

“It was in that way that we used to talk, in July, 1914, of Armageddon”: Wartime in Ford Madox Ford’s *Parade’s End* Tetralogy

Andrew Frayn

In histories of the First World War, and the commemorations that have followed, 4 August 1914 and 11 November 1918 have become iconic. The beginning and end dates of conflicts often stand, in retrospective analyses, for rupture from a *belle époque* and a new start respectively. Life continues during war, but its outbreak portends a dramatic change of state: in practical terms energy must be devoted to mobilising and providing for the disparate needs of military services; rules tend to be tightened and behaviour policed more assiduously, socially or by legislation. The dramatic jolt to the systems by which our lives are usually regulated means that time itself is experienced differently, a more febrile and uneven entity than its spatialised peacetime counterpart; recent critics such as Mary L. Dudziak and Mary A. Favret have begun to theorise a modern ‘wartime’. The Armistice finally allows reflection and relief, the beginning of the reintegration of military and associated personnel, and the slow process of the long-desired return to ‘normality’. In literary and historical accounts, beginning and end dates often become palimpsests on to which wartime experiences can be written, conduits for preceding or resultant narratives of historical change. Modernist literature is particularly interested in its relationship with time, negotiating between the ongoing global rationalisation and standardisation of time, and the scientific and philosophical work which sought to reinscribe its complexity. In Ford Madox Ford’s great war tetralogy *Parade’s End* (1924-8) the beginning and end of the First World War haunt the novels, but Ford refuses to allow the war to be neatly parenthesised. Just as important are the date in July 1912 on which the narrative begins, and the world after the war that we see in the final volume. In this chapter I use recent theories of wartime to analyse the function and representation of time in *Parade’s End*, arguing that seeing the war in terms both of its continuities and ruptures enables us to understand the ways in which the conditions for war are created, and the enduring impact of armed conflict.

Modern Time

Time itself was being reordered through the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As railway track spread through Britain, so the tracks of time needed to be aligned. Ford was acutely aware of the development of the railway, even beginning his study of *The*

English Novel (1930) with an account of the move from the country to the city, and the increasing atomisation of communities resulting from locomotion.¹ Greenwich Mean Time was taken up by the Railway Clearing House in 1847, and legally adopted in Great Britain in 1880.² The development of railways across the world led to demand for the International Meridian Conference, held in Washington, DC from 1-22 October 1884.³ The recommendations of that meeting took several decades to play out: the Bureau International de l'Heure (International Time Bureau) was created in 1913 to regulate national measurements of universal time, but many countries were yet to legislate standard time as official practice. Regulation of the international status of the bureau was delayed by the First World War.⁴ The war directly impacted the management of time: in Britain, for example, the 1916 Summer Time Act introduced daylight saving for the first time, while the British and Allied armed forces adopted the 24-hour clock gradually throughout the war. Ford points to the problems of enacting such changes in *Parade's End*: “‘Ho!’ says our Staff, ‘they are going to attack in force at such an hour ackemma,’ because naturally the staff thought in terms of ackemma years after the twenty-four-hour day had been established.”⁵ This tacit criticism of the military for its slow implementation of processes points to the slow pace of change when people’s ingrained habits are a factor, as both conceptually and practically. Legislation often precedes social and cultural change, and legally the measurement of time was more connected than ever globally, but more abstract in its relationship with the physical world.⁶

Literature, particularly modernist literature, tended to follow the lead of philosophy by setting consciousness and memory against the brute mechanics of standardised time. Michael Levenson, Stephen Kern, and Tim Armstrong, among others, have described what Charles Tung calls the ‘obsessive thematization of time—its movement into the spotlight from the quiet background for plot or the “invisible medium” of history’.⁷ The ground-breaking work of scientists such as Albert Einstein and Henri Poincaré quickly permeated the public consciousness, as Michael Whitworth has described,⁸ while the solar eclipse experiment that proved Einstein’s theory was being organised by A.S. Eddington in the last year of the war. In philosophy, the end of the decade that included the International Meridian Conference saw the publication of Henri Bergson’s thesis *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* (1889) and William James’s *Principles of Psychology* (1890). Both saw time as an affective experience in which duration varied. Such work, recent critics argue, must be understood historically in the context of the standardisation of time.⁹ Mary Ann Gillies, a leading writer on Bergson and modernism, argues that ‘because of their radical challenge to traditional

temporal concepts, they were central to the reconfigurations of culture carried out by modernists.¹⁰ Bergson was prominent in England before the First World War: that thesis was translated as *Time and Free Will* (1910), and his ideas were widely disseminated in the popular press.¹¹ Among the modernist network, Bertrand Russell championed Bergson, and T. E. Hulme published several letters and articles on him in *The New Age* from 1909-12.¹² James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922) and Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway* (1925) are paradigmatic examples of the ways in which Bergsonian models gave authors new ways to write time following the First World War, as they struggled to describe and understand the visceral experience of the conflict and its long-term impact.

Ford was early to use this method to represent the war. He attended the Tuesday evening discussions hosted by Hulme in 1912-3, which makes it probable that he was cognisant of Bergson's work and its importance.¹³ The time shifts of *Parade's End* follow, for the most part, the thoughts and memories of Christopher Tietjens, his wife Sylvia, his older brother Mark, his protégé Vincent Macmaster, and Valentine Wannop.¹⁴ In his reminiscence of Joseph Conrad, Ford wrote that:

what was the matter with the novel, and the British Novel in particular, was that it went straight forward, whereas in your gradual making acquaintanceship with your fellows you never do go straight forward .. To get ... a man in function you could not begin at his beginning and work his life chronologically to the end. You must first get him with a strong impression, and then work backwards and forwards over his past.¹⁵

The novels are acutely conscious of their historical moment as one of change, and working back and forth over the past is vital in writing and rewriting history. Adam Barrows argues that 'For Conrad, Joyce, and Woolf, standard time's uniform grid degrades and disenfranchises more meaningful temporal configurations and social linkages in the interests of empire and commerce.'¹⁶ Ford, a collaborator of Conrad and very much a modernist writer in the same way as these figures, might also usefully be considered in the light of this argument. In *Parade's End* we see the difficulties caused by trying to resist this and other processes of bureaucratic rationalisation, and the limited possibilities available to do so.

