university of groningen

University Medical Center Groningen

University of Groningen

“Three-Dimensional” Modernism

Maher, Ashley

Published in:
Journal of Modern Literature

DOI:
10.2979/jmodelite.43.1.05

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Citation for published version (APA):
Maher, A. (2019). “Three-Dimensional” Modernism: The Language of Architecture and British Literary Periodicals. *Journal of Modern Literature*, *43*(1), 71-93. https://doi.org/10.2979/jmodelite.43.1.05

Copyright
Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the “Taverne” license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment.

Take-down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): http://www.rug.nl/research/portal. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Download date: 28-04-2025

"Three-Dimensional" Modernism: The Language of Architecture and British Literary Periodicals

Ashley Maher
University of Groningen

Although periodicals have long been vital to modernist studies, architectural journals have been widely ignored, despite the fact that authors from all major British literary groups were committed contributors. Through their efforts, writers bridged two momentous publications: London's Architectural Review, *a trade journal that became British architectural modernism's mouthpiece in the 1930s, and* Horizon, *which, as Sean Latham argues, "deliberately … staged the end of the modernist 'little magazine.'" In these journals, D.H. Lawrence, W.H. Auden, and others submitted not just fiction and poetry but also buildings and architectural publications to close reading processes, while architects proclaimed that modernist structures displayed formal difficulty akin to that of modernist poetry. By exploring architecture as a "new, three-dimensional poetry," these figures merged Le Corbusier's "a house is a machine for living in" with I.A. Richards's "a book is a machine to think with" to create a shared critical impulse in the 1930s and 1940s.*

Keywords: architecture / little magazines / *Horizon* / Cyril Connolly / John Betjeman

As far back as Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane's field-defining *Modernism*, periodicals have been central to modernist literary studies; yet architectural magazines have been absent from major accounts of early twentieth-century print cultures. I argue that the interdisciplinary *Architectural Review*—in which "modernism" was the term used to describe emergent, radically

---

Ashley Maher (a.k.maher@rug.nl) is an assistant professor at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands. Before being appointed to that position, she was the Stevenson Junior Research Fellow in English at University College, Oxford, and a lecturer at the University of Sydney. She is the author of *Reconstructing Modernism: British Literature, Modern Architecture, and the State* (forthcoming, Oxford UP).

Copyright © The Trustees of Indiana University • DOI 10.2979/jmodelite.43.1.05

new architecture—allowed an enormous range of British authors to stretch their critical vocabulary and acquire exposure for their work well beyond the literary field. The London-based *Architectural Review*, a sizable, advertisement-heavy trade journal, also reveals the outsized influence of architectural publications on literary practice, seen most dramatically in Cyril Connolly's little magazine *Horizon*, which Michael N. Stanton proclaims "without doubt the most important new literary journal of the 1940s" (31).[1]

The British scene contrasts with other European centers for modernism, in which architectural publications were focused, had short runs, and were limited in authorship to writers already in an avant-garde movement. In France, Le Corbusier founded the little magazine *L'Esprit Nouveau* with poet Paul Dermée, who had links to the Dada movement. Germany had *G: Material zur elementaren Gestaltung*, edited by Mies van der Rohe and others, which counted Hans/Jean Arp as a contributor. In Italy, the avant-garde periodical *Lacerba* published a range of Futurist manifestos, including Antonio Sant'Elia's "Futurist Architecture." By contrast, the 1930s *Review* was founded in the nineteenth century and was less dogmatic than its European counterparts. It featured architects from several nations, reprinted work by writers across Europe, and invited a wide range of literary figures to submit architectural criticism, including some not typically considered modernists.

Architecture and design had in fact established the faultlines of British literary modernism from the beginning, when Wyndham Lewis severed ties with Bloomsbury after quarreling with Roger Fry over the Ideal Home Exhibition.[2] While Jed Esty has located a "shifting emphasis from aesthetic to cultural totality" in the late work of modernist authors (51), modernism's integration into national culture came even earlier through architecture, as the Ideal Home dispute reveals. Pledging to replace the physical structures that undergirded British social structures, modernist architects and planners offered new models for living; utopian rhetoric distinguished the British movement.[3] Lewis endorsed this public modernism by turning to the Egoist Press, an arm of the little magazine, to launch his 1919 manifesto, *The Caliph's Design*. Lewis declared that modernist revolution might spread through a "fertilising" architecture that provides "a new form-content for our everyday vision" (33-4): architecture molds the environment for literary modernists' reception and expands their audience to the entire public. Yet, E.M. Forster adapted the concept of autonomy to implicate architects and allied writers: "[F]rom the poet-writer's standpoint," Forster wrote in *Horizon*, "all this prevalent talk about a New Order is sheer waste of time" (379); order can come only through divine order or through "aesthetic order—the order that an artist can create in his own work" (381). As I explore elsewhere, debates over the compatibility of aesthetic and political order—and of literary and architectural modernism—led many to use criticism, poetry, and fiction to rebuke collectivist architecture from the 1920s onwards.[4]

This contested entwinement of literary and architectural modernism challenges us to reevaluate what makes a magazine "modernist." The *Review* became

a mouthpiece for architectural modernism after Hubert de Cronin Hastings assumed control in 1927 and made poet John Betjeman assistant editor in 1929. That transformation was vital to the British modern movement, because architects and publishers in this period characterized the movement as a *print* phenomenon. While modernist buildings emerged slowly, this new way of theorizing architecture gained momentum in books and journals, and Hastings's trade journal was the movement's leading publication. There, authors including Lewis and D.H. Lawrence refined their understanding of literary modernism with and against architectural modernism, and the journal rehoused international modernist writing by publishing excerpts from the likes of Radclyffe Hall, Marcel Proust, and Paul Valéry. Under Betjeman's influence, late modernist authors, including W.H. Auden and Cyril Connolly, submitted criticism to the journal early in their careers, and they later became core contributors to Connolly's *Horizon*. To match the *Review*'s literary features, Connolly and founding assistant editor Stephen Spender made architectural essays required reading for the midcentury person of letters through publishing work from Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius, and other figureheads of architecture's modern movement. The *Review* thus served as a pivotal point between literary modernism and late modernism, with an ascendant architectural modernism providing inspiration.

In what follows, I trace the cross-pollination of architectural and literary practice from the *Review* to *Horizon*. Whereas the *Review* engaged authors in an effort to establish architecture as an art rather than a trade, the advent of World War II and the dissolution of leading modernist magazines made Connolly fear for literature's own future as an art, and he harnessed architecture's popularity for *Horizon*. By recovering these ties, I challenge Raymond Williams's influential account of "metropolitan forms of perception" (46) that theorizes modernist networks in the context of an *already formed* city at the expense of the vibrant architectural debates taking place in the magazines.[5] I first reveal that modern architects' iconoclastic language of demolition and reconstruction prompted Lewis and Lawrence to advocate architectural reform as a necessary step toward creating an audience for experimental work. I then explore how Betjeman used the *Review* to cultivate cross-media critical practices, before demonstrating how Connolly's exposure to architectural journalism led him to use *Horizon*—and the little magazine format—to mediate wartime planning debates. I argue that *Horizon* did not so much "deliberately and sometimes melodramatically stag[e] the end of the modernist 'little magazine,'" as Sean Latham suggests ("Cyril"), as it used the little magazine format to imagine a future role for literature in an avant-garde newly dominated by architects.

CROSS-MEDIUM MODERNIST ICONOCLASM

As Hastings and Betjeman revamped the *Review* into a publication presenting architecture as an *art*, after its late nineteenth-century beginnings in a trade publication boom, key modernists complemented little magazine work with *Review*

publication. One such author was Lawrence, whose contributions cast new light on his body of literature, typified as indicting modern civilization's assault on creativity and fine feeling and industrialism's devastation of English landscapes. Through "Pictures on the Wall" and the posthumously published "Then Disaster Looms Ahead," Lawrence contemplates extending literary modernization to the visual arts and radically reworks literary modernist tropes of fragmentation and alienation by embracing a centrally planned urban Britain.

