

This work has been submitted to **NECTAR**, the **Northampton Electronic Collection of Theses and Research**.

Article

Title: The ordinary celebrity and the celebrated ordinary in 1930s modernist memoirs

Creator: Rosenquist, R.

DOI: [10.1215/00166928-3659122](https://doi.org/10.1215/00166928-3659122)

Example citation: Rosenquist, R. (2016) The ordinary celebrity and the celebrated ordinary in 1930s modernist memoirs. *Genre: Forms of Discourse and Culture*. **49**(3), pp. 359-383. 0016-6928.

It is advisable to refer to the **publisher's version** if you intend to cite from this work.

Version: Accepted version

Official URL: <http://genre.dukejournals.org/content/49/3/359>

<http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/8034/>



The Ordinary Celebrity and the Celebrated Ordinary in 1930s Modernist Memoirs

In her 1930 memoir of the early and high modernist period, *My Thirty Years' War*, Margaret Anderson quotes A. E. Orage in comparing the writer to a man on the stage, speaking in a voice entirely unrelated to “his natural manner of speech.” Orage appears to prefer what he calls the “natural”, that which is, by implication, considered less like performance, artifice or pretence, and hence more “real.” Orage goes on to claim, according to Anderson: “I’d give all of *Ulysses* for the letters Joyce wrote the Swiss government when he lost his luggage in that country. Interesting letters. Joyce really wanted his luggage” (Anderson 1930, 268). There are many suggestive implications arising from this quotation, but here I would like to examine what symbolic value Joyce’s letters may really have had for someone like Orage. Anderson invokes Orage as a spokesman for a transition within her own thinking (and, I will argue, literary culture more generally), shifting toward an interest in people and personality rather than literature and art. Orage himself appears to value the letters because there was genuine or sincere need for them, where perhaps, by implication, Joyce had no practical *need* to arrange for Stephen to meet up with Bloom in the Nighttown episode of his novel. Orage would have been familiar with Joyce’s description of an author from his first novel – distant, indifferent, paring his fingernails – and contrasted this to the man who *really* wants something. But had Bloom never met Stephen and had *Ulysses* never been written, would Orage still have had any interest in Joyce’s letters enquiring after his missing luggage – if Joyce was, in fact, writing these letters as anyone other than the author of *Ulysses*?

This kind of question re-appears a number of times in the modernist memoirs produced between 1930 and 1939. Which comes first: public interest in the lives of the modernist artists and writers of the period, or the works that make them worthy of that interest? At the same time

modernist writers of memoir were working through these problems of authorial self-staging and cultural values, Martin Heidegger was phrasing the paradox in similar terms: “The artist is the origin of the work of art. The work of art is the origin of the artist” (Heidegger 1993, 143). This formulation, built on the problem of how to structure the work of art, is central to relating life writing and the modernist aesthetic, as Max Saunders has pointed out (Saunders 2010, 503).

Through construction of an authorial persona – especially one bearing the power of the modernist stylistic imprimatur, to borrow the term from Aaron Jaffe (2005) – the author of a work of modern art becomes both creator and product of the cultural value of said work of art. All the same, the self-fashioning of authorship is not worked out in a closed system, particularly as the twentieth century grows increasingly associated with promotional culture, propaganda, advertising and mass circulation of public images. In the latter stages of high modernism, as the artists and writers of the movement were gaining increasing public notice in newspapers, magazines and other media, modernist artists became celebrities who could be considered worthy of interest even beyond the areas of their particular fame. As Aaron Jaffe and Jonathan Goldman make clear, this forms one prevalent definition of the celebrity, a figure that emerged about the same time as modernism itself. In fact, celebrity can be viewed as a unique product of a promotional culture arising in the late nineteenth century and growing in intensity throughout the twentieth century, distinct from fame or renown in that famous people are known for that which makes them famous, whereas a celebrity “is a person who is well-known for his [or her] well-knownness” (Boorstin 1961, 57). Jaffe and Goldman (2010, 9) assert “that celebrity names the form that fame takes under conditions of modernity [...] the triumph of a mass idol as a fantasy of discretely defined individualism.” By the 1930s, modernist authors increasingly served in this role, as well-known works like *Tender Buttons*, *Ulysses* and *The Waste Land* draw attention to

their authors in the press or in public gatherings, even amongst a public who had little interest in reading these works. How these authors dressed, what they ate or drank and who they associated with became public knowledge for an audience more interested in their celebrity value than the works that had made them famous.¹

The memoirs of the 1930s by and about modernist artists and writers were both a product of this widening celebrity culture, meeting and fuelling an audience demand for more personal representations and “behind-the-scenes” glimpses of the authors and artists, but also, I will argue, offering a critical re-evaluation of the modernist aesthetic leading to such celebrity valuation. The question with which we began over where cultural value originates – in the works of art, in the genius of individual artists, or in the public construction of reputation and celebrity – is raised frequently in these literary memoirs of the 1930s, as established writers sought new or larger markets and marginalised writers sought to capitalise on the cultural value of the modern movement’s successes. But there is an ongoing and inherent tension within these texts, as they simultaneously seek to provide the public face of the movement for emerging audiences, while also aiming to provide more authentic portraits of modernist artists than can be represented by the celebrity images proliferated by the emerging media. Each memoir must grapple in some way with the subject matter of the celebrity modernist, a figure who is both private and public, simultaneously low and high and at once deeply ordinary and exceptionally remarkable. The following article will examine how these memoirs seek to draw the aura of high art and exceptional artists into a generic framework for mass circulation and public consumption – not always for purposes of sales, but often in order to correct the inflationary trends of aestheticism, elitism and celebrity culture. The first section will seek to establish the conditions under which modernist memoirs thrived and the genres from which they grew and how they might be

distinguished. The second section will examine the “celebrated ordinary,” as the elite status of modernist celebrities are juxtaposed with ordinary objects or activities, thus introducing the modernist techniques of the everyday to the movement’s broadening public. The last section will investigate the identification and distancing of famous modernists, as certain memoir writers seek to burst the inflated perception of modernists as geniuses, undermining the celebrity value that extends beyond their various works of art. The conclusion will return to the question that opened the article – which comes first in establishing cultural value, the work of art or the public figure of the artist – revealing how life writing promotes the author as cultural producer, but simultaneously positions them as product of the celebrity culture and publicity sustaining the common readers’ interest. Through examination of these 1930s modernist memoirs, both how they promote the image of the artist and their art but also their ordinary lives in off-duty moments, we find a series of texts all engaged in breaking down oppositions between the ordinary and the celebrated, the low and the high, the generic and the exceptional, simultaneously taking part in and challenging the promotion of the modernist movement and the inflationary culture of celebrity.

