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4. In *Aesthetic Theory* Adorno also makes the point that modern art foregrounds the irrational core of administrative capitalism, arguing for its negative mimetic relationship to the rational. He writes, “The end of all rationality viewed as the sum total of all practical means would have to be something other than a means, hence a non-rational quality. Capitalist society hides and disavows precisely this irrationality, whereas art does not.” On this I follow Adorno entirely. As we'll see, though, my sense that modernism radically reconfigures the terms of reified social relations challenges Adorno's all too easy identification of artistic experiment with the reproduction of capital, where “the new in art is the aesthetic counterpart to the expanding reproduction of capital in society.” See Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 31, 79.


7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., p. 31.


11. Modernism, for Jameson, is a symptom of the prior developments in mass production and the crises it poses for the so-called “autonomous individual.”


15. On both the artisanal impulse exemplified by Bloomsbury and modernist avant-garde practices as training in capitalism’s constant revolutionizing of newness, see John Xiros Cooper, Modernism and the Culture of Market Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). Edward Comentale also aligns the British avant-garde with the managed production of surplus; see Modernism, Cultural Production, and the British Avant-Garde (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). For modernism’s construction of highbrow niche markets, see Rainey, Institutions of Modernism, and Jaffe, Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity.
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28. On this conflation of modernist experimentation, its rejection of conventional structures of production, and the development of new business and marketing models in the twentieth century, see especially Cooper, *Modernism and the Culture of Market Society*.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., p. 225.
36. Several scholars have noted a similar tendency within certain strains of modernism, particularly the more conservative ones like Eliot and Lewis. See for example Comentale, *Modernism, Cultural Production, and the British Avant-Garde*, pp. 69–110; Michael Levenson, *Modernism and the Fate of Individuality: Character and Novelistic Form from Conrad to Woolf* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 121–44. Vincent Pecora makes a brilliant case for a sense of autonomous selfhood in modern narrative that is fatally hampered by the reifying bourgeois institutions that bring it into being in the first place. See *Self and Form in Modern Narrative* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).
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1 Impressions of the Market: Ford, Conrad, and Modernist Investment Fantasy

3. As Mark Wollaeger points out, at this stage in Conrad’s career he focused increasingly on the business and marketing of his writing. Wollaeger writes, “A new shrewdness in self-advertisement becomes evident in Conrad’s correspondence around this time [1912–].” Rather than focus on the corollary development of a literary “‘easy listening’ for the aspiring highbrow,” in Conrad’s work after 1910, as Wollaeger does, I discuss Conrad’s interest in finance (in his letters, for example) and its relation to his critical representation of investment fraud in *Chance*. See Mark Wollaeger, *Joseph Conrad and the Fictions of Skepticism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), p. 180.
7. Audrey Jaffe persuasively argues for the force of feeling behind mid-Victorian conceptions of market culture in a way that continues to inform modernist and contemporary reflections on investment and finance. In particular,
Victorians anxious to distinguish between sound investment practices and exaggerated speculation often sought to do so by aligning the investor with a sense of cool detachment from market forces and the speculator with an impulsive fixation on fluctuating market values. This reliance on such slippery categories, Jaffe argues, gave rise to the figure of the villainous speculator in Victorian fiction who served “as a bogeyman whose function it is to make speculation safe for everyone else: to assume for the national psyche the risks of involvement in the market” (152). As I argue below, Conrad’s de Barral serves a similar function for modernist market culture, but also figures a hyper-reified investment market and acts as a stand in for the fantastic functions of twentieth century capitalism in general. See Audrey Jaffe, “Trollope in the Stock Market: Irrational Exuberance and The Prime Minister,” in Nancy Henry and Cannon Schmitt, eds, Victorian Investments, 143–60.


9. In a reading parallel to my own, Evelyn Cobbley situates the novel’s financial anxieties in relation to the emergent “culture of efficiency” in early twentieth-century discourses of capitalist production. Cobbley argues that “Ford equates a commitment to efficiency with the threat that standardization was generally thought to pose to the cherished notion of the unique human being,” and that “once the efficiency calculus becomes severed from a commitment to some public good [once it becomes an end in itself], it is thought to contribute to possessive individualism and the reification of consciousness under late capitalism.” See Evelyn Cobley, Modernism and the Culture of Efficiency: Ideology and Fiction (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), p. 226.
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The panic occurred in the fall of 1907, when the Knickerbocker Trust, New York’s third largest bank, collapsed at a moment of “apparent prosperity,” causing crowds of its depositors to rush the city’s banks and withdraw their money. Lacking adequate reserves, the banks faced imminent ruin, until an aging J. P. Morgan helped bolster and keep afloat the city and the stock market with his access to U.S. Treasury loans. See David Zimmerman, *Panic! Markets, Crises, and Crowds in American Fiction* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), pp. 151–6.


Poovey, *Genres of the Credit Economy*, p. 81. Giovanni Arrighi provides a broader and detailed examination of the history of Western capitalism as one of recurring cycles of accumulation and loss, showing how each major period of systemic accumulation reaches a point of crisis within “the dominant regime of accumulation,” during which the processes of accumulation particular to that regime either switch to another financial mode or become displaced by another means of concentrating capital. See Giovanni


21. Evelyn Cobley argues a similar point: "Where Edward considers efficiency to be a means to a noble end, Leonora approaches it as an end in itself," and "where Edward is the remnant of a residual feudal ideology, she is emblematic of the emergent ideology of bourgeois capitalism." See *Modernism and the Culture of Efficiency*, pp. 231, 234.