Lawrence submitted his first article in 1929, after Hastings approached him to compose something on "artists and decoration" ("Nancy").[6] In "Pictures on the Wall," Lawrence investigates how practices of reading modern literature might be adapted for bolstering public appreciation of modern art. According to him, "Modern people read modern books" (56), and circulating libraries gave many access to these enriching literary expressions of contemporaneity, for the works of "Milton or Ben Jonson or even Shakespeare" are incompatible with modernity (57). Libraries allowed readers to take risks on the new, and Lawrence proposes a "pictuary" (56) for circulating modern paintings, which "adults should *know* … as they know modern books" (57). Lawrence equates viewing practices with reading practices, and he argues that literary and artistic circulation necessitates a "grand clearance" of the old (56).

Lawrence's "Then Disaster Looms Ahead" extends this "grand clearance" from literature and decor to architecture. The *Review* declares the article the "last [Lawrence] wrote," informs readers that it emerged from "correspondence between D. H. Lawrence and the Editor," and characterizes it as a "protest against the shapeless kind of industrialization" (47). Industrialism thus becomes a problem of form, not a problem in itself. Accordingly, Lawrence assesses the architecture of his childhood village, "a curious cross between industrialism and the old agricultural England of Shakespeare and Milton and Fielding and George Eliot" (48). "[T]he pit did not mechanize" villagers but provided "a sort of intimate community" (48). In the General Strike's wake, Lawrence argues that ugly above-ground surroundings were what really failed miners: "The real tragedy of England … is the tragedy of ugliness," for if beautiful designs had been provided, "there would never have been an industrial problem" (49). While Lawrence links literature to an older, agrarian England, he sees architecture as the catalyst for national transformation, both aesthetic and sociopolitical.

After pronouncing industrialism—central to novels like *Lady Chatterley's Lover*—a design problem, Lawrence declares that England failed to "develop the real *urban* side of a man"; instead, it clung to the "silly little individualism" of the rural cottage ideal (50). Lawrence uses modern architects' language of planning as rebirth to obliterate imaginatively his old world: "Pull down my native village to the last brick. Plan a nucleus. Fix the focus. Make a handsome gesture of radiation from the focus. And then put up big buildings, handsome, that sweep to a civic centre….make an absolute clean start. Do it place by place. Make a new England" (50). Envisioning architecture as an iconoclastic form of modernism that might avoid censorship, unlike his literature and paintings, Lawrence demands an urban England, created through industrial channels.

Lawrence clearly intended this article for literary audiences too, as it ran in famed publisher John Middleton Murry's *New Adelphi* shortly before its *Review* appearance (Boulton xxxi). Lawrence was not alone in crossing audiences: Lewis also published in the *Review* to complement his little magazine work. These key early modernists bridged an increasingly defined audience for literary innovation and a readership witnessing British architectural modernism emerge through a visionary publisher's efforts. Although their ambitions for modern literature diverged, both united two revolutions, the word and the (built) world, and found common ground by imagining architectural modernism as a boon to their literature.

Much like Lawrence, Lewis recognized architecture as a tool for aesthetic and political modernization in his Egoist Press manifesto. He paired *Review* work with small press publication by following *The Caliph's Design: Architects! Where is Your Vortex?* with "Plain Home-Builder: Where is Your Vorticist?"[7] In that article, Lewis addresses architects directly as he contemplates how British modernism's expanded audience failed to materialize: "outraged protests have arisen at every fresh manifestation of 'advanced' art," including "'modernism' in novels, plays, and verse" (155). Lewis considers the "Plain Reader" alongside the "Plain Home Builder" and links architectural publications to little magazines, for "the architectural plans of Mr. Wells Coates" present problems of reception and interpretation similar to "Mr. Eliot's crossword puzzles in place of poems (as it seems to the uninitiated)" (155). Proclaiming his Vorticism "the characteristic movement with which all these modes of extreme modernism began in England" (156), Lewis calls the modernist house "an embryo, as it were, a foetus, of what … *shall be*" a larger flowering of modernism (158; emphasis in original). He equates the *Review* with this elevated perception by concluding, "I have not been addressing myself to an *average* Home-builder" (158).

Lewis underlined that the *Review*'s audience, as exceptional readers and builders, could reestablish the bonds between architecture and other modernist disciplines. Both Lawrence and Lewis believed that architecture could re-energize literature through introducing modernist forms on a grand scale, and they seized onto Hastings's trade journal as a place where the ties between criticism and formal realization were strong. In their estimation, architects might be as responsible for literature's future as authors, and literary publishers widened their focus to reflect that conjoined future.

ARCHITECTURAL MODERNISM AS A PRINT PHENOMENON

Considered a national treasure for his Victorian preservationism and poetry seemingly about Englishness itself, Betjeman makes an improbable advocate for literary or architectural modernism. Yet as the *Review*'s assistant editor, he championed experimental architecture and writing. After getting his editorial start at *Cherwell* and becoming acquainted with fellow students Auden, Evelyn Waugh, and Louis MacNeice, Betjeman joined the *Review* through the help of

Oxford fellow Maurice Bowra. Betjeman published his first review in 1929 before assuming the assistant editorship. The *Review* credits Betjeman for its outreach to modernist authors ("1922-1934" 43), and he sponsored the subsequent literary generation by providing an early outlet for many of the midcentury's major figures, including *Horizon* editor Connolly. Through these efforts, Betjeman exposed a range of authors to architectural modernism in its formative period.[8]

Much as Lewis likened Coates to Eliot, Betjeman in *The Studio* presented modernist flats from British firm Tecton alongside "the poetry of Yeats and Eliot" as potential triggers for national spiritual revival ("1837-1937" 72). That fervor permeates Betjeman's *Review* contributions, where he proclaims that the "stateliness of pylons and the clear-cut lines of a new ostentatious factory" would not "detract" from rural landscapes ("Passing" 93). Like Lawrence's condemnation of the "pseudo-cottagey" (50), Betjeman's statements resist figuring national identity in the pastoral and traditional. These stances prompted Betjeman's pamphlet *Antiquarian Prejudice*, issued by Woolf's Hogarth Press.

Because Hastings was retiring, Betjeman became the *Review*'s public face. Nonetheless, he had doubters: in Betjeman's obituary, architect Maxwell Fry remembers him as a "journalist and a Fleet Street man…. He was the enemy to Modernism. I knew … that at the end he would find himself in some other camp" (259). Yet Betjeman's *Review* tenure demonstrates that Britain's modern movement was as much a journalistic feat as an architectural one. Because of the scarce funding for modernist projects, language was the medium in which architectural modernism blossomed; the *Review* and organizations like the MARS Group publicized it through articles, exhibitions, and translations of Continental modernists. Betjeman proclaimed of this journalistic foundation, "If anyone asks me who invented modern architecture, I answer, 'Obscurity Hastings'" (Wilson 85).[9] Similarly, architect John Summerson called the *Review* "the Diaghelev of the English architectural stage" (Hillier 269).

