: The Expressionist Art History of Wilhelm Worringer*, ed. by Neil H. Donahue (University Part, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 1-12 (p. 1).

[110] Wilhelm Worringer, *Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 15.

[111] Ibid., p. 25.

[112] Raymond Durgnat, *The Crazy Mirror: Hollywood Comedy and the American Image* (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), p. 79.

[113] In *The Tramp* (1916), Chaplin is repeatedly hit by a car and he repeatedly stands up, unscathed.

[114] *D&F*, p. 71.

strand, or what Stannard calls the 'funereal touches', in Waugh's comedies.[115] Empathy was perhaps the very emotion from which the novelist refrained; he also discouraged it in the reader. Waugh relished the brick fight in the otherwise, for him, sentimental *The Kid*, an episode reminiscent of Chaplin's Keystone slapsticks, in which the cause and effect in reality is disrupted by a playfully violent act.

Even death, the ultimate act of disembodiment, is exploited for comic effect: Prendergast, the meek schoolmaster who, being drunk, wounds (and ultimately kills) Tangent – '"First blood to me!" said Mr Prendergast gleefully' – is, in turn, murdered in the most horrific manner by a religious fanatic in the prison where he is the Chaplain, a 'Modern Churchman' in spite of his doubt.[116] The Llanabba set, Paul, Prendergast, and, of course, Philbrick (Grimes will soon appear in Paul's second prison), gather in the same prison. A natural association between the prison and the public school is implied by Paul's ease at both places and explicitly pointed out by Prendergast, complaining that 'criminals are just as bad as boys'.[117] As at Llanabba, Prendergast is, again, not respected at Blackstone: 'in chapel they laugh so much that the warders spend all their time correcting them. It makes the services seem so irreverent.'[118] Instead, '[t]he hymn was the recognized time for the exchange of gossip.'[119] The murder of Prendergast in gory detail is exchanged between Paul and Philbrick on such an occasion. It is one of the most comic scenes in the novel, which works even better in the film adaptation:

> 'O God, our help in ages past,' sang Paul.
> 'Where's Prendergast to-today?'
> 'What, ain't you 'eard? 'e's been done in.'
> 'And our eternal home.'
>
> […]
>
> 'Time, like an ever-rolling stream,
> Bears all its sons away.'
> Poor Prendy 'ollered fit to kill
> For nearly 'alf an hour.
>
> […]

[115] Stannard here discusses *Vile Bodies* specifically, but it is also true of Waugh's other early works such as *Decline and Fall* and *A Handful of Dust*: 'At every opportunity he weaves funereal touches into its fabric, dark abstract metaphors of imminent collapse. […] Even the humour tastes of ashes.' Stannard, *TEY*, p. 203.
[116] *D&F*, pp. 71, 165.
[117] Ibid., p. 165.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Ibid., p. 183.

'Amen.'[120]

Ironically, this improvised hymn is loaded with gossip of the most violent nature; it can even be seen as a hymn to violence. This is Waugh's comic power at its height. He was reputedly not musical – nor was he particularly poetic – but his ear for language is much praised. If Green finds poetry in the dialect of the workers in his father's Birmingham factory, Waugh finds, quite literally, music in cockney. In the novel, Philbrick's speech does not, in any way, differentiate itself from that of others, including Oxford-educated Paul, except in the hymn, which perhaps gives the imposter away.[121]

According to Waugh, 'the real charm of the cinema is in the momentary pictures and situations which appear'; there are two such examples in *The Merry-go-Round* (1920): 'One was the gorilla standing in the window before it killed the circus-master, and the other, a little before it, was the scene in which the villain pursued the heroine round the half-lighted merry-go-round. The violent struggle in the strange, unmoving jungle of monstrous animals was almost Sitwellian.'[122] The hymn episode in the 1968 film is undoubtedly such a 'gorilla' moment, redeeming the otherwise mediocre adaptation. A Chaplinesque silent comedy, Waugh's first novel does not rely entirely on words but also on action. Silent cinema is, as Usai puts it, 'an art of abstraction, displaying a problematic coexistence between the image (the shot) and the written word (the intertitle)'.[123] Words and images shown interchangeably can tell the story of this particular episode in a silent film as aptly as in a sound film: the six stanzas of lyrics, separated, serve well as intertitles that illustrate images of Paul and Philbrick singing. Cinema is able to do justice to the novel here due to the latter's performativity. Intended not to be read but to be performed, the passage can almost be said to be written for the screen. Effortlessly interwoven the news of Prendergast's tragic end with the lyrics of the original hymn (to the same music), the new hymn sung by Paul and Philbrick can be regarded as an adaptation in itself. It may have been Waugh's playful parody of adaptation.

[120] Ibid., pp. 183-84.
[121] In the 1968 film, Philbrick, however, speaks cockney throughout.
[122] Waugh, 'Seen in the Dark: The Merry-Go-Round', in *EAR*, pp. 14-15 (p. 15).
[123] Usai, p. xviii.

More than a comedy, however, *Decline and Fall* is a satire. The subject of Waugh's satire is, however, deliberately left ambiguous due to the missing subject in the title. Waugh's novel ambitiously and parodically alludes to the weighty tomes of Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776) and Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West* (published in English in 1926), 'a work that can be read as a continuation of Gibbon's'.[124] In its earnest search for a subject to complete the title, the 1968 film adaptation of *Decline and Fall* finds '*... of a Birdwatcher*', a title which obscures the intelligent rendering of the novel. The ellipsis suggests its playfulness, a parody of Waugh's parody, but the addition fails to contribute to the rest of the film except at the opening, in which Paul, a biology student watching a rare bird with a pair binoculars is taken as a sexual pervert by two girls who happen to change near the uncurtained window next to the roof with the bird.[125] One of the girls who comes downstairs to report the incident to the college authorities collides with Paul, whose trousers by now have been stripped by the Bollinger Club. Both land on the floor, with Paul on top of the girl, and the girl screams. Since neither Paul's interest in birdwatching nor his binoculars reappear, this one-off episode is not meant to be an integral part of the adaptation. The subtlety of Waugh's comedy is sacrificed here for immediate comic effect. The farce, nonetheless, bears the clear mark of the sixties, when the film was made, an age which is generally acknowledged as a historical moment of unprecedented sexual freedom.

Asked if his fiction was meant to be satirical, Waugh gave an unequivocal answer in 'Fan-Fare' (1946) in the aftermath of the international, particularly American, success of *Brideshead Revisited* (1945):

> No. Satire is a matter of period. It flourishes in a stable society and presupposes homogeneous moral standards – the early Roman Empire and eighteenth-century Europe. It is aimed at inconsistency and hypocrisy. It exposes polite cruelty and folly by exaggerating them. It seeks to produce shame. All this has no place in the Century of the Common Man where vice no longer pays lip service to virtue.[126]

---

[124] McCartney, p. 17.

[125] Paul the birdwatcher seems to be a nod to William Boot, the equally innocent anti-hero of another satirical comic novel, *Scoop*, living in the country and writing articles about great crested grebes.

[126] Waugh, 'Fan-Fare', in *EAR*, pp. 300-04 (pp. 303-04).

Waugh's comment betrayed a romanticised idea of the past and a pessimistic view of post-war British society in the vein of *Brideshead*. Despite his own rejection of the label, Waugh has been acknowledged as a satirist since the earliest Waugh scholarship. In *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh*, Carens defines '[m]odern satire' as 'not a genre but an attitude toward man and society that may be given expression, by means of certain traditional techniques, in any literary form.'[127] Carens firmly situates Waugh among the 'class of satirical writers' and notes that 'Waugh's early novels are satirical romances, with some of the qualities of the novel. His later works, particularly the Crouchback trilogy, in which he approaches probability and verisimilitude, are a satirical blend of novel and romance. […] the influence of Ronald Firbank, who wrote satiric romance rather than Menippean satire, was of paramount importance in Waugh's development.'[128]

A contemporary of Waugh and Chaplin, Lewis, like Waugh, also preferred the outside method to the inside.[129] He claimed in *Men Without Art* (1934) that 'the greatest satire is nonmoral' and that 'perfect laughter […] would be inhuman.'[130] While Bergson found the comic in '[s]omething mechanical encrusted on the living',[131] Lewis contended that '[t]he root of the Comic is to be sought in the sensations resulting from the observations of a *thing* behaving like a person.'[132] Despite Waugh's insistence on the connection between satire and morality, both Waugh's and Chaplin's satire can be described as 'nonmoral'. While Chaplin's comedy derives from both the mechanical human and the animated thing, the

---

[127] Carens, *Satiric Art*, p. xi.

[128] Ibid., p. xii.

[129] Although not considered in Miller's *Late Modernism*, Waugh, like Lewis, who serves as Miller's prime example of 'self-reflective laughter', can also be regarded as a late modernist satirist. 'This laugher, functioning to preserve and shore up – to "stiffen" – a subjectivity at risk of dissolution, constitutes the telos and minimum basis of formal unity for the late modernist work' (Miller, p. 63). It is central to Miller's late modernism.
The genealogy of the study of laughter, satire, and comedy can be traced back to Nietzsche, Bergson, and Freud, with both Nietzsche and Freud rejecting the morality of satire. See Friedrich Neitzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, 1967) and Sigmund Freud, *The Joke and Its Relation to the Unconscious*, trans. by Joyce Crick (London: Penguin, 2002). For Lewis, a cold modernist according to Burstein, satire is 'the great Heaven of Ideas, where you meet the titans of red laughter; it is just below intuition, and life charged with black illusion.' Wyndham Lewis, 'Inferior Religions', in *The Wild Body* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928), pp. 233-44 (p. 236).

[130] Wyndham Lewis, *Men Without Art* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), pp. 103, 112.

[131] Henri Bergson, 'Laughter', in *Comedy: An Essay on Comedy/George Meredith; Laughter/Henri Bergson; Introduction and Appendix: 'The Meanings of Comedy'/ by Wylie Sypher*, ed. by Wylie Sypher (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), p. 84.

[132] Wyndham Lewis, 'The Meaning of the Wild Body', in *The Wild Body*, pp. 244-51 (p. 247).

comedy of Waugh, contrary to Lewis's notion of the comic and akin to Bergson's, lies primarily in a person behaving like a thing, or, more precisely, a modern man being made to behave like a machine.

Building on the body of criticism on Waugh's satire and Miller's study of late modernist satire and laughter, Jonathan Greenberg's *Modernism, Satire, and the Novel* (2011) includes Waugh's work, *Vile Bodies* and *A Handful of Dust* in particular, in his account of late modernist satire.[133] Moreover, Greenberg argues that '[a] full account of modernist satire must recognize the prominence in modernism of the reaction against sentimentality'.[134] This resonates with Burstein's 'cold modernism', 'the premise' of which is that 'there is a world in which the mind does not exist, let alone matter – or it does matter, but in the physical sense', in contrast to the 'hot modernism' of Woolf and Lawrence, which 'continues to be taken to represent literary modernism as a whole.'[135] Greenberg's account of anti-sentimentality, or the late modernists' rejection of the high modernists on the ground of the latter's 'affective excess' – as the high modernists before rebelled against their precursors, the Victorians and the Edwardians – however, runs the risk of viewing modernism merely as an exercise in being cold, or, to use Hemingway's word, hard-boiled.[136] According to Greenberg,

> [t]he modernity of satire, then, lies […] in a kind of temperament or outlook, a satiric *sensibility* – a characteristic of the implied author and reader who savor the transgressive pleasures that satire affords, who may deride the chaos of modernity but also need it, even help to create it. Hence what I call (modifying a term from Richard Rorty) *ironic redescription* proves a central operation of modernist satire.[137]

Since satire tends to redescribe things in ways which make them look bad, Greenberg links satire with the grotesque. This is certainly true of *Decline and Fall*.

In 1915, Chaplin, taking the Tramp character as an example, discussed the seriousness of comedy and his method: 'When I write a new play for the screen, I lay out my plot first, then I put it aside, and I start out to find my characters in real life

---

[133] Naomi Milthorpe also views Waugh as a major late modernist satirist, 'engag[ing] with satire as a central mode of creativity, and as a means of launching attacks from without.' Naomi Milthorpe, *Evelyn Waugh's Satire: Texts and Contexts* (Lanham, MD: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016), p. 9.

[134] Jonathan Greenberg, *Modernism, Satire, and the Novel* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 11.

[135] Jessica Burstein, *Cold Modernism: Literature, Fashion, Art* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012), pp. 2, 24.

[136] Greenberg, p. xiv.

[137] Ibid., p. 9.

[…] Generally, the best situation in a play, the funniest, will either be an exaggeration of such action in real life that I have seen my counterpart pass through, but which was not at all funny in itself.'[138] Chaplin always considered his audience's demands for laughter. What is also indispensible to comedy is restraint, for the laughter to be sustainable: 'It is much better when there is a continual ripple of amusement, with one or two big "stomach laughs", than when an audience "explodes" every minute or two.' [139] Stylistically, Waugh operated in a similar vein: exaggeration, contrast, surprise, and control, particularly his precision in timing, are all his tropes, too. Dialogue and action play central roles in his fiction. *Decline and Fall*, a more physical, bodily, grotesque comedy, accentuates action in particular. The reader's laughter is sustained throughout the novel by the characters' behaviour and utterances that betray their real identities and true intentions, which are subject to Waugh's satire.

A parody of Gibbon and Spengler, *Decline and Fall*, in the same tradition, satirises the decay of Western civilisation, constantly challenged and threatened, as Waugh saw it, by modernity and modernisation. Represented by the Bollinger Club, the college authorities, and such establishments as the public school, Oxford, and society, tradition, part of English civilisation, is capable of self-destruction and is also subject to Waugh's satirical gaze. The baying Bollingers are more savage than the baying musicians of the Llanabba Silver Band who seem to be exploited purely for comic purposes. The short Prelude is a masterpiece of satire of such a kind, and it is achieved through cinema and comedy: the first pages show Waugh at his most original and entertaining.

The novel opens with Mr Sniggs, the Junior Dean, and Mr Postlethwaite, the Domestic Bursar, sitting in the former's room overlooking the garden quad at Scone College. It is such an enclosed space that it seems to be a stage set and that the encounter to occur seems also staged. 'From the rooms of Sir Alastair Digby-Vane-Trumpington, two staircases away, came a confused roaring and breaking of glass. […] the annual Bollinger dinner is a difficult time for those in authority.'[140] The two, however, wish that they cause serious trouble so that enough fines can be collected for the 'highly prized port in the senior common-room cellar'

[138] Chaplin, 'Development of the Comic Story and the Tramp Character', in *Focus on Chaplin*, pp. 45-47 (p. 45).
[139] Ibid., p. 52.
[140] *D&F*, p. 9.

to be brought up and enjoyed.[141] It sounds promising: 'A shriller note could now be heard rising from Sir Alastair's rooms; any who have heard that sound will shrink at the recollection of it; it is the sound of the English country families baying for broken glass.'[142] Mr Sniggs therefore prays: '"Oh, please God, make them attack the Chapel."'[143] As the Bollingers are 'tumbling out into the quad […] for the real romp of the evening', Mr Sniggs and Mr Postlethwaite turn out the light in their room as if in a cinema, ready for a show: 'In darkness the two dons crept to the window. The quad below was a kaleidoscope of dimly discernible faces.'[144] While busy mentally calculating the fines in great excitement, the pair are on the edge of their seats, predicting the unpopular undergraduates whose rooms are going to be attacked.

A lot of damage having being done, it turns out to be 'a lovely evening'; but 'there was still a treat to come.'[145] In the written text, there is a pause and then a change of scene. The camera seems to move smoothly and effortlessly from the massed body of the roaring gang to focus on a single character, the protagonist, who comes from another direction and is shortly to be brought into confrontation with the drunkards. Paul, who happens to be in the wrong place at the wrong time, wearing the wrong tie, falls prey to the Bollinger Club. At one point Mr Postlethwaite mistakes Paul for Lord Reading and considers intervention, only to find out with great relief that it is, in fact, 'someone of no importance': 'Well, that saves a great deal of trouble. I am glad, Sniggs; I am really. What a lot of clothes the young man appears to have lost!'[146] The second morning sees the two dons counting the bottles of port, the Bollinger Club fined, and Paul sent down. No one shows any sympathy towards Paul, though he is the victim; no one sees him off, let alone wishes him well. The Chaplain stops Paul only to ensure that Paul returns his book; he regards the incident as an opportunity for Paul, who has been reading for the Church, to know himself: '"Well, you may congratulate yourself that you discovered your unfitness for the priesthood before it was too late."'[147] Paul tips the porter at the gates, who says unsympathetically: '"I expect you'll become a schoolmaster, sir. That's what

[141] Ibid., p. 10.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid., p. 11.
[146] Ibid., p. 13.
[147] Ibid., p. 14.

most of the gentlemen does, sir, that gets sent down for indecent behaviour.'"[148] Paul indeed, later, becomes a schoolmaster.

Waugh's satire of the authorities and establishments can be said to be Chaplinesque. According to Chaplin, laughter tends to be elicited when authority, policemen in particular, is challenged and subverted:

> Comedy moving pictures were an instant success because most of them showed policemen […] getting into all sorts of trouble. Here were men representing the dignity of the law, often very pompous themselves, being made ridiculous and undignified […]
>
> Even funnier than the man who has been made ridiculous, however, is the man who, having had something funny happen to him, refuses to admit that anything out of the way has happened, and attempts to maintain his dignity.[149]

If *Decline and Fall* were adapted by Chaplin, the scene of Paul leaving the College, where Paul's unfair treatment and the cold-heartedness of the College authorities converge to form the climax, would be a sad one, where tears would be expected. In *City Lights*, learning that the blind flower girl and her grandmother will be evicted from their home if they fail to pay the rent by the next day, the Tramp promises the crying girl that he will take care of it, though with little idea how he can achieve it. The audience of a Chaplin film is never left to dwell on misery. To keep his promise, the Tramp first works as a street cleaner, avoiding horses instead of cleaning after them, and then a boxer, fighting again a much stronger opponent and keeping the match going by hiding behind the referee and attacking unexpectedly. The fight is at once the most hilarious and saddest episode in the film, a Waugh's 'gorilla' moment surely. In *Decline and Fall*, the long shot, which would be used to maximise the comic effect of the Bollinger Club members' debauch and violence, however playful, would turn into a close-up of Paul's face to capture such a small detail: '"God damn and blast them all to hell," said Paul meekly to himself as he drove to the station, and then he felt rather ashamed, because he rarely swore.'[150] Like Chaplin, Waugh takes firm control of the balance: concluding the Prelude with Paul's mild curse and subsequent disproportionate embarrassment, Waugh swiftly moves the reader on from tragedy back to comedy.

What is most fiercely satirised by Waugh's *Decline and Fall* and Chaplin's silent

---

[148] Ibid.

[149] Chaplin, 'What People Laugh At', in *Focus on Chaplin*, pp. 48-54 (p. 48). In *Easy Street* (1917), there is an interesting role reversal, as the Tramp becomes a policeman.

[150] *D&F*, p. 14.

films is, however, modern times. Both protest against the automatism, the platitudinous, and the unthinking stock response of the modern age through comedy and cinema; laughter, one of the most embodied and violent emotions, is their weapon. Both the novelist and the film-maker can be seen as exterior modernist satirists because of their similar methods – their style and their use of satire and laughter – and, most crucially, their engagement with modernity.

The trajectory of Chaplin's silent feature films indicates the development and realisation of the artist's satirical power, which culminates in his last silent film *Modern Times*. Although somewhat precariously regarded as a modernist, Chaplin's enormous influence on literary modernism is generally acknowledged. Discussing high modernism's 'indebtedness' to early cinema, including mainstream cinema, represented by Chaplin, Trotter argues that 'Chaplin should be thought of as modern, and even modernist, by virtue not of anti-mimesis (supposedly modernism's calling-card), but of what I shall call hypermimesis.'[151] Reconstructing the 'love affair between Chaplin and an entire generation of German left-liberal intellectuals and follow[ing] their association through the 1920s and early 1930s', Sabine Hake observes that the Tramp was extolled as 'the new hero of the literary avant-garde, leaving traces on the work of such diverse writers as Louis Delluc, Blaise Cendrars, Louis Aragon, and Jean Cocteau.'[152] Yvan Goll, whose cinema-poem *Die Chapliniade* (1920) introduced Chaplin to many German intellectuals, viewed Chaplin as the 'embodiment of modernity'.[153]

For Susan McCabe, 'Stein's cinematic modernism relies upon the mechanical, circumambulatory bodily depictions of both hysteria – the Freudian disease of modernity – and modern comedy, iconicized for the avant-garde by Charlie Chaplin's trademark gestural slapstick.'[154] McCabe focuses on Stein's 'debt to cinematic bodily representations of plotlessness and the fragmented continuous present', or, more specifically, Chaplin's 'aimless, "jerky" gait'.[155] As Stein preferred Chaplin's early physical comedies to his later well-developed features,

[151] Trotter, *Cinema*, pp. 182, 183.
[152] Sabine Hake, 'Chaplin Reception in Weimar Germany', *New German Critique*, 51 (1990), 87-111 (p. 88).
[153] Ibid., p. 89.
[154] Susan McCabe, "Delight in Dislocation": The Cinematic Modernism of Stein, Chaplin, and Man Ray', *Modernism/modernity*, 8/3 (2001), 429-52 (p. 430). A revised version of the essay appears in Susan McCabe, *Cinematic Modernism: Modernist Poetry and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 56-92.
[155] Ibid., p. 432.

Chaplin said of their meeting in the thirties: 'She would like to see me in a movie just walking up the street and turning a corner, then another corner, and another'.[156] In 'Charlie Chaplin' (1948), André Bazin emphasised that the Tramp's 'physical "markings" would be of less than no importance if one did not perceive, more importantly, the interior constants that are the true constituents of the character.'[157] Denying his interiority, Stein seemed to seize upon the Tramp's physical otherness – as a social outcast, he presents an alternative to bourgeois existence – and turned him into an attraction, despite that cinema, Gunning argues, stopped being cinema of attractions in 1906.[158] The high modernists generally tended to be excited by cinema's formal and technical possibilities, and what it could achieve that they had not been able to on paper; subsequently they ignored cinema's narrativity.

Chaplin is oddly disembodied by Stein's overemphasis on his mechanic walk, but, paradoxically, it is the satiric effects that re-embody him.[159] For Bazin, writing in the late forties but focusing primarily on Chaplin's slapstick two-reelers and only briefly mentioning *Modern Times*, however, 'mechanization of movement is in a sense Charlie's original sin, the ceaseless temptation. His independence of things and events can only be projected in time in the shape of something mechanical, like a force of inertia which continues under its initial impetus.'[160] Bazin even suggested that 'every time Charlie makes us laugh at his own expense and not at that of other people, it is when he has been imprudent enough, one way or another, to presume that the future will resemble the past or to join naively in the game as played by society and to have faith in its elaborate machinery for building the future… its moral, social and political machinery.'[161] On the contrary, Chaplin's comedy, particularly the mechanical, comic body, in his narratively complex feature films is a means by which he achieves pithy satire of the machine: his 'body of modernity', as Gunning calls it, is a living indictment of modernisation, or the mechanisation and dehumanisation of the modern times in which he is trapped.[162]

---

[156] Chaplin quoted in McCabe. Ibid., p. 435.

[157] André Bazin, 'Charlie Chaplin', in *What Is Cinema?*, trans. by Hugh Gray, 2 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2005), I, pp. 144-53 (p. 145).

[158] However, the Tramp's idea of a good life, or the American Dream, as a suburban house with a beautiful housewife inside, evident in *Modern Times*, conforms to bourgeois values.

[159] In Fernand Léger and Dudley Murphy's film *Ballet Mécanique* (1924), Chaplin's body, like that in Picasso's paintings, is portrayed as fragmented body parts, which eventually break up.

[160] Bazin, p. 151.

[161] Ibid., p. 152.

[162] For Gunning, Chaplin 'laughed the world into a new physical realm, exploring the ambiguities –

In *Modern Times*, the Tramp tightens bolts mechanically on the assembly line in a fast-paced factory. The monotonous, jerky action takes its toll when he, so programmed, cannot stop: he tightens everything within reach and even chases women with buttons on their clothes. Surely that is a comic scene; it is also an indictment of the greed of Capitalism, personified by the owner of the factory who orders the assembly line to accelerate when it is already running at an impossible speed and monitors the workers through the screens installed in every corner of the factory, even in the lavatory. To further improve efficiency and productivity, the cold-hearted mercenary plans to introduce the feeding machine, supported by high technology, which frees the workers' hands and thus eliminates the lunch hour. So it is a machine that makes human into machine. No time is allowed to be wasted in a Fordist modern factory. The Tramp is chosen to test the machine, which soon turns out to be a disaster: going terribly wrong and out of control, the machine wreaks havoc by throwing food everywhere, running faster and faster as if the film were being fast-forwarded, and starting to spark and burn. If the Tramp, helplessly tortured by the feeding machine, is comic because of, literally, '[s]omething mechanical encrusted on the living', the malfunctioning machine is equally comic, but it elicits the Lewisian laughter, which derives from 'a *thing* behaving like a person.' Waywardly and playfully refusing to do what the human designs it to, the machine almost becomes its own agency. An animated thing, usually enabled by science and technology, however, also causes the living anxiety, who fear that it might take over their world.

Reviewing *Modern Times* for *The New York Post*, Thornton Delehanty undermined Chaplin's achievement by divorcing his comedy from satire: 'His story is not so much a satiric thrust at the machine age as it is an employment of machinery as a field for comedy.'[163] Richard Watts Jr from *The New York Herald Tribune* rightly identified the audience of the film as 'fun-lovers, egalitarians and philosophers.'[164] As with Waugh, for Chaplin from the twenties onwards, too, satire and laughter are not only compatible but also interdependent: while laughter has satire as its aim, satire, in turn, is instrumental in achieving laughter. The Tramp's

---

indeed the comedy – of the body of modernity.' Tom Gunning, 'Chaplin and the Body of Modernity', last accessed 16 August 2016, <
http://chaplin.bfi.org.uk/programme/conference/pdf/tom-gunning.pdf >.

[163] Thornton Delehanty quoted in McDonald, Conway, and Ricci, p. 202.

[164] Richard Watts Jr quoted in McDonald, Conway, and Ricci. Ibid., p. 203.

body, devoured by the machine on the assembly line, snaking its way through the gears and cogs has become a lasting image of cinema because of its 'satiric thrust at the machine age' as well as its comedy. As soon as the Tramp enters the machine, the music, however, suddenly changes from the crescendo of intense, fast, shrill discords to a slower, cheerful, playful melody, as if from a music box. Like the ballerina inside the music box, the Tramp, though entrapped, is gliding freely between the parts. What would result in a serious accident in reality is depicted in Chaplin's film not as something menacing but, rather, as something enjoyable, like a child's play. The machine then becomes a mother's womb, in which the child-like Tramp is protected and safe and momentarily free from the modern world outside.

Like Chaplin, Waugh, too, satirises automatism, a modern, if not modernist, attempt to subjugate human to machine. Margot, who obtains her vast wealth from the white slavery trade, buys the dilapidated King's Thursday, her husband's family seat, and commissions the young German architect Otto Silenus to modernise it with the instruction: '"Something clean and square"'.[165] Margot certainly envisages a *modernist* King's Thursday. The self-appointed Professor of Architecture has not yet achieved fame, nor has he an impressive portfolio:

> the rejected design for a chewing-gum factory which had been produced in a progressive Hungarian quarterly. His only other completed work was the *décor* for a cinema-film of great length and complexity of plot – a complexity rendered the more inextricable by the producer's austere elimination of all human characters, a fact which had proved fatal to its commercial success.[166]

But Silenus seems to be the ideal person to materialise Margot's vision. Although written a year after the publication of *Decline and Fall*, Waugh's review of *The City of Tomorrow and Its Planning* (1929), the English translation of Le Corbusier's *Urbanisme* (1925), illuminates his novel. Le Corbusier's city is understood by Waugh as that 'of square towers of glass set at intervals between trees', a vision not dissimilar to Margot's, which the novelist reproaches and satirises.[167] Waugh found the English title 'justifiable but slightly misleading', arguing that Le Corbusier's city is not a 'city of tomorrow' because, pragmatically designed to deal with existing problems, it cannot cope with the rapid growth of population and the accelerated process of urbanisation' and also because, aesthetically, 'iron furniture bent out of

[165] *D&F*, p. 119.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Waugh, 'Cities of the Future', in *EAR*, pp. 63-65 (p. 64).

shape would be more offensive than worm-eaten wood, and discoloured concrete and rusted metal than mellowed brick and stone'.[168] So the Tudor timber of King's Thursday, which not only boasts tradition, national as well as family, but also pleases the eye, is much preferable to Otto's '[s]omething clean and square'.

If modern factories succeed in turning humans into machines, modernist architects like Silenus aim to turn homes into factories. Interestingly, Silenus's King's Thursday, visualised in the film adaptation as something outlandish, even extraterritorial, made of concrete and metal in the shape between an observatory and a bunker, is not described in detail but merely mentioned in passing in a conversation between Paul and his Oxford friend Potts, which alludes not only to Le Corbusier but also to Bauhaus:

> 'I saw some of Otto Silenus's work at Munich,' said Potts. 'I think that he is a man worth watching. He was in Moscow at one time and in the Bauhaus at Dessau. He can't be more than twenty-five now. There were some photographs of King's Thursday in a paper the other day. It looked extraordinarily interesting. It's said to be the only really imaginative building since the French Revolution. He's got right away from Corbusier, anyway.'
>
> 'If people realized,' said Paul, 'Corbusier is a pure nineteenth-century, Manchester school utilitarian, and that's why they like him.'[169]

Paul here speaks for Waugh, whose satire and laughter target modernity, or, more specifically, the various modernist movements in their attempt to modernise.

Working on King's Thursday, the somewhat dubious architect, who certainly excels in self-fashioning and publicity, reveals his concept:

> 'The problem of architecture as I see it,' he told a journalist who had come to report on the progress of his surprising creation of ferro-concrete and aluminium, 'is the problem of all art – the elimination of the human element from the consideration of form. The only perfect building must be the factory, because that is built to house machines, not humans. I do not think it is possible for domestic architecture to be beautiful, but I am doing my best. All ill comes from man,' he said gloomily; 'please tell your readers that. Man is never beautiful, he is never happy except when he becomes the channel for the distribution of mechanical forces.'[170]

The link between Silenus and Bauhaus pointed out by Potts is thus made more explicit in the architect's paraphrase, albeit radical, of the 1919 manifesto of Bauhaus. Walter Gropius, the founder of the Bauhaus School, called for 'a new guild of craftsmen without the class distinctions that raise an arrogant barrier between

---

[168] Ibid., pp. 63, 65.
[169] *D&F*, p. 122.
[170] Ibid., p. 120.

craftsmen and artists' and 'the new structure of the future, which will embrace architecture and sculpture and painting in one unity'.[171] If '[t]he ultimate aim of all visual arts is the complete building', the problem of architecture is then the problem of all art.[172] Gropius proposed: 'To embellish buildings was once the noblest function of all the fine arts; they were the indispensable components of great architecture. Today the arts exist in isolation, from which they can be rescued only through the conscious, cooperative effort of all craftsmen.'[173] The elimination of ornamentation and the stress on functionality of Bauhaus is seen to correspond to the Machine Age, and, if implemented to extremes, will lead to factories that house machines. The Fagus Factory in Alfeld, Germany, designed by Gropius in around 1910 and completed in 1925, with 'its groundbreaking vast expanses of glass panels and functionalist aesthetics,' is 'a landmark in the development of modern architecture and industrial design.'[174] Contrary to Waugh's prophecy of modern architecture, not only is the Factory still operational today, it has become a World Heritage Site: 'It is a concrete expression of the functionality of the industrial complex in the interest of productivity and the humanisation of the working environment.'[175] Waugh would have objected to the thought of the Fagus Factory, or any factory, as humanist, as perhaps Chaplin would have done.

Silenus's attack on human continues and climaxes in a parody of Shakespeare's eulogy of the human in *Hamlet* (1603), which is often quoted as the manifesto of the Renaissance.[176] Silenus rants with great passion:

> 'What an immature, self-destructive, antiquated mischief is man! How obscure and gross his prancing and chattering on his little stage of evolution! How loathsome and beyond words boring all the thoughts and self-approval of his biological by-product! this half-formed, ill-conditioned body! this erratic, maladjusted mechanism of his soul: on one side the harmonious instincts and balanced responses of the animal, on the other the inflexible purpose of the engine, and between them man, equally alien from the *being* of Nature and the *doing* of the machine, the vile *becoming*!'[177]

---

[171] Walter Gropius, 'Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar', in Hans M. Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, trans. by Wolfgang Jabs and Basil Gilbert and ed. by Joseph Stein (Cambridge, MA and London : The MIT Press, 1969), pp. 31-33 (p. 31).

[172] Ibid.

[173] Ibid.

[174] 'Fagus Factory in Alfeld', *WHC UNESCO*, last accessed 21 July 2016, < http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1368/>.

[175] Ibid.

[176] William Shakepeare, *The Tragedy of* Hamlet *Prince of Denmark* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958), II. 2. 69.

[177] *D&F*, pp. 120-21.

Silenus's well-articulated, poetic, dramatic parody is meant to provoke laughter. But there is more, since laughter is the means to satire. Dehumanised by the machine, the human becomes a monstrous existence, awkwardly positioned between the natural and the constructed; this alienation which modern men and women – workers, clerks, writers, and artists – experience is the primary concern of many modernist writers, particularly in the twenties.

At the end of *Modern Times*, the Tramp walks away and is never to return; perhaps he has to make way for more pressing concerns of the late thirties such as the rise of Nazis and the imminence of the Second World War. Chaplin's next film, also his first sound film, *The Great Dictator*, is a satiric comedy in the vein of *Modern Times*. Or perhaps the Tramp has to go because there is simply no room for him in the modern world. It is a world of the big wheel at Luna Park for Margot, 'one of Waugh's goddesses of Modernity'.[178] Silenus explains that

> 'the nearer you can get to the hub of the wheel the slower it is moving and the easier it is to stay on. […] Lots of people just enjoy scrambling on and being whisked off and scrambling on again. How they all shriek and giggle! Then there are others, like Margot, who sit as far out as they can and hold on for dear life and enjoy that.'[179]

Silenus therefore classifies people as 'static and dynamic': while Margot is dynamic, Paul is static. But '"the whole point about the wheel is that you needn't get on it at all, if you don't want to. […] It doesn't suit everyone."'[180] Returning to his old life at the College 'after the absence of little more than a year', Paul finally denounces the modern world, the big wheel which does not suit him.[181]

Silenus tells Paul that he '"used that idea of the wheel in a cinema film once."'[182] Interestingly, Marcus notes:

> The interplay between stasis and mobility further intersects with that between the mechanical (frequently represented […] through images of dolls and automata) and the organic or living. The machine aesthetic, and the celebration of the machine, was central to avant-garde and experimental cinema and to film criticism and theory in the first decades of the century.[183]

Silenus certainly celebrates the machine, both in his anti-human film and in his King's Thursday made of concrete and aluminium. But he and what he represents is

---

[178] McCartney, p. 84.
[179] *D&F*, p. 208.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid., p. 209.
[182] Ibid.
[183] Marcus, *The Tenth Muse*, p. 3.

precisely the object of Waugh's and Chaplin's satire.

Chapter Three
Talk Fiction and the Group Mind:
Vile Bodies as the Group Novel

Waugh and his circle, such as Green, Isherwood, and Powell, were perceived as a distinctive generation by their contemporaries and later by literary critics and biographers. More than simply a retrospective critical construction, these exterior modernists considered themselves to be a generation. Compared to their formidable predecessors, the high modernists, with whom they had a complex relationship, this younger generation of writers can be seen as more homogenous, consciously forming and promoting themselves as a group. Notably, this group, unlike the Bloomsbury Group, was founded entirely on friendship. By their generation, two of the most vocal of these writers, namely Waugh and Isherwood, often more specifically referred to their largely overlapping, if not identical, circles of friends.[1] Accordingly, I propose to view these writers not as a generation but as a group. I define the group as a small number of people who share a similar background and consciously gravitate towards each other for social and professional reasons. So the group is often homogeneous, exclusive, and elitist. Not only did the exterior modernists operate as a group, similar to those in their novels, preoccupied with the concept of the group, they also wrote what can be described as 'the group novel'. Offering anthropological insights, Waugh's *Vile Bodies* (1930) and Green's *Party Going* (1939) are excellent studies of the group, its behaviour – talk in particular – and psychology.

This group of exterior modernists is marked by the production of what I call 'talk fiction'. I prefer the concept of talk fiction to Waugh's 'the "novel of conversation"',[2] which, Waugh claimed, was pioneered by Ronald Firbank, because conversation suggests communication, or the exchange of ideas, which is exactly what is often most lacking in the novels such as *Vile Bodies*, *Party Going*, and Powell's debut *Afternoon Men* (1931). Characters merely talk, and in spite of their incessant talk, both in person – often at a party – and through the new

[1] Michael North points out that Henry Green 'was a lifelong friend of Christopher Isherwood, best man to Evelyn Waugh, roommate to Anthony Powell, schoolmate of George Orwell and Cyril Connolly, literary associate of John Lehmann and Stephen Spender, and host to Auden for a tour of the factory where Green worked in the late twenties.' Michael North, *Henry Green and the Writing of His Generation* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1984), p. 1.

[2] Waugh, 'Ronald Firbank', in *EAR*, pp. 56-59 (p. 58).

communications technology of the telephone, it is the miscommunication, or rather the complete breakdown of communication, that is accentuated. Interestingly, the exterior modernists' experimentation with dialogue in fiction corresponded to the coming of sound to cinema. Growing up with silent films, this group of writers 'in the first media age' were, in fact, more influenced by the talkies. If silent cinema was more closely associated with high modernism, the exterior modernists claimed sound cinema for themselves. And the talkies certainly helped to promote talk fiction by offering immense opportunities to those young writers with their reputations for dialogue. This group of young writers sought work in film as eagerly as they themselves were sought by the industry, despite the fact that collaborations only occasionally came to fruition. The exterior modernists wrote not only *for* cinema but also *about* cinema in their fiction.

The group novels are concerned not only with the group but also with the crowd, in *Vile Bodies*, indirectly through the popular press, and in *Brideshead*, through its retrospective account of the 1926 General Strike, in *Party Going*, through its direct portrayal of crowd scenes, in Isherwood's *Goodbye to Berlin* (1939) and *Prater Violet* (1945), through their eyewitness accounts of the rise of the Nazis on the European Continent in the early thirties. The group is located in the context of the crowd. A distinction is therefore made between the group and the crowd, against which the group defines itself and, paradoxically, of which it is often oblivious. If the group is a coterie, the crowd, by contrast, refers to a large number of people who gather together either organised (workers in a strike) or spontaneous (passengers delayed at a railway terminus). The crowd has usually been associated with the masses and regarded as inferior both socially and intellectually. A mass medium, cinema not only attracted the masses but also portrayed them and was fascinated by their spectacle as a defining feature of modernity. The crowd can then be described as cinematic. Fritz Lang's silent *Metropolis* (1927) and sound *M* (1931) exemplify the on-screen crowd scenes.

The understanding of the group in what Gustave Le Bon called 'the ERA OF CROWDS' illuminates the group mind depicted in those group novels mentioned above.[3] The group mind, narrowly understood as the collective psychology of the group in this chapter, is less directly described, if at all, than reflected in talk. In *Vile*

[3] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (Mineola: Dover Publications, 2002), p. x.

Bodies and *Party Going*, the group mind is characterised by the desire for belonging and the fear of assimilation. Within the group, while *Vile Bodies* focuses on the former, *Party Going* is more concerned with the latter. The hierarchy in *Vile Bodies* is stable; by contrast, the position of the group leaders in *Party Going* is precarious because they are constantly challenged by both old and new members who attempt to replace them. Facing the crowd, the group, however, unites in its thinking about the containment of the crowd and the preservation of itself. Providing the individual with a new collective identity while protecting some of their individuality, the group is therefore regarded by the individual as a defence against the crowd, into which they fear to be absorbed, in an age of increasing instability, which is brought about by mass movements and threatens another war. Interestingly, on the eve of and during the Second World War, the exterior modernists returned to the 1926 General Strike, acknowledging its significance, which had not been clear to them at the time. The accounts retrospectively recorded in the mid-career autobiographies of Isherwood and Green, namely *Lions and Shadows* (1938) and *Pack My Back* (1940), and fictionalised in Waugh's *Brideshead* (yet omitted in *Vile Bodies*) shed light on the group's perception of the crowd.

The 'young men of 1922'[4]

The group of writers who were born in the first decade of the twentieth century and active from the late twenties, especially in the thirties, has always been perceived as a distinctive generation by their contemporaries – by Woolf, in particular, though not so complimentarily, in 'The Leaning Tower' (1940)[5] – and by later group studies and biographies.[6] As I will show, discussing Waugh and Isherwood, two of the most vocal about the generational debate, they considered themselves to be part of a generation, too. But, representing only a handful of the privileged, the 'young men of 1922' should, more precisely, be described as a group.

[4] Waugh, 'The Youngest Generation', in *EAR*, p. 11.

[5] Woolf referred to these writers as 'the group which began to write about 1925 and, it may be, came to an end as a group in 1939. […] Day Lewis, Auden, Spender, Isherwood, Louis MacNiece and so on.' Her definition is, however, generational. Virginia Woolf, 'The Leaning Tower', in *The Moment and Other Essays* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1948), pp. 128-154 (p. 139).

[6] See Samuel Hynes's *The Auden Generation* (1976), Martin Green's *Children of the Sun* (1976), Michael North's *Henry Green and the Writing of His Generation* (1984), Valentine Cunningham's *British Writers of the Thirties* (1988), Humphrey Carpenter's *The Brideshead Generation* (1989), and D. J. Taylor's *Bright Young People* (2007).

With an acute, historical sense of his own (narrowly defined) generation, Waugh was therefore preoccupied with discussions about generation: in his school journalism, 'The Youngest Generation' (1921), and two 1929 articles, 'Too Young at Forty' and 'The War and the Younger Generation', Waugh distinguished his generation, 'the young men of 1922', not only from his father's generation but also from his brother's generation, namely the 'young men of 1912' who had fought in the First World War.[7] The precocious schoolboy prophesied that the young men of 1922 'will be, above all things, clear-sighted […] The youngest generation are going to be very hard and analytical and unsympathetic, but they are going to aim at things as they are and they will not call their aim "Truth".'[8] Predating *Vile Bodies* by almost a decade, the editorial reads like a manifesto of the Bright Young People generation, and Waugh is unmistakably its spokesperson.[9]

His generation, Waugh claimed, 'will be reticent […] The young men of the nineties subsisted upon emotion and their poetry and their painting thrills with it. […] it [will be] hard to see the soul in the youngest generation.'[10] This reticence certainly manifests itself later in the exterior modernist fiction. Exterior modernism, as I have shown in Chapter Two, derives its exteriority from comedy as well as other sources such as cinema and satire. Waugh had been aware of this emotional reticence before he decided to be a writer: anti-sentimental, his generation 'will watch themselves with, probably, a greater egotism than did the young men of the nineties, but it will be with a cynical smile and often a laugh.'[11] For Waugh, his is, to sum up, a disillusioned, inconsolable generation living in the vast Waste Land of a dystopian world: 'It is a queer world which the old men have left them and they will have few ideals and illusions to console them when they "get to feeling old". They will not be a happy generation.'[12] Waugh's lucid and definitive account of the fate of his generation, sketched when he was only eighteen, resonates with a sense of how he and his contemporaries were generally perceived.

---

[7] Waugh, 'The Youngest Generation', p. 11.
[8] Ibid.
[9] D. J. Taylor, *Bright Young People: The Rise and Fall of a Generation 1918-1940* (London: Vintage, 2008), p. 4.
[10] Waugh, 'The Youngest Generation', p. 11. Alex Murray argues that Waugh's 'early encounter with the 1890s inaugurated a lifelong relationship that was marked by both influence and antagonism.' Alex Murray, 'Decadence Revisited: Evelyn Waugh and the Afterlife of the 1890s', *Modernism/modernity*, 22/3 (2015), 593-607 (p. 593).
[11] Waugh, 'The Youngest Generation', p. 11.
[12] Ibid.

