

EVELYN WAUGH STUDIES

Vol. 48, No. 1

Spring 2017

CONTENTS

- [Et in Chatsworth Ego](#) 2
Peter J Comerford
- [Guy's Deleted Nippers, Part II:](#) 10
[Orphaned Edits and Inconsistent Adaptations of *Unconditional Surrender*](#)
Jeffrey A. Manley

REVIEWS

- [Still No Apologies](#) 18
Evelyn Waugh, by Ann Pasternak Slater.
Reviewed by Robert Murray Davis
- [Rising Returns](#) 19
Decline and Fall: TV Adaptation of Evelyn Waugh's Novel.
Reviewed by Jeffrey A. Manley
- [Bats in the Library](#) 26
The Weight of a World of Feeling: Reviews and Essays by Elizabeth Bowen.
Reviewed by Jeffrey A. Manley

[NEWS](#)

Et in Chatsworth Ego?

Peter J. Comerford

Evelyn Waugh entitled the first book of *Brideshead Revisited* “Et in Arcadia Ego.” His decision to do so has not been the subject of much scholarly gloss, despite the fact that his choices as a writer are quite deliberate and meaningful (Falcetta 51). In their 1965 essay on *Brideshead*, among the first to explore the novel’s symbolism, Delasanta and D’Avanzo attribute that choice to a view of the Brideshead estate as an English Arcadia, hearkening to the ancient Greeks of that region, who worshipped Pan (146). From that point forward, there is little in the scholarly literature until Michael Brennan’s 2013 monograph on Waugh. Brennan explicitly says the title is derived from a painting by Nicholas Poussin, *Les bergers d’Arcadie*. There are two extant versions of this painting, and Waugh may have been familiar with both (Brennan 80). The first of these was painted in 1627, and is the version at Chatsworth, the ancestral home of the Duke of Devonshire in Derbyshire. In this version, a group of shepherds come upon a tomb in the woods, bearing the inscription *Et in Arcadia Ego*, and there is a skull on top of the tomb, facing the shepherds. The second version dates to 1637, and is in the Louvre. In this version the tomb is in a more open field, and there is no skull on top. It bears the same inscription.¹

If the book title is derived from a work of visual art, that would support the view that the role of artists, and especially painters, is an important message in *Brideshead* (Comerford 612). That Waugh knew the earlier version is important because that version is read as a warning against the pursuit of thoughtless pleasures and speaks to Charles’s need for spiritual transformation (Comerford 612, and note 1, *supra*). Had Waugh seen neither version, then this attribution is plainly amiss Brennan, however, makes the following assertion:

Evelyn had visited the Louvre at Christmas 1925 and viewed its Poussins (including his [Poussin’s] other masterpiece, ‘*Dance to the Music of Time*’); and the earlier [1627] version of Poussin’s ‘*Les bergers d’Arcadie*’ was at Chatsworth, the seat of the Duke and Duchess of Devonshire, which he had visited in late-1932 with Diana Cooper. The potent imagery of one or both of these versions may have lingered in his mind as an encapsulation of the four insistent dualities—innocence and experience, love and loss, life and death, sin and redemption—which haunt the narratives of *Brideshead*. (Brennan 81; emphasis added.)

The lone footnote in this passage is a reference to Evelyn Waugh’s diary, though the diary entry in question (*EWD* 240) deals solely with his 1925 visit to Paris and seeing the Poussins at the Louvre. Waugh appears not to have kept a diary during the period in 1932 when he visited Chatsworth (*EWD* 354). Upon my recent inquiry, Brennan said that his source for the information about the Chatsworth visit was Selina Hastings’s biography of Waugh.² The Hastings reference speaks of Waugh touring with Cooper, the socialite wife of diplomat Duff

Cooper and sometime actress, as she appeared in the play *The Miracle*, and tersely states that “by day the two of them visited some of the great houses, Chatsworth, Hardwick, Belvoir...” (264). Diana Cooper herself published three volumes of memoirs, and the second of these, *The Light of Common Day*, covers the period in question. She wrote, referring to touring with Waugh in the autumn of 1932, “Together we would motor over the wild Derbyshire Peak and look at famous houses” (109). It appears that in 1932 the painting in question was in a bedroom in the private quarters at Chatsworth.³

That Cooper and Waugh were visiting these houses, such as Chatsworth, on day-trips does not lend confidence to the notion that they entered a bedroom in the private residential quarters, so it may well be that Waugh did not see the painting during that visit. The direct evidence on this specific point is equivocal at best. Nevertheless, that does not mean he never saw it. Other evidence can be brought to bear on this question which will support Brennan’s inference that Waugh had seen the earlier (1627) version, and his assertion concerning the derivation therefrom of the title of the first book of Waugh’s novel.