Modernist “Table Talk”: new markets, appropriated genres

Wyndham Lewis first revealed himself as one of the leaders of the modernist revolution in the arts in pre-war London, later emerging, after lengthy post-war silence, as an author of long and difficult works of fiction and non-fiction on social, political, philosophical and aesthetic themes. But by 1937, he had not secured the kind of readership or reputation his high-modernist collaborators had. In searching for a new audience, he turned to autobiography, publishing *Blasting and Bombardiering* (1937), which aimed to be “an unorthodox hobnob with this group

of people [Joyce, Eliot, Pound and Yeats], whose less official goings and comings are the subject of these pages” (Lewis 1937, 13). Whereas Lewis’s work had previously been too difficult for the common reader, his memoir would make the claim, “But I *do* pretend to be able, like Defoe or Swift, to make myself intelligible to an average panel doctor or the teller in a bank: and I speak to them as man to man, not as a Regius professor to his maid-of-all-work” (3). Tensions arise, though, as he tries to describe his own intellectual activity: “The only trouble about it is that for such an autobiography as the present, it is somewhat highbrow. This is not a pot-boiling self-portrait. But it is meant to be pretty plain-sailing” (68). There is also tension in his attempt to present the high-culture art world to what he presumes is a broadly variable-browed audience, choosing to translate his ideas for the benefit of the common reader – with analogies to golf or to a man’s love for his lost “only girl” to make his ideas relatable (4), since with his previous books, he tells us, “I might as well have been talking to myself” (5) – all this without, he hopes, betraying his intellectual or aesthetic values. It is too difficult a balance to strike and he forgets his audience as the volume progresses, introducing his first meeting with Eliot, for instance, with the description that the poet “may be regarded perhaps as not unlike the plenipotentiary of the Evil Principle in the Thomistic Heaven of the post-war” (283). Sales for the autobiography were disappointing.² Lewis (1963, 248), who saw it as a book which “any publisher almost could have made a success of,” blamed his editor for encouraging him to make the memoirs less “high-brow” and for negative thinking as to its chances.

But why would Lewis expect “any publisher almost” to sell large numbers of copies of a literary memoir? And why would Lewis expect a more “high-brow” tone to prove more popular? The earliest memoirs of the period had mainly been produced in limited runs for smaller, coterie audiences, including Natalie Barney’s *Aventures de l’Esprit* (1929) and *Kiki’s Memoirs* (1929).

However, the breakthrough work of the genre – though it is by no means the most typical – was Gertrude Stein’s *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (1933). Stein had only a small but devoted readership up to this point, but the autobiography of her partner, focused on high-art figures from a middlebrow point of view, became a bestseller in the year it was published, pushing Stein to the celebrity status of baseball players and movie stars (Brinnin, 1987, 307-8). This no doubt added fuel to the modernist memoir fire, revealing its potential (if not always actual) popularity, joining other memoirs that year by Mabel Dodge, Storm Jameson and Ford Madox Ford, and quickly followed by the memoirs of Malcolm Cowley (1934), James “Jimmie the Barman” Charters (1934), Harold Stearns (1935), John Cournos (1935), Bravig Imbs (1936), Lewis (1937), Stein again (1937), Claude McKay (1937), Robert McAlmon (1938), Cyril Connolly (1938) and Hutchins Hapgood (1939) – to say nothing of the short pieces appearing in newspapers or magazines. In other words, the long-established genre of literary memoir was readily picked up by modernist figures during this period, riding on the celebrity value of authors of masterpieces and the appeal of high-art narratives, while targeting as readers those who did not always appreciate the works of art themselves.³ As Lewis says, “I am not writing this book for other highbrows like myself, more than for anybody else. Most of those who read it will have a smattering of knowledgeablebleness of course. They wouldn’t know which end to pick up a Picasso by, though. I am not going to teach them that” (Lewis 1937, 3-4). While not all 1930s memoir writers were as highbrow as Lewis considered himself to be, certainly a majority of the authors of these volumes felt it necessary to address the subject of high-art modernism and its cultural contexts, giving the public more intimate knowledge of the artists whose names were more readily circulated in the media as icons of the emerging movement, but without alienating a

middlebrow readership who had little time to study *Tender Buttons*, *Ulysses* or the works of Picasso for themselves.

In sharing details of the lives of those more famous for their high-cultural achievements, these memoir writers were certainly adopting some of the conventions of a genre with a lengthy history of its own. For example, the life of Samuel Johnson, the pre-eminent literary celebrity of his day, provided material for seven different biographies and memoirs within twelve years of his death. While he did not write his own life history, he was aware it would be done, as he is reported saying to Hester Thrale in 1773: “I wonder said he who will be my Biographer? [...] I intend to disappoint the Dogs, and either outlive them all or write my Life myself” (Thrale, 1951, 173). It is significant here that Johnson is aware of the inevitable life writing to come, but also his acknowledgement of the two conventions of the genre he desires to subvert; literary gossip in the form of “table talk” or “ana” was focused on famous figures but should not normally be produced by them, and should not typically appear during their lifetimes. Even examples that conformed to these conventions of the genre were treated with some distrust in literary culture. Hester (Thrale) Piozzi had both the advantage of having had a “request” to record Samuel Johnson’s life by the great author himself (Piozzi 1786, 2) and of having models of the genre in John Selden’s *Table Talk* (1689) or the continental “ana,” but the contemporary response to her work still reflects the attitudes of the literary elite. Her *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson*, which sold phenomenally well, was dismissed by Horace Walpole as “vulgar” and “a heap of rubbish” (Walpole 1861, 46), though Piozzi had even thought to offer a pre-emptive defence in her “Preface” (1786, vi), claiming it was her constant aim to show Johnson’s “superiority to the common forms of common life.” Even the authors of literary gossip, in other words, sought to use their anecdotes to elevate the cultural position of celebrity figures. Still, high-cultural

attitudes rarely embraced the form as Walpole's attitude implies, and her *Thraliana* notebooks themselves would not appear until 1942, a few years after the proliferation of modernist memoirs forming the subject of this article had signalled a shift in attitudes, often considered by pre-twentieth-century audiences as too low a form (Brownley 1985, 630).