The Architectural Association's John Brandon-Jones echoed Betjeman's assessment that writers and editors had produced the International Style: "[T]he style was taken up and sold by people who were not architects but critics…. For years they published it and nothing else, and they managed to sell it to intellectuals…. Architects took it up when it became clear that you could not get a building into the *Review* unless it was in the style" (270). Brandon-Jones testifies that critics, not architects, propelled architectural modernism as the *Review* marketed itself to "intellectuals" across disciplines. The architectural criticism to which Betjeman and other authors contributed, according to Brandon-Jones, did not record modernism's rise but *caused* it. Given that entanglement with language, it is fitting that a poet like Betjeman held so much responsibility for British modern architecture's growth.[10]

A *London Mercury* article from 1933 reveals Betjeman's quest to unite literary and architectural publications even more seamlessly. In it, Betjeman appeals to that magazine's audience as readers already attuned to architecture because the *Mercury* "makes a feature of architectural comments" (65). But Betjeman laments

that architectural journalism goes largely unrecognized: "I write and I write and I write, under different names and in different styles, yet no one has heard of me or my pseudonyms" (65). This obscurity is not to be worn proudly. Betjeman notes that, despite the great quantity of British architectural journals, their readers are primarily "architects who find their advertisements of greater assistance than their editorial matter" (65). These architectural journals are precisely the publications to which readers should subscribe to be well-read: "Can you, reader, who have read the Palace of Art, the Works of Ruskin, the descriptions of buildings by Milton, Pope and Shelley, and Southey, think of one architectural paper published in England to-day?" (65). Reading literature no longer suffices; instead, Betjeman promotes architectural knowledge as cultural capital.

For Betjeman, architectural journalism allowed literary figures to move from reflecting on everyday life to reshaping the world through architectural activism. Betjeman devised a new publishing model: he advocated, paradoxically, *expanding* architectural journals' readership to allow them to mimic little magazines, which Betjeman suggested fostered better art. He imagined responding as *Review* editor to an offending architect by citing literary practices: "Do you realise that we, in the architectural papers, are forbidden by people of your type to criticise your buildings? Poems are criticised, paintings are criticised, so why not buildings? Buildings, are, alas, far more permanent and immovable than poems or painting. Any other papers dealing with art are able to reject bad pictures or writing. We cannot" (66). Emphasizing that little magazine readers could become critics who forced architects to create attractive buildings, Betjeman declares "an architectural magazine … by reason of its subject, of as much and greater importance as any literary, political, humorous or religious periodical" (66-7). Betjeman makes literary criticism an exemplar for architectural criticism, before urging readers to consider architectural criticism an even higher calling, for it brings literary practices to bear on the larger world. Betjeman concludes, "If the public will take an interest in its journals, then there is some hope for English architecture" (67). Literary publications foster literary newness, Betjeman suggests, and those practices and reading strategies could equally shape modern architecture. Writing in MARS's founding year, he entreats literary practitioners and readers to guide architecture's revolution through revolutionizing its publications.

As Betjeman urged little magazine readers to embrace architectural journals, he oversaw the *Review*'s "Anthology" section, which Hastings had added to reprint passages addressing architecture from literature and essays. The *Review* thus presented literature as a medium for criticizing and shaping architecture. Many of these works were experimental literature, of the type little magazines featured. The anthology section appeared near the end of the issue, in a place reserved for reviews and opinion pieces, news of pressing events and debates, and critical exchange more generally. The literary pieces invited reflection and response, and the editors frequently borrowed literary modernist iconoclasm to signal architecture's own transformation.

The first anthology section excerpted Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* alongside Ruskin's *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. While Ruskin defines the architectural as that which is "useless" to buildings' structure, Hall's excerpt represents a new response to home design, much as her novel offered an alternative to the heterosexual family structure. She writes: "And now for the first time since leaving Morton, Stephen turned her mind to the making of a home. Through Brockett she found a young architect who seemed anxious to carry out all her instructions. He was one of those very rare architects who refrain from thrusting their views on their clients" (51). The editors use the lesbian protagonist's desire to redesign the home to signal a wider reworking of architectural tradition, represented by Ruskin. They arrange the page so these excerpts precede a review of a home exhibition featuring the work of modernist architect Serge Chermayeff, which the editors proclaim "a triumph of the progressive and creative spirit over the indifference and lassitude which has imprisoned creative English thought for a generation" ("Causerie"). Alongside a manifesto from the exhibition sponsor, the editors announce the *Review*'s role in guiding this domestic transformation: "For many years the *Review* has been upholding the principle that the twentieth century, like its predecessors, demands a mode of expression adapted to its own ideals and requirements." By publicizing this "mode of expression," the editors imply that the *Review*, after originating in the nineteenth century, had adapted itself to the demands of the modern age.

Further sections featured Decadent writers, proto-modernists, high modernists, and 1930s little magazine contributors, including excerpts from the novels, drama, and nonfiction of Siegfried Sassoon, H.G. Wells, Thomas Hardy, W.B. Yeats, Aldous Huxley, Lawrence, Valéry, and Proust (in separate *Swann's Way* selections).[11] Through the anthology section, the editors promoted these writers as visionaries of a new architecture as well as new literary movements. The editors titled one selection from Valéry's *Eupalinos, or the Architect* "Function and Beauty," making experimental Valéry an advocate for modernist functionalism. Elsewhere, an essay from Proust showcased his prescient "aware[ness] both of Ruskin's greatness as well as his weakness" ("Proust"). Using the heading "An Eighteen-Eighty Prophet," they similarly claimed Oscar Wilde as an early proponent of the utilitarian's beauty.[12] By transporting these works to the *Review*, the editors use literature to provide an august tradition and new inspiration for the modern movement in architecture.

As part of that drive to use literature as inspiration, the section promoted contemporary work like MacNeice's poem "Birmingham," which appeared shortly after debuting in *New Verse*.[13] That co-publication suggests that, much like Lawrence, MacNeice used the *Review* to disseminate modern writing in conjunction with little magazines, widening their reach.[14] Stephen Spender's "The Pylons" from *Poems 1933* graced November 1933's frontispiece, and the *Review* steered readers toward literary publications by reviewing recent fiction and poetry. Betjeman's "Architecture in Fiction" promoted Waugh's *A Handful of Dust*, which features a chromium-loving interior designer: "Architecture has only recently

come in for a mention in modern fiction," Betjeman contends; while Victorian authors largely ignored architecture, Betjeman identifies "re-birth of architectural consciousness in fiction writers" like Huxley and Waugh, who brought "a real understanding of architectural style" (174).[15] "*Decline and Fall* put jazz-modern [Art Deco] in its right place" (174), and Betjeman hopes others follow Waugh in condemning "beknighted architects" and "the extravagances of jazz-modernistic decoration" (175). Literature itself, for Betjeman, represented an avenue for implicit architectural criticism.

Implicit criticism at times became explicit when the *Review* asked writers to address controversial architectural proposals. In "What Public Opinion Says," Huxley, Sassoon, Osbert Sitwell, Rose Macaulay, Michael Sadleir, and Clive Bell, among others, judged whether Carlton House Terrace should be demolished for commercial development, a proposal Betjeman used his *Review* clout to fight. In both the survey form Betjeman used and the content of the individual responses, a civic model of architecture emerges, one that treats beautiful architecture as a public good and architectural criticism as a civic duty. Echoing Betjeman's plea for *Mercury* readers to become active critics of architecture, Hilaire Belloc warns, "hideous buildings, unlike bad verse and paintings, remain and must do harm to all who see them" (14). Through Betjeman's campaign, Carlton House Terrace was saved, and the *Review* demonstrated its faith in authors as fit judges of architecture.

In addition to these outwardly focused campaigns, Betjeman tapped his extended literary circles to enrich the *Review* by submitting criticism. Belloc, Waugh, Edmund Blunden, Nancy Mitford, Sacheverell Sitwell, Compton Mackenzie, and Brian Howard all published in the journal. Herbert Read became a regular contributor as part of his larger commitment to architectural modernism. He praised a Maxwell Fry-designed room at a Royal Academy exhibition ("Novelism"), and in reviewing Moholy-Nagy's *The New Vision: From Materials to Architecture*, he uses Bauhaus designs' attentiveness to the biological individual to pronounce Moholy-Nagy and Gropius "prophets of a new humanism" ("New" 150). Read's comment foreshadows one MARS member's assessment in 1944 of the social role of architecture: "the new architecture is humanism in a new age that the war and everything else is making" ("What"). Through the *Review*, many authors turned to architects as leaders of this reformed humanism.

