

## Modern Knowledge and Ford's Modern Novel

Sara Haslam  
Chester College

*The Good Soldier* is now regularly cited as one of the formative texts of the modernist era. Its subject matter is forceful: chaotic and destructive sexual relationships; hypocrisy; emotional violence. Its narrative technique is challenging: Dowell is one of the early unreliable narrators; the tale is told retrospectively, yet knowledge is endlessly deferred and obscured. Combined, material and method display clear adherence to the modernist literary tradition. However, a wider analysis of Ford's narrative prowess is necessary. His belief in what the novel, as genre, can achieve, in terms of its representations of modern life, cannot be adequately assessed by criticism of this one novel, significant though it is. Understanding of Ford's contribution to early modern writing demands exploration into the parameters of his belief in the novel; it demands contextualised and comparative readings of his works; it demands an inquiry into the stimuli for both his material and his method. My aim in this discussion is to provide some examples of this exploration and analysis.

Ford's thoughts on the capabilities of the novel are impressive in their scale. They can be divided into two categories: the psychological and the theoretical. In Ford's review of Sinclair Lewis's *Dodsworth* in the *Bookman*, in 1929, he writes:

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.<sup>1</sup>

In order to be fully affected by one's surroundings, Ford thinks, whether they be the landscape or the book one is reading, it is necessary to be unselfconscious; one must simply exist--feel, and especially suffer. Suffering imbues with reality and therefore prime effectiveness those surroundings. In the properly reflexive relationship between subject and author, text and reader, a system for communication is made possible, one which moves, extends, probes and unsettles.

Ford establishes his theoretical stance in writing the four novels that became *Parade's End*.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

This is an ambitious aim. It describes the attempt to capture and to report the pluralities of a whole age. In her statement which describes him as "a historian of our culture" who understood the "great historical shift" as the nineteenth century was grinding against and then giving way to the twentieth, Sondra Stang suggests that Ford fulfills that role.<sup>4</sup> But what sort of an historian, what sort of a chronicler, would Ford wish to be? An impressionistic one, partly, who establishes the sense of a period whilst representing its facts.

Ford's psychological and theoretical intentions are therefore related, and they encounter one another in practice, in writing which he admired as well as emulated:

Ivanhoe must permanently represent mediaevalism for a great proportion of the inhabitants of the globe, though Scott was a very poor artist; and the death of Emma Bovary will remain horrific in the reader's mind, whilst the murder of yesterday is on the morrow forgotten.<sup>5</sup>

The full power with which Ford credits the Novel is articulated here. As a *genre*, it is perceived as possessing immense responsibility: it extracts the

essence of the time and superimposes that essence upon the time. Like Lawrence, however, Ford resists the idea of such responsibility incorporating a prescriptive purpose.<sup>6</sup> The Novel must, after all, provide a history of its age. For Ford, this means that prose must not simply stimulate growth, or understanding, in one direction alone. The system of communication embodied by the Novel requires suffering, therefore, and is also pluralistic and unpredictable. It is in the context of this thinking that *The Good Soldier*, and others of Ford's novels, must be approached.

*The Good Soldier* is shaped by knowledge and understanding, by issues of communication, not necessarily preconceived ideas of the good and bad. The character patterns are unpredictable, changing as one level of knowledge is placed upon, or ranged against, another. In the following quotation, Dowell reviews the just-received information that his wife was not at all as he perceived. She has taken many lovers, whilst denying him sexual relations with her:

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.<sup>7</sup>

When viewed in isolation, the lack of response in this passage seems pathological. Dowell stereotypes his feeling as akin to 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."<sup>8</sup> The imperfect tense reigns in the quotation from Dowell, and in the novel, because the story is designed to avoid the habitual recourse to static, preconceived responses--Dowell cannot be in complete control (for "control" read "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 when considering this moment--in the process of coming to understanding--than in the production of a state of mind that is, in whatever way, certain. Ford follows the causation of situations, he follows the path of the deepest, perhaps secret motivations as people cautiously relate to each other. He is not a hospitable novelist, but a demanding one. Eventually, Ford also follows the discovery of these motivations, and so it is possible to come to understand, in effect, the why. Yet this does not detract from the fact that confusion and struggle with one's own memory of what seems to be an incomplete narrative ("Have I read about this already?") are the most frequent states of mind for the reader of this text.

