

LATE MODERNIST DEBUTS



Publishing and Professionalizing Young Novelists in 1920s Britain

Marius Hentea

In “Literature as a Profession,” a 1913 editorial in the *Times*, an unprecedented surge of aspiring young writers was met with the strongest discouragement: “There are now more youths than ever eager to be writers. There are more, indeed, than the public could possibly read, even if it regarded reading as a sacred duty; and it can only protect itself against their importunities by a dazed indifference like that of harassed tourists in the East.”¹

The imperial imagery—young writers were compared to colonial beggars, distracting the good people of England from the real sights they wanted to see—revealed the *Times*’s strong feelings on the matter. A man with an imperial connection of his own, Edward Bell (his publishing house’s Indian and Colonial Library sold nearly 1.5 million books between 1894 and 1911), was equally emphatic in his rejection of young authors.² He had edited Chatterton’s poetical works early in his publishing career, but in March 1914, when he heard of a proposal to turn the Author’s Union magazine into a platform for young writers, he did no more than quote *Punch*: “Don’t.”³

The assumption behind these rejections was that young writers lacked the experience to write anything worth reading. Yet in 1915, no doubt because “our boys” were suffering in the trenches, youth was given a chance in Nisbet’s *Writers of the Day* series, whose guiding idea was to have young authors assess their established elders. Its first two books, on Arnold Bennett and H. G. Wells, were authored by men aged thirty-seven and forty-two, both of whom had already published a number of books. Clearly youth in publishing is relative, as J. B. Priestley observed in a 1925 article, “The Younger Novelists”: the term is used for individuals who “are not young men, but, for the most part, men in their forties.”⁴ In a way, Priestley was right. Although it is difficult to find comprehensive data, and there is none specific to the novel, for the American market, in 1940, 20.0 percent of women and 31.0 percent of men were in the age group twenty-three to

thirty at the time of their debut, while in 1955, only 15.6 percent of writers made their debut before thirty-one years of age.⁵ Bernard Lahire's *La Condition littéraire* notes that in contemporary France, the average age for a debut author is forty-one years.⁶

But in a more crucial sense, Priestley was wrong by the standards of 1925, when he was thirty. It is startling how many young novelists were published in 1920s Britain, in a trying economic climate for the book industry.⁷ Evelyn Waugh, whose brother Alec was a best-selling wunderkind with *The Loom of Youth* (1917), observed at the start of the decade that "the very young have gained an almost complete monopoly of book, press and picture gallery. Youth is coming into its own."⁸ When Ronald Firbank in 1925 discovered a novel he had written when he was ten, he related his pride in having had "the tact as a child not to rush headlong into print."⁹ While he was probably thinking of Daisy Ashford, whose *The Young Visitors* (1919) sold over 230,000 copies in two years, netting its author £3,600 in royalties, there were many other young authors around.¹⁰ For the period 1920 to 1933, the list of British novelists whose debut occurred when they were twenty-five years or younger is staggering: Harold Acton, Michael Arlen, H. E. Bates, Barbara Cartland, Leslie Charteris, Noël Coward, Daphne du Maurier, Pamela Frankau, Louis Golding, Henry Green, Graham Greene, Patrick Hamilton, Georgette Heyer, James Hilton, R. C. Hutchinson, Christopher Isherwood, Malcolm Lowry, Ethel Mannin, Beverley Nichols, Mary Panter-Downes, William Plomer, Goronwy Rees, Edward Sackville-West, and Evelyn Waugh.

While a survey of literary history shows that there are always cases of young authors getting published, the 1920s was different because of the institutional apparatus encouraging the process. Publishers targeted and advertised youth, and they made a whole series of efforts to encourage young authors. The Great War expanded the field of writers and had a profound effect on both the content of writing and on the reading public's taste. Because the war provided youth with a distinctive experience, publishers became more receptive to their works. The British public was enthralled by young authors, who represented, in the 1920s, the future of the nation's cultural identity. Here Alec Waugh's *The Loom of Youth* was a pivotal work, opening up publishers to young writers. Institutional changes in the publishing industry followed—the creation of special series devoted to young authors, branding a publishing house as particularly receptive to youth, and prize competitions. The problems involved in advertising a book were partly alleviated if youth could be a selling point.

At the same time a shift in attitudes to writing, away from “inspiration” and toward “craft,” meant that young authors could be more profitable in an increasingly professionalized literary marketplace. Henry Green’s *Blindness* (1926) has traditionally been interpreted as a bildungsroman, but in fact its protagonist’s quest is not for artistry but professional authorship. The effects of professionalizing authors at an early age could account for the conventional character of late modernist writing, for which a number of the young authors listed earlier—Acton, Coward, Green, Greene, Hamilton, Isherwood, Lowry, and Waugh—are pivotal figures.

By autumn 1918, half of the British infantry in France was under nineteen years of age.¹¹ That youth was the war’s greatest casualty was apparent to all: Wilfred Owen’s “Anthem for Doomed Youth” speaks of “these who die as cattle.”¹² When John Galsworthy called the war “this vicarious butchery of Youth,” he meant not only the physical destruction of young lives on the front but also the death of innocence.¹³

The Great War triggered an explosion of personal writing across all sections of the population, spurred by the need for separated families and lovers to communicate via mail. The government encouraged letter writing by soldiers and reminded families of the importance to soldier morale of regular communication from home. Nineteen thousand bags of mail per day arrived in France. Soldiers also created trench newspapers: the Belgian army had 290 of them, the French army had perhaps 400, and, for the British army, 107 frontline magazines have been identified.¹⁴

Commanders encouraged letter writing and in some cases rewarded other types of writings: one *TLS*-reading colonel transferred Edmund Blunden out of the front line after a positive review therein of his poems. The *Times* began publishing war poems soon after the fighting began and had one per day for the war’s duration. Edmund Gosse estimated that 500 volumes of war poetry were published in Britain between August 1914 and November 1918.¹⁵ The manager of John Lane, B. C. Willett, noted in *Publishers’ Weekly* in 1919: “Young soldiers . . . have taken to writing, and whereas before the war they might have harked back in poetry to Greek mythology, they have dealt with their own experiences of the fighting, and it is a curious fact that a series of volumes on various war phases which we have projected sprang almost spontaneously from a number of manuscripts that came quite unsolicited into our hands.”¹⁶