Others, like Auden, voiced the dissent Betjeman sought from critically robust literary magazines. Spender characterized "New styles of architecture, a change of heart" in "Petition" (1930) as a statement supporting modern architecture ("Brave"), and Auden permitted his poem "I See Barns Falling" to appear in an issue of *Town and Country Planning*, alongside the article "Planning the Future Britain." However, in his *Review* contribution "What is Wrong with Architecture?", Auden questioned modern architecture's status as a humanist art form. "The popular complaint that 'modern' rooms look like operating theatres is quite just," Auden responds to two books on modern architecture; the remonstrations of "'[f]unctional' architects" often seem "priggish, like a schoolmaster's

lecture. 'You shall behave in such and such a way. You shall only like such and such a kind of picture'" (66). Auden presents architects not as prophets but as dictators, and he argues that architects should concentrate only on needs architecture can provide. Citizens must enforce those boundaries by "bring[ing] to the study of the passions of our neighbours and ourselves the same kind of interest we take in the physical world," "distinguish[ing] between those which are fulfilled in building and those which can only be satisfied in other spheres … and by our own efforts" (66). Against architecture's inability to address individuals' "passions," Auden implicitly carves out space for literature as a form addressing the personal, the emotional, and the non-material.

Among the *Review*'s most consistent literary voices, Connolly made that tension between literature and architecture a defining concern for *Horizon*.[16] In his reviews, he characterizes himself as an apprentice of art criticism, a calling that flowered in *Horizon*, billed as *A Review of Literature and Art*. When evaluating an exhibition featuring Vanessa Bell and Duncan Grant, Connolly describes undertaking criticism "without the knowledge or the taste that distinguishes an art critic": "Like a new boy who arrives in the middle of a term, one adopts a brazen attitude, secretly keeping one's ears open for the jargon of the older boys, then timidly experimenting in the new slang" ("Genuine"). Connolly celebrates the nuanced expression enabled by his exposure to the language of visual form, and through his contributions, we witness the development of *Horizon*'s vocabulary of good taste and connoisseurship.[17]

Connolly's "The New Medici," which documents artists' collaboration with Shell, cemented his importance in *Review* history and in British architectural criticism more generally.[18] Influential midcentury critic Reyner Banham pronounced Connolly's essay "epoch-marking." As Banham and a 1954 *Review* piece both note, Connolly's article appeared in an acclaimed *Review* issue from 1934, along with features on the Lawn Road Flats and Tecton's penguin housing ("E." 351). The *Review* went so far as to dub 1934 "the *annus mirabilis*" (351), and editors and critics recognized Connolly as a key figure in this fertile period. In "The New Medici," Connolly uses literature to ponder relations among modernist arts, industry, and utility. He observes that "us[ing] the phrase 'commercial art' as a term of depreciation is the equivalent of referring to all poetry written for a publisher as 'commercial literature'" (2). Literary publication becomes a reference for judging modernist artists' publication practices, and Connolly argues that the public's critical capabilities far exceed the work typically marketed to it. In considering this alliance between distinction and commercialization, Connolly examines how specialization and taste, associated with the modernism of Shell's artist partners, now sold gasoline through slogans like "'Artists, archaeologists, architects, etc., prefer Shell'" (2).

As a major contributor to a journal that drew largely upon advertising revenue and gave modernist literature a wider audience than little magazines, Connolly adapts Lawrence's model of modernist circulation, where the specialized reaches the masses. Lawrence's "pictuary" echoes in Connolly's suggestion that "a new

picture" might be treated like a "new book": "If … there were picture-libraries, the distinctions between the noisy, facile poster and the subtle, permeating, dun-coloured, penal servitude composition would disappear" (3). The Shell initiative allowed Connolly to explore the productive interchange between industry and creativity that came to define the *Review*. Comparing Shell to the Medicis, Connolly advocates a system of patronage that foreshadows the mission he envisioned for *Horizon*, keeping literary culture alive during the war. Although Connolly in *Enemies of Promise* (1938) identified journalism as a threat to literature and lamented that the reading public had abandoned books for magazines, he was nonetheless attentive, Alex Woloch stresses, to the unlikely periodical contexts from which canonical works like "Prufrock" emerged (xiv). Connolly likewise acknowledged the advantages he gained from the discipline of journalism (94).[19]

In the monthly *Review*, broad circulation became a virtue for both late modernist Connolly and early modernist Lawrence. As authors like Auden and Connolly modeled the inter-arts criticism Betjeman sought for architecture, they stretched modern architecture's language, and hence its practitioners' way of writing about and projecting a future for it. But in Connolly's *Horizon*, which featured throughout the 1940s writers who had early training at the *Review*, literature and architecture's relationship changed. *Horizon* arrived during what Woloch (xii) and Latham (873) identify as the last days of the modernist little magazine. Connolly saw war as a threat not only to little magazines but also to British literature more generally. Latham explains: "Connolly rightly understood that in an England on the brink of war, 'a magazine had to be eclectic to survive' and like Orwell he saw himself in essentially heroic terms as the embattled guardian of a collapsing culture" (859). By contrast, modern architecture received significant governmental backing during and after the war, as I have discussed elsewhere.[20] In response to these changed circumstances, *Horizon* incorporated architects as contributors while also, like Auden in the *Review*, keeping a critical eye on a collectivist modern architecture. Although *Horizon*'s editors certainly acknowledged the pressures facing literary publication, their eclecticism was not only a strategy of survival. Its editors' and contributors' exposure to architectural journalism inspired them to treat the literary magazine as a form that might be hybridized and reinvented.

LITERARY PLANNERS OFFER BLUEPRINTS FOR A BETTER WORLD

In his essay "Brave New Rooms" for *Design Quarterly*, Spender recalls his literary generation's wholehearted embrace of modern architecture and design in the 1930s, when many flocked to the *Review*. Though Spender acknowledges design reform's leftist element, he characterizes it as a concern for literature as a whole: "Even an antisocialist writer like Wyndham Lewis was excited by the idea that architecture … could alter people's lives" (2).[21] Spender recounts his own conversion to Bauhaus architecture in Weimar Germany and describes the modernist conversion of his writing space, the Hammersmith flat *Horizon* used as its office,

complete with Spender's custom-made modernist desk. He explicitly ties literary style to architectural style in acknowledging "some spiteful reviewer, sneering at one of my early books," who observed that "you could well imagine the kind of room in which the author lived" and gave a "rather devastating description" of the room's contents (5). Modern design promised not only domestic reform but also authorial self-modernization, to such a degree that reviewers could criticize that process as a fad for young authors.

Spender's "September Journal" series for *Horizon* reevaluates his investment in modernist design, as he explores the Bauhaus's failure to prevent fascism. After World War I, Germans "built houses with flat roofs" (107), yet their belief that environments shape people cost Germans their belief in individual determination (108); they didn't truly embrace the egalitarian values Bauhaus architecture symbolized (109). As Auden cautioned in the *Review*, architecture could not reform the heart. Yet Spender still believed literary figures should aid architecture through criticism, and in the editorial section normally reserved for Connolly, he argued that *Horizon* should attend to "constructing a better Britain after the war" and "planning better cities where the old ones have been bombed" (89). The little magazine could become the nation's conscience, for "literature deals with longer term and more universal aims than any political programme" (90).