It was not until Leigh Hunt's *Table Talk* in 1851 – nearly two centuries after the first examples of the genre – that these conventions were broken, according to Alexandra Smith (2001, 232), and even after this it was rare for elevated literary figures to produce their own literary gossip. The distrust of the literary establishment to the massive rise in memoirs and ordinary reminiscences in the late nineteenth century led to a wide range of responses, from satirical letters by J.M. Barrie to mockery in *Punch*, as detailed by Max Saunders in *Self-Impression* (2010, 15-16). These anxieties reflect the distrust of artists and the literary establishment in the face of invasive prying into subject matters considered irrelevant to the artistic merit making these figures into celebrities. As volumes of reminiscences continued to proliferate, Henry Adams would write to Henry James describing autobiography as “a mere shield of protection in the grave. I advise you to take your own life in the same way, in order to prevent biographers from taking it in theirs” (Adams 1992, 488). Even in the 1920s, modernist table talk was still mostly following the patterns of the genre established by Selden, Piozzi and numerous others. In 1928, Sisley Huddleston produced *Paris Salons, Cafés, Studios*, reproducing journalistic gossip on the art-world of Paris for eager readers in the US and England. Kiki, an artist's model and Montparnasse icon, offered her 1929 memoirs on “a crowd called Dadaists and some called Surréalistes, though for my part, I don't see much difference between them. [...] Our nights are spent talking, which doesn't bore me that much, even if I can't tell what's going on” (1930, 138). Natalie Barney, famed salon hostess, offers readers the table talk of a number of

mostly-dead male literary celebrities she had known intimately (e.g., Wilde, Proust, Rilke) in *Aventures de l'Esprit* (1929), before drawing in the still-living female artists of her “Academy of Women” in the second section. These volumes are all written from vantage points positioned near but not at the centre of artistic cultural creation of the period – focused on high-culture subjects but not *by* them. Where autobiography is still presented by the high-art figures themselves, such as the privately-printed and circulated *The Trembling of the Veil* (1922), W. B. Yeats makes it clear that he will only share gossip about those already dead, since “over the dead I have an historian’s rights” (v). He goes on to justify such intrusion into personal lives, arguing that “the life of a man of genius [...] is often an experiment that needs analysis and record. At least my generation so valued personality that it thought so.”

In this respect, Yeats’s generation is closer to the nineteenth-century approach to autobiography, rather than eighteenth-century gossip or twentieth-century impersonality. This is at the heart of some of the earliest critical attempts to define the various genres of life writing. In 1975, Karl J. Weintraub argued the true autobiography was largely a modern phenomenon, assuming its cultural function around the turn of the nineteenth century, based on a historical self-consciousness not prevalent prior to this. Weintraub (1975, 822-3) hoped to elevate the autobiography over other forms of life writing, promoting the “true” form as one of inner self-exploration and life experience, whereas memoir simply records the external world via event or social interaction. Weintraub’s preference for autobiography, then, is reflective of nineteenth-century ideals; for example a *Blackwoods Magazine* review from 1829, as Laura Marcus (1994, 31-2) points out, reserves autobiography for those of “lofty reputation” or “historical importance,” and excluding the “vulgar” writers trying to “excite prurient curiosity that may command a sale.” In many respects, however, as with high modernists like Lewis, the latter

pursuit is exactly the aim of the authors of 1930s memoir I am here examining – even by those with a “lofty reputation.” Certainly, a majority of them do not seek to promote, as Weintraub prefers, an essentialist sense of self-conception or personal development. Or when they do, as with F. Scott Fitzgerald’s personal confessions first published in *Esquire* in 1936 as “The Crack-Up”, the more intimate nature of his autobiographical details was widely criticised. His editor, Maxwell Perkins, wrote to encourage him that same year toward a type of life writing seemingly more fashionable in the 1930s, hoping he would write “a reminiscent book – not autobiographical, but reminiscent. Gertrude Stein’s autobiography is an apt one to mention” (Brucoli and Baughman 2004, 204). In other words, the 1930s public desires “table talk” rather than “confessions” even when the authors are of “lofty reputation” – the sort who would previously have written autobiography rather than memoir. Though Fitzgerald never produced a “reminiscent book” of this sort, it appears that he was “intrigued” (West 2011, viii), and many others in the decade published their own version. This variety of life writing, however, is neither the confessional form desired by *Blackwoods* built exclusively on the personal revelations by those of historical significance, nor entirely the “vulgar” memoirs of those trying to cash in on fame. As a mixture of the two, the modernist memoirs of the 1930s reveal writers conscious of their place in history, aware of an audience hungry for anecdotes of the lives of artists, but ultimately aiming, as I will show, to acknowledge the tensions between the elevated position of the author in an age of celebrity while returning artistic figures to more ordinary manifestations of modern life.

So while it can be seen that Wyndham Lewis, like other writers of memoir, desired a quickly-written book about his experiences with famous modernists to sell a large number of copies, having failed to find a broad audience with his more obscure work (T. Smith 1997, 181-

2), it is important not to write off these texts as “selling out” and instead to determine the nature of this genre as it developed in the 1930s. Though these volume can be shown to repeatedly cross “the Great Divide” between high culture and low – drawing the aura of high modernist aestheticism into middlebrow or even mass-market forms of gossip and anecdote – it is important to recognise how both an emergent celebrity culture and a developing modernist aesthetic were both invested in recognising the changing nature of worthy subject matter and the power of public perception in elevating the everyday. In the 1930s, mediated images of the authors of modernist masterpieces increasingly drew high culture to the attention of a wider audience just as modernist writers and artists grew increasingly interested in the ordinary, the uneventful or uncelebrated life. The genre of literary memoir or “table talk” proved the perfect form for drawing the two together, celebrating the ordinary and making the celebrated more ordinary – the subjects for the next two sections of this article – as the distant and detached nature of high culture was rendered attractive for a new audience.

The Aesthetic and the Ordinary

We have seen that, despite the proliferation of literary anecdotes and celebrity gossip arising toward the end of the Seventeenth Century, these forms of life writing maintained a certain reverence toward the high culture of the aesthetic world and supported the “lofty” ambitions of autobiography even into the beginning of the Twentieth Century. Hester Thrale Piozzi, though accused of vulgarizing the literary life of Samuel Johnson through the genre of table talk, still professed her ambition to always show his “superiority to the common forms of common life” (1786, vi). This is the point of departure for 1930s literary memoirs, where the subject matter often remains the lives of celebrated and “lofty” individuals in the modernist art

world, but the memoirs take a decisive turn toward revealing their portraits of celebrity artists engaged in the very most “common forms of common life.” Gertrude Stein’s *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, for example, while taking the conventional “ana” form via Alice’s perspective of her high modernist partner, not only promotes Stein as a notable literary figure, but simultaneously aims to reveal the most ordinary aspects of Alice’s artist subjects (including Stein) throughout the memoir. For example, in describing Pablo Picasso’s famous portrait of Stein, it is revealed that no one can remember the major events leading to this celebrated coming together of two notable modernists: who suggested the portrait, how it was agreed, or what motives were involved. Instead, we get “table talk” directly focused on lowering the stature of two figures acknowledged by the book as “geniuses”. Picasso’s appearance is described as that of “a good-looking bootblack,” lowering the expected high-cultural values. “He was sitting next to Gertrude Stein at dinner and she took up a piece of bread. This, said Picasso, snatching it back with violence, this piece of bread is mine. She laughed and he looked sheepish. That was the beginning of their intimacy” (Stein 2001, 52). On the one hand, this origin story, framed in terms of a significant first dinner between two of modernism’s biggest stars, reveals no more than two ordinary individuals bickering over a single piece of bread, regardless of the “lofty” status of their relative artistic positions. It is, in many ways, mere gossip.