A parallel narrative development is the increasing mnemonic function of specific dates and historical events.¹⁷ These become markers of epochal change onto which symbolic meaning is retrospectively loaded: the experience of rapid development in the period, along with the corollary interest in narratives of decline and disenchantment,¹⁸ meant that lines in the

sand were and are sought. For many the death of Queen Victoria in 1901 signalled the end of an era, conveniently at the turn of the century. Virginia Woolf looked to December 1910, while the appearance in 1913 of works such as Stravinsky's *The Rite of Spring* seemed to herald a new age.¹⁹ Others have looked to the modernist *annus mirabilis* of 1922, the General Strike of 1926, the Wall Street Crash of 1929, or the Nazi gains in the German election of 1930. The beginning and end of the First World War, often referred to as the Great War in contemporary accounts, seemed to provide clear demarcation, along with the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Mary L. Dudziak argues that 'War also breaks time into pieces, slicing human experience into eras, creating a before and an after',²⁰ while Mary A. Favret puts it succinctly: 'Periodization flourishes within wartime.'²¹ The sociologist Eviatar Zerubael makes a literary analogy in pointing out the constructedness of periodisation: 'as we are occasionally reminded by poems and books that begin, quite provocatively, in the middle of a sentence, historical discontinuity should in no way be regarded as a given. Like cropping photographs, carving conventional "periods" out of their historical surroundings is an artificial act and, as such, far from inevitable.'²² These choices are acts of framing, decisions about narrative structures, and they point to a desire to make events intersect on a particular horizon and thus spatialise time. Writing in the context of Ford's autobiographical writing and the First World War, Rob Hawkes argues, following Evelyn Cobley, that 'by destroying a particular sense of historical continuity [...] the war placed new pressures on the structures and forces which shape and stabilise narratives.'²³ For many, including leading intellectuals at the time, the conflict was seen as purgative; for others it was apocalyptic.

Wartime

The declaration of war is reported as rupture. Official proclamations and the discussion surrounding them highlight the change of state, and reports spread quicker and easier than ever before in the early years of the twentieth century. Certain rules are suspended in wartime but it comes about via longstanding diplomatic agreements and processes, and their failure. To see the war as an aberration is necessary for post-war recovery. Zerubavel argues that 'the effort to establish historical continuity is usually offset by the diametrically opposite sociomental process of constructing historical *discontinuity*,'²⁴ and via analysis of the *Chronicle of America*, he posits:

Especially in contrast with the amount of space allotted to their immediate chronological neighbors (the 1850s and 1950s), the actual

number of pages allotted to the 1860s and 1940s, for instance, is quite suggestive of the particular memorability of wartime periods, since from a strictly mathematical standpoint those decades were absolutely identical.²⁵

Wartime accumulates reporting in the most general sense: while life continues, unusual and extreme experiences proliferate. The human cost of the war, all too evident in the presence of mutilated and mentally ill ex-servicemen, and also simply in absence, haunts post-war literature—haunting itself is an uncanny destabilising of time.

In between those apparently firm parentheses, wartime is often registered as febrile, fluid, unstable. Recent theories of wartime, particularly from the US in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, focus on writing and anticipation during wartime as hopeful and fearful. Favret, invoking Raymond Williams's concept of structures of feeling, notes the importance of waiting for news,²⁶ while Dudziak discusses this in terms of the tensions of the Cold War.²⁷ These sensations are particularly to the fore in wartime. Kate McLoughlin, in her wide-ranging study of war literature, states that ongoing uncertainty about war's resolution 'gives wartime its special property of *open-endedness* or *endinglessness* (an acute form of endlessness): a situation in which various possible outcomes exist simultaneously in, to borrow a concept from quantum physics, *superposition*. [...T]ime is synchronic; diachronic temporal expressions are thrown into confusion.'²⁸ Wartime insistently looks to the end: pacifists sought an end to violence, while militarists hoped for a speedy victory. Both combatants and non-combatants endured the hopes and fears of waiting for friends and family to return, along with the new-found danger from the air. Wartime is awful and comes with a pressing desire to parenthesise it, but the complicity of the structures that enable it must also be considered.

Ford and the First World War

Ford was using fragmentation as a narrative technique before the war, as Sara Haslam points out,²⁹ but the war gave particular focus to that impulse. He was already renowned as a literary impressionist, and Laura Colombino notes that he 'dispenses with the cumbersome paraphernalia of realistic analysis (the accurate representation of facts) and avoids intruding into the story with his own voice to judge or comment on the characters. Through the use of intensely suggestive words, he wants impressions to speak for themselves and carry autonomous meanings.'³⁰ Unlike the omnisciently narrated realist works of the previous century, Ford's form is pointedly real-ish. Paul Sheehan argues that Ford's mastery of the form is clear by the outbreak of the First World War: 'At its most accomplished – as in, say, Conrad's

Heart of Darkness [...] or Ford's *The Good Soldier* (1915) – literary impressionism demonstrates the pre-eminence of perceptual anomaly over cognitive certainty, when phenomena are refracted through the prisms of time, consciousness and memory.³¹ Ford's development of this form before the war, perceiving the need to represent the fractured nature of modern life, positioned him well to write about it afterwards, and he did so earlier and more distinctively than most.

Ford enlisted in 1915, having already written two volumes of propaganda for his friend C. F. G. Masterman, but his age kept him out of the front line.³² Despite this, he was injured in a blast, which left him concussed and shell shocked. Ford struggled in the immediate post-war years, and worked to restore his physical, mental and literary strength at Red Ford, a secluded cottage in Pulborough, West Sussex. Military service did not interrupt Ford's literary production – he continued to write extensively in poetry and prose – but he would not publish another novel until 1923, and he did not tackle the war head on in prose until he began to write *Parade's End* at the end of the previous year.³³ These difficulties attest to his alienation from England;³⁴ his shell shock contributed to the development of his literary style. This ultimately led to the composition of his great post-war series, but the road was painful. The essays 'Arms and the Mind/War and the Mind' were written in September 1916 and summer 1917 but unpublished in Ford's lifetime,³⁵ while 'True Love and a G[eneral]. C[ourt].M[artial].' was started before the Armistice, but abandoned before Ford developed either the romance or the military-legal proceedings. However, it does give us an insight into his state of mind: the alienated protagonist Gabriel Morton strives to recover from the shell shock that returns him to childhood and fills him with dread: fear and temporal disorientation combine.³⁶ *No Enemy: A Tale of Reconstruction* (1929), Ford's other great Great War text, was written mostly in 1919,³⁷ and there remains an unpublished manuscript, *Mr. Croyd*, completed, after a creative struggle, in late 1920. Saunders describes it as raw, powerful, and featuring an idealised Fordian protagonist.³⁸ Ford also writes obliquely about the war in *A House* (1921), a long poem about his recovery at Red Ford into which wartime only sporadically intrudes.³⁹