If 1920 and 1921 saw Waugh pondering the problem of the old and the young, complicated by his strained relationship with his father, the next bout of serious thinking came in 1929, which corresponded to the period of the composition of *Vile Bodies* and found consummation in its publication in January 1930. 'Too Young At Forty: Youth Calls to the Peter Pans of Middle-Age Who Block the Way', which appeared in *Evening Standard* on 22 January 1929, is not only irreverent but also patricidal:

> Our seniors [..] must cure themselves of the arrested development that seems to afflict them. There are the Peter Pans of Bloomsbury, the skittish old critics who will not grow up, who must always be in the movement. Is there no one who will gently remind them of their silver hairs and explain to them, patiently and tactfully, that *there is a younger generation*?[13]

Waugh's generational polemics can best be described as indicative of the emergence of the next generation of writers, who rendered, or at least wished to render, the high modernists obsolete. Waugh listed 'five writers all known already to a considerable public who seem to me to sum up the aspirations and prejudices of my generation', namely Harold Acton, Robert Byron, Christopher Hollis, Peter Quennell, and Adrian Stokes, all of whom attended Oxford with him.[14] Promoting the younger generation of writers – mainly his circle of friends – ruthlessly at the cost of what he referred to as 'the pre-war *enfants terribles*',[15] Waugh intended to topple the previous generation by acting on his wish to replace them, although his comments about 'arrested development' and adult Peter Pans seem somewhat more applicable to his own generation than that of the high modernists. Martin Green calls Waugh and his group the *Sonnenkinder* and expounds their cult: 'They were, and saw themselves as, originators of a new "aesthetic" phase in English high culture, to be characterized by ornament and brilliancy, playfulness and youthfulness, and by a turning of the back on the old forms of seriousness and power.'[16]

In his *Spectator* article published in April 1929, 'The War and the Younger Generation', Waugh's tone was still shocking, not least to the older generation, but he began to openly criticise his own generation: 'Freedom produces sterility. There

[13] Waugh, 'Too Young At Forty: Youth Calls to the Peter Pans of Middle-Age Who Block the Way', in *EAR*, pp. 45-47 (p. 46).
[14] Ibid., p. 47.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Martin Green, *Children of the Sun: A Narrative of 'Decadence' in England After 1918* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 14.

was nothing left for the younger generation to rebel against, expect the widest conceptions of mere decency. Accordingly it was against these that it turned. The result in many cases is the perverse and aimless dissipation chronicled daily by the gossip-writer of the press.'[17] Writing under the shadow of high modernism, Waugh and his generation are particularly concerned with the in/distinction between high art – literature in their case – and mass culture. Many incorporate popular culture, cinema in particular, into their fiction writing, and thus further complicate the distinction by blurring it. But there was hope: 'There seem signs, however, that a small group of young men and women are breaking away from their generation and striving to regain the sense of values that should have been instinctive to them.'[18] Waugh did not identify this 'small group', but needless to say, he counted himself as one of them.

Most of Waugh's utterances on the topic of the generational divide – if not war – in his early adulthood, particularly in the two articles written in 1929, reaffirm his schoolboy opinions, expressed in his diaries as well as the 1921 Lancing editorial. Seemingly contradicting his diary entry 25-30 September 1920, which minutely records his opposition to 'the motion that "This House deplores the disrespect for age by modern youth"', 'What I Think of My Elders' (1930), in fact, ridicules the older generation in the same sarcastic vein as the description of Lord Horn's speech made to Waugh and his fellow public schoolboys on 25 June 1920, which 'seems to me the epitome of all that is most fine and most false in the old school.'[19] Moreover, the 1930 article conveys consistently the message, 'Ring out the old, ring in the new' – originally meant by Tennyson to welcome the New Year – which can here be metaphorically understood as Waugh's anticipation of a new literary dynasty, forcefully expressed earlier in 'Too Young at Forty'.

'Why Glorify Youth?' (1932) is, however, a baffling exception. Almost apologetic, Waugh confessed his reluctance to accept the commission to write the belligerent 'Too Young at Forty' and dismissed it as 'a fatuous subject':

> I wrote the article, stuffing it with all the clichés I could remember and doing all I could by bombast and exaggeration to qualify it for the trade label of 'challenging'. […] Now, three years later, I am invited to write on 'Why Glorify Youth?' – and it seems to me that this reversal of theme reveals a most salutary change of attitude, a cool wave of sanity

[17] Waugh, 'The War and the Younger Generation', in *EAR*, pp. 61-63 (p. 62).
[18] Ibid., p. 63.
[19] *Diaries*, pp. 107, 89. Waugh, 'What I Think of My Elders', in *EAR*, pp. 66-68.

> that has swept public opinion during the intervening time, washing away the picnic litter of Youth movement sentimentality.[20]

What prompted Waugh's 'change of attitude' then? Between these two articles lay his second novel, *Vile Bodies*, 'in which I attempted to summarize the chief features of those topsy-turvy years in which the younger generation succeeded in knocking the nonsense out of the attempts to sentimentalize them.'[21] Waugh then blamed the twenties, 'futile, obstreperous, anarchic, vulgar,' for '[breaking] up post-war Rupert Brooke magnificently-unprepared-for-the-long-bitterness-of-life sentimentality, and [making] Youth openly and ludicrously inglorious.'[22] Waugh's intense interest in the problems of age and youth coincided with the writing of *Vile Bodies*, but, in its process, the love between Waugh and the Bright Young People – and what they represent – seemed to have died. Now firmly established on the literary scene by the success of his second novel, Waugh perhaps lost interest in challenging the Peter Pans of high modernism or simply felt no more need for a battle cry. Isherwood famously summarised the battle cry of his generation as 'My Generation – right or wrong!' in his 1958 foreword to his first novel *All the Conspirators* (1928), and, like Waugh, he clearly also thought in such generational terms. Comparing his generation with the Angry Young Men of the fifties, Isherwood concluded that '[t]he Angry Young Man of my generation was angry with the Family and its official representatives […] You may call the motives of these characters trivial, but their struggle is mortal and passionate. And the author is as passionate as any of his characters.'[23]

To some extent, that Waugh stopped being an Angry Young Man of the twenties marks the beginning of his literary maturity. More significantly, preparing for his thirtieth birthday, he adopted a new strategy of self-promotion befitting a new stage of his career: 'In the ordinary arts of civilization – eating, drinking, clothes, hospitality, furnishing – all fashions are set by people between the ages of 30 and 55.'[24] But when Waugh ventured further to observe the great mistake of 'confusing Youth with Modernity' and suggested that 'with the Fine Arts of Literature, Music, Painting, the real "modern" are all men in late middle age. […] The "moderns" are

[20] Waugh, 'Why Glorify Youth?', in *EAR*, pp. 125-28 (pp. 125-26). It originally appeared in the March 1932 issue of *Women's Journal*.
[21] Ibid., p. 126. *Black Mischief*, Waugh's third novel, was published in October 1932.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Christopher Isherwood, *All the Conspirators* (London: Vintage, 2012), p. xi.
[24] Waugh, 'Why Glorify Youth?', p. 127.

mature artists, such as Mr James Joyce and M. Picasso',[25] his sincerity is compromised. Contradicting most of his other accounts, it is out of character: Joyce is almost everywhere else ridiculed by Waugh, whose aversion to Picasso is equally well known.[26]

Interestingly, Waugh also pointed out that '[t]he whole Glorious Youth legend was invented by the elderly and middle-aged.'[27] He refused to believe the downhill trajectory of one's life after youth: 'If Youth is our most valuable possession, then we are every one of us poorer and more pitiable every moment of our lives from birth to death.'[28] This, nonetheless, betrays the voice of a young man, for the optimism, this belief in a better future yet to come, is a notable gesture of youth. As *Brideshead* cruelly testifies more than a decade later, youth is perhaps later seen as the prime of one's life – a moveable feast in Hemingway's words – and its glorification is indeed an invention of the elderly and the middle-aged in reflection on their losses. In a completely different mood, Martin Green confirms that '[t]he simplest psychological fact at the root of this [*Sonnenkinder*] cult is that worship of the male adolescent by older men that is expressed in the myths of Narcissus, Adonis, and such.'[29] But in 1932, Waugh, on the one hand, acknowledged his literary achievement, which was largely derived from being young and writing about and for the young, but, on the other hand, still called for maturity and seriousness: 'The Youth boom has been very convenient for young men like myself who have made a living out of it, but it seems to me time that criticism adopted some more significant standard'.[30] This self-criticism, albeit rare, is more plausible than the homage paid to Joyce and Picasso.

Talk Fiction and the Talkies

[25] Ibid., pp. 127-28.
[26] 'Let Us Return to the Nineties: But Not to Oscar Wilde' for the November 1930 edition of *Harper's Bazaar* is an exception. Waugh observed that 'the poor decadents were, less than anyone, in touch with their own age' and that 'the artists and writers who can justly claim to be thought avant-garde are almost always middle-aged or quite elderly people – M. Picasso or Mr James Joyce.' Waugh, 'Let Us Return to the Nineties: But Not to Oscar Wilde', in *EAR*, pp. 122-25 (pp. 125, 123).
[27] Waugh, 'Why Glorify Youth?', p. 126.
[28] Ibid., p. 127.
[29] Martin Green, p. 6.
[30] Waugh, 'Why Glorify Youth?', p. 128.

In or about 1930, human character changed, again. The late twenties and early thirties saw the emergence of talk fiction, such as Green's *Living*, Waugh's *Vile Bodies*, and Powell's *Afternoon Men*. David Lodge observes that the foregrounding of dialogue in the fiction of 'the novelists of the 1930s' marks them as distinct from 'a particular daunting set of precursors': 'The stream of consciousness gives way to a stream of talk, but it is talk without the reassuring gloss of the classic novel's authorial voice, without a privileged access to the thoughts and motivations of characters, so that the "modern" note of disillusion, fragmentation and solipsism persists.'[31]

Beginning to write in the mid-twenties, these young writers were acutely aware of the legacy of what was to become Modernism, or high modernism. Again we see that the exterior modernists' relationship with high modernism is always a complex one. In 1958, Isherwood felt able to comment on his borrowing from the previous literary generation in his debut novel with a sense of humour afforded by the safe distance of three decades, which witnessed the canonisation of high modernism, and by his own achievement: 'Perhaps you will be able to enjoy this book simply as a period piece – smiling at its naive attempts at a James Joyce thought-stream, its aping of the mannerism of Stephen Dedalus, its quaint echoes of Virginia Woolf, its jerky flashback narration crudely imitated from E. M. Forster.'[32] In his 1958 *Paris Review* interview with Terry Southern, Green, however, summarised the sentiment of writers like him with regard to the high modernists, taking Joyce in the novel and Kafka in the short story by way of example: 'They're like cats which have licked the plate clean. You've got to dream up another dish if you're to be a writer.'[33] To 'dream up another dish', Green experimented with dialogue.

At the time of the composition, publication, and promotion of *Vile Bodies*, Waugh glorified youth to set the young writers of his group against those forty-year-old high modernist Peter Pans. Waugh's 1929 and 1930 generational polemics are full of hidden agendas: by promoting the aspirant writers of his Oxford circle, he was in fact promoting himself. A young writer's ambition to begin a new literary era aside, the late twenties saw the gradual dissolution of high modernism

[31] David Lodge, 'Dialogue in the Modern Novel', in *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 75-86 (p. 81).
[32] *Conspirators*, p. xii.
[33] Henry Green, 'The Art of Fiction', in *Surviving: The Uncollected Works of Henry Green* (London: Harvill Press, 1993), pp. 234-50 (p. 247).

and, as Miller argues, the beginning of late modernism. Waugh sensed that the literary trend was on the brink of change and took advantage of it, advocating his own particular sense of modernness and his particular version of modernism with a focus on exteriority. Waugh delineated his idea of being modern primarily in his reviews of his contemporaries. Firbank, Hemingway, and Green are all modern, according to Waugh, primarily because of their experimentation with external dialogue: their novels are a variety of talk fiction.

Praising Firbank's 'literary method', Waugh claimed in his 1929 article that the novelist, only a few years younger than Woolf and Joyce, 'is the first quite modern writer to solve for himself, quite unobtrusively and probably more or less unconsciously, the aesthetic interrelation of subject and form.'[34] Waugh attributed Firbank's major achievement to 'the "novel of conversation"': 'From the fashionable chatter of his period, vapid and interminable, he has plucked, like tiny brilliant feathers from the breast of a bird, the particles of his design'.[35] Regarding Hemingway as Firbank's successor 'developing [the latter's] technical discoveries',[36] Waugh admired Hemingway's dialogue in *Fiesta*, also known as *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), which was expressed in his diary entry on 15 July 1961: 'Hemingway's suicide has made me reread *Fiesta*. It was a revelation to me when it first came out – the drunk conversations rather than the fishing and bullfighting. Rereading I was still impressed by the writing'.[37] Waugh's own hyphenated drunk talk in his most experimental novel may have been inspired by that of Hemingway:

> 'Bet-you-can't-do-this.'
> […]
> 'Chap-in-the-train showed me,' he said.
> […]
> 'Just-you-try. Bet-you-anything-you-like you can't do it.'[38]

Vile Bodies is also marked by its telephone conversation, an innovation of which Waugh was proud, writing in the 1965 preface that 'I think I can claim that this was the first English novel in which dialogue on the telephone plays a large part.'[39] Chapter Eleven, only two pages in length, consists entirely of two Bright Young

[34] Waugh, 'Firbank', p. 57.
[35] Ibid., p. 58.
[36] Ibid., p. 56.
[37] *Diaries*, p. 822.
[38] *VB*, p. 35.
[39] Waugh, 'Preface', in *VB*, pp. 191-92 (p. 192).

People talking on the telephone; their exchanges are quick and monosyllabic:

> 'You haven't got the money?'
> 'No.'
> 'We aren't going to be married to-day?'
> 'No.'
> 'I see.'
> 'Well?'
> 'I said, I see.'
> 'Is that all?'
> 'Yes, that's all, Adam.'
> 'I'm sorry.'
> 'I'm sorry, too. Good-bye.'
> 'Good-bye, Nina.'[40]

Writing 'the "novel of conversation"', Waugh himself can be seen as a literary descendant of Firbank; so is Green, although he is not listed alongside Hemingway, Acton, and Gerhardie in Waugh's article. While Hemingway, old enough to have fought in the war, belonged to the generation of Waugh's brother, Alec, and Rupert Brooke, Green, two years Waugh's junior, was undoubtedly one of 'the young men of 1922'. Expressing how much he liked his friend's debut novel, *Blindness*, Waugh wrote to Green: 'It is extraordinary to me that anyone of our generation could have written so fine a book – and at Oxford of all places.'[41] And Green was modern. In his 1930 *Graphic* review of Green's second novel, *Living*, Waugh acknowledged his friend's daring, if not violent, linguistic experimentation, not least the omission of articles: 'There are the very opposite of slovenly writing. The effects which Mr Green wishes to make and the information he wishes to give are so accurately and subtly conceived that it becomes necessary to take language one step further than its grammatical limits allow.'[42]

Waugh greatly admired the style of *Living* and, in a letter to Green at the time of the novel's publication in 1929, described it as 'like those aluminium ribbons one stamps out in railway stations on penny in the slot machines. The absence of all that awful thing they call "word pictures", the way in which no appearances are described. The telegraphic narrative which might have been all wrong if you had used a present sense and is so perfectly right in the past.'[43] It is unclear what Waugh exactly meant by 'word pictures', but his brief explanation implies that he perhaps had in mind the

---

[40] *VB*, p. 154.
[41] *Letters*, p. 33.
[42] Waugh, 'A Neglected Masterpiece', in *EAR*, pp. 80-82 (pp. 81-82).
[43] *Letters*, pp. 44-45.

stream of consciousness, the iconic technique synonymous with high modernism which he found particularly problematic. Waugh denounced the vivid description of immanent minutiae, or the fluctuating mind, and extolled Green's 'telegraphic narrative', which immediately recalls the journalistic style of Hemingway. The 'violence' done to the English grammar enables Green to experiment freely: 'Indeed I don't see how else you could have made a framework for the dialogue which is magnificent. You seem to have invented an entire new language, doing for Birmingham born people what Singe [*sic*] did with Irish – making an artistic form out of a dialect so that every word is startling.'[44] Waugh's enthusiasm for Green's mastery of vernacular speech and his way of making it an art is shared by others. As Robert Byron observes, Green, the artist with an interest in anthropology, 'seeks beauty and discovers it', in the most unlikely places, not least in his father's Birmingham foundry.[45] V. S. Pritchett finds in Green's 'muddled sentences […] a clue to the inner life and a kind of sad lyrical poetry.'[46]

Woolf disagreed with Waugh on modern writers' invention of new languages in 'Craftsmanship', initially her BBC radio talk broadcast on 29 April 1937 as part of the *Words Fail Me* series and later collected in *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays* (1942). For Woolf, whose somewhat reverent attitude towards the language of Shakespeare can be said to be conservative, making a new language is not a writer's primary concern: 'Our business is to see what we can do with the English language as it is. How can we combine the old words in new orders so that they survive, so that they create beauty, so that they tell the truth? That is the question.'[47] By contrast, Waugh then certainly still believed in the evolution and constant renewal of the English language and, more importantly, in a writer's power to invent new languages, or at least in the possibility of inventing new languages for contemporaneous use. Even if the language of the Bright Young People was not entirely invented by him, Waugh recorded, embellished, and immortalised it in *Vile Bodies*: '"don't you think… or don't you?"', '"how shy-making"', '"isn't that divine?"', '"this really is all too bogus"'.[48]

---

[44] Ibid., p. 45.

[45] Robert Byron quoted in Jeremy Treglown, *Romancing: The Life and Work of Henry Green* (New York: Random House, 2000), p. 97.

[46] V. S. Pritchett, 'Back from the War', *The New York Times*, 1 October 1950, 28.

[47] Woolf, 'Craftsman', in *Selected Essays*, pp. 85-91 (p. 89).

[48] *VB*, pp. 49, 50.

Waugh's view of a regional dialect as 'an entire new language', however, betrayed his class bias. As he grew older, he perhaps changed his mind about the revitalisation of the English language, particularly during the composition of *Brideshead*. But it seems that Waugh had always endorsed a particular kind of language, or the so-called U English.[49] In *Exiles and Émigrés* (1970), Eagleton criticises what he terms the 'upper-class' novel of both Waugh and Woolf; on the other hand, he also takes issues with the 'lower middle-class' novel of writers such as Gissing, Bennett, Wells, and Orwell:

> Both of these *genres* are to some extent self-consciously hostile to what they see as the dominant cultural orthodoxy. […] Yet the truth is that both modes of fiction were tied, at crucial points, to the dominant orthodoxy they opposed. […] The novel, in consequence, was either constrained by the insistent detail of 'realist' experience or cut damagingly adrift from it, clinging to 'civilised' values which were themselves unable to comprehend more than a relatively small area of contemporary civilisation.[50]

In short, neither group of native British writers, for Eagleton, can achieve the 'totalisation' and 'transcendence' of the great Romantic and Realist literature of the nineteenth century.[51] Eagleton, however, does not mention Green, who straddles both the upper-class and the working-class worlds as an aristocrat managing the family foundry in Birmingham and fictionalising its workers; Green's novels, which straddle both the 'upper-class' and the 'lower middle-class' genres of Eagleton's, have a better chance to totalise and to transcend – if they have not already done so – than his peers.

A stylist himself, Waugh is particularly 'in the advance guard', observant of literary styles.[52] Green's biographer Jeremy Treglown states that 'since the death of Virginia Woolf, there had been no one to challenge Green as the leading experimental novelist in Britain, and one of the foremost novelists of all serious kinds.'[53] Waugh's keen promotion of Green's new style as he chose to understand it, however, revealed his hidden agenda: by promoting the works of his generation, Waugh not only promoted himself but, more significantly, fashioned a new modernism with a focus on exteriority against the grain, or Zeitgeist, of high

[49] Waugh contributed an open letter to *Noblesse Oblige: An Enquiry into the Identifiable Characteristics of the English Aristocracy* (1956), edited by Nancy Mitford.
[50] Terry Eagleton, *Exiles and Émigrés: Studies in Modern Literature* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1970), p. 13.
[51] Ibid., p. 10.
[52] Waugh, 'Felix Culpa?', p. 360.
[53] Treglown, p. 178.

modernism. Hailing *Living* as a 'masterpiece', Waugh naturally compared it with the works of Joyce: 'Modern novelists taught by Mr James Joyce are at last realizing the importance of re-echoing and remodifying the same themes. Note, for instance, the repeated metaphor of "pigeons" in *Living*.'[54] So, for Waugh, a modern novelist is the student of the high modernists but at the same time better than his or her mentors. Green's second novel is regarded by Waugh as 'modern in the real sense of the word,' or rather more modern than *Ulysses* (1922), because it is talk fiction.[55] But Waugh was selective, for his own purposes: he emphasised only the exterior aspect of Green's fiction and eschewed the intensely psychological. Green's understanding of prose is different from that of Waugh's:

> Prose is not to be read aloud but to oneself alone at night, and it is not quick as poetry but rather a gathering web of insinuations which go further than names however shared can ever go. Prose should be a long intimacy between strangers with no direct appeal to what both may have known. It should slowly appeal to feelings unexpressed, it should in the end draw tears out of the stone […][56]

Green's style, therefore, can best be described as oscillating between Waugh's exteriority and Woolf's interiority, and pushing both to their limits.[57]

Interestingly, concurrent with the group of exterior modernists' experimentation with talk in fiction, as discussed earlier, cinema was undergoing a sea change, namely the advent of sound. If cinema, then silent, as Shail argues, helped to give rise to literary modernism – it is high modernism that he has in mind – sound cinema contributed to the emergence and promotion of exterior modernism, a main feature of which is talk.[58] Waugh started to write for *The Daily Mail* from late 1929, giving advice on – what we now call – lifestyle, ranging from marriage, London nightlife, house parties, and manners to foreign travel. His two articles on cinema – 'My Favourite Film Star' and 'For Adult Audiences' – both of which appeared in 1930, fall into this category. Waugh's favourite film stars are perhaps of less interest than his remarks about sound cinema at its initial stage: 'I feel that nowadays, since the introduction of what are charitably known as "Talking Pictures", writing about the cinema is like writing about the music-hall; it tends to become a mere lament of a

[54] Waugh, 'Masterpiece', p. 82.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Henry Green, *Pack My Bag: A Self-Portrait* (London: Vintage, 2000), p. 55.
[57] Since his third novel, *Party Going*, Green had been published by the Hogarth Press.
[58] Shail, p. 3.

disappearing art.'[59]

Waugh's discussion of the talkies in May 1930 in Britain was topical and – important for a young novelist of this generation – fashionable. A crucial year in the history of cinema's conversion to sound, 1930, for many film scholars, completed the transitional process. 'Sound changes *everything*', writes Scott Eyman, who tells a dramatic story of *The Speed of Sound* (1997), 'And all of it happened within four short years' from 1926 to 1930.[60] It is true in the United States: 'By 1930, silent picture-making had virtually ceased in America, although many of the early talkies were also released in silent versions to cater for those cinemas yet to be wired for sound.'[61] But in Britain, and Europe for that matter, it is a different story. In *The Coming of Sound* (2005), Douglas Gomery notes: 'United Kingdom exhibitors wired most quickly (22 percent in 1929; 63 percent by the close of 1930). German theater owners moved more slowly; the penetration rate did not top 60 percent until 1932. French exhibitors proved even more recalcitrant.'[62] Tom Ryall situates in the same context Britain's, and Hitchcock's, first feature sound film *Blackmail*, released in June 1929: 'it was not until the middle of 1929 that British sound films began to appear in quantity. During that year British producers released a number of silent productions which had been hastily converted into sound pictures with the addition of dialogue scenes, music and sound effects, together with a smaller number of pictures conceived for sound.'[63]

The year between *Blackmail* and Waugh's article saw Britain adopting and accommodating sound at an accelerated rate. Waugh, however, was still hesitant about sound cinema, deploring its quality and thus lamenting the fast disappearing silent cinema, which he regarded as art. Waugh offered a counterexample to Eyman's account of the cinemagoers embracing early talkies uncritically and with heady enthusiasm:

> It is impossible to re-create the sense of wonder that made the public eager to abandon the visual and gestural dynamism of silent film, made them so eager to overlook the crudity of the technology and the stiffness of the first wave of sound films. For

[59] Waugh, 'My Favourite Film Star', in *EAR*, pp. 68-70 (p. 68).
[60] Scott Eyman, *The Speed of Sound: Hollywood and the Talkie Revolution, 1926-1930* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999), pp. 20, 21.
[61] Tom Ryall, 'Blackmail', in *British Film Institute Film Classics*, ed. by Edward Buscombe and Rob White, 2 vols (New York and London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2003), I, pp. 94-114 (p. 95).
[62] Douglas Gomery, *The Coming of Sound: A History* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), p. 107.
[63] Ryall, p. 95.

> audiences of 1926-1930, talkies were what the Lumière films had been for audiences of 1895 […][64]

Waugh was quick to point out both the 'crudity' – the 'uncouth voices' – and the 'stiffness' – 'an immobile reflection of what we once admired' – of the talkie in its early days.[65] For him, early sound cinema regressed to what is similar to 'cinema as attractions' from the late silent cinema with its complex narrativity. Surprisingly open-minded, Waugh had no objection to sound cinema; it was rather the sound technology at its initial stage – the restriction of actors' movement and the poor sound quality – that he found unsatisfactory: 'I know that I am in the minority in this feeling, and I hope fervently that this disturbing new invention will soon be tamed so that we can once more look upon the cinema – silent or "talky" – not as an imitation stage play but as genuine and self-sufficient art.'[66] While Waugh vaguely entertained the thought that the difference between silent and sound cinema was perhaps more fundamental than simply the presence of sound per se, Eyman suggests the need to understand sound cinema as a distinctive art form itself: 'Talkies were not an evolution, but a mutation, a different art form entirely; as a result, an art form was eliminated and hundreds of careers were extinguished. Major directors were ruined, great stars plummeted.'[67]

Waugh's eyewitness account of cinema's transition, together with Eyman's personal approach to this period of history with a focus on the individual, reveals the difficulty of introducing sound, which cannot be easily dismissed by Gomery. Gomery's insistence on viewing the U.S. film industry's conversion to sound as 'an industrial change' primarily from 'economic considerations' limits his understanding: 'The transition to sound by the U.S. film industry monopolists was fast, orderly, and profitable. All adjustments were made in fifteen months.'[68] Gomery thus attempts to achieve his aim to '[debunk] the usual conclusions of chaos and disorder as best exemplified by Donald Crafton and Scott Eyman.'[69] Although it may complement other views to help better understand cinema's transition from silent to sound, Gomery's master narrative of corporate interests concentrating on big players, be it

---

[64] Eyman, pp. 21-22.
[65] Waugh, 'Star', p. 68.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Eyman, p.22. See Michel Hazanavicius's film *The Artist* (2011).
[68] Gomery, pp. xv, xi, 5.
[69] Ibid., p. xviii. See Donald Crafton, *The Talkies: American Cinema's Transition to Sound, 1926-1931* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1977).

major film companies or America, and ignoring the small, the individual, and the regional, particularly cases of failure, can, however, seem crude and reductive.

Discussing the export of sound to the rest of the world, Gomery shows how the top-down U.S. model is followed: 'the deluxe cinemas' were given preferences, and then '[n]ative producers, importers, and owners of smaller cinemas simply had no choice but to acquiesce or lose the chance to capture a share of the surplus profits.'[70] Sharing the English language, Britain became the first important foreign market for Hollywood's sound films. The American monopoly described by Gomery is confirmed by Robert Murphy: 'Its inexperienced personnel, its limited – often foolishly squandered – capital resources, its reliance on foreign technology (or the worse alternative of inferior home produce substitutes) combined to make the coming of sound a traumatic period for the British film production industry.'[71] Hollywood's dominance, or rather the monopoly by the big American cooperates of sound equipment, met resistance, albeit unsuccessful: 'The coming of sound probably increased American power over the British exhibitors, and the possibility of the Gaumont-British circuit falling into American hands caused considerable alarm.'[72] The advent of sound posed serious threats to the survival of the British film industry and proved to be one of its most critical tests. 1931 might be 'a vintage year and the beginning of a period of prosperity for British film production',[73] but the road to it was eventful, if not chaotic and disorderly. So the process of sound conversion in Europe is far from straightforward, as Gomery suggests; not even '[a]ll technical problems of compatibility were easily eliminated', let alone those more controversial issues such as dubbing and subtitling.[74]

Cinema's difficult transition from silent to sound was, as I have shown, aptly captured by Waugh's 'My Favourite Film Star'; it, too, was captured in his second novel. While *Decline and Fall* has an affinity with silent cinema, particularly that of Chaplin, *Vile Bodies* associates itself with sound cinema, which does justice to Waugh's dialogue as well as action. If *Vile Bodies*, written in 1929 and published in January 1930, is, as Waugh claimed, 'the first English novel in which dialogue on the

[70] Gomery, p. 107.
[71] Robert Murphy, 'Coming of Sound to the Cinema in Britain', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 4/2 (1984), 143-60 (pp. 156-57).
[72] Ibid., p. 151.
[73] Michael Balcon quoted in Murphy, p. 158.
[74] Gomery, p. 107.

telephone plays a large part', it is very likely also to be the first English novel, too, in which sound cinema explicitly plays a major role. In the novel, Waugh has his protagonists go to a talkie. If, according to the figure provided by Gomery, only 22 percent of British cinemas were wired for sound in 1929, this fashionable novel was a pioneer in recording the experience of seeing a sound film. Adam and Nina plan to go to the cinema, but Adam picks Nina up late:

> She said, 'You're much later than you said. It's so boring to be late for a talkie.'
> He said, 'Talkies are boring, anyhow.'[75]

They are late for the film of Nina's choice. Once in the cinema, a scene from the film triggers a bitter discussion of what they are experiencing in their own lives: 'Then they started a real quarrel which lasted all through the film and all the way to Nina's flat'.[76] That is cinemagoing with a Bright Young People twist.

Although these Bright Young People seem perpetually bored – boring is a popular word in their vocabulary – why is it particularly boring to be late for a *talkie*? It may be Nina's fear of missing the beginning and thus having difficulties following the storyline. Missing the beginning of a silent film, however, potentially poses the same problem, unless the talkies are considered narratively more consistent. Nina's worry therefore hints at the notion that sound cinema narrates differently from silent cinema and that talkies perhaps rely on words in general and dialogue in particular for narration, which brings sound cinema closer to literature than silent cinema, which is primarily a visual medium. Indeed a reader rarely starts from the middle of a novel; the audience of a talkie should perhaps also begin from the beginning. Nina's concern at least reveals that even for the veteran cinemagoers the early talkies offer a new and disorienting experience. Moreover, Nina's interest clearly lies elsewhere – so is Adam's, since he considers all talkies boring – she seems to go to the cinema not to see the film but to contemplate and deal with her personal problems. Nina, like all other Bright Young People, is self-centred, or even narcissistic. But reality recedes in the darkened cinema, an affective environment conducive to the seduction of dream, imagination, and illusion. The audience are often somewhere between the real and the unreal, managing, on the one hand, to relate the film being screened to their personal life and, on the other hand, to follow

[75] *VB*, p. 76.
[76] Ibid.

absentmindedly what is happening on the screen.[77]

While the younger generation, as consumers of mass media, go to see the talkies, Colonel Blount makes one. On Adam's second visit to the Colonel, father of his on-and-off fiancée (Adam and Nina's engagement relies solely on Adam's finance), Doubting Hall, with its vast parkland, has been transformed into a film set. Taken as a journalist, Adam is introduced to the director, Mr Isaacs:

> 'of which you have just witnessed a mere fragment marks a stepping stone in the development of the British Film Industry. It is the most important All-Talkie super-religious film to be produced solely in this country by British artists and management and by British capital. It has been directed throughout regardless of difficulty and expense, and supervised by a staff of expert historians and theologians. Nothing has been omitted that would contribute to the meticulous accuracy of every detail. The life of that great social and religious reformer John Wesley is for the first time portrayed to a British public in all its humanity and tragedy… Look here, I've got all this written out. I'll have them give you a copy before you go.[78]

Ironically, Isaacs then shows Adam the shooting of a duel between Wesley and Whitefield, which is not historically recorded. What Adam initially suspects as 'a well-practised little speech' turns out to be publicity material ready to be handed out to the press.[79] The director's dramatic performance, if recorded as voice-over to accompany snippets of scenes and the title, catchy phrases, and major credits – names of the producers, director, and stars – (usually) in block capitals, completes a film trailer in the style of its time. Advertising, however, is one function of publicity, which is also closely associated with control and manipulation, in this case, of the popular press and ultimately of the cinemagoers, or the consumers of the film. The paragraph can be seen as Waugh's parody of the contemporary daily press. The novel also satirises those journalists on the tabloids who uncritically lift ready-made marketing passages directly for their newspapers.

---

[77] Cecilia, the protagonist of Woody Allen's meta-film *The Purple Rose of Cairo* (1985), is a prime example. This split of the self can also be found in writer cinemagoers such as Green and Bowen, for whom cinema seems to have offered an escape from reality, which, for writers, often means writing. Bowen expected to be "taken out of myself"' and '[i]t is not as a writer that I go to the cinema'. Elizabeth Bowen, 'Why I Go to the Cinema', in *Footnotes to the Film*, ed. by Charles Davy (London: Lovat Dickson, 1938), pp. 205-220 (pp. 205, 207). Green did not directly comment on sound cinema, but his reminiscence of the silents showed his understanding of these two distinctive forms: 'Those were the days of silent films when anyone with a hangover wept at words of his own he put onto the lips of the girl reproving her drunken lover on the screen, of Mary Pickford, "The World's Sweetheart," speechless yet or, for girls, of Valentino who never said a word in films. For me […] here was the place in which to work out the sense of guilt, to conquer that nausea of lunch after the night before's drinking.' *PMG*, p. 137.

[78] *VB*, p. 122.

[79] Ibid.

The biographical film of Wesley is certainly ambitious; the emphasis on its All-Talkie-ness and Britishness lends itself to a comparison with Hitchcock's *Blackmail*. Quickly running out of capital – the director makes failed attempts to persuade Adam to invest – the film ends up, however, at best, one of the so-called 'quota-quickies, films made on shoe-string budgets with little concern for quality' to fulfil the quota obligations imposed by the 1927 Cinematograph Film Act, a state intervention introduced to confront the domination of Hollywood under '[p]ressure from businessmen worried about the effects over the erosion of British culture at home and in the Empire'.[80] Both the making of the film and its screening, disturbing the otherwise tranquil country, seen by Adam as an antidote to the frenzied life of his group in London, are exploited for comic effect; the screening causes no less havoc than its making. The film is shown at the Rector's house, which has 'electric light', to a small audience of family and friends on Christmas Eve as 'a treat' from the Colonel:

> One of its peculiarities was that whenever the story reached a point of dramatic and significant action, the film seemed to get faster and faster. Villagers trotted to church as though galvanized; lovers shot in and out of windows; horses flashed past like motor cars; riots happened so quickly that they were hardly noticed. On the other hand, any scene of repose or inaction, a conversation in a garden between two clergymen, Mrs Wesley at her prayers, Lady Huntington asleep, etc., seemed prolonged almost unendurably. Even Colonel Blount suspected this imperfection.
> […]
> When the reel came to an end everyone stirred luxuriously.[81]

Nonetheless, everyone congratulates the Colonel on his achievement. There are four more reels, but the full film is never screened: 'Just at the beginning of the second part […] [t]here was a sudden crackling sound, a long blue spark, and the light was extinguished.'[82] The Rector's family is thus left without electricity throughout Christmas.

Sound transformed cinema. For writers, sound cinema presented itself as an unprecedented opportunity for work and success, both financially and professionally: 'Sound demanded writers of dialogue, and it seemed as if anyone with the most modest theatrical or journalistic credentials was imported to Hollywood. […] Lightweight New York literati became West Coast wage slaves and hated themselves

[80] Murphy, pp. 157, 143.
[81] *VB*, pp. 173, 178.
[82] Ibid., p. 178.

for abandoning what they imagined would have been glorious literary careers.'[83] Gomery also observes that 'Hollywood raided Broadway for speaking talent; over four hundred stage actors and actresses moved to the West Coast in 1929.'[84] For screenwriters, Hollywood headhunted novelists from beyond the United States. Waugh wrote sourly in 1930 that 'I have never been to Hollywood and I am unimpressed by my acquaintances who have been there and come back disillusioned.'[85] Waugh did not provide names and none of his fellow young novelists seemed to have travelled to Hollywood before 1930. P. G. Wodehouse, who belonged to an older generation than Waugh, arrived in Hollywood on 8 May 1930 but had to leave a year later when MGM did not renew his contract.[86] Fictionally, Sir Francis Hinsley in *The Loved One* (1948), whose cultural references are 'Joyce and Freud and Gertrude Stein', is likely to have been brought to Hollywood during the first years of sound cinema.[87] Waugh's fiercest attack on Hollywood opens with a scene of the decline and fall of the English colony in Hollywood:

> twenty years or more ago […] Sir Francis, in prime middle-age, was then the only knight in Hollywood, the doyen of English society, chief script-writer in Megalopolitan Pictures and President of the Cricket Club. […] English titles abounded now in Hollywood, several of them authentic, and Sir Ambrose had been known to speak slightingly of Sir Francis as a 'Lloyd George creation'.[88]

The protagonist Dennis Barlow, a young poet invited to Hollywood in the late forties to work as a screenwriter on a biopic of Shelley, is too late for the golden age.

The thirties, however, saw a surge of novelists working in film, if not in Hollywood. The 'young men of 1922', Waugh, Greene, and Isherwood in particular, found sound problematic and lamented the loss of the true art of silent cinema; on the other hand, they courted sound cinema as eagerly as they were courted by it. Leaving Duckworth in the autumn of 1936, Powell worked for six months as a scriptwriter at the Warner Brothers Studio in Teddington.[89] In early May 1937,

---

[83] Eyman, pp. 20-21.
[84] Gomery, p. 4.
[85] Waugh, 'Star', p. 68.
[86] Robert McCrum, *Wodehouse: A Life* (New York and London: Norton, 2004), p. 189.
[87] Evelyn Waugh, *The Loved One: An Anglo-American Tragedy* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 8.
[88] Ibid., p. 9.
[89] Bringing together sound cinema and psychoanalysis, the talking cure, Powell's *Agents and Patients* (1936) establishes a link between the talkies and talk fiction. *At Lady Molly's* (1957), the fourth volume of *A Dance to the Music of Time*, rewrites the early thirties, sharing similar concerns, including cinema, with the 1936 novel. Interestingly, John Heygate, known for breaking up Waugh's first marriage, published a fictional account of his experience of UFA and Berlin in the early thirties in

Powell left for Hollywood in search of employment, without success. His meeting with F. Scott Fitzgerald, whose *The Great Gatsby* (1925) he particularly admired, was the highlight of his trip.[90] Isherwood and Auden emigrated to the United States in January 1939; while Auden stayed in New York, Isherwood went on to Hollywood. Both were immortalised and ridiculed by Waugh in *Put Out More Flags*. In the 1974 introduction to his first successful novel, *Stamboul Train* (1932), Greene confessed that 'for the first and last time in my life I deliberately set out to write a book to please, one which with luck might be made into a film. The devil looks after his own and in *Stamboul Train* I succeeded in both aims'.[91] The novel was adapted into the film *Orient Express* (1934). Greene enjoyed a distinguished film career alongside his literary achievements, not least as film critic for *The Spectator* from the mid-thirties until the early forties and later as a screenwriter adapting his own novels and others' into cinematic classics.

The exterior modernists were quick to enter the debate about cinema in transition; more significantly, they incorporated it into their fiction, providing behind-the-scene knowledge of the workings of the early talkies. To different degrees, they were familiar with the making of the sound films of the early thirties. Although they grew up seeing silent films, the talkies came to exert more influence on this group of writers, and this constituted one of the definitive differences from the high modernists. Cinema's conversion to sound proved to be an invaluable opportunity for the exterior modernist novelists because the talkies particularly prized talk fiction. Waugh did not write for film until late 1936, but he imagined what it would be like to work in a film studio in 'Excursion in Reality' (1932).[92] This short story ridicules the volatility of the film industry, epitomised by the whims of the film magnate, and the cultural savages who work in it. Playing with the idea of reality, Waugh is also

---

Talking Picture (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934). Heygate modelled Powell, a good friend of his, for Rightlaw in the novel, but he himself was later fictionalised by Powell as Maltravers in *Agents and Patients*. Geoff Brown, 'I am also a camera: John Heygate and Talking Picture', *Film History: An International Journal*, 20/2 (2008), 202-216 (pp. 208, 212).

[90] Michael Barber, *Anthony Powell: A Life* (London, Woodstock, and New York: Duckworth Overlook, 2005), pp. 103-05.

[91] Greene quoted in Brian Lindsay Thomson, *Graham Greene and the Politics of Popular Fiction and Film* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 39.

[92] Waugh wrote altogether three treatments for Korda's film *Lovelies from America*, or the re-titled *Lovelies over London*, between late 1936 and early 1937, but 'the project died a silent death.' See Stannard, *TEY*, pp. 442, 445-6, 451, and 514. Lisa Colletta, *British Novelists in Hollywood, 1935-1965: Travelers, Exiles, and Expats* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, 2013), p. 26. In 1952, Waugh worked briefly with Carol Reed on a film. Stannard, *NAC*, p. 302.

concerned with topical issues such as the coming of sound, the relationship between sound cinema and fiction writers, and, more broadly, between cinema and literature, the centre of attention being adaptation, and the crowd. The story certainly anticipates his later satire of Hollywood, *The Loved One*.

The story's protagonist is the author himself, barely disguised. Simon Lent, described by the press as 'a "popular", "brilliant", "meteorically successful", "enviable" young novelist', is invited by Sir James Macrae to write dialogue for a film of *Hamlet* 'in modern speech.'

> I began reading a copy the other day and blessed if *I* could understand it. At once I said, 'What the public wants is Shakespeare with all his beauty of thought and character translated into the language of everyday life.' Now Mr. Lent's here was the man whose name naturally suggested itself. Many of the most high-class critics have commended Mr. Lent's dialogue.[93]

It is Simon's talk fiction that recommends him as the ideal screenwriter. By privileging the 'stream of talk' over the 'stream of consciousness', the talkies help to promote and popularise talk fiction.

Sir James's rationale, or rather a generalisation based on his own inability to understand Shakespeare, betrays his lack of culture. The film industry is, in fact, portrayed as a cultural waste land, not least in the violence done to the literary text from which the film is adapted, dictated by the caprice of the sole decision maker and advised by a group of 'experts – production, direction, casting, continuity, cutting and costing managers, bright eyes, eager to attract the great man's attention with some apt intrusion.'[94] When the script is finally ready for shooting, Sir James rejects it entirely: '"I don't like the dialogue. It misses all the poetry of the original. What the public wants is Shakespeare, the whole of Shakespeare and nothing but the Shakespeare."'[95] So Simon loses his job. His career in film surely is an excursion. Although Simon is depicted as a victim, his passivity cannot conceal a sense of superiority and arrogance.

If Waugh was an amateur in the film industry – although his imagination can largely be confirmed by reality – Isherwood was unarguably an insider. *Prater Violet* is based on his experience of adapting Ernst Lothar's novel into the British Gaumont film *Little Friend* (1934), directed by Berthold Viertel. In the novel, the making of

---

[93] Waugh, 'Excursion into Reality', in *Complete Short Stories*, pp. 73-86 (pp. 74, 80).
[94] Ibid., pp. 83, 84.
[95] Ibid., p. 85.

Prater Violet, a musical film, occurs in the early years of sound cinema. Isherwood found 'poetry' in silent cinema and saw sound as 'intrusion'.[96] Jamie Carr observes that for Isherwood, 'cinema became more invested in realism, an ostensibly objective representation of life in which normative subjectivities progress toward a teleology.'[97] Yet, Isherwood, the writer-protagonist, has difficulties materialising the dialogue of the characters.

> After all, this was movie work, hack work. It was something essentially false, cheap, vulgar. […] I was betraying my art. No wonder it was so difficult.
>
> Nonsense. I didn't really believe that, either. It isn't vulgar to be able to make people talk. […] Shakespeare would have known how [Toni's father] spoke. Tolstoy would have known. I didn't know because, for all my parlour socialism, I was a snob. I didn't know how anybody spoke, except public-school boys and neurotic bohemians.[98]

Isherwood's debate with himself exposes novelists' concerns about the classification of different art forms and their pride in creating 'literature' or what is regarded as 'high' art. Scriptwriting, and working in film in general, is, however, described here as a humbling experience for a novelist, who cannot easily dismiss the thought of 'prostitution'.[99] However melodramatic the story, the creative process of scriptwriting has an affinity with that of novel writing: the ultimate goal is to create art. It therefore challenges the 'Great Divide', which Andreas Huyssen defines as 'the kind of discourse which insists on the categorical distinction between high art and mass culture.'[100]

Working as a dialogue director in the studio, the protagonist is further humbled by his conversation with Lawrence Dwight, an editor.

> 'We don't need any romantic nineteenth-century whores. We need technicians. […] I don't treat film as if it were a bit of my intestine. […] The movies aren't drama, they aren't literature – they're pure mathematics. Of course, you'll never understand that, as long as you live.'[101]

Clearly Lawrence considers himself an artisan rather than an artist; he even takes issue with the consideration of film as art. In 'the age of mechanical reproduction',

---

[96] Christopher Isherwood, 'A Writer and the Films', in *Isherwood on Writing: The Lectures in California*, ed. by James J. Berg (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), pp. 99-113 (p. 103).

[97] Jamie M. Carr, *Queer Times: Christopher Isherwood's Modernity* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), p. 65.

[98] Christopher Isherwood, *Prater Violet* (London: Vintage, 2012), pp. 31-32.

[99] Ibid., p. 33.

[100] Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernist, Mass Culture and Postmodernism* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), p. viii.

