

‘So now tell me what you think!’: Sylvia Lynd's collaborative reading and reviewing - the work of an interwar middlewoman

Article

Accepted Version

Wilson, N. (2017) ‘So now tell me what you think!’: Sylvia Lynd's collaborative reading and reviewing - the work of an interwar middlewoman. *Literature & History*. ISSN 0306-1973 (In Press) Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/73208/>

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

Publisher: Manchester University Press

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Dr Nicola Wilson, English Literature, University of Reading. N.I.wilson@reading.ac.uk

This is the Green Open Access version of this article, the author final version after peer review corrections, in my own formatting (i.e. before editing and typesetting by the publisher). Required for REF.

It has been accepted for publication as part of a special issue co-edited by Alex Peat and Claire Battershill on 'Modernism and Collaboration' for the journal *Literature and History*.

Nicola Wilson

‘So now tell me what you think!’: Sylvia Lynd's collaborative reading and reviewing and the work of an interwar middlewoman

In a chapter on ‘Rose Macaulay: And Others’ in his *Reminiscences of Affection* (1968), publisher Victor Gollancz recalls Friday night gatherings at Robert and Sylvia Lynds’. ‘There was no one you might not meet there’ he wrote, ‘we looked forward eagerly to her Friday nights: these were almost weekly events when the season was right.’¹ In the late 1920s and ’30s, Sylvia and Robert Lynd were at the centre of a literary circle in Hampstead that dominated contemporary letters. Among the ‘middlemen’ critiqued by Q. D. Leavis, and painted with the brush of the ‘professional scribbler’ according to Virginia Woolf, the Hampstead set were well-known writers and journalists, broadcasters, publishers, and reviewers.² Describing themselves as ‘Broadbrows’, in J. B. Priestley’s irreverent terms, the artists and critics associated with the Lynds represented an alternative, though intersecting, set to the contemporary ‘Bloomsberries’.³ That their work and influence has attracted less attention is, as Aaron Jaffe points out, part of a critical legacy largely interested in certain forms of modernism and the predominance of key ‘imprimaturs in scenes of reading and promotion’.⁴ The spatial hierarchy and mapping of these different literary communities has been widely followed in subsequent patterns of scholarship; most noticeably in the proclivity of writing on Bloomsbury.⁵ What happens to ideas of modernist collaboration then, if we turn the gaze of a broadly-conceived print culture towards the Lynds and the Hampstead circle in the 1930s?

Seeking to reclaim the networks around the Lynds and their home as important to, in Lawrence Rainey’s influential terms, ‘the social spaces and staging venues’ where literary modernism happened, this article focuses on Sylvia Lynd (1888-1952) as an important

interwar ‘middlewoman’.⁶ Exploring Lynd’s professional work as reviewer and judge for the Book Society (established 1928) – the first monthly book sales club in Britain, modelled on the American Book-of-the-Month Club – I set out Lynd and the judges’ reading and decision-making on manuscripts as a shared, collaborative practice. Textual critics and bibliographers have long sought to describe the making of the collaborative or socially produced text, but the role of the new book club judges of the interwar period as agents and indeed, intermediaries, in this process is not well recognised.⁷ Drawing upon publisher’s records and other archival sources, as well as Lynd’s unpublished diaries and correspondence, this article makes a case for the significance of Sylvia Lynd as a ‘professional scribbler’ in the interwar period by exploring her multiple identities and collaborative roles as judge, editor, committee woman, wife, mother, and literary hostess.

My methodology for understanding collaboration and collaborative working practices is grounded in feminist research and recoveries of early twentieth-century women’s diverse contributions to print culture, in which we know women worked variously as writers, publishers, booksellers and *salonières*. The influential work of Shari Benstock and Bonnie Kime Scott is crucial here.⁸ Also important is Cathy Clay’s careful explication and mapping of feminist networks and friendship in her *British Women Writers 1914-45* (2006).⁹ As Clay points out in a detailed study of the women at the feminist journal *Time and Tide*, both public and private, urban and rural spaces ‘are imbibed pleasurably with business in geographies of work and pleasure in which female friendship lies at the heart’.¹⁰ For Sylvia Lynd, collaboration in the guise of professional work and friendships shaped her personal, domestic, and working lives. She grew up in a world of literary sociability and domestic productivity, shaped by early memories of her mother editing an Anarchist paper, *Freedom*, and ‘arrang[ing] the lay-out with a comrade who was the printer, on the dining-room table’.¹¹ Throughout her marriage and adult life, Lynd cultivated the role of hostess by throwing

frequent parties at her home where she brought business and social networks together, confirming her professional reputation as a usefully-connected judge and valuable committee woman. Her networks were broad and expansive and not exclusively feminist, and she used her social and domestic associations, particularly her spousal relationship to the fiery, Irish, Fleet Street editor Robert Lynd, to ground her own professional networks.

The core of this article focuses on Lynd's working relationship with the novelist Hugh Walpole, chair of the Book Society and president of the Society of Bookmen. In her paid work as reader and reviewer for the Book Society, Lynd cultivated with Walpole a form of shared, sociable reading that shaped how both critics read and assessed incoming manuscripts. The gendered implications of this relationship, muddied through the complex interplay of friendships in the Book Society and the long discursive framing of women's editorial and publishing efforts as 'literary midwifery', are part of my remit.¹² Arguing that Lynd's close reading relationship with Walpole provides a model for the negotiations of collaborative decision-making and the dialogic reading practices of interwar book club judges, I explore the textual implications of their collaboration and how Lynd's work as editor/reader occasionally made a tangible, documented impact on the pre-publication history of texts. Lately there has been a rise of academic research on sociable and shared forms of reading practices in response to the popularity of mediated and celebrity book clubs.¹³ Work in the archives allows us to better theorise and understand the role of the first wave of twentieth-century book club judges as part of this long and complex history of collaborative reading and taste-making.

5 Keats Grove, Hampstead, London NW3

In March 1924, Sylvia and Robert Lynd moved with their two daughters, Sigle and Máire, to what was to be their long-term married home, the elegant Regency house of 5 Keats Grove in the leafy suburb of Hampstead, north-west London. The house was bought by Lynd's maternal grandmother, Mary Ann Dryhurst, in the 1860s, and had been lived in by various members of the Dryhurst family.¹⁴ The open fields of Hampstead Heath were within spitting distance and Keats' manor house was just across the road.¹⁵ Though not as well mapped in literary and cultural history as Bloomsbury, Paternoster Row, or Chelsea and Kensington, interwar Hampstead was a significant literary neighbourhood, known locally as a village.¹⁶ It is described in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) as 'an artistic and thoughtful little suburb of London'; its bookshop culture and literary clientele are treated more satirically in George Orwell's *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936).¹⁷ In the 1930s, Hampstead was, according to poet Geoffrey Grigson who edited the influential *New Verse* from his home next door to the Lynds, 'full of artists and writers' and 'not an expensive place to live'.¹⁸ Near to the Lynds at the bottom of Keats Grove lived A. R. Orage, former editor of *The New Age* (1907-24) and editor of *The New English Weekly* (1932-34); from 1936 the poet Louis MacNeice lived next door. Lady Margaret Rhondda (editor of *Time & Tide*) lived across the Heath in Bay Tree Lodge, Frognaal.¹⁹ J. B. Priestley lived with his wife Jane and their children a few minutes from the Lynds in Well Walk, and Hugh Walpole spent most Sundays with the Cheevers at their family home in Hampstead.²⁰ Parties and evening engagements at the Lynds were a regular occurrence.

