

Novel perspectives

D. H. Lawrence's essay 'Why the Novel Matters',¹ focuses on issues of communication and plurality as displayed by the effective novel. Christopher Gillie cites this important essay at the beginning of his book on English literature from 1900 to 1940; he uses it to help create the relevant context for the modernist revolution.² The ideas in it echo those found in Chapter 1 of this book: the fight for communication that the novel represents; the ability of writing to stretch and extend human experience; the novelistic provision, in tune with modernism, of multiple truths; the primacy of change. The relationship between Ford and Lawrence at times was close, and at times was difficult. It began when Ford first published Lawrence in the *English Review* and 'introduced him to literary London'.³ Later Ford remembered reading 'Odour of Chrysanthemums' and discovering 'another genius', and, though he didn't want to publish *The White Peacock* (Lawrence's first novel) in the *Review*, he sent it with a recommendation to Heinemann, who published it in 1911.⁴ Here, Lawrence's thoughts are a useful way into Ford, his prose and his beliefs concerning that prose. Lawrence wants to be affected by a novel – 'I do ask that the whole of me shall tremble in its wholeness, some time or other' (p. 105). He doesn't specify the sort of connection for which he is looking, although it seems spiritual, and it is based on communication. What is communicated in Ford's novels, and how?

Ford's thoughts on the capabilities of the novel are impressive in their scale. They can be divided into two categories: the emotional or psychological; and the more intellectual or theoretical. The former is expounded in a review of Lewis's *Dodsworth* in the *Bookman* in 1929:

The fact is, if you go to look at a landscape, or to observe a country you

won't much do so, your impressions being too self-conscious; whereas, if you live and are your normal self and, above all, suffer in any given environment, that environment will eat itself into your mind and come back to you in moments of emotion and you will be part of that environment and you will know it. It is because Mr. Dodsworth suffers and endures in odd places all over the European and semi-European world that both he, as a person, and the settings in which he suffers, as settings, seem to me to be very real. When you have finished the book you, too, will have suffered and had your own emotions in the rue de la Paix.⁵

In order to really know one's fictional – and actual – surroundings, one must be made to suffer by them (perhaps this is why Dowell needs to return to places and parts of his story in *The Good Soldier* – his ignorance protects him from suffering). Suffering renders the relationship Lawrence would desire: the trembling of emotion in the response of the reader to the text. In the properly reflexive relationship between book and reader a system for communication is made possible, one that moves, extends, probes and unsettles. Lawrence stresses the physicality of this communication; in Ford's and Conrad's modernist methodology of impressionism, the communication would be based primarily on what that novel would 'make you see'.⁶

Ford establishes his theoretical stance in writing the four novels that became *Parade's End*.⁷ He expresses it in his autobiography: 'The work that at that time – and now – I wanted to see done was something on an immense scale, a little cloudy in immediate attack, but with the salient points and the final impression extraordinarily clear. I wanted the Novelist in fact to appear in his really proud position as historian of his own time'.⁸ This is an ambitious aim. It describes the attempt to capture and to report the pluralities of a whole (and complex) age. In her description of him as 'a historian of our culture' who understood the 'great historical shift' from the nineteenth century to the twentieth, Sondra Stang suggests that Ford fulfils that role.⁹ But what sort of an historian, what sort of a chronicler, would Ford wish to be? An impressionist one. This would mean living, suffering and writing in, creating many pictures of, 'his own time'.

Like Lawrence (who writes in his essay, 'we should ask for no absolutes'), Ford holds back from the idea of a literature with one prescriptive purpose. Ford does not simply stimulate growth, or life, in one direction alone. In addition, Ford's novelist is not a moral arbiter ('he sought to point no moral'; 'he desired neither to comment nor to explain' he writes of himself as novelist in his epilogue to *A Call*¹⁰). The

novel provokes suffering, then, and is also pluralistic and unpredictable in the vivid truths that it contains. It works as the kaleidoscope works (see the Introduction), with its author manipulating light and perspective. The rest of this chapter will be concerned with Ford's practical application of these theories, considering them from the internal world of some of his novels. Concentration will be less on context and more on content, on the 'how' and the 'why' of multiplicity in Ford's fiction. I will conclude by offering an explanatory framework for Ford's approach.

Time, knowledge and the dramatic perspective

The Good Soldier: plot

John Dowell, the American narrator of the text (in a nice pun, he, 'Do well', is from Philadelphia), has Puritan roots. With his wife, Florence, who suffers from a heart condition, he meets an English couple, Edward and Leonora Ashburnham, whilst taking the waters in continental Europe. The two couples are at Nauheim when they meet in 1904; Ashburnham impresses Dowell with his physical presence, his 'county family' air, his wealth, and his soldierly credentials. He is the 'Good Soldier' of the title. They are friends for nine years, during which time – unbeknownst to Dowell – Florence and Edward have an affair with each other, and take numerous other lovers too. Leonora tries to apprise Dowell of the state of things soon after they meet, on a joint trip to Marburg, scene of Luther's 'Protest'. Dowell, due to excessive naivety, thinks that her distress is caused solely by the fact that she is a Catholic in a Protestant stronghold, being taunted by Florence. Dowell does eventually discover Florence's duplicity; she does not have 'a heart' at all, but merely uses their separate bedrooms as an excuse to take other men into hers. On the night she sees herself as discovered by her husband, the same night that she sees herself as replaced in Ashburnham's affections by Nancy Rufford, Florence commits suicide. Nancy Rufford is the Ashburnhams' ward, and, towards the end of the chronological development of the tale, Edward does indeed conceive a passion for her. Rufford is a devout Catholic, and is devoted to her guardians, and to her faith. She, too, is ignorant as to the truths of human sexual behaviour that seethe through this text, to the extent that when she sees that truth, she loses her mind. She is sent away from Bramshaw Teleragh, the Ashburnhams' Hampshire house; Dowell accompanies her and Edward to the train station, and, shortly afterwards, Edward cuts his own throat. As the novel concludes, the hypocrisy of the upper-class 'game' of sexual infidelity has been exposed. Edward and Florence are dead as a result; Nancy is mad.

Dowell compares the destruction with the 'sack of the city' or the 'falling to pieces of a people'. Even to the attentive reader, it is only clear why when the last page is turned.