But this generic scene – this “table talk” – also establishes significance arising from the intimacy: first describing the intimacy arising between two figures of high modernism, but also the intimacy created by Alice sharing the candid image with a larger public. The coveted piece of bread, insignificant object in any other context, is elevated to the status of Event when it becomes the moment Stein and Picasso grew close, particularly when selected as such by Stein in the autobiography. Whereas Samuel Johnson only threatened to supplant his own biographers,

Stein does so through her intermediary figure of Alice, voicing Stein's observations of the more ordinary side of life in their shared home, and lending them the significance of Stein's cultural and celebrity value. She does reveal to us details of the works of art and artists within the volume, but they are often translated for a general audience through Toklas's more middlebrow perspective, as in the case of Matisse employing "his distorted drawing as a dissonance is used in music or as vinegar or lemons are used in cooking or egg shells in coffee to clarify. I do inevitably take my comparisons from the kitchen because I like food and cooking and know something about it" (Stein 2001, 46). But elsewhere, gossip is shared solely to bring the elevated celebrity artists back into the ordinary world; Tristan Tzara is introduced in terms of his public image, citing "stories of his violence and his wickedness"; but we are told that "when he came to the house [he] sat beside me at the tea-table and talked to me like a pleasant and not very exciting cousin" (212). Elsewhere much time is devoted to describing Picasso and his estranged-partner, Fernande, fighting over who was first to borrow the *Katzenjammer Kids* comics from Stein's American newspapers. Stein's first readers and reviewers were drawn to this anecdote, even more than to Picasso's discussion of his techniques, fascinated by Picasso thanking Stein, "his face full of satisfaction" (28), for the chance to engage in such commonplace, generic reading.⁴

This serves to link the genre of literary memoir to another meaning of that term: a focus on the common, the ordinary or everyday – that which is generic, as in genre painting. The strand of modernist studies focusing on the everyday or ordinary has gained ground with recent publications, many based on the work of the sociologist Henri Lefebvre and the techniques of modernist novelists and poets, examining how the ordinary, seemingly insignificant things grow in significance when brought into direct observation or treated with innovative forms of

representation.⁵ There is a connection here, though few observers have noted it, to the modernist memoir writers, who chose for their subjects the writers and artists of the modernist movement but also the narrative of an experiential modernity, largely represented through ordinary, everyday events occurring in extraordinary situations or to celebrated individuals.⁶ That modernist life writing emphasises the quotidian should not be a surprise when we recognise that the ordinary is at the heart of modernism in other genres. From Virginia Woolf's over-signification of the incidental snail in her narrative "The Mark on the Wall" to William Carlos Williams's "so much depends / upon / a red wheel / barrow," modernist readers are ready to accept that the ordinary or everyday becomes an event through the aesthetic mediation of the object. Or, as Siobhan Phillips (2010, 200) says about modernist poetry, "In a poetics of the quotidian, aesthetic timeliness does not depend on an event or condition that a poem's content may cite but on an ordinary pattern that a poem's recursions may incite." It is not only in poetry, however, that these ordinary patterns are sought over the notable event. Modernist memoirs similarly seeks to examine the aesthetic life through the ordinary patterns and daily life of the celebrated artists – not through the narration of an expected event, like the time Picasso decided to do Stein's portrait, but through the non-event, the ordinary piece of bread, significant only because it leads gradually to an intimacy between Picasso, Stein and (by extension) Stein's readers.

That this occurs in the high modernist period, when aesthetic values are commonly associated so explicitly with high culture and elite audiences, makes the intervention of 1930s memoirs that much more remarkable. As Ben Highmore (2011, x) has revealed, the very opposition of "the aesthetic" to "the ordinary" is a modern result of the specialisation of knowledge in the eighteenth century, developing, we should note, about the same time that life

writing and celebrity are taking their modern form. But just as aesthetics were closely associated with works of art and the detached autonomy of modernist artists – leading to their celebrity status, in many cases – the modernist memoir writers were re-positioning these celebrated artists within the framework of the ordinary and the everyday. This simultaneously lowers the celebrity writer (as will be explored in the next section) but also elevates ordinary or everyday life through the celebrity value borrowed from the famous writers or artists. In modernist poetry or fiction, the innovative artist manages to elevate the ordinary unnoticed object through the power of language and subjective notice; or in the words of Olson (2009, 7), “To say *this is ordinary* is to give significance to what is insignificant.” The memoirs act in a similar but inverted manner, with the public image of the celebrity artists themselves serving as celebrity objects; the memoirists draw close to the public figure, observing their “lofty” high-cultural status as celebrated artists, while simultaneously portraying them as ordinary via the patterns of everyday living. For many critics approaching modernism and the ordinary, the modernist artist elevates the ordinary subject through extraordinary prose; the memoirists, on the other hand, deflate this artistic elevation, portraying the exceptional artist in common terms, describing their ordinary lives in prose appealing to the general reader.

This brings us back to the question at the beginning of this article, arising from Orage’s preference for Joyce’s letters regarding his luggage, valued over and above the pages of *Ulysses*. Joyce’s luggage itself has no inherent value for Orage, but becomes culturally significant only because of the intensity of Joyce’s desire to retrieve it – and of course his status as celebrity. It is the cultural value of the figure of the author that bestows meaning on otherwise insignificant objects or occurrences, and this is increasingly evident in a number of memoirs of the 1930s, including Ford Madox Ford’s *It was the Nightingale* (1933). Interestingly, in the preface to this

volume, Ford distinguishes it from previous life writing he had undertaken, calling earlier memoirs like *Return to Yesterday* (1931), which focuses on literary connections with Joseph Conrad, Henry James, Stephen Crane and other writers, “reminiscences of which the main feature were found in the lives of other people and in which, as well as I could, I obscured myself” (Ford 2007, xviii). Instead, *It was the Nightingale* is to be his autobiography, “drawing material from my own literary age” (xviii). Yet the latter volume, the autobiography of a literary man, is devoted in large part to his career after World War I when he did little to no writing – when he was, in his own words, “no longer a literary figure” (71). Ford instead views himself as a farmer, and the ordinary rural life of a farmer is described in detail. All the same, he notices “how Letters, for me, will come creeping in. I had intended to make this a chapter generally about farming, and when I had written the last word of the paragraph above this one I said: ‘Now for the hoe and the nitrates!’” (17).