Sylvia Lynd was born, brought up, and married in Hampstead and, excluding a short period of time spent away from London during the bombing and disruption of the First World War, she lived there most of her life.²¹ She and her husband were professional writers, well-connected in the literary world and widely-known as 'Hampstead celebrities'.²² Robert Lynd, who moved to London from Belfast in 1901, was a prolific author and powerful man of

letters, literary editor of the *Daily News* and one of the founders and weekly columnists for the *New Statesman*.²³ Sylvia worked as an author and poet and was heavily involved in the paid, professional world of books as critic, reviewer, and publisher's reader. Her first novel, *The Chorus: A Tale of Love and Folly*, was published by Constable in 1915 and she published several volumes of poetry, much inspired by birds and the countryside.²⁴ As journalist, critic, short story writer, and reviewer, she contributed from her early twenties to periodicals and newspapers including the *Nation*, *New Statesman*, *Time & Tide*, and the *Bystander*, and she promoted the work of other writers through critical introductions and editions.²⁵ She was close friends with the publishers Victor Gollancz and Norman Collins and her roots in publishing ran deep. In the early 1920s, Lynd worked as literary advisor for Macmillan's in New York, looking to place work from London that hadn't yet found an American publisher, and by 1930 she was also working as a publisher's reader for John Lane at the Bodley Head.²⁶ Her eldest daughter Sigle (known as Sheila) worked for Gollancz in the early 1930s and was involved in the origins of the Left Book Club, while her younger daughter Máire (known as B. J., 'Baby Junior') had a long career with the publisher William Heinemann.²⁷ Describing an office party at Heinemann's in November 1935, Lynd recalls a conversation about her daughters' jobs with the publisher Peter Davies: 'I said that one of my regrets at not having a larger family was that I wouldn't have the fun of placing one of them in every publisher's in London.'²⁸ The Lynds were, as a family, a literary and publishing force to be reckoned with.

Lynd was also a significant figure in the new interwar world of book clubs and literary prizes. This was an important arena for professional women writers, critics, and those working in the publishing industry between the wars, worthy of much more critical attention.²⁹ Several important book prizes were established in Britain in the aftermath of the First World War including the Hawthornden Prize (for the best work of imaginative

literature), the James Tait Black Memorial Prizes (best novel and biography), and the *Prix Femina Vie Heureuse Anglais*.³⁰ Lynd contributed to the latter, a French initiative established in the spirit of rapprochement in June 1919, whereby an English committee of 25 literary women chose three titles for a French committee to decide upon a work that should be translated for a wider audience in France.³¹ Lynd was President of the *Prix Femina Vie Heureuse Anglais* committee in 1929 and 1938-9 (and Vice President in 1935). Transcripts of committee meetings show her to be an independent and fair-minded judge, a woman who worked hard to achieve consensus but who didn't suffer fools – or last-minute changes to the list of recommendations – gladly. She was valued especially for the insight she gave the *Femina* committee into new and contemporary writing through her paid work on the Book Society. When for instance in November 1937 the question of vacancies on the *Femina* was raised, it was pointed out that 'We have only Mrs Lynd to keep us in touch with very recent books and we are inclined to miss things when Mrs Lynd is absent'.³² It is one of the twists of archiving and cultural memory-making that we can now unpick Lynd's specific contributions to the anonymised, collective decision-making of the *Prix Femina Vie Heureuse Anglais* committee thanks to preservation of detailed records of conversations that took place behind closed doors.

While the intricacies of Lynd's work as literary committee woman occurred away from the public gaze, the frequent parties she held in Keats Grove announced her professional identity, and they proved memorable enough to enter public record. 'It was as a *salonnière* that Sylvia loomed largest in what were then our too crowded and emphatic lives', Gollancz writes in his memoirs: 'She was handsome, immensely energetic, ambitious, and a trifle ruthless and domineering. [...] There was something of the grande dame about her'.³³ Lynd grew up in a world of literary parties – Yeats, H. G. Wells, Rebecca West and Katherine Mansfield were early guests during her first years of married life – and her autobiography

recalls the ‘countless parties’ at 14 Downshire Hill, her home in the early 1920s before moving to Keats Grove, where they ‘made friends with Jack Squire, Clifford Sharp, and Desmond MacCarthy of the “New Statesman”’.³⁴ Lynd was an adept organiser and gracious host – she describes in her diaries how she would ‘play Puck’ at these occasions – and her parties helped to keep her and Robert at the centre of things.³⁵ The gatherings she arranged were elaborate affairs, often involving several rounds of guests (in an early diary entry from October 1935 she records ordering from the carpenter two extra leaves for the dining room table so she can seat ten rather than eight at the initial part).³⁶ In the opening pages of the diary she began keeping on 21 October 1935, Lynd describes at great length the success of the previous night’s party:

So then the evening at last. The headache better. The usual ringing up by men to know whether they should change or not. For supper smoked salmon, clear soup, stewed chicken, mashed potatoes, apricot tarts with meringue tops. Sherry, hocks brandy. Decent. Coffee v. weak. To eat it – the Max Beerbohms, Alan Herberts, Lionel Hale, Rose Macaulay ourselves. [...] After supper the children, Sheila looking her old self again in pale blue velvet, the David Davieses, Alan Thomas, Ruth Gollancz, Bryan Guinivere & after, Victor.³⁷

They talked rather than played games at this party, she records.³⁸ Conversation ranged from modernist decoration and the affectation of William Morris’s prints and furniture, through fashion and conversational slang, to Thomas Hardy, T. S. Eliot, and modern poetry.

Recent academic work on networks and collaboration has foregrounded the role of the party as an important site in ‘intellectual work and literary productivity’.³⁹ Robert and Sylvia Lynds’ Friday night gatherings are not included in Kate McLoughlin’s edited collection on *The Modernist Party* (2013), nor has Lynd, as *salonnière*, attracted the critical attention given

to other literary hostesses of the period such as Sybil Colefax or Syrie Maugham.⁴⁰ But the conception of the party as ‘a generative site in which intellectual and literary authority is defined and disseminated and in which cultural influence and intervention takes place’ surely applies to the Friday night gatherings at 5 Keats Grove.⁴¹ That Lynd opens the first entry of the diary she began keeping in October 1935 with a 20-page description of the previous night’s party indicates that the role of hostess was important to her own self-fashioning. Though such exhaustive diary-keeping was difficult to sustain, she appears to have used sketches in the diary partly as composition for a projected autobiography.⁴²

The set described by Gollancz as the Lynds’ Friday night ‘hard core’ were writers, journalists, publishers, and critics.⁴³ Several were early broadcasters; all were significant public tastemakers. A list of the regular guests (which is itself, as Kate McLoughlin points out, constitutive of making another party) must include Sylvia’s closest female friend, the novelist Rose Macaulay (1881-1958), as well as the (comic) writers J. B. Priestley, Alan P. Herbert (1890-1971), Lionel Hale (1909-77) and caricaturist Max Beerbohm (1872-1956).⁴⁴ The Lynds’ wider circle drew in novelist Margaret Kennedy (1896-1967), poet Humbert Wolfe (1885-1940), the artist Mark Gertler (1891-1939), historical novelist Margaret Irwin (1889-1967) (Mrs David Davies), and poet and critic W. J. Turner (1889-1946). If, as Aaron Jaffe wryly notes, it is customary to relate the importance of modernist networks to the iconic presence of literary imprimaturs, we must point out the presence of James Joyce amongst this fray.⁴⁵ Joyce and Nora Barnacle, as recorded by Gollancz and Priestley in their memoirs, enjoyed their wedding lunch at the Lynds’ house after getting married at Hampstead Town Hall on 4 July, 1931.⁴⁶ A few days later, a grand party was held at 5 Keats Grove in their honour. According to Máire Gaster, the Lynds’ youngest daughter, this was ‘The high point of my mother’s literary parties [...] Sometime after midnight...we all went into the drawing-room...and then Joyce went to the piano. He sang “Phil the Fluther’s Ball” and I particularly

remember the sad and beautiful “Shule Aroon””.⁴⁷ That Gaster calls attention to Joyce in her introduction to her mother’s unpublished autobiography underlines Jaffe’s argument about the promotional use of modernist celebrities.