The extract which follows comes from towards the beginning of the novel, typically occurring when the reader does not know the history, and actually not making sense until near its end. Then it assumes its rightful position, sequentially speaking, 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... (GS p. 55)

The reader is in exactly the same state of knowledge, or rather, of lack of knowledge, as the narrator. Ford allies that reader with Dowell, showing the horrors in the pit of hell, without giving them a shape or a name. The narrative levels thus expand as Ford articulates the presence of that which is awful, and which is beneath the surface. Perhaps Ford wants the reader to see his or her own horrors, but perhaps he also simply wants him or her to wait, with Dowell, in that imperfect tense which knows no completion.

A resultant effect of novelistic formations of this kind is a powerful sense of drama. Dramatic technique is indeed paramount. It is a technique pre-figured, in part, by Ford's trilogy, *The Fifth Queen* (named for Katherine Howard), which is, as a spectacular display, "a virtuoso performance--the first of Ford's great shows" in the opinion of William Gass.<sup>9</sup> 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 which opened out the times and people inhabiting them: these were the matters for debate. Classifications pertaining to this period are comparatively clear: one risks death by the faith one holds. The singular choice is clear, visible, and by the time of Dowell it has become plural, embedded, and complex.

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*, the complex debate surrounding the issue of suicide in *The Rash Act*, and the suicide of Christopher Tietjens's father in *Parade's End*. These later novels are distinguishable from *The Fifth Queen* trilogy primarily due to their far more complex interweaving of levels. However, there are abundant signs of a narrative construction which amplifies opposing and plural interests, or systems, in the later works. Focus shifts from religion to psychological dysfunction, wartime neurosis and nervousness about the nature and extent of female power.

In *Parade's End*, Ford's war tetralogy, he arranges three textual interests--Tietjens, Sylvia (his wife) and Valentine (his eventual lover)--as a typical paradigm. These interests are sexually connected, and although Tietjens, his protagonist, 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" (NP p. 306). The veracity, on one level, of this statement is compounded by the fact that Campion is himself sexually linked with the most rabid protagonist in the sex paradigm, Tietjens' wife, Sylvia.

It is the battlefield which best signifies Tietjens' movement through the novels, but it is a battlefield which is established for the wrangles of domestic and sexual as well as military power. Sylvia, deprived of her husband, the object of her sadistic evisceration, and driven by her sexual frustration, travels to France, and augments the terror of the Front with the terror of the sexual predator: "Not one line of Tietjens' 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" (NP p. 144). The reader is convinced by her oath. But Tietjens' analysis of one problem, that of the "relationship between

the sexes,” is flawed. The weight of the novel is derived from the meticulous attention to both the sexual and the military Fronts, and, more importantly, to the psychological interplay between them. Such attention is made necessary by the time.<sup>10</sup> War focused attention on individual psychology;<sup>11</sup> and indeed, Ford pursues his paradigmatic thinking into a man’s mind:

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 (SN p. 102).

This is the description of a nervous breakdown. It is precipitated by knowledge which is to do with sex--Sylvia, having cuckolded him, wishes to return. The language is evocative of balances which 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 with the presence of this catalyst, he succumbs to it. He’s beyond talking, he’s somehow above Macmaster’s efforts to loosen his clothes, and the part of him that can 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, separate from and more knowledgeable of his subconscious than any other.<sup>12</sup> 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 communication, in writing, of the dissolution of the man mirrors the dissolution of the system of marriage which is its catalyst.

Fifty pages earlier in the novel, Ford has related the above incident in a very different fashion, one which helps to give such weight and depth to the account above. Here he maintains the position of 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’ 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 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’ unconscious moves forward to take control, as the systems for

existence are further removed, so the reader is embedded more effectively in the tale.

Why does Ford write like this, exposing parallel narrative levels, dramatic debate, psychological fragmentation? I would argue that the answer is to do with the relationship between psychological theory and narrative technique. This is partly due to the subversive nature of the subtexts Ford employs. Ford's belief in the plural demands of the Novel is matched only by the pluralistic nature of the sex drive.

The fight for understanding is terrible in *The Good Soldier*, and it's fuelled by the force of the most subversive element in the text--sexuality. This force demands many representations of its vivacity. Dowell here struggles with two of those representations:

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 [...], I will vouch for the absolute chastity of my life [...]. 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? (GS p. 16)

There is something pathetic in this voicing by the most asexual character in the book. He embraces the intellectual approach, yet he evokes a Lawrentian image of primitive sexuality, made all the more powerful by the irony of its expression by one singularly 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, affeared 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 floundered 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 repeated intimations of the proliferation of fecundity, in the maelstrom of deception, suppressed and expressed desire, sexual knowledge



and naïveté and excruciating sexual cruelty, a question is found; it is not which man has the right to existence, but which projection, which manifestation, of the sex drive. Ford's reply to John Lane, his publisher, on hearing of a complaint against the subject matter, supports this reading of the novel as an indication of the plurality of the 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."<sup>13</sup> One wonders if a current Ford would add "and women" to that statement of intent (Florence, after all, enjoys many sexual encounters, Dowell none) and one simultaneously comes to understand the professional dedication of Ford 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.

