





Introduction

James Gifford, James M. Clawson,
& Fiona Tomkinson



Modernism as a movement and period has been defined by its networks and its archives. Perhaps even uniquely so, although Romanticism remains a disruptive precursor. Modernism exists for us only as an archive or window to the past: an ostensibly stable perspective through which we can understand and comment on its fragments and remainders. Under the spectre of authenticity, the archive dubiously attracts attention, yet foreclosing on the range of viable texts is equally suspect. Schools and networks exist in a similar tension, uncovering while also generating meaning. In actuality, these archives bespeak shifting networks, contexts, and politics, moving in parallax with interpretive agency and critical interventions. They offer a theoretical richness to challenge the bounds of intertextuality and question the limits of any text.

Archives & Networks of Modernism developed following a successful conference on Lawrence Durrell and the Archive held at the University of Victoria. This collection, however, developed without any single authorial focus to address or collapse the plurality of Modernist and Late Modernist networks and archives. The collection instead adopts an international perspective, in particular where each network or archive intersects or interrupts the other. In this, it draws from the established tropes of the New Modernist Studies, but often moving through somewhat less established locales, methods, figures, or paradigms.

Herbert Howarth, a poet-scholar who is himself considered in the following articles, casually suggested that several of the other modernist authors discussed here *all* “Snapped in a Library” (“Durrell” 71). By this he particularly meant the modernist stylistic trait of Durrell’s works that led Howarth to ready comparisons with Yeats, Pound, and Eliot. That is, the citational function of allusion and theft in an architectural and relational accretion of meaning over time. In all of Howarth’s major studies, the formal matters of allusion, citation, and theft mark out Modernism’s unique interests

in origins, revisions, rejuvenations, and recontextualizations. In each instance, the enactment of such recuperations through poetic form is combined with problems of history, periodization, eras, ages, and generations. Indeed, prior to the New Modernist Studies this tension thrived between a *Pound Era*, *Auden Generation*, and an *Age of Anxiety* diverging from the formalism of *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* and “Spatial Form in Modern Literature.” Yet, this divergence between history and form is not total, as in Perloff’s *The Poetics of Indeterminacy*. That is, Howarth sees the modernist poet as a writer “of the historical consciousness, the interpreter not of individuals but peoples” (71-72).

The problematic of “peoples” (an ideologically imposed unification based on nation, race, faith, or other artificial signifiers) sits adjacent to the “historical consciousness” that we ascribe to human groups as a function of the nation, collective, or state. The ordering of history’s fragments, such as through citation and allusion, is one expression of or shaping of such a form of collective consciousness. The same conceptual apparatus can be seen at work in Howarth’s more famous work *Notes on Some Figures Behind T.S. Eliot*, which implicitly recognizes the coterie perspective necessary for a meaningful discussion of the poet, his poetics, and the formal structure of his works. The same tension between a historical consciousness and modernist form reaffirms its influence through Howarth’s exploration of Eliot’s youth through to the “years of fragments.” Rather than the language of influence, Howarth tellingly draws from the indexical epistemologies that Michael O’Driscoll considers to great effect through Pound in this volume—in *The Waste Land*, Eliot “organizes.” This historical and allusive structure can be understood as a way for “Eliot to reorganize himself for another eight years...; it helped younger men to organize for another thirty” (*Notes* 241). Least famous, however, is Howarth’s own “networked” connections and “archival consciousness” that made possible his co-authored translation work with Ibrahim Shukrallah, *Images from the Arab World*, a text that presents a specific ideological perspective or historical consciousness for others’ consumption. Its impact is likewise one of formal matters of organization, classification, and indexical epistemologies as they apply to collectives, eras, and ages. In relation to this problem, each contribution to this collection offers an analysis of the organizational epistemologies that define the capacities and influences of networks as well as the framing grave of the archive, a notion proposed by Milan Kundera.

We have, of course, since moved on after Howarth to various

definitional excursions in relation to Modernism, with scholarship in each instance shaped by its own networks of contextualized meaning and generational shifts between the New and by contrast “Old” of Modernist Studies. Susan Stanford Friedman famously reframed the definitional labour behind these competing projections to catalogue and index Modernism. Since her 2001 intervention, Friedman’s critique has enabled subsequent reconsiderations, ranging from Rebecca Beasley’s 2007 re-introduction of a paradigm very much akin to Howarth with a “modern consciousness” deriving from Stephen Kern (19), a materialist orientation to mediated experiences of modernity marvelously elucidated by Julian Murphet in 2009, and Michael Levenson’s recent proposition of a new *Genealogy of Modernism* in his rethought *Modernism* from 2011.