Parade's End

1922 was a landmark year not only for literary and artistic modernism, but also for Ford. The end of that year saw his departure from England for Paris, where he founded and edited the *transatlantic review* (1924) and wrote much of the *Parade's End* novels. Earlier that year, Einstein and Bergson met for the first time in the same city, the latter trying publicly to

work out a resolution between Bergsonian *durée* and Einstein's work.⁴⁰ The publicity afforded to both men at the time was such that the widely-read Ford would likely have been aware of the debate, particularly given his previous interest in Bergson. However, his own account of the tetralogy's spark derives from the exemplary literary link between time and memory: Marcel Proust. Ford and his partner Stella Bowen arrived in Paris on 17 November 1922. Proust died the next day, on which Ford had been scheduled to meet him. Ford was inspired, although in not wishing his own work to be influenced he was yet to read Proust.⁴¹ He later claimed, however, 'an extremely vivid sense of [Proust's] personality and of his activities'. Revealingly, Ford describes Proust in *It Was the Nightingale* as 'the Unknown Soldier of the literature of that decade'.⁴² The Unknown Soldier symbolically represents all losses by ceremonially entombing unidentified soldiers killed in action, but here Ford implicitly worries about the enduring status of literary figures. Unknown to contemporary readers, he also drew the analogy with himself: the wartime essays are signed Miles Ignotus. From the very conception of the novel series on which his reputation has come to rest, it was deeply enmeshed in ideas about time and consciousness.

The *Parade's End* novels use an adapted saga form, which was popular in Britain in the early decades of the twentieth century due to the success of John Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga* (1906-22). Ford did not relish the comparison.⁴³ C. K. Scott Moncrieff also began to bring Proust to an Anglophone public in 1922. The form allowed an extended, nuanced engagement with the conflict at a time when no clear narrative had been established. Ford's literary eminence allows him to criticise conduct during the conflict in a manner unavailable to most at this stage; like other early writers to react against the conflict such as C. E. Montague, the literary form softens, or even obscures, the message. That difficulty is emphasised by the fact that Christopher Tietjens is determinedly out of time: he tells his godfather General Campion, later also his commanding officer, that he has 'no politics that did not disappear in the eighteenth century'.⁴⁴ The habit of experiencing the present through the past is, for Sascha Bru, a mode that was dominant several centuries earlier.⁴⁵ Paul K. Saint-Amour believes that the series 'imaginatively revives a member of the eighteenth-century squirearchy', asking: 'Who better to annotate the strange death of Liberal England than the extinct old-school Tory, an ethnographer from that other country, the past?'⁴⁶ While Tietjens is an obscure type, I do not see him as an entirely extinct one: social change is never as far ahead as modernist literature would have us believe. Tietjens is a residual type, to borrow from Raymond Williams,⁴⁷ but he embodies a number of sets of values still in circulation, if not often held by the same person.

Tietjens's untimeliness is mostly laudable, particularly compared to the very modern Sylvia, whose cruelty resounds through the tetralogy, and the oleaginous Macmaster, a proto-Eichmann whose belief in obeying orders enables him to ascend the greasy pole.

1912

The first novel of the tetralogy, *Some Do Not...* (1924) opens in the summer of 1912: Randall Stevenson identifies the tetralogy as one of a number of modernist novels of the 1920s that has the 'inclination to look back over the war's "pile of debris" toward the sunnier landscape of a preceding belle époque'.⁴⁸ The series starts with Tietjens and Macmaster on the train to play golf at Rye with other dignitaries, pointing to the importance of time in the tetralogy and evoking the temporal developments of the preceding century. The opening paragraph reads:

The two young men—they were of the English public official class—sat in the perfectly appointed railway carriage. The leather straps to the windows were of virgin newness; the mirrors beneath the new luggage racks immaculate as if they had reflected very little; the bulging upholstery in its luxuriant, regulated curves was scarlet and yellow in an intricate, minute dragon pattern, the design of a geometrician in Cologne. The compartment smelt faintly, hygienically of admirable varnish; the train ran as smoothly—Tietjens remembered thinking—as British gilt-edged securities. It travelled fast; yet had it swayed or jolted over the rail joints, except at the curve before Tonbridge or over the points at Ashford where these eccentricities are expected and allowed for. Macmaster, Tietjens felt certain, would have written to the company. Perhaps he would even have written to the *Times*.⁴⁹

The train represents the best of Britain in its luxury and speed, a symbol of timeliness and connectedness. The untouched newness, clarity and hygiene highlight that this is the apogee of modernity. However, the German-designed fiery upholstery points to conflict even in its luxury, and the unacceptable deviations portend the forthcoming jolt to the nation. These less desirable aspects foreshadow Tietjens's later experience in divisional transport during the War. The train, like Britain, is profoundly class-bound. 'Their class', the second paragraph begins, 'administered the world'.⁵⁰ The certainty of this statement is quickly unpicked: when we shift from Tietjens's mind to Macmaster's it becomes apparent they are not of the same class. Macmaster is acutely conscious of his own position:

Macmaster congratulated himself again on his appearance. It was all very well for Tietjens to look like a sweep; he was of these people. He,

Macmaster, wasn't. He had, if anything, to be an authority, and authorities wear gold tie-rings and broadcloth. [...] Tietjens only caught the Rye train by running alongside it, pitching his enormous kit-bag through the carriage window and swinging on the footboard. Macmaster reflected that if he had done that half the station would have been yelling, "Stand away there."⁵¹

The relationship between class and timeliness is represented by bureaucratic regulation. Macmaster, the obedient modern administrator, is always timely in the novel. Tietjens's high social status allows him to transgress and frees him from regulation in thought and deed. Macmaster's very name points to his subservience: the son of a master, although his Scottishness obscures his class status, and enables him to achieve preferment. When a Tietjens, however, decides to be timely Mark rises to become the 'Indispensible Official': the ingrained privilege of social status established through time still holds sway. Ford had already written before the war in *The Critical Attitude* (1911) about 'The Passing of the Great Figure', and this Tietjens certainly represents a Great Man whose age is ending.⁵²

Beginnings: 4 August 1914

4 August quickly became an iconic date for Ford, and he writes out his response to the war in articles for the *Outlook* that month.⁵³ In the second part of Ford's *The Good Soldier* (1915) 4 August becomes a conduit for calamity, the day on which Florence Dowell is born, sets out to travel, marries, commits adultery twice, and commits suicide. Julian Preece and Ambrose Gordon jr. differ on whether or not, respectively, the significance of the date was decided before or after war; the former seems highly unlikely.⁵⁴ It is also a key point of separation, departure or change in the unpublished epilogue to 'Women and Men' (1918), and *The Marsden Case* (1923).⁵⁵ In his reminiscences *Thus to Revisit* (1921), which mostly avoid the war, he explicitly links the writing of history with the outbreak of war: 'Facts are of no importance, and dwelling on facts leads at best to death—at worst to barbarism. In the truest sense, it was [historian of Rome, Theodor] Mommsen's accumulations that caused what occurred near Gemmenich at six o'clock on the morning of 4th August, 1914....'⁵⁶ In his memoir *Return to Yesterday* (1930) he lingers on the pre-war season of 1914, and claims in his late cultural study *Provence: From Minstrels to the Machine* (1935) that 'Christianity as a faith died a few days after the 4th of August, 1914'.⁵⁷ Ford's impressionistic sense of history means that he continues to seek key dates onto which to inscribe events, to stand symbolically for the chaos of events between and around them.