29. The literary impression, for Matz, “is never simply a feeling, a thought, or a sensation. It partakes, rather, of a mode of experience that is neither sensuous nor rational, neither felt nor thought, but somewhere in between” (16). As such, the impression also offers modernism a tenuous means with which “to imagine a juncture of subject and world through feeling, to move from ‘objects’ to ‘processes,’ to debunk the rational, and gain in the process a revitalized medium” (25). This imaginative unity of subject and the object world is the problematic and productive tension of literary impressionism. Emphasizing the processes of perception suggests an organic vision inherited from the Romantics, but one that, if fully realized, would mean the dissolution of the perceiving subject and a total reification of perception and representation that impressionism works to challenge through its ongoing and process-oriented “epistemological dialectic” (145).


31. Katz acknowledges that their “mutual distrust” originates with Edward’s feudal ideal and financial generosity to their tenants rather than in his infidelities. See *Impressionist Subjects*, p. 123.


34. Ibid., pp. 157, 153–4.


36. Katz makes this argument, based in part on a play on the word “affairs”: in Edward’s case, whether financial or erotic, they are secretive and generate loss. See *Impressionist Subjects*, p. 123.


38. Ibid., p. 118.
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42. See Zimmerman, Panic!, p. 2.
43. Ibid., p. 3.
44. Williams, The Country and the City, p. 61.
46. See Jones, “Modernism and the Marketplace.”
47. For this summary of limited liability and its role in the problem of speculation, I rely largely on George Robb, White-Collar Crime, pp. 80–91.
50. Robb, White-Collar Crime, pp. 82, 91.
52. For more on the often arbitrary use of bills of exchange and other credit instruments operating on the “mere appearance of respectability” as it emerged in nineteenth-century Britain, see Robb, White-Collar Crime, pp. 65–7.
53. Tratner, Deficits and Desires, pp. 26–7.
54. Ibid., p. 27.
57. Ibid., p. 116.
58. Ibid., p. 120.
59. For more on unregulated financial advertising, see Robb, White-Collar Crime, p. 97.
61. Ibid., p. 107.
63. See Robb, White-Collar Crime, pp. 139–41.
64. New York Times, May 7, 1895.
70. See Wollaeger, *Joseph Conrad*, p. 182.
72. Michael Tratner argues that, contrary to received opinions of a “retreat” from Victorian social outwardness to a solipsistic detachment, “modernism was an effort to escape the limitations of nineteenth-century individualist conventions and write about distinctively ‘collectivist’ phenomena”; see *Modernism and Mass Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 3.

2 *Dubliners’ IOU: Joyce’s Aesthetics of Exchange*

7. Ibid., p. 19.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 46 (my emphasis).
11. Ibid., p. 47.
16. Or, “The determination of the magnitude of value by labour-time is therefore a secret, hidden under the apparent fluctuations in the relative values of commodities” (pp. 86–7).
17. Garry Leonard makes a similar observation, writing that “Life itself seems to be a vehicle that hurries Jimmy from one point to another, never letting him quite catch his breath” in “his pursuit of an ideal image that he imagines is reflected in the gaze and recognition of others.” See Leonard, Reading Dubliners Again, pp. 113, 116.

18. Osteen makes a similar argument about Ulysses: “Joyce uses the mock realism of documentary facts [in Ulysses] but undermines it by permitting the text to smuggle in tropes, homophones, and tricks that demonstrate how the linguistic economy of realism—one meaning per word—always eludes its encirclement by the forces of authority.” See Osteen, Economy, p. 201. I think such trickery also applies to the linguistic economy of Dubliners, especially when the text is explicitly concerned with exchange in any of its many registers.


21. Ibid., p. 100.

22. Ibid., p. 96.


27. See Joseph V. O’Brien, “Dear, Dirty Dublin”: A City in Distress, 1899–1916 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982). As O’Brien suggests, the continued low wages and slight employment possibilities for lower-middle class women were often viewed as a major cause of prostitution; and the wages for female domestic servants during the period averaged about 5s. per week, 20–25 per cent less than their English counterparts (pp. 205–6). For a sense of general unemployment during the period, for which reliable figures are unavailable, see O’Brien, “Dear, Dirty Dublin,” pp. 209–13.


33. See also *The Ego and the Id* for a complication of the oral phase, likening it to the mechanisms operative in melancholia: “It may be that by this introjection, which is a kind of regression to the mechanism of the oral phase, the ego makes it easier for the object to be given up…. It may be that this identification is the sole condition under which the id can give up its objects.” *The Ego and the Id*, trans. Joan Riviere, ed. James Strachey (New York: Norton, 1960), p. 19.
35. A 1904 Royal Commission estimated that the minimum weekly income necessary to keep a family of four in bare necessities was £1; wages in the city were often well below that figure, as the wages in *Dubliners* often reflect. See *Dubliners*, Longman Cultural Edition, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Pearson, 2011), p. 195.
36. Marx, *Capital*, p. 84.
37. Ibid., pp. 80, 81.
38. Williams suggests this last point (regarding the girl’s “paying for her very own seduction”) as part of his argument that, in *Dubliners*, all relationships “are invaded by the economic dimension” (81).
42. As Herr puts it, “Readers who find here primarily a critique of the church rather than an anatomy of its cultural function attribute to Joyce an underlying belief in religion as the vessel of truth; they ignore his identification of the church as an economic institution.” *Joyce’s Anatomy*, pp. 244–5.
43. See also Osteen, who argues that “Just as the characters’ belief in economic well-being has been misplaced or undermined by their political condition, so… their religious faith has been betrayed by an equally unfair and hypocritical economic ideology,” so that both the Catholic Church and the colonial state enforce debt and paralyzing “apathy.” “Serving Two Masters,” pp. 81–2.
44. Luke 16:10. As Cheryl Herr suggests, the parable could be reasonably interpreted “as a displacement of spiritual terms by mundane ones,” the act of altering the accounts “compared to the laying up of treasure in heaven.” *Joyce’s Anatomy*, p. 244.
49. Ibid., p. 92.
50. Simmel, “Exchange,” p. 44.
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3 The Instant and the Outmoded: Wyndham Lewis, *Ulysses*, and the Spectacle of Time