The collaborations between those who attended the Lynds’ parties were multiple, generative, and sprawling. Some of the elements of patronage can be traced in the biographical record: J. B. Priestley was given his first regular reviewing by Robert Lynd and met his agent, A. D. Peters, at a party at the Lynds’ house; Máire Gaster would go on to be his editor at Heinemann.⁴⁸ Journals and publications tie certain names together. Sylvia Lynd and Rose Macaulay contributed to Lady Margaret Rhondda’s *Time & Tide*; Lionel Hale and Alan P. Herbert worked for *Punch*. The more intangible fruits of intellectual companionship and sociability are recorded in dedications: Hugh Walpole’s *All Souls Night* (1933) is dedicated ‘For 2 wise women, Sylvia Lynd & Rose Macaulay’ (this is a likely reference to Robert Lynd’s pseudonym, YY (two wise) as well); J. B. Priestley’s *Open House: a Book of Essays* (1927) is dedicated to ‘Robert and Sylvia Lynd’. The title essay, ‘Open House’, surely references the ‘spirit of generous hospitality’ he found at their home.⁴⁹

The English Book Society was also firmly rooted in the Hampstead set. When Walpole was asked to form a panel of judges for the selection committee he thought immediately of the Lynds and their circle, inviting first Rose Macaulay and J. B. Priestley on board, and then penning a long letter to Sylvia (‘I am very anxious that you should join us’).⁵⁰ Writing to Frere-Reeves, a director at Heinemann and manager of the Book Society, in May 1928, Walpole declared that he hoped to ‘get names on the committee that will reassure the public, people who are not cranks nor like to drive always in the direction of a special clique’.⁵¹ To Walpole, the Lynds epitomised this sense of fair-minded, public reassurance with their eclectic parties, extensive print-based networks, and powerful reputations on Fleet Street. While the professionalism of their journalistic writing, regular reviewing, and

investment in awards and literary prizes may have been privately trying to a writer like Woolf ('There were 10 second rate writers in second rate dress clothes [...] Sylvias & Gerald's & Roberts & Roses chimed & tinkled round the table', she wrote in her diary), what united the Lynds and the Hampstead set was a wide-ranging commitment to accessibility in prose, aesthetic entertainment, and textual pleasure.⁵² In Walpole's 1928 novel *Wintersmoon*, a character worries that his incomprehension of the modern arts 'seemed to him his own stupidity'.⁵³ This was precisely the reading public that the Book Society – with its monthly selections, reviews, and recommendations – was set up to assist.

'So now tell me what you think!'

Towards the end of Walpole's novel *Vanessa* (1933), the fourth in his *Herries* series, a party takes place in Hampstead. It is the second week of May 1930, and Alfred and his companion, Abigail Hill, have thrown a family dinner party to celebrate their new 'very fine and spacious house'.⁵⁴ Here the ever-sceptical Benjie is introduced to the Book Society, a scheme modelled on the American Book-of-the-Month club and the first monthly book sales club to operate in Britain.

'I'm afraid you don't read very much, Cousin Benjie.'

'No, not very much. I never have. [...]

'Well, *Kristin Lavransdatter's* miles long. I like long books, don't you? You go on and on and on. I got this one from the Book Society.'

'What's the Book Society?'

'Oh, five writers tell you what to read.'

'Why five?'

‘Oh, I don’t know. Five’s better than one. Not so prejudiced.’⁵⁵

“‘I should have thought five times as prejudiced,’” Benjie replies. “‘Anyway what do you want anyone to tell you what to read for?’ ‘The girl’s an idiot’, thought Benjie crossly.”⁵⁶

This is a parodic and self-confident, gently mocking take by Walpole on some of the criticism the Book Society faced. The scene captures the charges often levelled at the new club, namely its model of distribution and supposed creation of a passive reader/consumer, as well as its decisions-by-committee: a model of taste-forming and literary guidance that seemingly disrupted older, more sanctified, relationships between author and reader. Q. D. Leavis’s oft-cited critique of the literary ‘middlemen’ of the interwar era – the book-reviewers, advertisers and book clubs that helped ‘the majority [to have] its mind made up for it before buying or borrowing its reading’ – relied upon the fantasy of a direct correspondence between author and reader and distrust of paid intermediaries.⁵⁷ The question of who exactly was behind the choices and recommendations of the Book Society selection committee featured prominently in the public attack on the club that raged through the editorials and letters pages of *Time & Tide* between February and March 1932. How was the Book Society financed and were judges paid for their services? How much influence did the club’s financial directors and external publishers have over the decisions of the judges on the selection committee? In a personal slight to Lynd, the leading editorial of February 13 brought the well-known networks of 5 Keats Grove directly into disrepute, questioning if Lynd’s access to certain publishers was responsible for the predominance of Gollancz and Collins titles in the Book Society’s early lists.⁵⁸ Lynd dashed off a passionate defence of the Book Society and its judges in response, questioning as she did so the nature of *Time & Tide*’s own system of reviewing.⁵⁹ The spat caused a permanent break for Lynd from some of her former *Time & Tide* colleagues.

Leavis and other critics were right to suggest that the decision-making on the Book Society was inherently collaborative and the relationships between individual reviewers, authors, and publishers important. Publishers were involved significantly (if not in the way that *Time & Tide* suggested) as the first round of decision-making was made in publishing houses: it was the publisher who decided which of their forthcoming works were most likely to be chosen by the Book Society and subsequently organised five sets of proofs for the selection committee to read in advance of publication. In-person meetings were held between the five judges each month – normally at Walpole’s Piccadilly flat – to decide upon one or more monthly choices, and to make up the list of recommended titles to be reviewed in the *Book Society News* (between twelve and fifteen texts).⁶⁰ Reading was divided between those responsible for assessing new works of fiction (Lynd, Walpole, Priestley) and non-fiction (George Gordon, Edmund Blunden), and alliances formed accordingly. Where the first readers felt a choice or recommendation was warranted, the book would be passed to the rest of the committee.⁶¹ Walpole’s initial letter of invitation to Lynd stated that the judges were to be paid £200 annually for their services.⁶² In a diary entry for 28 November 1935, Lynd records receiving a cheque from Frere-Reeves for £5.10, adding that ‘Jack Priestley always says that the money he used to get from Reeves for reviewing books, which was always paid, individually, in new pound notes, was the pleasantest money he ever received – “money for nothing”’.⁶³ According to the descriptions of work in her diaries, Lynd was a relatively organised reviewer who fitted reading for the Book Society in around domestic and familial duties while her husband worked on his articles. The well-remunerated work she did for the Book Society was important to her professional identity and clearly carried over into her wider public role as literary committee woman and tastemaker.