Ford adopts a method of 'supporting' many of his apparently oppositional characters, perhaps most visibly so in *The Good Soldier*. This novel is driven by knowledge and understanding, by issues of communication, not preconceived ideas of good and bad. Its character patterns are unpredictable, changing as one level of knowledge is placed upon, or ranged against, another. Here, Dowell thinks back to his moment of vision of his wife's hidden (only to him) character:

No, I remember no emotion of any sort, but just the clear feeling that one has from time to time when one hears that some Mrs. So-and-So is *au mieux* with a certain gentleman. It made things plainer, suddenly, to my curiosity. It was as if I thought, at that moment, of a windy November evening, that, when I came to think it over afterwards, a dozen unexplained things would fit themselves into place. But I wasn't thinking things over then.¹¹

Viewed in isolation, the lack of response in this passage seems pathological. Dowell stereotypes his feeling as akin to that of a society murmur. He relates no anguish, no pain, no disappointment, no anger: he attempts to incorporate it into his experiential history, without ever experiencing it. And this point is one of the clues to the novel as a whole. Nietzsche says of human existence that it is 'an imperfect tense that never becomes a present'¹² – as is precisely the case in the majority of this text. The imperfect tense dominates in Dowell's story because it is designed to short-circuit habitual responses. Dowell cannot be in complete control (for 'control' read 'sight/knowledge') of his present, for he is not in complete control of his past. He simply 'goes on'. Ford seems to be more interested in the confused impulses of Dowell's brain at this point, and in their relationship with its later impulses, than in the production of a state of mind that is, in whatever way, certain.¹³

In *The Good Soldier* Ford follows, he renders or alludes to, the deepest, perhaps secret motivations as characters relate to each other. He is not a hospitable novelist, but a demanding one: confusion and struggle with one's own memory of the narrative ('Have I read about this already?') are the most frequent states of mind for the reader of this text. The apparent incompleteness of the narrative has been discussed:

Dowell tells it in 'spots of colour'; his narrative has been read as an analysand's tale.¹⁴ However, Ford has ways of suggesting what it is that Dowell doesn't, or cannot, say. Ford is busy communicating – as below Leonora is busy communicating, although they both adopt unorthodox means.

The following extract comes from towards the beginning of the novel, and doesn't make sense until near its end. Then it assumes its rightful linear position as the beginning of the end: 'Her eyes were enormously distended; her face was exactly that of a person looking into the pit of hell and seeing horrors there. And then suddenly she stopped. She was most amazingly, just Mrs. Ashburnham again' (p. 38). Leonora sees horrors that Dowell cannot – the fact that her husband intends to have sex with his wife (and, contrary to most analysis which focuses on the touch, it is Edward's *look* answering Florence's touch that convinces her¹⁵). Although Dowell is convinced by her excuse for her distress – she is a Catholic at Marburg – the reader senses that this is not the whole truth. Dowell, however, does not. His status as an innocent is often signalled by his visual, and thus dramatic, exclusion; Leonora's first look *at* him is like that of a lighthouse – she sees him completely, from every angle, dazzling him as she discovers the extent of his asexuality (she, then, should be the cubist narrator) (p. 29). Ever afterwards, to her, he is an 'invalid', not a man. His wife also has 'the seeing eye' (p. 16), and whilst it doesn't protect her from the late shock, which she gets 'in the face', of the 'beacon' of Edward's love for Nancy, it shows her that Dowell is a man who will willingly remain outside her bedroom door (pp. 76–7). The narrative levels thus expand, fragmented and differentiated, as are the characters, by sight or its lack in these instances, and Ford articulates the presence of that which is awful, incompletely. Perhaps he wants the reader to see self-inflicted horrors in Leonora's face, to guess at others, but perhaps he also simply wants him or her to wait, with Dowell, in that imperfect tense, delaying certainty.

In *Parade's End* (summarised later in this chapter), Ford's war tetralogy, sight fragments the narrative/cognitive levels, sometimes more completely. When Valentine sees Edith Duchemin 'mad before her', an explanation follows: Edith wants to know about abortion. With this sexual shock Valentine's fantasy of 'bright colonies of beings, chaste, beautiful in thought', surrounding Edith and her set, is destroyed; sex has intervened.¹⁶ Her experience is like Nancy's, who reads the divorce report in the newspaper near the climax to *The Good Soldier*, and learns

something terrible about the truth of human sexual relationships from what she sees (it leads to her madness). Dowell's wranglings with such knowledge are more protracted.

A resultant effect of novelistic formations of this kind is a powerful sense of drama. A series of events unfolds, sometimes excruciatingly slowly, with emphasis on each link in the chain, and one must watch carefully to try and ascertain the whole (cubist) picture. Indicative of great attention to the psychological and sexual revelations of *The Good Soldier* as each in turn rears its disturbed, disturbing head, it is these aspects of the main characters that regale the reader's own consciousness: 'It was as if his passion for her hadn't existed; as if the very words that he spoke, without knowing that he spoke them, created the passion as they went along. Before he spoke, there was nothing; afterwards, it was the integral part of his life' (p. 80). Surprised by his unconscious, Edward Ashburnham is the living embodiment of the pluralistic power of sexuality.¹⁷ His response is involuntary and he follows the anterior calling of his unconscious need: he knows not what he says. It is left to Dowell to relate the shape of Edward's desire for Nancy, whom until then he had regarded 'exactly as he would have regarded a daughter' (p. 77). Confused (incestuous) and conflicting emotional and sexual needs are precipitated out of the convolutions of the text and then resubmerged, to appear in other forms. Motivational understanding comes much later; the unrelenting dramatic technique is paramount.

This technique is prefigured, in part, by Ford's trilogy *The Fifth Queen* (1906–8), named for Catherine Howard (spelled 'Katharine' by Ford), the fifth of Henry VIII's wives. This is, as a spectacular display, a 'virtuoso performance – the first of Ford's great shows' in the opinion of William Gass.¹⁸ Less mature in this work, the drama is expressed by Ford not in the tortuousness of human sexuality and despair, but in the wealth of strong, and confrontational, characters; in the extent of visual effect; in questions raised by belief. Politics and theology, in the time of Henry VIII, were the big questions that shook the times and those who inhabited them: these were the matters for debate. Ford's early novelistic mind interpreted and used these issues in the way that his later novelistic mind interpreted and used sexuality. The vibrancy in the historical novels is not that of emotion, but of the livid pregnancy of detail. Gass warns of the need to watch closely, for '*The Fifth Queen* [...] is like Eisenstein's *Ivan*: slow, intense, pictorial, and operatic. Plot is both its subject and its method. Execution is its upshot and its art. *The Fifth Queen* is like Verdi's *Otello*: made of miscalculation,

mismaneuver [*sic*], and mistake. Motive is a metaphor with its meaning sheathed like a dagger'. The need for such warning is exemplified in the following scene, in the menace implicit in King Henry's approach:

The Duke, hearing behind him the swish pad of heavy soft shoes, as if a bear were coming over the pavement, faced the King.