5. I take the term “timeless time” from Mary Ann Doane who, following Laura Mulvey, argues that spectacle, unlike the event, is “atemporal.” See *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), pp. 170–1.
7. While the terms “obsolete” and “the outmoded” certainly overlap and condition each other, there is a crucial ontological difference: obsolescence refers to use or function, as when older technologies are so superseded that they can no longer be used or replaced. The outmoded adds to this the fluctuating social inscription of exchange value and fashionable taste, so that an outmoded technology might retain its earlier function but lag behind the current, preferred versions.
8. We should also note here Joyce’s anachronisms in the novel. *Ulysses* incorporates or alludes to cultural materials not in existence in 1904, the most prominent being World War I recruiting posters and images suggestive of the Easter 1916 uprising in Dublin. For more on the novel’s anachronistic archiving as a challenge to conventional historicism, see Robert Spoo, “‘Nestor’ and the Nightmare: The Presence of the Great War in *Ulysses*,” *Twentieth Century Literature* 32.2 (Summer 1986): pp. 137–54; and Mark Wollaeger, *Modernism, Media, and Propaganda: British Narrative from 1900 to 1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 164–216. While the category of anachronism bears a significant relation to my reading of
spectrum and historical time in *Ulysses*, I will focus rather on the way the text juxtaposes a spectacular present with its obsolete counterparts in the past as an explosive reconfiguration on capitalism’s ahistorical consciousness.


14. Hugh Kenner was perhaps the first to fully articulate this problem of historical consciousness and its significance to Lewis’s work in the 1920s. Citing the second issue of Lewis’s short-lived journal, *The Enemy*, Kenner shows that Lewis reacted against the easy acceptance of arbitrary historical “events” in succession as contributing to a dreamy determinism: “Lewis was enabled to discern as did no one else a special and unusual fact about the twentieth century: flux was not being taken for granted, it was being hypostatized.” See Hugh Kenner, *Wyndham Lewis* (London: Methuen, 1954), p. 73.

15. A generalized antagonism to corporate capitalism and its power to homogenize crowds of consumers is staple Lewis material. It serves as one of his governing premises in *The Art of Being Ruled* (1926), where he sees its complicity with a diluted Liberalism: “The libertarianism of today rejects with horror the idea of that ‘independence.’ In place of this *prose of the individual* it desire the *poetry of the mass*; in place of the *rhythm of the person*, the *rhythm of the crowd*”; and with mass production of fashion: “In the interest of great-scale industry and mass production the smaller the margin of diversity the better. The nearer the fashion is to a uniform the bigger the returns, the fewer dresses unsold.” See *The Art of Being Ruled* (Santa Rosa, CA: Black Sparrow, 1989), pp. 130, 362.

16. Here Lewis strikingly anticipates Theodor Adorno’s philosophical and sociological work on the culture industry. In his essay, “On the Fetish Character in Music and the Regression of Listening,” for example, Adorno notes the “liquidation of the individual” in hand with the ideology of “individualism” under modern mass production and consumption: “The sacrifice of individuality, which accommodates itself to the regularity of the successful, the doing of what everybody does, follows from the basic fact that in broad areas the same thing is offered to everybody by the standardized production of consumption goods. But the commercial necessity of connecting this identity leads to the manipulation of taste and the official culture’s pretence of individualism which necessarily increases in proportion to the liquidation of the individual” (40). For a study of “the commodified authentic” in modernism, the industrial production of “authenticity” including the fake antiques Lewis derides, see Elizabeth Outka, *Consuming Traditions: Modernity, Modernism, and the Commodified Authentic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

17. As Hal Foster and others have argued, Lewis also projects an armored mode of critical vision similar to Freud’s theory of forging a “protective
shield” out of and against the bombardment of mass culture’s stimuli. This is an important argument, but I’m less concerned with Lewis’s right-wing ego-formation and more interested in his (often paranoid) sense of technologies of time and their larger implications for modernist politics and historicism. See Hal Foster, “Prosthetic Gods,” Modernism/Modernity 4.2 (1997): p. 9.

18. Doane, The Emergence of Cinematic Time, pp. 70, 76.

23. Foster’s “Prosthetic Gods” emphasizes Lewis’s combating of a reified public sphere with more reification.
25. Miller, Late Modernism, p. 117.
33. Leonard and Richards tend to read Gerty’s consciousness as strictly a product of advertising.
34. Osteen, The Economy of Ulysses, p. 298.
35. Ibid., p. 280.
36. Ibid., p. 296. For a compelling recent reading of Gerty’s and Bloom’s “love at a distance,” for the ways in which their encounter epitomizes modernity’s emergent possibilities for forms of community and even intimacy in the face of social distance, see Michael Saveau, “’Love at a Distance (Bloomism)’: The


38. Pecora continues: “The authentic bourgeois self is then as socially rationalized as the debased system of exchange it hopes to rise above.” See *Self and Form in Modern Narrative* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), p. 77.