While most of the judges’ discussions about monthly choices took place on the telephone, during meetings, and in private discourse, there is nevertheless an extensive

correspondence between Lynd and Walpole that outlines their initial assessments, shared pleasures, and modification of opinions on the new works of fiction received by the Book Society. This correspondence, preserved between the King's School Canterbury and the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin, covers the first decade of the club's existence. Building rapidly in affection and trust and with a corresponding loss of formality, the relationship between Lynd and Walpole was aided by their literary and familial connections, their enthusiasm for reading and commenting on each others' creative work, and a shared passion for promoting new authors. Reading new writing together in a rush of proofs and monthly deadlines was an exhilarating as well as a daunting task, and the letters are full of hope for shared aesthetic experiences, the search for reading fulfilment, and eager anticipation of the others' tastes and dislikes. 'I do hope it will move you as it has me', Walpole wrote to Lynd after reading R. C. Hutchinson's *The Unforgotten Prisoner* in September 1933; 'I was charmed too by Forster's 'Dickension'. I wonder you didn't like it more'.⁶⁴

Epistolary theorists have described the nature of letter-writing as a textual form akin to conversation in which relationships are crafted and created and 'multiple selves [...] are uniquely fashioned in relation to the addressees and recipient'.⁶⁵ For Lynd and Walpole – simultaneously reading and appraising the same manuscripts while anticipating the views of each other in correspondence – their written discourse is evidence of a form of shared reading practice and community where, as DeNel Rehberg Sedo writes, a reading community 'is comprised of relationships' and 'can be conceptualized as emotional, psychological and/or social'.⁶⁶ The dialogic decision-making process traced in the letters about Book Society nominations between Lynd and Walpole is comparable to the nuanced, highly charged, and collective decisions about book selection made by today's reading groups.⁶⁷ A lively letter from Walpole to Lynd on 4 April 1933 for instance, outlines his own thoughts on that

month's manuscripts before anticipating Lynds' reading and reaction with the affirmative exclamation: 'So now tell me what you think!'.⁶⁸

The correspondence between Lynd and Walpole also reveals their alliance before the other judges in committee meetings, and the amount of networking and negotiation that occurred preceding the in-person meetings each month. As with the *Femina* transcripts, reading Lynd and Walpole's correspondence underlines the complexities of collaboration by committee, always subject to and formed by individual interactions. In June 1934 for instance, Walpole writes to Lynd: 'I must say that I think the Fleming a perfect August Choice. I knew you'd hate the Houghton. I don't. But I'll see that nothing decisive is done about it this afternoon.'⁶⁹ Similar alliances existed between other members of the Book Society selection committee, including for instance between Professor George Gordon (President of Magdalen College Oxford during much of his time on the Book Society) and Edmund Blunden (tutor at Merton).⁷⁰ Lynd – whom Walpole describes in a letter to the novelist George Blake as being 'all modern and high-brow' – acted as a cautionary restraint on Walpole's well-known ebullience, and their friendship was founded upon lively disagreement.⁷¹ Her diary entries suggest that her opinions on the Book Society carried significant weight, much as she often took the final decision in *Femina* meetings ('Alarming how they all defer to my opinion – most depreciatingly advanced').⁷² She missed the meeting in which the Book Society selection committee made one of their poorer choices in J. M. Denwood and S. Fowler Wright's *Red Ike: A Novel of Cumberland* (1931) – a local author to Walpole, whom he had publicly championed.⁷³ An apologetic letter from Walpole to Lynd duly ensued.

Walpole's portrait of Lynd as being 'all modern and high-brow' is part of his own caricature as an old-fashioned romantic (a continual theme in his diaries and letters), for Lynd's modernity was eclectic and savvy, and her loyalties to her personal networks fierce.

We know from correspondence that she fought hard for the work of her best friend, Rose Macaulay, on the Book Society selection committee, while she also insisted that they ‘mustn’t miss’ recommending more challenging works by iconic, celebrity modernists like Woolf.⁷⁴ Her published reviews for the Book Society are typically diverse, in keeping with the club’s aesthetic and affective commitments to the pleasurable and worthwhile read. Between 1936 and 1940, Lynd reviewed fiction by a variety of writers including Winifred Holtby (*South Riding*: Book Soc. Choice March 1936); Joyce Cary (*The African Witch*: Choice May 1936); Rosamond Lehmann (*The Weather in the Streets*: Choice July 1936); Stuart Cloette (*The Turning Wheels*. Choice Oct. 1937); and Mazo de la Roche (*Whiteoak Heritage*. Choice Nov. 1940). Often her reviews draw noticeable attention to literary style and skill. The keynote however is that of the Book Society’s collective commitment, as Lynd affirms in her review of Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca* (Choice, Aug. 1938), to the ‘art of story-telling’.⁷⁵ As a renowned hostess and games-maker, Lynd was well-qualified to celebrate life-affirming stories that entertained.

Lynd’s reviewing of works in proof for the Book Society was also clearly valued by the wider group of literary women whom she read and worked with for the *Prix Femina Vie Heureuse Anglais*. The *Femina* transcripts reveal some of Lynd’s reflections on, and sometimes resentment towards, Book Society choices and recommendations, as well as her sustained literary commitments. She keenly supported the careers of new and unknown women writers (something both organisations were set up to do, and the *raison d’être* of the *Femina*). In discussions between the *Femina* judges on the latter, Lynd was a firm champion of F. M. Mayor’s *The Squire’s Daughter* (1929); Stella Benson’s *Tobit Transplanted* (Book Soc. Choice Feb. 1931 and winner of the *Femina* for 1930-31); Kate O’Brien’s *Without my Cloak* (Book Soc. Choice Dec. 1931); and the early works of Rosamond Lehmann, Margaret Irwin, and Hilda Vaughan.⁷⁶ She was less enamoured of the more politically engaged, so-

called proletarian writing of the 1930s – seeing off support for Walter Greenwood’s bestselling *Love on the Dole* (1933) and Ralph Bates’ *Lean Men* (1934), for example.⁷⁷ The textual implications of her aesthetic tastes can be seen in more detail by uncovering the explicit editorial suggestions she made to authors and publishers as judge for the Book Society.

‘Don’t know what upset Sylvia’⁷⁸

Academic work in modernist print cultures has long focussed on the role of editors and publishers as textual collaborators. George Bornstein wrote in an early example: ‘Any text is an edited text, [...] A full textual inquiry will necessarily remind us of the many social and historical forces besides the author that contribute to the constitution of a text.’⁷⁹ Currently there is increased interest in the wide variety of players involved in textual production, particularly in literary censorship. In David Bradshaw and Rachel Potter’s edited *Prudes on the Prowl* (2013) for instance, the ‘prowling prudes’ involved in the production of the literary object is extended to include printers, librarians, customs officers, postmen and journalists.⁸⁰ The editorial impact of the interwar book-of-the-month clubs who were reading new works in proof form, pre-publication (unlike the judges of literary prizes like the *Femina* or cheap reprint series including the Book Guild or Foyle’s Book Club) is however not well known. This is hardly surprising. The book of the month club selection committees on both sides of the Atlantic styled themselves as reviewers and tastemakers, not editors nor censors. A letter in the American Book-of-the-Month Club (BOMC) archives regarding John Steinbeck’s agreement to ‘clean up’ some of the judges’ suggestions for ‘toning down’ the ‘general overemphasis of sex’ in *The Wayward Bus* (BOMC March 1947) makes this clear. Writing to long-standing BOMC judge, Dorothy Canfield Fisher in December 1946, Meredith Wood explained:

I also had an explicit understanding with Guinzberg that he would make it unmistakably clear to Steinbeck that (1) the book had been chosen unconditionally by our Judges, and (2) the suggestions for deletion were presented merely as illustrations [...]. The point of this was to make sure that there can be no subsequent charge by Steinbeck or Viking Press that the club is engaged in censorship.⁸¹

Unsurprisingly, it is largely in the archives and surviving letters between the judges of the new book of the month clubs that this form of textual collaboration and intervention can be found.