According to Waugh’s diary, in November 1924 he was visiting London’s National Gallery on occasion and was “beginning to ‘discover’ Velasquez, Rubens and Poussin. Poussin the least, however” (*EWD* 189). *Les bergers d’Arcadie* would not have been in the National Gallery at that time.⁴ At exactly that same period, Osbert Sitwell and his brother Sacheverell began a group called the Magnasco Society with the expressed purpose of restoring public regard for baroque art. The Sitwell siblings—Osbert, Sacheverell, and Edith—were British nobles with a country house, Renishaw, in Derbyshire, and all three were well known at the time for their literary and artistic endeavors.

Osbert Sitwell described the formation and activities of the Magnasco Society in detail in an article he later wrote for the British art magazine *Apollo*, entitled simply “The Magnasco Society.”⁵ This article sets forth details of each of the society’s exhibits, which occurred annually from 1924 through 1930, as well as reminiscences of some of the dinners that accompanied each year’s show. According to the Sitwells’ biographer, the Magnasco Society “became an influential publicity and pressure-group promoting the great and frequently neglected painters of the baroque” (Pearson 196). Moreover, “the society was conducted with true Sitwellian panache, the high point of its activities being a splendid annual dinner at the Savoy Hotel, surrounded by magnificent seventeenth-century paintings borrowed for the occasion” (Pearson 196).

During that period, Waugh had a strong connection with the Sitwells and noted in his diary that he stayed with them at their country home, Renishaw, for a visit lasting at least ten days during August 1930⁶ (*EWD* 327). As noted above, the next recorded instance of Waugh seeing the works of Poussin following his 1924 general discovery of Poussin in the National Gallery in London was his Christmas 1925 visit to the Louvre in Paris. The Louvre owns the later, 1637 version, of *Les bergers d’Arcadie*. While the pertinent diary entry simply says that he saw “the Poussins” during that visit (*EWD* 240), the paintings of Poussin are displayed in

proximity to one another in the Richelieu wing of the Louvre, so he is likely to have seen the painting in question.⁷

We know that he also kept up with the Sitwells during this period, noting, for instance, in a diary entry dated July 6, 1928, that he had had dinner at Osbert Sitwell's home in London and drank too much (*EWD* 295). At that same time (July 1928), the Magnasco Society had its fifth exhibit, featuring drawings of Nicholas Poussin and Claude Lorrain.⁸ The exhibit was at the Warren Gallery in London (Sitwell 387). It seems likely that Waugh would have gone to this exhibit, as he was in London at the time and dining with Sitwell, especially since we know that going to galleries and art museums was something Waugh enjoyed.⁹

On June 6, 1930, Waugh attended a lunch at the Ritz that included Sacheverell Sitwell (*EWD* 313). On June 12, 1930, he had cocktails with "Sachie," as he was known (*EWD* 314). He seems to have spent a good part of the next weeks in and around London, including a lunch on July 10, 1930, that again included Sachie Sitwell (*EWD* 321). This is significant, since the Magnasco Society had its seventh exhibition from June 26 to July 11, 1930. This exhibit was at the Spink and Son Gallery in London (Sitwell 390). Most important, for our purposes, this exhibit included the earlier (1627) Poussin version of *Les bergers d'Arcadie*, on loan from the Duke of Devonshire. An article about the exhibition appeared on July 5, 1930, in *The Spectator*,¹⁰ a conservative weekly with which Waugh was well familiar.¹¹ It is hard to imagine that in a close span of time, Waugh would have three social engagements with Sachie, including lunch on the penultimate day of the exhibit, and a fortnight at Renishaw with the Sitwells, and not have found time to go to this exhibit, which he quite likely read about, and see this painting.

Waugh's familiarity with the Magnasco Society is further confirmed in an odd way in his novel *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*. Duncan McLaren has pointed out parallels between Waugh's acquaintance with Monroe Wheeler, a long-time figure of importance at the Museum of Modern Art, and the character of an American art collector in *Pinfold*.¹² McLaren finds that this literary character is based on Wheeler and that there is a correspondence between the imagined conversation Pinfold has with the character and actual conversations Waugh had with Wheeler. When Waugh was touring in Ceylon in 1954, he encountered Wheeler and spent time with him looking at ruins. He wrote the following at the time in a letter to his wife, Laura:

I have had great fun sightseeing. Do you remember a nice little American who is director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, called Monroe Wheeler. [sic] We met him at Minnie Astor's. I ran into him in Colombo & we went off together for a few days looking at ruins & calling on the most eccentric local painter who lived in a very clean house with dozens of cheerful pictures by himself—half folk-art, half Picasso. (*LEW* 420)

In the novel, when Pinfold returns from his trip with the Wheeler figure, he is again plagued by the auditory hallucinations that trouble him throughout the book. On this occasion, the voices say, "We heard you, Gilbert. You were lying to that American. You've never stayed at

Rhinebeck. You've never heard of Magnasco. You don't know Osbert Sitwell" (OGP 217). Gilbert replies to these interior voices, "[h]ow you bore me!" (217). These must have been the same topics Waugh likely would have discussed with Wheeler. He does not make such allusions randomly, even where, as in this instance, the references are somewhat obscure or amount to an inside joke.