44. On this intermingling of language and desire between Bloom and Gerty, see also Sayeau, “Love at a Distance (Bloomism),” p. 250.


48. The Mutoscope and its offerings were at the center of political moral debates and stirred the particular ire of Parliamentary Conservatives like Samuel Smith, who launched a public tirade in letters to newspaper editors claiming that such forms of entertainment were sure to ruin the youth of Britain and Ireland. For more on Smith and the moral attacks on the Mutoscope, see Katherine Mullin, *James Joyce, Sexuality, and Social Purity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 166–7.


51. Ibid., p. 124.


60. Ibid., p. 56.
64. Prior to being jolted back to her typing work, Miss Dunne had been reading Wilkie Collins’s rather sensational novel *The Woman in White*, but wants to return it for something by nineteenth century sentimentalist Mary Cecil Haye. Like Gerty MacDowell, she enjoys the popular literary romances that resonate with the theatrical Kendall.
66. Interestingly, Lewis does not observe this function of market fantasy in *Ulysses*, where private anxieties and desires frequently interface with public displays of fashionable fantasy, choosing instead to dig his satirical teeth into Joyce’s “shabby genteel” nostalgic pretensions, bland naturalism, and stereotyped characters. Aside from hasty and unreflective references to the novel’s layers of ephemera Lewis does not question the way Joyce uses them to stage precisely that public unconscious in tune with the city plastered with ad posters, perhaps because in *Ulysses* the impulses that the ads set out to incite and direct often slip through the nets of their promises and demands.
68. Ibid., p. 77.
70. See Moretti, *Modern Epic*, p. 131.
71. As Dignam’s conflation of Marie Kendall’s poster image with “one of them mots” in cigarette packets suggests, she’s a modern day siren, and it’s in “Sirens” that Joyce makes explicit the incorporation of the “classical prototype” (Wollaeger) into ephemeral advertising. Indeed, Bloom’s associative response to a poster for mermaid cigarettes short-circuits any assumption that Dignam’s short attention span is only that of a high strung adolescent. With Bloom we see a similar dialectic of attention and distraction. Bloom spies the poster while buying paper to write to Martha Clifford in the role of his epistolary alter ego Henry Flower. His anxious thrill toward sexual indiscretions inflects his gaze, compounded by thinking about his recurring crossed paths with Blazes Boylan: “Wise Bloom eyed on the door a poster, a swaying mermaid smoking mid nice waves. Smoke mermaids, coolest whiff of all. Hair streaming: love-lorn. For some man. For Raoul. He eyed and saw afar on Essex bridge a gay hat riding on a jauntingcar” (*U*, 216–17).
73. Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, 4. In Benjamin’s complex oeuvre, and in this passage in particular, there is a problematic sense of a naive Jungian universal category of the collective unconscious defined by static archetypes. However, as Susan Buck-Morss points out, “the images of the unconscious [in Benjamin] are…formed as a result of concrete historical experiences, not (as with Jung’s archetypes) biologically inherited.” See *The Dialectics of
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74. There are a few recent, mostly persuasive, exceptions. For a fine study of the surrealists’ interest in the outmoded, see Hal Foster, Compulsive Beauty (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).

75. Foster, Compulsive Beauty, p. 159.

76. Ibid., p. 162.


78. Agamben, Infancy and History, p. 102.

79. It is no coincidence that “Circe” is the most comical and surreal episode in Ulysses, on the one hand, and the one most concerned with representing a completely commodified socius, on the other. As many critics have recently observed, this most dramatically inflated episode is saturated like no other with the force and functions of commodity fetishism. Franco Moretti states things most bluntly, claiming that the chapter amounts to the “unsurpassed literary representation of commodity fetishism.” See Signs Taken for Wonders, p. 185. Trevor Williams concurs, and points out in particular that commodities in “Circe” “appear like the gods of religion characterized by Marx in Capital,” to suggest that, if “Ulysses is a world of commodities,” then in “Circe” this is “nightmarishly so” (143, 175). Mark Osteen has offered the fullest discussion of the episode’s economic registers, showing how it “stages the transfers inherent in several economies” (all capitalistic) and arguing both that “the episode adapts the economy of prostitution as the foundation for its textual economy” and, recalling Cheryl Herr, that “Circe” “illuminates ‘the capitalist assumption that every item—inanimate or human—can be exchanged’ ” (319). In this performance of a culturally pervasive exchange mentality, “Circe” constantly shuttles between reifying social processes “into material shapes” and resisting that reification by keeping its themes and figurations in continuous circulation with reference to the whole of the novel (Osteen, The Economy of Ulysses, p. 320). We should add to this critically dramatic mode, though, the comic and historically materialist one whereby things are fully animated. Sara Danius, while she doesn’t discuss the economic dimension, rightly reminds us of “Joyce’s penchant for autonomization and animation” in “Circe,” where “inanimate objects have been upgraded to the level of human agency” (161).

80. Gifford, Ulysses Annotated, p. 453.

81. Mark Osteen offers a thorough and rigorous reading of Bloom’s soap and other objects in light of the Homeric correspondence with Odysseus’s moly. “Transubstantiated into THE SOAP,” he argues, “the lemony cake has become a host with magical powers to dispel threatening phantoms” (129). He points out that the soap works as such, in part, because of the personal associations it embodies: it recalls for Bloom Milly’s bath nights, Molly’s association with the color yellow, and the sense of safety it provides for Bloom when, in “Lestrygonians,” he spies Boylan and want to escape the jaunty seducer and his own thoughts of cuckoldry. See Osteen, The Economy of Ulysses (pp. 129–30).