[101] *PV*, pp. 62-63.

the boundary between artist and artisan, between art and technology, is perhaps increasingly blurred.[102] Moreover, the protagonist's harsh self-criticism of his disconnection with ordinary people, or, in his own words, 'parlour socialism', seems to directly answer to Woolf's criticism of this group in the 'leaning tower'. Working on site, he is made aware and appreciative of the concerted effort a film requires of all the parties involved from *auteur* to technicians. Simon is also quick to point out this collaboration, but, unlike Isherwood who finds in it a sense of camaraderie, he is at once attracted to the power, fame, and wealth the film industry brings and yet is repulsed by its philistinism: from his self-appointed cultural high ground, Simon despises the people with whom he works and ridicules even the notion of cooperation. Isherwood's is indeed a different reality from that of Simon's.

The Group Mind: Identity and Anxiety

When sociology emerged as a discipline in the late nineteenth century, the study of crowds and the group mind was foregrounded, notably in Gustave Le Bon's *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895). The introduction of the hive as an organism in biology in the nineteenth century opened up the possibilities of considering human society as a hive. Studying ant colonies, William Morton Wheeler observed 'very striking resemblances between human and ant societies':

> this resemblance cannot be superficial, but must depend on a high degree of adaptability and plasticity common to man and the social insects, for in order to live in permanent commonwealths an organism must be not only remarkably adaptive to changes in its external environment, but must also have an intense feeling of cooperation, forbearance and affection towards the other members of its community.[103]

The group mind was further developed in the early twentieth century, particularly in the aftermaths of the First World War, with such publications as William McDougall's *The Group Mind* (1920) and Freud's 'Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego' (1921).[104] The first decades of the twentieth century, which

[102] Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in *Illuminations*, ed. by Hannah Arendt and trans. by Harry Zorn (London: Pimlico, 1999), pp. 211-44.

[103] William Morton Wheeler, *Ants: Their Structure, Development and Behavior* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1910), pp. 4, 1-2.

[104] McDougall views group psychology as part of social psychology and distinguishes the highly organised group from the crowd, the former of which is considered superior in collective mental life. William McDougall, *The Group Mind* (Cambridge: University Press, 1921), pp. 2, 49-50. Freud defines the group as '*a number of individuals who have put one and the same object in the place of their ego*

corresponded to the period of literary modernism, were preoccupied with the group mind not only in social psychology but also in literature. In or about 1930, human character changed again, with the rise of the group novel. Woolf's *The Waves* (1930), published in the same year as *Vile Bodies*, is a group novel, and, in its strange, silent way, it is arguably also a talk novel. Also published in 1930 was Olaf Stapledon's science fiction *Last and First Men* (1930):

> In the Martians, 'telepathic' intercourse had resulted in a true group-mind, a single psychical process embodied in the electro-magnetic radiation of the whole race; but this group-mind was inferior in calibre to the individual minds. All that was distinctive of an individual at his best failed to contribute to the group-mind.[105]

The passage is reminiscent of Le Bon's observation of 'the extreme mental inferiority of crowds'.[106] Le Bon associates crowds with barbarians:

> Civilizations as yet have only been created and directed by a small intellectual aristocracy, never by crowds. Crowds are only powerful for destruction. Their rule is always tantamount to a barbarian phase. A civilization involves fixed rules, discipline, a passing from the instinctive to the rational state, forethought for the future, an elevated degree of culture – all of them conditions that crowds, left to themselves, have invariably shown themselves incapable of realising.[107]

Science fiction, in fact, has contributed greatly to the discussion and imagination of the group mind.[108] In recent years, philosophy of mind, specifically the discussion of functionalism, the extended mind, and collective intentionality, has revived the interest in the group mind. Deborah Tollefsen notes that '[t]he resistance to collective mental states is motivated by the view that mental states are located in minds and minds are located in heads. Since groups do not have heads or brains, they cannot have mental states.'[109] If, as the extended mind hypothesis of Clark and Chalmers

---

ideal and have consequently identified themselves with one another in their ego.' Sigmund Freud, 'Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego', in *Civilisation Society and Religion*, trans. by James Strachey and ed. by Albert Dickson (London: Penguin, 1991), pp. 91-178 (p. 147).

[105] Olaf Stapledon, *Last and First Men: A story of the Near and Far Future* (London: Methuen, 1930), p. 242.

[106] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (Mineola: Dover Publications, 2002), p. iv.

[107] Ibid., p. xiii.

[108] Jeff Prucher's *The Oxford Dictionary of Science Fiction* (2007) separates the entries of 'group mind' and 'hive mind', the latter of which is defined as 'a group mind, especially applied to insects or insectoids', and offers a list of examples for each. Jeff Prucher, ed., *Brave New Words: The Oxford Dictionary of Science Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 88. 'Group mind' is defined as 'a single consciousness or intelligence formed by the union of more than one individual's consciousness or intelligence' (p. 86).

[109] Deborah Perron Tollefsen, 'From Extended Mind to Collective Mind', *Cognitive Systems Research*, 7 (2006), 140-50 (p. 140). See also Tollefsen, 'Group Minds', last accessed 8 December 2015,

argues, the mind extends beyond the boundary of the brain (notably Otto's notebook), it is easier to understand and accept the mind of a group.

Both talk fiction and the talkies foreground dialogue, which, in turn, reflects thought. I have discussed earlier talk as a literary style, which can be regarded as the effort of the group of exterior modernists to break away from their high modernist precursors. Here I consider talk in a social context, and examine its content and how it sheds light on the group mind. In talk fiction, due to the restricted access to interiority, the reader is forced to exercise greater powers of inference in reading the characters' minds, but that is exactly true to life, of course, where there is no access to the others' minds. Moreover, cognition is seen as primarily social as opposed to individual, given that the mind seems to have evolved as humans developed in groups and needed to observe, infer, and anticipate. The group novels derive their comedy from something almost tribal that lurks just below the surface of civilised behaviour. This is more true in those – *Party Going* in particular – that deal with groups that are obsessed with outward appearance and being 'civilised'. As the party provides an optimal platform for the observation of a group, its behaviour, styles of communication, dynamics, and psychology, it will be the starting point of my exploration of the group mind.[110]

The group posits itself as an intermediary between the individual and the collective. By providing the individual with a distinctive, albeit collective, identity, the group protects the individual from being absorbed into the anonymous masses. Michael North's remark on the group in *Party Going* also applies to that in *Vile Bodies*: 'the partygoers' greatest fear, anonymity, spurs their fear of the masses'.[111] Mostly oblivious of the masses, Waugh's Bright Young People, a more unified group than Green's, fear the contamination of all kinds of outsiders, be they the nameless reading public of gossip columns or the unknown social climbers who live in the hope of joining the group at its core. On the other hand, to retain some degree of singularity, the individual needs to negotiate a place within the group, which may lead to the confrontation with the existing leadership and even the restructuring of the group. Facing challenges from both inside and outside, the group is therefore constantly threatened with breaking down either into the individual or into the

<http://www.hdc.ed.ac.uk/seminars/group-minds>.

[110] The party can refer to the group of people at a party.

[111] North, p. 97.

collective. Characterised by the tension between the individual's desire for belonging and anxiety of assimilation, the group mind manifests itself most strongly in the group's fear of the crowd and its wish for self-preservation. To illuminate the group's perception of the crowd, I will focus on the General Strike in 1926, which particularly preoccupied the social imagination of Waugh's group of writers on the eve of and during the Second World War.

The Group in the 'Era of Crowds'

To understand the collective psychology of the group, it is crucial to situate the group in the 'era of crowds'. So before an investigation of the group mind, I will first examine the crowd, which elicits much fear from the group.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Le Bon prophesised: 'The age we are about to enter will in truth be the ERA OF CROWDS.'[112] The crowd is often constituted by the lower classes and therefore most feared by the ruling classes, and, for John Carey, also by the intellectuals.[113] This is reflected in those crowd scenes prevalent in mid-Victorian novels that are set in the context of social and political transformations such as the industrial revolution. Taking Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South* (1855) and Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859) as examples for his study of crowds and power relations, Lodge shows that 'the fear of working-class militancy manifested in early and mid-Victorian "condition of England" novels, most intensely in their treatment of crowd behaviour, was fuelled and informed by memories and myths of the French Revolution.'[114] Lodge observes the enormous influence of Thomas Carlyle's *The French Revolution* (1837) on the thinking of his contemporaries, particularly Dickens: 'Carlyle was particularly good at crowd scenes'; for Lodge, 'Carlyle's treatment of the Revolution is, then, frankly apocalyptic'.[115] Le Bon also considers the French Revolution a good opportunity for

[112] Le Bon, p. x.
[113] Carey even suggests that '[Saki's] kind of cruel, aloof wit, which can be matched in Oscar Wilde, and later in Evelyn Waugh […] represented a response to a new pressure – the encroaching mass, with its demands for common human sympathy.' John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice Among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1990-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), p. 54.
[114] David Lodge, 'Crowds and Power in the Early Victorian Novel', in *After Bakhtin*, pp. 100-15 (pp. 103-04).
[115] Ibid., p. 106.

scrutinising group psychology and regrets that Hippolyte Taine has missed it.[116] In both Dickens's and Gaskell's novels, crowds are depicted as mobs, exhibiting precisely those characteristics of crowds summarised by Le Bon, such as 'impulsiveness, irritability, incapacity to reason, the absence of judgment and of the critical spirit, the exaggeration of the sentiments'.[117]

The interwar years inspired many cinematic as well as literary representations of crowds. However, although the constitution of the interwar crowd resembled the classic depiction of the revolutionary mob, particularly in the French Revolution, its primary concerns were now war and strikes, the latter directly challenging the ruling classes and thus shared the ideology of the Revolution. The interwar crowd, I argue, is cinematically conceived. There is a curious doubling in that the new cinemagoing crowd may seem often to be analogous to or a mirror of the crowd depicted cinematically: there is an identification of the on- and off-screen crowd. Cinema is, after all, a *mass* medium. By way of exemplification, I will briefly discuss the crowd scenes in two of Fritz Lang's films, namely the silent *Metropolis* and the sound *M*. If sound cinema is accused of killing the symbolism of silent cinema with its realism, it portrays more effectively the real violence of the thirties, which realises and exceeds the slapstick violence of the silent comedies.[118]

Waugh's two 1930 articles on cinema deal with two topical issues: 'My Favourite Film Star', as I have discussed, is concerned with the advent of sound; 'For Adult Audiences', as the title suggests, with cinema audiences, who are identified as primarily the crowd. Waugh saw the problem of the film industry as that it 'will try to do too much. It will insist, as no other art or industry has ever tried to insist, upon everything being suitable for everybody.'[119] So the result is 'a commodity mildly unsuitable to almost everyone. […] It aims instead at the adolescent.'[120] Not surprisingly, '[t]he adolescent is clearly a considerable factor in cinema audiences.'[121] Waugh then argued: 'It is not a matter of a few highbrows, but of a vast, responsible public waiting for anyone with the initiative to start a cinema

[116] Le Bon, p. xv.
[117] Ibid., p. 10.
[118] It is impossible to image the effectiveness of Hitler's fanatic speeches without sound. No wonder Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* is a sound film, his first sound film.
[119] Waugh, 'For Adult Audiences', in *EAR*, pp. 89-91 (p. 90).
[120] Ibid., pp. 90-91.
[121] Ibid., p. 91.

for grown-ups.'[122] But, understood figuratively, Waugh, who clearly considered himself highbrow, seemed to imply that cinema audiences were adolescent, 'embody[ing] all the lamentable characteristics of both ages – childhood without its freshness and purity and credulity, age without wisdom or maturity or culture', because he identified them as 'the proletarian', the intellectually-inferior masses.[123] It is necessary here to return briefly to 'Excursion in Reality', when Simon explains to his girlfriend the reality he has found in the film industry:

> 'The artist must no longer work alone. He is part of the age in which he lives; he must share (only of course, my dear Sylvia, in very different proportions) the weekly wage envelope of the proletarian. Vital art implies a corresponding set of social relationships. Co-operation… co-ordination… the hive endeavour of the community directed to a single end…'[124]

Simon's new-found sociological interest in collectivism is disturbing. Cinema has been closely associated with the working classes; like drinking in the pub, cinemagoing is now to be considered one of their favourite pastimes, if not 'the sole working-class pastime.' [125]

In *Living*, Lily Gates, the daughter of a factory worker, goes to the cinema regularly, either on her own or with her sweethearts, who also work in the Dupret factory. Only in the cinema can she escape the house chores, which occupy the majority of her waking life: 'His daughter Lily broke in saying would he get the beer tonight for she was going to the movies'.[126] Cinemagoing is, however, envisaged by Green as a unifying force for people from different backgrounds, particularly classes, a sense of camaraderie similar to what Isherwood, the writer-protagonist of *Prater Violet*, feels when he collaborates in the studio with directors, editors, technicians, actors, and everyone else involved in the film:

> A great number were in cinema, many standing, battalions were in cinemas over all the country, young Mr Dupret was in a cinema, over above up into the sky their feeling panted up supported by each other's feeling, away away, Europe and America, mass on mass their feeling united supporting, renewed their sky.[127]

Mr Dupret, soon to inherit the family foundry, earlier visits the factory and finds beauty and romance there – 'there's a kind of romance about it or perhaps it's only

---

[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Waugh, 'Excursion', pp. 81-82.
[125] Shail, p. 180.
[126] Henry Green, *Living*, in *Loving, Living, Party Going* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 205-382 (p. 218).
[127] Ibid., pp. 244-45.

romantic. In the iron foundry the castings, they call them, were very moving' – and therefore decides that 'this was the life to lead, making useful things which were beautiful, and the gladness to make them, which you could touch'.[128] Young Dupret, to some extent, resembles Freder in Lang's *Metropolis*, the son of the city's ruler, who fulfils his role as the mediator, or the heart that connects the head – his father – and the hand – the workers who build the great metropolis but are forced to live in the underground ghetto. It is a cruel reality that Simon discovers, as 'the hive endeavour' of the film industry is 'directed to a single end': to prey on 'the proletarian'. No evidence suggests that Waugh read Le Bon or made references to *The Crowd*. Waugh's diction, specifically 'hive', however, indicates some awareness of the debate about the crowd and the hive mind.

Like the factory workers who frequent the cinema in *Living*, the crowd represented by the films such as Lang's *Metropolis* and *M* and Chaplin's *Modern Times* is likely to be attracted to the cinema to see these films (and others): cinema is interested in the crowd as the crowd – a collective linked only through their gathering together to share the cinematic experience – is interested in cinema. The crowd, therefore, can be said to be cinematic in that the crowd is made available as it exists spectatorially for the cinema audience. Kracauer discusses the collective psychology of the crowd in *Metropolis*: 'the paralyzed collective mind seemed to be talking with unusual clarity in its sleep. […] *Metropolis* was rich in subterranean content that, like contraband, had crossed the borders of consciousness without being questioned.'[129] Critical of the reconciliation between the industrialist and his workers, who have destroyed the machines in a riot, achieved at the end of the film, Kracauer, however, interprets Freder's rebellion against his father as resulting 'in the establishment of totalitarian authority': 'Maria's demand that the heart mediate between hand and brain could well have been formulated by Goebbels. He, too, appealed to the heart – in the interest of totalitarian propaganda.'[130] The crowd is perceived to be fearful because it seems to be easily instigated and manipulated, particularly by images:

> the figurative imagination of crowds is very powerful, very active and very susceptible of being keenly impressed. The images evoked in their mind by a personage, an event, an accident, are almost as lifelike as the reality. Crowds are to some extent in the position of

[128] Ibid., pp. 230, 211.
[129] Kracauer, pp. 162-63.
[130] Ibid., pp. 163-64.

> the sleeper whose reason, suspended for the time being, allows the arousing in his mind of images of extreme intensity which would quickly be dissipated could they be submitted to the action of reflection. […] Crowds being only capable of thinking in images are only to be impressed by images. It is only images that terrify or attract them and become motives of action.[131]

Notably, Le Bon here referred to 'theatrical representations, in which the image is shown in its most clearly visible shape', not to cinema, because the latter was not invented until 1895, the year *The Crowd* was published.[132] But his comments are more true of cinema, which is, above all, a visual medium that relies on images. Not surprisingly, Le Bon's work on crowd psychology was taken advantage of by Hitler and Mussolini to fascist ends.[133]

Film critics have noted Lang's successful experimentation with the new medium of sound cinema in his first sound film, *M*. For Kracauer, 'Lang's imaginative use of sound to intensify dread and terror is unparalleled in the history of the talkies.'[134] In his study of the sound conversion in Weimar cinema, Ofer Ashkenazi argues that 'the complete break between sounds and visual images functions as the main means of identifying the killer. […] the sound he makes, his whistling, indicates an obvious insanity, which cannot be seen but can, as it were, be heard, testifying to his "genuine" identity.'[135] In contrast to the dependence on image to portray crowd scenes in *Metropolis*, *M* explores the ways in which sound can be employed to enhance the depiction of the crowd. The trial of the child murderer by a large group of criminals proves that the crowd is irrational and easily manipulated by sound, specifically speeches, as much as by images. The crowd is regarded by the group as dangerous because the individuals in the crowd seem to surrender their agency too easily and often too completely and thus depend on one individual as their leader and mind. The group is able to prevent the individual from being absorbed into the crowd because it allows certain autonomy on the part of the individual.

---

131 Le Bon, pp. 34-35.

132 Ibid., p. 35.

133 Kevin Passmore suggests that 'both Hitler and Mussolini cited Le Bon in support of their methods of rule, while Lenin's ideas about the openness of the group mind to simple images and violence hardly differed from Le Bon's.' Kevin Passmore, 'Introduction: Political Violence and Democracy in Western Europe, 1918-1940', in *Political Violence and Democracy in Western Europe, 1918-1940*, ed. by Chris Millington and Kevin Passmore (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 2.

134 Kracauer, p. 220.

135 Ofer Ashkenazi, '"A New Era of Peace and Understanding": The Integration of Sound Film into German Popular Cinema, 1929-1932', in *The Many Faces of Weimar Cinema: Rediscovering Germany's Filmic Legacy*, ed. by Christian Rogowski (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010), pp. 249-67 (p. 259). The murderer is identified by a blind old man from whom he has bought a balloon for a girl before he murders her.

The Party

Talk, particularly small talk and gossip at a party, is a crucial group behaviour, which can potentially cause anxiety about inclusivity and exclusivity (think of Prufrock). For Kate McLaughlin, 'Prufrock's fear is very specific. He is afraid that he will not be able to say a certain something in a certain situation. His sense of impending aphasia is formulated as a series of interweaved rhetorical questions'.[136] In her introduction to *The Modernist Party* (2013), McLoughlin observes: 'The need to assume "conscious sociability" exposes the imposed and enervating artificiality of party conversation and behaviour'.[137] By contrast, the Bright Young People in *Vile Bodies* and *Party Going* are ultra-confident performers and attention, or plainly outrage, seekers, not only playing by but also setting the rules. The group operates according to strictly coded behaviour. They are certainly conscious, but what they assume is not sociability. Too self-centred and self-indulgent, they do not go to parties to communicate, or at least they do not make an effort to reach out, to connect; communication, in fact, becomes increasingly difficult. Exterior modernist works are therefore less concerned with 'conflict, awkwardness and embarrassment', which mar the high modernist party, than with social exclusion (think of the many gatecrashers in these novels, not least Simon Balcairn, the named and anonymous followers of the set and readers of the gossip columns in *Vile Bodies*, the pigeon, Miss Fellowes, Amabel, and Embassy Richard in *Party Going*).[138] McLoughlin is aware of the limitation of her collection: 'Not everyone could be invited (a limited guest-list meant the there was no room for Mary Butts, Mina Loy, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Henry Green or Evelyn Waugh, for instance)'.[139] Notably, many of the omitted are exterior modernists (Hemingway is a glaring omission from this list of omissions); even invited, they would look like gatecrashers.

McLoughlin reads Prufrock's tongue-tiedness in the light of Habermasian theories of communicative action and the public sphere:

---

[136] Kate McLoughlin, 'Prufrock, Party-Goer: Tongue-Tied at Tea', in *The Modernist Party*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), pp. 45-63 (p. 47).

[137] Kate McLoughlin, 'Introduction: A Welcome from the Host', in *The Modernist Party*, pp. 1-24 (p. 6).

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid., p. 19.

> The bourgeois public sphere, in the context of early twentieth-century population growth and the continuing development of capitalism, is declining into impotence, fracturing into specialised elites who are increasingly unable to talk to each other. Discussion is vague and vapid, no basis for communicative action. To convey this moment, Eliot takes a ritual that is at once extremely familiar and wholly alien: a tea-party.[140]

Prufrock is seen as belonging to an elite group, although he is also portrayed as a liminal character, on its edges, fearing ridicule and employing contempt as a defence. However, central or peripheral, no one is secure in the group; the leaders may also suffer exclusion (Amabel is not invited by Max to his party). McLoughlin attributes these elites' inability to communicate within their group to an inward turn: 'Incapable of conceptualising a communicative competent external second person, the only internal "you" that Prufrock is able to construct is the equivalent of his "I", subsumed in the final line of the poem into "us" and "we"'.[141] In other words, preoccupied with their own minds, Prufrock and his fellow elites fail to make connections in the external, real world. Not dissimilar to the conflicted, voice-hearing Pinfold, they externalise their own minds and respond to their own thoughts: unable to engage with or imagine the outside, they collude with their minds to constitute 'we'.

In 'Varieties of Modernism, Varieties of Incomprehension' (2007), a study of the talk fiction of Hamilton and Bowen, two exterior modernists, John Mepham proposes to understand talk as 'not in the privacy of their minds, but in social interactions. The interest is in *intersubjectivity* rather than *inner subjectivity* and in the social contexts within which the personal goings on take place.'[142] Mepham associates the breakdown of communication with the pathological obsession with interiority, citing the protagonist of *Hangover Square* (1941) as an example:

> If you listen this carefully to your own thoughts you can hardly listen to anyone else at the same time. Could this picture of a disturbed mind be a subtle critique by Hamilton of 1920's stream of consciousness prose? Does George Harvey Bone just suffer an extreme version of a disease of consciousness that we also find in Miriam Henderson, Lily Briscoe and Clarissa Dalloway? Is having a stream of consciousness not, pace William James, the universal state of mental life but a very particular and somewhat pathological condition of mind?[143]

---

[140] McLoughlin, 'Prufrock, Party-Goer', p. 59.
[141] Ibid., p. 52.
[142] John Mepham, 'Varieties of Modernism, Varieties of Incomprehension: Patrick Hamilton and Elizabeth Bowen', in *British Fiction After Modernism: The Novel at Mid-Century*, ed. by Marina MacKay and Lyndsey Stonebridge (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 59-76 (p. 60).
[143] Ibid., p.66.

Prufrock, then, can be listed alongside the modernist heroines of Richardson and Woolf as a victim of the stream of consciousness.

Interestingly, Mepham connects 'the switch from inner subjectivity to intersubjectivity, the latter being presented as the sane option', with cinema's transition from silent to sound: 'This is again a reversal of high modernist rhetoric, in which the silent moment of poetic vision is most highly valued. It was also seen as the richest of possibilities in the aesthetic of silent film (poetic montage), endangered by the introduction of the talkies, which encouraged a switch to a film aesthetic based on dialogue and storytelling.'[144] I have already argued that a fundamental difference between the writers of 1914 and the writers of 1922 lies in their attitude to sound cinema. Acknowledging its artistic potential, the high modernists still had, at best, an uneasy relationship with silent cinema, and most of them condemned the sound conversion. The exterior modernists seemed more accepting of sound cinema, but not without some hesitation.[145] Sound cinema, with its more insistent narrativity, resembles literature more than its silent predecessor; it at once poses threats and offers opportunities to the novel. I have compared *Decline and Fall* to a Chaplinesque silent and *Vile Bodies* to a talkie; rather than the technical armoury of silent cinema, sound, particularly in the form of dialogue, is more illuminating as a means of technical contextualisation for Waugh's novels because it more closely shares the linguistic versatility and some of the limitations of narrative form, mediated through and preoccupied with language. It also reflects Waugh's personal interests in drama, speech, and events. From silent to sound, Mepham's definitive switch from visual and poetic to auditory and prosaic, or even 'a shift from visionary modernism to auditory modernism', suggests rigid binaries.[146] Woolf and Joyce's variety of modernism cannot be easily labelled as 'visionary', nor can Waugh, Green, Isherwood, Powell, Hamilton, and Bowen's be simply designated 'auditory'. Since sight and sound are both essential to the talkies, talk fiction is both visual and auditory.

---

[144] Ibid., pp. 66-67.

[145] Greene belongs to the writers of 1922 but perhaps cannot be regarded as an exterior modernist. His two disparaging articles in *The Times* on the advent of sound, 'A Film Principle: Sound and Silence' (10 July 1928) and 'Film Aesthetic: Its Distinction for Drama – The Province of the Screen' (19 March 1929), were in the vein of *Close Up*, which, for David Parkinson, betrayed 'the rather earnest pomposity of a disciple'. Graham Greene, *Mornings in the Dark: The Graham Greene Film Reader,* ed. by David Parkinson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995), pp. xi-xxxvii (p. xvii).

[146] Mepham, p. 67.

However, if high modernism is primarily concerned with inner subjectivity, or rather the individual mind, exterior modernism demonstrates a conscious outward turn towards intersubjectivity, which suggests the existence of the group mind.[147] But it may not be a simple replacement by intersubjectivity of inner subjectivity. The group mind can best be described as at once the desire for identification and belonging, which sustains the group, and the fear for the loss of individuality and autonomy, which threatens to pull the group apart. While *Vile Bodies* focuses on the former, *Party Going* is more concerned with the latter. Although the group may balance precariously due to the tension from within, against the crowd, it acts collectively to defend its own interests.

Vile Bodies emphasises the group members' sense of belonging. As the group is portrayed as hierarchically stable, in which the members imitate rather than challenge their leaders, the fear lies not in assimilation but in exclusion. The Bright Young People are treated as one, particularly in the opening chapters: they act collectively – 'The Bright Young People heard it.'[148] – and they speak in one voice. Only the leaders of the group are named and allowed individual voices:

> 'Oh,' said the Bright Young People. 'Oh, oh oh.'
> 'It's just exactly like being inside a cocktail shaker,' said Miles Malpractice. 'Darling, your face – eau de Nil.'
> 'Too, too sick-making,' said Miss Runcible, with one of her rare flashes of accuracy.[149]

The leaders' linguistic idiosyncrasy is quickly echoed in the speech of the group members. '[C]heered up wonderfully' by Agatha's experience at the customs:

> '*Well*,' they said. '*Well*! how too, too shaming, Agatha, darling,' they said. 'How devastating, how unpoliceman-like, how goat-like, how sick-making, how too, too awful.'[150]

All the seemingly different utterances belong essentially to one voice: the Bright Young People speak the same language.

In *Vile Bodies*, exclusion is not only fearful but can also be lethal. For Simon Balcairn, a titled Bright Young Person, not being invited to Margot's party 'means

---

[147] The OED defines 'intersubjective' as 'Existing between conscious minds'; 'inter' emphasises 'between' and, in intersubjectivity specifically, sharing and agreement. Group mind definitions usually emphasise synchronicity and shared outlooks. The 'intersubjective' entry in *Oxford English Dictionary*, last accessed 17 November 2015, < http://www.oed.com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/>.

[148] *VB*, p. 17.

[149] Ibid., p. 11.

[150] Ibid., p. 23.

ruin for me'.[151] He is banned from the party because Margot objects to the fact that, as Mr Chatterbox, he has 'written things about me in the papers.'[152] Although the ruin Simon refers to appears more professional than social, his profession as a gossip writer relies heavily, if not solely, on his social standing, which provides exclusive access to society gossip, a hot commodity on the market. His job in popular journalism certainly takes its toll on his social life; Simon has good reasons to worry about a social ruin, too, as society hostesses begin to shut their doors on him. Knowing that his rival, Van, a cousin of Margot's, is invited, Simon entreats Adam to put in a good word for him:

> 'It's so damned unfair. […] There were furious at the office about Van getting that Downing Street "scoop". If I miss this party I may as well leave Fleet Street for good … I may as well put my head into a gas-oven and have done with it… I'm sure if Margot knew how much it meant to me she wouldn't mind my coming.'
>
> Great tears stood in his eyes threatening to overflow.[153]

The ellipses throughout Simon's conversation with Adam indicate his seriously disturbed mind: even Mr Chatterbox is lost for words. It eerily responds to one of the excerpts from *Through the Looking Glass* in the epigraph:

> 'If I wasn't real,' Alice said – half-laughing through her tears, it all seemed so ridiculous – 'I shouldn't be able to cry.'
>
> 'I hope you don't suppose those are real tears?' Tweedledum interrupted in a tone of great contempt.[154]

Contrary to Davis's remark that 'they are not crying "real tears"', Simon's tears are real after all.[155]

Adam tries but fails to change the hostess's mind. Neither Margot nor Adam realises the serious consequences of Simon's social exclusion. That Simon gatecrashes Margot's party, disguised himself with a false beard, but is found out and turned away serves as the final straw that prompts him to put his head in the oven. Simon's tragic death is described in meticulous detail in the matter-of-fact, hard-boiled style of Hemingway with one verb following another at an accelerated speed pushing towards the climax. Simon is elated by his swan song as Mr Chatterbox; the lies he dictates over the phone as news, rather than gossip for his

---

[151] Ibid., p. 72.
[152] Ibid., p. 75.
[153] Ibid., pp. 72-73.
[154] Ibid., p. 5.
[155] Davis, *Forms*, p. 142.

column, perhaps excite him less than the knowledge of his imminent death, which is contemplated and choreographed inside his mind. Since a suicidal thought is the most private thought, Simon's death, according to his journalist instinct, is potentially a scoop.

> He spread a sheet of newspaper on the lowest tray and lay down, resting his head on it. Then he noticed that by some mischance he had chosen Vanburgh's gossip-page in the *Morning Despatch*. He put in another sheet. (There were crumbs on the floor.) Then he turned on the gas. It came surprisingly with a loud roar; the wind of it stirred his hair and the remaining particles of his bread. At first he held his breath. Then he thought that was silly and gave a sniff. The sniff made him cough, and coughing made him breathe, and breathing made him feel very ill; but soon he fell into a coma and presently died.[156]

The passage is worth quoting at length simply for Waugh's trademark dark comedy. Moreover, the last sentence shows his mastery in allowing chance and contingency to build into its own kind of absurd mimicry of a providential order, similar to the fact that the number 13 pit, among many other subsequent warning signs, points to Agatha's fatal crash. This rapid and unexpected development, spiralling out of control from something simple and trivial to something complex and significant, invites a reading in the light of chaos theory, a prime example of which is 'The Butterfly Effect'.[157] On a larger scale, Simon's exclusion from Margot's party, snowballing and gathering significance as well as speed, leads eventually to his suicide. And it continues: Simon's death marks the turn of the fate of his group. In his 1964 preface, Waugh referred to the breakdown of his first marriage and its effect on the novel: 'The composition of *Vile Bodies* was interrupted by a sharp disturbance in my private life and was finished in a very different mood from that in which it was begun. The reader may, perhaps, notice the transition from gaiety to bitterness.'[158] Studying the manuscript, Stannard identifies the end of Chapter Six, when Simon

---

[156] *VB*, pp. 89-90.

[157] The term chaos is used to 'refer collectively to processes of this sort – ones that appear to proceed according to chance even though their behavior is in fact determined by precise laws.' And '[a]ccording to the broader definition of randomness, a *random* sequence is simply one in which any one of several things can happen next, even though not necessarily *anything* that can ever happen can happen next. What actually is possible next will then dependent upon what has just happened.' For Edward Lorenz, the expression of 'The Butterfly Effect', now a symbol for chaos, 'appears to have arisen following a paper that I presented at a meeting in Washington in 1972, entitled "Does the Flap of a Butterfly's Wing in Brazil Set Off a Tornado in Texas?"' Edward N. Lorenz, *The Essence of Chaos* (London: UCL Press, 1995), pp. 4, 7, 14. For the application of chaos theory to literature, see Harriet Hawkins, *Strange Attractors: Literature, Culture and Chaos Theory* (New York and London: Prentice Hall, 1995) and N. Katherine Hayles, *Chaos Bound: Orderly Disorder in Contemporary Literature and Science* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1990).

[158] *VB*, p. 192.

commits suicide, as the turning point of the novel.[159]

If, with Simon's death, the group begins to disintegrate, Agatha's death brings about its final dissolution. Convalescing in the nursing home, Agatha reveals to Adam:

> 'D'you know, all that time when I was dotty, I had the most awful dreams. I thought we were all driving round and round in a motor race and none of us could stop, and there was an enormous audience composed entirely of gossip writers and gate-crashers and Archie Schwert and people like that, all shouting to us at once to go faster, and car after car kept crashing until I was left all alone driving and driving – and then I used to crash and wake up.'[160]

Before Adam can respond, Miles, another leading Bright Young Person, comes in, and 'soon there was quite a party'.[161] The usual frivolity of the group disrupts Agatha's serious and disturbing contemplation not only of her own fate but also that of her set. Agatha lays the blame on 'gossip writers and gate-crashers and Archie Schwert', who are regarded as outsiders and intruders threatening to the existence of her group.

The focus of Waugh's attack in *Vile Bodies* is not journalism in general, as in *Scoop*; his satirical energy is specifically directed at the gossip columns, which indicate a cultural decline and fall. Gossip is a mode of groupspeak that is shown throughout the nineteenth-century novel as helping to bind together communities as in *Emma* (1815), for example, but what Waugh seems to satirise is its trivialisation and commodification under the influence of the rise of mass media culture. By the time of the late twenties, for Habermas, what he refers to as the bourgeois public sphere has long disintegrated: in the transformation from a cultural-debating to a cultural-consuming public.[162] Habermas argues:

> The communication of the public that debated critically about culture remained dependent on reading pursued in the closed-off privacy of the home. The leisure activities of the culture-consuming public [such as cinemagoing, listening to the radio, and watching TV], on the contrary, themselves take place within a social climate, and they do not require any further discussions. The private form of appropriation removed the ground for a communication about what has been appropriated.[163]

This reversal, or rather distortion, of the public and the private is particularly

---

[159] Stannard, *TEY*, p. 206.
[160] *VB*, p. 158.
[161] Ibid., p. 159.
[162] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), p. 159.
[163] Ibid., p. 163.

interesting. Reading gossip columns, although not necessarily happening in the public space, is a culture-consuming activity, and the daily papers feed the public what it wants.

Agatha holds gossip writers responsible but fails to acknowledge the role played by a vast number of eager readers of gossip columns in the daily papers. She is unconcerned with the crowd. In *Vile Bodies*, the crowd is depicted as these (often low-class) consumers of society gossip with '[n]asty prying minds', such as the old woman whom Adam overhears in the Underground station commenting on Agatha's treatment at the customs office with indignation: 'You know I feel about that girl just as though it was me own daughter. Seeing her picture so often and our Sarah having done the back stairs, Tuesdays, at them flats and where her aunt used to live – the one as had that 'orrible divorce last year.'[164]

Unlike gossip writers and gatecrashers, Archie, however, has access to the Bright Young People: he hosts their parties. Having just returned to England at the beginning of the novel, Adam is invited to Archie's party but does not know who he is.

> 'Oh, he's someone new since you went away. The *most* bogus man. Miles discovered him, and since then he's been climbing and climbing and *climbing*, my dear, till he hardly knows us. He's rather sweet, really, only too terribly common, poor darling. He lives at the Ritz, and I think that's rather grand, don't you?'[165]

Later Nina warns Adam: 'Don't dress up. No one will, except Archie.'[166] For the group, Archie, seen as a nouveau riche social climber, is clearly not one of them. So Archie shares with gossip writers and gatecrashers the same desire to get inside: while the latter two wish to get into the group's parties, Archie hopes to belong to the group, as Miss Mouse, another nouveau riche, attempts to be one of the Bright Young People by funding their parties: 'It was too thrilling to see all that dull money her father had amassed, metamorphosed in this way into so much glitter and noise and so many bored young faces.'[167] At the party, funded by Miss Mouse and hosted by Archie, both suffer from exclusion. Miss Mouse brings a friend of her own 'because it was so much more fun if one had someone to talk to.'[168] When Archie,

---

[164] *VB*, p. 29.
[165] Ibid., p. 24.
[166] Ibid., p. 28.
[167] Ibid., p. 43.
[168] Ibid.

'pausing with a bottle of champagne' in his hand, interrupts Adam and Nina's conversation, Adam tells him to '"Go away, hog's rump"' in Cockney; the pair then ignore Archie by continuing to talk to each other.[169]

Whenever Adam and Nina go to a party, they seem to be only interested in keeping to themselves; both the time and pace of the novel slow down, as if recorded in slow motion: the pair are focalised and seen tenderly talking to each other, while the party, or rather the world, seems to swirl at a frenzied speed around them. Their conversation is, however, constantly interrupted by outsiders, which is seen by them as an intrusion and is unwelcome. Adam offers an incomplete list of the parties, pronouncing the names as if attacking them one by one.

> 'Oh, Nina, *what a lot of parties*.'
> (… Masked parties, Savage parties, Victorian parties, Greek parties, […] all that succession and repetition of massed humanity… Those vile bodies…)[170]

This much-quoted passage attracts attention because of its reference to the novel's title. But what follows immediately, often neglected, is one of the rare tender moments of this otherwise ultramodern, cold, metallic novel. More importantly, it affords a glimpse of the souls of these young people – the young women as well as the young men of 1922 – and their sense of futility, tragedy, and doom:

> He leant his forehead, to cool it, on Nina's arm and kissed her in the hollow of her forearm.
> 'I know, darling,' she said, and put her hand on his hair.
> Ginger came strutting jauntily by, his hands clasped under his coat-tails.[171]

Ginger later marries Nina and leaves Adam inconsolable: 'It hurt Adam deeply to think much about Nina.'[172] Adam's summary of all the parties and the exhaustion he feels afterwards suggests the end of the party. Soon Agatha, the leader of the Bright Young Set, exclaims '[h]ow people are disappearing'.[173]

The end of the group seems inevitable because it is immanent in the dissipated, irresponsible, self-destructive lives that its members lead. There is a constant sense of the group as defence against the fragility of things but the group itself falls prey to all those forces of fragility and at times serves as a vehicle for them. The group's extinction partly results from its exclusivity, which, paradoxically, is also its

[169] Ibid., p. 45.
[170] Ibid., p. 104.
[171] Ibid.
[172] Ibid., p. 156.
[173] Ibid., p. 158.

irresistible appeal to the outsiders. After fits of delirium about driving at a dangerous speed, unable to stop, amidst a huge cheering crowd, shouting 'Faster, faster,' Agatha dies alone on the same night of the Bright Young People's last party in her ward.[174] From their set, only Adam and Van attend her funeral; Adam mentions it in passing in a conversation with Nina, which prompts Nina's comment: '"You know there seems to be none of us left now except you and me."'[175]

The fate of Agatha's group might be seen as a warning to the aristocrats, who, as Waugh saw it, were experiencing decay. It is significant that Simon, 'the eighth Earl of Balcairn, Viscount Erdinge, Baron Cairn of Balcairn, Red Knight of Lancaster, Count of the Holy Roman Empire and Chenonceaux Heral to the Duchy of Aquitaine,'[176] has fallen so ignobly low as to become a gossip writer and that his job eventually kills him. As Christopher Ames remarks:

> Mr Chatterbox fell a good deal before his death though, scratching out a miserable living feeding unsuccessfully off the shallow social set. […] Behind the layers of imitation lurk real lives; Simon's real death reminds us, comically, even farcically, of the slow death creeping up on all those lives controlled by the multiple poses of the social world.[177]

In *The Life of the Party* (1991), Ames explains his 'festive vision', which means 'life conceived in terms of celebration. The impulse to celebrate helps define and create community, and the celebration itself allows individuals to come to grips with mortality.'[178] Informed by Bakhtin and René Girard's writing, Ames establishes in this work 'a common cultural significance for ritual death: festivity enacts a symbolic triumph over death to purge the community of its fear of violence and destruction.'[179] Ames views the death of an individual from a communal perspective and argues for its meaning to the community:

> festivals incorporate the basic functions of religion: they involve the individual in a community of participant believers and in so doing make that individual better able to live with the tribulations of life and with his or her own mortality. Festivity's ritual treatment of death approaches religious status by affirming life in a public setting through systematic, ritualized performance.[180]

Like Tony Last in *A Handful of Dust*, Simon is also the last of his family line.

---

[174] Ibid., p. 168.
[175] Ibid., p. 174.
[176] Ibid., p. 42.
[177] Christopher Ames, *The Life of the Party: Festive Vision in Modern Fiction* (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1991), p. 190.
[178] Ibid., pp. 2-3.
[179] Ibid., p. 9.
[180] Ibid.

Simon's death is, however, a complete annihilation, collectively as well as individually. His death is so bleak precisely due to its failure to regenerate and enrich the communities to which he belongs, neither his family nor the Bright Young Set. Simon's death, by his own hand, is trivial and comic, compared with what is described as the tragic, heroic deaths of his ancestors primarily for the cause of building and expanding the British Empire.[181] With Simon, Waugh has in mind the decline and fall, if not the extinction, of aristocracy, a theme fully developed in *Brideshead*.

Party Going, however, portrays a more nuanced sense of belonging than *Vile Bodies*, which is simultaneously strained by the fear of losing one's individuality and the ambition to replace the leader. Discussing 'Virginia Woolf's Idea of a Party', Bryony Randall regards the party space as non-hierarchical, reflected by 'inconsecutive conversation'.[182] Randall notes that '[a] powerful means of guarding against hierarchisation is movement – hence the semi-paradox of "dancing" in "unity". The party space, though potentially oppressive, at least offers in principle the opportunity to move, change perspective.'[183] But *Mrs Dalloway* surely is preoccupied with hierarchies that Woolf is at pains to convey. Clarissa deliberately does not ask Ellie Henderson, now in reduced circumstances, to her party; when Mrs Marsham pleads on behalf of Ellie, who 'so much wanted to come', Clarissa, displeased by the interference, defends her decision by thinking 'why should she invite all the dull women in London to her parties?' Yet, this painfully reminds her of Lady Bruton, 'whose lunch parties were said to be extraordinarily amusing', once not inviting her, which is not only seen as her own social failure but also as her failure as a politician's wife: '[s]he had failed him'.[184]

For the exterior modernists, the party space is strictly hierarchical. There lacks what Bakhtin calls the 'utopian':

> True, the scene is strictly limited by time, the time of the banquet, but during that period there are no footlights, no separation of participant and spectators. Everyone participates. While the usual world order is suspended, the new utopian order which has come to

[181] *VB*, p. 90.
[182] Woolf's *The Years* (1937) quoted in Bryony Randall, 'Virginia Woolf's Idea of a Party', in *The Modernist Party*, pp. 95-111 (p. 100).
[183] Ibid., p. 105.
[184] Virginia Woolf, *Mrs Dalloway* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 100.

replace it is sovereign and embraces all.[185]

Becoming intrinsic to the daily existence of the Bright Young People, the party therefore no longer suspends or subverts the established authority and the everyday order. With their titles, their money, and their rules, the Bright Young People rather represent the establishment: if '[b]y "unofficial" is meant a peculiar conception free from selfish interests, norms, and appreciation of "this world" (that is, the established world, which it is always profitable to serve)', they are exactly official.[186] Carnival, for Bakhtin, 'did liberate human consciousness and permit a new outlook, but at the same time it implied no nihilism; it had a positive character because it disclosed the abundant material principle, change and becoming, the irresistible triumph of the new immortal people.'[187] In that sense, the party of the Bright Young People cannot be said to be carnivalesque because of its tendency to deny the affirmation of life and future. Although the ending of *Party Going* offers more hope than that of *Vile Bodies*, the future can best be described as unclear, for a war may break out soon, and it is ambiguous if the new order it brings in terms of class realignments should be seen as a positive change.

The snippets of conversation at the party, as if captured by a moving camera by chance, in Waugh's and Green's novels affirm an insurmountable hierarchy within the group, but movement does not guarantee a change of perspective. In *Vile Bodies*, 'inconsecutive conversation' certainly disrupts order, or status quo, social as well as group (think of Adam and Nina being always interrupted by outsiders such as Archie and Ginger). In *Party Going*, however, interrupted talk can also be employed by group leaders to reassert their control. Working similar to a hive, the group in *Party Going* has its own 'Queen Bee', Amabel, whose position is coveted and therefore constantly challenged by other group members, both old (Julia) and new (Angela).[188] The talk games relentlessly shift the power dynamics between the members within the group. Even Amabel's domination becomes precarious as the gossip circulates in the hotel room downstairs about her gatecrashing Max's party – Max deliberately avoids her – but, with her dramatic entrance halfway through the novel, (textually)

[185] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. by Helene Iswolsky (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press, 1968), p. 265.
[186] Ibid., p. 262.
[187] Ibid., p. 274.
[188] Henry Green, *Party Going*, in *Loving, Living, Party Going* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 383-528 (p. 526).

interrupting the private conversation between Julia and Max and playing the Hollywood goddess by demanding a bath, she is restored to her rightfully queenly status and regains her territory with a vengeance.