In *Parade's End* the immediate significance of 4 August is personal. That initial moment of national pride and trauma is for Tietjens a moment of extreme social tension, which stands for the complex negotiated treaty position that leads to the beginning of the War.⁵⁸ His willingness to discomfit himself on behalf of others is unpicked as a result of his shell shock. Tietjens provides social propriety by chaperoning Mrs Duchemin, soon to be Mrs Macmaster, away from a potentially compromising situation. Sylvia identifies her, in the midst of a harangue about the nature of his mental illness: 'the woman you travelled down from Bishop Auckland with. On the day war was declared. [...] Is she your mistress, or only Macmaster's, or the mistress of both of you?'⁵⁹ The example points outward, from the personal conflict not his own that Tietjens is working to avert, to the global one that he is powerless to affect. It also highlights the continuation of the domestic in the face of national conflict; life carries on until war is meaningfully, physically proximate. Tietjens's saving of Macmaster's reputation at the expense of his own is recalled as he suffers from trauma incurred while a soldier, saving the country at his own expense.

Ford was conscious from the outbreak of war that he was experiencing an historic event, and in the tetralogy he situates the events in terms of a long historical narrative. Favret posits that 'wartime [...] has trouble measuring its distance from other times of war: it produces a history of the present always permeable to other presents, other wartimes.'⁶⁰ In his prefatory letter to *No More Parades* (1925), the second volume of the tetralogy, Ford writes: 'All novels are historical, but all novels do not deal with such events as get on to the pages of history.'⁶¹ The novel makes it clear that this is a new type of war. Ford gives a sympathetic hearing to General Campion, a Regular Army man, in the context of the front line. We see his knowledge of military history and sympathy for his men as he prepares to send Tietjens to the front line. He sees this war in terms of 'The whole of military history [...] from the campaigns of Xerxes and operations during the wars of the Greeks and Romans, to the campaigns of Marlborough and Napoleon and the Prussian operations of 1866 and 1870'. In support of the appointment of a single command, he claims that 'Modern developments in arms had made no shade at all of difference to strategy and had made differences merely of time and numbers to tactics.'⁶² He asserts the value of expertise in ending attritional warfare, and shows his own foresight: the single command was put in place after the German offensives of spring 1918. Conscious of the greater likelihood of becoming one of those numbers, Tietjens cannot see it from Campion's point of view: 'He cast back along his military history: what had his mind done in similar moments before? ... But there had never been a similar moment!'⁶³ Formerly blessed with

encyclopedic knowledge of history, he can only see things in terms of his immediate environment. Implicitly, the novelty of the moment refers not only to his military history, but the whole of it. While Campion's point that structural similarities remain is true, for those whose bodies were at risk the physical experience was radically different.

Shell shock and wartime

Shell shock is the paradigmatic example of the impact of modern war on the individual. A new diagnosis in that decade, the term first circulated in the Balkans conflicts of 1912-13, but was not theorised in print until Charles S. Myers's 1915 article in the *Lancet*.⁶⁴ Melba Cuddy-Keane, Alexandra Peat and Adam Hammond state that shock was a key word in the early twentieth century with a wide range of meaning (these shocks recall the search for epochal dates), of which shell shock was the 'most significant modernist variant'.⁶⁵ Kent Puckett and Ruben Borg concur: 'To be a modernist is to be intensely aware of (one's place in) tradition; and at the same time, to experience this as crisis. A sense of being at history's end cleaves the present whereupon, in the combination of anarchic time and total memory, historical identity is simultaneously preserved and destroyed.'⁶⁶ Favret goes so far as to say that 'wartime is often the experience of an undoing or damaging of rational sense'.⁶⁷ There is pathos in the attempt of John Dowell, the unreliable narrator of Ford's *The Good Soldier* to plan for a 'shock-proof world'.⁶⁸ Shell shock is a disturbance of time in the form of traumatic memory. This is enacted in Ford's memoirs: *Return to Yesterday* ends with the outbreak of war, while the later *It Was the Nightingale* begins with Ford's demobilization. For Rob Hawkes, 'the war writings of Ford [...] continue to depend upon – and, indeed, thematise – whilst persistently undermining the shaping and structuring forces of character and plot.'⁶⁹ The memoirs are largely chronological, but the war intrudes periodically on the latter volume, reappearing in the form of memories triggered by later events and destabilising the narrative structure.⁷⁰

As a result of Tietjens's shell shock, he goes from literally correcting the encyclopedia to being unable to remember. Sylvia's belief that shell shock is a ruse to get out of fighting emphasises the experiential gap between civilian and combatant.⁷¹ For Tietjens it is all too real. The gory death in his arms of one of his troops causes his illness:

What about the accursed obsession of O Nine Morgan that intermittently jumped on him? [...] And all the time a dreadful depression! A weight! [...] It was getting to be a serious matter! It might mean that there was a crack in his, Tietjens' brain. A lesion! If that was to go on ... O Nine Morgan, dirty as he always was, and with

the mystified eyes of the subject races on his face, rising up before his horse's off-shoulder! But alive, not with half his head cut away....⁷²

The self-questioning, the insistent exclamation, and the tortured ellipses, in addition to the brutality of the image itself, register shock formally. The experience of the event as a crack in his brain demonstrates the sense of rupture; Valentine Wannop later describes the Armistice memorably as 'this crack across the table of history'.⁷³ In 'War and the Mind', written around the same time that this scene in the novel is set, Ford writes: 'an invisible barrier in my brain seems to lie between the profession of Arms and the mind that puts things into words. And I ask myself: why? And I ask myself: why?'⁷⁴ That repeated question is a barrier, the traumatic event causing the absence of appropriate language. Ford represents this in terms of Tietjens's amnesia, which Hawkes argues damages his narrative authority.⁷⁵ Not only must he replenish his knowledge by reading the encyclopedia he once corrected from memory, but the specific example is telling. Tietjens has been left a telephone message by Mrs Wannop, Valentine's mother and an impoverished genius writer, who cannot remember a crucial piece of information for her article on war babies. Neither can Tietjens:

"Met ... Met ... It's Met ..." He wiped his brow with a table-napkin, looked at it with a start, threw it on the floor and pulled out a handkerchief.... He muttered: "Mett ... Metter ...". His face illuminated itself like the face of a child listening at a shell.

Sylvia screamed with a passion of hatred:

"For God's sake say *Metternich* ... you're driving me mad!"