'This is my brother's child,' he said. 'She is sore hurt. I would not leave her like a dog,' and he asked the King's pardon.

'Why, God forbid,' the King said. 'Your Grace shall succour her.'

Culpepper had his back to them, caring nothing for either in his passion.

Henry said: 'Aye, take good care for her,' and passed on with Privy Seal on his arm.

The Duke heaved a sigh of relief. But he remembered again that Anne of Cleves was coming, and his black anger that Cromwell should thus once again have the King thrown back to him, came out in his haughty and forbidding tone to Culpepper:

'Take thou my niece to the water-gate. I shall send women to her.' He hastened frostily up the path to be gone before Henry should return again.¹⁹

Character, personality: neither of these more subtle tools are crucial here. The language is primitive – the scene takes place adjacent to the Thames – basic, sensual. The only reference to passion is made because Culpepper turns his back upon the main action, that of power and politics, as propagated by Henry VIII, and the Duke of Norfolk, Katharine's uncle.²⁰ Katharine's foray into the heart of her uncle is foreshortened by Norfolk's remembrance of the real issue at hand, that of the renewed power of Thomas Cromwell with the coming of Anne of Cleves. Ford's inhospitable novelistic behaviour makes an earlier appearance; the exploration of the brutal side of human sexuality in *The Good Soldier* resonates instead in the politically and visibly tormented protagonists of Tudor England.

For H. Robert Huntley, Ford's belief that 'successive historical ages produce different and dominant psychological types' is realised fictionally for the first time in the *Fifth Queen* trilogy.²¹ It is in these novels that Ford begins to express fictionally a relationship between the systems of the time and those who live in them: Magister Udal is sly, greedy and predatory; it is only the elderly printer (unafraid for his life) who can afford to bemoan that 'in my day we could pray to St Leonard for a fair wind' (p. 7). Potential self-destruction lurks in any careless

act, and Ford investigates the external manifestations of political and theological adherence to which he can later add the complications and more internal tensions of sexual morality (sex does figure here, of course, however). It is as though Ford has had to become the historian of another time in order to learn more fully how to become a better, more thorough, historian of his own time. The classifications pertaining to this period are comparatively clear: one risks death by the faith one holds. Faith is thus of ultimate strength. The singular choice is clear, visible; by the time of Dowell it has become plural, embedded and complex.

The Fifth Queen is dedicated in some senses to discovering how people experience their belief or faith, how they respond to what they perceive as being larger and infinitely more permanent than themselves: their king and their God. Ford appears to revel in influential ideologies, and in the shadows that they throw. There is room for an author to move amidst such a tapestry of strongly and violently held opinion. The times carry the plot. The semantic and physical environment is one of near-hysteria due to the power wielded by a religious and paranoid king, a fact rendered dramatically so that its full contrastive energies are felt – ‘Katharine fell upon her knees before this holy man’ (p. 91). Similarly, she goes to her death ‘slowly down over the flags of the great hall. Her figure in black velvet was like a small shadow, dark and liquid, amongst shadows that fell softly and like draperies from the roof’ (*Fifth Queen Crowned*, p. 313). The action must be watched, for this is about the way in which people behave in the face of situations; it is about how the light of favour falls.²² Katharine herself pays the ultimate price, hence Ford’s interest in her, for she will not repent.

The devotion of the human being, in droves, to a particular faith, belief or pattern of behaviour is a source of inspiration and motivation to Ford in the writing of this trilogy. Why?

Of course [Lewis’s] characters do indulge themselves in a great number of expository disquisitions but Mr. Lewis makes it sufficiently clear that he backs neither set of views when they do discourse. Thus, things remain very much as they were at the beginning and the final impression is one of a sort of solidarity of mankind from Altoona to the Adriatic and back.²³

Ford admires Lewis for providing what amounts to a forum for debate on human truths (see Chapter 7 for a discussion of this in relation to Ford’s autobiography and opinion of the novel as genre). It is a

dramatic, multiplicitous, exploration. Lewis does not need to make his personal feelings clear, and Ford, too, ‘supports’ all sides (as he usually does), relating the historical fact of the popular swing towards Katharine Howard and thus Catholicism and then away from her as she goes to the scaffold. Both faiths, indeed, are ‘murdered’; things ultimately ‘remain very much as they were at the beginning’, as they do for Dowell.²⁴ The reader has been witnessing an exploration into what people need to believe, how they express it, what they will sacrifice for it, and how the power thus caused shifts and divides.

As is to be expected, Katharine Howard’s story ends in her execution. By not renouncing her beliefs when pragmatism dictates, she sentences herself to death. The psycho-political geography of Ford’s writing is thus confirmed in its period of relative certainty, especially when compared with the suicides of Edward and Florence in *The Good Soldier*, and the suicide of Tietjens’s father in *Parade’s End*. These later novels are distinguishable from the *Fifth Queen* trilogy primarily due to their more complex interweaving of levels.

Parade’s End

Parade’s End: plot

The four novels that make up this tetralogy follow Christopher Tietjens through his domestic, emotional, political and moral crises – crises that are held to be typical of the age. Arthur Mizener writes that ‘the focus of our attention is on the slow, tortured process by which Christopher becomes consciously aware that the conventional life of Edwardian society no longer embodies the principles that it professes and that he has tried with such heroic literalness to live by’ (p. 499). The text opens on Tietjens, on a train with his great friend Macmaster, as they travel to Rye to play golf. Things change very quickly, not least when suffragettes interrupt their round. Tietjens fights in the First World War – he is an officer, and suffers shell-shock, but this experience causes him arguably less pain than the cuckolding by his wife, Sylvia, and its concomitant, excessive, cruelty. He has a prospective lover, Valentine, but remains unable to make love to her for most of the tetralogy; he has friends who rely on him more than he can on them; his Tory, feudal attitude to his land, at Groby, is relentlessly challenged by the modern world. The narrative is told from a variety of perspectives, and shifts its geographical location regularly. The time shift is almost, but not quite, as pronounced as it is in *The Good Soldier*.