Green's characters frequently seem to be not listening while others are addressing them directly because they are busy calculating their appropriate responses according to their own hidden agendas. Silence is manipulated into the most effective and chilling response. Claire is talking about her aunt, Miss Fellowes, who suddenly falls ill at the railway terminus and requires medical attention, but none of her interlocutors cares to respond:

> 'We have had the doctor, Robert did you pay him, what does one do about hotel doctors, Amabel, do you know, or do they put it on the bill?' She looked round and saw her husband was not listening, he was staring at Amabel. 'Yes', she went on, 'it really is too strange, Evelyn and I can't make her out at all, it's so unlike her.' And then, more embarrassing still, she realized Amabel was not listening.[189]

While her husband, mesmerised by Amabel, is really not listening, Amabel, 'a money snob', is likely to have heard Claire but decided to ignore her.[190] Claire's conversation is thus rendered a soliloquy.

Although Max easily manages Julia, invited to join him alone in his room upstairs, he meets his rival in Amabel, who is presented as his alter ego. 'She was here to manage Max' after all.[191] Amabel has the power to manipulate other girls in the group into her allies and then to reduce grown men, including Max, to schoolboy responses. Max's imagination of Amabel's naked flesh in the bath excites his desire for her, which is taken advantage of by Amabel to punish him:

> 'Look round, darling,' Amabel said as cruel as could be, 'I'm here, not floating around outside.' […] he could not bring himself to look at her and this made him seem ashamed.
>
> 'Hamlet,' said Julia, and then all three girls laughed.
>
> 'Well, my darlings, and what shall we do?' she went on and laughed twice, for Max had turned his back again, he looked so like any boy at school […][192]

Julia, in spite of her rivalry with Amabel and her resentment towards her, is quick to join her to retaliate. Laughter is here regarded as more powerful than talk, deadly if accompanied by silence. Amabel is next seen silently smiling at Max's back while playing 'a bone paper knife', reminiscent of Peter Walsh's knife in *Mrs Dalloway* as

[189] Ibid., p. 464.
[190] Ibid., p. 463.
[191] Ibid., p. 463.
[192] Ibid., p. 484.

an unmistakable phallic symbol.[193] Amabel reigns by laughter: she laughs when she possesses power. Others laugh with her to stay in the game:

> It seems to her she had sufficiently established her claim over him, so she laughed again. And Julia laughed to save her face and lastly Angela laughed to keep in with them.[194]

One sentence reveals the characters' positions within the group, particularly that of Angela, who is a newcomer. She learns the workings of the group fast and cunningly negotiates a place for herself, which prompts Evelyn's comment that Angela is '"trying to be one of us."'[195]

Unlike Julia, Amabel betrays no wish to break into Max's mind, but she succeeds in momentarily breaking him mentally. While she is advancing triumphantly in their battle of quick verbal exchanges, Max is rapidly losing ground and retreating into his mind, repeating '"I don't know. Mad. Mad."'[196] Amabel and Max's quarrel curiously ends in the two falling asleep: 'very likely it may have been her sleep reaching out over him, but anyway he felt so right he slipped into it too and dropped off on those outspread wings into her sleep with his, like two soft evenings meeting.'[197] They seem to be united in their sleep and have become one. Although the bodies in *Party Going* seem to be more vile than those in Waugh's novel, there is still something innocent about them: '[Amabel] laughed. "They would never believe if we told them we had been asleep wrapped up in our clothes like babes in the wood," she said.'[198] The scene recalls that of Adam falling asleep in Nina's lap at Archie's party. Waugh perhaps takes less interest in symbolism than Green, but the image of Adam sleeping seems to be symbolic: with Nina, Adam feels a sense of home, as if returning to the mother's womb, his childhood, and innocence, where he is loved, protected, and happily oblivious of the world outside. It is further developed into the better articulated 'Sebastian contra mundum' in *Brideshead*.[199] But the flesh is so vulnerable: 'He could see her pink tongue. She looked tired and older. He laughed.'[200] Revived by the nap, Max reasserts his control:

---

193 Ibid.
194 Ibid., p. 487.
195 Ibid., p. 470.
196 Ibid., p. 505.
197 Ibid., p. 512.
198 Ibid.
199 Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 128.
200 *PG*, p. 487.

> But now he had become silent again and paid no attention to her. He smoothed down his clothes and straightened his tie while she lay back watching him. When he was done he came up to her politely smiling, took hold of her wrists and pulled her up. He did not kiss her, even when her coat fell open.[201]

The group, comfortably installed in the hotel rooms, is preoccupied with their self-indulgent, meaningless nursery games, which have little claim to reality: 'Julia thought how selfish everyone is'.[202]

Despite the destabilising self-interest of its members, the group in *Party Going* remains strong. Contrary to what Marius Hentea argues as 'The End of the Party', the party goes on. The ending of *Party Going* sees the fog lifting, trains moving again, and Max's group starting their journey. While *Vile Bodies* with its apocalyptic ending can be said to entertain 'sentimentalism and nostalgia', *Party Going*, as the title suggests and similar to a stage play, is very much in the present, except for a few characters' reminiscences of childhood.[203] Rather than 'this sense of things having already happened and one having missed out', Waugh's and Green's novels amplify a sense of nevermore: the Bright Young People are experiencing a historical moment; they are on the brink of an irrecoverable change.[204] While *Vile Bodies* concludes with an imaginary war, *Party Going* heralds the Second World War.

The War

A novel which ends with its protagonist 'in the biggest battlefield in the history of the world' cannot perhaps boast a 'Happy Ending', as the title of the last chapter of *Vile Bodies* suggests.[205] Ironically, Waugh may have really meant the ending to be happy, with a war that seems to end not only all wars but also all civilisations.[206] In 'Oxford and the Next War', which appeared in the *Isis* on 12 March 1924, Waugh

---

[201] Ibid., pp. 512-13.

[202] Ibid., p. 519.

[203] Marius Hentea, 'The End of the Party: The Bright Young People in *Vile Bodies*, *Afternoon Men*, and *Party Going*', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 56/1 (Spring 2014), 90-111 (p. 107). I argue, however, that the group in Powell's *Afternoon Men* is closer to the Bloomsbury Group than the Bright Young People. Also, the circular structure of *Afternoon Men* points to the opposite of an end.

[204] Ibid.

[205] *VB*, p. 186. Critical of *Vile Bodies* in general, William Myers finds that 'the most unsatisfactory element is the ending: the war is a mere expedient for winding up a narrative that is out of control.' William Myers, *Evelyn Waugh and the Problem of Evil* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), pp. 14-15.

[206] Stephen Fry's film adaptation of *Vile Bodies*, *Bright Young Things* (2003), forces upon Waugh's novel a Hollywood happy ending.

was ‘convinced’ that ‘what we want is another war’:

> the fighting people at least have moments of really intense enjoyment and really intense misery – both things which one wants at our age. As far as I can see, there is just no chance of any of us being able to earn a living, or at least a living decent enough to allow of any sort of excitement or depravity. Here we are with bills, over-fastidious tastes and a completely hopeless future. What can we do but long for a war or a revolution?[207]

The war in *Vile Bodies* is Waugh’s wishful thinking of a war for himself and his generation to make up for the First World War, which they bitterly missed. Isherwood, too, longed for war: ‘Like most of my generation, I was obsessed by a complex of terrors and longings connected with the idea of “War”. “War”, in this purely neurotic sense, meant The Test. The Test of your courage, or your maturity, of your sexual prowess: “Are you really a Man?”’[208] Only the Second World War would significantly alter their views; Waugh’s *Sword of Honour* is a prime example.

Father Rothschild finds ‘historical’ the younger generation’s loss of faith and ‘almost fatal hunger for permanence.’[209] By ‘historical’, he refers to the ‘“war that’s coming”’: ‘“a radical instability in our whole world-order”’.[210] Soon afterwards he ‘pulled on a pair of overall trousers in the forecourt and, mounting his motor cycle, disappeared into the night, for he had many people to see and much business to transact before he went to bed.’[211] The Jesuit, who keeps a false beard in his borrowed suitcase and goes about alone at night conducting business, is hardly trustworthy and surely meant to be comical. But he is insightful in pointing out the connection between the young people’s desire for belonging and the social and political upheavals, the aftermaths of one war which may lead to another.

The group is certainly seen as a form of defence against the crowd, which the group finds particularly threatening. It is in the group members’ own interest to unite and fight the class war with concerted efforts. In the age of mass politics and mass media, group identity becomes a pressing need. The thirties saw violent mass movements across Europe, particularly in Germany, Spain, and Russia. Living in Berlin from autumn 1930 to winter 1932-33 and gathering first-hand material like a reporter, the writer-protagonist Isherwood in *Goodbye to Berlin* observes and

---

[207] Waugh, ‘Oxford and the Next War: A Letter of Exhortation from an Undergraduate to a Friend Abroad’, in *EAR*, pp. 20-21 (p. 21).
[208] *L&S*, p. 52.
[209] *VB*, p. 111.
[210] Ibid., p. 112.
[211] Ibid.

documents the rise of the Nazis: 'I am a camera with its shutter open, quite passive, recording, not thinking.'[212] Isherwood's acute political awareness evidently derives from his personal experience on the European Continent. In *Prater Violet*, a sequel to *Goodbye to Berlin*, Isherwood, having returned to London, now works on the eponymous musical film in late 1933 and 1934 with Friedrich Bergmann, an Austrian Jewish director. Bergmann's family are still in Austria; letters from home show the increasingly worrying political situation and imminent danger. Fiction and reality, or the melodramatic plot of a film about the love story between the Crown Prince of Borodania and a flower girl in the Vienna Prater, peppered with a palace revolution, and the real horror and everyday violence, are therefore intertwined. In England, the public simply do not believe that another war is looming; Isherwood himself admits: 'For the coming war was as unreal to me as death itself.'[213] But 'MEANWHILE, in Berlin, the proceedings of the Reichstag Fire Trial continued through October, November and into the first weeks of December.'[214] With hindsight, even for the novel's contemporary readers, the knowledge of the events, now historical, makes the initial denial look ridiculous: 'Bergmann seemed to imagine that [the fogs] covered not only London but the entire island; thereby accounting for all our less agreeable racial characteristics, our insularity, our hypocrisy, our political muddling, our prudery and our refusal to face facts.'[215] And Isherwood seems to agree with him and 'envied his freedom – the freedom of a foreigner', first and foremost, to speak the truth.[216]

However oblivious they are of the social and political situations of their times, epitomised by the crowd, the Bright Young People in *Vile Bodies* and *Party Going* are doomed to live in a world significantly altered by the First World War and on the brink of more change with the threat of a coming war. From Waugh's novel to Green's, bracketing one of the most politicised decades, the crowd becomes increasingly visible and impossible to ignore. Considering the 'long 1939' from September 1938 to May 1940, Steve Ellis examines what Forster called 'the 1939 State': 'The Munich crisis brought the nation to the brink of war and thus created an intense war-consciousness; in the wake of this it prompted key questions about what

[212] Christopher Isherwood, *Goodbye to Berlin* (London: Vintage, 1998), p. 1.
[213] *PV*, p. 39.
[214] Ibid., p. 41.
[215] Ibid., p. 48.
[216] Ibid., p. 50.

values the nation would be fighting to defend, and who its real enemies were.'[217] Critics emphasise the fantastic quality of *Vile Bodies*, similar to the *Alice* books quoted in its epigraphs. Davis suggests that with *Vile Bodies*, 'Waugh was not only exaggerating for the purposes of satire but escaping into fantasy.'[218] For Bradbury, the novel is 'a comedy of manners with a strong element of fantasy and surrealism.'[219] Similarly, Garnett considers it as '[a] fantasy of ephemeral material, mixed mood, and erratic development'.[220] What kills Agatha is not simply the physical injury from her crash but, more deadly, the mental shock of reality. However fantastical it seems, the race is a dramatised version of real life, in which every action has its consequences. It is the Bright Young People who have been living in their own enclosed fantasy of a world without consequences held together by and reflected in their inconsequential talk.

Nina's view from the aeroplane and her subsequent sickness is interpreted as illustrating how she, confronted with reality, denies and rejects it. Valentine Cunningham notes: '*Airmindedness and being airminded*, are characteristic concepts of the period. The OED Supplement traces *airminded* to 1928.'[221] Moreover, with the rapid expansions of major cities after the First World War, not least Paris, London, and Berlin, aerial photography began to be closely associated with urban planning: 'Concurrent with the opening of these new territorial boundaries at the beginning of the 1920s was the dawn of the first campaigns of urban aerial photography. For many large cities this marked the advent of a new cadastral means of representation.'[222] What Nina sees, conveniently sprawling beneath for her perusal, is reality, or the everyday life of ordinary people, alienating and unimaginable for her and her small group of friends:

> inclined at an odd angle a horizon of straggling red suburb; arterial roads dotted with little cars; factories, some of them working, others empty and decaying; a disused canal; some distant hills sown with bungalows; wireless masts and overhead power cables; men

[217] Steve Ellis, *British Writers and the Approach of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 7, 1, 12. Ellis, however, concentrates on the high modernists, particularly Woolf and Eliot, and only mentions Waugh and Green in passing.
[218] Davis, *Forms*, p. 130.
[219] Bradbury, p. 46.
[220] Garnett, p. 75.
[221] Valentine Cunningham, *British Writers of the Thirties* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 167.
[222] Nathalie Roseau, 'The City Seen from the Aeroplane: Distorted Reflections and Urban Futures', in *Seeing From Above: The Aerial View in Visual Culture*, ed. by Mark Dorrian and Frédéric Pousin (London: I. B. Tauris, 2013), pp. 210-26 (p. 214).

> and women were indiscernible except as tiny spots; they were marrying and shopping and making money and having children. The scene lurched and tilted again as the aeroplane struck a current of air.[223]

Beaty focuses on the juxtaposition of Nina's and Ginger's different perceptions of England by 'the objective narrator': 'Playing off idealistic notions of England's former glory against what he considers to be her present state of degradation, the author portrays an entire society oblivious to the gravity of its true situation.'[224] Notably, the abstraction – 'they were marrying and shopping and making money and having children' – is an editorial comment because Nina cannot possibly see all this. For her, the masses are almost invisible, as they are everywhere else in the novel. Heath notes that '[t]he scene is Waugh's version of Eliot's "birth and copulation and death" in "Fragment of an Agon"'.[225] Eagleton argues that 'the passage satirises Nina for her absurdly inadequate response to what she sees […] but also suggests that what she sees, from this privileged and distorting height, is the substantial truth of the ordinary world.'[226] Interestingly, Eagleton's remark recalls the criticism of Woolf of the 'leaning tower' writers and their 'raised', albeit 'no longer steady', and slanted view.[227]

Eagleton associates Nina's aerial view with 'a framed and contemplated cinematic image'.[228] Nina surely scans the small piece of earth like the camera of a documentary film in the vein of Walter Ruttmann's *Berlin: Die Sinfonie der Großstadt* (1927) (*Berlin: Symphony of a Great City*) and Dziga Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929), but these documentaries in marked contrast to Nina's high, out-of-touch point of view accentuate a low, down-to-earth viewpoint by tilting the camera back to capture (often distorted and alarming) images of tall buildings, bridges, towers, and other loci of modernity. Terming such films 'city symphonies', Marcus argues that

> film-makers in the 1920s sought to renew the medium – and to turn away from commercial and narrative cinema – by returning to cinema's origins in the documenting of reality, but with the particular twist given by the perspectives and angles of modernism. […] Like the one-day novels of the period, [the city symphonies] open up the question of 'modernist dailiness'.[229]

---

[223] *VB*, p. 168.
[224] Beaty, p. 51.
[225] Heath, *Prison*, p. 88.
[226] Eagleton, pp. 52-53.
[227] Woolf, 'The Leaning Tower', p. 139.
[228] Eagleton, p. 52.
[229] Laura Marcus, '"A Hymn to Movement": The "City Symphony" of the 1920s and 1930s',

For Ruttmann and Vertov, who seem sceptical of the aerial view, reality cannot be found but on the ground. What Nina sees is, however, not the city, but the suburb, the likely destination of the delayed commuters in *Party Going* after a day's work in the city. Similar to Woolf in the opening pages of *Mrs Dalloway* listing all the goings-on on the busy London streets (and all of Clarissa's sensations while she is interacting with her environment), Waugh spells out Nina's vision in great detail, but with much less enthusiasm and no sense of exhilaration; in fact, the monotonous and soporific rhythm befits the sense of insignificance and prolonged boredom. Waugh is less concerned with the everyday, which is essential to the high modernist imagination and portrayal of human life, than with extraordinary and extreme experiences, akin to Hemingway's bullfighting, deep-sea fishing, and big-game hunting. Although described as uneventful and dreary, the ordinary life is acknowledged as the real in this novel. It is not Nina but Ginger who fails to see reality, even when confronted, (mis)quoting *Richard II* – '"*This sceptre'd isle, this earth of majesty, this something or other Eden*"' – and offering Nina paper bags.[230] Ginger's reaction, more than Nina's, can be described as 'absurdly inadequate', and it is comic, too.

The high viewpoint is often deployed by writers to put worldly things into perspective and offer a metaphysical, if not religious, understanding of humanity (think of Rollo Martins and Harry Lime looking down from the Ferris wheel in Greene's *The Third Man* (1950)).[231] In *Party Going*, Green has some of his Bright Young People look from the windows of their hotel rooms at the crowd in the station concourse, their fellow travellers who are also affected by the dense fog:

> Looking down [Julia] saw the whole of that station below them, lit now by electricity, and covered from end to end by one mass of people. 'Oh, my dear!' she said, 'poor Thomson.' […] She wondered if this were what you saw when you stood on your wedding day, a Queen, on your balcony looking at subjects massed below.[232]

Unlike Amabel, the 'Queen Bee', Julia seems to have a heart: she is worried about Thomson, her servant. But her sympathy does not last long, for she is preoccupied with playing the Queen and enjoying the feeling of it. Later she is shown to be more concerned about her luggage, which is with Thomson downstairs and, she fears,

---

Modernist Cultures, 5/1 (2010), 30-46 (p. 30).

[230] *VB*, p. 168.

[231] Graham Greene, *The Third Man*, in *The Third Man and the Fallen Idol* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 1-98 (p. 86).

[232] *PG*, p. 430.

unprotected: '"Oh, him! Bother him!"'[233]

The confined space of the railway terminus is several times compared to a stage in a theatre – 'Through those lidded windows, the curtains so thick and heavy they seemed made of plaster on stage sets' – particularly when the crowd start to sing: 'What [Julia] could not tell was that those who were singing were Welshmen up for a match, and what they sang in Welsh was of the rape of a Druid's silly daughter under one of Snowdon's wilder mountains. She thought only they knew what it meant, but it sounded light-hearted.'[234] Julia, Max, and the rest of the group sit in their boxes, watching the developments downstairs at a distance. Nevertheless, they become increasingly uncomfortable in the shrunken territory to which they have retreated; they are, in fact, trapped in their hotel rooms, for the steel door which keeps the crowd from coming inside also prevents the group from going outside: '"But how about my claustrophobia?" Alex asked.'[235] Soon Julia 'had forgotten what it was to be outside, what it smelled and felt like, and she had not realized what this crowd was, just seeing it through glass.'[236]

Moreover, this confinement does not necessarily guarantee safety. The seemingly meek crowd may break the steel door with violence and come into the hotel and upstairs, as the crowd did last time when there was a thick fog like this: 'by weight of numbers they had smashed everything, furniture, lounges, reception offices, the two bars, doors. Fifty-two had been injured'.[237] Not entirely aware of the violence of which this crowd is capable, as Julia does not know the dark meaning of the 'light-hearted' song, the group, however, sense something of the nature of a threat and attempt to suppress their fears by deluding themselves that the status quo will be maintained.[238] Although Julia here thinks specifically about the situation of the railway terminus, Green may well discuss the social structure of England, which is particularly unstable, in the period leading up to the Second World War:

> through being above them by reason of Max having bought their room and by having money, she saw in what lay below her an example of her own way of living because they were underneath and kept there.
>
> 'Aren't you glad you aren't down there?' she said, and he replied he wondered how it was going to be possible to get them out.

[233] Ibid., p. 467.
[234] Ibid., pp. 466, 467.
[235] Ibid., p. 416.
[236] Ibid., p. 437.
[237] Ibid., p. 437.
[238] Ibid., p. 467.

> ‘Have you ever been in a great crowd?’ she said, because she had this feeling she must exchange and share with him.
> Down below Amabel broke into their silence by saying:
> ‘Well, and what about my bath, if you please?’[239]

Julia seems one of the few characters in the novel who are allowed some depth because she thinks, and because her thoughts (and feelings) are explained. She reaches out to Max in the wish to share her soul with him and to connect with his, but she is only met with the latter’s, first, reluctance and, then, silence. Without warning or transition, the plot of the novel, as if in a montage, quickly moves on to Amabel demanding her bath in a room downstairs. Textually, Amabel interrupts Julia and Max’s conversation, but it is essentially Julia’s difficult questions which touch upon the threat posed by the crowd as the group sees it and the anxiety of the group about its identity that break down their communication.

Party Going certainly plays with the tensions between upstairs and downstairs and between inside and outside at many levels. Julia looks out of the hotel room window and is confronted by the crowd. Evelyn seems, however, completely unaware of the crowd’s existence:

> ‘Have you looked outside?’ Julia said to Evelyn upstairs.
> ‘How d’you mean, outside?’[240]

But the inside/outside and upstairs/downstairs binaries are crumbling. The turn to the group mind in the early twentieth century was partly due to the emergence of mass media, cinema in particular, and partly due to the First World War, which broke up the old class system and gave rise to a new, more mobile society in which old and new money, tradition and modernity, mingled and constantly challenged the boundary between each other, and belonging, understood as allegiance, therefore became increasingly insecure and difficult. Soon those people who are inside will have to come into contact with the outside. The mysterious man, who not only gatecrashes Max’s party but also moves freely on both sides of the steel door. By crossing the boundary, the man disrupts order and, due to his unknown identity, causes fear. Likely to be an imposter similar to Philbrick, the shady butler in *Decline and Fall*, this man changes his accents in accordance with that of his interlocutor and the required situation.[241] Not surprisingly Green’s talk fiction should play with how

[239] Ibid., p. 468.
[240] Ibid., p. 482.
[241] Alex mistakes him for the hotel detective. Ibid., p. 426.

people talk as well as what people talk about. Although the man hardly offers a model for a way to connect the two worlds, his existence indicates the possibility of change, which is likely to be initiated from below.

The Strike

It is one particular crowd that elicits the group's reactions on a continuum from fascination to fear, namely the workers in the 1926 General Strike. The group's perception of this crowd exemplifies the group mind. Officially, the Strike lasted for nine days from 3 to 12 May 1926, during which 'four million workers came out in sympathy with coal miners, who were protesting against attempts by mine owners and managers to reduce wages and lengthen hours.'[242] Studying the volunteers in the Strike, such as university students and society ladies, Rachelle Hope Saltzman observes that '[t]he General Strike was not merely evidence of class divisions and a post-war society in transition; the event and its participants have become national forklore symbols for Britishness – a more broadly construed identity than Englishness in 1926, and one that extended beyond the Home Counties, both literally and symbolically.'[243]

It is no coincidence that the exterior modernists returned to the General Strike in the late thirties and early forties: Isherwood in his 1938 autobiography, *Lions and Shadows*, Green, also, in his 1940 autobiography, *Pack My Bag*, and Waugh in *Brideshead*, a war-time fictional autobiography of a character who resembles himself all too uncomfortably. Charles Ferrall and Dougal McNeill argue that '[f]or many writers the Strike was the main event between the wars in which the personal and historical intersected.'[244] With hindsight and particularly in the light of the Second World War, the Strike is reconsidered as a crucial turning point for the young men of 1922: the event, which turns out to be no less divisive than the Spanish Civil War a decade later, marks the political coming of age of this generation.[245] The choice of playing one's part or not results from one's political alignment as much as one's

[242] Rachelle Hope Saltzman, *A Lark for the Sake of Their Country: The 1926 General Strike Volunteers in Forklore and Memory* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 4.
[243] Ibid., p. 22.
[244] Charles Ferrall and Dougal McNeill, *Writing the 1926 General Strike: Literature, Culture, Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 2.
[245] See Nancy Cunard's 1937 questionnaire quoted in Tom Buchanan, *Britain and the Spanish Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 158-59.

personal preference, for the Strike is as direct a confrontation between the ruling and working classes as the Second World War, which, for Waugh at least, is also a class war that heralds the 'age of Hooper' and the welfare state.[246] The Strike of the masses serves as a wake-up call for the privileged group: juxtaposed with the parties of the Bright Young People in the Roaring Twenties, it points to an inevitable and irrevocable social change.

Despite the fact that all three are exterior modernists, Waugh, Green, and Isherwood disagree politically: they adopt a similar style to convey different, albeit ambiguous, messages. Both the non-fictional and fictional accounts of Waugh and his fellow novelists suggest that there was no serious fighting during the Strike; its significance, made disproportionate through reflection and reconstruction, lies, therefore, not in the Strike itself but in this generation's responses to it. Not surprisingly, the writers resort to the most intimate form of writing, but their lack of distance from the material does not prevent them from being self-critical: on the contrary, they criticise themselves harshly. Woolf, the publisher of *Lions and Shadows* and *Pack My Bag*, remarked:

> No other ten years can have produced so much autobiography as the ten years between 1930 and 1940. […] But the leaning-tower writers wrote about themselves honestly, therefore creatively. They told the unpleasant truths, not only the flattering truths. That is why their autobiography is so much better than their fiction or their poetry.[247]

Woolf's bias towards these younger writers contributes to her unfair dismissal of their creative output, but no other group perhaps is seen to rely on, or simply exploit, their personal experiences for novelistic and poetic purposes as much as this one. Even their autobiographies read like fiction.

Writing close to the outbreak of the Second World War, Isherwood associated the General Strike with the imminent war. What Isherwood called 'The Test' can be understood as the war itself, a second chance for his generation who possessed an inferiority complex because they had missed the previous one. Isherwood was to fail the test – as was Auden – by moving to America before the war even began. More importantly, the Strike, 'a dress rehearsal of "The Test"', consolidated his political views, which were enormously influenced by his communist friend Edward Upward:

> For the first time, I knew that I detested my own class: so sure of themselves, so

[246] *BR*, p. 325.
[247] Woolf, 'The Leaning Tower', p. 148.

> confident that they were in the right, so grandly indifferent to the strikers' case. Most of us didn't even know why the men had struck. I didn't know, myself. I couldn't think about such things: I could only shudder with fear and hatred; hating both parties […] I hated myself, too, for being neutral. I tried to get on with my novel; instead, I found myself opening Wilfred.[248]

Notably, Isherwood's political struggle was also personal due to his homosexuality. The result of the Strike, unsatisfactory to the workers, was thus summarised: 'The Poshocracy had won, as it always did win, in a thoroughly gentlemanly manner.'[249]

By contrast, the account offered by Green in *Pack My Bag* is more ambiguous. For Green, still at Oxford, the Strike occurred without drama: it did not break out; it simply 'came'. Only the 'But' with which he began his recollection subtly implies some sort of disruption:

> But the General Strike came in my second year. No one will suppose with the attitude I thought I had won that I could take a hand. The moment it happened, striking just where I had been most afraid as for some time I had been unable to look a labourer in the eye, I had to get away at once.[250]

Green's inability to 'look a labourer in the eye' derives less from fear than from shame, for he seemed to take the Strike personally and felt responsible for causing it. Unlike most of his fellow students, the fictional Charles Ryder included, who eagerly went down to London to do their part for the country, or rather defend their own interest as the ruling classes, Green decided to go home by way of escape. His class privilege afforded him a country house to turn to, where he could eat strawberries in peace at a moment of what believed to be national crisis. What follows is one of the finest crowd scenes in literature:

> at a crossroads was a crowd of about three thousand people watching a policeman with no traffic to direct. His face was white because they did not make a sound, no one so much as coughed in this unnatural silence of the strike, they only stared at him. We stopped [the car], wondering if it would be safe to go by and that is why I know it was so quiet with their waiting, as I felt, for one man to throw a stone when all would have joined in. And was it their comment in bitterness at things as they found them or was it curiosity this silence that seemed on the surface to be so like the attitude I had adopted and which I thought then to be unique to my sort of education?[251]

Like a sound film momentarily devoid of sound, 'this unnatural silence' so pregnant with potential violence is treated as a tipping point. In the standoff, the suspense, more than the possible violence, creates much of the tension and elicits a sense of

---

[248] *L&S*, p.133.
[249] Ibid., p. 134.
[250] *PMB*, p. 151.
[251] Ibid., p. 152.

generalised fear. It is unknown how much of Green's skill as a novelist seeps into the narrative of a real event here, but the stone not thrown recalls the one thrown in *North and South*. The stone from one striker in the angry crowd hits Margret Hale instead, who protects the mill owner Mr Thornton with her body. But no violence ensues: the strikers condemn the attacker and the crowd disperse.

The English crowd portrayed by Green in *Party Going* seems also to be incapable of real violence. They are meek: singing collectively is all they do when they are stranded in the railway terminus after a day's tiring work desperate to go home. Similar to cinemagoing, singing in a crowd, for Green, demonstrates a sense of solidarity that is almost moving. However, within the same paragraph, the reader is told that 'this feeling did not last and soon they did not agree about songs, that section would be going on while another sang one of their own. Then no one sang at all.'[252] This bathos recalls Waugh's, not least in his portrayal of the dubious Jesuit in *Vile Bodies*; for these disillusioned 'young men of 1922', nothing can be truly heroic. In *Pack My Bag*, Green, however, captures and freezes a delicate and somewhat sinister moment of the crowd when anything can happen; what really happens, violent or otherwise, interests him less and is therefore omitted.

Invested as part of the ruling classes and pressurised to take action, Green gave in: 'Here all pretence at non-cooperation failed. I said I would do any kind of "national" work.'[253] Like his friend Isherwood, who also reluctantly signed up but had no opportunity to do anything, Green was given a job but, due to muddled credentials, was not allowed to work. The comic potential of the Strike is fully realised in Waugh's fictional account in *Brideshead*. Unlike Isherwood, Green never openly denounced his own class, but he admitted: 'There was a knell in this experience for ears attuned to Oxford bells and to mutterings of a life I did not know but feared. It was the crowd's silence which drove the point home'.[254] In his muffled self-criticism more than a decade later, Green attempted to pin down the meaning of the Strike to him specifically and hoped to understand the current situation of the late thirties:

> What is despairing in my case is that I should acquiesce, in the old days I should never have done so, and that is my farewell to youth in this absolute bewilderment of July 1939, that I should be so little unwilling to fight and yet likely enough to die by fighting for

[252] *PG*, p. 496.
[253] *PMB*, p. 152.
[254] Ibid.

> something which, as I am now, for the life of me I cannot understand.[255]

The present tense clearly indicates the voice of the older, commenting Green, 'taking stock', at a moment similar to that of the silent standoff between the strikers and the policeman.[256] Green's mid-career autobiography is preoccupied with death because its author sincerely feared the end and felt the urgency to tell his story; Green urged his group of novelist friends and perhaps his generation more broadly to do so, too: 'All of these otherwise would be used in novels, material is better in that form or in any other than is not directly personal, but we I feel no longer have the time.'[257]

If Green, however evasive, shared Isherwood's leftism, Waugh was unmistakably on the right end of the political continuum. Stylistically opposing each other, the seemingly strange pair of the exterior *Vile Bodies* and the interior *Brideshead*, however, complement one another in many ways. Oblivious of the existence of the masses, let alone their plight, in his smart society novel *Vile Bodies*, Waugh, rewriting the twenties in *Brideshead*, inserted an episode of the General Strike. Charles returns to London from Paris, where he is learning to paint, because

> I and several friends in circumstances like my own came seriously to believe that our country was in danger and that our duty lay there. We were joined by a Belgian Futurist, who lived under the, I think, assumed name of Jean de Brissac la Motte, and claimed the right to bear arms in any battle anywhere against the lower classes.[258]

Charles is unequivocal in declaring the Strike to be a class war, identifying the enemies as the workers, and swearing allegiance to the ruling classes. But the fake aristocrat, more than merely a comic relief, undermines Charles's heroism.

In fact, the entire episode of the General Strike is depicted comically, achieved through the constant tension between the young, experiencing protagonist and the middle-aged, cynical narrator. The discrepancies expose the follies of the younger self judged by the older self.

> We crossed together, in a high-spirited, male party, expecting to find unfolding before us at Dover the history so often repeated of late, with so few variations, from all parts of Europe, that I, at any rate, had formed in my mind a clear, composite picture of 'Revolution' – the red flag on the post office, the overturned tram, the drunken N.C.O.s, the gaol open and gangs of released criminals prowling the streets, the train from the capital that did not arrive. One had read it in the papers, seen it in the films, heard it at café tables again and again for six or seven years now, till it had become part of one's

[255] Ibid., p. 153.
[256] Ibid., p. 1.
[257] Ibid.
[258] *BR*, p. 188.

> experience, at second hand, like the mud of Flanders and the flies of Mesopotamia.[259]

The French Revolution still exerts enormous influence on those 'high-spirited' young men's imagination of crowds. It is no accident that Charles chooses Paris, even if Paris is *the* place for both aspiring and established artists and writers in the twenties. Charles undoubtedly belongs to this generation who have missed one war and are desperate to take the test, any test, to prove their manhood and validity. The young artist's active mind, conjecturing up vivid images fed to him through snippets of information, if not outright propaganda, from newspapers, films, and talks. Charles internalises these second-hand experiences the way he does those from the war of which he hears so much; the collective memories thus become his personal memories, so real as if he had smelt and trodden on 'the mud of Flanders' and felt the heat of Mesopotamia and waved away 'the flies'. Like the crowd, Charles also falls prey to images: what runs through his mind when he imagines the Strike resembles a documentary film, replete with close-ups of the most meticulous and vivid details, not least the redness of the flag. A sense of irony underlies the narrative: a critical voice resounds calmly beneath the surface enthusiasm. It is foreshadowed that reality falls short of expectations: 'Then we landed and met the old routine of the customs-sheds, the punctual boat-train, the porters lining the platform at Victoria and converging on the first-class carriages; the long line of waiting taxis.'[260] Neither is this crossing as bad as the one which opens *Vile Bodies*, nor is the experience at the customs as embarrassing as Agatha's or as hopeless as Adam's. At the sight of order, far from the promised exciting chaos, Charles is quickly disappointed by the realisation that 'nothing was happening; nothing, at any rate, which needed our presence.'[261]

If *Vile Bodies* is fantasy, *Brideshead* is reality. In the crowd scene, there is no death, but the violence, or more precisely the hunger for violence, is real. Charles's high spirits are restored at the news of '"a perfectly good battle"':

> We drove at great speed and arrived to find a steel hawser stretched between lamp posts, an overturned truck and a policeman, alone on the pavement, being kicked by half a dozen youths. On either side of this centre of disturbance, and at a little distance from it, two opposing parties had formed. Near us, as we disembarked, a second policeman was sitting on the pavement, dazed, with his head in his hands and blood running through his fingers; two or three sympathizers were standing over him; on the other side of the

[259] Ibid.
[260] Ibid., pp. 188-89.
[261] Ibid., p. 189.

> hawser was a hostile knot of young dockers. We charged in cheerfully, relieved the policeman […][262]

Waugh's fictionalised crowd is more capable of violence than the real one depicted by Green. It is sinister that Charles seems to relish the attack on a policeman and the sight of blood, the blood of his ally, not enemy: the 'blood running through [the policeman's] fingers' in reality echoes and materialises his zealous revolutionary vision represented by 'the red flag on the post office'. He will eventually come to realise 'the fierce little human tragedy in which I played', but the Charles of 1926 nonetheless enters the battle 'cheerfully' with a sense of boyish heroism.[263]

The autobiographical accounts of Isherwood and Green and Waugh's fictional account of the General Strike converge in the undramatic development of the event and its quiet, natural end. Overall, the Strike fails to achieve what has been promised, either to the workers or, paradoxically, to the young men of – or closely associated with – the ruling classes. So the Strike is nothing but 'a beast long fabled for its ferocity [that] had emerged for an hour, scented danger, and slunk back to its lair', failing to satisfy Charles's hunger for violence and ultimately his hunger for heroism and honour, which, as he is made to believe by the tales of the previous war, can only be obtained through violence.[264] Rex is the kind of man who 'made a lot of kudos out of the strike', but Charles is no Rex.[265] The war, in which the middle-aged narrator is involved, is the real and final Test, but Charles, like Guy Crouchback, is disillusioned. While Isherwood admits to his unpreparedness for the Test, Charles and Guy have to find out when they are confronted with real violence.

That Jean, the suspected fake aristocrat, who 'had a pot of ferns dropped on his head by an elderly widow in Camden Town and was in hospital for a week', returns to conclude the episode (another bathos) renders Charles's experience of the Strike ridiculous and farcical, which compares to Chaplin's Keystone comedies.[266] But the joke turns against Charles, as he begins to understand tragedy. The religious ending of *Brideshead* seems to offer reconciliation, if not Charles's repentance, although the message is incongruous with the rest of the novel, and the tension between the group

[262] Ibid., p. 193.
[263] Ibid., p. 326.
[264] Ibid., p. 194.
[265] Ibid., p. 195.
[266] Ibid., p. 194.

and the crowd remains unresolved.[267] The 'homeless, childless, middle-aged, loveless' Charles finds solace in the 'small red flame' in the chapel at Brideshead:

> 'Something quite remote from anything the builders intended, has come out of their work, and out of the fierce little human tragedy in which I played; […] the flame which the old knights saw from their tombs, which they saw put out; that flame burns again for other soldiers, far from home, farther, in heart, than Acre or Jerusalem. It could not have been lit but for the builders and the tragedians, and there I found it this morning, burning anew among the old stones.'[268]

The first 'builders' refers unapologetically to the generations of Flytes who 'made a new house with the stones of the old castle; year by year, generation by generation, they enriched and extended it; […] until, in sudden frost, came the age of Hooper; the place was desolate and the work all brought to nothing'.[269] The 'builders and the tragedians' later, however, seem to include the masses like Hooper, for whom the frame also burns. Despite his detestation of Hooper's class, made all the more explicit by his disapproval of Hooper's '"Rightyoh"', Charles maintains a strange bond with Hooper as an individual.[270] Charles is reluctant to align himself with the crowd, or the workers whom he has helped to crush in the General Strike, but his religion brings him closer to them and enables him to empathise with them at a higher level which transcends class and other differences.[271] The group members define themselves against the crowd and precariously guard their individuality; without the group they easily become part of the crowd. In Charles's epiphany, the masses are allowed individuality: although the flame burns for everyone, the journey

---

[267] M. H. Abrams discusses 'the Romantic theme of the justification of evil and suffering [or theodicy], represented in the plot-form of a circuitous yet progressive self-education, self-discovery, and the discovery of vocation, in a life which terminates in this world.' This circuitous educational journey is also associated with Christianity, particularly the parable of the Prodigal Son and the ultimate wish to restore Eden. Redemption is therefore 'represented in the central Christian trope of life as a pilgrimage and quest: the *Bildungsgeschichte* of the Romantic philosophy of consciousness tends to be imagined in the story form of a *Bildungsreise* whose end is its own beginning.' The Catholic theme is particularly evident in *Brideshead*, a novel which is also Romantic. M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (London: Oxford University, 1971), pp. 123, 194, 191.

[268] *BR*, pp. 325, 326.

[269] Ibid., p. 325.

[270] Ibid., p. 7.

[271] For Marcel DeCoste, in the red flame Charles sees 'a good and a beauty greater than those that issue from the artist's hand'. D. Marcel DeCoste, *The Vocation of Evelyn Waugh: Faith and Art in the Post-war Fiction* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 41. Similarly, Davis argues that '[s]ince he had learned to see all places and all actions in light of a larger purpose, Ryder can give up the idea of an earthly *there* to which he can escape from *here*, can see what seems to be past loss in light of hope, and can fit together the tiny bits – artist, lover, soldier – into a whole, Captain Charles Ryder, which comes together only as the novel ends.' Robert Murray Davis, 'Imagined Space in *Brideshead Revisited*', in *New Directions*, pp. 22-34 (p. 33).

to that realisation can only be achieved by the individual's self-discovery. Charles has found Christianity; his fellow soldiers have to find it in their own ways.

Chapter Four
Waugh's Heritage:
Brideshead Revisited and Adaptation

This study of exterior modernism began in mid-twenties with Waugh's, and generally exterior modernists', anxiety concerning the influence of high modernism. This idea of a high modernism began to feel like a settled legacy by the end of the Second World War. This chapter will conclude the argument of the thesis therefore by examining *Brideshead Revisited* (1945) as a heritage novel, but through focusing on the ways in which it models its own version of interiority in the wake of high modernism by allowing objects and emotions to interact as a means of indirectly displaying what are more usually conceived as interior cognitive processes. *Brideshead*'s afterlives in adaptation, particularly in the context of heritage film and television, will be the focus of the final part of the chapter.

With *Brideshead* – in some ways Waugh's most 'interior' novel – exterior modernism at mid-century, like the author in his mid-career, seems to encounter a moment of crisis. For this best known of his novels might be regarded as interior not so much because it offers psychological depth through the adoption of a stream-of-consciousness style as in Joyce, or even Woolf's development of free indirect discourse, but primarily in the sense that it examines depth of feeling, precisely what is emphatically eschewed in Waugh's interwar novels. However, as objects and emotions are brought together in this novel in a manner reminiscent of what is referred to in Eliot's essay on 'Hamlet' as a technique of 'objective correlative', *Brideshead*, with a similarly and studiedly distributed sense of affectivity, might still be regarded as another variant of exterior modernism.[1]

Brideshead's uniqueness, both stylistic and thematic, within Waugh's oeuvre, did not prevent it from becoming a cult text, to which the epic 1981 Granada television adaptation greatly contributed. The adaptation of Waugh's fiction not only reflected the author's fluctuating literary reputation, which peaked in the ninety-eighties and the first decades of the twenty-first century, but also helped to

[1] While Waugh was anxious about the influence of Joyce and Woolf, he admired and borrowed freely from Eliot, also a high modernist, and acknowledged his borrowings, partly because Eliot worked in a different genre and partly because Waugh shared Eliot's views on civilisation, Christianity, and politics.

shape his legacy. After two failed attempts during Waugh's lifetime, *Brideshead* was finally adapted for the screen posthumously in the context of the burgeoning genre of heritage film and television. I argue that this is precisely because the novel, with a clear aim to archive and to preserve, evident in its preoccupations with period detail, was intended by Waugh to be a heritage novel. On the other hand, the mood of the eighties, dominated by nostalgia, for the lost empire in particular, also found its ultimate expression in Waugh's novel. *Brideshead* is therefore also a mood novel, exploring mood at different levels, both social and individual. For Heidegger, mood (*Stimmung*) 'comes neither from "outside" nor from "inside", but arises out of Being-in-the-world, as a way of such Being.'[2] Nostalgia is defined in *The Oxford English Dictionary* as '[a]cute longing for familiar surroundings, esp. regarded as a medical condition; homesickness', or '[s]entimental longing *for* or regretful memory of a period of the past, esp. one in an individual's own lifetime; (also) sentimental imagining or evocation of a period of the past.'[3] So the nostalgic mood, understood as the longing to be being in the past, or a sense of belonging to the past, suggests dual temporality; it is a past that is not only relevant to but is also reconstructed by the present.

Apophrades: High Modernism Revisited

Brideshead, an instant international bestseller, prompted Waugh's comment in his preface to the revised 1960 edition: 'This novel, which is here re-issued with many small additions and some substantial cuts, lost me such esteem as I once enjoyed among my contemporaries and led me into an unfamiliar world of fan-mail and press photographers.'[4] Waugh and many of his contemporaries (professedly) took issue with popularity, which, easily associated with being middlebrow, was therefore to be avoided at all cost. Carpenter notes that, in Waugh's vocabulary, '"[p]opular" means middlebrow', and this sentiment was shared by his friends, who also 'admired the Nineties and the Wilde set (and began their own careers by imitating them) because Wilde and his associates had attempted to create a milieu for art that was remote

[2] Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), p. 176.
[3] 'Nostalgia', *Oxford English Dictionary*, last accessed 31 July 2016, <www.oed.com>.
[4] *BR*, p. ix.

from the common herd'.[5] Woolf's contempt for the middlebrow is expressed in an unsent letter to the editor of *The New Statesman*, in which she defined the middlebrow as 'the man, or woman, of middlebred intelligence who ambles and saunters now on this side of the hedge, now on that, in pursuit of no single object, neither art itself or life itself, but both mixed indistinguishably, and rather nastily, with money, fame, power, or prestige.'[6] Comparing Beverley Nichols's *Crazy Pavements* (1927) with Waugh's *Vile Bodies*, two similar texts, and considering the different fate of the two novelists, Erica Brown argues:

> The changing critical landscape of the twentieth century that valued modernist experimentation above other, more accessible forms of writing also increasingly denigrated the commercially-minded professional writer. Nichols […] effectively destroyed his own critical reputation through becoming someone who could and would write almost anything for money.[7]

Notably, Waugh's claim to modernism, or even his reputation as a serious writer, has been precarious. Nicola Humble, for example, regards Waugh as a middlebrow novelist, and *Brideshead* a middlebrow novel.[8] Although more ready than the previous generation to incorporate elements from popular culture, neither Waugh nor his fellow exterior modernists are in any way securely middlebrow. The novels of the exterior modernists – except perhaps Green's – are evidently more accessible than those of the high modernists. Their direct manner of writing is likely to have been influenced by Hemingway, a writer many of them admired, whose style, under the influence of journalism, is often described as deceptively simple. Many exterior modernists also worked in journalism; Waugh's experience as a war correspondent found its way into the fictional world of *Scoop*. Isherwood's simple prose may also have involved intentional political preference as advocated in the vein of Orwell's promotion of simple, clear writing in his 'Politics and the English Language' (1946).[9]

---

[5] Carpenter, p. 302.