He cannot escape the literary life at least partly because, as we learn, he becomes a public figure as a writer and not as a farmer – though he has ambitions as the latter. He announces that just after World War I “everyone was filled with public spirit. That was the era of reconstruction, and each human being had his own plans for the salvation of humanity. My own contributions were to be [...] evolving a disease-proof potato” (Ford 2007, 106). Even his agricultural activity, however, is framed by literary celebrity in this autobiography, as he names the various varieties he propagates after his associates and their famous precursors. He reports being woken each morning by his man-servant with updates on his potatoes: “Mr. ‘Enry James have picked up proper in the night, but Mr. Conrad do peek and pine and is yellowin’. Mr. Galsworthy’s beetles ‘ave spread all over Miss Austen....” (Ford 2007, 111, ellipsis in original). Throughout Ford’s memoir, then, readers follow the great author and editor as he takes up everyday life, both

literary and decidedly unliterary, but they are always aware that the life is framed by Ford's position at or near the heart of late-Victorian, Edwardian and eventually modernist artistic activity. It is this that gives it significance as a life, thus elevating the cultural position of even the most ordinary objects. Ford tells us, "I have tried in various departments of life to be a benefactor to my species," (109), outlining his design for irrigation of sweet corn, his invention of a new kind of collar stud and a further invention for "adjusting the flavour of garlic in dishes to the taste of the individual diner" (109-10). But these objects, his contributions to everyday living, now lost and insignificant, are always framed within the larger narrative of his literary endeavours, through roles he takes on elsewhere in the volume as a collaborator of Conrad, Hemingway's employer at the *Transatlantic Review* or the author of *Parade's End*. Even when Ford writes of significant events or of his own extraordinary celebrity status – such as the comical moment he receives 27 autograph-seekers from a cruise ship in his own hotel bathroom wearing nothing but running shorts – it is the meditation on the insignificant object that most often pulls the narrative into some autobiographical significance, in this case, a meditation on the fountain pen one of the tourists leaves behind, now lost, leading him into thoughts on composition, creativity and modern technology.

Wyndham Lewis's *Blasting and Bombardiering* treats literary celebrity in a similar fashion. While much of the autobiography is meant to detail his experiences as an officer in World War I, it is the conflation of the reader's interest in notable aesthetic figures and the corresponding ordinary artefacts of the literary life that gives the broader frame to these everyday activities. While art and war overlap throughout most of the book, his introduction, the climactic fifth of five parts and his conclusion all make clear that the frame giving his life significance is his art. And yet even the fifth section, providing detail on the group proclaimed "The Men of

1914”, is lowered by its title: “The Tale of an Old Pair of Shoes.” The literary group is brought before its public in the chapter entitled “First Meeting with James Joyce”, where it is revealed: “It was quite impossible, under these circumstances, to encounter Joyce otherwise than as one of a pair of figures in the biography of a big Penman – I, of course being the interloper” (Lewis 1937, 271). In other words, the high-art status of Joyce’s work (along with that of Eliot, Pound and Lewis himself) ensures that this will be a significant moment in the posterity of the cultural movement. It is recognised as a key Event in literary history and a meeting of celebrity writers. But Lewis suggests, “It does not follow that a couple of authors, when they come face to face need meet as ‘authors’” (271). The inverted commas around “authors” signify the elevated position of celebrity subjects in a literary autobiography, but the anecdote that Lewis shares is not aimed at maintaining this elevated position. In fact, it is an ordinary parcel, sent to Joyce from Pound via Eliot and Lewis, that brings the four together in the same hotel room. This parcel takes centre stage, “placed in the middle of a large Second Empire marble table, standing upon gilt eagles’ claws in the centre of the apartment” (273). Like a work of art upon a pedestal, the simple parcel in “damp British brown paper” (275) and tied with “the crafty housewifely knots of the cunning old Ezra” (274) is elevated in this scene by the proximity and the attention given it by four of the most famous of the high modernists. However, the value of the parcel and the gravity of the moment – the first assembly of “The Men of the 1914” – is undermined once the package is opened and it is found to contain “a fairly presentable pair of *old brown shoes*” (275, emphasis in original).

While the “Tale of an Old Pair of Shoes” dominates a number of chapters relating to Eliot, Pound and Joyce – particularly focusing on Joyce’s reaction to having his pride stung in being witnessed receiving second-hand shoes and other garments – seldom is enough attention

paid to how this anecdote is set up by Lewis. The ordinary object of the old shoes would carry little weight in such an autobiography if there were not such expectations for the momentous Event built into the narrative: the sense of “the champion Penman” in a “momentous encounter” framed by “all that is historic” and by a self-conscious “*biography*” (Lewis 1937, 271-2). It is this sense of inflated expectation and celebrity values that leaves us surprised – along with Joyce, “exclaiming very faintly ‘Oh!’” (275) – to find the pedestal holding nothing more than ordinary shoes. But close readers will have noticed, earlier in the chapter, that Lewis had warned us, before the narrative even unfolds, that he does not think in terms of history, nor biography, nor the momentous: “What should have been a momentous encounter, then, turned out to be as matter-of-fact a social clash as the coming together of two navvies, or the brusque *how do you do* of a couple of dogs out for a walk” (272). In fact, even in his introduction Lewis warns us not to expect the typical fare of literary reminiscences and “table talk” of those deceased artistic figures who had become public figures. “With what assurance people compose accounts of the demeanour and most private thoughts of the departed great! [...] Every ‘great man’ to-day knows that he is living potentially a life of fiction. Sooner or later he will find himself the centre of a romance” by “those of the Strachey kidney” (Lewis 1937, 13). Lewis announces: “But I, for a change, will stake out a modest claim in the *living*,” and it is the everyday – what Lefebvre calls the “residual” or “what is left over” after the momentous events are singled out for analysis – that allows his memoirs to subvert expectations.

These are examples – taken from Stein, Ford and Lewis – of the high modernist aesthetic of the ordinary, the insignificant or the everyday conveyed through a genre expected to focus on the extraordinary, the momentous or the event. Similarly, Margaret Anderson produces sketches of celebrity modernist lives in their natural environments: Ezra Pound, agitated, in his studio;

James Joyce in his apartment, apologizing for his lack of ancestral portraits on the walls as they had been packed away; and Gertrude Stein, wearing heavy men's shoes and driving her battered Ford (Anderson 1930, 243-9). Jimmie "the Barman" Charters takes up the genre from his own perspective in 1934, classifying artists and drinkers according to their drinking habits – Joyce, for instance, is one of the "white-winners" (Charters 1989, 35). And though he acknowledges that "it is silly to make such classifications" (50), the tensions inherent in trying to define or categorize the artist, to draw the exceptional celebrity a little closer to generic life, in fact provided the narrative drive that appeared to attract a readership modernism had not previously attracted. For instance, *Time* magazine, reviewing the book, does not dismiss Charters's inexpert understanding of artistic themes, nor his repetition of generic gossip. Instead, they refuse to condemn, as it is claimed one normally would, "the well-chewed-over material – the renamings of expatriate celebrities" since Jimmie is so clearly writing as the ordinary barman, resulting in "a somewhat more workaday point of view" (Anonymous 1937). In fact, the ordinary becomes more than ordinary when revealed in the lives of modernist celebrities and thus becomes their connection to the uncelebrated reader who gives them value through purchasing the volume. As Wyndham Lewis's memoir acknowledges, his readers desire a glimpse of "Joyce's little beard, and Eliot's great toe" (Lewis 1937, 256) and not an analysis of their literary techniques or contributions to literary history, even if this is what makes their beards and toes worthy of notice.