Publishers scrambled to bring out letters or essays by soldiers who had died. The *New Statesman* attributed the proliferation of soldiers’ letters, journals, and poetry to the widespread sentiment that these writings were

“beyond criticism,” making “it . . . an ungracious task to estimate their promise or indicate their limitations.”¹⁷ While some of these came to have a lasting literary importance (Wilfred Owen’s poems were published by Chatto & Windus in 1920), others were exorbitantly priced memorial volumes preying on public sentiment. This practice became so widespread that *Publishers’ Weekly* was moved to condemn it as unethical.¹⁸ Yet these volumes were profitable: in 1919 the Medici Society published a special edition of *The Collected Poems of Rupert Brooke*, with 1,000 copies on Riccardi handmade paper, Michalet boards, and linen backs at £2; the same in whole natural parchment at £3; and 15 copies on vellum at £26 5s each.¹⁹ Though Brooke’s complete poems were first published in 1915, and there was a popular trade edition issued in 1918, the entire run of the luxury edition was quickly exhausted.

Youth culture began to play a major role in the postwar redefinition of national identity, which pitted the need for cultural continuity against the new—the very topic of T. S. Eliot’s “Tradition and the Individual Talent” (1919). Hugh Walpole feared that unless young authors were given the opportunities to publish, their talents would be forced into “the commercial novel” or turn to the cinema, thus diluting England’s literary heritage.²⁰ That heritage was considered a “storehouse of recorded values” of a people: thus it had to be not only preserved for future generations but also continually revitalized to be a living tradition (as Eliot argued).²¹

Any number of novels took youth as their title premise: *The Revolt of Youth*, *Wild Youth and Another* (1919); *A Cry of Youth*, *The Book of Youth*, *When Youth Meets Youth* (1920); *The Old Man’s Youth* (1921); *The Manuscript of Youth*, *The Measure of Youth*, *Truant Youth*, *The Bank of Youth* (1922); *A Poet’s Youth*, *Flaming Youth*, *Wild Heart of Youth* (1923); *In the Land of Youth*, *The Wings of Youth* (1924); *Adventurous Youth*, *Wayward Youth*, *Wild Heart of Youth* (1925); *Reverie of Youth*, *Passionate Youth* (1926); *The Adorable Youth*, *The Quest of Youth* (1927); *Desire of Youth*, *Farewell to Youth* (1928); *The Adventure of Youth*, *When Youth Calls* (1929). Every year of the decade was covered, and this selective list includes only books published in Britain. Publishers had invented a new genre, “a novel of youth.” This distinguished it from a novel *for* youth, but those novels, too, experienced phenomenal growth in the 1920s. The *Publishers’ Circular* noted that for the British market in 1923, “juvenile” was the second most popular book category, behind fiction, whereas in 1913 it had been sixth, behind technology and science.²²

As Wyndham Lewis polemically noted, young authors had become “profitable.”²³ The British publishing industry faced a series of economic

problems throughout the 1920s, including the rise in paper and production costs but also industrial action, which meant that “the complete production of a book in 1914 often amounted to less than the mere setting of the type does to-day.”²⁴ The *Daily Mail* reported in November 1919:

The man who is hardest hit by the present conditions is the new author. It is very difficult for him to find a publisher willing to undertake the risk of publication. The big firms, with their long lists of popular favourites sure of a market, are not ready to take him on; the small firms on the lookout for works of promise find it impossible to do so.

“I never publish a novel nowadays,” said a well-known publisher, “unless I can print a first edition of 5,000 copies with a good chance of selling them.”²⁵

Publishers, in other words, needed a strong reason to publish a debut novel as the industry was, Geoffrey Faber lamented, “fast degenerating into a gambling competition for potential best-sellers.”²⁶

The young novelist who opened up the market was Alec Waugh, whose *The Loom of Youth* was published in 1917 by Grant Richards (in the same week as Conrad’s *Youth*). Its *succès de scandale* came from its condemnation of public schools and discussion of schoolboy homosexuality. Written in “seven and a half weeks, which included a week off half-way,” the *Künstlerroman* follows Gordon Caruthers, who arrives at Fernhurst full of ambition and personality but finds that nothing matters except games.²⁷ Learning is despised while “cribbing is an art,” the school masters cannot keep order and their authority is “a nuisance,” and the boys are molded into a “satisfactory type.”²⁸ Eventually a friendly master shows him the right path, poetry, and Gordon leaves the school determined to make something of himself.

Although Waugh’s father was the managing director of Chapman & Hall, the manuscript made the full round of the London publishers in 1916 and was uniformly rejected, showing how resistant publishers then were to young authors. The manuscript was put away until Alec’s professor of history at Sandhurst, Thomas Seccombe, offered to put in a word to publishers. Grant Richards later described the book’s acceptance at his publishing house:

Introductions are almost always out of place in novels but here was a special book in which an introduction with Thomas Seccombe’s name at the end of it was bound to attract the attention of literary editors. . . .

It would go out for review and, considering the fact that youth from all the public schools of the country was now going through the furnace and that the subject was of crying importance, the critics would surely be told to hurry up with their opinions. And they did.²⁹

Seccombe's introduction spared no invective in blaming the Little England ethos of public schools for the war. He called the novel the song of the youth generation: "They feel the most positive conviction that their elders have made a consummate muddle of things."³⁰ Although thinking it "scarcely credible" that a "lad" could write so incisively about public school, "a theme that has baffled the most expert writers," he predicted that "they are going to do wonders, the new generation, by the Divine Right of Youth—that is to say, superior genius."³¹ The nation's cultural identity, in other hands, needed youth to revitalize it, and Waugh's novel was the first of a promising new movement.

As a literary effort Waugh's novel is not overwhelming (that he was so pleased to have written it in seven and a half weeks says it all), but its polemical views on education were topical: Lord Desborough's 1917 report urging wholesale public school reforms used such terms as "gross stupidity," "blindness," and "arrogance and stupidity."³² *The Loom of Youth* became part of that debate and was called the "*Uncle Tom's Cabin* of the public school system."³³ H. W. Massingham devoted a column to it in the *Nation*. The *Spectator* published correspondence on it for ten weeks. There even appeared a line-by-line refutation by a member of Pop at Eton, entitled *A Dream of Youth: An Etonian's Reply to "The Loom of Youth."*³⁴ As a kind of literary fatwa, the Old Shirburnian Society expelled Waugh. In short, the novel was a success, reprinted five times in the first three months and eight times in its first year.