[6] Virginia Woolf, 'Middlebrow', in *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays* (London: Hogarth Press, 1943), pp. 113-19 (p. 115).

[7] Erica Brown, 'The Rise and Fall of "The Original Bright Young Thing": Beverley Nichols, *Crazy Pavements* (1927) and Popular Authorship', *The Review of English Studies*, 66/273 (2015), 144-63 (p. 146).

[8] Nicola Humble, *The Feminine Middlebrow Novel, 1920s to 1950s: Class, Domesticity, and Bohemianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 64.

[9] 'This mixture of vagueness and sheer incompetence is the most marked characteristic of modern English prose.' And '[t]he great enemy of clear language is insincerity', political insincerity in particular. George Orwell, 'Politics and the English Language', in George Orwell, *Essays* (London:

Waugh at once enjoyed the popularity (and 'money, fame, power, or prestige', which Woolf condemned) brought about by *Brideshead* and saw it as a problem. The epic 1981 Granada television adaptation further popularised *Brideshead* and established the novel's cult status in Waugh's oeuvre. Waugh's afterlife has relied heavily on this particular novel, now the signature for his fiction. *Brideshead* is, however, neither introductory nor representative: it is one of the most complex, if not perplexing, of Waugh's works; both stylistically and thematically, its position in his overall body of work is more unique than typical. That *Brideshead* is a mid-career departure is regarded by some critics as more problematic than its enormous success with the common readers, to which Waugh mostly attributed this less enthusiastic expert reception.[10] Edmund Wilson, who had been impressed by Waugh's earlier works, described *Brideshead* as 'a bitter blow' and 'disastrous': 'his deficiency in common sense here ceases to be an asset and gets him into some embarrassing situations, and his creative imagination, accustomed in his satirical fiction to work partly in two-dimensional caricature but now called upon for passions and motives, produces mere romantic fantasy.'[11] Wilson particularly took issue with the novel's 'dispiriting clichés' and 'Waugh's snobbery, hitherto held in check by his satirical point of view, [which] has here emerged shameless and rampant.'[12] But he predicted that *Brideshead* would 'prove to be the most successful, the only extremely successful, book that Evelyn Waugh has written, and that it will soon be up in the best-seller list somewhere between *The Black Rose* and *The Manatee*.'[13] It is a prophecy that was not only realised but also surpassed.

Waugh retorted in 'Fan-Fare' that 'Mr Edmund Wilson, who once professed a generous interest in me […] was outraged (quite legitimately by his standards) at

---

Penguin, 2000), pp. 348-60 (pp. 350, 357).

[10] See *Evelyn Waugh: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Martin Stannard (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 233-71. Most reviewers such as J. D. Beresford in *The Manchester Guardian*, the anonymous reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement*, Henry Reed in *The New Statesman*, Rose Macaulay in *Horizon*, and Donat O'Donnell in *The Bell* admired Waugh's mastery of prose but deplored the messages it conveyed. Two exceptions were V. C. Clinton-Baddeley's review in *The Spectator*, which hailed *Brideshead* as Waugh's 'most ambitious novel and his best' (p. 238), and John K. Hutchens in *The New York Times Book Review*, claiming the novel as the author's 'finest achievement' (p. 244).

[11] Edmund Wilson, 'Splendors and Miseries of Evelyn Waugh', in *Classics and Commercials: A Literary Chronicle of the Forties* (London: W. H. Allen, 1950), pp. 298-305 (pp. 298, 299).

[12] Ibid., pp. 299, 300.

[13] Ibid., p. 302. Bradbury wrote in 1964 that *Brideshead* 'is probably Waugh's best known novel '(Bradbury, p. 85).

finding God introduced into my story.'[14] But, for Wilson, religion itself is not the problem; the problem is rather Waugh's failure to convey 'any actual religious experience.'[15] Waugh evoked God in his defence against Wilson's criticism only in order to launch an attack on high modernism:

> you can only leave God out by making your characters pure abstractions. Countless admirable writers, perhaps some of the best in the world, succeed in this. Henry James was the last of them. The failure of modern novelists since and including James Joyce is one of presumption and exorbitance. […] They try to represent the whole human mind and soul and yet omit its determining character – that of being God's creature with a defined purpose.[16]

Waugh's preface to the revised 1960 edition of the novel directly responds to such criticism as Wilson's.[17] While he would not give in on the melodramatic scenes, which, he believed, were 'essentially of the mood of writing', he was apologetic about *Brideshead*'s style: 'I am less happy about its form, whose more glaring defects may be blamed on the circumstances in which it was written.'[18] He then elaborated: 'It was a bleak period of present privation and threatening disaster – the period of soya beans and Basic English – and in consequence the book is infused with a kind of gluttony, for food and wine, for the splendours for the recent past, and for rhetorical and ornamental language, which now with a full stomach I find distasteful.'[19] Waugh certainly alluded to the so-called post-war settlement that brought in a Labour government and 'modernisation', which also prompted Eliot's critique in 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture' (1948). Like Waugh's novel, Eliot's treatise can be described as a nostalgic revisioning of England, remade in a feudal set of relations cemented by Christianity. Eliot understands 'the culture of a people as an *incarnation* of its religion', and 'Christian culture […] which has been the culture of Europe […] is the highest culture the world has ever known.'[20] In his

---

[14] Waugh, 'Fan-Fare', p. 302.
[15] Wilson, p. 301.
[16] Waugh, 'Fan-Fare', p. 302.
[17] See *Critical Heritage*, pp. 271-87. Reviewing the revised 1960 edition, David Pryce-Jones in *Time and Tide* and John Coleman in *The Spectator* found the revisions insubstantial: 'few and unimportant' for Pryce-Jones and 'in no way fundamental' in Coleman's opinion (pp. 272, 278), and both attacked Waugh's snobbery as the reviewers of the 1945 edition had done. Frank Kermode's famous essay, entitled 'Mr Waugh's Cities', in *Encounter* also took issue with Waugh's class bias in the novel, seen as 'the fullest statement of this image of the City, powered by that historical intransigence that equates the English aristocratic with the Catholic tradition' (p. 286).
[18] *BR*, pp. x, ix.
[19] Ibid., p. ix.
[20] T. S. Eliot, 'from Notes Towards the Definition of Culture', in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), pp. 292-305 (p. 299).

defence of class, he maintains:

> In an élite composed of individuals who find their way into it solely for their individual pre-eminence, the differences of background will be so great, that they will be united only by their common interests, and separated by everything else. An élite must therefore be attached to *some* class, whether higher or lower: but so long as there are classes at all it is likely to be the dominant class that attracts this élite to itself.[21]

For Eliot, 'a vigorous society there will be visible both class and élite, with some overlapping and constant interaction between them.'[22] Eliot's and Waugh's version of F. R. Leavis's earlier 'organic community', reviles the new era of welfare statism, also ridiculed by Waugh in his post-war journalism, particularly 'What to Do with the Upper Classes: A Modest Proposal' (1946), and his short story, 'Love Among the Ruins: A Romance of the Near Future' (1952).[23]

Drawing attention to the datedness of *Brideshead*, Waugh, however, eschewed an important issue, which is the influence of high modernism. Stylistically, the novel revisits high modernism in its introspection and retrospection, a style that he had previously denounced. Given the novel's unique style in Waugh's oeuvre, a discussion of the novelist's 'anxiety of influence' becomes all the more pertinent. In his influential study, *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), Harold Bloom, drawing on Nietzsche's *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887) and Freud's mechanisms of defence, proposes 'six revisionary ratios': '*clinamen*', '*tessera*', '*kenosis*', '*daemonization*', '*askesis*', and '*apophrades*'.[24] As if in an effort to venture inside, *Brideshead*, and Powell's mid-career 12-volume cycle, *A Dance to the Music of Time* (1951-1975), too, attempt their own *apophrades*, 'or the return of the dead':

> The later poet, in his own final phase, already burdened by an imaginative solitude that is almost a solipsism, holds his own poem so open again to the precursor's work that at first we might believe the wheel has come full circle, and that we are back in the later poet's flooded apprenticeship, before his strength began to assert itself in the revisionary ratios. But the poem is now *held* open to the precursor, where once it *was* open, and the uncanny effect is that the new poem's achievement makes it seem to us, not as though the precursor were writing it, but as though the later poet himself had written the precursor's characteristic work.[25]

Perhaps Waugh felt that there was enough distance now for him at last to return to

---

[21] Ibid., p. 300.
[22] Ibid., p. 301.
[23] F. R. Leavis and Denys Thompson, *Culture and Environment: The Training of Critical Awareness* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1959), p. 87.
[24] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 14-16.
[25] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

the canonical style of the previous generation, believing it to be safely dead, but it is more likely that, like Pinfold, haunted by the ghosts of his unconscious, however successfully suppressed in the past, Waugh was forced at last to confront the meaning for him of high modernism. That was, as it were, his mid-career crisis. *Brideshead*'s *problem* therefore is not, as Waugh understood it, its popularity, but more its style, or more specifically, its uncomfortable closeness to high modernism.

By the time Waugh began *Brideshead*, high modernism was already beginning to feel part of British, or more precisely perhaps, part of English heritage culture. Considering 'the relationship between a fading imperialism and the putative death of English modernism (understood as the last major phase of English literature)', Jed Esty in his *A Shrinking Island* (2004) focuses on 'late modernism's indirect and mediated representations of imperial contraction in the form of an "anthropological turn" manifested in both cultural doctrine and literary style.'[26] Esty argues that late, if not last, works of canonical high modernists such as Eliot's *Four Quartets* (1943), Woolf's *Between the Acts* (1941), and Forster's pageant plays 'reveal the inner logic and stylistic contours of a major literary culture caught in the act of becoming minor.'[27] But it is 'a sense of British crisis and English opportunity.'[28] Viewed only as a counterexample, Waugh's generation is rendered irrelevant to 'the entwined story of late modernism and late imperialism' because texts such as *Decline and Fall* and Greene's *Brighton Rock* (1938) 'are overtly based on the predicament of a provincial ex-empire.'[29] For Esty, *A Handful of Dust* 'offers a satirical acknowledgement of its own self-enclosure in the elite traditions of English country-house and imperial romance fiction, all the more so because it is only able to invert and parody those genres rather than write its way out of their shadow.'[30]

Notably, Esty understands 'late modernism' differently from Miller, who introduces the term to open up modernism by (re)considering those writers and works that have previously been marginalised or excluded by the dominant version of modernism, which has been taken to represent modernism. Although Esty defines late modernism as the period between 1930 and 1960, his study concentrates

[26] Jed Esty, *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 2.
[27] Ibid., p. 3.
[28] Ibid., p. 19.
[29] Ibid., p. 8.
[30] Ibid., p. 222.

primarily on the thirties and early forties and fails to examine in detail literary works published after the Second World War or by the generation of writers after high modernism, both of which are generally acknowledged as mid-century. Esty's 'late modernism', in fact, refers to the late stage of high modernism; his discussion of 'late modernism', or rather a rereading of high modernism, is very much situated within the modernist canon, now challenged particularly by scholars of late modernism. If late modernism, as Esty argues, is characterised by the turn away from Britishness to Englishness, or 'the fading significance of English universalism and the emergent significance of English particularism', and the transition from empire to welfare state, *Brideshead*, pertinent to such a discussion, should be considered within the context of late modernism.[31]

Remembering his Oxford days, the middle-aged Charles Ryder is tempted to rewrite the past:

> I should like to think – indeed I sometimes do think – that I decorated those rooms with Morris stuffs and Arundel prints and that my shelves were filled with seventeenth-century folios and French novels of the second empire in Russia-leather and watered silk. But this was not the truth. On my first afternoon I proudly hung a reproduction of Van Gogh's *Sunflowers* over the fire and set up a screen, painted by Roger Fry with a Provençal landscape […] My books were meagre and commonplace – Roger Fry's *Vision and Design*, the Medici Press edition of *A Shropshire Lad*, *Eminent Victorians*, some volumes of *Georgian Poetry*, *Sinister Street* and *South Wind* – and my earliest friends fitted well into this background […][32]

In his efforts to efface the high modernism of the Bloomsbury Group from his memory, Charles attempts to deny its influence. Situated alongside the Edwardians and even the Victorians, Fry and Strachey are dismissed as now obsolete. Contrary to Powell's *Books Do Furnish a Room* (1971), the tenth book in the *Dance* sequence, Charles's friends seem to furnish his room and books. Having spent only an afternoon with the Romantic Sebastian, at whose luncheon party Anthony Blanche 'in languishing tones recited passages from *The Waste Land*',[33] Charles is completely under Sebastian's charm, privileging aestheticism over intellectualism. As soon as he returns to his rooms, he removes the screen. It is the end of high modernism, for Charles, but not for Waugh.

In 'Modernist Nostalgia/Nostalgia for Modernism' (2013), Marina MacKay expands the theme of nostalgia in *Brideshead* to the novel's style. MacKay regards

[31] Ibid., pp. 5, 4.
[32] *BR*, pp. 22-23.
[33] Ibid., p. 28.

Waugh, with his mid-career departure, *Brideshead*, and Powell, with his mid-career departure, *Dance*, as 'two of modernism's differently untimely admirers', and she observes that as 'in the 1930s […] modernism is becoming a thing of the past'; 'what is particularly interesting about these retrospective projects is that by the time of writing, "modernist nostalgia" was not a mode novelists could unthinkingly reprise, but, rather, modernism itself had become something to be nostalgic *for*.'[34] Notably, modernism is here still defined as high modernism. MacKay reads *Brideshead* as a reflective work on high modernism: 'Throughout this novel there is a deep unease about trying to do Proustian modernism "straight", an unease we might take as expressive of Waugh's sense that there is something inherently misguided about trying in the mid-1940s to "do" modernism at all. And this is very much a novel about aesthetic anachronism'.[35] If *Brideshead* revisits not only a significant historical moment, the twenties, but also the literary style that defines it, it explains why the novel, after many failed attempts, was successfully adapted in the eighties, when modernist studies was dominated by the reading of its aesthetics as constituting an 'inward turn'. MacKay considers *Brideshead* in the context of high modernism but does not make any claim to situate Waugh as a modernist, high or otherwise. Moreover, it is hardly the case that it was in the mid-century that Waugh and Powell suddenly found themselves at once attracted to certain high modernist predecessors (Proust, but not Woolf) and compelled to maintain enough distance because of their acute awareness of the danger involved in not doing so. 'Admirer' then is not an entirely accurate description. Waugh's generation of writers, in particular his group of exterior modernists, had a troubled relationship with high modernism from the very beginning of their careers in the late twenties when they consciously sought a different literary voice from that of Woolf and Joyce, who were still actively creating new works and evolving their styles.

Critics such as Bradbury, Carens, and Davis emphasise the significance of the unusual first-person narrator in *Brideshead*.[36] Waugh, in fact, used this narrative voice in *Work Suspended* (1939, first published in 1942). Now collected as a short story, the piece was originally intended as the first two chapters of a novel. Seeking publication as a 'fragment', Waugh explained in his letter to Alexander Woollcott

[34] MacKay, 'Modernist Nostalgia', p. 237.
[35] Ibid., p. 240.
[36] Bradbury, p. 77; Carens, *Satiric Art*, p. 106; and Davis, *Forms*, p. 203.

that the work could not be finished because 'the world in which and for which it was designed, has ceased to exist.'[37] Sharing similar concerns (particularly memory) and moods (a sense of irrevocable loss, pathos, and nostalgia), it anticipates *Brideshead*. The unfinished novel – unfinishable, according to the author himself – is therefore a forerunner, no less and, perhaps, no more.

Another unfinished work of a novelist friend of Waugh's, namely Green's *Mood* (1926), may shed light on the difficulties Waugh encountered with *Work Suspended* and *Brideshead*. Years later, in 'An Unfinished Novel' (1960), published in *The London Magazine*, Green expounded the reason why he had had to abandon what would have been his second novel: 'That this happened was due I now feel sure to the basic weakness of the construction, a succession of moods indeed, just reflections with no action. And so, as the surge of ideas slowed down, I lost heart'.[38] So the problem, for Green, was 'the lack of animation, which is probably the first sign of dissolution, the seeds of death'.[39] There is action in *Mood*, not least the protagonist Constance Igtham's walking down Oxford Street towards Hyde Park; Green contrasted action, in the same sense Waugh used the word when he explained his interests in drama, speech, and events, with thought, or any activities which happen inside the mind. Green illustrated how *Mood* could have been improved: 'The passage starts a long return by Constance as she sits in Hyde Park, a "flash back" in her mind to her time with Celia by the Mediterranean. It would read better if carried out in dialogue, the "do you remember" sort of thing, with Constance's young man also present to act as a foil.'[40]

Notably that is how *Living*, Green's second novel, and *Party Going* solve the problem of *Mood*: with dialogue. *Party Going*, in particular, resembles *Mood* (Constance sitting in Hyde Park for example) in that it does not contain much action, for the characters spend much of the time stranded in the hotel rooms of a railway terminus. The movement in the novel is primarily afforded by dialogue, which requires the characters to group and regroup in the way dancers in a classical ballet constantly form and change patterns.[41] If Green, as suggested by his correspondence

[37] Waugh quoted in *Complete Short Stories*, p. 227.
[38] Green, 'An Unfinished Novel', in *Surviving*, pp. 251- 59 (p. 256).
[39] Ibid., p. 258.
[40] Ibid., p. 257.
[41] Treglown suggests a link between the narrative structure of *Party Going* and the ballet *Les Sylphides* (Treglown, p. 104). I would suggest a more general formal link between *Party Going* and

with Nevill Coghill, was still working on *Mood* in the early thirties,[42] which coincided with his composition of *Party Going*, it was with *Party Going* and, more significantly, exterior modernism that Green rejected *Mood* and a tendency to imitate Woolf. The young writer's unfinished novel immediately recalls *Mrs Dalloway*, published a year before, not least with its very first sentence: '*She walks down Oxford Street.*'[43] Thanks to literary critics such as Rachel Bowlby and Deborah Parsons, the image of a female character walking the streets of London, particularly Oxford Street, watching the shop windows and thinking in a stream-of-consciousness manner, more often than not, to work out some problems in her life, has become unmistakably a signature motif of high modernism.[44] The sensibility and imagination with which Green created female experience demonstrate remarkable novelistic power: 'But he was a man. She felt he had been half mocking at her for being a woman.'[45] However, it seems all too similar to *Mrs Dalloway*, which might have inspired *Mood*.

So, although Green did not say it explicitly, the real reason which prevented him from finishing the novel seems to have been anxiety concerning the influence of high modernism, and Woolf more specifically. This is also true of *Work Suspended* and, to some extent, of *Brideshead*. For Green, moods are inadequate as means to move a story forward; he therefore resorted to '[t]his so-called symbolism, the love for a significant object' in *Mood*:[46]

> Her father, Mr Igtham's room looked to be what he was, comfortable and prosperous, also a country gentleman. […] That vase was very ugly and faded, chipped and old, but he held it in a great affection because he could remember where it stood when he was small and his nurse was washing him, and tickling him. […] he worshipped his childhood and his parents in that vase.[47]

But Green did not contemplate seriously the possibility of locating moods in objects, which Waugh would utilise in *Brideshead* to explore depth of feeling without

---

any classic ballet.

[42] Green, 'Mood', in *Surviving*, pp. 28-47 (p. 28).

[43] Ibid.

[44] See Rachel Bowlby, *Feminist Destinations and Further Essays on Virginia Woolf* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997), particularly the chapter 'Walking, Women and Writing', pp. 191-219. And Deborah Parsons, *Streetwalking the Metropolis: Women, the City, and Modernity* (2000).

[45] Green, 'Mood', p. 46.

[46] Green, 'An Unfinished Novel', p. 253.

[47] Green, 'Mood', p. 32.

entering the character's heart or mind, or other bodily locations of emotions.[48]

The Heritage Novel: Objects and Emotions

Not simply a country house novel, *Brideshead* is more precisely also a heritage novel, envisaged as such by the novelist himself. In 1959, Waugh explained how 'impossible to foresee, in the spring of 1944, the present cult of the English country house' and how he 'piled it on rather, with passionate sincerity': 'Much of this book therefore is a panegyric preached over an empty coffin. […] It is offered to a younger generation of readers as a souvenir of the Second War rather than of the twenties or of the thirties, with which it ostensibly deals.'[49] The novel is 'a souvenir', a work of art that freezes a particular moment, which immediately recalls not only the Grecian urn but also Keats's ode to it.[50] With a mission to record and preserve things that are deemed valuable and endangered for the benefit of future generations, such a novel, not surprisingly, has an artist protagonist who paints stately homes and the country houses before their decay or destruction. Charles's first commission is Marchmain House before it is converted into a block of flats, which is seen by Charles as destruction rather than modernisation. Moreover, the fact that Mrs Beaver in *A Handful of Dust* also turns historic houses in London into flats and provides a hotbed for affairs such as Brenda and her son's suggests already a sense of immorality surrounding these conversions. Contrary to an artist's intuition, Charles admits that what he admires in a building is less its artistic value than its history and tradition: 'More even than the work of the great architects, I love buildings that grew silently with the centuries, catching and keeping the best of each generation, while time curbed the artist's pride and the Philistine's vulgarity, and

[48] Drawing on the enactive and embodied mind, Giovanna Colombetti argues that 'affective phenomena such as emotions and moods come with a variety of bodily experiences'. Giovanna Colombetti, *The Feeling Body: Affective Science Meets the Enactive Mind* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014), p. xv.

[49] *BR*, p. x.

[50] Rodney Delasanta and Mario L. D'Avanzo argue for the unity of truth and beauty in *Brideshead*: 'Does Keats's bride teach us that Beauty is Truth? Waugh's Bride reminds us that Truth is also Beauty.' Rodney Delasanta and Mario L. D'Avanzo, 'Truth and Beauty in *Brideshead Revisited*', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 11/2 (1965), 140-52 (p. 145). By contrast, Heath contrasts Brideshead with the urn and points out an 'important discrepancy': 'while truth is always morally beautiful, it may not be physically prepossessing, and physical beauty may conceal error and immaturity' (Heath, *Prison*, pp. 173, 174). Heath's criticism of Sebastian, however, tends to be harsh.

repaired the clumsiness of the dull workman.'[51] Although Charles here discusses buildings, it is certainly also true of his view of the English aristocracy being part and custodians of a tradition on which they, in turn, build; the identification of the aristocrats and their ancestral seats, particularly their intertwined fate (of extinction) is made explicit in Waugh's preface. Charles's painterly eye affords him a meticulous attention to the details of objects, but he is also interested in the values that are associated with the objects and the emotions they evoke.

MacKay suggests that by revisiting high modernism, Waugh and his fellow exterior modernists managed to produce better fiction because this return offered them access to more depth: 'a mid-century "modernist nostalgia" could inspire the creation of novels more complex than the sometimes cartoonishly conservative real-life politics of writers like Waugh, Green, and Powell would otherwise allow.'[52] *Brideshead*, for MacKay, is therefore a product of 'the high modernism of the mid-century imagination.'[53] The strength of the novel, however, lies not in the examination of the mind – or in Woolf's words: 'Let us record the atoms as they fall upon the mind in the order in which they fall, let us trace the pattern, however disconnected and incoherent in appearance, which each sight or incident scores upon the consciousness' – but in its exploration of depth of feeling, which is eschewed in Waugh's earlier work.[54] Bradbury argues that *Brideshead* is 'a fable about providence and also a novel of sentiments – that is, we are less interested in the moral conduct of the characters than in the emotions (love, nostalgia, affection, prejudice, faith) that explain it.'[55] Critical of the novel and in favour of Waugh's earlier satirical work, Carens goes further to suggest that '[m]ore disturbing even than the structural flaw of *Brideshead* is the novelist's tendency so to romanticize experience that his tone degenerates into sentimentality.'[56]

Emotions in the novel are not displayed in a process of spelling out and laying bare; rather, they are articulated or expressed indirectly through their relation to certain objects. Eliot's concept of the 'objective correlative', when he contemplates the problem of *Hamlet*, usefully throws light on the relationship between emotions

[51] *BR*, pp. 211-12.
[52] MacKay, 'Modernist Nostalgia', p. 249.
[53] Ibid., p. 248.
[54] Woolf, 'Modern Fiction', p. 9.
[55] Bradbury, p. 88.
[56] Carens, *Satiric Art*, p. 106.

and objects as portrayed by Waugh in *Brideshead*: 'The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an "objective correlative"; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that *particular* emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked.'[57] This is Hamlet's, and Shakespeare's, problem as Eliot sees it:

> The artistic 'inevitability' lies in this complete adequacy of the external to the emotion; and this is precisely what is deficient in *Hamlet*. Hamlet (the man) is dominated by an emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in *excess* of the facts as they appear. […] that Hamlet's bafflement at the absence of objective equivalent to his feelings is a prolongation of the bafflement of his creator in the face of his artistic problem.[58]

If the expression of feelings can be – should be, as Eliot argues – impersonal, or the inner (emotions) can be externalised and projected on to the world (of objects), *Brideshead*, in spite of the close proximity of all Waugh's novels to high modernism, is still in that sense an exterior modernist work.

In 'Feeling Things' (2012), Steven Connor states that 'our dependence on objects is not one source of emotion among others – it is emotion (= "moving out") itself.'[59] Although there is no mention of distributed cognition, Connor's rejection of the Cartesian view of thinking aligns his analysis to the extended mind thesis. Extended cognition can certainly inform such an understanding as Connor's of the relationship between things, or objects, and human beings, or subjects: 'only things can give us the faculty of reaching out, of extending into the world. Only by not giving themselves to me can things help give me to myself, by embodying the possibility that there is in fact a world for me to be in that is more than my own autistic empire of self-seeming, which is to say the saving possibility that I may not be everything'.[60]

In 'Extending the Extended Mind: The Case for Extended Affectivity' (2014), Giovanna Colombetti and Tom Roberts contend that '[t]he domain of the affective, too, can extend beyond the skin. […] the arguments deployed to motivate an extended treatment of belief, memory, planning, and calculation can be applied to

---

[57] T. S. Eliot, 'Hamlet', in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), pp. 45-49 (p. 48).
[58] Ibid.
[59] Steven Connor, 'Feeling Things', last accessed 25 May 2016, <http://stevenconnor.com/feelingthings.html>. It was a talk given at *Objects of Emotion* at Wellcome Collection in London on 16 June 2012.
[60] Ibid.

cases of mood, sentiment, temperament, character, and emotion.'[61] One of their examples is a grieving jazz saxophonist, who improvises as she plays. Her

> playing sets up a mutually constraining cycle of affective responding and expression: the qualities of the music performed, and of the actions and gestures initiated, feed back into the character of the musician's emotional experience, which in turn governs what she plays next. A self-stimulating, coupled relationship is instantiated between musician and instrument, that is quite unlike the unidirectional casual link that holds between an environment happening and a feeling response in ordinary cases.[62]

What is essential for such a relationship to occur is incorporation: objects are 'incorporated by the subject in such a way that a relatively stable, enduring system can be identified, whose functional properties are, intuitively, recognizably mental in character.'[63]

Interestingly, affect, as defined by Gregory Seigworth and Melissa Gregg in their important collection *The Affect Theory Reader* (2010), is intrinsically extended:

> Affect arises in the midst of *in-between-ness*: in the capacities to act and be acted upon. Affect is an impingement or extrusion of a momentary or sometimes more sustained state of relation *as well as* the passage (and the duration of passage) of forces or intensities. […] affect is persistent proof of a body's never less than ongoing immersion in and among the world's obstinacies and rhythms, its refusals as much as its invitations.[64]

Such a definition of affect at once verifies Colombetti and Roberts's claim about extended affectivity and renders it redundant.[65] Like Connor, Seigworth and Gregg do not engage explicitly with the distributed cognition thesis but they do mention 'non-Cartesian traditions in philosophy' in their theorisation.[66]

Based on Émile Durkheim's 'emotional intensification collective effervescence', Randall Collins develops his 'theory of interaction rituals (IRs).'[67] Collins regards

---

[61] Giovanna Colombetti and Tom Roberts, 'Extending the Extended Mind: The Case for Extended Affectivity', *Philosophical Studies*, 172/5 (2015), 1243-1263 (p. 1260).

[62] Ibid., pp. 1258-59.

[63] Ibid., p. 1246.

[64] Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, 'An Inventory of Shimmers', in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. by Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 1-25 (p. 1).

[65] Similar to Colombetti and Roberts, Jan Slaby, in theorising extended emotion, does not consider affect's intrinsic extendedness. Moreover, he argues for the incompatibility between the extended mind (EM) 'orthodoxy' and extended emotion and the need for 'a potential revision of the EM framework so that it may encompass emotions and other phenomenal experiences.' Jan Slaby, 'Emotions and the Extended Mind', in *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, ed. by Christian von Scheve and Mikko Salmela (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 32-46 (p. 33).

[66] Seigworth and Gregg, p. 6.

[67] Randall Collins, 'Interaction Ritual Chains and Collective Effervescence', in *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, ed. by Christian von Scheve and Mikko

emotions as 'intrinsically social […] in that they are predictable responses to particular kinds of social interactions; but also they are often collective – they are strengthened by being shared with others.'[68] If understood as 'intrinsically social' and 'often collective', emotions, religious feelings in particular, are, and should be, impersonal in order to be shared to create a sense of community. For Collins, a successful IR results in 'solidarity, a feeling of belonging together in a common identity'; 'membership symbols, emblems that the group respect and which remind them of their common membership'; and 'emotional energy (EE) – a longer-lasting feeling that individuals take with them from the group, giving them confidence, enthusiasm, and initiative'.[69] Collins's IR theory can elucidate the Catholic theme of *Brideshead*.

Bringing into dialogue Eliot's 'objective correlative', distributed cognition, and affect theory, I therefore argue that the key to the technique and preoccupation of *Brideshead*, which also mediates its relation to high modernism, is that in its world emotions, at once embodied and extended, not only have corresponding objects but also interact with them, and that it is through this dynamic interaction that emotions can be known. To examine the emotions in the novel, I focus on three key objects: the fountain and the chapel of Brideshead and Sebastian's teddy bear. While the fountain is associated with life in this world, the chapel represents divine grace. The novel traces the opposite trajectories of the fate of the fountain and the chapel: as the fountain wanes, the chapel waxes. At different stages, the same objects evoke emotions as disparate as happiness and pain. Notably, not a rejection of the worldly to achieve the divine, the ideal is *both* the fountain *and* the chapel, but it seems intended that the chapel, regarded as fundamental, should always be given hermeneutic priority. Aloysius, Sebastian's anthropomorphised teddy bear, serves as an imaginary friend and, most significantly, a male companion. Sebastian's preoccupation with childhood can be viewed as his attempt to escape the present by returning to a time of innocence before the dawning of awareness of sexuality. Sebastian is unable to reconcile his homosexuality with either his family or his religion, epitomised by his mother, Lady Marchmain; however, because of this tension, he is able to unite the human and the divine, happiness and suffering.

Salmela (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 299-311 (p. 299).

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid., p. 300.

Charles's narrative reminiscence follows a chronological order except for the first event, or more precisely, image, which has been triggered by his return to Brideshead. The distillation of it from a whirling pool of more indistinct memories gives it a peculiar prominence. It epitomises his friendship with Sebastian at its initial stage, which is marked by happiness:

> On a sheep-cropped knoll under a clump of elms we ate the strawberries and drank the wine – as Sebastian promised, they were delicious together – and we lit fat, Turkish cigarettes and lay on our backs, Sebastian's eyes on the leaves above him, mine on his profile, while the blue-grey smoke rose, untroubled by any wind, to the blue-green shadows of foliage, and the sweet scent of the tobacco merged with the sweet summer scents around us and the fumes of the sweet, golden wine seemed to lift us a finger's breath above the turf and hold us suspended.
>
> 'Just the place to bury a crock of gold,' said Sebastian. 'I should like to bury something precious in every place where I've been happy and then, when I was old and ugly and miserable, I could come back and dig it up and remember.'[70]

This is happiness: the sense of lightness, of being lifted and suspended in the air. And this is beauty: youth and the colours of gold and green. It is a powerful image, described in a sensuous and elusive language. For Sebastian, and Charles, too, this is a moment of being that is worth cherishing for ever. Lest he forget, Sebastian feels the need to bury something equally precious, which resembles recording memorable events in a diary, to remind him if he revisits the same place in future. (Interestingly, Sebastian uses the speculative mood, as if he does not believe that he will ever grow old – particularly when he associates age with ugliness and misery – or that he will live to be old.) In other words, he finds an objective correlative for his emotion and expects the object to evoke the same emotion every time he sees it; in doing so, he extends his emotion to the object and the object is incorporated as part of himself. Memory is therefore not only temporal but also spatial, both subjective and objective. Sebastian's idea of memory, however, suggests a sense of sacrifice: burial is ritualistic, particularly in relation to death. To be able to remember later, one loses a bit of oneself in the past – or a bit of oneself dies – and only through the act of remembering can the piece of the lost, or dead, self be recovered, however momentarily.

The middle-aged Charles summarises his summer term with Sebastian as 'a brief

[70] *BR*, pp. 18-19.

spell of what I had never known, a happy childhood, and though its toys were silk shirts and liqueurs and cigars and its naughtiness high in the catalogue of grave sins, there was something of nursery freshness about us that fell little short of the joy of innocence.'[71] This happiness extends throughout the summer when they are inseparable, particularly at Brideshead and in Venice. Between Brideshead and Italy, the fountain is the link. Significantly, Charles's first sight of Brideshead prompts Sebastian to promise to show him the fountain:

> Beyond the dome lay receding steps of water and round it, guarding and hiding it, stood the soft hills.
> 'Well?'
> 'What a place to live in!' I said.
> 'You must see the garden front and the fountain.'[72]

But the promise is not fulfilled on Charles's first visit; Charles is shown the chapel instead. From the beginning, the fountain is firmly connected with life in this world, initially understood as a good life and associated with happiness, which elicits Charles's exclamation and envy. Charles is discovered by Sebastian at Oxford and subsequently exposed to a new way of life beyond his imagination.

Invited to stay at Brideshead, Charles feels: 'It was an aesthetic education to live within those walls, […] to sit, hour after hour, in the shade looking out on the terrace [at the fountain].'[73] Asked by Sebastian to draw the fountain, Charles, from the perspective of an artist studying an object in order to represent it and that of an art historian interested in its story, provides a detailed account:

> such a fountain as one might expect to find in a piazza of southern Italy; such a fountain as was, indeed, found there a century ago by one of Sebastian's ancestors; found, purchased, imported, and re-erected in an alien but welcoming climate.
> […] an oval basin with an island of sculptured rocks at its centre; on the rocks grew, in stone, formal tropical vegetation and wild English fern in its natural fronds; through them ran a dozen streams that counterfeited springs, and round them sported fantastic tropical animals, camels and camelopards and an ebullient lion, all vomiting water; on the rocks, to the height of the pediment, stood an Egyptian obelisk of red sandstone […][74]

Charles's description is so meticulously visual that the fountain can easily be constructed in the reader's mind. Not only is it a striking image, opulent and exotic, it promises an illustrious history. That the fountain comes originally from Italy is

[71] Ibid., p. 39.
[72] Ibid., p. 29.
[73] Ibid., p. 72.
[74] Ibid., p. 73.

significant in that it immediately evokes an image of Italy, similar to that portrayed in Forster's *A Room with a View* (1908), with all its romantic associations, not least sunshine, youth and adventure (think of the Grand Tour), love, happiness, artistic and sexual freedom, culture, and a classic education (such as the kind available to the Kingsmen in the Bloomsbury Group). *Brideshead* certainly pays homage to Italy, not only its art but – I will show later – also its religion.

Crucially for Charles the artist, the fountain is associated with creativity. Elated by what he calls the new-found beauty, Charles rejects both 'the puritanism of Ruskin' and 'the puritanism of Roger Fry' and, instead, talks about 'his sentiments at heart [being] insular and medieval' and his 'conversion to the Baroque': 'I felt a whole new system of nerves alive within me, as though the water that spurted and bubbled among its stones, was indeed a life-giving spring.'[75] Charles is walking on the ground of Brideshead, seeing vivid details and being moved to feel 'alive' (emotion suggests motion). The pen Charles uses to draw the fountain seems to become an extension of him, similar to the saxophone of a jazz improviser. The pen's movements, however subtle, affect the artist's emotions, and the artist's emotions, in turn, direct the movements of the pen. Not surprisingly, Charles feels inspired. Moreover, because he is happy, he finds happiness in everything. Notably this is in Charles's memory: after all his 'theme is memory, that winged host that soared about me one grey morning of war-time.'[76] So it is a movement through not only space but also time. The beautiful, evocative language paints Charles's reminiscence in a golden hue. If Charles had decided to paint instead of writing his story, his theme colours would have been gold and green. Revisiting the past, he not only re-enacts the events but also relives the emotions, and the emotions seem stronger and sharper than the events, the latter of which are generally considered more tangible and more easily conjured up. Discussing the significant role of emotion in remembering, Sue Campbell argues that 'the emotional valence of memory can subtly shift in relation to what we come to know and do and how we change. Thus, experiential memories

[75] Ibid., pp. 73-74.

[76] Ibid., p. 211. As cognition and affect, memory, a mental process, is also understood as distributed. John Sutton observes that distributed cognition – and situated cognition as well – challenges classical cognitivism 'by treating inner representations and traces as often incomplete, partial, and context-sensitive, to be reconstructed rather than reproduced, and by widening the representational realm outside the organismic boundary'. John Sutton, 'Remembering', in *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*, ed. by Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 217-235 (p. 229).

come to represent our biographies more generally, and bring us under their influence, as well as under the influence of the particular events in them.'[77]

While the fountain means happiness for Charles when he is with Sebastian, with Julia it witnesses some of his most painful experiences. This oscillation between extreme emotions seems highly Romantic in execution; both happiness and pain, however, prove to be transient and contingent because life itself seems chaotic. Charles is once again by the fountain, but this time with Sebastian's sister. Estranged from their respective spouses, Julia and Charles live together as a couple at Brideshead: 'There Julia sat, in a tight little gold tunic and a white gown, one hand in the water idly turning an emerald ring to catch the fire of the sunset; the carved animals mounted over her dark head in a cumulus of green moss and glowing stone and dense shadow, and the waters round them flashed and bubbled and broke into scattered flames.'[78] They are remembering the past and planning the future: '"I want to marry you, Charles."'[79] Supposedly another happy moment, like that of Charles and Sebastian's, which is worth remembering, the present is, however, fraught with something menacing. It is the same fountain with the same bubbling water, but the emotions it gives rise to seem very different. As gold (Julia's tunic) and green (her ring and the moss) remain on the palette, it is the additional red colour ('the fire of the sunset' and 'flames') that changes the mood and thus the entire painting. The atmospheric sunset catches not only the ring but also the fountain and the two characters. It heightens and contrasts the colours ('glowing stone and dense shadow') and emotions: the happiness of being together and (Julia's) guilt of '"living in sin"'.[80] With Sebastian, the happiness seems pure because there is harmony; with Julia, the happiness is marred by discord. It is also true that Julia's conflicting emotions are projected on to the fountain coloured by the fiery sunset: the juxtaposition of contrasting objects reflects her conflicted interior.

The sunset, however passionate and climactic, suggests the end. It is almost expected that someone will point out Julia's adulterous relationship with Charles and remind her of her sin. Soon Brideshead, the elder brother, who tolerates his sister and

---

[77] Sue Campbell, 'Our Faithful to the Past: Reconstructing Memory Value', in *Our Faithful to the Past: The Ethics and Politics of Memory*, ed. by Sue Campbell, Christine M. Koggel, and Rockney Jacobsen (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 30-49 (p. 34).
[78] *BR*, p. 259.
[79] Ibid., p. 261.
[80] Ibid., p. 267.

Charles in silent acquiescence, refuses to bring his wife home to meet them, because the wife, 'a woman of strict Catholic principle fortified by the prejudices of the middle class', will not approve of Julia's sin.[81] Julia leaves the room in visible distress and tears; Charles searches for her and eventually 'found her in the darkest refuge, on a wooden seat, in a bay of the clipped box which encircled the basin.'[82] Charles does not understand Julia's strong reaction, disproportionate, for him, to Brideshead's comments. Then still a non-believer, he feels helpless:

> I could do nothing; I was adrift in a strange sea; my hands on the metal-spun threads of her tunic were cold and stiff, my eyes dry; I was as far from her in spirit, as she clung to me in the darkness, as when years ago I had lit her cigarette on the way from the station; as far as when she was out of mind, in the dry, empty years at the Old Rectory, and in the jungle.[83]

This long sentence reveals the sentimentality eschewed in Waugh's interwar works. The use of metaphors to repeat, explain, and emphasise slows down the pace and creates a lingering effect. In Hemingway's style, which Waugh particularly admired and emulated in his novels written in the twenties and thirties, it could be divided into three short sentences and stripped down to the essentials: I could do nothing. My hands were cold and stiff, my eyes dry. I was far from her in spirit. The long version, however, does not disclose more than this short version; the indirectness and elusiveness of Waugh's text precisely suggest Charles's difficulty in articulating his emotions in a confused and frustrated state of mind.

Later, Charles and Julia find themselves by the fountain for a third time:

> 'It's like the setting for a comedy,' I said. 'Scene: a Baroque fountain in a nobleman's grounds. Act one, sunset; act two, dusk; act three, moonlight. The characters keep assembling at the fountain for no very clear reason.'
>
> […]
>
> 'Oh, don't talk in that damned bounderish way. Why must you see everything second-hand? Why must this be a play? Why must my conscience be a pre-Raphaelite picture?'[84]

Charles sees an analogy between his life and a play, acknowledging the illusion of free will and the existence of a mysterious hand, here understood as that of a writer. His ontological sense of being an actor in a play out of his own control resembles the Christian idea of predestination. Charles is often unaware of his religious sensibility,

---

[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., p. 268.
[83] Ibid., p. 270.
[84] Ibid., pp. 272-73.

but Brideshead points out at their first meeting that Charles, the agnostic, takes '"art as a means not as an end. That is strict theology"'.[85] Julia's blindness to what Brideshead, the staunch Catholic, can see in Charles, to some extent, betrays her own troubled relationship with her religion. Charles fails to see first-hand, not everything as Julia complains, but Catholicism, the one thing that underpins everything for believers, because he is an outsider and cannot understand. In finding analogies, metaphors, or anything but the thing itself, he attempts to relate to what he already knows to know the new thing. Learning about Catholicism in this way, Charles is gradually converting to it. His difficult journey of self-discovery contrasts with Rex's easy, insincere conversion. Lady Marchmain is well aware that Rex would do anything to marry Julia:

> 'He's the most difficult convert I have ever met.'
> 'Oh dear, I thought he was going to make it so easy.'
> 'That's exactly it. I can't get anywhere near him. He doesn't seem to have the least intellectual curiosity or natural piety.'[86]

Charles is right that life is volatile and that comedy and tragedy, because they are human, may well be the same.

The drama reaches its climax when Julia, in a rage, hits her lover but soon regrets. Julia's infliction of physical pain on Charles can be regarded as her desperate attempt to communicate her psychological pain, to extend her hatred and anger to share with him, and, in doing so, to make him understand. Significantly, she uses a switch, which mediates between them. But the object, which lashes Charles's face hard and leaves a mark and physical pain, fails to connect the two either by emotion or by understanding. Consequently, it has to be abandoned: 'the half-peeled wand […] floated white and black in the moonlight', silently witnessing the failure and futility of Julia's attempt, and the colours white and black are a reminder of the irreconcilable conflicts within her and the irreconcilable differences between the two.[87] To be with Charles, Julia can only suppress her pain or replace it. Here her pain, derived from Charles's lack of understanding, is substituted by another pain of hers which results from the pain she causes by punishing him physically. The reconciliation is only momentary.

---

[85] Ibid., p. 85.
[86] Ibid., p. 179.
[87] Ibid., p. 273.