This last work’s persuasiveness lies in the organic unity of its narrative unfolding of a Modernism stretching from the 1880s through 1940s. His reconceptualization of the disruptive origins of Modernism returns to the atomized spectacles and audacious oppositions of proto-modernist culture such that they move from being individual events to a related series, which is itself again a rethinking of the “organization” mused by Howarth:

The decisive event was the emergence of an oppositional culture. It was only when singular disturbances... became connected to one another that modernity recognized modernism, and modernists became conscious of their historical possibility. (Levenson 8)

This seemingly obvious insight allows Levenson to rearticulate the relations among proto-modernist, high modernist, and late modernist literatures. In this regard, his work carries a potent polemical charge for those continuing in the New Modernist Studies. This oppositional culture was made possible through the networked alliances and affiliations of friendship emphasized in this collection by Celia Aijmer Rydsjö and AnnKatrin Jonsson, and its historicity relies profoundly on what Ross recognizes in O’Driscoll’s work as a utopian or heterotopian impulse in archival consciousness, itself standing in conflict with the “enormous common grave” that Kundera calls into vision as a defense against his fellow Parisians’ threatening *critique génétique*. Yet, O’Driscoll’s method would remind us that an indexical reading would recognize Kundera’s polemic aegis as an iteration, one of five English language variant works containing the same passage: “The archive’s ideal: the sweet

equality that reigns in an enormous common grave” (Kundera 97). In these five coexisting statements, the language is rich. The archive’s utopian break creates equality at the expense of life itself, wrongly implying that a hierarchy imposed by a single individual in a position of authority is the only way to preserve life (the passage follows on a celebration of the author’s sole ownership of every form of his or her text). This aristocratic and well-nigh fascist vision of the archival utopian break from history is reinforced by the fact that it “reigns,” it rules, over the atrocity of a mass grave, which Kundera casts as the *telos* of revolution. This language is suspect, but the reader may marvel at the antiauthoritarian role such an approach grants the archival scholar who takes up a spade to exhume the censored history and to enliven the remaining artifacts, placing them on equal footing as “speakers” or actants with the author or archivist who buried them, and retracing the outlines of missing fragments marked as a negative space by the recuperations around them. The revivification grants freedom to the reader from the tyranny of the author, as if the buried had a purpose of later discovery, to tell their own truths and to give their own evidence. The archive’s remainder is the parapraxis of the author’s censored contents.

Contrary to the irreducible multiplicity of variants, Kundera’s author is authoritative and controls the only conduit for a reader’s interpretive activities because “‘the work’ [*l’oeuvre*] is what the writer will approve in his own final assessment” (96). The archive, in contrast, shows the threatening stages of development, the parapraxes that the author might prefer to censor, since they demonstrate the mortal birth of his immortal creation, and hence its inevitable demise. All works are mortal—all texts are insufficient.

But what does this fragility say about theorizing the archive? Apart from established visions of the archive as the embodiment of state authority and law; as a fetish that acts as a substitutive gratification for the impossibility of “truth” as an “organized” index that materially contextualizes man’s consciousness; and as the censored contents of the unconscious speaking through a parapraxis, what other relationship need we explore? Modernist authors were prodigiously aware of the value and tax benefits to be found in their archives, as well as their individual “organizational” talent. An author’s claim of ownership is surely amiss since *my own* copy will

bear my name¹ and is surely in my own possession—he or she may claim it as property, but I surely possess it as my own, very often beyond the author’s mortal failure or posthumous ownership. The author’s claim instead lies in the *text* that I construct as a reader from the material artifacts comprised of books and paper when I put them to use, that is, unless we take faith in the spectral existence of the text beyond the mortal frame of its various unopened books.

The ideal iteration of this archive is by necessity personal, and we as readers can only speak from the subject position of the first person. In my personal library, Jerome McGann’s *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* works in a double relationship with Immanuel Kant as well as “Jerry” McGann. Crucially, mine is the second printing in 1996 of the 1992 University of Virginia paperback edition of the book, not its original 1983 University of Chicago Press edition—or else *Black Riders* might seem more *à propos*. My own artifact of *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* is poorly printed, poorly bound, poorly proofed, and poorly edited—at some points, its poor printing is so blurred that I become dizzy looking at the error-filled page. The effect is delightful. In my clean copy of *Black Riders*, McGann asserts

In a culture that largely imagines print as a vehicle for linguistic meaning, the effect is to foreground textuality as such, turning words from means to ends-in-themselves. The text here is hard to read, is too thick with its own materialities. It resists any processing that would simply treat it as a set of referential signs pointing beyond themselves to semantic content. (74)

Unfortunately, *Black Riders* does not make me feel this way as a reader, not even its dialogically dueling McGanns. However, in my cheap paperback of *A Critique*, I cannot find the “semantic content” without struggling through the book’s “own materialities,” mainly the blurred type that make the final pages and notes almost utterly illegible. My bad edition reminds me of the process in which I am involved—I am using a suspicious object to construct a metaphysical notion. I lose the suspension of disbelief that typically renders *the book* invisible before the blinding light of *the text*, the

¹ We unapologetically speak from and recognize our individual and collective subjectivities in this editorial project, each position fostering the other.

semantic content I construct in reading. In my bad copy, the book remains opaque. Such a habit runs contrary to the epistemologies of the hermeneutic tradition upon which Modernism mediates our vision while at the same time enlivening the relational nature of meaning that the networked manifestation of Modernism as a movement exemplified.