After Waugh's example—a young writer rebuffed by scores of publishers going on to become the hit of the season—other young authors found themselves better placed to break into print. Andrew Nash describes how Waugh's example influenced Frank Swinnerton into recommending publication of *Prelude* (1920) by Beverley Nichols, who was twenty-one when it reached Chatto & Windus.³⁵ Having rejected *The Loom of Youth* in 1916, Swinnerton once again had to judge a public school novel. Even though he had grave doubts about *Prelude's* merit, his reader's report notes that "we must not pass a money-earner with careless sangfroid."³⁶ While begrudgingly accepting Nichols's manuscript, Swinnerton lobbied hard for Chatto & Windus to publish Aldous Huxley's *Limbo* (1920) because "it would

unquestionably help to establish us among the younger writers as a house of distinction and enterprise.”³⁷ Virginia Woolf began her *TLS* review of *Limbo* by noting that “Mr. Huxley is very clever; and his publisher informs us that he is young. For both these reasons his reviewers may . . . give themselves the pleasure of taking him seriously.” She wondered aloud whether it was wise for young authors to rush into publication: “Yet we cannot help thinking that it is well to leave a mind under a counterpane of ignorance; it grows more slowly, but being more slowly exposed it avoids that excessive surface sensibility which wastes the strength of the precocious.”³⁸ Nevertheless, Chatto & Windus succeeded in branding itself as the house for young authors in the 1920s, with a list including Acton, Ashford, Golding, Huxley, Rosamond Lehmann, Nichols, Owen, and Peter Quennell.

Swinerton’s desire to “brand” Chatto & Windus is one aspect of the increasingly institutionalized practice to promote young novelists. Fisher & Unwin’s First Novel series was advertised as “giving the young authors a chance!”³⁹ It was in that series that James Hilton, then a twenty-year-old university student, was launched with *Catherine Herself* (1920). John Long in 1920 had a £500 first novel competition (which it continued for a number of years); one of the losing entries that nonetheless came to be published by the firm was twenty-two-year-old Viola Bankes’s *Shadow Show* (1922). Fitzgerald’s *This Side of Paradise* was published in Britain in Collins’s First Novel Library series. Ethel Mannin, one of the continuously strongest-selling British authors of the twentieth century, was twenty-three when *Martha* (1923) won a first novel competition.

These contests not only unearthed talent but also generated publicity: prizewinners could be marketed more prominently than other novels. Changes in book advertising in the 1920s aided the publication efforts of young authors, for their age was an advertisement in itself. Advertising had become a critical consideration for the industry, as James Ford argued in 1922:

The science of publicity . . . made its way rapidly and was speedily adopted by progressive publishers. The simple paragraphs of an elder age assumed a new and more interesting form, dealing not only with the books but with their authors, concerning whom all sorts of personal information was set afloat and widely read and quoted. . . . Ideas for attracting attention took on a high value in the eyes of publishers, and many a book has been successfully launched on the uncertain sea of public approval by the adroit work of the press agent.⁴⁰

While Ford was discussing the American market, the growth of advertising agencies in the 1920s made British publishers turn away from the traditional presentation of lists in plain Westminster type and toward more typographically daring efforts. They may not have gone as far as hiring sandwich men to walk the streets to advertise a new novel, as Alfred Knopf had done in New York City, but there was certainly an effort to integrate advertising into the launch of a new novel.⁴¹ While Q. D. Leavis overstated the case when warning against the “dangerous level of efficiency” in book advertising, she was not mistaken in seeing publicity as overwhelmingly important for the literary market.⁴²

If publicity is, as Lawrence Rainey argues, “the surest commodity of the modernist economy,” it is also true that publicity began to shift focus from the book to the author—and a young one attracted attention *sui generis*.⁴³ In France, Bernard Grassett, whose doctoral degree was in economics and who prided himself on being a “theorist” of the book market, paid for Gaumont to produce a news film of “the youngest novelist in France,” seventeen-year-old Raymond Radiguet, signing the contract for *Le Diable au corps* (1923). Grassett later explained: “I didn’t say, ‘I have found a great novelist.’ I simply said, ‘I’ve discovered a seventeen year-old writer.’”⁴⁴

Youth, in other words, was its own publicity. When Henry Green’s *Blindness* appeared, Dent advertised it as “a very remarkable first novel written by a very young man.”⁴⁵ Rosamond Lehmann, whose *Dusty Answer* was published in 1927, when she was twenty-six years old, told her publisher that she was “besieged with requests for photographs, interviews, personal notes etc.”⁴⁶ While complaining about bothersome interview requests, Lehmann dutifully accepted them; and she happily completed “a most astonishing questionnaire respecting my looks, tastes, hobbies, likes, dislikes, superstitions, etc. etc. etc. for publicity purposes” because it had come from the Book-of-the-Month Club.⁴⁷ Perhaps the best example is Mary Panter-Downes’s *The Shoreless Sea* (1923), written when she was sixteen and serialized in the *Daily Mail*: the sides of London buses featured prominent advertisements emphasizing the author’s youth.⁴⁸ Publishers also did not mind stretching the truth about an author’s age. When Charles Morgan’s *Portrait in a Mirror* (1929) was published, he was advertised as a member of “the first flight of young novelists”; that might have been true for his debut, which came out when he was twenty-four years old, but that had been a decade earlier.⁴⁹