Identification and Distancing: The Blemish on the Celebrity Aura

Though there were of course literary memoirs before 1930, I have argued that it was this decade where the "lofty" status of high-art figures clashed most obviously with the publicly-demanded genres of literary gossip and "table talk." In fact, the celebrity value of high

modernists – as distinct from their literary value – both drew a new audience to the modernist movement, but also provided an occasion for criticism of their aesthetic stance, as the 1930s saw the beginning of the end of a notional autonomous high modernism and the beginning of a more politically-charged movement. While some memoirs, as we have seen, look to elevate the quotidian or the ordinary in relation to modernist aesthetics, there is a simultaneous move by others to deflate the elevated reputation of high-culture aestheticism and artistic celebrities throughout the period. In fact, this is reflected in the 1930s through a shift in the status of celebrities more generally. One of the foundational texts of contemporary celebrity studies, Richard Dyer’s *Stars*, explores the ongoing conflict between “stars-as-special” and “stars-as-ordinary”, revealing the historical point of transition in cinematic celebrity in about 1930 as “from gods to mortals” – just the moment modernist memoirs started to reveal a similar trend in attitudes to literary authors (Dyer, 1979, 43, 21-3). In film, this transition is linked to the introduction of sound, as the once-inscrutable, silent gods of the screen lose their divine status as their voices make them real, even ordinary. There is something similar involved in the treatment of gossipy material about artists and authors in 1930s memoirs, as the previously autonomous, detached, impersonal high modernists increasingly became more “real” to their readers.

Sometimes, as we have seen in the previous section, this took the form of intimacy or nearness – the distance between author and reader narrowed by the memoirs just as new cinematic technologies broke down the aura of the film star. Dyer terms this “identification”, a term frequently used in celebrity studies to reveal the hunger for consumption of celebrity images and narratives that reveal the more ordinary aspects of the stars. But the “nearness” sometimes leads to hostility, and subsequent work has identified the role celebrity publications play in “both the construction and ‘deconstruction’ of contemporary celebrity” (Holmes 2005,

24). In other words, in seeking to reveal the ordinary lives of the extraordinary individuals – that celebrities are just like the rest of us – celebrity publications sometimes appear to attack the figures at the heart of the market they depend upon. As critics have outlined, there is a market for glimpses of celebrities revealing the less-than-polished side of their personae, seeking the “off-guard, unkempt, unready, unsanitized . . . the realm of the cellulite bottom and the rogue nipple” (Casper Llewellyn-Davies, quoted in Holmes 2005, 23). The hunger for the behind-the-scenes glimpse of the celebrity, in other words, often leads to a desire for the mask to slip and the aura to lose its shine, a result of “identification” in the discourse of celebrity gossip. It is this paradox which can be identified in the approach of certain memoirists themselves, especially the American expatriates, whose engagement with literary celebrity focus on the most “real” or ordinary activities of the artists and authors, while simultaneously revealing where they fall short of the memoirists’ own aesthetic values or expectations for ordinary or “real life.” Certainly a large proportion of the early reviewers of Stein’s *Autobiography* identified her volume as, in the words of the influential columnist Lewis Gannett (1933), “a gossip book.” Most reviewers were drawn to the long list of famous “names” mentioned by Stein, but the most frequently cited examples usually involved scornful dismissals of contemporaries, including Hemingway, Pound and Eliot, undermining the cultural value they had won for themselves by the 1930s. Readers only learn that Pound, in Stein’s opinion, is a “village explainer” or Hemingway “was yellow” because Stein is eager to render these celebrated modernists as ordinary and undermine the values that inflate interest in their personalities beyond that of their work. This is, in the words of one contemporary scholar of celebrity culture, simultaneous “identification and distancing” (Johansson 2006, 349).

Robert McAlmon's memoir, *Being Geniuses Together*, at first glance appears to cater to an audience seeking tales of masterpiece-writers and high-art devotees. But McAlmon's tone and approach reveals a weariness of overly-literary qualities or those who announce their own genius. Even Joyce, one of the celebrity subjects of the book, was taken in by the title, commenting to McAlmon that he should rather title the book "Advocatus Diaboli," to which McAlmon responded, "What in the hell do you think the title means, that I take genius without salt?" (Ellmann 1982, 672).⁷ McAlmon proudly quotes William Carlos Williams in claiming that he (McAlmon) has "a genius for life" (McAlmon and Boyle 1984, 169). Pound, Stein and Hemingway all make obligatory appearances, as the genre and the reading public demands, but all are considered too consumed with posturing, technique, or literary pedagogy. Joyce comes off better, but the Irish novelist disapproved of his own portrait, since it is the drinking, the poverty, the squabbles with wife Nora that merit recording, not his writing. Where his work is mentioned, it is shown great respect, but considered too careful or precious, perhaps too mannered and literary. McAlmon (1984, 119) relishes telling of his own changes to the "Penelope" episode of *Ulysses*, making his corrections to the masterpiece haphazardly, rather than where Joyce carefully had dictated. The high art of Joyce, the genius in literary qualities, meets its match in McAlmon, the genius in life, who so often in his text prefers the bars with lively but non-celebrity individuals to the solemn soirees and readings by the more famous of his fellow writers. There is a constant note of disgust in McAlmon's discourse (not evident in the alternating chapters later inserted by McAlmon's friend, fellow-writer and editor, Kay Boyle), almost ashamed to relate his attendance at Stein's salon or the reading of the newly translated version of *Ulysses*. He prefers the company of other ordinary, less-literary sorts, suggesting, "Their presence at any party was always a relief to me, for when some of the megalomaniac geniuses,

seers, or high priestesses held forth at too great a length one could exchange understanding glances with them” (McAlmon and Boyle 1984, 200).

Malcolm Cowley’s book is, in this way at least, similar. It is the myth of the great names that sustains Cowley and his reminiscences, coming to Paris to find Eliot, Pound, Joyce, taking us on the pilgrimages that his readers desire. The section recounting his approach to these figures, portraying himself as the young writer surveying the field, is called “Readings in the Lives of the Saints,” as he searches out the conventions that make up a modernist author. But his intrusion into the lives of the masters often breaks the myth, rendering the geniuses merely generic. Writing of Joyce, he describes their moment of meeting:

I saw a tall, emaciated man with a very high white forehead and smoked glasses; on his thin mouth and puckered corners of his eyes was a look of suffering so plainly marked that I forgot the questions with which I had come prepared. I was simply a younger person meeting an older person who needed help.

“Is there anything I can do for you, Mr. Joyce?” I said.