Modernist print objects compel us to consider the archive not as a phantom of equality but as a relation of texts among texts, authors among others, and history amidst histories. Kundera opens *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* with allusion, demonstrating his text's existence among others, despite his despise for the archive later in *The Curtain*. Lawrence Durrell's novels obsessively return to their material instantiations in notebooks, variants, and correspondences. Emily Dickinson has become, *par excellence*, the author whose works cannot be reduced from the archive to typographical depictions. But what of Franz Kafka, Carl Jung's *Red Book*, or even Malcolm Lowry's *Under the Volcano*, which exists in multiple final "intentional objects"? The expansion of modernist interests in Sylvia Plath and Marianne Moore call attention to the same plurality, much as Murphet contends "the mutual and reciprocal determination that structure the systemic relations between old and new media" (14). If the economism of determinism is set aside, this still retains the relational accrual of meaning among a network of materials, and the works collected in this volume each call to this "organizational" and relational understanding of the artifacts of Modernism, two notions that have survived across the Old and New of Modernist Studies.

Indeed, we come to Modernism as an archive or window to the past, and the historical consciousness contextualized or organized by this frame aligns with the silhouette of the archons guiding our understanding. *Archives & Networks of Modernism* develops from this premise in a debate structure that encourages readers to actively contest or build forward from the "semantic content" between these boards of this suspicious object. We hope that readers find this structure an invitation to further response.

We hope, too, that the interconnected references stretching across the volume prove as insightful to the reader as they were delightful to us. For example, the final two contributions, by Christos Hadjiyiannis and by Sejal Sutaria, call into question traditional approaches to modernist networks in ways that resonate with the work by Celia Aijmer Rydsjö and AnnKatrin Jonsson and the response by Nicholas Beauchesne. Hadjiyiannis challenges tradi-

tional readings of Hulme's "Lecture on Modern Poetry," arguing for his study beyond the foundations of Imagism and signaling later inclinations in his work. In her response, Sutaria contextualizes the writing of Hulme beside that of his contemporaries: Pound, Eliot, Lawrence, and the Bloomsbury Group, among others. In doing so, Sutaria joins Hadjiyiannis in upsetting binaries to build a fuller image of the network of mutual influences otherwise overshadowed in much consideration of Hulme personally, Imagism specifically, and modernism in general. Aijmer Rydsjö and Jonsson likewise challenge traditional studies of little magazines, widening the sphere of influence over their networks as they look equally to creation of the word, creation of the printed object, and creation of the market. Little magazines depended as much on shared opportunity and circumstance as they depended on shared writers and editors. To these matters, Beauchesne adds spiritualist concerns, suggesting that the little magazines depended equally on shared beliefs.

Other contributions—by Michael O'Driscoll, by Stephen Ross, by Caroline Krzakowski, and by James Clawson—build their commentary on proximities: of books and documents in a physical archive, of ideas in a metaphysical topos. For O'Driscoll, poets like Pound constructed a utopian index of an archive of culture. This "archival consciousness" is informed by changes in the technology of libraries and standards in publication that lead modernist writers to intertextual gestures. Ross extends the Freudian construction of O'Driscoll's "archival consciousness" by suggesting that it might rather be the archive-as-unconscious that informs the construction of the text-as-consciousness. In doing so, he suggests that the modernist long poem might in fact derive from an indexical desire for order in the face of the chaos of the archive. And for Krzakowski, too, the act of diplomacy itself is born of place—not just nearness of borders but also by the very nature of the archive. A state's central archives serve to collect in one place all the treaties with other state actors, all the rules of networking that run in conflict with the ideologies recalled by Cohn and Gifford. It is difficult, too, to read Krzakowski's argument without indexically recalling the prolix and generous intellect of Andrew John Miller and his work on sovereignty and, in his last presentations, the passport as a Modernist replacement of the letter of introduction amidst the confusions of territorial nationalism. Krzakowski's discussion here is, then, itself a diplomon to other archives of scholarship and memories of colleagues in our expanding and sometimes narrowing personal networks. It is, hence, the job of the diplomat to navigate among these points,

since failure in diplomacy, as Clawson notes, leads to unexpected nodes in the network with unexpected “ripples,” borrow from Sutaria’s terminology. O’Driscoll establishes modernists as the first post-indexicalists—the first to write with the perspective of that distilled space of a text which inverts (and, in so doing, embeds) the shared space of a library. Krzakowski likewise offers the diplomat as among the first to operate from the distilled nowhere of all places and all states. Real spaces of the British Library infiltrate Pound’s archival consciousness, and real policies and archival necessities of the diplomat infiltrate Durrell’s writing, though in his work with a self-conscious infiltration into form of the unconscious forces Ross returns to our attention.