Many authors joined Spender in using *Horizon* to develop literature with and against architectural modernism; in fact, *Horizon*'s first issue primarily features past *Review* contributors, including Auden, Betjeman, MacNeice, and Read, along with Connolly and Spender. *Horizon*'s editors had pressing historical reasons for monitoring architectural publication. The war opened new publication venues for architecture, mass-marketed books and pamphlets that used wartime destruction to propose state-sponsored modernist reconstruction. While architecture's audience expanded, 1939 brought an end to many major little magazines, including *London Mercury* and *New Verse*, which had provided opportunities for parallel publication with the *Review*. *Horizon* contributors responded by interpreting architecture and town planning for discerning readers, bringing close reading of architecture to the little magazine and bridging readership as Betjeman had desired.

Horizon mediated reconstruction debates with a special planning series introduced by J.B. Priestley. "While the good folk are wearily searching for ink and paper for the blueprints of the new world," Priestley warns, "the gangs will have moved in again.... Therefore the blueprints must already exist. And the people must be told that they already exist, that disinterested men and women have been at work on their behalf" (170). Priestley uses the language of detachment to underline not only planners' expertise, but also the journal's reasoned external perspective. *Horizon* offered combined aesthetic and political judgment from authors like Read, who called British institutions "empty forms" that "would have to be rebuilt in a new style" as the postwar period reenergized poetry and architecture ("Art" 309). Articles like C.E.M. Joad's "The Face of England: How It Is Ravaged and How It May Be Preserved" provided "notes which might

form the basis for consideration by the newly established ministry of Works and Planning" (345). *Horizon* editors presumed a planning readership, while shifting the locus of planning efforts by urging *Horizon* readers and authors to contribute. To survive a war that silenced other little magazines, *Horizon* became a voice of cultural authority in an age when architects and planners held sway, a test case as to whether the little magazine as a form could persevere in the new political era.[22]

In *Horizon*'s first year, Connolly compared it to the *Review*: "the war permeates not only the poetry of *Horizon*, but the country of *Country Life*, or the architecture of the *Architectural Review*" (Dec. 1940 "Comment" 283). While *Country Life* preserved an English rural ideal, *Horizon* and the *Review*, Connolly implies, preserve modernist experimentation.[23] Arguing that England must provide an answer to both Corbusier and Proust, Connolly demanded "an English Renaissance" (July 1941 "Comment" 5). Through a postwar "Comment" that advocated dismantling and rebuilding London according to the Abercrombie Plan (Sept. 1945 "Comment" 152), we have clear evidence that Connolly continued to read architectural publications long after his *Review* stint.[24] Much like Hastings, Connolly represented literature as an art among other arts, and through producing a little magazine in which literature, the visual arts, and architecture met, Connolly envisioned himself enabling an English Renaissance.

Connolly thus adopted the prophetic tone of the 1930s *Review*. In 1941, Connolly reworked Lewis's modernist Caliph by demanding a "Word Controller" who could "clean up our language" by "re-shap[ing]" it (Oct. 1941 "Comment" 229). For Connolly, architectural practice functions as an analogy for literary practice: "Nobody should learn this alphabet who can abuse it, who jerry-builds the English language as if it were the English countryside" (231). While addressing London's "home crisis," he conversely portrays architecture as visionary poetry: "if we could only produce a great architect, a man or a group who could create a new three-dimensional poetry in a material suitable to our climate and our time, then the whole nightmare of war-destruction, housing schemes, ruin and dilapidation would vanish" (Apr. 1947 "Comment" 153). Innovative modernist poetry inspires necessary disregard for architectural tradition, and Connolly, like Auden, urges architects to turn outside their own discipline for the values of the society they sought to build (153).

Yet Connolly acknowledges the danger of modeling literary innovation on architecture and planning, with their mass audience: the "great architect" who "could create a new three-dimensional poetry" could become authoritarian. In 1944, Connolly contemplated an England governed by a "great Dictator" who uses "beauty" as an "experiment" in autocratic rule (May 1944 "Comment" 292). With a nod to former *Review* assistant editor Betjeman, Connolly described the dictator releasing from "mines and labour camps" "some Betjemanites," "intractable prisoners who remembered [*New Verse* editor and *Review* contributor] Grigson and had marched with [*Horizon* cover designer and *Review* contributor] Piper" (292-3). As Betjemanites destroy post-1840 housing in his fictional account, they use a city's literary associations to determine value: "Scarborough was spared because

of its associations with the Sitwells, Wigan with Orwell, but the Commissioner for Southern England was an extreme Betjemanite who remembered the master's curse on Slough" (293). Connolly echoes Lawrence's desired grand clearance in his dictator's threat to his cities: "'If you bastards aren't beautiful we're going to bomb you until you bloody well are'" (294). Yet an advisor informs him that even though they've restored "'Georgian architecture … the last vision of humanism,'" reinstating "'the country that Blake and Jane Austen loved,'" bankrupted midcentury aesthetic values meant that citizens immediately rebuilt their "Kosy Kar-wash Kafé" (295). Connolly questions whether architects should be made chiefly responsible for restoring humanism, while also acknowledging literary figures' own extremist calls for architecture-led reform.

Connolly's parable suggests that architecture, if kept unchecked, might betray the broad-minded literary atmosphere *Horizon* dedicated itself to preserving. While Auden feared that modern architecture seemingly lacked a spiritual dimension, Connolly insisted on literature's innate resistance to political cooption: "the poetical life is the true opposite of the totalitarian one" (May 1949 "Comment" 306). Thus Connolly and Spender envisioned *Horizon* as modernism's conscience, for it featured authors skilled in both anti-totalitarian literary forms and nonfiction reviews of other media. Even as Connolly disparaged the dictatorial—and short-sighted—modernist planner, he invited architects to share the "poetical life," and through his efforts to make architects readers and contributors—much as the *Review* welcomed authors—we fully witness his vision for *Horizon* as arbiter of modernist arts.

NEW CONFIGURATIONS OF THE BRITISH AVANT-GARDE

Amid visions of literature's dim future under architectural modernism, Rudolph Friedmann proposed in *Horizon* a "bookshop of the future," where literary publication harmonized with modern architecture. In "The World of the Father," the bookseller functions as an "analyst" who "surveys literature from the distance necessary to the forming of a detached yet enthusiastic viewpoint" (Friedmann 276), making him the ultimate detached modernist. The accompanying ideal bookshop is a "modern building, designed by an architect such as Walter Gropius … which would contain a place for all the arts—a bookshop, a picture gallery, a concert hall for music, a theatre for drama and ballet and a cinema," all supervised by this bookseller who, manipulating design objects, the visual display of books, and modernist architectural space, creates the ideal environment for reading modern literature (276-7). In this "planned bookshop" (278), those responsible for literary circulation become planners themselves.

Betjeman's notion of periodicals as inter-arts moderators came full circle with *Horizon*'s Ugly Buildings Competition, in which the editors offered prizes for the best examples of ugly architecture encountered on holiday. After the Lawn Road Flats "split second place with a slum property in Cumberland" (Banham), *Horizon* published architects' outraged responses. Writing in 1955, architectural

critic Banham argued that the competition and its aftermath brought to a head the postwar "crisis of the English *avant-garde*." He attributed Connolly's jab at this representative modernist building to his larger antipathy toward authors and intellectuals who left Britain in the years surrounding the war, as many prominent architects did.[25] Banham thus deemed the competition a milestone in the "disintegration of that alliance between the various elements of the English *avant-garde*." CIAM's Siegfried Giedion responded that he found it "absolutely absurd that the building of Wells Coates, erected in 1934 as the first modern building in England after the sleep of three decades," was chosen, a move he considered "completely inadequate with the literary and artistic line of your highly estimated magazine." Echoing Lewis's appraisal of Coates's work as beneficially difficult, much like Eliot's poetry, Giedion appealed to literary taste as an adjudicator of architectural taste. Walter Gropius, former Lawn Road Flats resident and Friedmann's chosen architect for the "bookshop of the future," protested, "Reading the December issue of Horizon I was baffled to find the Lawn Road Flats … brandished under the caption 'Ugly Buildings Competition.'" Connolly also drew censure from a leading architectural publication, as Banham notes: "in the *Architects' Journal*, [pseudonymous columnist of wit] Astragal laid aside the mask of comedy and read Mr. Connolly (in 'his unquiet playpen') a stiff sermon about the competition in general, and about the description of Wells Coates as 'architect unknown' in particular."[26] Because "The New Medici" appeared in the *Review* issue that featured Coates's building, Connolly's sly decision to include the contestant's response of "Architect: ?" was a provocative act. While showing that architects and architectural critics read *Horizon* and affirmed his authority mediating modernist taste, Connolly cast himself as a literary figure valuably distanced from architectural practice, and thus a privileged reader of its forms and aims.