We know from Lynd and Walpole's early correspondence that Lynd was mindful of what she perceived to be the conservative literary standards of the Book Society's subscribers and that she (much like Dorothy Canfield Fisher in the States) was a cautious book club judge. Reining in Walpole's initial enthusiasm for Joan Lowell's *The Cradle of the Deep* (1929) as first Book Society Choice, for example, Lynd spoke in favour of Helen Beauclerk's whimsical *The Love of the Foolish Angel* (Book Soc. Choice April 1929), declaring that Lowell would shock their subscribers and that the author 'of *The Cradle* is a victim of the Ethel M. Dell complex. That's why I particularly shudder at her'.⁸² Recording in her diary a conversation between the judges about literary censorship and Julian Huxley's amusing retelling of the obscenity trial at which he gave evidence in support of Edward Charles's *The Sexual Impulse* (1935), Lynd notes the committees' general concurrence with Huxley's views.⁸³ After discussion turns to the absurdity of some censored versions and the contemporary publishing practice of using asterisks to indicate omissions, Lynd confides to her diary: 'All the same', I prefer asterisks, I think, like Rose's lady who when the man said he would not mince matters, said that she preferred them minced'.⁸⁴

Lynd's role as cautious censor on the selection committee was profound. Her correspondence with Walpole shows that she regularly made editorial suggestions to texts likely to be chosen by the Book Society which were then rung through to the author and publisher concerned. Lynd's suggestions ranged from minor emendations to substantial revisions, incorporating requests to modify certain characters or passages, to reorder material or revise sections of the plot. A pleading letter from Walpole on 7 April 1930, for instance, shows Lynd had to be persuaded to accept Vita Sackville-West's *The Edwardians* as Book Society Choice; a surprising reluctance given *The Edwardians* subsequent success:

I'm so glad to hear from you because I think we're in a rather a mess. I wrote to Mrs Nicholson and she replied that all the bits about Edward were now modified. I don't think we can well ask her to do more. [...] The 'Three Daughters' has been a failure and I don't think 'And Co' will be much better. Mrs Nic: is known widely through her Broadcasting and I think 'The Es' will be popular. I wouldn't dream of urging that as a reason were it not that I do think the book has much beauty and life. Also there is really no decent alternative. Do think it over now that she has modified Edward.⁸⁵

Two further examples of Lynd's propensity towards 'mincing' the texts chosen by the Book Society surface in the archives. On 6 January 1931, the publisher Jonathan Cape sent a telegram to Eric Linklater announcing that the latter's third novel, *Juan in America*, was to be Book Society Choice for March, entailing a large initial order from the Book Society of 13,000 copies.⁸⁶ All of the judges, wrote Cape, were 'unanimously of the view that it would be a good plan if you could in some way separate part one from the rest of the book, as they are afraid that the length of it may perhaps deter some readers from getting into the body of the book'.⁸⁷ As Priestley's review for the *Book Society News* was likely to address this, and as this would make useful copy on the jacket, Cape advised Linklater to make the change. This was swiftly executed, with Part 1 becoming the 'Prologue', and Linklater supplying a note for

the reader ‘to the effect that this Prologue is not really part of the book’ and might be read afterwards, with readers advised to begin, mock seriously, ‘at page 63, where the account of JUAN IN AMERICA really opens’.⁸⁸ The second editorial suggestion from the Book Society came directly from Lynd who thought ‘with all deference, that the bottom paragraph on page 76 might perhaps upset some readers.’⁸⁹ A comic exchange between author and publisher followed as to which particular passage Lynd objected to in the name of the ‘delicate mind of the General Reader’ – ‘was it a word or a thought?’ mused Linklater, ‘It’s difficult to decide which can be more shocking’ – following on from the author’s misplacing of the second set of proofs so that, as he wrote in a telegram to Cape: ‘Don’t know what upset Sylvia’.⁹⁰ The passage in question turned out to refer to the ‘Himalayan consummation’ of two yaks in Central Park, a ‘remarkable sight’ on Juan’s first day in New York that characterises the text’s comically irreverent views on sex, the absurdity of American experience, and the picaresque human condition.⁹¹ Cape suggested that the wording in the paragraph might be altered slightly and, with a first printing of twenty thousand copies promised, Linklater readily agreed.

The revisions Lynd suggested to George Blake’s *The Shipbuilders* (Book Soc. Choice March 1935) were more extensive. Blake, a journalist and editor and director of the publishers Faber and Faber, was a close friend of Walpole, so the latter was keen to make clear that the selection committee’s decision had been agreed upon *en masse*. Walpole wrote to Blake on 11 January 1935:

To show you that this is not only my loving enthusiasm, I’ll tell you a secret, – namely that after I had read the typescript, it was sent post haste to Sylvia Lynd, who hates things in typescript, is all modern and high-brow, and is sharply Irish against Scotch. She sent the next day a message to the Book Society saying that this was first class work and an inevitable choice for any month of the year.⁹²

Lynd felt compelled nevertheless to make some revisions. Blake confided to Walpole that he had received ‘a deliciously Sylvia letter! Wants some things out or cut out, notably the literary party.’⁹³ She also suggested changes to the language of the Glaswegian working-class characters in the novel to which Blake offered a conciliatory reply:

These people do speak a foul idiom, and I suppose I just slipped into it. No desire on my part, I assure you, to be the shocking young man; in fact, I’m really with you when ugly words stick out and I’ll gladly abate much of the luridness – though I’ll have to let some get through in the football and pub scenes.⁹⁴

The concessions to language and idiom here are revealing. *The Shipbuilders* was an unusual choice for the Book Society for it was not just ‘scotch’, as Walpole pointed out, but engaged directly, if in a largely paternalistic and conservative way, with the contemporary depression and crisis of mass unemployment. The Book Society selection committee, whose lists of the 1930s remained dominated by historical fiction, eschewed the more topical, proletarian writing of the period, and we know from the *Femina* transcripts that Lynd was reluctant to embrace such work. In the debate on whether the *Femina* should consider adding Walter Greenwood’s *Love on the Dole* to the lists of recommendations, for example, Lynd put aside her friend Rebecca West’s pleading for a book that wasn’t to her personal tastes.⁹⁵ Reading George Blake’s *The Shipbuilders* in typescript for the Book Society, however, gave Lynd the chance to shape the text’s published form and to reduce its linguistic ‘luridness’. Direct evidence of editorial revisions prompted by book club judges are rarely preserved in publisher’s or other archives but they provide important, revealing intimations of how the range of titles chosen by the Book Society may have undergone some form of pre-publication revision in response to the suggestions of the selection committee and its judges.⁹⁶ The implications of shared reading practices between professional reviewers and the correspondence between cultural authorities that might influence the publication history of a

text are a fascinating addition to our understandings of literary texts as socially produced, mediated cultural forms.