Ford has animated his characters with that which will cause such 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." 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. Dowell is the foil for, almost the excuse 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. As his knowledge increases, as what is unconscious becomes conscious, as Ford finally communicates to him how it is, so the whole hypocritical edifice collapses.

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.<sup>14</sup> Said says of Freud that he

deliberately avoids the instruments socially, culturally, and institutionally linked in the west to the practice of fiction, even as his material is--and remains throughout his career--firmly connected to that same practice. 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.<sup>15</sup>

In Said’s view--as in Marcus’--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 inter-changeable. Said, using Freud, introduces the idea of interpreting the patterns of fiction as though they were the symbol of something deeper. *The Good Soldier* is particularly applicable to this form of analysis; the reason for this is one which attests yet further to both Ford’s narrative skill and the currency of his intellectual, cultural attention. Said continues:

A way of breaking through the barrier is to be found, I think, 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. In such a case the image of a man conceals behind it multiple meanings and multiple determinations (Said 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. It is the deepest, most unreachable part of a dream, perhaps, (Dowell dreams, which unconscious activity is granted much close attention by Ford) but it can be translated into fictional terms, using Said’s model, as representing secrets of motivation and what is yet deeper still, sexual desire. In *The Good Soldier* the narrative structure embodies the semi-complete preservation of those

secrets, whilst alluding to their presence. If the subject matter of the novel were examined without the protective barriers provided by the text--the novelistic technique of time-shift which serves often to delay the true impact of each revelation for those concerned; 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. The themes are those of semi-incest; sexual promiscuity, unfaithfulness and dishonesty; suicide and widespread misery. I suggest that Ford is attempting to contain, to a certain extent, the barest and most basic forces that he sees at work within humanity by rendering them as story, and as this kind of story. He is attempting to render them more cunningly than if they were overt, stark, and thus more easily dismissable. 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.

Much of Freud's published work is contemporaneous with Ford's writing; the significant footnote appeared in 1914, one year before the publication of *The Good Soldier*. Samuel Hynes draws specific attention to the post-war "treatment of sex that captured the attention of English intellectuals."<sup>16</sup> *The New Statesman* put the matter even more strongly in 1923:

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 (quoted by Hynes p. 366).

There was certainly great interest, but one which brought in its wake much debate. The controversy mentioned in the second Said quotation refers to the public resistance to much of what Freud was trying to say. The classical story of Oedipus shapes Freud's thought in a relevant example of adroit design; relevant in terms of the fictional behaviour, and fictional material, of Ford Madox Ford. This relates to the earlier suggestion that the design of *The Good Soldier* was a cunning one, created to avoid a too swift denial of the force of the subject, created to lodge the story in the less conscious minds of its readers as they battled with its tangles and wondered at what they did not know. 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.

Ford was pilloried for providing an unwelcome challenge which unsettled: "its plot is most unsavoury" stated one reviewer; he was condemned for taking the novel to a new place in its relation to morality and society: "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 whatsoever," intoned another.<sup>17</sup> Many reviews were condemnatory of the behaviour he shows which 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 is behaving, as he would suggest, as the responsible novelist must.

Saunders has examined the links between Ford's thought and that of Freud:

Apart from a passing reference to having known about--and disapproved of--The Interpretation of Dreams before the war, there is no record of Ford's having read Freud. Nevertheless, the influence of Freud's ideas about the Oedipus complex is probable (Saunders I p. 425).

Analyzing the thought processes of Tietjens' son, as he thinks on his mother, and on sex, I would argue that this influence is more than probably present:

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 (LP p. 73).

The boy seems to preclude his existence within the sex that is "opposite" to that of his mother, he is 'of her' in his analysis of his mother's sexual cruelty (a cruelty described in the words she too has used<sup>8</sup>). His sexually triumphant mother is splendid, and she excites him, "his breath came short". Sylvia would approve of this, she knows the Oedipal truth of this relationship; after all, she

has told us herself that, “I prefer to pin my faith to Mrs. Vanderdecken. And, of course, Freud” (SN p. 50). In this war-torn world of collapsing faiths, Sylvia has found hers. This is an initially fragmenting faith, based on the concept of a divided mind. As such, it is peculiarly resonant in the texts which have been the concern of the current discussion. But such a faith also resonates 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 narratives.