In addition to these published letters, *Horizon* featured criticism by architects and designers, allowing Connolly to moderate architectural and art publication alongside literary publication.[27] Despite paper shortages and occasional jabs at architects and planners, Connolly offered space for lengthy reviews and reprints of influential architectural texts.[28] In Connolly's selected extracts from "New World of Space," Le Corbusier declares that modernist architecture could provide what literature could not: the "*miracle of ineffable space*," form that stymies language (280). Yet he also claims individualism and spiritual experience for architecture, sculpture, and painting by dubbing "[a] work of art" "the sincere mirror of an individual passion … that confession of a fellow man whose direct and eloquent words are spoken in absolute communion; perhaps that Sermon on the Mount" (281). Much as he described MARS designs as "'poems in steel, glass and concrete'" (Design), Le Corbusier—and, by extension, Connolly—represents architecture as a shared language.

Beyond simply republishing criticism, *Horizon* complemented its planning series by inviting architects to interpret planning literature. Modernist architect Ernö Goldfinger responded by reviewing the book that generated the popular traveling exhibition "Living in Cities."[29] Expressing concerns much like

Connolly's about publication and preservation, Goldfinger examines architecture's avant-garde: "The *avant garde* architect is always haunted by the need to put across his ideas to the general public....since Le Corbusier wrote *Vers une Architecture*, this has taken a specific form, that of a picture book in the shape of a stores catalogue" (*Living*). Producing "so many slogans for the shapes of things to come," architecture had embraced language as its medium. Goldfinger plays on Wells's utopian novel-turned-film *Things to Come*, which featured modernist sets. Like Connolly, he worried that architecture's critical language was degrading amid war. Goldfinger sought to improve architecture by holding nonfiction to high standards, thereby joining Connolly's calls to patrol art forms' critical vocabulary.

We witness *Horizon*'s move from reviewing architectural journalism to composing it directly in "Bread & Butter and Architecture" by John Summerson, a MARS member and friend of Betjeman. Summerson chronicles architecture's evolution as practitioners joined governmental planning bodies, echoing that issue's "Comment," which explored how state employment influenced literary practice. Much as Connolly emphasized little magazines' role in experimental literature, Summerson acknowledges periodicals' role in architectural modernism: the "ordinary student" is "an addict of architectural journalism. His designs take their colour from the pages of the *Review*, the *Journal*, the *Architect* and half a dozen other periodicals; or from the shiny quartos on le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright" (241). Yet when moving from criticism to practice, Summerson notes, architects are necessarily more constrained and had recently infringed on literary territory through "the vanity of trying to fly level with the poet-innovator le Corbusier" (242). Despite enormous resources put into exhibitions like "Living in Cities," Summerson believes "'modern' architecture" to the "layman" seems "as 'obscure' as some modern poetry" (242). He appeals to *Horizon* readers as privileged members of the public, uniquely able to interpret "obscure" forms, and advocates abandoning older versions of elevated modernist taste for national taste, modernism through planning, which nonetheless retains elements of modern poetry, as Betjeman argued in *The Studio*.[30]

Through its eclecticism, *Horizon* positioned itself as a leader in international modernism, featuring poets, planners, and architectural "poet-innovators" who demonstrated for a broad audience how architecture might be read literarily—and literature architecturally. When Maxwell Fry contributed "A Letter about Architecture" while stationed at sea, he self-consciously modeled how reading modern poetry could enrich architectural practice. Using the guise of writing to his wife, architect and designer Jane Drew, Fry recalls Connolly's description of submitting criticism to an architectural periodical: "My Dear J, I have not the temerity to address readers whom I cannot imagine on a subject in which I feel insecure, but you and I having so often talked of architecture sitting on our verandah at Accra I can continue in the same vein to you without feeling myself launched upon perilous seas" (322). Through the epistle form often employed in literature, Fry narrativizes architecture and brings the subject down from lofty planning rhetoric to the intimate, individual level. In doing so, he looks to

Lawrence, who demanded architectural revolution in the *Review* and inspired an early *Horizon* number. Addressing charges of mechanization and uniformity that were leveled against modern architecture, Fry describes how Lawrence's poetry tempered his and Drew's practice:

> I remember how one evening as we discussed our attitude to the mechanistic side of modern life you read with glowing emphasis D. H. Lawrence's poem that starts with the line
>
> There is no point in work unless it absorbs you...
>
> and ends abruptly with
>
> we will cancel the machines we have got
>
> and how our affection for what is innocent and unconscious in the African way of life was stirred by the lines
>
> … so with houses, ships, shoes, wagons or cups or loaves
> Men might put them forth as a snail its shell, as a bird that leans
> its breast against its nest, to make it round.
>
> And remembering this I add to it the sense of an argument that took place in Boston in which we qualified our welcome of science and industrialism by saying that we accepted them as a fate but took leave to look every new gift horse in the mouth, hoping to know the difference between teeth and fangs. (322)[31]

As Connolly and Spender hoped, poetry—through the act of interpretation—becomes architectural modernists' conscience. While Fry feared that Betjeman would betray modernism, he looks to Lawrence to guide architects. Fry imagines a joint literary and architectural project of resisting mechanical language, embodied in "press echoing press in immaculate black and white print issuing endlessly" (323). After testifying to good poetry's restorative power, Fry cautions against a periodical culture too easily seduced by material newness while arguing, against Auden's criticism, that "material can enrich spirit" (323) and architecture uphold "the dignity of the individual" (324).

Throughout, Fry adopts the poetic tropes of self-reflection and confession. Recalled conversations with Drew show architecture's values being formulated through language, as they seek "enrichment" for the "vocabulary of modern architecture" (327). Fry praises the "reintroduction of stone" by Le Corbusier as "a poet's necessity rather than a builder's," which "corrected" modern architecture's hitherto "restricted … emotional range" (324). He interweaves architecture's—and Europe's—future with literature's future. As he "measure[s] the extent of taste in the community" through "signs of liveliness in the appreciation of music, sculpture, painting, poetry, architecture and town planning" (328), Fry notes "the interest in architecture and town planning among the general public" (329) and the "popularity of Puffin and King Penguin books" (330). Fry seeks news of the arts from Drew, whom he establishes as a representative discerning reader of culture, form, and literature.

Just as Fry began with their joint interpretation of Lawrence's poetry, he concludes by using literature to model self-reflection. Fry reports that he has been

reading one play from Drew's Shakespeare collection every day, and as he professes belief in literature's power, he uses Shakespeare—and *Horizon*—to inspire belief in modernist architecture: "I recommend Shakespeare as a cure for sick hearts, there being so much of him about in even so small a company as this ship carries that one must believe in us, and with us, our architecture" (330). In Fry's letter—and, indeed, throughout *Horizon*—criticism establishes common ground among modernist arts and models literary self-expression, as nonfiction and architecture borrow from poetry's emotional directness and fiction's narrativity. Evaluating architecture merges with discussing literature and becomes a literary act itself.