Young authors were also economically attractive because writing was in the process of changing from an art to a craft. By this logic, a young author had a greater potential profit because there were more productive

years ahead for him or her.⁵⁰ The creation of the Iowa Writing Program in 1922 reflected this changing attitude. While writing teachers had been noted in Gissing's *New Grub Street* (1891), the professional degree the Iowa program conferred was another matter altogether. For those who could not make it to Iowa City, a spate of books published in London promised budding writers success in the marketplace: *How to Write Stories for Money* (1920), *How to Write and Sell Short Stories* (1926), and *Creative Writing: A Guide for Those Who Aspire to Authorship* (1929). The series of books by Michael Joseph on professional authorship, covering short story writing, journalism, serial fiction, and magazine stories, was compiled into *Complete Writing for Profit* (1930). These books encouraged writers to meet the demands of the marketplace: "The effect of applying the rules of scientific journalism to the magazine," Q. D. Leavis argued, "has been to close the market to genius, talent, and distinction, and to force instead a kind of anaemic ability to satisfy the reading habit."⁵¹ The downside of treating writing as a professional craft, as Arthur Clutton Brock argued in a 1918 *TLS* cover article, was that it offered quick answers, technical ones, since "it is much easier to write professional verses in any style than to write songs of innocence."⁵² In 1930, A. C. Ward derided the "smooth and almost absentminded competence which is the bane of present-day traditional novelists."⁵³ In that year Allen Clark Maple (who also authored *Write It and Sell It*, a title of some genius because that undefined "it" seemingly applied to everything) had a novel appear with a more curious title, *Best Seller: The Story of a Young Man Who Came to New York to Write a Novel about a Young Man Who Came to New York to Write a Novel*. The title came full circle to the problem at hand: that writing was increasingly about profit rather than literary art, and *Well-to-Do Author* (a 1920 novel by Pett Ridge, where "the adolescent population" has "plenty of money to burn") could be its own story: the *Künstlerroman* gives way to the *Bestsellerautorroman*.⁵⁴

The Eton Society of Arts was started by "a small band of enthusiasts, 'for the purpose of creating a centre for the discussion of Art at Eton.'"⁵⁵ Its formation, Henry Green remembered, was "a watershed, after this there was no turning back. I determined to be a writer."⁵⁶ His election to the post of secretary of the society "gave me confidence even if there was nothing in it so that, like everyone else, I began to write a novel."⁵⁷

That seemingly throwaway phrase, "like everyone else," is an entry point for reading his first novel, *Blindness*, in the context of young authorship. My reading will contest the prevailing view of the novel: "Most critics . . . have agreed in describing *Blindness* as a *Bildungsroman* or *Künstlerroman* in

which the tragically blinded protagonist, John Haye, overcomes his disability through his acceptance of its compensatory benefits and their exploitation in his writing.”⁵⁸ The logic of the work’s tripartite structure (Caterpillar, Chrysalis, and Butterfly) makes this reading attractive: the “budding author” should realize his potential in the end, as the ancient Greek for “butterfly,” *psychē*, also means “soul” or “mind.”⁵⁹ Critics, though, have failed to consider the distinction between an artist and a professional writer: rather than being a *Künstlerroman*, Green’s novel shows how this quest is complicated when writing moves away from internal necessity and toward professionalization.

John Haye, a public schoolboy with an aesthetic temperament, is blinded in an accident. Unable to complete his schooling, he is forced to go back home with his stepmother, who worries about his “after-life” (368): “Some occupation must be found for him, it was the future one had to think about,” she thinks (382). This is an economic question, for “now that he was blind there was no hope of his ever making any money” (386). The appearance of a blind piano tuner signals John’s depressing career prospects (443). Raffles, the family dog, “poor blind old thing,” is another counterpoint to John’s condition, as his stepmother wonders whether the dog should be “destroyed” (382).

As the *Illustrated London News* noted in its review, John’s disability “is a painful subject, but one of a kind which the war made familiar.”⁶⁰ By the end of the war, more than 1,300 British soldiers had been blinded, which brought the problem of retraining them “very keenly to the fore.”⁶¹ The Departmental Committee on the Welfare of the Blind, which released its first major report in 1917, called for “more active intervention of the State” to get blind veterans back to work. Indeed, its definition of blindness was not medical but industrial: “Blindness means too blind to perform work for which eyesight is essential.”⁶² A Labour Party MP had this to say in support of the 1920 Blind (Education, Employment, and Maintenance) Bill: “God’s greatest gift was eyesight, and to be denied it was to be deprived of life’s greatest privilege. We were not capable of miracles like the Nazarene, but we could, at least, substitute friendship and sympathy; that would inspire the blind in their work, and bestow upon them the great blessing of occupation.”⁶³ A 1923 Ministry of Health circular continued this push toward economic reintegration: “The primary object of training a blind person should be to fit him for following some definite vocation in which he can become in greater or lesser degree self-supporting.”⁶⁴ Douglas McMurtrie, director of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, noted that “the day when the mutilated occupies a regular employment marks the definitive success of the work of re-education undertaken.”⁶⁵

While John is not a war veteran, he shares with them the need for a career, and the possible occupations his stepmother contemplates are the same as those available to blind veterans: "They must find some occupation for the boy. . . . Making fancy baskets, or pen-wipers, all those things blinded soldiers did, something to do" (384). For a public schoolboy, though, these are unsuitable. John thinks that writing is the solution, for it is "the only thing in which the blind are not hampered" (463). In the first scene after his blinding, his stepmother offers to take down his stories and read aloud "all your nice books" (371). When her offer is dismissed, she promises to engage "a professional reader" (393). Yet she cannot fully believe in writing as a possible career and dismisses his writing as a "hobby," telling him, "but no one has ever written on either side of the family" (481).

The diary section (Part I), which ends with a letter announcing John's blinding in an accident, had already shown his budding efforts at professional authorship. He effuses over books, writes stories for school magazines, and participates in an arts society (largely modeled on the Eton Society of Arts). While he writes in his diary that "there is a sense of degradation attached to appearing in print" (357), he hopes one of his short stories given to a school magazine will be rejected so that he could "send it up to some London magazine" (357). His understanding of the professional art network, and the need for a young author to become a part of it, leads him to write to "several artists" to address the Arts Society at his school. John is thrilled to receive a positive response from "the biggest swell I wrote to . . . the most flaming tip-top swell who has written thousands of books, as well as his drawings, which are very well known indeed" (353).

After his blinding, John promises to devote himself to writing: "he had really worked quite hard at writing, and he would go on now, there was time when one was blind" (394). This desire, though, is complicated by a growing isolation: "He felt the grass, but it was not the same as the grass he had seen. . . . He was shut out, into himself, in the cold" (395). Words and objects have been severed from their intimate connection: "He said 'tree' out loud and it was a word. He saw branches with vague substances blocked round them, and he built up a picture of lawn and tree, but there were gaps, and his brain reeled from the effort of filling them" (394).