Roger Sale has claimed that 'Ford needs Sylvia just as he needs Valentine, as major alternative sources of energy and complication to set off against Tietjens'.²⁵ Ford thus arranges three textual interests as a typical paradigm. These interests are sexually connected, and although Tietjens finds himself at war, he expresses the main difficulties of his existence as those forced upon him by the question of sex. 'My problem will remain the same whether I'm here or not', says Tietjens to General Campion, of his presence at the front in France, 'For it's insoluble. It's the whole problem of the relations of the sexes' (p. 491). He doesn't even know that Campion is himself sexually linked with the most rabid protagonist in the sex paradigm, his own wife, Sylvia. The contemporary political and cultural 'trouble with women' was discussed in the Introduction. The war, according to some commentators, exacerbated it: 'the war had demolished the myth of female sexual apathy, since there had been so much evidence, and fear, of women's sexual activity'.²⁶ Cate Haste refers here to the 'fear', amongst certain men, of the 'new woman', and her threat to the status quo. It is hard to imagine a more sexually active woman in fiction than Sylvia Tietjens: sadist, serial adulteress, voyeur. It is also crucial that Tietjens's problem is 'the relation between the sexes'; what constituted the connection between masculinity and femininity was one of the most hotly debated sexological questions of the time – as I discuss later in this chapter.

It is the battlefield that best signifies Tietjens's movement through the novels, but it is a field that is established for the wrangles of domestic and sexual existence as well as of military power. Again, the language of physical geography is used as an effective analogy for the contemporary extending map of personal geography.²⁷ Sylvia, deprived of the object of her sadistic evisceration and driven by her sexual frustration, travels to France, augmenting the terror of the front with the terror of the sexual predator:

Not one line of Tietjens's face had moved when he had received back his card. It had been then that Sylvia had sworn that she would yet make his wooden face wince...

His face was intolerable. Heavy; fixed. Not insolent, but simply gazing over the heads of all things and created beings, into a world too distant for them to enter... And yet it seemed to her, since he was so clumsy and worn out, almost not sporting to persecute him. It was like whipping a dying bulldog... (p. 381)

The violence of the last image survives, despite the 'concessionary' attitude of which it is the product. The continuation dots propagate its life: Sylvia will institute it. The first continuation dots are also effective (and such a preferred technique) for they serve to symbolise the non-effectiveness of language in reaching and describing the levels of imagined suffering.

Graham Greene examines this multiplication of the zones of personal suffering: 'While a novel like *All Quiet on the Western Front* confined its horror to the physical, to the terrors of the trenches, so that it is even possible to think of such physical terrors as an escape for some characters from the burden of thought and mental pain, Ford turned the screw. Here there was no escape from the private life'.²⁸ Ford 'turned the screw', and wrote of the misery of two worlds instead of one. Tietjens is wrong when he simplifies this into one 'problem', of the 'relationship between the sexes'; the weight of the work is derived from the meticulous attention to both, and, more importantly, to the psychological interplay between them. The manifestation of fragmenting systems, the opening out of existential levels and the exhibition of the movement between them, the analysis of plural 'interests' as they make themselves known, are essential to Ford's fiction. The dramatic technique is pursued by him into the internal dynamic of a man's mind (think here of the discussion of fragmentation in Chapter 1):

Back in his room under the rafters, Tietjens fell, nevertheless, at once a prey to real agitation. For a long time he pounded from wall to wall and, since he could not shake off the train of thought, he got out at last his patience cards, and devoted himself seriously to thinking out the conditions of his life with Sylvia. He wanted to stop scandal if he could; he wanted them to live within his income; he wanted to subtract that child from the influence of its mother. These were all definite but difficult things... Then one half of his mind lost itself in the rearrangement of schedules, and on his brilliant table his hands set queens on kings and checked their recurrences.

In that way the sudden entrance of Macmaster gave him a really terrible physical shock. He nearly vomited: his brain reeled and the room fell about. He drank a great quantity of whisky in front of Macmaster's goggling eyes; but even at that he couldn't talk, and he dropped into his bed faintly aware of his friend's efforts to loosen his clothes. He had, he knew, carried the suppression of thought in his conscious mind so far that his unconscious self had taken command and had, for the time, paralysed both his body and his mind. (pp. 79–80)

This is the description of a nervous breakdown. W. H. R. Rivers wrote in 1920 that ‘mental health depends on the presence of a state of equilibrium between instinctive tendencies and the forces by which they are controlled’,²⁹ and in the psychoanalytic model of the mind a continual system of negotiations between the *id*, *ego* and *superego* is in operation. In Tietjens, balances have ceased to work. In the first line, the word ‘nevertheless’, between two commas, clearly decides the issue of self-control; Tietjens has lost it, for that word also signifies the concept ‘despite himself’. Concentrated physical activity cannot restore his equilibrium and so he looks to planning his future life with Sylvia to escape his mental agitation. He decides what he wants, but the threefold repetition of that word seems to lessen its power; he can articulate the wants, but fears impotence in bringing them to fruition – ‘These were all definite but difficult things ...’. He reaches an impasse.

And so he returns to his cards, and because his mind can achieve great things, one half of it dedicates itself to the brilliance of the table. The other half of it, for now, is unmentioned in order for the full irony of Macmaster’s entrance to become apparent. When Macmaster does come in, the enormity of the effort it has taken to keep that other half silent shows itself in the physicality of the shock caused. Tietjens has been hovering on the edge of collapse, and in the presence of this catalyst he succumbs to it. Ford relates this collapse in quintessential manner, for, in the language he chooses, Tietjens seems almost to exceed normal human existence, rather than become less than it. Ford expands upon the expanding levels of the man. Tietjens’s mind is working too fast for him to be able to talk, to control himself: even an enormous amount of tranquilliser in the form of whisky does not work. He is beyond talking, he is somehow above Macmaster’s efforts to loosen his clothes, and the part of him that can now vaguely think is undergoing something like an out of body experience. The final sentence quoted splits him up into many parts – ‘he had’ is the experiential Tietjens, the living one; ‘he knew’ is the part of him that understands and comprehends the present paralysis.³⁰ This part sees the suppression of thought in his conscious mind, things being so ‘difficult’ and, more importantly, it sees the necessary and self-protective action of the unconscious in stepping forward and trying to shut everything down. To all intents and purposes, it succeeds: only one part remains functional, that which watches, cognitively – and that part seems to be beyond any feelings at all. Ford’s shattering of the man into

his constituent parts (using grammatical tools) mirrors the dissolution of the system of marriage that is its catalyst.³¹

Fifty pages earlier in the novel, Ford has related the above incident in a very different fashion, one that helps to give such weight and depth to the account above. At the point in question, Ford is a novelist merely describing a scene. Macmaster is seen to give Tietjens a start, but they manage a small conversation and there is no way of divining the extent of Tietjens's mental anguish. The external vision is ordinary; what is extraordinary is the technique of regressively pursuing the incident to a much more profound level. Ford's adoptive style is that of deepening the reader's understanding, making it more complex, rather than progressing it; he constructs parallel lines of narrative. These lines correspond to differing levels of consciousness, differing levels of communication, and perfectly complement the subject matter. The latter introduction of the deeper level of communication is similarly appropriate, for as Tietjens's unconscious moves forward to take control, so the reader is embedded more effectively, more complicat- edly, in the tale.