CONCLUSION

The *Architectural Review* and *Horizon* provide a small glimpse of the ways in which I.A. Richards's "a book is a machine to think with" and Le Corbusier's "a house is a machine for living in" converged to form a shared critical impulse in the 1930s and 1940s. For example, in 1935 Read reviewed Gropius's *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus* for Leavis's *Scrutiny*, which underlines how absorbed the practice of architectural analysis was in midcentury literary criticism, with *Scrutiny* providing an important foundation for academic criticism. This conjoined architectural and literary critical archive recasts midcentury formalism, since authors submitted not just fiction and poetry but also buildings and architectural publications to close reading processes, while architects promoted modern architecture as displaying formal difficulty akin to that of modernist poetry. Criticism—both literary and architectural—steered this period's literary production and publication, yet authors' intense engagement with the new architecture has gone virtually unrecognized.

Modernist Journals Project co-directors Latham and Robert Scholes called for "interdisciplinary cooperation" (518) in light of individual periodicals' diverse content and individual authors' diverse periodical publications. Scholes and Clifford Wulfman accordingly emphasized, "Modernism happened in the magazines all right, but it didn't happen only in the little ones" (41). It didn't happen only in the literary ones, either.[32] Because this era's literary and architectural periodicals were so interconnected, it is important to look beyond literary publications to understand not only little magazines but also modernist literary culture more generally. These not-so-little architectural magazines are a crucial and provocative component of the rich periodical culture that launched and sustained modern literature.

Notes

1. Following the journal's own practice, I will hereafter refer to the *Architectural Review* as "the *Review*."

2. Lewis was a member of Fry's Omega Workshops but left after he discovered that an invitation to design a room in the Ideal Home Exhibition had been kept from him. Fry took the commission for the Omega Workshops instead.

3. Evelyn Waugh noted this British tendency, citing the decision to translate Corbusier's *Urbanisme* as *The City of Tomorrow*. See Waugh's "Cities of the Future."

4. See Maher, *Reconstructing Modernism*, forthcoming January 2020 from Oxford UP.

5. Williams set a precedent for making the city/metropolis the key term rather than architecture itself, and literary modernist scholars have largely followed that example. These works often frame the city as a text to be read, but in relying upon this metaphor, they miss the more explicitly verbal nature of modern architecture—its plans, manifestos, journals, and exhibitions.

6. In contrast to unremunerative little magazine work, the *Review* offered cash-strapped Lawrence a sizable twenty guineas. In the February 1930 "Marginalia" section, the editors pronounce Lawrence a "first-rate English stylist" (108) and an inspiration for architects as well as writers. Following Lawrence's death, the editors twice featured his literary style through excerpting *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

7. The *Review* expanded Lewis's own audience by making him a guide for architects. One month after Lawrence's first article, the editors quote Lewis—"'There is nothing for it today, if you have an appetite for the beautiful, but *to create new beauty*'"—as a model for approaching the architecture of historical institutions ("Marginalia" 163).

8. Though many loyalists attribute Betjeman's support for modernist architecture to toeing the company line, his commitment extended beyond the *Review*. Betjeman was a founding member of the MARS Group, the British offshoot of CIAM, which united Continental powerhouses Gropius and Le Corbusier. He also developed deep relationships with P. Morton Shand, who translated Gropius for English-speaking audiences, and Frederick Etchells, an associate of Lewis who translated essays Le Corbusier published in *L'Esprit Nouveau*.

9. Betjeman's nickname for Hastings was "Obscurity."

10. In accordance with that understanding of modern architecture as a print phenomenon, Betjeman often treated the *Review* like a little magazine. He experimented with its construction, sometimes choosing pricey handmade papers for opening pages and wallpapers for editorials ("1922-1934" 43). Typography and page appearance obsessed Hastings, and the *Review* matched modernist forms with unconventional layouts. Betjeman's first poetry volume, *Mount Zion*, reflects Hastings's influence: Betjeman proudly told friend Tom Driberg that Hastings provided drawings, and fireworks paper formed the binding.

11. Valéry wrote *Eupalinos ou l'Architecte*, the *Review* notes, "at the request of the French review *Architectures*" ("Eupalinos" 55).

12. Wilde was made to be a voice for functionalism through his assertion that "beautiful decoration is always an expression of the use you put a thing to" and his argument that "good designs" for objects and cities can come through industrial channels. The *Review* similarly enlisted writers to envision modern architecture's continued development: in "Design in Utopia," the editors quote Thomas More's *Utopia*, William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, Wells's *The Shape of Things to Come*, and Olaf Stapledon's *First and Last Men* as they imagine the future architectural landscape. Wells made that book a film, using modernist architects to imagine the utopian future's architecture; stills were included as models of good architecture in the *Review*.

13. After a short letter published in 1936, editor Geoffrey Grigson began contributing to the *Review* following the demise of *New Verse*. His first contribution was an article on Hardy's architectural practice.

14. Even after Betjeman left the *Review*, his poetry volumes were frequently reviewed by contributors like Festival of Britain architect Hugh Casson, who illustrated Betjeman's *Summoned by Bells*.

15. In this period, Huxley wrote architectural criticism for architectural and home journals.

16. Connolly's contributions were celebrated in a 1979 feature reflecting on this high point in *Review* history ("1932" 285).

17. Connolly's reviews sometimes allowed him to investigate cross-medium collaborations, as in "The French Pictures," where Connolly notes the alliances between nineteenth-century French painters and poets, whom he calls "the founders of the modern outlook" (67). Their modernity, he argues, is seen particularly in their treatment of the industrial city and its architecture (67).

18. Betjeman also produced travel guides for Shell.

19. Connolly was particularly concerned that journalism led authors to spend large amounts of their time reviewing substandard work.

20. See Maher, "'Swastika Arms.'"

21. Unlike Raymond Williams's "metropolitan forms of perception" (46), these authors sought to produce a *new* architecture that would only then radically alter inhabitants' perception.

22. Yet even as *Horizon* brought authors' art and architectural criticism from the *Review* to the little magazine, many contributors distinguished literature's aims from architecture's. In "The New Disorder," Forster criticizes authors' efforts to institute political order in collaboration with architects: "each time Mr. Wells and my other architectural friends anticipate a great outburst of post-war activity and world-planning, my heart contracts. To me, the best chance for future society lies through apathy, uninventiveness, and inertia" (380). He describes a return to autonomy as the best course for wartime British literature: "Art for Art's sake? I should just think so, and more so than ever at the present time." (381).

23. As Darling notes, *Country Life* also dedicated itself to evaluating modern architecture. See *Re-forming* 28.

24. The Abercrombie Plan launched the New Towns movement in Britain.

25. While Coates stayed in Britain, many others associated with the Lawn Road Flats through living and working there, including Gropius and Marcel Breuer, left for America.

26. The "unquiet playpen" is a reference to Connolly's *The Unquiet Grave*, published under the pseudonym Palinurus.

27. *Horizon* also featured numerous advertisements for planning publications.

28. One review surveyed *Brazil Builds*, an account of architectural innovation amid world war that paralleled Connolly's efforts to preserve literary experimentation.

29. Goldfinger had already reviewed the exhibition for *Horizon*'s readers.

30. Poetic buildings appear once more in 1947's American-themed *Horizon*, in which famed architects Philip C. Johnson and Edgar Kaufmann, Jr. analyze American modern architecture: "Wright never fails to create a poetic sense of space in his buildings" (63). They preview Wright's "heretofore unpublished plans" (63), making *Horizon* a venue for cutting-edge architectural publication.

31. Africa, for Fry, represents communal culture threatened by industrialism; like Lawrence, he felt architectural modernism might recover "communal life" (323).