"He would be very queer," John tells himself, "with little fragments of insanity here and there. It would work" (399). Rather than wholeness, writing would be a kind of cutting, he tells Joan (a country girl he has grown fond of, but in an illusory fashion, as his continual naming of her as June shows):

But now, do you know what I am going to do now? After all, one must have something to put against one's name. For I am going to write, yes, to write. Such books, June, such amazing tales, rich with intricate plot. Life will be clotted and I will dissect it, choosing little bits to analyse. I shall be a great writer. I am sure of it. (463)

"I must justify myself somehow," he explains. "I will be a great writer one day, and people will be brought to see the famous blind man who lends people in his books the eyes that he lost" (463). Writing is valued not for its intrinsic worth but for an inflated sense of the self-worth or notoriety it can bring. As a broken young man, John does not respect writing for what it can express but rather for the benefits it can bring him. He veers closer and closer to becoming like Joan's father, a drunken parson who sees the world as broken and hostile and who dreams of getting his revenge upon it through a great work (which never gets written).

While Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* concludes with a diary section, with Stephen Dedalus committing himself to exile and the lofty goal "to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race," the flatness of the diary that opens *Blindness* is not overturned by any noticeable progression in John's writing.⁶⁶ By the novel's close, he is no closer to a literary breakthrough. He is convinced that the countryside is ill-suited to writing (481), but London is not more hospitable. He arrives in London "ill, ill" (493) and the city breaks him down, for "in London so much went on that there was no time to separate or analyse your sensations, everything crowded in upon you and left you dazed" (493–494). This leads to a physical breakdown, an epileptic fit, which feels "as if there were something straining behind his eyeballs to get out" (503).

The only piece of John's writing after the blindness is a letter that concludes the novel. Addressed to his friend B. G., it congratulates him on breaking into print. While his friend is one of those young authors making his way in the literary marketplace, John is still at the point of beginning: "I am going to settle down to writing now" (504). To "settle down" into writing recalls him fulfilling his stepmother's earlier wish: "But it was an anxious time for Momma, waiting to see him settled. And it was the end, to settle down. He could not; one did not dare to" (440). But for a writer to accept settling down implies an abrogation of the duty to experiment and follow the path of artistic integrity; it is to accept the growing pressures of the market. Rather than becoming an artist, John could become a young author whose life story—a promising public schoolboy tragically blinded in a

senseless accident—would appeal to publishers. The novel, in other words, rather than being a *Künstlerroman*, is a portrait of a writer's professionalization—and therein lies the blindness of the title.

My reading of *Blindness* is buttressed by Green's later attitudes towards authorship. The publication of *Blindness* had given him a certain celebrity among aesthetes at Oxford, and he admits to this having filled his head at the time. For a while he frequented Lady Ottoline Morrell's salon at Garsington. Yet Green stayed resolutely independent from literary coteries and went to work full time in his family's engineering firm (as a laborer in Birmingham first, then in management). He was "never an essayist, propagandist or journalist."⁶⁷ After *Blindness*, Edward Garnett pressed him for a light, upper-class comedy, "not *too* intellectual," he advised, but "kindly, satirical view[s] of the activities of the whole tribe."⁶⁸ Green, though, produced *Living* (1929), an experimental working-class novel. Although he had published two novels by the age of twenty-four, Green's distrust of authorship as a profession and his income from other sources meant that he could wait ten years before publishing *Party Going* (1939), and his moment of literary blossoming was during the Second World War. It is not a coincidence that Green "was a far more consciously experimental novelist than any of his contemporaries," the only one carrying forward the modernist project in a period "generally unsympathetic to aesthetic experimentation."⁶⁹

There is a certain irony in reading *Blindness*, published when Green was twenty-one, as a cautionary tale about the pitfalls of professional authorship. While Evelyn Waugh thought it "extraordinary . . . that anyone of our generation could have written so fine a book," Green would later deplore "the snobbish way everything was put" in his debut and thought it unreadable.⁷⁰ But if *Blindness* is indeed a critique of the professionalization of young authors, it helps us to understand late modernism, which critics often characterize as a falling away from modernist experimentation.⁷¹

Because publishers in the 1920s were rushing authors into print earlier than ever, the necessary struggle of the author with his or her medium was removed. It became easier to publish, provided one accepted the norms of the publishing world at an early age, which potentially meant, in the long run, a diminished tendency for experimentation. The process of professionalization and socialization could begin as early as age twelve, when Nathalia Crane, a child poet from Brooklyn, was inducted into the British Society of Authors, Playwrights and Composers in 1925.⁷² Christopher Wilson, surveying literary professionalism in early twentieth-century America, notes that writers "came to see their craft predominantly as the product of technical expertise rather than inspiration, viewed the market as the primary ar-

biter of literary value, and were guided principally by an internalized sense of responsibility to their public.”⁷³ Professionalization in 1920s Britain had even stronger effects on young authors because the institutional dynamic of the publishing industry targeted them at an earlier age than ever before. While Gertrude Stein could distinguish between her “moneymaking style” and her “really creative one,” this kind of split, which is already deeply problematic, would be even harder to make if professionalization occurred in one’s youth.⁷⁴

Émile Zola, in “The Influence of Money in Literature,” argued that the natural selection of the market ensures that only authors who persist, and thus have developed something to say, are rewarded. For those young aspirants whose literary instincts were killed off by journalism, Zola’s pitiless retort was that it “kills those who should be killed off, that is all.”⁷⁵ Zola’s argument was echoed in 1927 by Richard Le Gallienne, who saw the current ease of publication for young authors as destructive to art:

The old proverbial way was to starve genius in his garret. The new way is to kill him with kindness, to drown him in honey. Both ways, of course, are bad; but the old way was the best. For, as a matter of fact, genius cannot be starved; and, so long as it is not carried too far, the process is salutary. Premature laurel, on the contrary, is too apt to provoke that premature self-satisfaction which inevitably ends in premature decay. For a writer to be “discovered” too soon is frequently a misfortune. His gift is best served by an apprenticeship to obscurity. In obscurity he relies upon himself. When he has become famous he is too apt to rely upon his public; and he may even come to regard the puffs of his publishers as the verdict of posterity.⁷⁶