The reader of *Parade's End* has been granted access to Tietjens's unbalanced mind. Ford reveals the inner workings of the human subject. *The Good Soldier* could be interpreted as an earlier version of this novelistic task.

In 1934 Ford claimed to 'sit frequently and dream of writing an immense novel in which all the characters should be great masses of people – or interests. You would have Interest A, remorselessly and under the stress of blind necessities, slowly or cataclysmically over- whelming Interest Z, without the attraction of sympathy for a picturesque or upright individual' (*It Was the Nightingale*, p. 215). I think he had already written this novel, though not in exactly the form he imagines here. In *The Good Soldier* the 'great masses of people' are absent, but the 'interests' are there; the interests may relate to charac- ters, but they could map onto the psychic components of *id*, *ego* and *superego*. Interest A, compelled by destiny and blind, erotic necessity, is the *id*; Interest Z is the *ego*, negotiating (and fighting a losing battle) with the *id*; finally there is the forgotten *superego*, abandoned in its moral compunction in the primitiveness of the fight. As we know, conceptions of right and wrong have no place in this text; its *superego* is as yet fairly undeveloped. Instead the reader witnesses varieties of the *id* rampant (in Florence and Edward), with the *ego* just, at times, holding on to its coat-tails, its reality principle thrown into disarray by

the libido's unfeasible strength. (Dowell offers a peculiar manifestation of this principle: he guards Florence's locked bedroom, enabling her to take as many lovers as she chooses. Leonora's manifestation of the reality principle poses more of a challenge.) Perhaps, though, the more effective reading pays attention to the characters' distinct and discrete contributions to what has become, in this text, a psycho-sexual debate.

Sex roles

Ford's reply to John Lane, his publisher, on hearing of a complaint against the subject matter of *The Good Soldier*, supports a reading of the novel as an indication of the plurality of the sex drive; 'that work', Ford explains, 'is as serious an analysis of the polygamous desires that underlie all men [...] as 'When Blood is their Argument' is an analysis of Prussian Culture' (Saunders I, p. 403). A current Ford would add 'and women' to that statement of intent (Florence, after all, enjoys many sexual encounters, Dowell none), one that reveals his professional dedication to his subject matter: it is serious, academic, investigative, and it seeks to portray the contemporary chaos caused by the sex debate in all its polymorphous glory.

The fight for understanding is terrible in *The Good Soldier*, fuelled by a force that it shares with sexuality: matter for understanding always has to do with sex. Dowell here struggles with two manifestations of the sex instinct:

If poor Edward was dangerous because of the chastity of his expressions – and they say that is always the hall-mark of a libertine – what about myself? For I solemnly avow that not only have I never so much as hinted at an impropriety in my conversation in the whole of my days; and more than that, I will vouch for the cleanness of my thoughts and the absolute chastity of my life. At what, then, does it all work out? Is the whole thing a folly and a mockery? Am I no better than a eunuch or is the proper man – the man with the right to existence – a raging stallion forever neighing after his neighbour's womankind? (p. 15)

This is a pathetic struggle. Dowell embraces an intellectual approach, yet he evokes a Lawrentian image of primitive sexuality, rendered all the more desirable in this expression by a man inappropriate to its demands. Dowell feels its strength, or, rather, the metaphorical strength of its expression, and simultaneously cannot feel it: he is one stage removed. His pitiable need for self-justification renders him in awe of the power to which he can only allude. This patterning of

allusion and reflection evokes *his* vision of *Leonora's* vision of 'the pit of hell'. Dowell flounders then, as he flounders now, equipped only to watch open mouthed as sexual terror is wrought through another, whether it be the metaphorical stallion or the tortured and impotent woman. In the proliferations of fecundity, in the maelstrom of deception and desire, sexual knowledge, naivety and excruciating sexual cruelty, a question is found; it is not which man has the right to existence, but which projection, which human manifestation, of the sex drive.

'In the nineteenth century', writes Joseph Bristow, 'the idea that the sexes were polar opposites magnetically attracted to each other had a tight ideological grip on the culture'. He suggests that even such 'sex radicals' as Karl Heinrich Ulrichs and Edward Carpenter conceived of the distinctions between the sexes in 'strikingly orthodox terms'.³² However, in 1903 Otto Weininger produced a (more populist) work on the subject. *Sex and Character* sold extremely well, and contributed to what has been called Weininger's 'cult' status in Austro-German intellectual life, as well as having a much wider cultural impact.³³ In this book, as part of a thesis concerning the supposed decline of modern civilisation, Weininger suggests that the sexes are not, in fact, polar opposites, but are rather like 'two substances combined in different proportions'.³⁴ Ford read Weininger's text.³⁵ In *The Good Soldier* he provides examples of differently mixed proportions of masculinity and femininity: all four protagonists manifest a singular (though changeable) combination, equating them with either a 'eunuch' or a 'raging stallion' or their female equivalents.

Ford has animated his characters with proportions of masculinity and femininity, of libidinous capacity, that will cause a massive implosion once all is known. Until that time, when suicide curtails the battle, the shifting systems of psychological and sexual knowledge and control can be likened to the display of Tietjens's fragmented mind, when one elemental force wrestles with its 'neighbour' – back to the psychological imaging. Dowell is like the side of Tietjens's brain that seeks ignorance in the card game whilst Florence, Leonora and Edward whirl around one another, advocating varying levels of sexual expression, from cold and punitive abstention to the suggestion of enjoying one another in secret. Ford is not advocating free love; he has no moral stance, but he is attempting to show how life is – in this respect concerning himself with the reality of 'polygamous desire'. Foucault was cited in Chapter 1 to show that fragmentation comes out of repres-

sion lifting: with an increase in questioning comes a multiplication of possibilities and a collapse of what can be taken for granted. Dowell is the foil for the non-repression of the other three, for he doesn't know about sex, and takes Florence's chastity for granted, validating the 'game' – as she takes numerous lovers behind her locked door. When he can no longer ignore how it is, so the whole hypocritical edifice collapses.