32. In "*Focus*: A Little Magazine and Architectural Modernism in 1930s Britain," architectural historian Elizabeth Darling exposed periodical scholars' neglect of architectural little magazines and offered an astute analysis of one particular publication. While Darling notes that the editors of *Focus* drew inspiration from *Scrutiny* and the Unit One catalogue (which was edited by Herbert Read), *Focus* did not stage the rich exchange between authors and architects that characterized the *Review* and *Horizon*.

Works Cited

Auden, W.H. "I See Barns Falling." *Town and Country Planning*, Dec. 1948, p. 69.

———. "What is Wrong with Architecture?" *Architectural Review*, Aug. 1933, p. 66.

An Autobiography by Frank Lloyd Wright. Advertisement. *Horizon*, Sept. 1945, p. 146.

Banham, Reyner. "History." *Architectural Review*, July 1955, p. 54.

Betjeman, John. "Architecture in Fiction." *Architectural Review*, Nov. 1934, p. 174.

———. "Architecture." *London Mercury*, Nov. 1933, pp. 65-7.

———. "1837-1937." *Studio*, Feb. 1937, pp. 56-73.

———. "The Passing of the Village." *Architectural Review*, Sept. 1932, pp. 89-93.

———. "To Tom Driberg." 20 Nov. 1931. *Letters*, edited by Candida Lycett Green. Methuen, 2006, p. 85.

Boulton, James T., editor. *D.H. Lawrence: Late Essays and Articles*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

"Causerie." *Architectural Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 51.

Connolly, Cyril. Comment. *Horizon*, Dec. 1940, pp. 279-85.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, July 1941, pp. 5-8.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, Oct. 1941, pp. 229-31.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, Dec. 1941, pp. 375-7.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, May 1944, pp. 292-5.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, Sept. 1945, pp. 149-53.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, Apr. 1947, pp. 151-4.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, May 1949, pp. 305-6.

———. *Enemies of Promise*, edited by Alex Woloch, U of Chicago P, 2008.

———. "The French Pictures." *Architectural Review*, Feb. 1932, pp. 66-7.

———. "Genuine Arts and Crafts." *Architectural Review*, Jan. 1932, p. 23.

———. "The New Medici." *Architectural Review*, July 1934, pp. 2-4.

Le Corbusier. "New World of Space." *Horizon*, Oct. 1948, pp. 279-84.

Darling, Elizabeth. "*Focus*: A Little Magazine and Architectural Modernism in 1930s Britain." *Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2012, pp. 39-63.

———. *Re-forming Britain: Narratives of Modernity before Reconstruction*. Routledge, 2007.

"Design in Utopia." *Architectural Review*, Dec. 1935, pp. 302-4.

Design Museum. "The MARS Group." *Design at the Design Museum*, design.designmuseum.org/design/the-mars-group.html. Accessed 29 Aug. 2016.

"E. McKnight Kauffer." *Architectural Review*, Dec. 1954, pp. 351-2.

Esty, Jed. *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England*. Princeton UP, 2004.

Forster, E.M. "The New Disorder." *Horizon*, Dec. 1941, pp. 379-84.

Friedmann, Rudolph. "The World of the Father." *Horizon*, Oct. 1945, pp. 269-78.

Fry, Maxwell. "A Letter about Architecture." *Horizon*, May 1946, pp. 322-30.

Giedion, Siegfried. Letter. 22 Jan. 1947. *Horizon*, Apr. 1947, p. 225.

Goldfinger, Ernö. "Living in Cities." *Horizon*, June 1941, back cover.

———. "*Living in Cities*." *Horizon*, Aug. 1942, p. 146.

Gropius, Walter. Letter. 10 Jan. 1947. *Horizon*, Apr. 1947, p. 225.

Hall, Radclyffe, and John Ruskin. "Anthology." *Architectural Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 51.

Hillier, Bevis. *Young Betjeman*. John Murray, 1988.

Joad, C.E.M. "The Face of England." *Horizon*, May 1942, pp. 335-48.

Johnson, Philip C. and Edgar Kauffman, Jr. "American Architecture." *Horizon*, Oct. 1947, pp. 62-6.

Latham, Sean. "Cyril Connolly's *Horizon* (1940-50) and the End of Modernism." *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines: Volume I*, edited by Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, Oxford UP, 2013. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2015.

Latham, Sean, and Robert Scholes. "The Rise of Periodical Studies." *PMLA*, vol. 121, no. 2, 2006, pp. 517-31.

Lawrence, D.H. "To Nancy Pearn." 1 May 1929. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Edited by Keith Sagar and James T. Boulton, vol. VII, Cambridge UP, 1993, p. 269.

———. "Pictures on the Wall." *Architectural Review*, Feb. 1930, pp. 55-7.

———. "Then Disaster Looms Ahead." *Architectural Review*, Aug. 1930, pp. 47-50.

Lewis, Wyndham. *The Caliph's Design*. Gingko, 1986.

———. "Plain Home-Builder: Where Is Your Vorticist?" *Architectural Review*, Nov. 1934, pp. 155-8.

Loutit, Janelia Sinclair. Letter. *Horizon*, Apr. 1947, p. 225.

Maher, Ashley. "'Swastika arms of passage leading to nothing': Late Modernism and the 'New' Britain." *ELH*, vol. 80, no. 1, 2013, pp. 251-85.

"Marginalia." Editors' comment. *Architectural Review*, Feb. 1930, pp. 107-10.

"Marginalia." Editors' comment. *Architectural Review*, Mar. 1930, pp. 163-6.

Martin, J.L. "*Brazil Builds*." *Horizon*, Oct. 1943, pp. 280-5.

"1932." *Architectural Review*, Nov. 1979, pp. 285-7.

"1922-1934." *Architectural Review*, May 1996, pp. 42-52.

Priestley, J.B. "Prologue to Planning." *Horizon*, Mar. 1941, pp. 168-70.

Proust, Marcel. "Proust on Ruskin." *Architectural Review*, July 1952, p. 61

Read, Herbert. "Art in an Electric Atmosphere." *Horizon*, May 1941, pp. 308-13.

———. "Gropius." *Scrutiny*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1935, pp. 313-5.

———. "A New Humanism." *Architectural Review*, Oct. 1935, pp. 150-1.

———. "Novelism at the Royal Academy." *Architectural Review*, Feb. 1935, pp. 45-50.

Scholes, Robert, and Clifford Wulfman. *Modernism in the Magazines*. Yale UP, 2010.

Sitwell, Osbert, et al. "What Public Opinion Says." *Architectural Review*, Jan. 1933, pp. 11-6.

Spender, Stephen. "Brave New Rooms." *Design Quarterly*, vol. 158, Winter 1993, pp. 2-6.

———. Comment. *Horizon*, Feb. 1941, pp. 89-90.

———. "September Journal." *Horizon*, Feb. 1940, pp. 102-21.

Stanton, Michael N. *English Literary Journals, 1900-1950*. Gale, 1982.

Summerson, John. "Bread & Butter and Architecture." *Horizon*, Oct. 1942, pp. 233-43.

Valéry, Paul. "Eupalinos." Translated by William McCausland Stewart. *Architectural Review*, Aug. 1931, pp. 55-6.

———. "Function and Beauty." Translated by William McCausland Stewart. *Architectural Review*, Sept. 1931, p. 87.

Waugh, Evelyn. "Cities of the Future." *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, edited by Donat Gallagher, Methuen, 1983, pp. 63-5.

"What is Modern Architecture?" *MARS Report*, June 1945, p. 32.

Wilde, Oscar. "An Eighteen-Eighty Prophet." *Architectural Review*, Sept. 1932, p. 115.

Williams, Raymond. *The Politics of Modernism*. Edited by Tony Pinkney, Verso, 1989.

Wilson, A.N. *Betjeman*. Hutchinson, 2006.