When young authors had little chance of breaking into print, they had to work outside the marketplace to develop their voice and style. This changed in the 1920s when they began to see so many of their contemporaries reviewed in the *TLS* or considered for the Book-of-the-Month Club. As Malcolm Cowley noted, young authors now enjoyed easy access to publishers as long as their work was “fashionable.”⁷⁷ The fashionable, in Q. D. Leavis’s mind, meant a “thoroughly commercialized . . . fiction market” with “stereotyped . . . demands.”⁷⁸ Juliet McMasters, the founder of the Juvenilia Press, has observed that young writers tend to be drawn to preexisting models: they “are fascinated by the book as object, and in many ways, it seems, the book generates the story, rather than the other way round.”⁷⁹ In her

analysis, they are inherently imitative because they do not have a wide arena of judgment. Joseph Conrad took pride in having had the time to ripen before publishing, because “a man who never wrote a line for print till he was thirty-six cannot bring himself to look upon his existence and his experience . . . as only so much material” for his books.⁸⁰ Young authors, by implication, turn everything into material without an independent perspective to evaluate life. As the *New Statesman* argued in 1922, “a too early spring is often as disastrous to an artist as to a garden.”⁸¹

Added to these pressures was an industry coming to treat authors like industrialized workers, resulting in a cannibalization of authors and literary quality that was decried even in *Publishers' Circular* in 1921:

An author makes a hit with a story which deserves its success, too often he is pounced upon by literary agencies and syndicates whose dazzling offers lead him against his better judgment to bind himself to produce so many new novels in a stipulated time. It is needless to enlarge on what is almost certain to happen to the author—bound like a machine to turn out so much in a given time. It often happens that in a few years the syndicate has exhausted the author who has also exhausted his public—then another victim is fastened on. Good work cannot be produced under this hot-house forcing system.⁸²

Because writing had been reconceptualized as a craft, publishers now expected young authors to produce new books at a reasonably brisk pace—not so fast that they appeared to be potboilers, but not so slow as to confound deadlines. This pressure to produce after the first novel was partly driven by the publisher, who wanted to capitalize on the success of a first book, and partly driven by the author, who needed the advance from the contract. Those advances were comparatively small, certainly less than those available to Victorian authors when the triple-decker ruled the library stalls, which meant, Mark Morrisson argues, that “any young, untested, ‘highbrow’ writer who had a family and wished to live a moderately middle-class life had to publish frequently.”⁸³ A number of young authors did just that. Beverley Nichols, after the publication of *Prelude* in 1920, wrote two more novels in the next two years. Patrick Hamilton, whose first novel was published in 1925, when he was twenty-one, had produced his third novel three years later. Graham Greene, twenty-five years old when his first novel was published in 1929, wrote two forgettable novels in the next two years. Daphne du Maurier published five novels in seven years after a 1929 debut, when she was twenty-two.

Evelyn Waugh's early career shows this process at work. When he was at work on his second novel, *Vile Bodies* (1930), in the summer of 1929, Waugh wrote his close friend Green of his desperate need for money and how he "must write a lot quickly."⁸⁴ He told Harold Acton that his novel was "a welter of sex and snobbery written simply in the hope of selling some copies."⁸⁵ Copies were sold: "Those Vile Bodies seem to be selling like Hot Cakes," Waugh came to exult.⁸⁶ His satire targets authorship as a profession: the plot revolves around Adam Fenwick-Symes's problems raising money after his book, which he has written in Paris, is taken away by a customs official, who calls it "just downright dirt."⁸⁷ Adam's defense is not a high-spirited call for art but simply that his "whole livelihood depends on this book."⁸⁸ His writing is purely commercial: as the otherwise sympathetic publisher puts it, his work was scheduled for a fortnight's run before Johnnie Hoop's autobiography, "a seller."⁸⁹ While Waugh might have satirized the professionalism of art, he had no qualms embodying the author-salesman, telling his agent that "it would be nice if we could persuade them [newspaper editors] that I personify the English youth movement."⁹⁰ His conversion to Roman Catholicism in autumn 1930 was made an exclusive for Tom Driberg, with the resultant story headlined "Young Satirist of Mayfair."⁹¹ In his 1930 travel book, *Labels*, Waugh's tips on the "arts of successful authorship" boil down to keeping "one's name" prominent to publishers and readers.⁹² Waugh might have intended Adam Fenwick-Symes to be a satire of would-be writers in the changing publishing world, but perhaps the portrayal was so bitter because Waugh was not far removed from his creation.

While this essay has focused on Britain, there is good reason to believe that the phenomenon of publishing young authors was common elsewhere. The close relationship between the British and American book markets at the time meant that there was a significant overlap in overall trends. The American market furnished one of the great young novelists of the decade in F. Scott Fitzgerald, whose *This Side of Paradise* was one of the best-selling books of 1920 (Fitzgerald was twenty-four years old then). In a November 1921 interview, publisher George Doran said that America "is very much awake to the voices of its younger writers."⁹³ Malcolm Cowley remembers the decade as one of opportunity for young authors so long as they delivered what the market demanded: "Publishers in those days were willing to make an advance of \$500.00 to almost any young writer of talent who would promise to write the sort of book that was fashionable; either a looking down the nose biography in the manner of Lytton Strachey or a first autobiographical novel which, the publisher hopes, would be as widely discussed

as ‘This Side of Paradise.’”⁹⁴ In France, the Dadaists and Surrealists stormed the citadels of literature at precocious ages: Tristan Tzara was twenty when he began publishing *Dada*, André Breton and Philippe Soupault were in their early twenties at the time of *Les Champs magnétiques* (1920). At fifteen, Mircea Eliade began writing an autobiographical novel, parts of which were published in Romanian avant-garde reviews.⁹⁵

The professionalization of young authors would have far-reaching consequences for public conceptions of authorship. What happened in 1920s Britain does not seem so strange to us any more: MFA programs have gone global, and young writers are institutionalized through lists in *Granta* and the *New Yorker*. The decade was a critical moment in bringing about that change, which transformed the meaning and the craft of modern authorship.