The Chapel: Divine Grace

Upon the novel's publication in 1945, Waugh warned his readers that *Brideshead*, unlike *Decline and Fall*, was 'not meant to be funny' and explained that 'the general theme is at once romantic and eschatological. It is ambitious, perhaps intolerably presumptuous; nothing less than an attempt to trace the workings of the divine purpose in a pagan world'.[88] If the fountain bears the romantic plot, the chapel is the setting for the theological drama. Waugh's rationale behind his own conversion illuminates the underpinning theology in *Brideshead*. In 'Converted to Rome', published in *The Daily Express* on 20 October 1930, shortly after he was received into the Roman Catholic Church (on 29 September 1930),[89] Waugh explained that 'in the present phase of European history the essential issue is no longer between Catholicism, on one side, and Protestantism, on the other, but between Christianity and Chaos.'[90] For Waugh, 'Christianity is essential to civilization and […] it is in greater need of combative strength than it has been for centuries'; 'Christianity exists in its most complete and vital form in the Roman Catholic Church.'[91] In choosing Catholicism, Waugh chose order and civilisation. Waugh's understanding of civilisation as, not 'talking cinemas and tinned food, nor even surgery and hygienic houses, but the whole moral and artistic organization of Europe', of an urgent sense of crisis – Civilisation 'has not in itself the power of survival' – and of its relationship with Christianity – 'It came into being through Christianity, and without it has no significance or power to command allegiance' – shares Eliot's view on culture and Christianity, eloquently expressed in 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture'.[92]

Interestingly, Julia explains her decision to marry Charles as a wish '"to put my life in some sort of order in a human way, before all human order comes to an end."'[93] But, evident in Charles's relationships with Sebastian and Julia, both happiness and sadness prove to be ephemeral and erratic, because they are human. So *Brideshead* seems to suggest that human order does not exist and that the true

[88] Waugh quoted in *Critical Heritage*, p. 236.
[89] Stannard, *TEY*, p. 229.
[90] Waugh, 'Converted to Rome: Why It Has Happened to Me', in *EAR*, pp. 103-05 (p. 103).
[91] Ibid., p. 104.
[92] Ibid.
[93] *BR*, p. 272.

order can only be achieved through Catholicism. The Bright Young People's 'hunger for permanence' is, in Father Rothschild's words, 'almost fatal' and certainly futile precisely because they seek permanence in the human rather than the divine.[94] In *Brideshead*, a good life is associated with things Italian, the fountain in particular. Waugh certainly pays tribute to the country, not only its way of life but also its religion. As life seems intrinsically chaotic, transient, contingent, religion is unmistakably the more significant of the two. Waugh models the English nobility on their Italian counterparts, not least in *Brideshead* and *Sword of Honour*. Carens observes that '*Brideshead* associates the ideal values of aristocracy – continuity, order, honour – with the Roman Catholic religion.'[95] Reviewing Federico Fellini's *La Dolce Vita* (1960), Waugh dwelled not on the sensuous Trevi Fountain scene but on the scene of two revellers soberly and solemnly following the elderly members of their family to Mass. It epitomises 'a twitch upon the thread', the working of divine grace that Waugh took pains to convey in *Brideshead*.[96] The acute sense of the crisis of civilisation, which Waugh had felt thirty years ago when he entered the Church, remains, but the scene seems to afford a glimpse of hope: 'It was a reminder that Rome is for most Christians the capital of Christendom and that behind all the hubbub the essential population are industrious and pious […] The city has absorbed and civilized succeeding waves of barbarian invasion. It will conquer again in its own good time.' That is perhaps why Waugh found the scene 'very moving'.[97]

On Charles's first visit to Brideshead, Sebastian shows him the chapel as a matter not of religious but of aesthetic interest: '"You must see that. It's a monument of *art nouveau*."'[98] Entering the chapel, 'Sebastian dipped his fingers in the water stoup, crossed himself, and genuflected'; Charles copies him out of 'good manners', but his action angers his friend: '"Well, you needn't on my account. You wanted to do sight-seeing"'.[99] Sebastian's remark sounds harsh and hurtful particularly to Charles, the outsider who feels inferior, both socially and aesthetically. Sebastian excludes Charles from his religion and family, however, not because he regards them as *his* privileges only, but because they are things to which he finds it difficult to

[94] *VB*, p. 111.
[95] Carens, *Satiric Art*, p. 30.
[96] Book Three of the novel is entitled *A Twitch upon the Thread*.
[97] Waugh, 'These Roman Scandals', in *EAR*, pp. 540-42 (p. 542).
[98] *BR*, p. 33.
[99] Ibid.

reconcile himself. His overreaction precisely reflects this inner conflict, which Charles cannot understand, yet.

With his painterly eye, Charles studies the chapel:

> The whole interior had been gutted, elaborately refurnished and redecorated in the arts-and-crafts style of the last decade of the nineteenth century. Angels in printed cotton smocks, rambler-roses, flower-spangled meadows, frisking lambs, texts in Celtic script, saints in armour, covered the walls in an intricate pattern of clear, bright colours. There was a triptych of pale oak, carved so as to give it the peculiar property of seeming to have been moulded in Plasticine. The sanctuary lamp and all the metal furniture were of bronze, hand-beaten to the patina of a pock-marked skin; the altar steps had a carpet of grass-green, strewn with white and gold daisies.[100]

The thorough survey is conducted in a dispassionate and disinterested manner, disclosing no emotion or judgment. Charles does not seem interested in its history, either; Sebastian, however, mentions that the chapel was his father's wedding present to his mother, and thus firmly connects it with his family, his mother in particular. Charles's initial impression of the chapel, which can be described as cold and distant, is markedly different from his reaction to the fountain; in fact, not until the very end can he fully understand and appreciate the meaning of the 'small red flame',[101] which is now only '[t]he sanctuary lamp' for him. Throughout most of the novel, the chapel remains in the background, its significance only clarified slowly and gradually.

The chapel's existence is constantly threatened; its decay parallels the decline of the stately homes, which, for Charles, represent culture and civilisation. At the time of the chapel's closure, Charles is preoccupied with painting such houses as Marchmain House before they become extinct. Cordelia, who finds the chapel 'beautiful', breaks the news to him:

> 'They've closed the chapel at Brideshead, Bridey and the Bishop; mummy's Requiem was the last mass said there. After she was buried the priest came in – I was there alone. I don't think he saw me – and took out the altar stone and put it in his bag; then he burned the wads of wool with the holy oil on them and threw the ash outside; he emptied the holy-water stoop and blew out the lamp in the sanctuary, and left the tabernacle open and empty, as though from now on it was always to be Good Friday. I suppose none of this makes any sense to you, Charles, poor agnostic. I stayed there till he was gone, and then, suddenly, there wasn't any chapel there any more, just an oddly decorated room. I can't tell you what it felt like. […]'[102]

For Cordelia, the death of her mother means the loss of her family – Lady

[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid., p. 326.
[102] Ibid., pp. 83, 206.

Marchmain has somehow managed to keep the family together, except, of course, Lord Marchmain and Sebastian, who have escaped abroad – and possibly of her childhood home, Brideshead; most painfully, it means the loss of her spiritual home, the chapel. The death is therefore a tragedy on many levels. Drawing on Charles Moorman's grouping of 'the mythmaking mind and Eliot's notion of the unified sensibility under the concept of sacramentality', Patrick Query argues that '[t]he core of the sacramental point of view is the capacity to embrace simultaneously the utter physicality of form, in this case [the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist] the elements of bread and wine, and the utter intangibility of spiritual content, here the divine presence. At the same time, the temporal distance between present and past must be imaginatively collapsed.'[103] Cordelia's minute account is heartbreakingly beautiful: even the closure of the chapel is a ritual, elegantly performed, to no spectator, and pregnant with meaning and emotions.[104] As the ritual objects play an important part in the Catholic faith, their removal, particularly of the pyx which contains the consecrated bread, a symbol of the body of the Christ, leaves Brideshead and the family in perpetual suffering.

Away from Brideshead and further away from God, Charles the artist thrives:

> I had had my finger in the great, succulent pie of creation. I was a man of the Renaissance that evening – of Browning's renaissance. I, who had walked the streets of Rome in Genoa velvet and had seen the stars through Galileo's tube, spurned the friars, with their dusty tomes and their sunken, jealous eyes and their crabbed hair-splitting speech.[105]

The undertone of the older, reminiscing Charles is sarcastic: he sees folly in the younger self, the pride which makes him mistake imitation for creation. As he preys on the endangered great houses, he seems to take advantage of the decline of the chapel. The chapel is forgotten until the end of the novel when Lord Marchmain, who comes home to die, asks about it, contemplating sin and punishment and fearing death. The eschatological plot of *Brideshead* reaches its climax at Lord Marchmain's deathbed, not only in that the excommunicated shows his repentance by making the sign of cross and is thus forgiven and blessed, but also in that the novel's protagonist,

---

[103] Patrick Query, 'Catholicism and Form from Hopkins to Waugh', in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 37-44 (p. 38).

[104] On the importance of the 'ritual space', see Patrick Query, *Ritual and the Idea of Europe in Interwar Writing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 175.

[105] *BR*, p. 208.

having long resisted, finally accepts the faith. Both the repentance, certainly treated like a miracle, and the conversion, when Charles forgoes what Father Mowbray calls 'intellectual curiosity' and resorts to his 'natural piety', can be considered signs of 'a twitch upon the thread'.[106]

Charles's wartime visit to Brideshead, also the point of view from which he narrates his story, witnesses the completely different fate of the fountain and the chapel. The fountain, having seen glory and life, is dry and defaced by the soldiers and 'their cigarette-ends and the remains of the sandwiches'.[107] For Carens, 'Waugh, with the assurance of a mature artist and a mordant satirist, has lifted these details from the level of fact: he has transformed them into images of pain and disgust.'[108] By contrast, the chapel, having experienced decline and desertion, is restored: 'The chapel showed no ill-effects of its long neglect; the *art-nouveau* paint was as fresh and bright as ever; the *art-nouveau* lamp burned once more before the altar. I said a prayer, an ancient, newly-learned form of words'.[109] The 'homeless, childless, middle-aged, loveless' Charles is consoled and cheered up by the sight of 'a small red flame – a beaten-copper lamp of deplorable design relit before the beaten-copper doors of a tabernacle'.[110] It recalls Charles's debate with Brideshead concerning the chapel's value. Learning that Charles does not consider the chapel aesthetically pleasing – '"I don't happen to like it much"', Brideshead challenges him by making a distinction '"between liking a thing and thinking it good"'; Charles knows immediately that 'this disagreement was not a matter of words only, but expressed a deep and impassable division between us; neither had any understanding of the other, nor ever could.'[111] Returning after a long journey to the same place and seeing the same object, Charles now understands: although Charles the artist still finds little aesthetic value in the chapel, Charles the believer sees the good in it. Similar to the Mass-going scene in *La Dolce Vita*, the flame 'burning anew among the old stones'

---

[106] Gallagher argues that 'Waugh's often-reiterated belief that God "calls" every man and woman to perform some unique service, of which he or she alone is capable, is not a mere point of theology. […] it was a humanizing contribution to the Roman Catholicism of Waugh's day, which tended to reduce itself to a belief-system and moral-code aptly titled the "apparatus" of salvation. It also signalled a transition in Waugh, from a convert who felt Catholicism as intellectually compelling, to a mature believer who felt its reality.' Donat Gallagher, 'The Humanizing Factor: Evelyn Waugh's "Very Personal View of Providence"', in *Waugh without End*, pp. 21-36 (p. 21).

[107] *BR*, p. 322.

[108] Carens, *Satiric Art*, p. 105.

[109] *BR*, p. 325.

[110] Ibid., p. 326.

[111] Ibid., p. 83.

offers hope.[112]

Sebastian and His Teddy Bear

Charles revisits the chapel last and thus gives it the definitive last word. The novel's ending, which sees the decay of the fountain and the restoration of the chapel, seemingly suggests that devotion to God requires the denial of worldly life. Laura White seems to suggest a total rejection of beauty, art, and even life, more radical than 'the rejection of beauty as a mode of ultimate meaning': 'Pater, Bell, Huysmans, Fry, Eliot, Yeats, and all their modernist ilk have received Waugh's rebuke. That all of Waugh's own artistic achievement is implicitly rebuked as well […] seems not to have bothered Waugh any more than Charles is bothered by losing the golden opulence of Brideshead.'[113] In the novel, compared with the worldly, the heavenly, and the faith in it, is acknowledged as undoubtedly essential. Charles's, and Waugh's, intense lament of the loss of beauty and nostalgia for the idyllic pre-war life, however, points to a different conclusion. The sacrifice of personal possessions and human happiness is not expected by God but necessitated, in the case of *Brideshead*, by war, a *human* tragedy indeed. Although the war dictates the hardship of war-time living, *Brideshead*, and *Sword of Honour*, too, imply that the war affects the upper classes more than the lower: while the war hits the upper classes hard, to the point of making them extinct, it offers the lower classes, be it Rex, Hooper, or Trimmer, an opportunity to rise and take over.[114] The outlook for the post-war society is no less bleak: the Second World War for Britain is certainly regarded by Charles also as a class war, and the winners and losers are clear. The Britain, or more precisely England, Charles hankers after and wishes to return to, is epitomised by the Flytes at their height: aristocratic, feudal, rich, powerful, and devout. Like the elements of fire and water, both the chapel and the fountain are indispensable. It is less a matter of choice than a matter of priority. In *The Vocation of Evelyn Waugh* (2015), D. Marcel DeCoste views *Brideshead* as Waugh's 'serious meditation on Christian vocation and its compatibility with that call to literary art he hereby saw himself embracing. In Ryder's narrative – in its substance and in its execution as an act more of witness

[112] Ibid., p. 326.
[113] Laura White, 'The Rejection of Beauty in Waugh's *Brideshead Revisited*', *Renascence: Essays on Values in Literature,* 58/3 (2006), 181-94 (p. 191).
[114] Trimmer and Virginia's son becomes Guy's heir, a similar ending to that of *Howards End*.

than invention – we see the reconciliation of these two callings.'[115]

Sebastian, as full of inner conflicts as Julia, is able to unite the fountain and the chapel, or the human and the divine. His spirituality directs him naturally to God, but his homosexuality, viewed by the Church to be as grave a sin as Julia's adultery, makes it impossible for him to be fully reconciled with his religion or family. Serious discussion of the homosexual theme in *Brideshead* has been eschewed by critics until recently. Peter G. Christensen argues that *Brideshead* 'treats homosexuality sympathetically instead of condemning it. A chief tension in the novel is the struggle between two Catholicisms, a stifling version and a more generous and *catholic* spirit. By the end of the novel, catholic spirit triumphs.'[116] Comparing *Brideshead* with Forster's posthumous *Maurice* (1971), particularly their two protagonists, Charles and Maurice respectively, of 'similar personal and social backgrounds', Roberto A. Valdeón García comments on their different choices:

> Charles Ryder will opt for respectability, social position, tradition, joining the establishment. […] His choice is the spoken.
>
> On the other hand, Maurice Hall will reject his friend's insistence to join the ranks of heterosexual society. […] He opts for the unspoken.[117]

Charles then resembles Clive, the Sebastian figure in Forster's novel, who conforms to the expectations of society and family. Valdeón García, however, takes for granted that Charles is homosexual. But Charles's sexuality is, at best, ambiguous. For Christensen, 'a major conflict in the novel arises from the fact that Sebastian is gay and Charles is not.'[118] I tend to agree with Christensen on Charles's heterosexuality, but the major conflict in the novel, at least from Sebastian's perspective, is less their different sexual orientations – whether Charles is homosexual, heterosexual, bisexual, or undecided – than Sebastian's inner conflict between homosexuality and Catholicism.[119] Due to conformity, heterosexuality, or something else, Charles drifts

---

[115] DeCoste, p. 44.

[116] Peter G. Christensen, 'Homosexuality in *Brideshead Revisited*: "Something quite remote from anything the [builder] intended"', in *A Handful of Mischief: New Essays on Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher, Ann Pasternak Slater, and John Howard Wilson (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011), pp. 137-59 (pp. 137-38). Christensen then offers an overview (pp. 138-41) to show that 'many critics have failed to take the relationship of Sebastian and Charles and the role of homosexuality in the novel seriously. This trend is evident in criticism from 1958 to 1998' (p. 138).

[117] Roberto A. Valdeón García, 'The Spoken and the Unspoken: The Homosexual Theme in E. M. Forster and Evelyn Waugh', in *Waugh without End*, pp. 155-179 (p. 177).

[118] Christensen, p. 140.

[119] I will discuss in detail later Charles's and Sebastian's different ways of loving, made explicit to Charles by Cara, Lord Marchmain's Italian mistress.

away from Sebastian.

Charles is unable to understand Sebastian until he himself converts to Catholicism. An outsider, the younger, experiencing, agonistic Charles often relies on others to know his friend. It is, again, Charles's 'see[ing] everything second-hand' of which Julia complains. *Brideshead*'s multiperspectivism, similar to that in Woolf's *Jacob's Room*, offers a variety of views on Sebastian; unlike Jacob, who remains a mystery, however, a clear image of Sebastian seems to emerge from these fragmented accounts. Charles makes his feelings for Sebastian known but seems reticent about his opinion of his friend: he collects others' remarks without offering his own judgement. His ultimate conversion to Catholicism, the religion of his friend, perhaps serves as a final, yet unspoken, comment. Sebastian can therefore only be constructed through others' impressions, particularly those of Anthony, Cara, and Cordelia, mediated by Charles's memory and framed by his narration. Telling the story, Charles honestly admits that others can see in Sebastian what he then cannot, and acknowledges that he comes to an understanding of his friend only gradually. Notably for Charles, the process of knowing Sebastian parallels his discovery of God, and the two strands converge in the end: his acceptance of divine grace enables him to eventually understand his friend.

At Oxford, Anthony criticises Sebastian's charm and warns Charles of it. Had it not been for Charles's blind loyalty, he later admits to Sebastian, Anthony might 'almost [have] succeeded'.[120] Anthony's desperate and unsuccessful attempt to convert Charles to himself, however, undermines his critique of their mutual friend, which verges on a malicious assault out of jealousy and revenge:

> 'Tell me candidly, have you ever heard Sebastian say *anything* you have remembered for five minutes? You know, when I hear him talk, I am reminded of that in some ways nauseating pictures of "*Bubbles*". […]'
>
> And then Anthony spoke of the proper experiences of an artist, of the appreciation and criticism and stimulus he should expect from his friends, of the hazards he should take in the pursuit of emotion, of one thing and another while I fell drowsy and let my mind wander a little.[121]

Interestingly, Anthony associates Sebastian with bubbles; Charles often describes the water of the fountain at Brideshead as 'bubbled'.[122] A link between Sebastian and the fountain is therefore established. Davis argues that 'Blanche's appearance

[120] *BR*, p. 53.
[121] Ibid., p. 49.
[122] Ibid., pp. 74, 259.

implied a darker or more sinister side to the way of life offered by Sebastian.'[123] On the contrary, it is Blanche who tries to turn Charles away from the good. However modern, or modernist, and sophisticated, Anthony holds a Cartesian view of body and mind. He separates emotions from objects, and objects are for him linked with intellect. Sebastian is childlike and simple, crudely described by Anthony: '"Of course those that have charm don't really need brains."'[124] Anthony correctly points out Sebastian's intuition but wrongly mocks it because he fails to understand that his friend's charm and beauty lie in his spirituality, or the recognition of God in His every creation and the ability to unite objects and emotions. Sebastian says he '"must go to the Botanical Gardens […] [t]o see the ivy"' and explains to Charles, who has never been there: '"There's a beautiful arch there and more different kinds of ivy than I knew existed. I don't know where I should be without the Botanical Gardens."'[125] Sebastian's sense of wonder, or 'natural piety', leads him to the chapel, to God. Giving up his 'intellectual curiosity' and relying on his own 'natural piety', Charles the convert, long separated from Sebastian, is, paradoxically, closer to his friend spiritually than he has ever been. Comparing different versions of the novel, Davis observes: 'In the final version Sebastian is not presented as harmful to Charles's artistic career; Anthony is not the artist *manqué* but a potential audience and source of help.'[126] But I would suggest that Charles completely rejects Anthony in the end. Moreover, Charles's rejection of the high modernist character in the novel, who 'dined with Proust and Gide and was on closer terms with Cocteau and Diaghilev', can be regarded as Waugh's rejection of high modernism itself.[127]

In Venice, Cara remarks to Charles on the nature of his relationship with Sebastian:

> 'I know of these romantic friendships of the English and the Germans. They are not Latin. I think they are very good if they do not go on too long.'
>
> She was so composed and matter-of-fact that I could not take her amiss, but I failed to find an answer. […]
>
> 'It is a kind of love that comes to children before they know its meaning. In England it comes when you are almost men […]'[128]

Cara's frankness embarrasses and disturbs Charles. She seems to suggest that the

[123] Davis, *Writer*, p. 127.
[124] *BR*, p. 46.
[125] Ibid., p. 28.
[126] Davis, *Writer*, p. 132.
[127] *BR*, p. 40.
[128] Ibid., p. 92.

attraction between the same sexes is acceptable as long as it is only a passing phase. Charles finds it difficult to enter such a conversation because Cara's comment sounds also like a warning. Cara is well aware of the difference between Charles and Sebastian, from the ways they drink. Soon Charles realises, too, that: 'I got drunk often, but through an excess of high spirit, in the love of the moment, and the wish to prolong and enhance it; Sebastian drank to escape.'[129]

What Cara really wants to point out to Charles by talking indirectly about their different ways of drinking, and what Charles later seems to confirm, is their different ways of loving. Cara can see that '"Sebastian is in love with his own childhood. That will make him very unhappy. His teddy-bear, his nanny… and he is nineteen years old. …"'[130] Martin Green dismissively categorises Sebastian as the naïf, 'a form of *Sonnenkind*'.[131] Following Cara's argument, Sebastian's efforts to prolong his childhood can be considered his wish to perpetuate his 'romantic friendships' with other men. In other words, Charles may be homoerotic, but Sebastian is homosexual; this fundamental difference in particular and Sebastian's homosexuality in general will make him unhappy. Sebastian's preoccupation with his childhood can also be seen as his longing to return to a previous state in which sexuality play no conscious role. Effaced along with sexuality is the difference between Charles and himself. Moreover, without the awareness of his homosexuality, which is regarded by his religion as a sin, he can stop feeling guilty or shameful: Charles tells Lady Marchmain that Sebastian is '"ashamed of being unhappy"'.[132] The monastery where the dying Sebastian is looked after is an environment closest to the nursery. Ian Littlewood notes: 'In adult life the monastery will offer him the security that as a child he had found in the nursery.'[133] But what is known cannot be unknown.

Having returned to Brideshead after years abroad and a visit to Sebastian in the monastery, Cordelia speaks to a perplexed Charles of her brother's holiness: '"that's what you've got to understand about Sebastian."'[134] Frank Kermode acknowledges Sebastian's saintliness but suggests that he neither contributes to nor controls it: 'Sebastian, gifted with the power to attract love, attracts the love of God and is

[129] Ibid., p. 118.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Martin Green, p. 13. The two other types are the dandy and the rogue (p. 14).
[132] *BR*, p. 125.
[133] Ian Littlewood, *The Writings of Evelyn Waugh* (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1983), p. 163.
[134] *BR*, p. 287.

hounded through alcoholism and pauperism into simple holiness.'[135] It is too passive; Sebastian's holiness is achieved through his active and constant struggle within himself, so his agency should not be dismissed. Alcoholism and pauperism are signs; the irreconcilability of his homosexuality with his religion is the true cause of his suffering.[136] Cordelia thus imagines the end for Sebastian: '"He'll live on, half in, half out, the community […] Then one morning, after one of his drinking bouts, he'll be picked up at the gate dying, and show by a mere flicker of the eyelid that he is conscious when they give him the last sacraments."'[137] Although Cordelia seems unaware of the nature of Sebastian's struggle – nor does she contemplate it – she correctly notes Sebastian's in-betweenness, an outward sign of his inner conflict between the human and the divine. Cordelia here speaks in the future tense, but when Charles asks whether Sebastian suffers, Cordelia's reply seems to imply that Sebastian is already dead and now living in paradise: '"One can have no idea what the suffering may be, to be maimed as he is – no dignity, no power of will. No one is ever holy without suffering. […] He's in a very beautiful place, you know, by the sea – white cloisters, a bell tower, rows of green vegetables, and a monk watering them when the sun is low."'[138] As 'there was no past tense in Cordelia's verb "to love"', it is difficult to tell whether her imagined ending is not an alternative to Sebastian's real ending or wishful thinking.[139] Alive or not, Sebastian seems to have achieved immortality. Sebastian is what Sara Ahmed calls an 'unhappy queer', albeit one with a happy ending.[140] However, he neither achieves 'queer happiness' nor becomes 'happily queer'. Asexuality, either in the nursery or in the monastery, as an

[135] Frank Kermode, 'Mr Waugh's Cities', in *Critical Heritage*, pp. 279-87 (p. 285).

[136] Thomas Gilmore interprets Sebastian's alcoholism as a spiritual illness: 'His Catholicism sets such extremely high standards of conduct that Sebastian feels his departure from those standards more keenly than any non-Catholic could. The worse his drinking becomes, the more acutely Sebastian suffers from the widening gulf between his values and his drunken behavior.' Thomas B. Gilmore, *Equivocal Spirits: Alcoholism and Drinking in Twentieth-Century Literature* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), p. 39. Like Kermode, Gilmore does not see the real reason behind Sebastian's alcoholism as his homosexuality, which, more than his drinking, may be perceived by the orthodox view of Catholicism as 'a spiritual illness'. Like Kermode, Gilmore also denies Sebastian's agency, arguing that 'alcoholism is having a desirable effect, wasting the flesh and increasing Sebastian's spiritual purity. By reducing him to a condition of abject, childlike helplessness and dependence on God, a condition not natural for one of Sebastian's station, his alcoholism further contributes to this purity' (p. 45).

[137] *BR*, pp. 289-90.

[138] Ibid., p. 290.

[139] Ibid., p. 289.

[140] See 'Unhappy Queers', in Sara Ahmed, *The Promise of Happiness* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 88-120.

alternative to heterosexuality is unlikely to be satisfactory to queers: 'To be happily queer might mean being happy to be the cause of unhappiness […], as well as to be happy with where we get to if we go beyond the straight lines of happiness scripts.'[141] Ultimately, Sebastian, the 'affect alien', incapable of reproduction and thus identified by the family, a 'happy object', as the source of unhappiness, is made happy by his faith; spiritual fraternity saves him from unhappiness.[142]

Cordelia's description of the possible ending of Sebastian and her conclusion that '"[i]t's not such a bad way of getting through one's life"' immediately conjure up in Charles's mind the image of 'the youth with the teddy-bear under the flowering chestnuts' and his lamentation that '"[i]t's not what one would have foretold"'.[143] Similar to Charles Stringham in *Dance*, Sebastian fails to fulfil his promises. Not only does *Brideshead* as a whole have a clear circular structure, it is also full of nested intricate loops. Sebastian with Aloysius is how Charles remembers, and chooses to remember, his friend; it is also the beginning, to which Charles returns for a sense of closure. Sebastian is, however, primarily seen to be inseparable from his teddy bear at Oxford, particularly in that summer term which, for Charles, is 'a happy childhood'.[144] Although Charles has heard of Sebastian's reputation: 'his beauty, which was arresting, and his eccentricities of behaviour, which seemed to know no bounds', at first sight of Sebastian in person, Charles is 'struck less by his looks than by the fact that he was carrying a large teddy-bear.'[145] The bear not only has a name but also seems to take on a life of its, or rather his, own.[146] Sebastian

---

[141] Ibid., p. 115.

[142] Sara Ahmed, 'Happy Objects', in *The Affect Theory Reader*, pp. 29-51 (p. 30). In fact, all four Flyte children are 'affect aliens'.

[143] *BR*, p. 290.

[144] Ibid., p. 39.

[145] Ibid., p. 24.

[146] Aloysius enjoys an existence even outside the novel and the popular 1981 Granada television drama *Brideshead Revisited*, the latter of which has firmly established Aloysius's centrality as the third character. He is also seen between Charles and Sebastian on all kinds of promotional materials, such as DVD covers, posters, and stills. The 2008 film version of *Brideshead Revisited*, however, accentuates the role of Julia, who replaces Aloysius, and creates a love triangle which is neither in the novel nor to the point. The Granada *Brideshead* has triggered a teddy bear mania, which seems no end. See Ewan Fletcher, 'Found: Aloysius the Brideshead bear', *The Daily Mail*, 2 June 2007, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-459461/Found-Aloysius-Brideshead-bear.html>, and Jon Henley, William Leith, Andrew Martin, Guy Browning, and Oliver James, 'Man's Best Friend', The Guardian, 4 October 2008, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2008/oct/04/brideshead.revisted.teddies>. Moreover, Aloysius has a separate entry in Wikipedia. See 'Aloysius (Waugh)', *Wikipedia*, last accessed 15 June 2016, < https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aloysius_(Waugh) >. Similar to Castle Howard, the Brideshead

buys a hair brush for Aloysius:

> 'it had to have very stiff bristles, *not*, Lord Sebastian said, to brush him with, but to threaten him with a spanking when he was sulky. […]' The [barber], who, in his time, had had ample chance to tire of undergraduate fantasy, was plainly captivated. I, however, remained censorious, and subsequent glimpses of him, driving in a hansom cab and dining at the George in false whiskers, did not soften me, although Collins, who was reading Freud, had a number of technical terms to cover everything.[147]

Throughout his writing career and life, Waugh ridiculed and resisted Freud, particularly in 'The Balance' and *Pinfold*. But psychoanalysis is often able to offer insightful and interesting interpretations of Waugh's work, if not of the author himself. Sebastian's teddy bear can be considered to be what the paediatrician and psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott calls a 'transitional object'. In 'Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena' (1971), breaking down the individual and the world binary, Winnicott proposes 'the third part of the life of a human being': 'an intermediate area of *experiencing*, to which inner reality and external life both contribute. […] it shall exist as a resting-place for the individual engaged in the perpetual human task of keeping inner and outer reality separate yet interrelated.'[148] A 'transitional object' is understood as '*the original "not-me" possession*'.[149] So, like Otto's notebook, the Jazz improviser's saxophone, Charles's pen, and Sebastian's teddy bear, it operates in the extended field of cognition and emotion, which is neither entirely within nor entirely without. Children tend to resort to 'transitional objects', stuffed toys and comfort blankets in particular, to negotiate between the self and the world; adults need the same negotiation, but they do not normally employ classically recognised 'transitional objects' of the kind associated with children, at least not in public.[150]

That is why Sebastian's parading his teddy bear is considered (by adults) to be eccentric. Winnicott is concerned with '*illusion*, that which is allowed to the infant, and which in adult life is inherent in art and religion, and yet becomes the hallmark

---

of the 1981 television drama and the 2008 film, Aloysius, or the teddy bear in general, has become a heritage object.

147 *BR*, p. 24.

148 Donald Woods Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), p. 2. The original hypothesis was formulated in 1951.

149 Ibid., pp. 4, 5. See Winnicott's explanation of the relationship between 'transitional objects' and Melanie Klein's 'internal objects', pp. 9-10.

150 Privately, it is a different matter. See 'Third of Adults "Still Take Teddy Bear to Bed"', *The Telegraph*, 16 August 2010, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/howaboutthat/7947502/Third-of-adults-still-take-teddy-bear-to-bed.html>.

of madness when an adult puts too powerful a claim on the credulity of others, forcing them to acknowledge a sharing of illusion that is not their own.'[151] Although the barber indulges Sebastian in his 'undergraduate fantasy', not everyone tolerates his eccentricity.[152] At Sebastian's luncheon party,

> 'That beast Hobson has put Aloysius next door,' he said. 'Perhaps it's as well, as there wouldn't have been any plovers' eggs for him. D'you know, Hobson hates Aloysius. I wish I had a scout like yours […]'[153]

Hobson clearly does not share Sebastian's illusion. Moreover, Aloysius, an imaginary friend gendered as male, is Sebastian's public display of private feelings, or more precisely his homosexuality. His teddy bear is then as symbolic as Wilde's green carnation. Sebastian's identification with his teddy bear reveals his identity, as Sherry Turkle puts it: '*Objects are able to catalyze self-creation.* […] *we often feel at one with our objects.*'[154] On to Aloysius Hobson projects his hatred for Sebastian's immaturity and perhaps also his homosexuality. Upon Charles's arrival at Oxford, Cousin Jasper warns him preciously of people like Sebastian: '"Beware of the Anglo-Catholics – they're all sodomites with unpleasant accents."'[155] The warning betrays that homosexuality seems to be particularly related to the upper classes and is more common and more acceptable at public schools and Oxford and Cambridge than anywhere else and other stages of one's life.[156] In 'Plato's Apostles' (1997), Julie Anne Taddeo examines how the Cambridge Apostles, later core members of the Bloomsbury Group, such as John Maynard Keynes and Lytton Strachey, promote their 'New Style of Love', 'an alternative creed of manliness and transcendental love', to revolt, in the fellow Apostle Leonard Woolf's words, 'against the Victorian morality and code of conduct.'[157] Sebastian does not share the Apostles' polemics; instead, he makes a personal statement with his teddy bear. Their differences lie in class, intellect, and, most importantly, religion.

Having 'discovered' Charles, Sebastian becomes private again: he is interested

---

[151] Winnicott, p. 3.
[152] *BR*, p. 24.
[153] Ibid., p. 27.
[154] Sherry Turkle, 'Introduction: The Things That Matter', in *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*, ed. by Sherry Turkle (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2011), pp. 3-10 (p. 9).
[155] Ibid., p. 22.
[156] At the night club in London with Boy Mulcaster, Sebastian and Charles make efforts to be interested in two girls who think they are 'fairies'. It can be regarded as conformity to the expectations of an environment distinct from Oxford, if not society itself. *BR*, pp. 105, 106.
[157] Julie Anne Taddeo, 'Plato's Apostles: Edwardian Cambridge and the "New Style of Love"', *Journal of History of Sexuality*, 8/2 (1997), 196-228 (p. 197). Leonard Woolf quoted in Taddeo, ibid.

in an exclusive relationship with Charles.[158] The middle-aged narrator's realisation that 'to know and love one other human being is the root of all wisdom' is high praise for his friend.[159] Loving Charles, Sebastian shares everything with him, 'though its toys were silk shirts and liqueurs and cigars'.[160] Littlewood argues that 'in [the] image of Aloysius as a heathen fetish, it is implied that the security of childhood, the nursery world that is to be found at Brideshead, might also constitute a rival good to God's.'[161] Critical of this 'rival good', Littlewood, however, unwittingly points out that, for Sebastian, Aloysius, a symbol of his homosexuality, *is* a rival to God and that the adult Sebastian sets up a nursery environment to defend himself against God, or his own guilty conscience about his *sin*. More than 'toys', Sebastian shares Nanny Hawkins; it is to see her, '"a friend"', that Sebastian brings Charles to Brideshead for the first time.[162] Nanny Hawkins, for Sebastian, is synonymous with his childhood, the happy time when sexuality is unknown and unimportant. Introducing his nanny to Charles, Sebastian reveals to him something most private and intimate about himself. Notably, Nanny Hawkins with her rosary is a devout Catholic; objects in *Brideshead* seem to define their owners.[163] Similar to showing Charles the family chapel, introducing Nanny Hawkins to Charles, Sebastian unawares leads Charles to Catholicism, which he avoids contemplating because of his homosexuality.

The young Charles happily plays with Sebastian and shares his wine, strawberries, figs, orchids, cigars, Brideshead, and many other material things, but he does not accept Aloysius or Sebastian's faith: both the bear, the personification of his homosexuality and his ideal of male bonding, and Catholicism are dismissed by Charles as Sebastian's foibles.[164]

---

[158] *BR*, p. 28. Anthony Blanche says to Charles at their first meeting at Sebastian's luncheon party: '"I think it's perfectly brilliant of Sebastian to have discovered you."'

[159] Ibid., p. 39.

[160] Ibid.

[161] Littlewood, p. 134.

[162] *BR*, p. 19.

[163] Disapproving of the miscellaneous objects in Sebastian's room, Heath argues: 'His undiscriminating taste reflects his lack of discipline' (Heath, *Prison*, p. 176). Or it reflects Sebastian's spontaneity. With his intuition, Sebastian is a Romantic figure.

[164] In 'Murray: The Stuffed Bunny', collected in Sherry Turkle's *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With* (2011), Tracy Gleason, a developmental psychologist with a focus on young children's imaginary companions, studies her little sister Shayna's relationship with her stuffed bunny named Murray. Gleason notices that 'Murray's latest adventures […] reflect Shayna's current hopes, interests, and fears' and that 'Murray has nothing to do with intellect and everything to do with love.' Tracy Gleason, 'Murray: The Stuffed Bunny', in *Evocative Objects*, pp. 170-77 (pp. 174, 175). Like Murray,

> ‘Oh dear, it’s very difficult being a Catholic.’
> ‘Does it make much difference to you?’
> ‘Of course. All the time.’
> ‘Well, I can’t say I’ve noticed. Are you struggling against temptation? You don’t seem much more virtuous than me.’
> ‘I’m very, very much wickeder,’ said Sebastian indignantly.[165]

Sebastian cannot tell Charles that his ‘temptation’ is his attraction to and love for men. Evident from his difficult conversation with Cara, Charles is, to some extent, aware of the different sexual orientations between them. Sebastian’s rescue of Charles from the female guests at Charles’s college in Eights Week – ‘“You’re to come away at once, out of danger”’ – and his effort to keep his friend away from his family, Julia in particular, betray his awareness, or at least suspicion, of Charles’s attraction to women.[166] So Sebastian and Charles, who is ‘in search of love in those days’, are both accomplices in their ‘romantic friendship’, which they know, like youth and many other beautiful things, will not last.[167] Sebastian says to Charles:

> ‘If it could only be like this always – always summer, always alone, the fruit always ripe, and Aloysius in a good temper. …’
> It is thus I like to remember Sebastian, as he was that summer, when we wandered alone together through that enchanted palace […][168]

The ellipsis in Sebastian’s quoted speech fails to prolong summer, youth, or happiness, but, like a sigh, laments the loss as they are passing. In short, Charles does not share Sebastian’s illusion, or what Winnicott calls ‘the objectivity of his subjective phenomena’, but the two manage to find some overlapping, however temporary, in their corresponding immediate areas, or ‘common experience between members of a group in art or religion or philosophy.’[169] Or love.

Aloysius can be regarded as a ‘transitional object’ because he positions himself in the extended area of Sebastian’s cognition and emotion and mediates between

---

Aloysius is also an ‘evocative object’: for Sebastian, he evokes love; for Charles, he evokes the memory of Sebastian, whom he identifies with Aloysius. Moreover, extending her love for her sister to Murray, Gleason herself develops a relationship with Murray and acknowledges his significance and contribution to her life: ‘Murray teaches me about myself. When I think about him I can sense how willingly I blur the edges of fantasy and reality, and how we all choose imagination as a forum for practicing our social skills or safely experiencing powerful emotions’ (p. 176). Gleason’s role in the relationship between Shayna and Murray resembles that of Charles in the relationship between Sebastian and Aloysius. That Charles has no feelings for Aloysius and dismisses him, instead, is telling of his own relationship with Sebastian.

[165] *BR*, p. 77.
[166] Ibid., p. 18.
[167] Ibid., pp. 26, 92.
[168] Ibid., p. 71.
[169] Winnicott, p. 14.

Sebastian and the outside world. Aloysius is a 'transitional object' also because he not only witnesses but also facilitates Sebastian's development and transition. Notably, Sebastian leaves Aloysius behind when he goes into self-imposed exile. It is a rite of passage which Charles is unable to understand, and seems unwilling to acknowledge, until he becomes a Catholic himself. Sebastian replaces Aloysius with Kurt, a German boy, who bears a resemblance to Otto in *Goodbye to Berlin*.[170] Charles does not make explicit but hints at the nature of Sebastian's friendship with Kurt as homosexual in the conversation with Brideshead after his visit to Sebastian in Fez:

> 'Do you consider,' asked Brideshead, 'that there is anything vicious in my brother's connexion with this German?'
>
> 'No. I'm sure not. It's simply a case of two waifs coming together.'
>
> […]
>
> In some ways Brideshead was an easy man to deal with. He had a kind of mad certainty about everything which made his decisions swift and easy.[171]

Although Charles replaces Sebastian with Julia, it is hard for him emotionally to accept the fact that for Sebastian he seems equally replaceable: '"You went to my house? Did you like it? Is Kurt still there? I won't ask if you liked Kurt; no one does. It's funny – I couldn't get on without him, you know."'[172] If Brideshead is merely 'where my family live', 'my house' here indicates a strong sense of belonging and pride, to which not perhaps the house itself but Kurt greatly contributes.[173] It is significant that Aloysius is always between Sebastian and Charles, even at the height of their 'romantic friendship', as if all three of them are in the relationship. Aloysius's presence is necessitated by the unspoken and unspeakable difference between Sebastian and Charles. For Sebastian, Aloysius at once fills the void between Charles and himself and constantly reminds him of Charles's lack. In spite of Kurt's vice, only he can fully replace Aloysius. From the perspective of Sebastian's personal development, the conscious choice of leaving his teddy bear behind, no less difficult than weaning, marks his transition from childhood to adulthood. And Kurt completes this process. The fate of a 'transitional object' is characterised by Winnicott as

---

[170] Interestingly, both the fictional Sebastian and the real-life Isherwood eventually find solace in spiritual fraternity.

[171] *BR*, p. 203.

[172] Ibid., pp. 200-1.

[173] Ibid., p. 29.

> to be gradually allowed to be decathected, so that in the course of years it becomes not so much forgotten as relegated to limbo. […] It is not forgotten and it is not mourned. It loses meaning, and this is because the transitional phenomena have become diffused, have become spread out over the whole intermediate territory between 'inner psychic reality' and 'the external world as perceived by two persons in common', that is to say, over the whole cultural field.[174]

Unlike children, most adults have no need for a specific object, or an imaginary friend, as the intermediary between the self and the world; their cognition and emotion are distributed and invisible.

In 'Toys', collected in *Mythologies* (1957), Roland Barthes is concerned with French toys, but his theory has a wider application: 'The fact that French toys *literally* prefigure the world of adult functions obviously cannot but prepare the child to accept them all […] faced with this world of faithful and complicated objects, the child can only identify himself as owner, as user, never as creator'.[175] As an alternative to the ready-made, and usually plastic, toys, Barthes proposes the 'mere set of blocks, provided it is not too refined'; the child therefore 'creates forms which walk, which roll; he creates life, not property: objects now act by themselves, they are no longer an inert and complicated material in the palm of his hand.'[176] Privileging wood over plastic, Barthes's choice reveals a more profound contrast than that of the two materials – one considered to be warm and alive, the other cold and dead: that is the natural against the unnatural: 'the plastic material of which [the toys] are made has an appearance at once gross and hygienic, it destroys all the pleasure, the sweetness, the humanity of touch. A sign which fills one with consternation is the gradual disappearance of wood, in spite of its being an ideal material because of its firmness and its softness, and the natural warmth of its touch.'[177] Although a teddy bear is not natural in the sense that it is man-made and perhaps mass-produced, it is closer to wood than plastic in texture and in nature.

---

[174] Winnicott, p. 5.

[175] Roland Barthes, 'Toys', in *The Object Reader*, ed. by Fiona Candlin and Raiford Guins (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 39-40 (p. 39). One of Barthes's examples is dolls that urinate, which 'is meant to prepare the little girl for the causality of house-keeping, to "condition" her to her future role as mother' (ibid.).

[176] Ibid., p. 40.

[177] Ibid. Barthes's object relations emphasises the sense and sensation of touch. The hand reaching out is the most extended part of the self and therefore the most tangibly interactive with the world. Although interesting, Garrington's *Haptic Modernism* is primarily concerned with high modernism and views skin as 'a border vital to the notion of an individuated self'. Abbie Garrington, *Haptic Modernism: Touch and the Tactile in Modernist Writing* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), p. 18.

Most importantly, it seems alive.

The relationship between child's play, work, and creativity is at the centre of Barthes's thinking about toys. For Barthes, child's play is a rehearsal for adult's work. The adult Sebastian, who has taken care of Aloysius in his youth, is described by a brother in the monastery as '[a] real Samaritan' for what he does for Kurt, a German soldier.[178] Sebastian, himself ill and weak, says to Charles: 'it's rather a pleasant change when all your life you've had people looking after you, to have someone to look after yourself. Only of course it has to be someone pretty hopeless to need looking after by *me*.'[179] Kurt not only takes Sebastian's kindness for granted but also takes advantage of it. Kurt wants cigarettes:

> Sebastian began painfully to rise from his chair.
> 'I'll get them,' I said. 'Where's his bed?'
> 'No, that's my job,' said Sebastian.
> 'Yeth,' said Kurt, 'I reckon that's Sebastian's job.'[180]

DeCoste interprets the scene as such: 'The boy-man who refused love's call to duty here jealously guards his charitable labor, having finally, in suffering, discovered his need to love and to serve, as much as to be loved and served.'[181] On the contrary, Sebastian loves and serves all along. Charles neither takes care of Sebastian nor allows Sebastian to take care of him. Drawing on the psychoanalyst Erick Erikson's theory of play as children's work, Turkle emphasises children's agency in the search for suitable objects for their maturity: 'Children use play to separate from adults and develop their own identities. Separation and individuation is the work of childhood and children choose to play objects that help them do this work. From this perspective, play, object work, is deeply motivated'.[182] So Sebastian actively seeks another object to replace Aloysius and finds, not Charles, but Kurt. Charles first learns about Kurt through Anthony, who reports that 'Sebastian found him', in a similar way he describes Sebastian's discovery of Charles.[183]

While Aloysius is Sebastian's 'transitional object', Sebastian, relegated by Charles to the past and remembered as a dream that might never have happened, then

---

[178] *BR*, p. 200. Saint Sebastian is the patron saint of soldiers. 'Sebastian's teddy bear sat at the wheel. We put him between us – "Take care he's not sick" – and drove off' (p. 19).
[179] Ibid., p. 202.
[180] Ibid., pp. 202-3.
[181] DeCoste, p. 27.
[182] Sherry Turkle, 'Objects Inspire', in *The Object Reader*, pp. 297-304 (p. 300).
[183] *BR*, p. 191.

becomes Charles's 'transitional object', or, in Charles's own words, 'the forerunner'.[184] Later, becoming a Catholic himself, Charles understands that 'the shadow which turns the corner always a pace or two ahead of us' is God and that all human loves lead to the love for Him.[185]

Heritage and Heritage-making: Adapting *Brideshead Revisited*

Although Waugh may not have regarded or projected himself as a popular writer, his fiction has gained enormous popularity from all the forms and modes of adaptation it received through mass media, ranging from theatre to film, from radio to television. Most of his major works have been adapted for the screen.[186] I have discussed in previous chapters the ways in which cinema contributed to the genesis of exterior modernism, but exterior modernist fiction, being cinematic, also lent and continues to lend itself to cinematisation much more readily than interiorised modes of modernism. In the specific case of *Brideshead*, in addition to Waugh's dialogue and (melo)dramatic story, the novel seems particularly adaptable because it is visual, preoccupied with detail, and, more importantly, because emotion is externalised through objects. The screen can just as easily convey the affective through objects – light and dark, perspectives, foregrounding, and the like – as print.