James Gifford and Jesse Cohn, finally, rely on the understanding of an idealized proximity for collaboration and confounding among writers and movements. For Gifford, the *Personal Landscape* poets constructed for themselves a defining style readapting surrealism to anarchist (rather than communist) ends while also incorporating Greek techniques of historical, literary, and geolocative allusion. Personal friendships, correspondence, and collaborations in publications helped to establish this network of exchange and cross-pollination. Cohn questions the extent to which we might accurately read into these networks an anarchic sensibility in the output of the writers. Just as for O’Driscoll and Krzakowski the use of archives and networks depends on a writer’s ability to actuate that virtual proximity, for Gifford and Cohn, too, the Cairo Poets’ capacity for carrying the baton passed by anarchists and surrealists depends in part on our ability to judge the quality of their closeness. And just as for Aijmer Rydsjö and Jonsson the workings and networkings of little magazines depended on more than just contributors, we see in Gifford and Cohn deep reliance on the material connections of the surrealist and anarchic networks of modernism.

The editors of this collection would first like to thank the contributors for patience and generosity during the protracted production process. Likewise, the respondents for each article have generously begun a dialogue with the authors as an invitation to readerly interventions, and their efforts have our deep appreciation. The inspiration for this structure derives from Stephen Ross’s edited collection *Modernism and Theory*, and his participation here was particularly welcome. Fairleigh Dickinson University, Vancouver, has funded the production of this issue, and its research stipends have sponsored discussions among the network of editors (from British

Columbia, Louisiana, and Turkey) in Kentucky and England. Thanks are also due for the several anonymous readers whose feedback was thorough and generous as well as extremely productive.

James Gifford is Assistant Professor of English and Director of the University Core at Fairleigh Dickinson University, Vancouver. He is most active in trans-Atlantic modernist and twentieth-century literature, in particular antiauthoritarian poetry networks. He is equally active in music performance and cultural studies.

James Clawson is Assistant Professor of English at Grambling State University. His research focuses on interactions with philosophy and politics in 20th-century British literature, especially considering elements of the Romantic in works by Irish and Scottish novelists. His recent articles have appeared in *Mosaic* and *Deus Loci*.

Fiona Tomkinson is Associate Professor at Yeditepe University, Istanbul where she teaches full time in the English Literature Department and part-time in the Philosophy Department. She has also taught part-time in the Philosophy Department at Bogaziçi University. She holds a BA and MA in English Language and Literature from the University of Oxford and an MA and a PhD in Philosophy from Bogaziçi University, Istanbul. She has published numerous articles in the areas of literature and philosophy.

Works Cited

- Auden, W.H. *The Age of Anxiety: A Baroque Eclogue*. New York: Random House, 1947. Print.
- Beasley, Rebecca. *Theorists of Modernist Poetry: T.S. Eliot, T.E. Hulme, Ezra Pound*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Brooks, Cleanth. *Modern Poetry and the Tradition*. 1939. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1965. Print.
- Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.4 (1945): 643-653. Print.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism." *Modernism/modernity* 8.3 (2001): 493-513. Print.
- Howarth, Herbert. "Durrell Snapped in a Library." *London Magazine* ns 12.1 (1972): 71-84. Print.
- . *Images from the Arab World*. London: Pilot Press, 1994. Print.
- . *Notes on Some Figures Behind T.S. Eliot*. Boston: Houghton Mif-

- flin, 1964. Print.
- Hynes, Samuel. *The Auden Generation: Literature & Politics in England in the 1930s*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. Print.
- Kenner, Hugh. *The Pound Era*. Berkeley: U California P, 1973. Print.
- Kundera, Milan. *The Curtain*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007. Print.
- Levenson, Michael. *Modernism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2011. Print.
- . *A Genealogy of Modernism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.
- McGann, Jerome. *Black Riders: The Visible Language of Modernism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. Print.
- . *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 1992. Print.
- Murphet, Julian. *Multimedia Modernism: Literature and the Anglo-American Avant-garde*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Perloff, Marjorie. *The Poetics of Indeterminacy: Rimbaud to Cage*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1999. Print.
- Ross, Stephen. Ed. *Modernism and Theory: A Critical Debate*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.