Notes

1. *Times*, June 2, 1913, 9.
2. *Oxford DNB* entry.
3. *Times*, March 24, 1914, 5.
4. J. B. Priestley, “The Younger Novelists,” *English Journal* 14 (1925): 435–443, at 435.
5. Bo G. Ekelund and Mikael Börjesson, “The Shape of the Literary Career: An Analysis of Publishing Trajectories,” *Poetics* 30 (2002): 341–364, at 346.
6. Bernard Lahire, *La Condition littéraire: La double vie des écrivains* (Paris: Éditions La Découverte, 2006), 591.
7. I emphasize novels or prose works as opposed to poetry, which has had a long line of young authors (Pope, Blake, Chatterton, Rimbaud).
8. Evelyn Waugh, *The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. Michael Davie (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), 103.
9. Quoted in Miriam J. Benkovitz, *Ronald Firbank: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), 18.
10. Daisy Ashford to Chatto & Windus, June 12, 1919, in “Letters from Daisy Ashford (Mrs. Margaret Devlin) to Chatto & Windus,” CW 5/5, 2 folders, University of Reading Publishers’ Archive, Reading, U.K., folder 1 (hereafter cited as DACW); Daisy Ashford to Chatto & Windus, July 26, 1919, DACW, folder 1; Daisy Ashford to Mr. Spalding, July 31, 1920, DACW, folder 2. I am grateful to Terence Rose, of the Daisy Ashford Estate, and the Random House Group Ltd. for permission to cite from these Chatto & Windus files.
11. John Stevenson, *British Society, 1914–45* (London: A. Lane, 1984), 66.
12. The original title was “Anthem to Dead Youth,” but in the course of revisions it was changed to “Anthem for Doomed Youth”—“doomed” was suggested by Siegfried Sassoon. See The First World War Poetry Digital Archive, Oxford University, <http://www.oucs.ox.ac.uk/wwlit/>, which contains accessible images of successive manuscript versions of the poem.
13. John Galsworthy to H. W. Massingham, September 16, 1917, in H. V. Marrot, *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy* (London: Heinemann, 1935), 770.
14. A. D. Harvey, *A Muse of Fire: Literature, Art and War* (London: Hambledon Press, 1998), 83.
15. Edmund Gosse, *Some Diversions of a Man of Letters* (London: Heinemann, 1919), 264.

16. "Some English Publishers Talk of New Year Prospects," *Publishers' Weekly*, January 19, 1919, 138 (hereafter cited as *PW*).
17. "Soldiers' Letters," *New Statesman*, January 17, 1920, 440.
18. "Post-War Publishing," *PW*, June 7, 1919, 1581.
19. P. H. Lee Warner, "Letters to the Editor," *Publishers' Circular*, December 20, 1919, 569 (hereafter cited as *PC*). Warner was the publisher of the Medici Society.
20. Hugh Walpole, "First Novels," *TLS*, September 18, 1919, 500.
21. I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (1925; repr., New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961), 32.
22. See *Times*, January 8, 1924, 10, reporting from *PC*.
23. Wyndham Lewis, *Doom of Youth* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1932), 3.
24. Stanley Unwin, *The Truth about Publishing*, 3rd ed. (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1929), 45.
25. Reprinted as "Publishers' Profits and Their Losses," *PC*, December 27, 1919, 591.
26. Geoffrey Faber, "A Publisher Speaking," in *Publishers on Publishing*, ed. Gerald Gross (London: Secker and Warburg, 1961), 213-234, at 228.
27. Alec Waugh, *The Early Years of Alec Waugh* (London: Cassell, 1962), 81.
28. Alec Waugh, *The Loom of Youth* (1917; repr., London: Richards Press, 1947), 54, 58, 141.
29. Grant Richards, *Author Hunting: Memories of Years Spent Mainly in Publishing* (1934; repr., London: Unicorn Press, 1960), 196.
30. Thomas Seccombe, preface to Waugh, *Loom of Youth*, 10.
31. *Ibid.*, 11-12.
32. Quoted in T. Pellatt, *Public School Education and the War: An Answer to the Attack upon Eton Education* (London: Duckworth, 1917), 53.
33. Waugh, *Early Years*, 48.
34. Martin Browne, *A Dream of Youth: An Etonian's Reply to "The Loom of Youth"* (London: Longmans, 1918).
35. Andrew Nash, "A Publisher's Reader on the Verge of Modernity: The Case of Frank Swinnerton," *Book History* 6 (2003): 175-195, at 186.
36. Reader's report, July 23, 1919, quoted in Nash, "Publisher's Reader," 186. *Prelude* did not become a best seller, but Nichols's autobiography was one of the first ten sixpenny Penguins in 1935.
37. Quoted in Nash, "Publisher's Reader," 191. Huxley's first published volume was *The Defeat of Youth, and Other Poems* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1918).
38. "Cleverness and Youth," *TLS*, February 5, 1920, 83.
39. "Notes and Announcements," *PC*, July 17, 1920, 49.
40. Quoted in *PW*, September 9, 1922, 756.
41. See Jennifer Wicke, *Advertising Fictions: Literature, Advertisement and Social Reading* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 172.
42. Q. D. Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public* (1932; repr., London: Chatto and Windus, 1965), 22.
43. Lawrence Rainey, *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998), 99. See also Catherine Turner, *Marketing Modernism between the Two World Wars* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); and Timothy W. Galow, "Literary Modernism in the Age of Celebrity," *Modernism/Modernity* 17 (2010): 313-329.
44. Bernard Grasset, "Le Lancement d'un livre," *Le Grand Écho*, October 13, 1931, quoted in Monique Nemer, *Raymond Radiguet* (Paris: Fayard, 2002), 441. When Gollancz published Colin Wilson's *The Outsider* in spring 1956, the 137-line blurb ended: "The author of this remarkable book is only 24." See Kenneth Allsop, *The Angry Decade: A Survey of the*

Cultural Revolt of the Nineteen-Fifties (London: Peter Owen, 1958), 149. All translations mine.