Tietjens undergoes a similar discovery, much to Macmaster's discomfort, and advocates honesty instead of hypocrisy: 'it would be better [for a fellow] just to boast about his conquests in a straightforward and exultant way' he exhorts (p. 18). He has no illusions as to the effect this would have on the upper-class 'game',³⁶ or system, as understood, and relied upon, by Macmaster, by Edward and Florence, and by Leonora: it would destroy it, and in the apprehension of this destruction Macmaster is reduced to an inarticulate and spluttering rage. Tietjens is not playing the game when he challenges Macmaster thus:

'It's like you polygamists with women. There aren't enough women in the world to go round to satisfy your insatiable appetites. And there aren't enough men in the world to give each woman one. And most women want several. So you have divorce cases. I suppose you won't say that because you're so circumspect and right there shall be no more divorce? Well, war is as inevitable as divorce...' (p. 21)³⁷

Macmaster, unable to take any more, has caused those ellipses. He escapes, interrupting the psychological battering he is receiving from Tietjens by putting his head out of the carriage window to call for a porter. One might equally interpret this as a call for help from Macmaster's view of the status quo. Yet war, and divorce, are come to fragment it.

Pre-war, the challenge to the polygamists is rarely so vocal and certain, and, due in part to the narrative style, the levels of intimacy created between the four protagonists of *The Good Soldier* undermine the differences between them. This intimacy is of an incestuous strength. As Leonora turns her lighthouse stare upon Dowell he writes that it was 'the look of a mother to her son, of a sister to her brother. It implied trust; it implied the want of any necessity for barriers' (p. 29). Leonora thus merges the love of mother for a son, the love of a sister for a brother – although Dowell may simply not recognise the difference. This incestuous sense translates into the sexual relations between the four figures. Leonora and Dowell do not copulate, true – and nor

do Dowell and Ashburnham. And yet Dowell says of Edward, in terms reminiscent of Cathy's transgressional love for Heathcliff, 'For I can't conceal from myself the fact that I loved Edward Ashburnham – and that I loved him because he was just myself' (p. 161).³⁸

Such intimacy shortens the perspective; it exacerbates the narrative chaos. Even Dowell understands that sex has an impact on the human subject, musing that 'a love affair, a love for any definite woman – is something in the nature of a widening of the experience ... there appears to come a broadening of the outlook, or, if you like, an acquiring of new territory' (p. 79). With each sexual experience comes a concomitant development in the character, an increase of knowledge. What Dowell doesn't, and cannot, completely understand, is how devastating the acquisition of this new territory can be.

Ford's framework

In his book *Beginnings: Intention and Method*, Edward Said draws Freud into the history of the novel and regards his function primarily as a writer (see Chapter 1). Said says of Freud that 'for "dreams" we can easily imagine substituting the word "fiction", for "distortion" the "point of view", for "regression" and "condensation" the term "biography", for "parents" the novelistic "family" and so on'.³⁹ In Said's view (and in the view of many others) the writing of fiction can be linked to the interpretation of the unconscious. To prove his point, he conflates the independent languages associated with the two disciplines and shows that, in certain cases, they are interchangeable. Said, using Freud, introduces the idea of interpreting the patterns of fiction as though they were the symbol of something deeper. Within the text of *The Good Soldier* Ford pays attention, employing delaying tactics, to the nature of his characters as they perform, ignore, are jealous and frantic about, repress, sex. In the battle just witnessed in *Parade's End*, Macmaster's conscious systems of will, and 'proper' behaviour, have been challenged by Tietjens's attention to the less conscious systems of desire. In *Parade's End* the issue is clear; in *The Good Soldier* it rarely is so. Why? 'A way of breaking through the barrier is to be found', Said might suggest,

in Freud's interpretation of the Oedipus story – specifically, in a footnote that he added in 1914 and that was apparently the section of his text that provoked the most controversy [...]. Once again Freud draws attention to a type of knowledge so devastating as to be unbearable in one's sight,

and only slightly more bearable as a subject of psychological interpretation. In essence, this knowledge is of incest, which can be very correctly described as a tangling of the family sequence [...]. What overwhelms Oedipus is the burden of plural identities incapable of coexisting within one person. (pp. 169–70)

The ‘barrier’ Said refers to in the first line describes a ‘tangle’ which resists interpretation. In Freud’s work, this usually presents itself in the form of a dream, or part of a dream, which stubbornly remains obscure (Dowell dreams of course), but it can be translated into fictional terms, using Said’s model, as representing secrets of motivation and what is yet deeper, sexual desire. In *The Good Soldier* the narrative structure both occludes, and alludes to, desire and sex. At its heart is the possibility of incest (see Saunders I, pp. 420–7). If the subject matter of the novel were examined without the protective barriers provided by the text – the novelistic (modernist) technique of time-shift that delays the true impact of each revelation; the narrator’s predominant calm which softens each blow; and the general refusal of the characters to discuss what is going on – it would emerge as singularly Freudian in its distastefulness. As it eventually does. Is Ford attempting to contain the barest and most basic forces that he sees at work within humanity by placing them within story, and within this kind of story, in this way? Is he attempting to render them more cunningly than if they were overt, stark, and thus more easily dismissable? Perhaps. But he is also being true to the nature of his exploration, for the levels amongst which he explores are those of the normally functioning, repressive and expressive human mind. As Saunders writes, ‘Ford’s description of [*The Good Soldier*’s] “intricate tangle of references and cross-references” cannot be bettered for its tangling together of terms of technique and psychological bafflement’ (Saunders I, p. 402). The subject matter requires a certain style, and it is the ‘tangle’ that resists interpretation that it requires.