The adaptation of Waugh's fiction reflected the writer's literary reputation, peaking in the ninety-eighties and in the past decade or so. In both periods, biographical and critical works on Waugh proliferated, as the film, television, and radio adaptations of his novels and short stories also flourished. Sustaining and boosting Waugh's popularity, the 1981 Granada *Brideshead*, however, can claim to have made, and to still be making, Waugh's afterlives. In '*Brideshead* Re-Positioned: Re-Ma(r)king Text and Tone in Filmed Adaptation' (2005), Patrick Denman Flanery

---

[184] Ibid., p. 284. Charles slips into reverie at the end of the Prologue and wakes up at the beginning of the Epilogue. Remembering the past is treated as dreaming. The past as a dream is suspended between reality and imagination; the rememberer/dreamer awoken is not sure whether the past events, so vividly conjured up by the mind, have really happened. That the opening sentence of Book One echoes the last sentence of the Prologue but shifts the focus from 'I had been *there* before' to '"I have been *here* before"' can be compared to the cinematic techniques of dissolve and flashback (pp. 14, 17; italics mine). Similarly, the imaginary avalanche, a symbol and a striking image in Charles's painterly mind of the mounting tension between Julia and himself, awakens Charles; the dream dissolves, and the novel flashes forward to reality.

[185] Ibid.

[186] See Bibliography.

calls for Waugh scholars to consider 'the ways in which multiple media adaptations of the works have handled the source material, profoundly manipulating the tone and affecting a work's reception, whilst constituting separate and equally significant events in the constantly evolving history of the text(s).'[187] More broadly, a literary work 'should not be regarded as a single, monolithic, authoritative print- and paper-bound text, but rather as destabilised across (un)published and adapted forms, incarnated in all species of media'.[188] A study of Waugh's heritage therefore should certainly investigate not only the texts but also the adaptations; the relationship between the so-called source text – the multiple editions of *Brideshead* challenge the very idea of an *original* text – and the adaptation is dynamic, as meaning is constantly constructed and reconstructed.[189]

Brideshead can therefore be considered to be 'a fluid text', a term coined and defined by John Bryant to underpin his genetic adaptation theory as 'any work that exists in multiple versions in which the primary cause of those versions is some form of revision. Revisions may be performed by originating writers, by their editors and publishers, or by readers and audiences, who reshape the originating work to reflect their own desires for the text, themselves, their culture.'[190] Flanery offers an overview of the novel's publishing history and a summary of its media rights to demonstrate the fluidity of *Brideshead*, but he does not probe the reasons behind the many successful and unsuccessful attempts to adapt the novel for different media. Examining the two failed attempts in 1947 and 1950 to adapt *Brideshead* for the screen and the influential 1981 Granada television series, I argue that Waugh's insistence on fidelity, in opposition to Greene's view of adaptation as collaboration and dialogue, prevented *Brideshead* – and many other of his fictional works – from being adapted during his lifetime and that the context of heritage film and television and the specific historical moment of the eighties, marked by the mood of nostalgia

---

[187] Patrick Denman Flanery, '*Brideshead* Re-Positioned: Re-Ma(r)king Text and Tone in Filmed Adaptation', in *Waugh without End*, pp. 193-223 (p. 194).

[188] Ibid., p. 209.

[189] For Linda Hutcheon, the 'adapted text', 'the purely descriptive term I prefer to "source" or "original"', suggests no hierarchy. Linda Hutcheon, *The Theory of Adaptation* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006), p. xiii. Davis observes that 'Waugh never regarded the manuscripts as anything like a final version but regarded typescript and even proof as integral parts of the process of composition. For him, […] the work of authorship did not end even with publication' (Davis, *Forms*, pp. 171-72).

[190] John Bryant, 'Textual Identity and Adaptive Revision: Editing Adaptation as a Fluid Text', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 47-67 (p. 48).

and the preoccupation with heritage, offered a fertile ground for an adaptation of *Brideshead* that might have been endorsed by the novelist himself.

Literary Adaptation: Waugh versus Greene

In spite of adaptation scholars' fierce and unanimous critique of studies based on fidelity since the publication of George Bluestone's seminal *Novels into Film* (1957),[191] fidelity criticism has dominated the discourse on adaptation and remains an 'unavoidable question'.[192] Current scholarship sees a further move away from the originality and authorship of the adapted towards a dialogue between the adapted and the adaptation – the latter of which is considered a creative process – a dialogue initiated in the late seventies by the publications such as Seymour Chatman's *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (1978) and Keith Cohen's *Film and Fiction: The Dynamics of Exchanges* (1979).[193] In *Novels to Film* (1996), Brian McFarlane observes: 'Modern critical notions of *intertextuality* represent a more sophisticated approach, in relation to adaption, to the idea of the original novel as a "resource".'[194] Despite his awareness of the value of intertextuality to adaptation, McFarlane himself does not pursuit it; instead, he bases his theory on Bluestone's media specificity and fails to break much new ground.[195] Drawing on '[s]tructural and poststructuralist developments [which] cast suspicion on ideas of purity and essence and origin,' Robert Stam proposes alternative tropes to fidelity, such as 'translation, actualization, reading, critique, dialogization, cannibalization,

[191] Bluestone overemphasises the distinction between the two media in an effort to legitimate literary adaptation as a separate art as the adapted novel. However, his binary of the novel as internal and the film as external is too rigid: 'what is peculiarly filmic and what is peculiarly novelistic cannot be converted without destroying an integral part of each. That is why Proust and Joyce would seem absurd on film as Chaplin would in print.' George Bluestone, *Novels into Film* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1957), p. 63.

[192] Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, '"There and Back Again": New Challenges and New Directions in Adaption Studies', in *Adaptation Studies*, pp. 1-16 (p. 5). 'Fidelity, then, is questioned but not forgotten in current research, where it constantly resurfaces in the form of questions of medium specificity based on non-evaluative grounds' (p. 6).

[193] Yvonne Griggs, *The Bloomsbury Introduction to Adaptation Studies: Adapting the Canon in Film, TV, Novels and Popular Culture* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), p. 5.

[194] Brian McFarlane, *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 10.

[195] Making a distinction between 'transfer' and 'adaptation', McFarlane regards literary adaptation as the processes 'of *transferring* the novel's narrative basis and of *adapting* those aspects of its enunciation which are held to be important to retain, but which resist transfer, so as to achieve, through quite different means of signification and reception, affective responses that evoke the viewer's memory of the original text without doing violence to it' (ibid., pp. 13, 21).

transmutation, transfiguration, incarnation, transmorgrification, transcoding, performance, signifying, rewriting, detournement', and therefore argues that '[i]ntertextual dialogism, then, helps us transcend the aporias of "fidelity".'[196] More recently, Jørgen Bruhn's 'Dialogizing Adaptation Studies: From One-Way Transport to A Dialogic Two-Way Process' (2013) contributes to what he calls 'an "intertextual turn" in adaptation studies'.[197] Complaining that too much repetition has prevented adaptation theories from evolving, Kamilla Elliott suggests that 'theories also need to adapt to adaptations' and advocates an interdisciplinary approach to adaptation theories, which she has experimented with in her *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* by turning to cognitive theory.[198]

Waugh and Greene's friendship 'started rather late' but lasted until Waugh's death.[199] The two novelists are often considered alongside each other because of their faith: both converted to Catholicism in their twenties.[200] I propose, however, to connect and compare Waugh and Greene through a focus on cinema, more specifically adaptation, to which the two adopted completely different approaches. Since Waugh insisted on fidelity, all screen adaptations except the 1965 film *The Loved One* were made posthumously. By contrast, Greene, being ahead of his times, demystified the originality of the *source* text and encouraged a dialogue between the adapted and the adaptation, and made many of his fiction into cinema classics. *The End of the Affair* (1951), a novel which is also concerned with the Second World War and Catholicism and has been adapted into a film twice, in 1955, though not by Greene himself, and posthumously in 1999, lends itself to a comparison with

---

[196] Robert Stam, *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaption* (Malden, M.A. and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), p. 4. The idea was first presented in Robert Stam, 'Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation', in *Film Adaptation*, ed. by James Naremore (London: The Athlone Press, 2000), pp. 54-76.

[197] Jørgen Bruhn, 'Dialogizing Adaptation Studies: From One-Way Transport to A Dialogic Two-Way Process', in *Adaptation Studies*, pp. 69-88 (p. 75).

[198] Kamilla Elliott, 'Theorizing Adaptations/ Adaptation Theories', in *Adaptation Studies*, 19-45 (p. 32).

[199] *Letters*, p. 439.

[200] Stopp observes that 'the triangular relationship between Bendrix, Sara, and her faith in the *End of the Affair* is similar in its general lines to that between Charles, Julia, and her religion in the closing parts of *Brideshead Revisited*' (p. 113). See also Query, 'Like Going Home: Greene and Waugh in Mexico', in *Ritual and the Idea of Europe in Interwar Writing*, pp. 169-95; Cristina Flores Moreno, 'Dialogue Between E. Waugh and G. Greene: Two Different Approaches to Art and Religion in *Brideshead Revisited* and *The End of the Affair*', in *Waugh without End*, pp. 181-191; Ian Turnbull Ker, *The Catholic Revival in English Literature, 1845-1961: Newman, Hopkins, Belloc, Chesterton, Greene, Waugh* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003); and James A. Devereux, 'Catholic Matters in the Correspondence of Evelyn Waugh and Graham Greene', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 14/1 (1987), 111-126.

Brideshead.[201] But Greene's film work ethic manifests itself in his collaboration with the director Carol Reed.[202]

Waugh articulated his opinion on adaptation primarily on such occasions as his 1932 short story 'Excursion into Reality', his 1947 and 1957 memoranda of the proposed film adaptations of *Brideshead* and *Scoop*, and his 1947 article 'Why Hollywood is a Term of Disparagement'. Not surprisingly, all accounts are critical. More importantly, Waugh saw fidelity as essential to any literary adaptation. 'Excursion in Reality' ridicules how a film adaptation of *Hamlet* 'spread[s] majestically' to incorporate Macbeth, Julius Caesar, and King Arthur and eventually collapses.[203] Both 'Why Hollywood is a Term of Disparagement' and *The Loved One* can be regarded as Waugh's retaliation for the failed negotiation with MGM of a film version of *Brideshead* in 1947.[204] In the article, Waugh, on the one hand, considered cinema 'the perfect medium for presenting a straight plot. The effects at which [the novelist] labours so painfully may here be achieved with ease. All descriptions are superfluous. Here you have narrative reduced to its essentials – dialogue and action. A great, simple art should have come into existence.'[205] On the other hand, Waugh had an aversion to Hollywood and a low opinion of its adaptations. He cited Robert Siodmak's 1944 film *Christmas Holiday*, based loosely on Somerset Maugham's novel, as one of the 'frightful examples of favourite books we have seen thus sterilized': 'Why, one wonders, do they trouble to purchase rights? I cannot believe that any action for plagiarism would lie if they had produced that film without reference to Mr Maugham.'[206] In his *Scoop* memorandum for Messrs Endfield & Fisz, dated 12 April 1957, Waugh clarified the theme of the novel as 'a light satire on modern journalism, not a schoolboy's adventure story of plot, counterplot, capture and escape' and advised the studio 'to devise a story conforming to the theme and retaining as much as possible of the original dialogue' and to '[t]ry

[201] Waugh reviewed *The End of the Affair* for *Month* (6 September 1951) but did not relate it to *Brideshead*. See Waugh, 'The Point of Departure', in *EAR*, pp. 404-06.
[202] Greene and Reed collaboratively made three films: *The Fallen Idol* (1948), *The Third Man* (1949), and *Our Man in Havana* (1959).
[203] Waugh, 'Excursion', p. 84.
[204] Ironically, *The Loved One* was adapted by MGM and released in 1965, the only film adaptation made in Waugh's lifetime.
[205] Waugh, 'Why Hollywood is a Term of Disparagement', in *EAR*, pp. 325-31 (p. 328). The article originally appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Morning Post* on 30 April and 1 May 1947.
[206] Ibid., pp. 328-29, 329.

to produce a work of art' in spite of the demands of cinema audiences.[207] To 'the original dialogue', Waugh added an aside in his usual parentheses with a great emphasis on the originality and authority of the creator of the novel: '(The dialogue of the novel has certain idiosyncrasies which few can imitate successfully. All additional dialogue should be submitted to the original author for translation.)'[208]

Had Waugh's trip to Hollywood in 1947 been successful, *Brideshead* could have been adapted only two years after its publication. Never impressed by Hollywood, or America in general, Waugh might not have taken MGM's proposal seriously enough in the first place. What attracted him was 'a tax-free trip, lecture-free, with a minimum of work of any kind at the other end. Luxury not lionisation is the thing. And all the trouble spared me of getting permits & booking cabins etc.'[209] However, Waugh was not entirely to blame for the collapse of the deal. It was the censorship of Joseph Ignatius Breen and his office, the Production Code Administration, 'with the power to grant or retain to every picture released in America the Seal of Approval necessary for all but the most limited and seedy distribution', that eventually killed the project.[210] The Production Code set clear and strict rules on issues such as divorce, adultery, and homosexuality, all prominent in *Brideshead*. In the first diary entry after his return to England, Waugh wrote on 7 April 1947: 'Gordon [the producer], I think, lost heart as soon as I explained to him what *Brideshead* was about, until-in [*sic*] the end when the censor made some difficulties he accepted them as an easy excuse for abandoning the whole project.'[211] Davis suggests that the studio, if not Gordon, Waugh's fellow countryman, singlehandedly, sabotaged the project: Gordon's letter to Breen 'in effect dictated Breen's answer. Gordon began by saying that the novel presented "an immediate problem and heavy financial obligations" because M-G-M had to make a commitment or withdraw.'[212] Despite Davis's remark that '[n]either Waugh's diary nor his letters indicate that he was aware of the controversy over film morality', Waugh's memorandum suggests

[207] Evelyn Waugh, 'Notes on the Film Adaptations of *Brideshead Revisited* and *Scoop*', *Areté,* 14 (2004), 19-29 (pp. 27, 28, 29). It is introduced by Donat Gallagher.
[208] Ibid., p. 28.
[209] Waugh quoted in Hastings, p. 513.
[210] Robert Murray Davis, *Mischief in the Sun: The Making and Unmaking of The Loved One* (Troy, NY: The Whitston Publishing Company, 1999), p. 35.
[211] *Diaries*, p. 710.
[212] Davis, *Mischief*, p. 46.

otherwise.[213] It shows a certain awareness on his part of the issues which can be potentially problematic and, more significantly, his willingness to make changes for the film: 'The character of Anthony Blanche will need considerable modification at the discretion of the producer.'[214]

Waugh had a clear vision of a screen adaptation of *Brideshead* and eloquently articulated it in his 1947 memorandum for MGM, a necessary clarification, if not defence, of the author's intentions particularly when Waugh distrusted Keith Winter, the scriptwriter, who saw the novel 'purely as a love story.'[215] Waugh insisted on his authorship and authority by describing Winter as 'the "writer"'.[216] The theme of *Brideshead*, according to Waugh's memorandum, is 'theological': 'The novel deals with what is theologically termed "the operation of Grace," that is to say, the unmerited and unilateral act of love by which God continually calls souls to himself.'[217] Interestingly, Waugh had previously explained the theme of the novel as 'at once romantic and eschatological'.[218] Although it is likely that Waugh revised the theme two years after the novel's publication, his consideration would not have been an adaptation to a different medium.[219] More likely, by making thematic changes, he intended to show the studio that he was the *original* author, not the (script)writer in quotation marks. Discarding the more popular romantic theme or overstressing the theological theme, Waugh did not necessarily demonstrate his superiority, in authority or intellect, but potentially made the adaptation more difficult.

Under the plot section in Waugh's memorandum, 'the Chapel' – notably with a capital C – and the fountain, used to 'typify the conflicting characteristics of the English aristocratic tradition', are mentioned first, followed by a description of major characters and then an explanation of the storyline.[220] The centrality of these two objects, one heavenly and the other worldly, to the plot of the novel, is thus established, as if they were two major characters. Waugh insisted on 'see[ing]

---

[213] *Diaries*, p. 38.
[214] Waugh quoted in Davis, *Mischief*, p. 41. Davis reproduces Waugh's memorandum in its entirety.
[215] *Diaries*, p. 708.
[216] Ibid.
[217] Waugh quoted in Davis, *Mischief*, p. 39.
[218] Waugh quoted in *Critical Heritage*, p. 236.
[219] Similar to his 1947 MGM memorandum, Waugh's preface to the 1960 revised edition of *Brideshead* states the theme as 'the operation of divine grace on a group of diverse but closely connected character' (*BR*, p. ix).
[220] Waugh quoted in Davis, *Mischief*, p. 40.

preliminary sketches of these two features drawn under my supervision' before he left Hollywood.[221]

To accentuate the Catholic theme, Waugh would even rewrite parts of the novel:

> The Chapel in the book is a new one, and Lord Marchmain is represented as a recent and half-hearted convert to Catholicism. For the purposes of the film the Chapel should be old and part of the original castle on the site of which the baroque palace has been built. The Flytes should be represented as one of the English noble families which retained their religion throughout the Reformation period. The Chapel should therefore be small and medieval, and should contain the Flyte tombs which in the novel are described as standing in the parish church.[222]

This, however, should not be confused with a willingness to adapt '[f]or the purposes of the film'. Very much in control, Waugh was exercising his authority as the original writer editing and making changes to his own work as he pleased. Studying the manuscripts of *Brideshead*, Davis observes that 'Waugh never regarded the manuscripts as anything like a final version but regarded typescript and even proof as integral parts of the process of composition. For him, […] the work of authorship did not end even with publication'.[223] For example, Brideshead the house 'continued to change in successive revisions, and in revising proof Waugh gave it even greater importance.'[224] So Waugh saw MGM's proposal as an opportunity for him to continue to revisit and revise it; Waugh incorporated the adaptation of his novel into his own creative process. It is, however, not evident in the memorandum that Waugh considered other changes necessary to accommodate these fundamental changes that he suggested for the film version. If the chapel is the foundation of Brideshead and the Flytes devout Catholics, the chapel is unlikely to be closed immediately after Lady Marchmain's death. In the novel, the chapel is under threat even before her death precisely because there are not enough Catholics in the household to justify its existence.[225] My interest lies not in fidelity studies – although Waugh certainly insisted on fidelity – but in the fact that the author's proposed changes, which are underdeveloped and problematic, have far-reaching consequences.

For the fountain, equally meticulous 'stage directions' are offered:

> The fountain represents the worldly eighteenth century splendor of the family. It has been brought from Italy and I see it as a combination of three famous works of Bernini at

[221] Ibid.
[222] Ibid.
[223] Davis, *Forms*, pp. 171-72.
[224] Davis, *Writer*, p. 169.
[225] *BR*, p. 83.

> Rome, photographs of which may be found in any architectural handbook. There are the Trevi and Piazza Navona fountains and the elephant bearing the obelisk in the Piazza Minerva which the Romans fondly call 'the little pig.'[226]

Unlike the chapel, the fountain does not undergo transformation, except that unostentatious and perhaps unknown in the novel, it comes from a piazza in southern Italy, not from central Rome. Waugh's aggrandising effort produces an even more striking and certainly more recognisable image than that in the book. It is worth quoting Waugh's instructions at length not only to suggest that the level of detail and fidelity required by the novelist poses difficulties to a proposed adaptation but also to explain an obsession with certain objects, which is later taken up by the heritage industry. Davis's examination of the *Brideshead* manuscripts indicates Waugh's 'addition of extravagant and enlivening detail', not least in his revision of Anthony's discussion of the Flytes with Charles at Oxford, in 'the addition of Rex Mottram's Christmas gift to Julia, […] [c]onsciously introduced as an objective correlative of Sebastian's decline', and in 'the description of Ryder's sketch of the fountain'.[227]

1950 saw another abortive attempt to adapt *Brideshead* for the screen. Greene was asked to write the screenplay, and Waugh was delighted.[228] Greene expressed his concerns and his wish to collaborate with Waugh:

> a script writer does not have complete control over a film! I would rather it had been any other man almost than Selznick behind this, because he is an extraordinarily stupid and conventionally-minded man. […] The trouble is that in order to get a good script one must work almost daily with a sympathetic director, and I can't think of anyone in England who would have the faintest idea what *Brideshead* is about.[229]

Short of funds, the project of filming the novel was, again, unrealised.[230]

Unlike Waugh, Greene is not generally so highly regarded as an innovative prose stylist. In 'Felix Culpa?', Waugh's review of *The Heart of Matter*, he described Greene's style as 'grim': 'It is not a specially literary style at all. The words are functional, devoid of sensuous attraction, of ancestry and of independent

---

[226] Waugh quoted in Davis, *Mischief*, p. 40.
[227] Davis, *Writer*, pp. 133, 147, 151.
[228] *Letters*, p. 379.
[229] Graham Greene, *Graham Greene: A Life in Letters*, ed. by Richard Greene (London: Abacus, 2008), pp. 175-76. Recounting his experience with Selznick in his autobiography *Ways of Escape* (1980), Greene described how he 'learned at first hand what a director may have to endure at the hands of a producer' and how Selznick's 'destructive view of the whole venture left me speechless.' Graham Greene, *Ways of Escape* (London: Vintage, 1999), pp. 64-65, 66.
[230] Quentin Falk, *Travels in Greeneland: The Cinema of Graham Greene* (London and New York: Quartet Books, 1990), p. 226.

life. […] The words are simply mathematical signs for his thought.'[231] Like Waugh, and many other writers of their generation, Greene was significantly influenced by cinema, but Greene can also be said to have made his mark on cinema. James Naremore notes that after the Second World War, Greene 'briefly became an auteur in the British industry and was given a measure of control over the final product.'[232] Together with Reed, Greene made enormous contributions to, if not exactly creating, British film noir. Given its hybridity, film noir is difficult to define but is generally acknowledged to have 'originated in America, emerging out of a synthesis of hard-boiled fiction and German expressionism. The term also associated with certain visual and narrative traits, including low-key photography, images of wet city streets, pop-Freudian characterizations, and romantic fascination with femmes fatales.'[233] The connection between film noir and German expressionist cinema is evident, not least in the fact that directors such as Fritz Lang and Robert Siodmak brought German expressionist cinema to the US and made film noirs in exile.

Greene's prefaces to *The Third Man* (1949) and *The Fallen Idol*, first published under the title *The Basement Room* (1935) and adapted into the 1948 film *The Fallen Idol*, elucidate his views on adaptation and demonstrate his understanding of cinema as a medium.[234] Compared with Greene, Waugh lacked the commitment to cinema and to adaptation, even of his own works. In the preface to the published story, Greene admits that '*The Third Man* was never written to be read but only to be seen.'[235] The film version then is not an adaptation in the conventional sense. But it begins as a story: 'Even a film depends on more than plot, on a certain measure of characterization, on mood and atmosphere; and these seem to me almost impossible to capture for the first time in the dull shorthand of a script. One can reproduce an effect caught in another medium, but one cannot make the first act of creation in script form.'[236] Greene's emphasis on the value of a good story, in contrast to a good script, for a film, betrays a writer's bias, giving precedence to the literary over the

[231] Waugh, 'Felix Culpa?', pp. 361-62.
[232] James Naremore, *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press, 1998), p. 75.
[233] Ibid., p. 9. To Naremore's list of origins, Mar Bould adds 'French poetic realism'. Mark Bould, *Film Noir: From Berlin to Sin City* (London and New York: Wallflower, 2005), p. 2.
[234] Joseph Cotton, who played Holly Martins in *The Third Man*, appeared as Paul Henty in *High Green Wall* (1954), a short television drama based on Waugh's short story 'The Man Who Liked Dickens' (1933).
[235] Greene, *The Third Man*, p. 1.
[236] Ibid., p. 3.

cinematic and consequently distrusting any film without a literary source. To generalise with 'one', Greene rather refers to himself or a fellow novelist, who tends to dismiss cinema as merely a form of literary adaptation. With his limitations, Greene is still more open-minded than perhaps many novelists, including Waugh, who obstinately holds on to the myth of the original author's supremacy and allows little conversation between story and film. A healthy dialogue is evident in Greene as writer and Reed as director, whose creative collaboration is built on mutual admiration and trust:

> so much value lies in the clear cut-and-thrust of argument between two people. […] The reader will notice many differences between the story and the film, and he should not imagine these changes were forced on an unwilling author: as likely as not they were suggested by the author. The film in fact, is better than the story because it is in this case the finished state of the story.[237]

Moreover, to adapt to the requirements of the film, Greene is willing to make substantial changes to the plot and setting of his story. In his preface to *The Fallen Idol*, Greene briefly traces the process of turning an 'unfilmable' story into a successful film: 'the story was quietly changed […] I think this, especially with Reed's handling, was a good subject'.[238]

Greene understood the medium of cinema better than Waugh. He wrote and made award-winning films and reviewed for *The Spectator*, something much more serious than Waugh's flirtation with film-making and reviewing as an undergraduate at Oxford. More importantly, Greene appreciated and respected that a film, as opposed to a novel, is a collaborative work, the very idea to which Waugh directed his satirical energy in 'Excursion in Reality'. Greene's humility was also essential to his constant development. Not only did Greene show no reservation in his praise of Reed, he described their relationship in a manner similar to that of mentor and student.[239] Waugh's and Greene's different approaches to adaptation, and to cinema more generally, result in the disparate fate of their fiction in relation to film during their lifetime.

Granada Brideshead, *Nostalgia, and Heritage*

[237] Ibid., p. 4.
[238] Greene, *The Fallen Idol*, in *The Third Man and The Fallen Idol*, pp. 99-130 (p. 101).
[239] Ibid., p. 102.

At the beginning of this chapter, I discussed Waugh's, and also Powell's, resurrection – albeit with an exterior modernist twist – of high modernism, already for them the style of a bygone literary golden age. In this last section, I return to the theme of nostalgia, but from the perspective of national identity. The ninety-eighties and the first decade of the twentieth-first century saw the revival of Waugh. Viewed in relation to aspects of British culture, these dates are particularly interesting. The two decades were marked by political conservatism: Margret Thatcher reigned throughout the eighties; the New Labour of Tony Blair is often regarded as closely associated with the legacy of Thatcherism.[240] The eighties marked the beginning of Britain's preoccupation with heritage, with the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983 and the rise of fictional genres such as the neo-Victorian novel and of the heritage genre in film and television. Nostalgia is an act of looking back constructed from the emotional needs of the present. What was lost in the Second World War and the subsequent years essentially was much of Britain's status as a world power. Nostalgia was, and still is, employed as a political strategy. As Collins observes, 'memory of the past is carried on the success of rituals in the present; we may think we are commemorating the past, just as religious believers may think they are commemorating sacred events of long ago or in a transhistorical reality, but in fact it is the emotional solidarity that they derive from the present use of these symbols that determines whether they keep them alive or not.'[241] Moreover, nostalgia for a *lost* empire is a successful IR because '[n]egative interests are easier to see clearly and easier to mobilize around than positive interests. […] in a loss or threat to what one already possesses, the emotion is generated individually and then is amplified by the group process.'[242] It is hardly surprising therefore that the heritage films of the eighties contributed markedly to the nation's construction of a myth of its glorious past. It was a particular moment, or a particular heritage, that was being evoked: the British Empire. So the eighties, nostalgically preoccupied with lost greatness and also with lost beauty, was attracted to the Edwardian era, or, as often, the interwar years, when the Empire was at its height.

More than simply a novel concerning emotion and the cathecting of emotion,

[240] Richard Heffernan, *New Labour and Tatcherism: Political Change in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), p. ix. See also 'The Thatcher Legacy II: The New Labour Experiment', in Eric Evans, *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 138-52.
[241] Randall Collins, p. 301.
[242] Ibid., p. 305.

Brideshead is fundamentally a mood novel. Waugh's 1959 preface defends his insistence on the Burgundy and the moonlight on the ground that 'they were essentially of the mood of writing'.[243] Sebastian admits that 'Brideshead often has that effect on me': 'His mood was lightening now. The further we drove from Brideshead, the more he seemed to cast off his uneasiness – the almost furtive restlessness and irritability that had possessed him. The sun was behind us as we drove, so that we seemed to be in pursuit of our own shadows.'[244] Waugh's shadow is resonant with Eliot's shadow in *The Waste Land* (1922), which also offers Waugh the title of another important novel of his:

> There is shadow under this red rock,
> (Come in under the shadow of this red rock),
> And I will show you something different from either
> Your shadow at morning striding behind you
> Or your shadow at evening rising to meet you;
> I will show you fear in a handful of dust.[245]

There are also Julia's changing moods, epitomised by the fountain scenes in such a short span of time as one evening. Even youth, so transient, so unpredictable, and so vulnerable, is treated as a mood. *Brideshead* is essentially a novel about happiness and the pursuit of it. Sebastian tells Charles that happiness is '"all I want"'.[246]

The dominant mood in *Brideshead* is nostalgic, accompanied by a poignant sense of loss and unbearable pain. Charles looks to the past for meaning: 'These memories, which are my life – for we possess nothing certainly except the past – were always with me.'[247] It is a past lost and romanticised. Leaving Brideshead and Sebastian, Charles feels:

> A door had shut, the low door in the wall I had sought and found in Oxford; open it now and I should find no enchanted garden.
> […]
> I had left behind me – what? Youth? Adolescence? Romance?[248]

Littlewood, however, argues that '[t]his, the most nostalgic of Waugh's novels, is also the one that subjects nostalgia to the closest scrutiny': 'As the Epilogue makes clear, Waugh's ultimate concern in this novel is not to indulge nostalgia but to

[243] *BR*, p. x.
[244] Ibid., pp. 33, 34.
[245] T. S. Eliot, *The Waste Land: Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism*, ed. by Michael North (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 2001), pp. 5-6.
[246] *BR*, p. 80.
[247] Ibid., p. 211.
[248] Ibid., p. 158.

transcend it.'[249] And it is religion that helps to transcend nostalgia, as it helps to reject beauty, as White argues. Although, Charles undoubtedly has an epiphany, a sense of spiritual fraternity that resembles Sebastian's in the monastery, he in no way denies the past.[250] Rather, he reveres the past, which, for him, is inextricably linked with Catholicism, because it is tradition; his conversion can be seen as his wish to inherit this tradition. For MacKay, *Brideshead* is written as 'a memorial to traditional feudal England', and in it, as in *Put Out More Flags*, 'there [is] anything to compensate for what has been lost, culturally and artistically.'[251]

In *The Image of the English Gentleman in Twentieth-Century Literature* (2007), Christine Berberich investigates the topics of Englishness and nostalgia in Waugh's novels. For Berberich, Guy Crouchback is 'the perfect knight-gentleman'.[252] In *Brideshead*, interpreted as 'Waugh's reaction to a world changing before his eyes, and as he saw it, not changing for the better', Berberich observes that 'notions of gentlemanliness are clearly marked by a class divide.'[253] Class consciousness is seen as an important aspect of Englishness.[254] The middle-class Charles certainly considers himself to be a gentleman; while excluding the Common Man from the category, Charles looks to the aristocratic Sebastian for a model of the gentleman. Following Charles's logic, it is not difficult to reach such a conclusion that the upper classes are more *English* than the lower classes. This discriminatory concept of Englishness is precisely reflected by the partial and carefully-selected heritage (the country house but not the miners' strike, for example) which evokes nostalgia and sustains a romanticised and even mystical idea of England; this was the context in which the first and most influential screen adaptation of *Brideshead* appeared.

If the England of Waugh and his fellow exterior modernists had been a 'leaning tower' or 'a shrinking island', it was even more so for England in the eighties. Interestingly, if Charles Sturridge's two adaptations of Waugh in the context of heritage film and television, namely *Brideshead Revisited* (1981) and *A Handful of Dust* (1988), showed one side of England in the eighties, the 1987 London Weekend

[249] Littlewood, pp. 131, 134-35.
[250] Even Sebastian, in exile, is nostalgic: '"I was out of my mind for a day or two," he said. "I kept thinking I was back in Oxford"' (*BR*, p. 200).
[251] Marina MacKay, *Modernism and World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 2, 126.
[252] Christine Berberich, *The Image of the English Gentleman in Twentieth-Century Literature: Englishness and Nostalgia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 134.
[253] Ibid., pp. 96, 120.
[254] Ibid., p. 97.

Television (LWT) *Scoop*, though much less well received, revealed another.[255] This *Scoop* seemed a topical criticism of Rupert Murdoch, the contemporary Lord Beaverbrook/ Lord Copper, and perhaps also an indirect protest against Thatcher. In January 1986, Murdoch's move of News International's editorial and printing operations from the Fleet Street to Wapping in East London triggered a year-long strike and clashes between the workers and the police, which ended in the dismissal of the nearly six thousand strike workers and the arrest of over a thousand.[256] The Trades Union Congress vocally criticises the 'unholy alliance between lawyers, police, government and News International that exemplifies the "malign and corrosive" influence of Rupert Murdoch on the British establishment.'[257] The Wapping dispute cannot compare with the miners' strikes in terms of scale, but it is part of the same class struggle prevalent in the seventies and eighties, particularly the three-day week in 1974 and the 1984-85 miners' strike. These strikes recall the General Strike in 1926, which I have discussed in the previous chapter, including Waugh's retrospective depiction of the event in *Brideshead*.

But the eighties' preoccupation with heritage and the reality of continued strikes may well be the two sides of the same story, because the latter explains the need and call for the former. As the workers' strikes are suppressed by big businesses and a government that supports their corporate interests, the LWT *Scoop*, based on an essentially country house novel with some political edge, topical and fashionable in the late thirties, is eclipsed by the unapologetically lavish Granada *Brideshead*. Considering the resemblances between British society between the wars, particularly in the twenties, and British society in the eighties, with mass movements on the one

---

[255] The *Telegraph* reviewer of the DVD version regards the adaptation as 'a nostalgic cartoonish pleasure with some nice sharp edges' and gives it three stars. Philip Horne, '*Scoop*, DVD Review', in *The Telegraph*, 17 July 2009, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/dvd-reviews/5836014/Scoop-DVD-review.html>, last accessed 5 April 2016. William Boyd, the screenwriter, describes his own film as 'a lavish adaptation of Evelyn Waugh's comic masterpiece' on his personal website, <http://www.williamboyd.co.uk/scoop-author-notes>, last accessed 5 April 2016. In a 2006 *Guardian* interview and reiterated in his keynote speech on his experience of adapting Waugh's *Scoop* and *Sword of Honour* (2001) for the screen at the 2015 International Evelyn Waugh Conference, Boyd defends his decision to leave out the 'great crested grebe' joke against the audiences' 'furore' on the ground that film should be acknowledged as a different medium from the novel. Stuart Jefferies, 'Screen Player', in *The Guardian*, 21 January 2006, <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2006/jan/21/books.news>, last accessed 5 April 2016.

[256] Jon Henley, 'Rupert Murdoch and the Battle of Wapping: 25 Years On', in *The Guardian*, 27 July 2011, last accessed 2 April 2016, < http://www.theguardian.com/media/2011/jul/27/rupert-murdoch-wapping-25-years>.

[257] Ibid.

hand and the growing prosperity of the ruling classes and widening of economic divisions on the other, it is hardly surprising that the eighties revisited the twenties. Interestingly in the case of *Brideshead*, the twenties which the 1981 adaptation revisits has already been mediated by another layer of nostalgia: Charles remembers, and reconstructs as much, an arcadia during the Second World War.

Brideshead is a heritage novel that lends itself to an adaptation at a particular historical moment when heritage, understood as a reconstructed and perpetually reconstructable memory of past glory serving present purposes, is perhaps what a dying, if not already dead, empire has left to it as consolation. The novel's nostalgia matches and articulates the social mood of the eighties. The Granada *Brideshead* is often acknowledged not only as a prime example of heritage film and television but also as 'the embodiment of all that was best British television'.[258] For Andrew Higson, it 'might be said to have initiated the nostalgic heritage cinema of the Thatcher years.'[259] The heritage film is not a recognised genre in the industrial sense; it is critically constructed.[260] Belén Vidal observes: 'The heritage film is, in short, a distinctive strand in contemporary cinema, albeit one dogged by a certain bad press. The heritage film is often associated with craftsmanship, with competent yet unexciting filmmaking.'[261]

The 'bad press' is represented by the critical views of Cairns Craig, Tana Wollen, and Higson. All three question the heritage film's representation of the national past, its employment of nostalgia as a strategy – similar to Thatcher – to eschew the social problems of contemporary Britain, and its commodification of Englishness, particularly for international consumption. In 'Rooms without a View' (1991), Craig observes that heritage films

---

[258] Andrew Higson, *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama Since 1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 15. I make no distinction between heritage film and heritage television here. Other examples of heritage film and television include *Chariots of Fire* (1981), *Another Country* (1984), adaptations of Forster's novels such as *A Room with a View* (1986), *Maurice* (1987), *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1991), and *Howards End* (1992), and adaptations of Jane Austen such as *Pride and Prejudice* (1995), *Sense and Sensibility* (1995), and *Emma* (1996). The producer Ismail Merchant and the director James Ivory collaboratively made some of the most popular heritage films.

[259] Andrew Higson, 'Nostalgia is Not What It Used to Be: Heritage Films, Nostalgia Websites and Contemporary Consumers', *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 17/2 (2014), 120-42 (p. 113).

[260] Claire Monk, 'The British Heritage-Film Debate Re visited', in *British Historical Cinema: The History, Heritage, and Costume Film*, ed. by Claire Monk and Amy Sargeant (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 176-98 (p. 183).

[261] Belén Vidal, *Heritage Film: Nation, Genre and Representation* (London and New York: Wallflower, 2012), p. 1.

> allow their audiences to experience the tensions of an interrelatedness which contemporary British culture – *pace* Mrs Thatcher and the Bruges group – will have to live with, but within the profoundly safe context of the past. They can confront the need to build a new identity through open relations with other cultures only by reinforcing the values of a world which allowed its borders to be crossed one way only, at its own discretion and in the direction of its choice.[262]

The insulation from the present and other cultures again suggests 'a shrinking island' which looks backwards and inwards. For Wollen, '[t]he inter-war years become, in the early eighties, a period of quintessential, enduring Englishness that can be reproduced time and again.'[263] Higson argues that 'the past is displayed as visually spectacular pastiche, inviting a nostalgic gaze that resists the ironies and social critiques so often suggested narratively by these films'.[264] Critiquing what she calls 'anti-heritage discourse', Claire Monk draws attention to the other side of the heritage film, such as multiple authorship, 'multiple *cultural* origins', 'a prioritisation of the personal', and the exploration of gender and sexuality.[265] But, focusing on a portion of heritage films, primarily those adapted from Forster's novels, and dismissing differences of nationality, race, and class, Monk fails to respond to or argue convincingly against those 'anti-heritage' critics. Moreover, borrowing from the feminist historian Alison Light, Monk argues that English liberalism 'rather than a version of Thatcherism might be said to lie at the heart of the Merchant-Ivory films and their project'; what Monk refers to as liberalism, however, seems to be universalism, the very idea under attack from feminist and postcolonial scholars.[266]

More recently, with such publications as Monk's *Heritage Film Audiences* (2011) and Higson's 'Nostalgia is Not What It Used to Be' (2014), the heritage film debate

---

[262] Cairns Craig, 'Rooms Without a View', *Sight and Sound*, 1 June 1991, 10-13 (p. 13).

[263] Tana Wollen, 'Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgia Screen Fictions for the 1980s', in *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*, ed. by John Corner and Sylvia Harvey (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 173-88 (p. 180).

[264] Andrew Higson, 'Re-presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film', in *British Cinema and Thatcherism: Fires Were Started*, ed. by Lester Friedman (London: UCL Press, 1993), pp. 109-29 (p. 109).

[265] Claire Monk, 'The British "Heritage Film" and Its Critics', *Critical Survey*, 7/2 (1995), 116-24 (pp. 117, 119, 120).

[266] Alison Light quoted in Monk. Ibid., p. 123. Monk later revisits the heritage film debate and promotes her concept of 'post-heritage'. Claire Monk, 'The British Heritage-Film Debate Revisited', *British Historical Cinema: The History, Heritage, and Costume Film*, ed. by Claire Monk and Amy Sargeant (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 176-98 (p. 182). Post-heritage or not, the heritage film from the mid-nineties onwards – Jane Campion's *The Piano* (1993), for example – shows more awareness and consideration of such critical and cultural debates as feminism and postcolonialism.

has seen an increasing awareness of audience/consumer response. Higson concludes that the failure of Julian Jerrold's 2008 film *Brideshead*, constantly compared unfavourably with its 1981 precursor, is 'in part down to the particular strategies of the film-makers and their efforts to resist what they perceived as some of the problems of the heritage film. But that strategy also seemed to limit the pleasure that audiences might gain from the films, in so far as that pleasure is related to relatively spectacular forms of *mise-en-scène*.'[267] So the audiences are disappointed precisely because they look for the nostalgic experience, modern or postmodern, in what they perceive as *heritage* films and find it lacking.[268]

Those critics of heritage film tend to emphasise the 1981 *Brideshead*'s fidelity to the details of both the novel and its historical setting. Higson mentions the television drama's 'loving attention to the period details of a mid-twentieth-century aristocratic style.'[269] Wollen notes that 'the rooms Evelyn Waugh had occupied at Oxford were used and a great deal was made of an "unreal" prop in order to show how painstaking attention to detail had been.'[270] Castle Howard, which stands for Lord Marchmain's family seat in both the 1981 and 2008 adaptations, is now synonymous with Brideshead.[271] The two crucial features, the chapel and the fountain, which Waugh was at pains to create in the novel and recreate in his 1947 memorandum for MGM, are, however, conspicuously distinct in their departure from the novelist's designs. The chapel at Castle Howard, 'redecorated [in the 1870s] in the pre-Raphaelite style [, boasting] impressive William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones designs'[272] resembles the one in the novel 'in the arts-and-crafts style of the last decade of the nineteenth century'[273] more than the medieval chapel envisaged for the proposed MGM film adaptation. The fountain at Castle Howard neither comes from Italy nor has a history as illustrious as Waugh intended: it was 'commissioned

---

[267] Higson, 'Nostalgia', p. 135.

[268] Higson distinguishes between 'the *modern*, temporal version of nostalgia' and the postmodern, '*a*temporal' version of nostalgia. Ibid., p. 123.

[269] Ibid., p. 133.

[270] Tana Wollen, 'Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgia Screen Fictions for the 1980s', in *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*, ed. by John Corner and Sylvia Harvey (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 173-88 (p. 186).

[271] The success of the Granada series has boosted the popularity of Castle Howard, which reportedly 'became one of the most frequently visited stately homes in Europe.' Anonymous quoted in Higson, *English Heritage,* p. 58.

[272] 'The Chapel', last accessed 28 June 2016, <http://www.castlehoward.co.uk/house-and-grounds/the-house-and-family/the-chapel>.

[273] *BR*, p. 33.

by the 7th Earl in 1850 from the landscape gardener William Andrews Nesfield; the sea gods that surround Atlas were carved by the sculptor John Thomas and transported from London by railway.'[274] The fidelity of the Granada *Brideshead* therefore lies less in the details of objects than in the generalised and pervasive mood of nostalgia, evoked by Waugh's elegiac tone, exuberant language, and golden and green imageries. The success of the Granada adaptation depends on the film-makers' employment of 'formal characteristics [… which] have become signifiers of nostalgia by convention.'[275] Monk argues that 'directors such as James Ivory favoured techniques that produced a relative static "pictorialist" style rather than making the fullest use of the *moving* image – long takes, slow, smooth camera movement, and narratively unmotivated crane and high-angle shots […] – the films were regarded as uncinematic.'[276] More significant than the cinematic/televisual techniques, the 1981 *Brideshead* relies on the audiences' complicity. *Brideshead* was adapted in the eighties because the time, or rather the mood, was right; Waugh's obstinacy was eventually rewarded.

[274] 'Lakes & Waterways', last accessed 28 June 2016, <http://www.castlehoward.co.uk/house-and-grounds/the-grounds-and-gardens/lakes-and-waterways>.
[275] Higson, 'Nostalgia', p. 129.
[276] Claire Monk, *Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), p. 16.