45. PC, August 7, 1926, 159.
46. Rosamond Lehmann to Mr. Raymond, June 17, 1927, in "Letters from Rosamond Lehmann," CW 37/3, 4 folders, University of Reading Publishers' Archive, Reading, U.K., folder 1 (hereafter cited as RL). I am grateful to the Society of Authors, the literary representative of the Estate of Rosamond Lehmann, for permission to cite from this archive.
47. Rosamond Lehmann to Mr. Raymond, July 6, 1927, RL, folder 1.
48. *Oxford DNB* entry.
49. *Times*, March 15, 1929, 22. Authors tended to fib as well; the most famous example is F. T. Marinetti's claim in the 1909 Futurist manifesto that "the oldest of us is thirty"; at the time, he was thirty-three.
50. Consider the statement by the director of Éditions de Minuit: "If a manuscript interests me and I find out that the author is seventy years old, that manuscript will interest me much less than if the author were twenty." Quoted in Lahire, *La Condition littéraire*, 183–184.
51. Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public*, 31.
52. Anon. [Arthur Clutton-Brock], "Professionalism in Art," *TLS*, January 31, 1918, 49–50, at 50; the essay was reprinted in his *Essays on Art* (London: Methuen, 1919), 120–131.
53. A. C. Ward, *The Nineteen-Twenties: Literature and Ideas in the Post-War Decade* (London: Methuen, 1930), 112–113.
54. "Well-to-Do Author," *TLS*, February 19, 1920, 123.
55. *Eton College Chronicle*, October 25, 1923, 513.
56. Henry Green, *Pack My Bag: A Self-Portrait* (1940; repr., New York: New Directions, 2004), 159.
57. *Ibid.*, 169.
58. Pascale Aebischer, "Creative Disability/Disabled Creativity in Henry Green's *Blindness* (1926)," *Studies in the Novel* 35 (2003): 510–523, at 511.
59. Henry Green, *Blindness* (1926), in *Nothing; Doting; Blindness* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), 358. Further references are given after quotations in the text.
60. "Books of the Day," *London Illustrated News*, January 1, 1927, 12.
61. Arnold Lawson, *War Blindness at St. Dunstan's* (London: Henry Frowde and Hodder and Stoughton, 1922), 127. In Green's *Caught* (1943; repr., London: Harvill Press, 2001), Pye recalls during the First World War "lines of men coming back in single file, their hands on each other's shoulders, blinded" (17).
62. *Times*, August 14, 1917, 4. Arthur Pearson, the director of St. Dunstan's, also defined blindness as the inability "to do ordinary work in an ordinary way." See Arthur Pearson, *Victory over Blindness: How It Was Won by the Men of St. Dunstan's and How Others May Win It* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 28.
63. *Times*, March 13, 1920, 9.
64. "Welfare of the Blind: Co-Operation between Training and Employing Agencies," *Beacon* 7, no. 78 (June 1923): 3. The *Beacon* was a journal devoted to social problems faced by people who were blind.
65. Douglas C. McMurtrie, *Les Mutilés de la guerre* (Paris: Masson, 1920), 66.
66. James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996), 288.
67. Edward Stokes, *The Novels of Henry Green* (London: Hogarth Press, 1959), 7.
68. Jeremy Treglown, *Romancing: The Life and Work of Henry Green* (New York: Random House, 2000), 70.
69. Michael Gorra, *The English Novel at Mid-Century: From the Leaning Tower* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), 9; David Lodge, *The Practice of Writing: Essays, Lectures, Reviews and a Diary* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1996), 119.

70. Evelyn Waugh to Henry Yorke, 1926, in *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*, ed. by Mark Armory (New Haven, Conn.: Ticknor and Fields, 1980), 24 (hereafter cited as *Letters*); David Lambourne, "'No Thundering Horses': The Novels of Henry Green," *Shenandoah* 26, no. 4 (Summer 1975): 57–71, at 61.
71. On the deflation of form in late modernism, see Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 18.
72. David Sadler, "Innocent Hearts: The Child Authors of the 1920s," *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 17, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 24–30, at 25.
73. Christopher Wilson, *The Labor of Words: Literary Professionalism in the Progressive Era* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 204.
74. Galow, "Literary Modernism in the Age of Celebrity," 315.
75. Émile Zola, "The Influence of Money in Literature," in *The Experimental Novel and Other Essays*, trans. Belle M. Sherman (New York: Cassell, 1892), 161–206, at 185.
76. Richard Le Gallienne, "On the Present Inflation of Literary Values," *New Statesman*, January 8, 1927, 387.
77. Malcolm Cowley, "Matthew Josephson" (mid-1940s), in Newberry Library, Chicago, Midwest MS Cowley, Series 2, Box 106, Folder 5000.
78. Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public*, 31.
79. Juliet McMasters, "'Adults' Literature," by Children," *The Lion and the Unicorn* 25 (2001): 277–299, at 289.
80. Joseph Conrad, "A Familiar Preface," in *A Personal Record; Notes on Life and Letters* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1928), xiii–xxiii, at xv–xvi.
81. "Youth," *New Statesman*, May 20, 1922, 177–178.
82. "The Bookselling Problem To-Day," *PC*, January 15, 1921, 35.
83. Mark Morrisson, "Selling Modernism," *Modernism/Modernity* 5 (1998): 155–162, at 158. Morrisson's data on Victorian advances come from P. J. Keating, *The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel, 1875–1914* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1989), 422–425.
84. Evelyn Waugh to Henry Yorke, June 1929, *Letters*, 36.
85. Evelyn Waugh to Harold Acton, July 1929, *Letters*, 37.
86. Evelyn Waugh to A. D. Peters, January 1930, quoted in Robert Garnett, *From Grimes to Brideshead: The Early Novels of Evelyn Waugh* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1990), 76.
87. Evelyn Waugh, *Vile Bodies* (1930; repr., Boston: Little, Brown, 1977), 25.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*, 33.
90. Evelyn Waugh to A. D. Peters, n.d. (but late 1928 or early 1929), *Letters*, 30.
91. *Daily Express*, September 30, 1930, quoted in Douglas Lane Patey, *The Life of Evelyn Waugh: A Critical Biography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1998), 35.
92. Evelyn Waugh, *Labels: A Mediterranean Journey* (London: Duckworth, 1930), 9–10. Waugh told Green that he should be married "very obtrusively—a fashionable wedding is worth a four column review in the *Times Literary Supplement* to a novelist." Evelyn Waugh to Henry Yorke, May 4, 1929, *Letters*, 34.
93. Quoted in John Tebbel, *A History of Book Publishing in the United States* (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978), 3:45.
94. Cowley, "Matthew Josephson."
95. See Mircea Eliade, *Romanul adolescentului miop* (Bucharest: Muzeul Literaturii Romane, 1989).