Yes, there was something I could do: he had no stamps, he didn’t feel well enough to go out and there was nobody to run errands for him. I went out to buy stamps, with a sense of relief as I stepped into the street. He had achieved genius, I thought, but there was something about the genius as cold as the touch at parting of his long, smooth, cold, wet-marble fingers. (Cowley 1976, 118-19)

While Cowley never loses respect for the great authors of the high modernist period, speaking in turn about Eliot, Joyce, Pound, Proust and Valéry as literary geniuses, there is a hollowness in his depictions of them, a description of anaemia seeming to result from a too-narrow approach to life. There is a deliberate deflation of aura and pricking of the mythic bubble grown up around these figures. Just as other celebrity publications take pride in pointing out the flaw in the usually perfectly-presented star, Cowley (1976, 118) enjoys showing Joyce’s lack of genius for life, disappointedly claiming, “Except in matters concerning literature or the opera, his opinions were those of a fourth or fifth-rate mind.”

Cowley moves on to reveal how far each of his “saints” are affected by this aesthetic malaise. And Cowley is not alone in his attitude, as many memoir writers deflate the aura of the high-modernist figure through their portraits of celebrity authors living mundane lives – even, at times, their own. In their ready depiction of the ordinary aspects of celebrated authors, literary memoirists appear to aim for a revision of artistic success, promoting a new ideal of art much less detached or autonomous than the high modernists held before them. Barbara Will (2000), in her study of Gertrude Stein’s conception of genius, identifies the modernist appropriation of a Romantic ideal of freedom, “but a freedom *from* the practical context of everyday life, as from social engagement altogether” (4). In some ways, this reflects the perception of modernism as detached, autonomous and indifferent. Yet Stein was at the forefront of shifting the modernist paradigm of genius back toward everyday life, and other memoirists appear to support and contextualize this transition. Modernism, as described by the 1930s memoirists, once more re-engages the everyday and all its practical contexts, including Picasso’s comics, Ford’s potatoes or Joyce’s old shoes, postage stamps, or lost luggage.

Conclusion: Publicity for Everybody

As the 1930s neared conclusion and the spectre of another war loomed, Stein would write her second memoir of the period, this time calling it *Everybody’s Autobiography* (1937), which begins: “Alice B. Toklas did hers and now anybody will do theirs” (Stein 1993, 1). Immediately the aura of high culture dissipates and the autobiography belongs to anyone and everyone. In this volume, geniuses like Hemingway, Picasso and Matisse are replaced by hotel managers or automobile mechanics. The ordinary has fully supplanted the auratic, though she still asserts her own genius. But she has been changed by her tour of America as the celebrity author of *The*

Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas and the genius author of more experimental works. She writes of being recognized on the street, being asked for autographs and feeling disoriented after seeing her name on an electric sign saying, “Gertrude Stein has come” (Stein 1993, 180). She becomes a victim of her own aura, able to witness the distance between her own self-identification and the celebrity value she has become, reproducible on paper, in photographs or on electric notice boards. As Will (2000, 137-8) says, “Stein further disavows the uniqueness of this figure by claiming that her newfound fame in the 1930s is not so much a sign of genial superiority as of generic commonality, since in America ‘everybody is a public something.’” If the proliferation of genius simply leads to its being generic, Stein (1993, 72) once more looks for the genius in everyday life, in the mundane or generic activity, suggesting, “It takes a lot of time to be a genius, you have to sit around so much doing nothing, really doing nothing.” There is a genius to be found, Stein seems to suggest, in the most mundane, everyday task – drawing the attention of the reader to the elevated status of the artist while also pulling them into the anonymity of the ordinary, daily life.

An investigation of the memoirists’ strategies, target audiences and narrative techniques reveals that the 1930s modernist memoir engages a complex interplay between the genius and the generic, between the aura of celebrity and their ordinary lives. It is surely a stretch to suggest that these memoirs changed modernism, but they almost certainly reflected a change in its self-presentation and its audience. The memoirs narrating the movement not only increased its audience to include those who were already piqued but perplexed by the difficulties of high modernism; they offered a realigned perspective on the values of modernism, engaging with the fetish for detachment, autonomy and genius, while offering their version of genius with a pinch of generic table salt. The 1930s was not, of course, the end of modernism, nor even the end of

modernist memoirs, as many more were published in the 1950s and 60s, albeit with differing aims and effects. But the memoirs of this decade play an important role in an emerging late modernism, where Joyce's pursuit of postage stamps or his wrangle with the Swiss government over his luggage takes on a new priority – on comparable terms, for some, to *Ulysses* itself – working along with a shift toward a more political or practical applications of modernist thought during the 1930s. These memoirs signal, to a certain extent, the moment modernism – already built on an aesthetic of the everyday – became *part* of the everyday: where artistic innovation and aesthetics were reproduced, sometimes in vast quantities for a broad audience, through a celebrity discourse based on the ordinary life of the exceptional individual. These volumes were built on the celebrity value afforded to exceptional individuals who maintained some form of artistic aura – but they often left behind only the celebrity image of the artist, deflating the aura lent by the work of art by negating the distance between the extraordinary figure and an ordinary life.

So we return to the question of precedence: does the celebrity life of artists come first or the work that makes them an artist? Or: would Orage be interested in Joyce's letters if Joyce had not published *Ulysses*? In *Everybody's Autobiography* (1993, 51), Stein reflects on this very question, announcing, "It always did bother me that the American public were more interested in me than in my work." She relates her belief that one should only "sell one's personality" when it "expressed itself in work," something which could be said to be true of Stein's earlier autobiography. But later, Stein sounds less sure as she reflects on the rise in both cultural and monetary value of her work and that of Picasso's, but also recognizing that, even if works of art are destroyed or burgled, the aura of a genius lives on – that even without the works of art to prove the worth of the artist, "somehow every one can feel that it has been" (Stein 1993, 93).

Stein admits that the work of art that “makes” the artist is ultimately less permanent than the public perception of the artist figure that first created it. She concludes that “perhaps after all they are right the Americans in being more interested in you than in the work you have done although they would not be in you if you had not done the work you had done” (1993, 93). This concession to that which had previously bothered her – celebrity value and the power of publicity – highlights the tensions caused by the rise of celebrity personalities within a high-modernist framework of text-centered authorship. Stein recognizes the role of autobiography in this shift, acknowledging the pressure placed on the literary arts and the typical modernist genres by the rise of promotional culture and the age of celebrity, asking “how can you believe what you make up [in novels] when publicity makes them up to be so much realer than you can dream. And so autobiography is written which is in a way to say that publicity is right, they [personalities] are as the public sees them” (Stein 1993, 71). The shift toward memoir-writing in the 1930s, then, engages directly with the question of the status of the celebrity artist and the consumption of everyday lives, even when this aesthetic is detached from the aesthetic objects that have made them into celebrities. In this, if not in other ways, Stein speaks on behalf of other memoir writers engaged in the promotion of the modernist movement through the generic reproduction of extraordinary celebrity personalities.