Bibliography

Abrams, Albert, *New Concepts in Diagnosis and Treatment: Physico-clinical Medicine, the Practical Application of the Electronic Theory in the Interpretation and Treatment of Disease* (San Francisco, CA: Philopolis Press, 1916).

---. *New Concepts in Diagnosis and Treatment: Physico-clinical Medicine, the Practical Application of the Electronic Theory in the Interpretation and Treatment of Disease* (Pomeroy, WA: Health Research, 1977).

Abrams, M. H., *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (London: Oxford University, 1971).

Ahmed, Sara, 'Happy Objects', in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. by Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 29-51.

---. *The Promise of Happiness* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010).

Amberg, George, ed., *The Film Society Programmes 1925-1939* (New York: Arno Press, 1972). Ames, Christopher, *The Life of the Party: Festive Vision in Modern Fiction* (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1991).

Aristotle, *Poetics* (London: Penguin, 1996).

Ashkenazi, Ofer, '"A New Era of Peace and Understanding": The Integration of Sound Film into German Popular Cinema, 1929-1932', in *The Many Faces of Weimar Cinema: Rediscovering Germany's Filmic Legacy*, ed. by Christian Rogowski (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010), pp. 249-67.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. by Helene Iswolsky (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press, 1968).

---. *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by Michael Holquist and trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Taxes Press, 2011).

Barber, Michael, *Anthony Powell: A Life* (London, Woodstock, and New York: Duckworth Overlook, 2005).

Barthes, Roland, 'Toys', in *The Object Reader*, ed. by Fiona Candlin and Raiford Guins (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 39-40.

Bazin, André, 'Charlie Chaplin', in *What Is Cinema?*, trans. by Hugh Gray, 2 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2005), I, pp.

144-53.

Beaty, Frederick L., *The Ironic World of Evelyn Waugh: A Study of Eight Novels* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992).

Beenfeldt, Christian, *The Philosophical Background and Scientific Legacy of E. B. Titchener's Psychology: Understanding Introspectionism* (Cham and New York: Springer, 2013).

Benjamin, Walter, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in *Illuminations*, ed. by Hannah Arendt and trans. by Harry Zorn (London: Pimlico, 1999), pp. 211-44.

Berberich, Christine, *The Image of the English Gentleman in Twentieth-Century Literature: Englishness and Nostalgia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Bergson, Henri, 'Laughter', in *Comedy: An Essay on Comedy/George Meredith*; Laughter/Henri Bergson; Introduction and Appendix: 'The Meanings of Comedy'/ by Wylie Sypher, ed. by Wylie Sypher (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980).

Bilton, Alan, *Silent Film Comedy and American Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Black, Peter, 'Funny enough, but the original Waugh is hard to follow', *The Daily Mail*, 17 December 1970, p. 3.

Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Bluemel, Kristin, 'Appendix: Who are the Intermodernists?', in *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain*, ed. by Kristin Bluemel (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp. 208-24.

---. 'Introduction: What is Intermodernism?', in *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain*, ed. by Kristin Bluemel (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp. 1-17.

Bluestone, George, *Novels into Film* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1957).

Blumenfeld, Robert, *Tools and Techniques for Character Interpretation: A Handbook of Psychology for Actors, Writers, and Directors* (New Jersey: Limelight Editions, 2006).

Bogaards, Winnifred M., 'Evelyn Waugh and the BBC', in *Evelyn Waugh: New Directions*, ed. by Alain Blayac (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 85-111.

Borges, Jorge Luis, 'Borges and I', in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. by Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), pp. 282-83.

Bould, Mark, *Film Noir: From Berlin to Sin City* (London and New York: Wallflower, 2005).

Bowen, Elizabeth, 'Why I Go to the Cinema', in *Footnotes to the Film*, ed. by Charles Davy (London: Lovat Dickson, 1938), pp. 205-220.

Bowker, Gordon, *James Joyce: A Biography* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011).

Bradbury, Malcolm, *Evelyn Waugh* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964).

Bromberg, Philip M., *Awakening the Dreamer: Clinical Journeys* (New York and Hove: Taylor & Francis, 2011).

Brooks, Peter, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Brown, Erica, 'The Rise and Fall of "The Original Bright Young Thing": Beverley Nichols, *Crazy Pavements* (1927) and Popular Authorship', *The Review of English Studies*, 66/273 (2015), 144-63.

Brown, Geoff, 'I am also a camera: John Heygate and Talking Picture', *Film History: An International Journal*, 20/2 (2008), 202-216.

Bruhn, Jørgen, 'Dialogizing Adaptation Studies: From One-Way Transport to A Dialogic Two-Way Process', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 69-88.

Bruhn, Jørgen, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, '"There and Back Again": New Challenges and New Directions in Adaption Studies', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 1-16.

Bryant, John, 'Textual Identity and Adaptive Revision: Editing Adaptation as a Fluid Text', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, eds. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 47-67.

Buchanan, Tom, *Britain and the Spanish Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Burstein, Jessica, *Cold Modernism: Literature, Fashion, Art* (University Park, PA:

The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012).

Byrne, Paula, *Mad World: Evelyn Waugh and the Secrets of Brideshead* (London: Harper Press, 2009).

Campbell, Sue, 'Our Faithful to the Past: Reconstructing Memory Value', in *Our Faithful to the Past: The Ethics and Politics of Memory*, ed. by Sue Campbell, Christine M. Koggel, and Rockney Jacobsen (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 30-49.

Carens, James F., *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1966).

Carey, John, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice Among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1990-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992).

Carpenter, Humphrey, *The Brideshead Generation: Evelyn Waugh and His Friends* (London: Faber and Faber, 2008).

Carr, Jamie M., *Queer Times: Christopher Isherwood's Modernity* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).

Carver, Beci, *Granular Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Cave, Terence, *Thinking with Literature: Towards a Cognitive Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Chaplin, Charlie, 'A Rejection of the Talkies', in *Focus on Chaplin*, ed. by Donald W. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 63-65.

---. 'Development of the Comic Story and the Tramp Character', in *Focus on Chaplin*, ed. by Donald W. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 45-47.

---. 'What People Laugh At', in *Focus on Chaplin*, ed. by Donald W. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 48-54.

Christensen, Peter G., 'Homosexuality in *Brideshead Revisited*: "Something quite remote from anything the [builder] intended"', in *A Handful of Mischief: New Essays on Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher, Ann Pasternak Slater, and John Howard Wilson (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011), pp. 137-59.

Clark, Andy, and David J. Chalmers, 'The Extended Mind', in *The Extended Mind*, ed. by Richard Menary (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010), pp. 27-42.

Cohen, Debra Rae, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty, 'Introduction: Signing On', in

Broadcasting Modernism, ed. by Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009), pp. 1-7.

Colletta, Lisa, *British Novelists in Hollywood, 1935-1965: Travelers, Exiles, and Expats* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, 2013).

Collins, Randall, 'Interaction Ritual Chains and Collective Effervescence', in *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, ed. by Christian von Scheve and Mikko Salmela (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 299-311.

Colombetti, Giovanna, *The Feeling Bodies: Affective Science Meets the Enactive Mind* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Colombetti, Giovanna, and Tom Roberts, 'Extending the Extended Mind: The Case for Extended Affectivity', *Philosophical Studies*, 172/5 (2015), 1243-1263.

Connor, Steven, *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

---. 'I Switch Off: Beckett and the Ordeals of Radio', in *Broadcasting Modernism*, ed. by Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009), pp. 274-93.

---. 'Thinking Things', *Textual Practice*, 24/1 (2010), 1-20.

Craig, Cairns, 'Rooms Without a View', *Sight and Sound*, 1 June 1991, 10-13.

Crane, Hart, 'Chaplinesque', in *The Complete Poems and Selected Letters and Prose of Hart Crane*, ed. by Brom Weber (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).

Cunningham, Valentine, *British Writers of the Thirties* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Davis, Robert Murray, *Evelyn Waugh and the Forms of His Time* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989).

---. *Evelyn Waugh, Apprentice: The Early Writings, 1910-1927* (Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1985).

---. *Evelyn Waugh, Writer* (Norman, OK: Pilgrim Press Books, 1981).

---. 'Imagined Space in Brideshead Revisited', in *Evelyn Waugh: New Directions*, ed. by Alain Blayac (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 22-34.

---. *Mischief in the Sun: The Making and Unmaking of The Loved One* (Troy, NY: The Whitston Publishing Company, 1999).

Davis, Thomas S., 'Late Modernism: British Literature at Midcentury', *Literature Compass*, 9/4 (2012), 326-37.

---. *The Extinct Scene: Late Modernism and Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).

DeCoste, D. Marcel, *The Vocation of Evelyn Waugh: Faith and Art in the Post-war Fiction* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).

Delasanta, Rodney, and Mario L. D'Avanzo, 'Truth and Beauty in *Brideshead Revisited*', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 11/2 (1965), 140-52.

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5 (Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

Donahue, Neil H., 'Introduction: Art History or "Sublime Hysteria"?', in *Invisible Cathedrals: The Expressionist Art History of Wilhelm Worringer*, ed. by Neil H. Donahue (University Part, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 1-12.

Durgnat, Raymond, *The Crazy Mirror: Hollywood Comedy and the American Image* (London: Faber and Faber,1969).

Eade, Philip, *Evelyn Waugh: A Life Revisited* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2016).

Eagleton, Terry, *Exiles and Émigrés: Studies in Modern Literature* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1970).

Eisenstein, Sergei, *Film Form: Essay in Film Theory*, ed. and trans. by Jay Leyda (London: Dennis Dobson, 1963).

Eliot, T. S., *Four Quartets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979).

---. 'from Notes Towards the Definition of Culture', in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), pp. 292-305.

---. 'Hamlet', in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), pp. 45-49.

---. 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock', in *The Waste Land and Other Poems* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), pp. 3-8.

---. *The Waste Land: Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism*, ed. by Michael North (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 2001).

Elliott, Kamilla, *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

---. 'Theorizing Adaptations/ Adaptation Theories', *Adaptation Studies*, 19-45.

Ellis, Steve, *British Writers and the Approach of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Ennis, Sally-Anne, ‘King Lear: The Mirror Cracked’, in *Cognitive Analytic Therapy and Later Life: A New Perspective on Old Age*, ed. by Jason Hepple and Laura Sutton (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 109-32.

Erdelyi, Matthew Hugh, ‘Repression, Reconstruction, and Defense: History and Integration of the Psychoanalytic and Experimental Frameworks’, in *Repression and Dissociation: Implications for Personality Theory, Psychopathology, and Health*, ed. by Jerome L. Singer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 1-31.

Esty, Jed, *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004).

Eyman, Scott, *The Speed of Sound: Hollywood and the Talkie Revolution, 1926-1930* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999).

Falk, Quentin, *Travels in Greeneland: The Cinema of Graham Greene* (London and New York: Quartet Books, 1990).

Farquhar, Michael, *A Treasury of Deception: Liars, Misleaders, Hoodwinkers and the Extraordinary True Stories of History's Greatest Hoaxes, Fakes and Frauds* (New York: Penguin, 2005).

Ferrall, Charles, and Dougal McNeill, *Writing the 1926 General Strike: Literature, Culture, Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Flanery, Patrick Denman, ‘*Brideshead* Re-Positioned: Re-Ma(r)king Text and Tone in Filmed Adaptation’, in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 193-223.

Fleming, Ian, *Casino Royale* (London: Vintage, 2012).

Forster, E. M., *Aspects of the Novel* (London: Penguin, 2005).

Freer, Ian, ed., *Empire Movie Miscellany: Instant Film Buff Status Guaranteed* (London: Virgin Books, 2007).

Freud, Sigmund, ‘Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego’, in *Civilisation Society and Religion*, trans. by James Strachey and ed. by Albert Dickson (London: Penguin, 1991), pp. 91-178.

---. ‘The Neuro-Psychoses of Defence’, trans. by J. Rickman, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. by James Strachey, 24 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-74), III (1962), pp. 41-68.

Gallagher, Donat, ‘The Humanizing Factor: Evelyn Waugh’s “Very Personal View of

Providence"', in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 21-36.

Gallagher, Donat, ed., *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh* (London: Methuen, 1983).

Gang, Joshua, *'Behaviourism and Literary Modernity, 1913-2009'* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2012).

García, Roberto A. Valdeón, 'The Spoken and the Unspoken: The Homosexual Theme in E. M. Forster and Evelyn Waugh', in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 155-179.

Garnett, Robert R., *From Grimes to Brideshead: The Early Novels of Evelyn Waugh* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990).

Garrington, Abbie, *Haptic Modernism: Touch and the Tactile in Modernist Writing* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013).

Gilmore, Thomas B., *Equivocal Spirits: Alcoholism and Drinking in Twentieth-Century Literature* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

Gleason, Tracy, 'Murray: The Stuffed Bunny', in *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*, ed. by Sherry Turkle (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2011), pp. 170-77.

Gomery, Douglas, *The Coming of Sound: A History* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005).

Green, Henry, 'An Unfinished Novel', in *Surviving: The Uncollected Writing of Henry Green*, ed. by Mathew Yorke (London: Harvill, 1993), pp. 251- 59.

---. *Living*, in *Loving, Living, Party Going* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 205-382.

---. 'Mood', in *Surviving: The Uncollected Writing of Henry Green*, ed. by Mathew Yorke (London: Harvill, 1993), pp. 28-47.

---. *Pack My Bag: A Self-Portrait* (London: Vintage, 2000).

---. *Party Going*, in *Loving, Living, Party Going* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 383-528.

---. 'The Art of Fiction', in *Surviving: The Uncollected Works of Henry Green*, ed. by Mathew Yorke (London: Harvill, 1993), pp. 234-50.

Green, Martin, *Children of the Sun: A Narrative of 'Decadence' in England After*

1918 (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

Greenberg, Jonathan, *Modernism, Satire, and the Novel* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Greene, Graham, *Graham Greene: A Life in Letters*, ed. by Richard Greene (London: Abacus, 2008).

---. *Mornings in the Dark: The Graham Greene Film Reader,* ed. by David Parkinson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995).

---. *The Fallen Idol*, in *The Third Man and The Fallen Idol* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 99-130.

---. *The Third Man*, in *The Third Man and the Fallen Idol* (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. 1-98.

---. *Ways of Escape* (London: Vintage, 1999).

Griggs, Yvonne, *The Bloomsbury Introduction to Adaptation Studies: Adapting the Canon in Film, TV, Novels and Popular Culture* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016).

Gunning, Tom, 'The Cinema of Attraction[s]: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant-Garde', in *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, ed. by Wanda Strauven (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), pp. 381-88.

Gropius, Walter, 'Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar', in Hans M. Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, trans. by Wolfgang Jabs and Basil Gilbert and ed. by Joseph Stein (Cambridge, MA and London : The MIT Press, 1969), pp. 31-33.

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

Hake, Sabine, 'Chaplin Reception in Weimar Germany', *New German Critique*, 51 (1990), pp. 87-111.

Hastings, Selina, *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1994).

Heath, Jeffrey M., *The Picturesque Prison: Evelyn Waugh and His Writing* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1982).

---. 'Waugh's *Decline and Fall* in Manuscript', *English Studies*, 55/6 (1974), 523-30.

Heffernan, Richard, *New Labour and Tatcherism: Political Change in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquarrie and Edward

Robinson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973).

Hemingway, Ernest, *Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* (London: Arrow Books, 2004).

---. *A Moveable Feast* (London: Arrow Books, 2004).

Henke, Robert, *Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell'Arte* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Hentea, Marius, 'The End of the Party: The Bright Young People in Vile Bodies, Afternoon Men, and Party Going', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 56/1 (Spring 2014), 90-111.

Hepple, Jason and Laura Sutton, 'Introduction', in *Cognitive Analytic Therapy and Later Life: A New Perspective on Old Age*, ed. by Jason Hepple and Laura Sutton (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. xv-xvi.

Herman, David, '1880-1945: Re-minding Modernism', in *The Emergence of Mind: Representation of Consciousness in Narrative Discourse in English*, ed. by David Herman (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), pp. 243-72.

Heygate, John, *Talking Picture* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934).

Higson, Andrew, *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama Since 1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

---. 'Nostalgia is Not What It Used to Be: Heritage Films, Nostalgia Websites and Contemporary Consumers', *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 17/2 (2014), 120-42.

---. 'Re-presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film', in *British Cinema and Thatcherism: Fires Were Started*, ed. by Lester Friedman (London: UCL Press, 1993), pp. 109-29.

Holtby, Winifred, *Virginia Woolf: A Critical Memoir* (Chicago: Academy Press, 1978).

Horowitz, Mardi J., Henry C. Markman, Charles H. Stinson, Bram Fridhandler, and Jess H. Ghannam, 'A Classification Theory of Defense', in *Repression and Dissociation: Implications for Personality Theory, Psychopathology, and Health, ed. by Jerome L. Singer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990)*, pp. 61-84.

Hosmer, Robert, 'An Interview with Dame Muriel Spark', *Salmagundi*, 146/147 (2005), 127-58.

Howell, Elizabeth F., 'From Hysteria to Chronic Relational Trauma Disorder: The History of Borderline Personality Disorder and its Links with Dissociation and

Psychosis', in *Psychosis, Trauma and Dissociation: Emerging Perspectives on Severe Psychopathology*, eds. by Andrew Moskowitz, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), pp. 105-15.

---. *The Dissociative Mind* (New York and Hove: Routledge, 2005).

Humble, Nicola, *The Feminine Middlebrow Novel, 1920s to 1950s: Class, Domesticity, and Bohemianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Hutcheon, Linda, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

---. *The Theory of Adaptation* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006).

Hutchins, Edward, *Cognition in the Wild* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996).

Huyssen, Andreas, *After the Great Divide: Modernist, Mass Culture and Postmodernism* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988).

Isaacs, Kenneth S., 'Searching for Science in Psychoanalysis', *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 29/3 (1999), 235-52.

Isherwood, Christopher, 'A Writer and the Films', in *Isherwood on Writing: The Lectures in California*, ed. by James J. Berg (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), pp. 99-113.

---. *All the Conspirators* (London: Vintage, 2012).

---. *Goodbye to Berlin* (London: Vintage, 1998).

---. *Lions and Shadows: An Education in the Twenties* (London: Vintage, 2013).

---. *Prater Violet* (London: Vintage, 2012).

Jacobs, Richard, 'Introduction', in *Evelyn Waugh, Vile Bodies* (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. ix-xxxiv.

---. 'Introduction', in *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold: A Conversation Piece* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. vii-xliii.

Jaffe, Aaron, 'Inventing the Radio Cosmopolitan: Vernacular Modernism at a Standstill', in *Broadcasting Modernism*, ed. by Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009), pp. 11-30.

Jordan, Peter, *The Venetian Origins of the Commedia dell'Arte* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014).

Kermode, Frank, 'Biographical Preface', in *Virginia Woolf: Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. vii-x.

---. 'Mr Waugh's Cities', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Martin

Stannard (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 279-87.

---. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (London, Oxford, and New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).

Kracauer, Siegfried, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966).

Kuhn, Annette, and Guy Westwell, *A Dictionary of Film Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Latour, Bruno, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Leavis, F. R., and Denys Thompson, *Culture and Environment: The Training of Critical Awareness* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1959).

Le Bon, Gustave, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (Mineola: Dover Publications, 2002).

Lewis, Wyndham, 'Inferior Religions', in *The Wild Body* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928), pp. 233-44.

---. *Men Without Art* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964).

---. *Satire and Fiction (*Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1970).

---. 'The Meaning of the Wild Body', in *The Wild Body* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928), pp. 244-51.

Linck, Jr, Charles E., 'Waugh-Greenidge Film – *The Scarlet Woman*', *Evelyn Waugh Newsletter*, 3/ 2 (1969), 1-7.

Littlewood, Ian, *The Writings of Evelyn Waugh* (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1983).

Lodge, David, 'Crowds and Power in the Early Victorian Novel', in *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 100-15.

---. 'Dialogue in the Modern Novel', in *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 75-86.

Lorenz, Edward N., *The Essence of Chaos* (London: UCL Press, 1995).

Lynch, James J., 'Evelyn Waugh During the Pinfold Years', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 32/4 (1986), 543-59.

MacKay, Marina, *Modernism and World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

---. 'Modernist Nostalgia/Nostalgia for Modernism: Anthony Powell and Evelyn

Waugh', in *Modernism and Nostalgia: Bodies, Location, Aesthetics*, ed. by Tammy Clewell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 237-251.

Mao, Douglas, and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, 'Introduction: Modernisms Bad and New', in *Bad Modernisms* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 1-17.

---. 'The New Modernist Studies', *PMLA*, 123/3 (2008), 737-48.

Marcus, Laura, '"A Hymn to Movement": The "City Symphony" of the 1920s and 1930s', *Modernist Cultures*, 5/1 (2010), 30-46.

---. *Dreams of Modernity: Psychoanalysis, Literature, Cinema* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

---. *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

McCabe, Susan, *Cinematic Modernism: Modernist Poetry and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

---. '"Delight in Dislocation": The Cinematic Modernism of Stein, Chaplin, and Man Ray', *Modernism/modernity*, 8/3 (2001), 429-52.

McCartney, George, *Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2004).

McCrum, Robert, *Wodehouse: A Life* (New York and London: Norton, 2004).

McDonald, Gerald D., Michael Conway, and Mark Ricci, *The Films of Charlie Chaplin* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1965).

McDougall, William, *The Group Mind: A Sketch of the Principles of Collective Psychology with Some Attempt to Apply Them To the Interpretation of National Life and Character* (Cambridge: University Press, 1921).

McFarlane, Brian, *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

McLoughlin, Kate, 'Introduction: A Welcome from the Host', in *The Modernist Party*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), pp. 1-24.

---. 'Prufrock, Party-Goer: Tongue-Tied at Tea', in *The Modernist Party*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), pp. 45-63.

McLuhan, Marshall, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

Mepham, John, 'Varieties of Modernism, Varieties of Incomprehension: Patrick

Hamilton and Elizabeth Bowen', in *British Fiction After Modernism: The Novel at Mid-Century*, ed. by Marina MacKay and Lyndsey Stonebridge (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 59-76.

Miller, Tyrus, *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction and the Art between the World Wars* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1999).

Milthorpe, Naomi, *Evelyn Waugh's Satire: Texts and Contexts* (Lanham, MD: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016).

Monchaux, Cecily de, 'Dreaming and the Organizing Function of the Ego', in *The Dream Discourse Today*, ed. by Sara Flanders (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 195-212.

Monk, Claire, *Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011).

---. 'The British Heritage-Film Debate Re visited', in *British Historical Cinema: The History, Heritage, and Costume Film*, eds. by Claire Monk and Amy Sargeant (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 176-98.

---. 'The British "Heritage Film" and Its Critics', *Critical Survey*, 7/2 (1995), 116-24.

Moskowitz, Andrew, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy, 'Introduction', in *Psychosis, Trauma and Dissociation: Emerging Perspectives on Severe Psychopathology*, eds. by Andrew Moskowitz, Ingo Schäfer, and Martin J. Dorahy (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), pp. 1-6.

Murphy, Robert, 'Coming of Sound to the Cinema in Britain', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 4/2 (1984), 143-60.

Murray, Alex, 'Decadence Revisited: Evelyn Waugh and the Afterlife of the 1890s', *Modernism/modernity*, 22/3 (2015), 593-607.

William Myers, *Evelyn Waugh and the Problem of Evil* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991).

Naremore, James, *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press, 1998).

North, Michael, *Henry Green and the Writing of His Generation* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1984).

Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. 'Politics and the English Language', in George Orwell, *Essays* (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. 348-60.

Passmore, Kevin, 'Introduction: Political Violence and Democracy in Western

Europe, 1918-1940', in *Political Violence and Democracy in Western Europe, 1918-1940,* ed. by Chris Millington and Kevin Passmore (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Pasternak Slater, Ann, 'Introduction', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. xi-xliii.

Priestley, J. B., 'What Was Wrong With Pinfold', in *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold: A Conversation Piece* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 156-59.

Pritchett, V. S., 'Back from the War', *The New York Times*, 1 October 1950, p. 28.

Prucher, Jeff, ed., *Brave New Words: The Oxford Dictionary of Science Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Query, Patrick, 'Catholicism and Form from Hopkins to Waugh', in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 37-44.

---. *Ritual and the Idea of Europe in Interwar Writing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

Randall, Bryony, 'Virginia Woolf's Idea of a Party', in *The Modernist Party*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), pp. 95-111.

Roseau, Nathalie, 'The City Seen from the Aeroplane: Distorted Reflections and Urban Futures', in *Seeing From Above: The Aerial View in Visual Culture*, ed. by Mark Dorrian and Frédéric Pousin (London: I. B. Tauris, 2013), pp. 210-26.

Ryall, Tom, 'Blackmail', in *British Film Institute Film Classics*, ed. by Edward Buscombe and Rob White, 2 vols (New York and London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2003), I, pp. 94-114.

Saltzman, Rachelle Hope, *A Lark for the Sake of Their Country: The 1926 General Strike Volunteers in Forklore and Memory* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2012).

Seigworth, Gregory J., and Melissa Gregg, 'An Inventory of Shimmers', in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. by Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 1-25.

Shail, Andrew, *The Cinema and the Origins of Literary Modernism* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

Shakespeare, William, *King Lear* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

---. William Shakepeare, *The Tragedy of* Hamlet *Prince of Denmark* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958).

Slaby, Jan, 'Emotions and the Extended Mind', in *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, ed. by Christian von Scheve and Mikko Salmela (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 32-46.

Spark, Muriel, *Curriculum Vitae: A Volume of Autobiography* (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 2009).

---. 'My Conversion', in *Critical Essays on Muriel Spark*, ed. by Joseph Hynes (New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1992), pp. 24-28.

---. *The Comforters* (London: Virago Press, 2009).

Stam, Robert, 'Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation', in *Film Adaptation*, ed. by James Naremore (London: The Athlone Press, 2000), pp. 54-76.

---. *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaption* (Malden, M.A. and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

Stanfield, Paul Scott, '"This Implacable Doctrine": Behaviourism in Wyndham Lewis's "Snooty Baronet"', *Twentieth Century Literature*, 47/2 (2001), 241-67.

Stannard, Martin, *Evelyn Waugh: No Abiding City, 1939-1966* (London: Flamingo, 1993).

Stannard, Martin, ed., *Evelyn Waugh: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).

---. *Evelyn Waugh: The Early Years, 1903-1939* (New York: Norton, 1986).

---. *Muriel Spark: The Biography* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2009).

Stapledon, Olaf, *Last and First Men: A story of the Near and Far Future* (London: Methuen, 1930).

Stern, J. P., *On Realsim* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973).

Stopp, Frederick J., *Evelyn Waugh: Portrait of an Artist* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1958).

Sutton, John, 'Remembering', in *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*, ed. by Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 217-235.

Taddeo, Julie Anne, 'Plato's Apostles: Edwardian Cambridge and the "New Style of Love"', *Journal of History of Sexuality*, 8/2 (1997), 196-228.

Tandy, Arthur, 'A University Cinema Club: How They are Doing it at Cambridge', *The Isis*, 659 (11 June 1924), 15.

---. 'Headington New Cinema', in *The Isis*, 657 (28 May 1924), 26.

Taylor, D. J., *Bright Young People: The Rise and Fall of a Generation 1918-1940*

(London: Vintage, 2008).

The Isis, 645 (23 January 1924), i.

---. 661 (5 October 1924), 3.

Thomson, Brian Lindsay, *Graham Greene and the Politics of Popular Fiction and Film* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Tollefsen, Deborah Perron, 'From Extended Mind to Collective Mind', in *Cognitive Systems Research*, 7 (2006), 140-50.

Treglown, Jeremy, *Romancing: The Life and Work of Henry Green* (New York: Random House, 2000).

Trotter, David, *Cinema and Modernism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

---. *Literature in the First Media Age: Britain Between the Wars* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Turkle, Sherry, 'Introduction: The Things That Matter', in *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*, ed. by Sherry Turkle (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2011), pp. 3-10.

---. 'Objects Inspire', in *The Object Reader*, ed. by Fiona Candlin and Raiford Guins (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 297-304.

Usai, Paolo Cherchi, *Silent Cinema: An Introduction* (London: BFI Publishing, 2000).

Vaillant, George E., 'Repression in College Men Followed for Half a Century', in *Repression and Dissociation: Implications for Personality Theory, Psychopathology, and Health*, ed. by Jerome L. Singer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 259-73.

Vidal, Belén, *Heritage Film: Nation, Genre and Representation* (London and New York: Wallflower, 2012).

Vygotsky, Lev, *Thought and Language*, ed. and trans. by Eugenia Hanfmann, Gertrude Vakar, and Alex Kozulin (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Watson, John B., *Behaviourism* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1931).

---. 'Behaviourism: A Psychology Based on Reflex-action', *Philosophy*, 1/4 (1926), pp. 454-66.

---. 'Psychology as the Behaviourist Views It', *Psychological Review*, 20/2 (1913), pp. 158-77.

Waugh, Evelyn, *A Handful of Dust* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. *A Little Learning: The First Volume of an Autobiography* (London: Penguin,

2010).

---. ‘Anything Wrong with Priestley?’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 527-29.

---. ‘Basil Seal Rides Again’, in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 489-518.

---. *Black Mischief* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. *Brideshead Revisited* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. ‘By Special Request: An Alternative Ending to *A Handful of Dust*’, in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 147-54.

---. ‘Cities of the Future’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 63-65.

---. ‘Converted to Rome: Why It Has Happened to Me’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 103-05.

---. *Decline and Fall* (London: Penguin, 2003).

---. ‘Excursion into Reality’, in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 73-86.

---. ‘Fan-Fare’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 300-04.

---. ‘Felix Culpa’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 360-65.

---. ‘For Adult Audiences’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 89-91.

---. ‘Let Us Return to the Nineties: But Not to Oscar Wilde’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 122-25.

---. ‘My Favourite Film Star’, in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 68-70.

---. ‘Notes on the Film Adaptations of *Brideshead Revisited* and *Scoop*’, *Aretę*, 14 (2004), pp. 19-29.

---. ‘Out of Depth’, in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected*

Drawings, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 135-45.

---. 'Oxford and the Next War: A Letter of Exhortation from an Undergraduate to a Friend Abroad', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 20-21.

---. *Put Out More Flags* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. 'Ronald Firbank', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 56-59.

---. *Scoop* (London: Penguin, 2003).

---. 'Seen in the Dark: The Merry-Go-Round', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 14-15.

---. 'Something Fresh', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 518-19.

---. *Sword of Honour* (London: Penguin, 2001).

---. 'The Balance', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 3-38.

---. *The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Michael Davie, (London: Phoenix, 2009).

---. *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Mary Amory (London: Phoenix, 2009).

---. *The Loved One: An Anglo-American Tragedy* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. 'The Man Hollywood Hates', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 337-39.

---. 'The Man Who Liked Dickens', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 119-34.

---. *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold: A Conversation Piece* (London: Penguin, 2006).

---. 'The Point of Departure', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 404-6.

---. 'The Sympathetic Passenger', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 221-24.

---. 'The War and the Younger Generation', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 61-63.

---. 'The Youngest Generation', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn*

Waugh, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), p. 11.

---. 'These Roman Scandals', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 540-42.

---. 'To Mrs. Ian Fleming', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), p. 487.

---. 'Too Young At Forty: Youth Calls to the Peter Pans of Middle-Age Who Block the Way', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 45-47.

---. *Vile Bodies* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---. 'What I Think of My Elders', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 66-68.

---. 'Why Glorify Youth?', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 125-26.

---. 'Why Hollywood is a Term of Disparagement', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 325-31.

---. 'Wittenberg and Oxford: "A Little More than Kin and A Less than Kind"', in *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Donat Gallagher (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 15-16.

---. 'Work Suspended: Two Chapters of an Unfinished Novel', in *Evelyn Waugh: The Complete Short Stories and Selected Drawings*, ed. by Ann Pasternak Slater (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), pp. 227-320.

Waugh, Patricia, *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1988).

---. 'Precarious Voices: Moderns, Moods, and Moving Epochs', in *Moving Modernisms: Motion, Technology, and Modernity*, ed. by David Bradshaw, Laura Marcus, and Rebecca Roach (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 191-213.

---. 'Thinking in Literature: Modernism and Contemporary Neuroscience', in *The Legacies of Modernism: Historicising Postwar and Contemporary Fiction*, ed. by David James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 75-95.

Wheeler, William Morton, *Ants: Their Structure, Development and Behavior* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1910).

White, Laura, 'The Rejection of Beauty in Waugh's *Brideshead Revisited*', *Renascence: Essays on Values in Literature*, 58/3 (2006), 181-94.

Whitechapel, Simon, 'Adam and Evelyn: "The Balance", in *The Temple at Thatch*, and *666'*, *Evelyn Waugh Newsletter and Studies*, 33/2 (2002), 1-9.

Wilson, Edmund, 'Splendors and Miseries of Evelyn Waugh', in *Classics and Commercials: A Literary Chronicle of the Forties* (London: W. H. Allen, 1950), pp. 298-305.

Winnicott, Donald Woods, *Playing and Reality* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991).

Wollen, Tana, 'Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgia Screen Fictions for the 1980s', in *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*, ed. by John Corner and Sylvia Harvey (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 173-88.

Woolf, Virginia, 'Character in Fiction', in *Virginia Woolf Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 37-54.

Woolf, Virginia, 'Craftsman', in *Virginia Woolf Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 85-91.

---. *Jacob's Room*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

---. 'Middlebrow', in *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays* (London: Hogarth Press, 1943), pp. 113-19.

---. 'Modern Fiction', in *Virginia Woolf Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 6-12.

---. *Mrs Dalloway* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

---. 'Street Haunting: A London Adventure', in *Virginia Woolf Selected Essays*, ed. by David Bradshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 177-87.

---. 'The Cinema', in *Collected Essays*, ed. by Leonard Woolf, 4 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1966-67), II (1966), pp. 268-72.

---. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Anne Oliver Bell, 5 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1977-84), II (1978).

---. 'The Leaning Tower', in *The Moment and Other Essays* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1948), pp. 128-154.

---. 'The Mark on the Wall', in *Selected Short Stories*, ed. by Sandra Kemp (London: Penguin, 1993), pp. 53-60.

---. 'The "Movie" Novel', in *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Andrew McNeillie and Stuart Nelson Clarke, 5 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1986-94), II (1987),

pp. 288-91.

Wollen, Tana, 'Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgia Screen Fictions for the 1980s', in *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*, ed. by John Corner and Sylvia Harvey (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 173-88.

Worringer, Wilhelm, *Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).

Consulted but not cited (selected):

Avery, Todd, *Radio Modernism: Literature, Ethics, and the BBC, 1922-1938* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006).

Bowlby, Rachel, *Feminist Destinations and Further Essays on Virginia Woolf* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997).

Brennan, Michael G., *Evelyn Waugh: Fictions, Faith and Family* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

Bruhn, Mark J., and Donald R. Wehrs, eds, *Cognition, Literature and History* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

Chatman, Seymour, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978).

Cohen, Keith, *Film and Fiction: The Dynamics of Exchanges* (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 1979).

Collier, Patrick, *Modernism on Fleet Street* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006).

Crafton, Donald, *The Talkies: American Cinema's Transition to Sound, 1926-1931* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1977).

Davis, Robert Murray, *Brideshead Revisited: The Past Redeemed* (Boston: Twayne Puslishers, 1990).

Devereux, James A., 'Catholic Matters in the Correspondence of Evelyn Waugh and Graham Greene', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 14/1 (1987), 111-126.

Evans, Eric, *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013).

Freud, Sigmund, *The Joke and Its Relation to the Unconscious*, trans. by Joyce Crick (London: Penguin, 2002).

Gallagher, Donat, and Carlos Villar Flor, *In the Picture: The Facts Behind the*

Fiction in Evelyn Waugh's Sword of Honour (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014).

Hawkins, Harriet, *Strange Attractors: Literature, Culture and Chaos Theory* (New York and London: Prentice Hall, 1995).

Hayles, N. Katherine, *Chaos Bound: Orderly Disorder in Contemporary Literature and Science* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Hentea, Marius, *Henry Green at the Limits of Modernism* (Brighton and Chicago: Sussex Academic Press, 2014).

---. 'Late Modernist Debuts: Publishing and Professionalizing Young Novelists in 1920s Britain', *Book History*, 14/1 (2011), 167-86.

Howell, Elizabeth F., and Sheldon Itzkowitz eds, *The Dissociative Mind in Psychoanalysis: Understanding and Working with Trauma* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).

Hynes, Samuel, *The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s* (London: Bodley Head, 1976).

Jaén, Isabel, and Julien Jacques Simon, eds, *Cognitive Literary Studies: Current Themes and New Directions* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2013).

Ker, Ian Turnbull, *The Catholic Revival in English Literature, 1845-1961: Newman, Hopkins, Belloc, Chesterton, Greene, Waugh* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

MacKay, Marina, '"Doing Business with Totalitaria": British Late Modernism and the Politics of Reputation', *ELH*, 73/3 (2006), 729-53.

Maher, Ashley, '"Swastika Arms of Passage Leading to Nothing": Late Modernism and the "New" Britain', *ELH*, 80/1 (2013), 251-85.

Marcus, Laura, and Ankhi Mukherjee, eds, *A Concise Companion to Psychoanalysis, Literature, and Culture* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

Moreno, Cristina Flores, 'Dialogue Between E. Waugh and G. Greene: Two Different Approaches to Art and Religion in *Brideshead Revisited* and *The End of the Affair*', in *Waugh without End: New Trends in Evelyn Waugh Studies*, ed. by Carlos Villar Flor and Robert Murray Davis (Bern: Perter Lang, 2005), pp. 181-191.

Neitzsche, Friedrich, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, 1967).

Page, Norman, *An Evelyn Waugh Chronology* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).

Parsons, Deborah, *Streetwalking the Metropolis: Women, the City, and Modernity*

(2000).

Patey, Douglas Lane, *The Life of Evelyn Waugh: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998).

Powell, Anthony, *Afternoon Men* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015).

---. *Agents and Patients* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2014).

---. *At Lady Molly's* (London: Arrow Books, 2005).

Pryce-Jones, David, ed., *Evelyn Waugh and His World* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973).

Sykes, Christopher, *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography* (London: Collins, 1975).

Thacker, Andrew, Moving Through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Wilson, John Howard, *Evelyn Waugh: A Literary Biography, 1903-1924* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001).

Zunshine, Lisa, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Literary Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Films and Television:

A Handful of Dust, dir. by Charles Sturridge (Granada International, 1988).

Brideshead Revisited, dir. by Charles Sturridge (Independent Television (ITV), 1981).

Brideshead Revisited, dir. by Julian Jarrold (2 Entertain, 2008).

Bright Young Things, dir. by Stephen Fry (FilmFour, 2003).

City Lights, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (United Artists, 1931).

Decline and Fall… of a Birdwatcher, dir. by John Krish (Twentieth Century Fox, 1968).

Destiny, dir. by Fritz Lang (Weiss Brothers Artclass Pictures, 1921).

Easy Street, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (Mutual Film, 1917).

High Green Wall, dir. by Nicholas Ray (CBS, 1954).

M, dir. by Fritz Lang (Vereinigte Star-Film GmbH, 1931).

Metropolis, dir. by Fritz Lang (Paramount-Ufa-Metro-Verleihbetriebe GmbH (Parufamet), 1927).

Modern Times, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (United Artists, 1936).

Monsieur Verdoux, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (United Artists, 1947).

Mr Loveday's Little Outing, dir by. Sam Hobkinson Cullingham (BBC, 2006).

Our Man in Havana, dir. by Carol Reed (Columbia Picture Corporation, 1959).

Put Out More Flags, dir. by Mark Cullingham (BBC, 1970).

Scoop, dir. by Gavin Millar (Independent Television (ITV), 1987).

Sword of Honour, dir. by Donald McWhinnie (BBC, 1967).

Sword of Honour, dir. by Bill Anderson (Channel 4 Television Corporation, 2001).

The Artist, dir. by Michel Hazanavicius (Warner Bros, 2011).

The Cabinet of Dr Caligari, dir. by Robert Wiene (Decla-Bioscop AG, 1920)

The Fallen Idol, dir. by Carol Reed (British Lion Film Corporation, 1948).

The Floorwalker, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (Mutual Film, 1916).

The Gold Rush, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (United Artists, 1925).

The Great Dictator, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (United Artists, 1940).

The Jazz Singer, dir by Alan Crosland (Warner Bros, 1927).

The Kid, dir. by Charlie Chaplin (First National Pictures, 1921).

The Loved One, dir. by Tony Richardson (MGM, 1965).

The Purple Rose of Cairo, dir. by Woody Allen (Orion Pictures, 1985).

The Scarlet Woman: An Ecclesiastical Melodrama, dir. by Terence Greenidge (Hypocrites Club, 1924).

The Story of the Kelly Gang, dir. by Charles Tait (J. & N. Tait; Johnson and Gibson, 1906).

The Third Man, dir. by Carol Reed (British Lion Film Corporation, 1949).

'The Waugh Trilogy: Part 3 An Englishman's Home', *Arena*, BBC Two England, 20 April 1987.

Other Sources:

AFI Catalog of Feature Films, last accessed 15 July 2016, <http://www.afi.com/members/catalog/>.

'Aloysius (Waugh)', *Wikipedia*, last accessed 15 June 2016, < https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aloysius_(Waugh) >.

Boyd, William, 'William Boyd on *Scoop'*, *Williamboyd.co.uk*, last accessed 5 April 2016, <http://www.williamboyd.co.uk/scoop-author-notes>.

'Commedia dell'Arte: Language', *National Theatre Discover*, last accessed 19 July 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gTs9xWJcgg>.

Connor, Steven, 'Feeling Things', *Stevenconnor.com*, last accessed 25 May 2016, <http://stevenconnor.com/feelingthings.html>.

'Fagus Factory in Alfeld', *WHC UNESCO*, last accessed 21 July 2016, < http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1368/>.

Fletcher, Ewan, 'Found: Aloysius the Brideshead bear', *The Daily Mail*, 2 June 2007, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-459461/Found-Aloysius-Brideshead-bear.html>.

Gunning, Tom, 'Chaplin and the Body of Modernity', *Chaplin.bfi.org.uk*, last accessed 16 August 2016, < http://chaplin.bfi.org.uk/programme/conference/pdf/tom-gunning.pdf >.

Henley, Jon, 'Rupert Murdoch and the Battle of Wapping: 25 Years On', *The Guardian*, 27 July 2011, last accessed 2 April 2016, < http://www.theguardian.com/media/2011/jul/27/rupert-murdoch-wapping-25-years>.

Henley, Jon, William Leith, Andrew Martin, Guy Browning, and Oliver James, 'Man's Best Friend', *The Guardian*, 4 October 2008, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2008/oct/04/brideshead.revisted.teddies>.

'Heritage', *Empire Cinemas*, last accessed 3 August 2016, < http://www.empirecinemas.co.uk/about_us/heritage/c47/t5>.

Horne, Philip, '*Scoop*, DVD Review', *The Telegraph*, 17 July 2009, last accessed 5 April 2016, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/dvd-reviews/5836014/Scoop-DVD-review.html>.

'Intersubjective', *Oxford English Dictionary*, last accessed 17 November 2015, < http://www.oed.com>.

Jebb, Julian, 'Evelyn Waugh, The Art of Fiction, No. 30', *The Paris Review*, 30 (1963), last accessed 8 December 2016, <https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4537/evelyn-waugh-the-art-of-fiction-no-30-evelyn-waugh>.

Jefferies, Stuart, 'Screen Player', *The Guardian*, 21 January 2006, last accessed 5 April 2016, <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2006/jan/21/books.news>.

'Lakes & Waterways', *Castlehoward.co.uk*, last accessed 28 June 2016,

<http://www.castlehoward.co.uk/house-and-grounds/the-grounds-and-gardens/lakes-and-waterways>.

'Mr Chaplin's New Film: *The Gold Rush* at The Tivoli' (*The Times*, 15 September 1925, p. 10), *The Times Digital Archive*, last accessed 14 July 2016 <http://gale.cengage.co.uk/times.aspx/>.

'Nostalgia', *Oxford English Dictionary*, last accessed 31 July 2016, <www.oed.com>.

Reynolds, Stanley, 'Put Out More Flags', (*The Times*, 17 December 1970, p. 13) *The Times Digital Archive*, last accessed 14 July 2016 <http://gale.cengage.co.uk/times.aspx/>.

'Silenus', *Oxford Dictionaries Online*, last accessed 19 July 2016, < http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/Silenus>.

'The Chapel', *Castlehoward.co.uk*, last accessed 28 June 2016, <http://www.castlehoward.co.uk/house-and-grounds/the-house-and-family/the-chapel>.

'The Story of the Kelly Gang (1906)', *UNESCO Memory of the World Register*, last accessed 15 July 2016, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/flagship-project-activities/memory-of-the-world/register/>.

'The World of Commedia dell'Arte', *National Theatre Discover*, last accessed 19 July 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h_0TAXWt8hY>.

'Third of Adults "Still Take Teddy Bear to Bed"', *The Telegraph*, 16 August 2010, last accessed 15 June 2016, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/howaboutthat/7947502/Third-of-adults-still-take-teddy-bear-to-bed.html>.

Tollefsen, Deborah Perron, 'Group Minds', *A History of Distributed Cognition*, last accessed 17 August 2016, <http://www.hdc.ed.ac.uk/seminars/group-minds>.