83. Daniel Moshenberg also acknowledges the correspondence in this passage with Marx on the fetish, claiming succinctly that Bloom’s “reciprocal relation with the soap” exemplifies the creation of surplus values. See “The Capital Couple: Speculating on Ulysses,” James Joyce Quarterly 25 (1988): p. 338.

84. Cheryl Herr has shown how Joyce appropriates the strategic ways whereby popular performance around the turn of the century both staged and reconstituted anxieties of class, gender, and sexual deviance. See Joyce’s Anatomy of Culture, pp. 96–221. Austin Briggs traces the historical intersections between the whorehouse and theater, as overlapping sites for negotiating the cultural meanings of sexual performance, as they inform the “Circe” episode. See “Whorehouse/Playhouse: The Brothel as Theater in the ‘Circe’ Chapter of Ulysses,” Journal of Modern Literature 26.1 (2002): pp. 42–57.


87. We might note here one of the episode’s many dramatic recapitulations of the previous day, when Gerty MacDowell confronts Bloom, and this time her spectacular performance of his desires are haunted by the economic abjection of her future. In the stage directions, Gerty “limps forward” and “shows coyly her bloodied clout,” then addresses Bloom with the hopelessness of her marriage fantasy rendered in terms of pure exchange: “With all my worldly goods I thee and thou…. You did that. I hate you” (442). Her fantasmatic sacrifice of all her “worldy goods” recalls Christ’s injunction to give up one’s possessions and follow a selfless path to redemption, here yoked to prostituting one’s body to gain the promise of “an abode of bliss” in marriage. And Bloom plays Peter to Gerty’s commercial Christ, replying “I? When? You’re dreaming. I never saw you” (442). Hinging on a conceptual severance of the natural body from the spectacular image, Bloom indeed never saw “her,” but rather the performance of his own desires as mediated by soft commercial porn. In their erotic encounter on the beach, they were both dreaming a respite from their respective material constraints. The hallucinating vision of Gerty here dramatizes the constraints on collective fantasy imposed by the “dreaming” affect of serialized spectacle, thwarting its purified pretensions by incorporating material sacrifice, Gerty’s “bloodied clout,” into its ceaseless production and domestication of desire.

88. According to Gifford, advertisers “set the tone” for Photo Bits with a range of products including “Flagellations and Flagellants,” rare books, “and innumerable books and pills that promised ‘Manhood Restored.’ ” Ulysses Annotated, p. 78.


90. Ibid., p. 40.


92. Ibid.

93. For recent approaches to the Romanticism-Classicism debate in modernism, see Comentale, Modernism, Cultural Production, and the British Avant-Garde,
which analyzes the politics of aesthetic production in both camps; Aaron Jaffe, *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* looks closely at the behind-the-scenes modes of modernist cultural production geared toward a masculine model of scarcity (associated in large part with Eliot and Pound) shored up against fears of a feminized mass culture of romantic excess. Like these studies, I suggest that Joyce’s fantasmatic reconfigurations of the fetishized commodity points to an economic dimension that historically underpins the debate between classical and romantic modernisms.


96. This hardened ego applies more broadly, too, as Hal Foster, in a Freudian vein, has described as “a new ego that can withstand the shocks of the military-industrial, the modern-urban, and the mass-political, indeed that can forge these stimuli into a protective shield, even convert them into a hardened subject able to *thrive* on such shocks.” See “Prosthetic Gods,” *Modernism/Modernity* 4.2 (1997): p. 9.


98. Here we might recall Fredric Jameson’s apt statement on Lewis’s modernism in the context of the period’s sense of a reified, fragmented socius. For Jameson, modernism in its many guises both recapitulates the “fragmentation and commodification of the psyche” and tries to “overcome that reification as well,” by investing the psychic monad with utopian and libidinal charges of its own. And “Lewis’ ‘modernism’ … is to be understood as just such a protest against the reified experience of an alienated social life, in which, against its own will, it remains formally and ideologically locked.” See Fredric Jameson, *Fables of Aggression: Wyndham Lewis, the Modernist as Fascist* (Berkeley, CA: California Univ. Press, 1979), p. 14.

99. My comparison here follows a line parallel to Scott Klein’s study of Lewis and Joyce, which argues extensively for their incorporations of opposition into their work. Klein, however, focuses on the strictly aesthetic questions of mimesis and authenticity, and I want to emphasize the economics of spectacle and obsolescence that underlies any such aesthetic considerations. See Klein, *The Fictions of James Joyce and Wyndham Lewis*.

### 4 Alienated Vision and the Will to Intimacy, or, Virginia Woolf and “the Human Spectacle”

Notes 217


2. I take the phrase “myriad impressions” from Woolf’s essay “Modern Fiction,” where she critiques the Edwardian realists, whom she labels “materialist,” for not attending to the psychological experiences of modernity in their attention to the external conditions of characters’ social existences. For more on Woolf’s relation to the realist tradition, one that argues for her “reconstitution” of the assumptions of realism, see Patrick Whiteley, *Knowledge and Experimental Realism in Conrad, Lawrence, and Woolf* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), pp. 145–215.

3. Pecora continues: “The authentic bourgeois self is then as socially rationalized as the debased system of exchange it hopes to rise above.” See *Self and Form in Modern Narrative* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), p. 77.

4. I take the phrase “the human spectacle” from Woolf’s essay “Street Haunting,” which I discuss below. Heather Levy has shown how Woolf’s ambivalence toward the working class manifests an array of social contradictions and how, by the time of her later short fiction, she came to view working class women with increasing distaste or to render them entirely invisible. See “ ‘These Ghost Figures of Distorted Passion’: Becoming Privy to Working-Class Desire in ‘The Watering Place’ and ‘The Ladies Lavatory,’” *Modern Fiction Studies* 50.1 (Spring 2004): pp. 31–57.


Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990), pp. 113–53. For a study
of Woolf’s “evasion,” her strategy of subsuming major political discourses
under the banal as a cosmopolitan resistance to war and blindly destructive
patriotism, see Rebecca Walkowitz, *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism Beyond the
Nation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), pp. 79–105. For studies
that have less bearing on my own arguments, but that significantly show
Woolf’s ongoing challenges to empire and war, see Kathy Phillips, *Virginia
Woolf Against Empire* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1994) and
Karen Levenback, *Virginia Woolf and the Great War* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse
University Press, 1999).

8. See also Jennifer Wicke, “Mrs. Dalloway Goes to Market: Woolf, Keynes, and
As I will also argue, Wicke sees Woolf’s fiction as exemplary of a “mate-
rial modernism” engaged with giving aesthetic shape to the fluid chaos and
abstractions of modern markets. Wicke’s argument, though, turns on a fun-
damental methodological contradiction: claiming that Woolf’s work doesn’t
simply reflect, but gives open-ended form to the flux of the market, her read-
ing of *Mrs. Dalloway* nonetheless suggests that the novel reflects a distinct
ideological thrust of market society as culture industry in which “conscious-
ness and consumption are conflated.” That said, her argument intersects
with my own in several places, most important of which is Woolf’s interest,
influenced by J. M. Keynes, in critiquing an outmoded savings or hoarding
economy by way of surplus expenditures (14, 17, 20).

*On Individuality and Social Forms* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press,
abbreviated JR and cited parenthetically in the text.
12. Woolf’s mocking figures of corporate and imperial power controlling con-
sciousness in order to direct consumption nicely illustrates what Mark
Seltzer, in a different context, describes as “the conversion of individuals
into numbers and cases and the conversion of bodies into visual displays” in
a social control mechanism linking statistics and surveillance. See *Bodies and
13. Compare her rather terse statement on the matter of masses of consumers
carefully watched for their shifting tastes by the invisible machine of “trade”
in “The Docks of London”: “Trade watches us anxiously to see what new
desires are beginning to grow in us, what new dislikes.” Virginia Woolf,
“The Docks of London,” in *The London Scene: Five Essays by Virginia Woolf*
p. 79.
15. Vincent Pecora, *Self and Form in Modern Narrative* (Baltimore, MD: Johns
16. Woolf employed a reflection-effect to figure a range of social affects in the
service of power relations, perhaps the most famous being the argument in
*A Room of One’s Own* that women serve “as looking-glasses possessing the
magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size." *A Room of One's Own* (1929) (San Diego, CA: Harvest, 1989), p. 35.

17. Matz reads this scene similarly, also placing it in the context of the novel's figurations of alienating economic functions, arguing that “Jacob produces no impressions” and that the failed interaction between him and Mrs Norman reflects “a model in which life in on the one hand the material commerce of banks and on the other the unseizable force of the economic invisible hand, and any vision of character in itself becomes impossible,” making the novel “anti-Impressionistic.” See *Literary Impressionism and Modernist Aesthetics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 193. While I agree with the impossibility of humanist character that the novel foregrounds, I argue that Woolf entertains the possibility of unconventional intimacies that might emerge precisely from within, and pose a challenge to, a totalizing economy governed by invisible hands.


19. We might note here the influence of movies on this decoupling of vision and mind. See Woolf, “The Cinema,” *Collected Essays*, Vol. 2 (London: Hogarth Press, 1966), pp. 268–72. In that short essay, written in the previous year (1926), Woolf says of the cinematic image that “The eye licks it all up instantaneously, and the brain, agreeably titillated, settles down to watch things happening without bestirring itself to think.” The “enormous eye” in “Street Haunting” experiments in such a cinematic mode of attention and the capacity of the movies to picture a “real with a different reality from that which we perceive in daily life,” similar to Benjamin’s appeal to an “optical unconscious,” and with the potential to recouple sight and thought according to a new and contingent order of reality (268, 269, 271).


23. Alex Zwerdling notes this ambivalence, pointing out that “the ‘lower orders’ in her fiction are conspicuous by their absence,” and that Woolf developed a “middle-class guilt.” Unable to “justify the system [of capital] that was liberating her,” Zwerdling argues, Woolf worked “to widen the distance between herself and ‘the lower orders.’” As my discussion of Woolf’s visual and sympathetic oscillations suggests, I think Zwerdling overstates the case. See *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*, pp. 96–9. Similarly, Heather Levy notes the regular marginalization or invisibility of working class women in Woolf’s short fiction. See “ ‘These Ghost Figures of Distorted Passion’: Becoming Privy to Working-Class Desire in ‘The Watering Place’ and ‘The Ladies Lavatory,”’ *Modern Fiction Studies* 50.1 (Spring 2004): pp. 31–57. Melba Cuddy-Keane strikes a vastly different note on Woolf’s class vision, one that
is quite similar to my reading of “Street Haunting.” For Cuddy-Keane, “in promoting the ideal of the classless intellectual, [Woolf] pursued the emancipation of all.” More specifically, she finds Woolf to have been much more strongly drawn to the working class, or “lowbrows,” than to those “middle-brows” defined by their social climbing aspirations. See Virginia Woolf, the Intellectual, and the Public Sphere (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 6, 13–58.