Despite the view of the *New Statesman* in 1923 that ‘we are all psycho-analysts now. That is to say that it is as difficult for an educated person to neglect the theories of Freud and his rivals as it would have been for his father to ignore the theories of Darwin’,⁴⁰ there was fierce public resistance to much of what Freud was trying to say (see Chapter 1). The classical story of Oedipus shaped Freud’s thought in an example of adroit design; the design of *The Good Soldier* is similarly adroit, created to avoid a too swift denial of the force of the subject, and to lodge it in the less conscious minds of its readers in the battle with

its tangles. But despite these attempts, if attempts they were, both to be truthful to the nature of the material, and to assure the longevity of his worrying hypotheses, Ford also met much opposition to the substance of his work. People often did not like what they read. Three contemporary reviews of *The Good Soldier* follow, reviews that emanated from both sides of the Atlantic:

The novel may be called 'realistic' – with all the limitations of the term. This realism and consistency are the sole virtues of the story. The portrayal of marital infidelity is dangerous enough even when delicately handled, and for the written page to linger upon the indelicacies of intrigue [...] there is no excuse whatever.⁴¹

Its plot is most unsavoury [...] whereas Mr. James concerns himself with the minds and motives of his characters, Mr. Hueffer is concerned with their actions, deducing their psychology from what they do rather than from what they think.⁴²

We can well imagine that the work will prove of some value to the specialist in pathology.⁴³

Though these reviews do not constitute the complete critical response to Ford's novel, what is interesting is that they all concern themselves with the morality of the text. The reviewers all adopt a moral position from which they judge Ford's vision of current life. Ford is providing what could be described as an unwelcome challenge that unsettles; he is taking the novel to a new place in its relation to society. All three reviewers are condemnatory of behaviour that defies restrictions and breaks boundaries, of action as opposed to the relative safety of cerebral emphasis. Ford is telling it as it is, not as it should be; thus he puts his belief in the novel and its relation to society, discussed at the outset of this chapter, into practice.

Said states that the Oedipus story is not simply about the factual horror of what he does (although this is enough to make him put out his eyes); it also displays 'the burden of plural identities incapable of coexisting within one person'. Ford's story also represents the different manifestations of a man, and indicates the unimaginable pain caused by their dislocation and totalitarian action. There are implications of incest in *The Good Soldier*; the characters could be said each to represent part of the same psyche; death, madness and suicide crown the tale. Finally, in a stunning allusion to the matter, if not the exact occurrence,⁴⁴ of Sophocles's text, Dowell muses, once he can reveal all: 'I think that it would have been better in the eyes of God if they had all

attempted to gouge out each other's eyes with carving knives' (p. 158). 'Better' it would have been, maybe, but also impossible; for they had no 'God' to show them how it would go. Instead, they are left, in a phrase that Dowell repeats, 'under four eyes' – of judgement, of their better selves, or, ultimately, for those who avoid death or madness, of memory.

Saunders has examined the links between Ford's thought and that of Freud, concluding that 'there is no record of Ford's having read Freud' (Saunders I, p. 425). However, Freud's influence on the thought processes of Tietjens's son, as he thinks about his mother and about sex, is pronounced: 'The dominion of women over those of the opposite sex was a terrible thing. He had seen the General wimper like a whipped dog and mumble in his poor white moustache. . . . Mother was splendid. But wasn't sex a terrible thing. . . . His breath came short' (p. 713). The boy both sees and condones his mother's sexual cruelty, a cruelty that has been evoked in exactly the same words when applied to her treatment of his father. His sexually triumphant mother is splendid, and she excites him, 'his breath came short'. Sylvia would approve of this; after all, she has said herself, "I prefer to pin my faith to Mrs. Vanderdecken. And, of course, Freud'" (p. 37). In this world of collapsing faiths, Sylvia has found hers. As discussed in Chapter 1, this is an initially fragmenting faith, based on communication and on narrative. As such, it is peculiarly resonant in *The Good Soldier*, due to the sheer irredeemable scale of tragedy, the confusion and repression and manipulation of sexual identities, and the obscurantist nature and the dualistic technique of the text.

The tragedy of *The Good Soldier* is indeed irredeemable; the design of the text is such that it resists, in the dynamic between knowledge and ignorance, revelation and implication, 'easy' incorporation by the reader. This is partly out of a dedication on Ford's part to expressing the true, multiple nature of his subject. But Allen Tate suggests that '*The Good Soldier* falls short of tragic action', because 'it is Ford's great theme that tragic action must be incomplete in a world that does not allow the hero to take the full Oedipean responsibility for the evil that he did not intend but that he has nevertheless done'.⁴⁵ Not only is the reader encouraged to keep the subject matter alive, therefore, and effective, but the characters are similarly encouraged. Unable to take responsibility, and to atone, for their sins (unable to put a symbolic end to what they have seen), they guarantee incompleteness. The matter of the book holds onto its animated existence. It cannot be put away.

This stubborn non-closure takes the end of this chapter back to its beginning. Ford has found the perfect way to make his novels live, and be fragmentingly true, in modernist fashion, to the ‘whole man alive’.⁴⁶ In Robert Grimshaw of *A Call*, the subject of my next chapter, the fragmenting systems of Edwardian society are used to communicate an alternative version of this novelistic task. The extent of the threat posed by women is explored, and the individual battle with sexual identity is further explained.

Notes

- 1 D. H. Lawrence, ‘Why the Novel Matters’ in Anthony Beale (ed.), *Selected Literary Criticism D. H. Lawrence* (London, Heinemann, 1967). This essay was published posthumously in 1936.
- 2 Christopher Gillie, *Movements in English Literature 1900–1940* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 11.
- 3 Alan Judd, *Ford Madox Ford* (London, HarperCollins, 1990), p. 169.
- 4 See Saunders I, pp. 247–8, 297–8.
- 5 Ford Madox Ford, review in *Bookman* 69, April 1929, p. 191.
- 6 Ford Madox Ford, *Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance* (New York, Ecco, 1989), p. 178.
- 7 These four novels are: *Some Do Not...* (London, Duckworth, 1924); *No More Parades* (London, Duckworth, 1925); *A Man Could Stand Up* (London, Duckworth, 1926); *Last Post* (London, Duckworth, 1928).
- 8 Ford Madox Ford, *It Was the Nightingale* (1934) (New York, Ecco, 1984), p. 199.
- 9 Sondra Stang (ed.), *The Presence of Ford Madox Ford* (Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), p. xxvi.
- 10 Ford Madox Ford, *A Call* (1910) (Manchester, Carcanet, 1984), epistolary epilogue.
- 11 Ford Madox Ford, *The Good Soldier* (1915), Martin Stannard (ed.) (New York and London, Norton, 1995), p. 73.
- 12 Friedrich Nietzsche, ‘The Use and Abuse of History’ in Oscar Levy (ed.), *Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, Vol. 5, ii, *Thoughts Out of Season* (Edinburgh, T. N. Foulis, 1909), p. 7.
- 13 No, he is not interested in certainty, and neither was the literary tradition to which he had come. Think of the framing of *Heart of Darkness*, of the train-enabled town and country conflict in *Howards End*, of the multiple viewpoints of *Dubliners* (which appeared as *The Good Soldier* was being written, in June 1914).
- 14 See Peter Childs, *Modernism* (London, Routledge, 2000), p. 52; Saunders I, p. 456; and the Introduction here.