This article has mapped some of the multiple levels of collaborations in the book worlds of Sylvia Lynd and 5 Keats Grove in the early 1930s. Like many other writers in the modernist period, Lynd played numerous roles in what Robert Darnton once described as the ‘communications circuit’: as reviewer and distributor, as critic and editor, as book club judge, publisher’s reader, and literary prize-giver. That she is now best known for her parties as a ‘Hampstead celebrity’ demonstrates the continued need for the recovery of the work of women writers and critics in publishing houses, book clubs, and literary committee meetings across the early twentieth century. The point here is not to re-canonise the work of Sylvia Lynd (though this is tempting, particularly now her diaries and autobiographical writings are in the public domain) but to explore her wide-ranging contributions to print culture and the variety of personal and professional roles she undertook in terms of promotion, networking, and the formation of literary taste. Reclaiming this work allows us to appreciate better the middlemen and middlewomen of literary modernism and their effects upon texts, readers, and the circulation and cultures of print.

Author’s note. I would like to thank Alex Peat and Claire Battershill for their insightful comments on an earlier draft of this essay, and Sarah LeFanu, Andrew Nash, and Guy Baxter for enabling further archival research on Sylvia Lynd. For permission to quote from materials held in the archives of British Publishing and Printing at the University of Reading I thank Penguin Random House UK.

- ¹ V. Gollancz, *Reminiscences of Affection* (London: Gollancz, 1968), p. 86.
- ² Q. D. Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public* (1932; London: Chatto & Windus, 1965), p. 31. Virginia Woolf makes this private remark in her diaries about Máire (B. J.) Lynd, Sylvia's youngest daughter. V. Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf. Vol. 4 1931-35*, ed. A. O. Bell (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), 30 October 1935, p. 349.
- ³ J. B. Priestley, 'High, Low, Broad', *Saturday Review*, 20 February 1926, 222; reprinted in *Open House: A Book of Essays* (London: Heinemann, 1930), p. 162. The coining of the term 'Bloomsberies' is associated with Molly MacCarthy. See 'Clive Bell: Bloomsbury' in S. P. Rosenbaum (ed.), *The Bloomsbury Group. A Collection of Memoirs and Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), pp. 114-23 (p. 117).
- ⁴ A. Jaffe, *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), p. 17.
- ⁵ For a recent project that offers a broader historical chronology of the importance of Bloomsbury see the AHRC-funded 'UCL Bloomsbury Project' <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/bloomsbury-project/>. On the increasing scholarship on 'Global Bloomsbury' see for instance *Leonard & Virginia Woolf. The Hogarth Press and the Networks of Modernism*, ed. H. Southworth (Edinburgh: EUP, 2010), pp. 103-75.
- ⁶ L. Rainey, *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1998), p. 5. For feminist use of the term 'bookwomen' see T. Travis, 'The Women in Print Movement': History and Implications', *Book History*, 11 (2008), 275-300 (276).
- ⁷ For an early example see J. Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (Oxford: OUP, 1991). For a useful overview of this work, which is rooted in the scholarship of D. F. McKenzie and J. McGann, see for instance F. Hammill and M. Hussey, *Modernism's Print Cultures* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), p. 89.
- ⁸ S. Benstock, *Women of the Left Bank. Paris, 1900-1940* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986); B. Kime Scott (ed.), *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990); B. Kime Scott, *Refiguring Modernism. Vol. I, The Women of 1928* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995). See also T. Travis, 'The Women in Print Movement', for an important discussion of feminist book history.
- ⁹ C. Clay, *British Women Writers 1914-1945* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 15.
- ¹⁰ Clay, *British Women Writers*, p. 25. Lynd was an early contributor to *Time & Tide* but she is on the margins of Clay's study, mentioned only briefly.
- ¹¹ University of Reading Special Collections, Reading (hereafter UoR), Diaries and Autobiography of Sylvia Lynd, MS 5585, box 2/A2. Typescript of the first three chapters of an undated autobiography, Ch 1.
- ¹² See Benstock, pp. 20-24.
- ¹³ For an important collection see D. Rehberg Sedo (ed.), *Reading Communities from Salons to Cyberspace* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- ¹⁴ UoR, MS 5585, box 2/A2. Typescript of the first three chapters of an undated autobiography, Ch 1.
- ¹⁵ The street was renamed Keats Grove, earlier names in the nineteenth century include Albion Street and John Street.
- ¹⁶ See I. Norrie (ed.), *Writers and Hampstead. Observations on the Place and the People. 101 commentators from Domesday to Drabble* (Hampstead: High Hill Press, 1987). Clay includes a map of north west London (including Hampstead) in her *British Women Writers*, p. 21.
- ¹⁷ E. M. Forster, *Passage to India* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), p. 246. Orwell worked at Francis and Myfanwy Westrope's second-hand bookshop in South End Drive on what was known as Booklovers' Corner in Hampstead from late 1933 to late 1935. D. J. Taylor, *Orwell. The Life* (London: Vintage, 2003), pp. 147-50.

¹⁸ G. Grigson, *Recollections: Mainly of Writers and Artists* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1984) qtd in Norrie (ed.), *Writers and Hampstead*, p. 91. The present-day Hampstead set includes Kate Moss (who lives in the house once lived in by Coleridge and Priestley) and the recently deceased George Michael, who lived in the childhood home of Roger Fry. Thanks to Dennis Duncan for this information.

¹⁹ Clay speculates that Rhondda may have moved from Chelsea to the more illustrious Hampstead in 1933 partly due to the influence of the Hampstead circle, *British Women Writers*, p. 17.

²⁰ The Priestleys lived at 27 Well Walk, Hampstead, between September 1928 and February 1932 before moving across the Heath to 3 The Grove, Highgate, a four-storey house once lived in by Coleridge. See J. Cook, *Priestley* (London: Bloomsbury, 1997), p. 96, 114. Hugh Walpole was in a romantic relationship with Harold Cheever, his assistant, and was welcomed into the family by Harold's wife, Ethel, and their sons. After the Cheevers moved to Hampstead in January 1928 Walpole wrote in his diary, 'I must mark with a cross my first full day at Hampstead. Short of Brackenburn it will be my real home. I have never been in the heart of a family as I am in this one'. Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin (hereafter HRC), Hugh Walpole diaries/notebooks. 15 January 1928.

²¹ Between 1917 and 1922 the Lynds lived in St Ives, Lyme Regis, Abinger Hammer and Steyning in Sussex. See S. McMahan, *Robert Lynd. Galway of the Races. Selected Essays* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1990), p. 33.

²² Sylvia uses this term in her diary, reporting the unexpected arrival of a young artist, Miss Lind (a protégé of Thomas Sturge Moore) to make drawings of her and Robert. UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 21 October 1935, p. 4.

²³ Robert Wilson Lynd, 9 years Sylvia's senior, was born in Belfast in 1879. He moved to London in his early twenties and met Sylvia while he was in digs in 9 Gayton Road, Hampstead. They corresponded daily during Sylvia's studies at King Alfred School, the Slade, and RADA, and married in Hampstead Registry Office on 21 April 1909. See S. McMahan, *Robert Lynd*, pp. 25-8. Robert Lynd is named representative of the 'newspaper crocus' and art of the journalist in Virginia Woolf's 1924 essay, 'The Patron and the Crocus'. V. Woolf, *The Common Reader. Volume 1*, ed. A. McNeillie (London: Vintage, 2003), p. 208.