Bibliography

- Adams, Henry. 1992. *Selected Letters*. Edited by Ernest Samuels. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, Margaret. 1930. *My Thirty Years' War: an autobiography*. London: Knopf.
- Anonymous. 1937. "Barman to Barflies." *Time*, October 04.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. 1961. *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Event in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brinnin, John Malcolm. 1987. *The Third Rose: Gertrude Stein and her World*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brownley, Martine Watson. 1985. "Samuel Johnson and the Printing Career of Hester Thrale Piozzi." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 67 (2): 623-40.
- Brucoli, Matthew J. and Judith Baughman. 2004. *The Sons of Maxwell Perkins: Letters of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Thomas Wolfe and Their Editor*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Charters, James. 1989. *This Must Be the Place: Memoirs of Montparnasse*. Edited by Hugh Ford. London: Collier Macmillan.
- Cowley, Malcolm. 1976. *Exile's Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s*. London: Penguin.
- Dolan, Marc. 1996. *Modern Lives: a cultural re-reading of "the Lost Generation."* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Dyer, Richard. 1979. *Stars*. London: BFI.
- Ellmann, Richard. 1982. *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, Ford Madox. 2007. *It Was the Nightingale*. Edited by John Coyle. Manchester: Carcanet.

- Galow, Timothy W. 2011. *Writing Celebrity: Stein, Fitzgerald and the Modern(ist) Art of Self-Fashioning*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gannett, Lewis. 1933. "Books and Things," in *New York Herald Tribune*, Sep 1. Clipping in Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, YCAL MSS76, Box 5 Folder 105.
- Glass, Loren. 2004. *Authors, Inc.: Literary celebrity in the modern United States, 1880-1980*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jaffe, Aaron and Jonathan Goldman, eds. 2010. *Modernist Star Maps*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Goldman, Jonathan. 2011. *Modernism is the Literature of Celebrity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hammill, Faye. 2007. *Women, Celebrity and Literary Culture between the World Wars*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1993. "The Origin of the Work of Art." Translated by Albert Hofstadter. In *Basic Writings*. Edited by David Farrell Krell, 143-212. New York: HarperCollins.
- Highmore, Ben. 2002. *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, Su. 2005. "'Off-guard, Unkempt, Unready'?: Deconstructing Contemporary Celebrity in *heat* Magazine," in *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 19 (1): 21-38.
- Jaffe, Aaron. 2005. *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, Sofia. 2006. "'Sometimes you wanna hate celebrities': tabloid readers and celebrity coverage," in *Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture*. Edited by Su Holmes and Sean Redmond. London: Routledge.
- Kiki. 1930. *Kiki's Memoirs*. Translated by Samuel Putnam. Paris: E. W. Titus.
- Lewis, Wyndham. 1937. *Blasting and Bombardiering*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

- Lewis, Wyndham. 1963. *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis*. Edited by W. K. Rose. Norfolk, CT: New Directions.
- Marcus, Laura. 1994. *Auto/biographical Discourses: theory, criticism, practice*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- McAlmon, Robert, and Kay Boyle. 1984. *Being Geniuses Together 1920-1930*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Monk, Craig. 2008. *Writing the Lost Generation: expatriate autobiography and American modernism*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Olsen, Liesl. 2009. *Modernism and the Ordinary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, Siobhan. 2010. *The Poetics of the Everyday: Creative Repetition in Modern American Verse*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Piozzi, Hester Lynch. 1786. *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, L.L.D., during the Last Twenty Years of His Life*. Dublin: Mssrs. Moncrieffe.
- Pizer, Donald. 1996. *American Expatriate Writing and the Paris Moment: Modernism and Place*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Pound, Omar S., and Philip Grover. 1978. *Wyndham Lewis: A Descriptive Bibliography*. Folkestone, Kent: William Dawson.
- Randall, Bryony. 2008. *Modernism, Daily Time, and Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saunders, Max. 2010. *Self Impression: life-writing, autobiografiction, and the forms of modern fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheringham, Michael. 2006. *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, Alexandra. 2001. "Dialogues, Conversations and Table Talk", in *Encyclopedia of Life Writing: Autobiographical and Biographical Forms*. Edited by Margaretta Jolly. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Thomas R. 1997. Introduction to "Preliminary Aside to the Reader; Regarding Gossip, and its Pitfalls" by Wyndham Lewis, *Modernism/modernity* 4 (2): 181-7.
- Stein, Gertrude. 2001. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. London: Penguin.
- Stein, Gertrude. 1993. *Everybody's Autobiography*. Cambridge: Exact Change.
- Thrale, Hester Lynch. 1951. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs Hester Lynch Thrale (later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*. Volume 1. Edited by Katherine C. Balderston. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Walpole, Horace. 1861. *The Letters of Horace Walpole*. Volume IX. Edited by Peter Cunningham. London: Bohn.
- Weintraub, Karl J. 1975. "Autobiography and Historical Consciousness." *Critical Inquiry* 1:4 (June): 821-48.
- West III, James L. W. 2011. Introduction to *A Short Autobiography*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald, vii-xii. New York: Scribners.
- Will, Barbara. 2000. *Gertrude Stein, Modernism, and the Problem of "Genius"*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Yeats, W.B. 1922. *The Trembling of the Veil*. London: T. Werner Laurie.

Early drafts of this article were read by a number of individuals whose input has been very welcome, including Tim Armstrong, Alice Wood and several other readers who remain anonymous.

¹ As well as texts already cited, for modernism and celebrity see also Glass (2004), Hammill, (2007), Goldman, (2011) and Galow (2011).

² It seems about 1400 copies were sold or given away. See Pound and Grover (1978).

³ Beyond Saunders' work cited above, modernist life writing, particularly involving the American trend toward memoir, has been explored by Pizer (1996), Dolan (1996) and Monk (2008).

⁴ Stein's early reviews can be surveyed, via her own clippings service, at the Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, Yale University – there are certain anecdotes regularly quoted by reviewers, with Picasso's interest in the Katzenjammer Kids vying with anecdotes of Hemingway, Eliot and Pound for most frequently cited.

⁵ These include Randall (2008), Olsen, (2009), Phillips, (2010) Sheringham (2006) and Highmore (2002).

⁶ Aaron Jaffe and Jonathan Goldman (2010, 13) begin their introduction to *Modernist Star Maps* with an intriguing discussion of Virginia Woolf's character Mrs Brown as celebrity, in all her ordinariness, leading to the claim that modernist studies, since 1999, has grown into a readiness for understanding modernism's personality.

⁷ Ellmann relates Joyce's displeasure with the memoir and his depiction, not as an author, but as a public figure in Parisian circles. The Irish author's description of the book as "the office boy's revenge" (672) further reveals his own attitude toward the memoir genre.