When she looked at him again his face had cleared and he was walking quickly to the telephone in the corner of the room. [...]

"Mrs. Wannop? Oh! My wife has just reminded me that Metternich was the evil genius of the Congress of Vienna...." He said: "Yes! Yes!" and listened. After a time he said: "Oh, you could put it stronger than that. You could put it that the Tory determination to ruin Napoleon at all costs was one of those pieces of party imbecility that, etc.... Yes; Castlereagh. And of course Wellington...."⁷⁶

The physical and mental impact on Tietjens remains evident in the halting, literally fevered attempt to remember. The allusion to the Congress of Vienna, the peace conference at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, directly points out the self-serving strategy of its chair; Castlereagh and Wellington were the British representatives. For a contemporary audience it also could not fail to evoke the Treaty of Versailles. Indeed, Zerubavel uses this as a particular example of historical continuity: 'Incorporating the "lessons" of the 1815 Congress of Vienna was an integral part of drafting the 1919 Treaty of Versailles.'⁷⁷ In demonstrating the unstable nature

of temporality in wartime, Tietjens enacts the difficulty of connecting with the lessons of history.

The immediacy of wartime is emphasised by its lurching between stasis and mortal danger. The war seems simultaneously interminable, equated with the Hundred Years War,⁷⁸ and beyond experiencing as anything other than a succession of present moments. Tietjens describes:

the process of the eternal waiting that is War. You hung about and you hung about, and you kicked your heels and you kicked your heels: waiting for Mills bombs to come, or for jam, or for generals, or for the tanks, or transport, or the clearance of the road ahead. You waited in offices under the eyes of somnolent orderlies, under fire on the banks of canals, you waited in hotels, dug-outs, tin sheds, ruined houses. There will be no man who survives of His Majesty's Armed Forces that shall not remember those eternal hours when Time itself stayed still as the true image of bloody War! ...⁷⁹

The repetition and insistent listing emphasise the paradoxical pervasiveness of waiting: Time itself, personified, is unmoving, despite the fact that waiting presupposes time's movement. Implicit in waiting for danger is the anticipation of death, a key factor in imagining a future beyond the war. Combatants in the novel can only envisage the very immediate future or an indeterminate past. Future time, for all the army's need for precision, seems both imminent and arbitrary: 'every ten minutes', Tietjens complains, 'you had two hours of lights out for an air-raid'; General Campion tells Levin to give Tietjens ten minutes, while Levin is later himself dismissed for ten minutes; the needed Mills bombs will arrive, perhaps, in ten minutes.⁸⁰ The development of the wristwatch meant that personal time was no longer hidden in a watch pocket, but there at a glance. For Dudziak this is a key characteristic of wartime: 'During World War I, soldiers synchronized their watches before heading into combat. Yet battle became an extended present, as considerations of past and future were suspended by the violence of the moment.'⁸¹ Cedric van Dijck points to the importance of the wristwatch in compelling combatants to live by the clock, and the developing 'unspoken understanding between the Tommy and the systems in power: that time in war was the bureaucrat's business. It is evident that the wristwatch emerged out of a moment in modern history when temporality, integral to the smooth performance of the war machinery, turned into an oppressive system of control.'⁸² This led to its rejection in times of crisis: in waiting for cataclysm Tietjens no longer engages with clock time, but simply waits on his own terms: 'By now Tietjens had counted

two hundred and eighty since the big cannon had said “Pho.o.o.o.h.”⁸³ The insistent and open-ended counting highlights how lives were lived from moment to dangerous moment.

Endings: 11 November 1918

Characteristic of presentness of wartime is the inability of combatants to imagine the conflict’s end. War’s end is being planned for from its beginning, and is evoked in the titles of the second and third volumes, and the tetralogy as a whole. Tietjens observes the plans: ‘At the beginning of the war [...] I had to look in on the War Office, and in a room I found a fellow [...] devising the ceremonial for the disbanding of a Kitchener battalion. You can’t say we were not prepared in one matter at least.... Well, the end of the show was to be: the adjutant would stand the battalion at ease: the band would play *Land of Hope and Glory*, and then the adjutant would say: *There will be no more parades....*’⁸⁴ Tietjens emphasises the importance of the moment by repetition, but trails off into ellipsis: the effects of war last long beyond the point at which violence stops. The formal removal of military formalities, he implies, is a waste of time. As Sylvia comes to find Christopher on the Western Front, desirous of talking to him about what might happen after the war ends or he is killed, he is unable to talk about the end of the conflict: ‘He said that must settle itself later. The war would no doubt last a good deal longer. While it lasted there could be no question of his coming back. [...A]part from his having no intention of getting himself killed, the matter was absolutely out of his hands.’⁸⁵ The matter is, of course, out of his hands: long range and aerial weaponry meant that death could come seemingly out of nothing.

When the war does finally end, we first experience the Armistice through Valentine, who is largely absent from the war sections. The telephone, a technological embodiment of the collapsing of time and space, prevents her from celebrating with the children of her school, a garbled conversation down a crackly and unreliable line ensuing with the woman who is now Lady Macmaster (ironically misheard as Lady Blastus), but who she remembers as Edith Duchemin.⁸⁶ The new method of connecting people more easily removes Valentine from the moment of communal celebration. Her reflections on the end of the war and the changes it has wrought take her back to that initial meeting with Tietjens:

In those days they had worn broad red stripes down the outsides of their trousers, Generals. What a change! *How* significant of the times!

That had been in 1912.... Say the first of July; she could not remember exactly. Summer weather, anyhow, before haymaking or just about. [...] Say the 1/7/12.

Now it was Eleven Eleven.... What? Oh, Eighteen, of course!

Six years ago! What changes in the world! What cataclysms! What Revolutions! ... She heard all the newspapers, all the half-penny paper journalists in creation crying in chorus!⁸⁷

The end of wartime frees Valentine to return to before the conflict. She registers the subtleties that illustrate a move away from pre-war pomp and circumstance, and returns pointedly to before the harvest, the unscythed crop evoking the soldiers in Flanders fields. The intervening six years contain dramatic public and regime change, but the end of the war allows the reinstatement of the importance of individual lives and timelines. Bru, in discussing the reconfiguration of public time, points out that ‘it is because they have either the past or the future on their horizon that people experience life differently.’⁸⁸ Valentine is doing both: looking to the past in trying to reconnect the threads of her relationship with Tietjens. Where the change of states arising from the outbreak of war comes as a shock leading to the date’s iconic status, the Armistice is a tailing off that promotes reflection; the date accrued greater significance in retrospect.⁸⁹ It was not certain at the time that the Armistice would end the war.⁹⁰ It also did not, for most soldiers, mean the end of their service. Ford later wrote: ‘I remember Armistice Day very well because I was kept so busy with military duties that I was on my feet all day until I fell into bed stone sober, at 4 next morning.’⁹¹ He did, however, see his leaving the army in 1919 as a new beginning in the most dramatic terms. He begins his memoir *This Was the Nightingale* (1933) with an account of his feelings on demobilization: ‘Naked I came from my mother’s womb. On that day I was nearly as denuded of possessions.’⁹²