²⁴ I am not aware of existing bibliographic work on Lynd. Her *Collected Poems of Sylvia Lynd* (London: Macmillan, 1945) lists the following works: *The Thrush and the Jay: A Miscellany of Verse and Prose* (London: Constable, 1916); *The Goldfinches* (London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1920); *The Swallowdive: A Novel* ([n.d.]); *The Mulberry Bush, and other stories* (London: Macmillan, 1925); *The Yellow Placard: Poems* (London: Gollancz, 1931); *The Enemies: Poems* (London: Dent, 1934); *English Children: A Very Short History* (London: Collins, 1942).

²⁵ See for instance S. Lynd, 'Introduction' to T. Hardy, *The Return of the Native* (London: Macmillan, 1935), pp. vii-xix; S. Lynd (ed.), *The Christmas Omnibus* (London: Gollancz, 1932).

²⁶ There are letters from Lynd to the Hogarth Press in 1924 describing her work for Macmillan's in New York, and some of her reader's reports from 1930 for John Lane have been preserved. It is likely that she worked for other publishing firms in addition. UoR, Hogarth Press, MS 2750/277. S. Lynd to L. Woolf, 4 August 1924; UoR, John Lane Papers, JLRR 1/01/45.

²⁷ Sheila's involvement with Gollancz is discussed in R. D. Edwards, *Victor Gollancz. A Biography* (London: Gollancz, 1987), pp. 199-200, 232, 302-4.

²⁸ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 1 November 1935.

²⁹ On a new class of professional (middle-class) women workers in Britain between the wars in the context of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919, see for instance C. Clay, “‘WHAT WE MIGHT EXPECT-If the Highbrow Weeklies Advertized like the Patent Foods’”: *Time and Tide*, Advertising, and the “Battle of the Brows”, *Modernist Cultures*, 6:1 (2011), 60-95; A. Staveley, ‘Marketing Virginia Woolf: Women, War, and Public Relations in Three Guineas’, *Book History*, 12 (2009), 295-339; S. Lonsdale, *The Journalist in British Fiction and Film. Guarding the Guardians from 1900 to the Present* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), pp. 188-202.

³⁰ C. E. Murray, *Famous Literary Prizes* (Jamaica, N.Y.: Queen’s Borough Public Library, 1934).

³¹ A French committee of literary women did likewise for the English committee. This prize for the best work of French letters was awarded as the Northcliffe Prize. See Murray, pp. 25, 7-8, 10-11. The *Prix Femina Vie Heureuse* for the best work of imagination in the French language was established in France in 1904.

³² Cambridge University Library, Femina Vie Heureuse Prize, English Committee (hereafter Cambridge, Femina), MS8900, box 1, 1/2/45. Minutes, 17 November 1937.

³³ Gollancz, *Reminiscences*, pp. 85-6.

³⁴ UoR, MS 5585, box 2/A1 (1 of 4). Sylvia relates Robert’s alcoholism, a difficult theme explored throughout her diaries and autobiographical writings, explicitly here and elsewhere to his alliance with the *New Statesman* in 1924.

³⁵ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 21 October 1935, p. 19.

³⁶ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 23 October 1935.

³⁷ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 21 October 1935, p. 5.

³⁸ Gollancz discusses some of the games played at the Lynds, *Reminiscences*, pp. 87-9. On game-playing and literary hostesses of the period see also F. Hammill, ‘Noel Coward, Rebecca West, and the Modernist Scene’, *Modernist Cultures*, 11:3 (2016), 351-69, 358-9.

³⁹ J. Winning, “‘Ezra through the open door’”: The Parties of Natalie Barney, Adrienne Monnier and Sylvia Beach as Lesbian Modernist Cultural Production’, in K. McLoughlin (ed.), *The Modernist Party* (Edinburgh: EUP, 2013), pp. 127-46 (p. 127).

⁴⁰ See for instance P. C. Metcalf, *Syrie Maugham: Staging Glamourous Interiors* (NY: Acanthus Press, 2010); and K. McLeod, *A Passion for Friendship: Sybil Colefax and her Circle* (London: Michael Joseph, 1991). Hammill, ‘Noel Coward, Rebecca West’ offers an excellent precis of the role of London and New York’s interwar hostesses.

⁴¹ Winning, “‘Ezra through the open door’”, p. 128.

⁴² This long diary entry from 21 October 1935 is also included in typescript among Lynd’s autobiographical papers, with ‘Intro’ written in pen at the top. UoR, MS 5585, box 2. MS 5585/A1 (4 of 4). The textual and editorial history of Lynd’s autobiographical writings is complex as Lynd continuously recast the material. Her daughter, Máire Gaster, made further editorial changes when she inherited them as she sought to prepare her mother’s autobiography for publication. I am grateful to Sarah LeFanu for alerting me to the preservation of these private papers, which she was able to draw on in her *Rose Macaulay: A Biography* (London: Virago, 2003). See also S. LeFanu, *Dreaming of Rose. A Biographer’s Journal* (Bristol: SilverWood, 2013). These papers have recently been acquired by the UoR and are now in the public domain.

⁴³ Gollancz, *Reminiscences*, p. 86.

⁴⁴ K. McLoughlin, ‘Introduction: A Welcome from the Host’, in K. McLoughlin (ed.), *The Modernist Party* (Edinburgh: EUP, 2013), pp. 1-24 (p. 10).

⁴⁵ Jaffe, p. 17. Jaffe discusses the promotional use of Joyce especially.

⁴⁶ Gollancz, *Reminiscences*, p. 90. Priestley writes: ‘the only time I spent an evening in his company. He was all amiability, and sang, in a pleasant light tenor, many comic songs’. J. B. Priestley, *Margin Released. A Writer’s Reminiscences and Reflections* (London: Heinemann, 1962), p. 158.

⁴⁷ See I. Norrie (ed.), *Writers and Hampstead. Observations on the Place and the People. 101 commentators from Domesday to Drabble* (Hampstead: High Hill Press, 1987), p.*.

⁴⁸ V. Brome, *J. B. Priestley* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1988), p. 95.

⁴⁹ J. B. Priestley, *Open House. A Book of Essays* (London: Heinemann, 1930), p. 194.

⁵⁰ The Hugh Walpole Collection at the King’s School Canterbury (hereafter Canterbury), Hugh Walpole (hereafter HW) to Sylvia Lynd (hereafter SL), 1 November 1928. Rose Macaulay’s involvement with the selection committee was not long-lived. She was replaced by Clemence Dane before the Book Society launched in April 1929.

⁵¹ HW to A. S. Frere, May 1928, qtd in Rupert Hart-Davis, *Hugh Walpole* (1952; Stroud: Sutton, 1997), p. 299.

⁵² The comments in Woolf’s diaries as to the ‘second rate’ Lynds, Goulds, and Macaulay - tied up with Leonard’s work for the *Nation & Athenaeum* - belie Woolf’s complex attitude to public intellectualism, professionalism, and journalism. V. Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf. Vol. 3 1925-30*, ed. A. O. Bell (London: Hogarth Press, 1980), 27 March 1926, p. 70. On the latter see for instance M. Cuddy Keane, *Virginia Woolf, the Intellectual, and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

⁵³ HW, *Wintersmoon* (London: Macmillan, 1928), p. 96.