- 15 'And then – smash – it all went. It went to pieces at the moment when Florence laid her hand upon Edward's wrist. Or rather, it went when she noticed the look in Edward's eyes as he gazed back into Florence's. She knew that look' (p. 123).
- 16 Ford Madox Ford, *Parade's End* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1988), pp. 229–31.
- 17 The text is linked in this way, as Saunders avers, to the controversial work of sexologists Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis (I, p. 427).
- 18 William Gass, 'The Neglect of the Fifth Queen' in Stang (ed.), *Presence of Ford Madox Ford*, p. 35.
- 19 Ford Madox Ford, *The Fifth Queen: and How She Came to Court* (London, Alston Rivers, 1906), p. 49. This is the first volume of the trilogy. Volume 2 (*Privy Seal*) was published in 1907, Volume 3 (*The Fifth Queen Crowned*) was published in 1908.
- 20 Whereas *A Call* had the subtitle *The Tale of Two Passions*, and *The Good Soldier* that of *A Tale of Passion*.
- 21 H. Robert Huntley, 'Ford, Holbein and Dürer', *South Atlantic Bulletin* 30: 4–6, May 1965.
- 22 When Katharine comes to confess, she halts at 'the edge of the sunlight'; when Henry tries to persuade her to retract, 'she confronted him, being in the shadow' (*Fifth Queen Crowned*, pp. 302, 305). On Katharine's final exit, Ford concentrates on the sound of her departure (p. 314).
- 23 *Bookman* review, pp. 191–2.
- 24 'Here I am', Dowell says, at the end of the novel, 'very much where I started thirteen years ago' (p. 151).
- 25 Stang (ed.), *Presence of Ford Madox Ford*, p. 75.
- 26 Cate Haste, *Rules of Desire: Sex in Britain World War I to the Present* (London, Pimlico, 1992), p. 56.
- 27 I refer the reader to chapter 4 ('Maps') of Allyson Booth's *Postcards from the Trenches: Negotiating the Space Between Modernism and the First World War* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996). Her analysis includes metaphorical and symbolic uses of maps at war and in fiction; she also adopts a more historical approach.
- 28 Stang (ed.), *Presence of Ford Madox Ford*, p. 10.
- 29 W. H. R. Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious: A Contribution to a Biological Theory of the Psycho-Neuroses*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 119. In *The Problem of Nervous Breakdown* (London, Mills and Boon, 1919), Edwin Ash calls the chapter on cure 'Redressing the Balance' (p. 173).
- 30 In an emulation of this narrative structure, which reveals the different parts of a man's mind, Ford pushes Tietjens into battle with the possibility of sexual union with Valentine, 'She loved him, he knew, with a deep, an unshakeable passion' (p. 214). That 'he knew' displays his continued

fragmentation, his mental delay and moral debate, for he is still unable, and remains unable for hundreds of pages of the book, to make love to her.

- 31 In 1912 Ford wrote on the subject of marriage that ‘on the one hand, it is appalling that any two incompatible beings should be tied together; on the other, it is abhorrent that any two beings joined together by the Lord should be severed by mortal means. The State should render divorce as easy as possible. The Churches should continue to punish with the threat of Hell any of their communicants who infringe their marriage laws. Society should go along doing what it does – ignoring, as far as possible, the decrees of Church and State’ (‘Church, State, and Divorce’ in *The Bystander*, 24 January 1912, pp. 188–9).
- 32 Ulrichs produced a detailed typology of sexual variation between 1864 and 1879 (including male homosexuality); Carpenter published three pamphlets in 1894 that were concerned with sex and sexual behaviour. See Joseph Bristow, *Sexuality* (London, Routledge, 1997), pp. 19–25.
- 33 Editors’ introduction to extract from *Sex and Character* in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (eds), *Art in Theory: 1900–1990* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA, Blackwell, 1995), p. 34. The editors also term the work ‘violently misogynistic and anti-Semitic’.
- 34 Otto Weininger, *Sex and Character* (New York, AMS Press, 1975), p. 8. ‘Thanks to *Sex and Character*’, celebrates Gunnar Brandell, ‘the name of Freud and something of his theories for the first time reached a broad and interested public’ (*Freud: A Man of His Century*, Brighton, Harvester Press, 1979, p. 27).
- 35 See his disparaging mention of it in *Women and Men* (Paris, Three Mountains Press, 1923, p. 32), a work that also addresses stereotypical male and female behaviour; refer also Saunders I, p. 336.
- 36 Of her inability to take a lover adulterously, Leonora says ‘That certainly wasn’t playing the game was it now?’ (*The Good Soldier*, p. 13). This ‘game’ is the collective noun for what Dowell calls a ‘whole collection of rules’ applying to class structure, behaviour and that which one can take for granted about one’s fellow man. The rules are no longer clear or dependable in the world that he sees.
- 37 I want to extract two further points from this quotation: the first is the mention of the polygamy of women, ten years on from Ford’s letter to John Lane; the second is the fact that the war has appeared in their discussion. In the same way that Macmaster cannot accept the end of the sex game as he knows it, and the resultant necessity for divorce, he also cannot accept the thought of war.
- 38 ‘He shall never know how I love him’, cries Cathy, ‘and that [...] because he’s more myself than I am’. Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1961), p. 80.

- 39 Edward Said, *Beginnings: Intentions and Method* (Columbia, Columbia University Press, 1985), pp. 161–2.
- 40 Quoted in Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London, Pimlico, 1992), p. 366.
- 41 *Boston Transcript*, 17 March 1915.
- 42 *Outlook* (London) XXXV, 17 April 1915.
- 43 *Bookman* (London) XLVIII, 117, July 1915.
- 44 Allen Tate discusses why this inexactitude is deliberate on the part of the author, but nonetheless intentionally evocative of Sophocles's text (see p. 60). John Meixner's reading of the novel foregrounds its 'visceral intensity', an intensity that is 'completely unknown to James – one we are more likely to associate with the Greeks'. John A. Meixner, 'The Saddest Story' in Richard Cassell (ed.), *Ford Madox Ford: Modern Judgements* (London, Macmillan, 1972), p. 70.
- 45 Stang (ed.), *Presence of Ford Madox Ford*, p. 13.
- 46 Lawrence, 'Why the Novel Matters', p. 105.