The war portends the end of the hegemonic power of families such as the Tietjenses. The final novel *Last Post* (1928) exhibits a dramatic shift of narrative consciousness.⁹³ The protagonist is not Christopher Tietjens, who is a ghostly and rarely seen presence in the background, but Mark, who is lying immobile in the Sussex countryside. The eldest son, he represents the hereditary, patriarchal transfer of privilege. His wife Marie Léonie tells us that:

The last word he had spoken had been whilst one of his colleagues at the Ministry had been telephoning to tell her, for Mark’s information, what the terms of the Armistice were. At the news, which she had had to give him over her shoulder, he had made some sort of remark.—He had been recovering from double pneumonia at the time.—What the

remark had been she could not exactly repeat; she was almost certain that it had been to the effect—in English—that he would never speak again. But she was aware that her own predilection was sufficient to bias her hearing.⁹⁴

Ford combines the full stop with the em dash, the two punctuation marks indicating the longest oral pause, the latter taking up the most typographical space, emphasising the quietness of Mark's final words—this is the silencing of his kind. His lack of interest in post-war leadership is evidenced by the letting of Groby, the ancestral home, to the voluble American Mrs de Bray Pape, and Christopher's relegation to sourcing English antiques to sell to that market; three of the five Tietjens siblings die in the war, the sister while a Red Cross matron, and two brothers in action at Gallipoli.⁹⁵ Ford saw the end of the conflict as a watershed, writing in *The English Novel* (1930) that 'From the beginnings of industrialism till 1918 we went on rolling round within the immense gyrations of buzzings, clicks, rattles, and bangs that is modern life under the auspices of the applied sciences; we went on contentedly spinning round like worms within madly whirring walnuts. But as a guide the great figure had gone.'⁹⁶ Four of the Tietjens siblings are dead at the end of the tetralogy, and just one is left, about to become father to a child born out of wedlock.

The end of the tetralogy offers a qualified hope. Unusually in First World War fiction, Ford sees a world beyond the war. Christopher's child by Sylvia is coming into his own and, while his paternity is never securely established, it is clear that by nature or nurture he is Christopher's son. During *Last Post* Valentine is pregnant with Christopher's child and while the pair struggle, they have also shaken off the shackles of social convention. Recovery is uncertain, and readjustment is hard. It is calamity at Groby, in the form of damage to the house and the destruction of its great tree that provokes Mark to speak his final words: "“Never thou let thy child weep for thy sharp tongue to thy goodman.... A good man! Groby Great Tree is down...” He said: “Hold my hand!””⁹⁷ Mark's counsel reflects the ongoing confusion of time. Speaking in archaic language, he relies on proverbial advice to look to the future, while the symbolic felling of the tree is counteracted by the handholding which offers comfort and points to the support Valentine receives from the Tietjens family. Valentine is fearful about the future, but her athleticism and fortitude in her own childhood points to a resilience passed through her, the child of a once-great family who has become assimilated into the bourgeoisie. The presence of the children of such well-intentioned people as Christopher and Valentine offers hope for the future.

The interwar period tends to come sharply split. The work of recovery in the 1920s; the War Books Boom of 1928-30; the rise of fascism from 1930 to the Second World War.⁹⁸ The depression made it difficult to see any potential arising from the First World War: Ford wrote in 1933 that ‘the most vigorous and alert of the young men had been killed or mangled—physically and mentally. It had been impossible for a young man sound physically and of healthy imagination not to volunteer in the years between 1914 and 1917. Those who remained and filled all the posts in 1919 were the physically unfit and the mentally frigid.’⁹⁹ He distinguishes the intelligentsia from the vigorous alert, but it is clear that only five years after *Last Post*, Ford was struggling to see even the cautious optimism he put forth in that novel. Paul Saint-Amour even argues that the interwar period was always felt as such.¹⁰⁰ While the 1920s were a period of political and social conflict in Britain, this does not necessarily portend war. War, indeed, always comes as a shock, if not a surprise. Hope for change arises from conflict, and the history of armistice celebration is yet to be written. So dramatic are the cataclysms of 1914-18 and 1939-45 that an interwar period seems inevitable. However, Rebecca Solnit puts it well: ‘Sometimes the earth closes over this moment and it has no obvious consequences; sometimes empires crumble and ideologies fall away like shackles. But you don’t know beforehand.’¹⁰¹ The end of *Parade’s End* shows fear and apprehensiveness about what will happen, but it also shows resilience and positivity. Solnit continues: ‘Together we are very powerful, and we have a seldom-told, seldom-remembered history of victories and transformations that can give us confidence that yes, we can change the world because we have many times before. You row forward looking back, and telling this history is part of helping people navigate toward the future.’¹⁰² Ford, in *Parade’s End*, offered his contemporary readership a map towards the future, looking back and forward in time to offer a set of values that might help recover from what was felt as a moment of radical historical rupture.

¹ Ford Madox Ford, *The English Novel: From the Earliest Days to the Death of Joseph Conrad* (1930; Manchester: Carcanet, 1997), pp. 6-13.

² See, for example, Peter Galison, *Einstein’s Clocks, Poincaré’s Maps: Empires of Time* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2003), p. 30; Adam Barrows, *The Cosmic Time of Empire: Modern Britain and World Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), p. 8.

³ A full contemporary account was published: *International Conference Held at Washington for the Purpose of Fixing a Prime Meridian and a Universal Day: Protocols of the Proceedings* (Washington, D.C.: Gibson, 1884).

⁴ Judah Levine, ‘The history of time and frequency from antiquity to the present day’, *The European Physical Journal H*, 41 (2016), 1-67 (p. 24). As Levine goes on to discuss in his extensive survey, which moves between the technical and the historical, this followed on from the founding of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM) in 1875 (p. 34).

⁵ AMCSU, p. 136.

⁶ On the ways in which clocks can only approximate natural rhythms see, for example, Giordano Nanni, *The Colonisation of Time: Ritual, routine and resistance in the British Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), ch. 1.