25. See Matz, Literary Impressionism, p. 205.

26. Zwerdling points out that Woolf, from her “highbrow” position, was highly critical of comparably privileged thinkers that “pretended to join the ranks” of labor and the like, and thereby worked from a perspective of “false consciousness.” And in this sense, her attempts to write from the positions of the economically dispossessed, as in “Street Haunting,” are always felt to be “second-hand,” realizing those efforts at class mimeticism to result in “fantasy.” See Virginia Woolf and the Real World, pp. 98–9, 105, 117. I agree with Zwerdling’s argument, but, as we’ll see, I also want to complicate its assumptions, particularly that a coherent privileged consciousness independent of its property exists in the first place. Woolf is at her best when she shows the bourgeois subject to be an illusion based in its pretensions to property.


29. As Karen Levenback has shown, “For the most part sympathy and assistance afforded to veterans had all but ceased by 1921,” and terms like shell shock “proscribed” by institutions like the War Office Committee because understood “as an excuse for malingering or insubordination.” See Virginia Woolf and the Great War, p. 58.


31. We might note the similarity here with Michel Foucault’s sense of a “political technology of the body”: “power relations have an immediate hold upon [the body]; they invest it, mark it, train it,” and so on, in order to bind the body “with its economic use; it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination; but, on the other hand, its constitution as labour power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection... the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body.” See Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1979), pp. 24–6.


33. Ibid., p. 29.

34. Ibid., p. 31.

35. Ibid., p. 41.


40. Ibid., pp. 106, 116.

41. See Walkowitz, *Cosmopolitan Style*, p. 92.

42. Reginald Abbott makes a similar point, writing that the in the skywriting scene “loyalty to a favorite brand of toffee replaces loyalty to Crown.” “What Miss Kilman’s Petticoat Means: Virginia Woolf, Shopping, and Spectacle,” *Modern Fiction Studies* 38.1 (Spring 1992): p. 203. The problem with this formulation, and which my reading works to unsettle, is that brand loyalty is not in question, since Woolf submerges such consumer devotion to product under the affective capacities that the spectacle appeals to and momentarily releases.

43. In *Room of One’s Own*, Woolf suggests that for women to advance in the world of fiction writing, “The book has somehow to be adapted to the body, and at a venture one would say that women’s books should be shorter, more concentrated than those of men, and framed so that they do not need long hours of steady and uninterrupted work” (78).

44. Or, as James Naremore puts it, “What is important [in the aeroplane scene] is not so much the actual writing as the diving, swooping dance of the airplane, which attracts everyone and as the passage develops seems to hold them in a trance…. The author herself seems to be caught up in the collective consciousness, watching the event with a dreamy wonder.” *The World Without a Self: Virginia Woolf and the Novel* (New Haven, CO: Yale University Press, 1973), p. 83.


46. For example, Zwerdling writes that “By the time Woolf wrote *Between the Acts*, the concept of a gradual improvement either in history or in human relationships had come to seem naïve…. and Woolf was beginning to think of history as retrogressive rather than progressive.” See *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*, p. 305. For Karen Levenback, Woolf’s last works “suggest an inability for individuals (even those around her) to resist the herd instinct, a reality that finally not even she can resist.” See *Virginia Woolf and the Great War*, p. 158. Susan Squier locates Woolf’s disenchantment on the eve of the war in a bomb-besieged London: “with the destruction of the familiar urban landscape, Woolf had lost her hard-won mature vision of a utopian city in which men and women are free of the war-creating instincts of male aggressiveness and maternal possessiveness.” *Virginia Woolf and London*, p. 189.


56. Ibid., pp. 119, 127.
60. Ibid., p. 14.
61. Ibid., p. 23.

5 *Good Morning, Midnight*: Jean Rhys’s Melancholic Late Modernism

1. Few critics have argued for Rhys as a late modernist, often suggesting that her work is difficult to place in such literary historical categories, but much of her work from this period, and especially *Good Morning, Midnight*, demonstrates a set of concerns shared with Tyrus Miller’s late modernist schema, including “a reaction to a certain type of modernist fiction dominated by an aesthetic of formal mastery, and [that] drew on a marginalized ‘figural’ tendency within modernism as the instrument of its attack on high modernist fiction”; and a tendency to “represent a world in free fall, offering vertiginously deranged commentary as word, body, and thing fly apart with a ridiculous lack of grace.” See *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), pp. 18, 19. I situate this late modernist turn specifically in the context of an emergent consumerism, and so also have in mind Michael Tratner’s observation, at the end of *Modernism and Mass Politics*, that with the emergence of the welfare state together with a shift in capitalism’s individualist ideology to one of “market segments,” modernism lost its anti-capitalist footing and came to recognize the unruly nature of a mass unconscious as a driving force inherent to an expansive consumer economy. See Tratner, *Modernism and Mass Politics*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), pp. 241–3.


   In line with my own thinking, several critics have read Rhys as a modernist in specifically economic terms. Arnold E. Davidson pays attention to economic “destitution” in *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* and Rhys’s strange affirmation in *Good Morning, Midnight*; see his *Jean Rhys* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1985). Judith Kegan Gardiner argues that Rhys’s depictions of alienation and her stylistic collapsing of oppositions situate her work at the endpoint of modernism as Europe is about to descend into the nightmares of the 1940s; see “*Good Morning, Midnight; Good Night, Modernism,“ Boundary 2 11.1/2 (1982–3): pp. 233–51. Although not explicitly concerned with defining modernism, Kerstin Fest argues for the complexity and centrality of feminine masquerade and performance in Rhys, a reading that my discussion of narcissism and reified affect in fashion relies on; see *And All Women Mere Players? Performance and Identity in Dorothy Richardson, Jean Rhys, and Radclyffe Hall* (Wien, Austria: Braumüller, 2009), pp. 82–113. For more on consumer politics in Rhys and others, see Alissa G. Karl, *Modernism and the Marketplace: Literary Culture and Consumer Capitalism in Rhys, Woolf, Stein, and Nella Larson* (New York: Routledge, 2009). Karl provides a useful historical delineation of early twentieth-century consumer economics in Britain and the USA, and shows how Rhys’s fiction critiques the disciplining of desire and the commodifying colonization of women’s bodies in the imperial metropolis.