⁵⁴ HW, *The Herries Chronicle* (London: Macmillan, 1939), p. 1463.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1466-7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1467.

⁵⁷ Leavis, p. 33. This critique can be interestingly placed alongside current work on book clubs and intermediaries and ‘reading and community as a commodified social practice’. See D. Fuller, D. Rehberg Sedo and C. Squires, ‘Marionettes and Puppeteers? The Relationship between Book Club Readers and Publishers’ in D. Rehberg Sedo (ed.), *Reading Communities from Salons to Cyberspace* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 181-99 (p. 181).

⁵⁸ Anon., ‘The Book Society’, *Time & Tide*, 13 February 1932, pp. 166-7.

⁵⁹ SL, Letter, *Time & Tide*, 27 February 1932, p. 227.

⁶⁰ Attendance of the five judges at any one time was patchy, with George Gordon (travelling from Oxford) and Clemence Dane – often away and with a burgeoning career in Hollywood – regularly absent. An editorial and publisher’s representative was also invited to meetings. In the 1930s this was at various points Alan Bott, Arthur Frere-Reeves, and Colin de la Mare. UoR, Macmillan archive 193/29. Memo by Alan Bott (confidential), ‘The Book Society: Some explanatory points’, April 1938.

⁶¹ According to the confidential memo by Alan Bott produced in April 1938 (see note 60), in some cases, office readers sent out a book clearly worthy of a choice to all judges simultaneously, without waiting for initial opinions. Records of the Book Society have been lost so we cannot trace the impact of this further layer of readers. In contrast, extensive first readers’ reports for the American Book-of-the-Month Club have survived and are available for consultation in several American research libraries.

⁶² Canterbury, HW to SL, 1 November 1928.

⁶³ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 28 November 1935.

⁶⁴ Canterbury, HW to SL, 27 September 1933; 10 March 1934.

⁶⁵ Clay, pp. 30-31, drawing on the work of M. Jolly (ed.), *Dear Laughing Motorbyke: Letters from Women Welders of the Second World War* (London: Scarlet Press, 1997).

⁶⁶ D. Rehberg Sedo, 'An Introduction to Reading Communities: Processes and Formations', in D. Rehberg Sedo (ed.), *Reading Communities from Salons to Cyberspace* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 1-24 (p. 11).

⁶⁷ E. Long discusses this process in *Book Clubs: Women and the Uses of Reading in Everyday Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 114-16.

⁶⁸ Canterbury, HW to SL, 4 April 1933.

⁶⁹ Canterbury, HW to SL, 5 June 1934.

⁷⁰ This relationship is evident in Gordon's correspondence. Magdalen College Oxford, MC:PR33 Papers of President George Stuart Gordon (P. 1928-1942).

⁷¹ HRC, Walpole, H. MS Letters. Blake, George. HW to George Blake, 11 January 1935.

⁷² UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 5 March 1937.

⁷³ Walpole provided the preface to Hutchinson's first edition. *Red Ike* was one of the choices that *Time & Tide* particularly criticised, questioning thereby the Book Society's understanding of literary merit. Anon., 'The Book Society', *Time & Tide*, 13 February 1932, p. 166-7.

⁷⁴ HRC, Walpole, H. Lynd, Sylvia (Dryhurst) MS Recip. SL to HW, 14 October 1931. On Lynd's championing of Woolf see N. Wilson, 'Virginia Woolf and the Book Society Limited', in J. Vandivere and M. Hicks (eds.), *Virginia Woolf and her Female Contemporaries* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2016), pp. *.

⁷⁵ SL, 'Rebecca', *Book Society News*, August (1938), 5-6.

⁷⁷ Cambridge, Femina. MS8900, box 1, 1/2/23 and 1/2/28. Minutes, 14 November 1933 and 14 November 1934.

⁷⁸ UoR, Cape, A27. Linklater to Howard, 9 January 1931. Telegram Linklater to Howard, 9 January 1931.

⁷⁹ G. Bornstein, 'Introduction', in G. Bornstein (ed.), *Representing Modernist Texts. Editing as Interpretation* (Ann Arbor: Uni. Michigan Press, 1991), pp. 1-16 (p. 9).

⁸⁰ D. Bradshaw and R. Potter (eds.), *Prudes on the Prowl. Fiction & Obscenity in England, 1850 to the Present Day* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), p. 4.

⁸¹ Washington, Library of Congress, Book-of-the-Month Club records 153835. Box 57. Meredith Wood to Dorothy Canfield Fisher, 3 December 1946.

⁸² HRC, Walpole, H. Lynd, Sylvia (Dryhurst) MS Recip. SL to HW, 16 March 1929. Lynd's intuition proved useful. On the controversy that *Cradle of the Deep* caused the American BOMC when the purported autobiography was declared a hoax see C. Lee, *The Hidden Public. The Story of the Book-of-the-Month Club* (New York: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 45-9.

⁸³ Julian Huxley was on the Book Society selection committee from the end of 1935 to early 1937. In 1925, on a four-figure salary as Professor of Zoology at King's College London, he bought a house in Highgate, 'conveniently close to Hampstead Heath'. J. Huxley, *Memories I* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 141.

⁸⁴ UoR, MS 5585, box 1. Diary, 30 November 1935. On asterisks and publishers' excisions see A. Nash, 'Literary Culture and Literary Publishing in Inter-War Britain: A View from Chatto and Windus,' in S. Eliot, A. Nash and I. Willison (eds.), *Literary Cultures and the Material Book* (London: British Library, 2007), pp. 323-42 (pp. 328-31).

⁸⁵ Canterbury, HW to SL, 7 April 1930.

⁸⁶ Additional orders of this scale placed by the Book Society were hugely influential in a period when average sales in hardback were between 3-5000 copies. See N. Wilson, 'Libraries, Reading Patterns and Censorship', in P. Parrinder and A. Gasiorek (eds), *The Oxford History of the Novel in English, Vol. 4. The Reinvention of the British and Irish Novel 1880-1940* (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 36-51 (p. 50).

⁸⁷ UoR, Jonathan Cape archive (hereafter Cape), A27. G. Wren Howard to Eric Linklater, 6 January 1931.

⁸⁸ UoR, Cape, A27. Howard to Linklater, 6 January 1931. E. Linklater, *Juan in America* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953), p. 13.

⁸⁹ UoR, Cape, A27. Howard to Linklater, 6 January 1931.

⁹⁰ UoR, Cape, A27. Linklater to Howard, 9 January 1931. Telegram Linklater to Howard, 9 January 1931.

⁹¹ Linklater, *Juan in America*, pp. 77, 76.

⁹² HRC, Walpole, H. MS Letters. Blake, George. HW to George Blake, 11 January 1935.

⁹³ HRC, Walpole, H. MS Recip. Blake, George. Blake to Walpole, Sunday [n.d.] [1935].

⁹⁴ Richard Ford catalogue. MS. George Blake to SL, 12 January 1935. [*]

⁹⁵ In a meeting of the *Femina* committee on 14 November 1933, Lynd decides to stick to the rules and not add any more books to the list under consideration, ignoring Rebecca West's championing of *Love on the Dole*. Cambridge, Femina. MS8900, box 1, 1/2/23. Minutes, 14 November 1933.

⁹⁶ On this point and Virginia Woolf's *Flush* (1933) see N. Wilson, 'Virginia Woolf, Hugh Walpole, the Hogarth Press, and the Book Society', *English Literary History*, 79:1 (2012), 237-60.