- ⁷ Charles M. Tung, 'Modernism, Time Machines, and the Defamiliarization of Time', *Configurations*, 23 (2015), 93-121 (p. 107).
- ⁸ Michael Whitworth, *Einstein's Wake: Relativity, Metaphor, and Modernist Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- ⁹ Barrows, *Cosmic Time of Empire*, p. 11; Tung, 'Modernism, Time Machines, and the Defamiliarization of Time', p. 116.
- ¹⁰ Mary Ann Gillies, 'Bergsonism, "Time Out of Mind"', *A Concise Companion to Modernism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 95-115 (p. 101).
- ¹¹ Mary Ann Gillies, *Henri Bergson and British Modernism* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), p. 28.
- ¹² Bertrand Russell, 'The Philosophy of Bergson', *The Monist*, 22 (1912), 321-47. For a full list of Hulme's writings see Appendix C, 'A Bibliography of Hulme's Writings', T.E. Hulme, *Further Speculations*, ed. by Sam Hynes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), pp. 221-4.
- ¹³ Max Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 2, p. 368. Saunders's biography is the definitive critical account of Ford's life and writing, and should be consulted on any issue or text. I have not noted this at each occasion unless I am directly engaging with Saunders's argument or quoting from him.
- ¹⁴ Arthur Mizener produced a surprising chronological account of the text, which is reproduced in Sondra Stang, *Ford Madox Ford* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1977), pp. 132-7.
- ¹⁵ Ford Madox Ford, *Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance* (London: Duckworth, 1924), p. 129.
- ¹⁶ Adam Barrows, "'The Shortcomings of Timetables': Greenwich, Modernism, and the Limits of Modernity", *Modern Fiction Studies*, 56.2 (2010), 262-89 (p. 281). A longer version of this article is in *The Cosmic Time of Empire*, ch. 4.
- ¹⁷ It cannot be coincidental that this impulse coincides with the early bureaucratisation of the university and the development of English Literature as a discipline. See Eric Hayot, 'Against Periodization: or, On Institutional Time', *New Literary History*, 42 (2011), 739-56.
- ¹⁸ See, for example, Andrew Frayn, *Writing Disenchantment: British First World War Prose, 1914-1930* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014); Daniel Pick, *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c.1848-c.1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- ¹⁹ Modris Eksteins situates pre-war artistic turmoil on the way to the First World War in *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Modern Age* (1989; New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), ch. 1.
- ²⁰ Mary L. Dudziak, *War-Time: An Idea, Its History, Its Consequences* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 3.
- ²¹ Mary A. Favret, *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Wartime* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), p. 30.
- ²² Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. 95. Chapter four, from which this quotation is taken, focuses on Historical Discontinuity.
- ²³ Rob Hawkes, *Ford Madox Ford and the Misfit Moderns* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 102.
- ²⁴ Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, p. 2.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- ²⁶ Favret, *War at a Distance*, pp. 53-68.
- ²⁷ Dudziak, *War Time*, ch. 3. Judith Butler's *Precarious Life: the Powers of Mourning and Violence* (2004) points to similar issues.
- ²⁸ Kate McLoughlin, *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 107-8. This is from Ch. 4, 'Duration', pp. 107-34.
- ²⁹ Sara Haslam, *Fragmenting Modernism: Ford Madox Ford, the Novel and the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 22.
- ³⁰ Laura Colombino, 'Ford's Literary Impressionism', in *An Introduction to Ford Madox Ford*, ed. by Ashley Chantler and Rob Hawkes (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 63-76 (p. 63). For a clear and brief account of Ford's writings on impressionism, see Rebecca Bowler, *Literary Impressionism: Vision and Memory in Dorothy Richardson, Ford Madox Ford, H.D. and May Sinclair* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 18-19, 25-7.
- ³¹ Paul Sheehan, *Modernism and the Aesthetics of Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 100.
- ³² On the workings of Masterman's propaganda unit at Wellington House, see Mark Wollaeger, *Modernism, Media, and Propaganda: British Narrative from 1900 to 1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 13-22. On Ford's propaganda in that context, see Anurag Jain, 'When Propaganda is Your Argument: Ford and First World War Propaganda', in Dennis Brown and Jenny Plastow (eds), *Ford Madox Ford and Englishness, International Ford Madox Ford Studies 5* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 163-75. A good detailed account of one of the volumes can be found in Sara Haslam, 'Making a Text the Fordian Way: *Between St Dennis and St*

George, Propaganda and the First World War', in Mary Hammond and Shafquat Towheed (eds), *Publishing in the First World War: Essays in Book History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007), pp. 202-14.

³³ For a survey of Ford's war writing, see Andrew Frayn, 'Ford and the First World War', in *An Introduction to Ford Madox Ford*, pp. 121-33.

³⁴ Ambrose Gordon jr. *The Invisible Tent: The War Novels of Ford Madox Ford* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964), p. 18.

³⁵ Ford, *War Prose*, ed. by Max Saunders (Manchester: Carcanet, 1999) pp. 36-48.

³⁶ See Saunders, 2, pp. 5-6, 8-14.

³⁷ Paul Skinner, Introduction to Ford Madox Ford, *No Enemy: A Tale of Reconstruction* (1929; Manchester: Carcanet, 2002), pp. vii-xxiii (p. vii).

³⁸ Saunders, 2, pp. 92-3.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-91.

⁴⁰ For a brisk account of their meeting at the Philosophical Society of Paris see David Scott, 'The "concept of time" and the "being of the clock": Bergson, Einstein, Heidegger, and the interrogation of the temporality of modernism', *Continental Philosophy Review*, 39 (2006), 183-213 (pp. 185-8).

⁴¹ See also John Coyle, 'Mourning and Rumour in Ford and Proust', in *Ford Madox Ford's Literary Contacts*, ed. by Paul Skinner, *International Ford Madox Ford Studies* 6 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), pp. 113-20.

⁴² Both quotations Ford Madox Ford, *It Was the Nightingale*, ed. by John Coyle (1933; Manchester: Carcanet, 2007), p. 179.

⁴³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Literary Portraits: III. Mr John Galsworthy' (1907), in *Critical Essays*, eds Max Saunders and Richard Stang (Manchester: Carcanet, 2002), p. 34. See also 'Literary Portraits: VI. Mr John Galsworthy and The Dark Flower' (1913), *Critical Essays*, pp. 114-18; Sondra J. Stang, *Ford Madox Ford*, p. 96.

⁴⁴ NMP, p. 235; see also AMCSU, p. 209. See Sara Haslam, 'From Conversation to Humiliation: *Parade's End* and the Eighteenth Century', *Ford Madox Ford's Parade's End: The First World War, Culture, and Modernity*, ed. by Ashley Chantler and Rob Hawkes, *International Ford Madox Ford Studies* 13 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014), pp. 37-52.

⁴⁵ Sascha Bru, 'Avant-Garde News: Presentist Reconfigurations of Public Time', *Modernist Cultures*, 8 (2013), 272-87 (p. 273). He goes on to make the astute point that 'Regardless of their frequent focus on myth and the past, many so-called High Modernist writers and poets kept a close watch upon time and the present moment.' (p. 278)

⁴⁶ Paul K. Saint-Amour, *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 271.