The tragedy of *The Good Soldier* is 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 why else, due to the time and due to Ford’s intentions for narrative, could this be? Allen Tate writes that

Ford [...] will be made “known” to us through [...] the pathos which will fall just a little short of tragedy, as *The Good Soldier* falls short of tragic action. And why should this be so? 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 Oedipian responsibility for the evil that he did not intend but that he has nevertheless done (*Presence* p. 13).

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 by implication therefore unable to atone, for their sins, unable, as Dowell points out, to “put out their eyes” (as does Oedipus), they guarantee incompleteness. The matter of the book holds onto its animated existence. It cannot be put away.

Ford contains appalling modern knowledge within acutely modern novels. His belief in the ability of literature to isolate and to capture the age which produces it is matched by his development of techniques with which to represent that age. Such techniques came into their own as his attunement to the formative events and thinking of the early twentieth century matured to the extent that he could write about them. His fiction, in its form and in its content, illuminates this consciousness with startling and original clarity.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Ford Madox Ford, review in *Bookman*, 69, April, 1929, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> 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). They are hereafter cited by initials. The texts were collected and published as one edition, called *Parade's End*, Ford's title for such a project, in 1950, by Knopf.

<sup>3</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *It Was the Nightingale* (London: Heinemann, 1934) p. 180.

<sup>4</sup> Sondra Stang, *The Presence of Ford Madox Ford* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), p. xxvi. Hereafter cited as *Presence*.

<sup>5</sup> Ford, Ford Madox, *The English Novel: From the Earliest Days to the Death of Joseph Conrad* (London: Constable and Co., 1930), pp. 11-12.

<sup>6</sup> See Lawrence's famous essay, "Why the Novel Matters".

<sup>7</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *The Good Soldier* (London: John Lane, 1915), p. 124. Hereafter cited as GS.

<sup>8</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Use and Abuse of History" in *Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, ed. Oscar Levy, Vol. 5, ii, *Thoughts Out of Season* (Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis, 1909), p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> This trilogy is made up of *The Fifth Queen* (London: Alston Rivers, 1906); *Privy Seal* (London: Alston Rivers, 1907) and *The Fifth Queen Crowned* (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1908). It launched Ford as a known novelist. William Gass' comment appears in an essay, "The Neglect of the Fifth Queen" in *Presence*, p. 35.

<sup>10</sup> The relationship between the sexes is cited by Samuel Hynes, Peter Gay, and George Dangerfield, amongst other historians and cultural analysts, as one of the extreme indicators of cultural upheaval in the years leading up to the war. This wasn't simply due to the increasing violence associated with the cause of the suffrage, later suffragette, movement. Gay states that "in the anguished and inconclusive debate over woman's true place, the fear of woman and the fear of change met and merged." Part of what Ford is doing in his tetralogy, which stretches back to pre-1914, is coming to terms with that legacy.

Peter Gay, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*, volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 225.

<sup>11</sup> As Samuel Hynes has observed, "Freud's methods became acceptable only after they had been proved in war-time treatment of shell-shock cases". Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 114.

<sup>12</sup> 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 unshakable passion" (SN p. 264). 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.

<sup>13</sup> Quoted by Max Saunders in his biography of Ford.

Max Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life*, volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 403. Hereafter cited as Saunders 1.

<sup>14</sup> As Steven Marcus has done in his study of the cultural relationship between the language of psychology and that of the modernist narrative; refer to the initial discussion in his book, *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis: Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity* (Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1984).

<sup>15</sup> Edward Said, *Beginnings: Intentions and Method* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1985), pp. 161-2. Hereafter cited as Said.

<sup>16</sup> Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London: Pimlico, 1992), p. 365.

<sup>17</sup> The first review appeared in the *Outlook* (London) XXXV, April 17, 1915; the second in the *Boston Transcript*, March 17, 1915. Not all reviews were this negative, but they generally do concern themselves with the morality of the text. Ford is deemed to have shown what he should not have done, what should have remained hidden, unacknowledged. Real life, as he saw it, was said by the critics not to be the stuff of fiction; Ford disagreed.

<sup>18</sup> Sylvia has previously said, "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..." (NP p 145). She decides, in the end, to continue the persecution.