5. *Good Morning, Midnight* is Rhys’s last novel from the period; her next major novel, *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), is more fittingly a post-colonial text.

6. Interestingly, Sasha dreams at one point of being stuck in the Exhibition, unable to find the exit, and this serves as one of Rhys’s many tropes for the socioeconomic and psychological “impasses” that Sasha faces. As Mary Lou Emery points out, the Exhibition signified the intense political and social tensions of late 1930s Paris, “symbolized best perhaps by the two major buildings of the exposition which confronted one another directly on each side of the Champs de Mars—that of the Soviet Union, topped by giant figures of a marching man and woman with hammer and sickle held high, and that of Nazi Germany, crowned by an immense gold eagle

7. Alissa G. Karl makes a similar point, suggesting that Rhys’s novels from this period structurally reflect the ways that consumer economics unleash and seek to contain or discipline promiscuous desires, making the experience of reading her work analogous to shopping. See Modernism and the Marketplace, p. 24.

8. See especially Miller, Late Modernism.


12. Thomas Staley made this comparison some time ago, suggesting that “The women in Rhys’s novels live in a world far different from that depicted by Katherine Mansfield, Virginia Woolf, or even Dorothy Richardson; they are more vulnerable; there is less holding them together.” Staley’s position on the matter, however, is limited by his humanistic assumptions of Rhys’s characters as victims, which I challenge here by calling attention to Rhys’s sense of economically constructed fantasies of self and desire that precede such assumptions. See Jean Rhys: A Critical Study, p. 55.

13. This tension between expressive emotion (which in Rhys is not simply of the self, but is always socially responsive) and a reified, performed affect, complicates readings like those of Anne B. Simpson that find in Rhys a “far-ranging suspicion of social circles” and an “awareness of how conventions of every kind exert pressure on the individual to mask genuine feelings with contrived forms of outer display,” a general “distrust for external show.” As I’ve argued, Rhys’s women are drawn to the allure of commodified masquerade, but they also recognize that it demands a displacement of emotion that is sometimes impossible. See Simpson, Territories of the Psyche, p. 5.


20. Sasha’s anxieties here perhaps exemplify what Thomas Staley, following Therese Benedek, calls “negative narcissism” in Rhys, “where the female, treated exclusively as an object, reaches an emotional state in which the
exclusive object of her psychic energy is the self and the emotions are depressive and painful.” See Jean Rhys: A Critical Study, p. 53.
23. Ibid., p. 245.
24. Ibid., p. 249.
25. I take this line of thinking about melancholia as a category for understanding a shared sense of loss within the upheavals of modernity from Jonathan Flatley. See Affective Mapping: Melancholia and the Politics of Modernism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), p. 2.
29. Judith Kegan Gardiner has also analyzed the “theme of women being exchanged like money” in Rhys’s earlier collection of short fiction, The Left Bank, which was promoted with a favorable (if paternalistic) preface by Ford. See Rhys, Stead, Lessing, and the Politics of Empathy, pp. 26–31.
31. Ibid., p. 79.
32. Ibid.
33. See Miller, Late Modernism, pp. 45, 64.
34. Flatley, Affective Mapping, pp. 3, 6.
36. Ibid., p. 2.
37. As Flatley points out, a melancholic becoming-other to oneself “is not liberatory in itself, but inasmuch as the relationships between space and time, for example, that we are used to in our everyday lives are altered in some way or another, we may see that the logic of the world we live in is not compulsory. Things might work differently.” See Affective Mapping, p. 81.
41. As Sara Danius argues, Ulysses “turns itself into an all-encompassing literary artifact, an ambitious literary encyclopedia that declares the received idea of the novel obsolete and in any event inadequate to the task of capturing modern everyday life,” and the novel shows that “the dialectic of the new and the old, the original and the conventional, has been exhausted.” See The Senses of Modernism, pp. 184, 187. More generally, Tyrus Miller argues that “in the empty spaces left by high modernism’s dissolution, late modernists reassembled fragments into disfigured likenesses of modernist masterpieces: the unlovely allegories of a world’s end.” Late Modernism, p. 14. Judith Kegan
Gardiner situates Rhys within this aesthetic shift, arguing that “by the late 1930s Rhys seems to have found fashionable modernist irony too disengaged for the depressing realities of the times.” See “Good Morning, Midnight, Good Night, Modernism,” p. 234.

42. In the Grundrisse, Marx writes, “Not only is production immediately consumption and consumption immediately production, not only is production a means for consumption and consumption the aim of production, i.e. each supplies the other with its object (production supplying the external object of consumption, consumption the conceived object of production); but also, each of them, apart from being immediately the other, and apart from mediating the other, in addition to this creates the other in completing itself, and creates itself as the other.” Or, more tersely, “Production thus not only creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object.” See the Grundrisse, 1857–8, trans. Martin Nicolaus, The Marx-Engels Reader, second edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker (New York: Norton, 1978), pp. 230, 231.
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