⁴⁷ Raymond Williams, 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory', *New Left Review*, I/82 (Nov-Dec 1973), 3-16.

⁴⁸ Randall Stevenson, 'Remembering the Pleasant Bits: Nostalgia and the Legacies of Modernism', *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, 43 (2010), 132-9 (p. 132).

⁴⁹ SDN, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁵² Ford Madox Ford, *The Critical Attitude* (London: Duckworth, 1911), ch. 5.

⁵³ Saunders, I, pp. 466-8. These articles are excerpted as 'Early Responses to the War' in Ford, *War Prose*, pp. 207-14.

⁵⁴ Julian Preece, 'Anglo-German Dilemmas in *The Good Soldier*, or: Europe on the Brink in 1913', in Max Saunders and Sara Haslam (eds), *Ford Madox Ford's The Good Soldier: Centenary Essays*, *International Ford Madox Ford Studies* 14 (Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2015), pp. 231-2; Gordon jr., *The Invisible Tent*, pp. 51-7.

⁵⁵ *War Prose*, p. 59; *No Enemy*, p. 13, pp. 114-30

⁵⁶ Ford Madox Ford, *Thus to Revisit: Some Reminiscences* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1921), p. 193.

⁵⁷ Ford Madox Ford, *Provence: From Minstrels to the Machine*, ed. by John Coyle (1935; Manchester: Carcanet, 2009), pp. 297-8.

⁵⁸ On Britain at the outbreak of war, see Adrian Gregory, 'British "War Enthusiasm" in 1914: a Reassessment', in Gail Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War* (Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), pp. 67-85. Jay M. Winter discusses commemoration and the call to arms in *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European cultural history* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 80.

⁵⁹ SDN, p. 195.

⁶⁰ Favret, *War at a Distance*, p. 30.

⁶¹ NMP, p. 3.

⁶² Both quotations NMP, p. 211.

⁶³ NMP, p. 223.

⁶⁴ Charles S. Myers, 'A Contribution to the Study of Shell Shock', *Lancet*, 13 February 1915, pp. 316-20.

- ⁶⁵ Melba Cuddy-Keane, Adam Hammond, Alexandra Peat, *Modernism: Keywords* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 'Shock, Shell Shock', pp. 214-22 (p. 214, p. 216). See also Nicholas Daly, *Literature, Technology, and Modernity, 1860–2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), ch. 2.
- ⁶⁶ Kent Puckett and Ruben Borg, 'Ethics of the Event: The Apocalyptic Turn in Modernism', *Partial Answers*, 9 (2011), 188-201 (p. 192).
- ⁶⁷ Favret, *War at a Distance*, p. 15.
- ⁶⁸ Ford Madox Ford, *The Good Soldier*, ed. by Martin Stannard, 2nd ed'n (1915; New York: Norton, 2012), p. 41.
- ⁶⁹ Hawkes, *Ford Madox Ford and the Misfit Moderns*, p. 102.
- ⁷⁰ See, for example, Ford, *It Was the Nightingale*, pp. 99-100, pp. 173-5.
- ⁷¹ SDN, p. 207.
- ⁷² NMP, pp. 228-9.
- ⁷³ AMCSU, p. 17.
- ⁷⁴ 'War and the Mind', *War Prose*, p. 37.
- ⁷⁵ Hawkes, *Ford Madox Ford and the Misfit Moderns*, p. 152.
- ⁷⁶ SDN, pp. 205-6.
- ⁷⁷ Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, p. 49.
- ⁷⁸ AMCSU, p. 68.
- ⁷⁹ AMCSU, pp. 92-3. (Cf. AMCSU 130, 166)
- ⁸⁰ NMP, p. 14, p. 191, p. 210; AMCSU, p. 89.
- ⁸¹ Dudziak, *War Time*, p. 3.
- ⁸² Cedric van Dijk, 'Time on the Pulse: Affective Encounters with the Wristwatch in the Literature of Modernism and the First World War', *Modernist Cultures*, 11 (2016), 161-78 (p. 166). See also Kern, p. xiii. A thorough and lavishly-illustrated account of the technical development of the wristwatch is given in Dominique Fléchon, *The Mastery of Time: A History of Timekeeping, from the Sundial to the Wristwatch: Discoveries, Inventions, and Advances in Master Watchmaking* (Paris: Flammarion, 2011), pp. 307-81.
- ⁸³ AMCSU, p. 101.
- ⁸⁴ NMP, p. 27.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 170.
- ⁸⁶ AMCSU, pp. 7-16. Ford had written before the war about the psychological effects of the phone on those unfamiliar with it in *A Call* (1910; Manchester: Carcanet, 1988). See also Philip Horne, 'Absent-Mindedness: Ford on the Phone', *Ford Madox Ford's Modernity*, ed. by Robert Hampson and Max Saunders, *International Ford Madox Ford Studies* 2 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003), pp. 17-34; Kate McLoughlin, 'Interruption Overload: Telephones in Ford Madox Ford's "4692 Padd"', *A Call and A Man Could Stand Up—*, *Journal of Modern Literature*, 36 (2013), 50-68.
- ⁸⁷ AMCSU, p. 33.
- ⁸⁸ Bru, 'Avant-Garde News', p. 273.
- ⁸⁹ Adrian Gregory, *The Silence of Memory: Armistice Day 1919–1946* (Oxford: Berg, 1994).
- ⁹⁰ Bullitt Lowry, *Armistice 1918* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1996).
- ⁹¹ Ford Madox Ford, 'Preparedness' (1927), in *War Prose*, p. 72. See Saunders, 2, pp. 54-60.
- ⁹² Ford, *It Was the Nightingale*, p. 3.
- ⁹³ On the problematic history of *Last Post* as a part of the *Parade's End* series, see Hawkes, *Ford Madox Ford and the Misfit Moderns*, pp. 141-3.
- ⁹⁴ LP, p. 26.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 86.
- ⁹⁶ Ford, *The English Novel*, p. 17.
- ⁹⁷ LP, p. 204.
- ⁹⁸ In the famous *Authors Take Sides on the Spanish Civil War* volume (London: Left Review, 1937), Ford declared himself against Franco. See Ford Madox Ford, *Critical Essays*, ed. by Max Saunders and Richard Stang (Manchester: Carcanet, 2002), p. 321.
- ⁹⁹ Ford, *It Was the Nightingale*, p. 50.
- ¹⁰⁰ Saint-Amour, *Tense Future*, pp. 33-7.
- ¹⁰¹ Rebecca Solnit, *Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities*, 3rd edn (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2016), p. xxiii.
- ¹⁰² Solnit, *Hope in the Dark*, p. xxiv.