Rhinebeck is the town in New York that is home to the Astors' mansion, where Waugh met Wheeler¹³. Waugh in fact stayed on the Astors' estate in Rhinebeck in December 1948 (Manley 7) and, as noted above, he certainly knew Osbert Sitwell.^{14 15} The juxtaposition in Waugh's novel of Sitwell and Magnasco in the context of a discussion with a museum curator seems strongly to suggest that Waugh is referring to the Magnasco Society and not to the relatively obscure baroque painter Allesandro Magnasco for whom the society was named. If this inference is accurate, it would further suggest that Waugh must have had vivid memories of the Magnasco Society, whose last exhibit was in 1930, to still be talking about it almost thirty years later when he published *Pinfold* in 1957.

As for the Poussin, the Duke again lent the 1627 painting, this time for an exhibit *French Art 1200-1900* at the Royal Academy of Arts in London from January 4 to March 12, 1932.¹⁶ Waugh did not keep a diary during this period, so we have no direct record of his attendance at this exhibit. According to a letter in his collected papers, during that period he was working on an essay about the Royal Academy.¹⁷ It is well known that Waugh frequently visited museums and art galleries. It thus seems likely that he would have seen the painting for a second time during that show. Moreover, if he in fact saw the painting at Chatsworth later in the autumn of 1932, on the "great houses tour" with Diana Cooper, as Brennan suggests, it may well have been the *third* time in two years that he had seen it. One could well imagine him asking his hosts to allow him to see the painting if it had intrigued him, especially if he had seen it only months before (for the *second* time) at the Royal Academy.

From all the preceding evidence, we therefore create and trace the chronology of the following times and places that Waugh saw some version (either 1627 or 1637) of the Poussin painting *Les bergers d'Arcadie* under consideration in this article: 1924, Waugh's general discovery of Poussin's work in the National Gallery; 1925, the exhibition of the 1637 version in the Louvre (the specific Poussin painting, however, is not mentioned explicitly in the evidence); 1930, the Magnasco Society's exhibition in Spink and Son Gallery (London), of the 1627 version of the Poussin loaned from Chatsworth; from January 4 to March 12, 1932, the exhibition of the 1627 version of the Poussin in Royal Academy of Arts (London); and finally later in 1932, Waugh's viewing with Diana Cooper of the 1627 version again at Chatsworth.

Waugh might have viewed the painting, therefore, in either version, up to four times and clearly his aesthetic experience had an impact on his later artistic choices in his novel, *Brideshead Revisited*. Brennan's insight, although not heavily documented, proves to be correct. Quite likely, Waugh was familiar with both the 1627 and 1637 versions of the Poussin painting.

Evelyn Waugh Studies 6

As the 1627 Chatsworth version has a skull atop the tomb, and as he saw it on more occasions, and closer in time to writing *Brideshead*, that painting is the likely source of the Book I title. That connection is consistent with the fact that in *Brideshead*, Charles has a human skull in his rooms, purchased from the School of Medicine, which he sets in a bowl of roses with the motto “*Et in Arcadia ego*” inscribed on its forehead (*BR* 42). Waugh is, thus, telling us that the (merely) Arcadian existence Charles and Sebastian enjoyed was destined to be transitory, a precursor to the spiritual transformation of each.¹⁸

Evelyn Waugh Studies 7

Works Cited

- Amory, Mark, ed. *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*. Boston, Ma.: Ticknor & Fields, 1980.
- Brennan, Michael G. *Evelyn Waugh: Fictions, Faith and Family*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
- Comerford, Peter J. "Great Bosh: Modern Art in *Brideshead Revisited*." *Religion and the Arts*. 20.5 (2016). 608-636.
- Cooper, Diana *The Light of Common Day*. Boston, Ma.: Houghton Mifflin, 1959.
- Davie, Michael, ed. *The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh*. Boston, Ma.: Little, Brown, 1976.
- Delasanta, Rodney and D'Avanzo, Mario L. "Truth and Beauty in *Brideshead Revisited*." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 11 (1965), 140-152.
- Falcetta, Jennie-Rebecca. "Brideshead Illustrated: The Sacred and Profane Aesthetics of Captain Charles Ryder." *Religion & Literature* 46. 1 (Spring 2014): 51-74.
- Hastings, Selina. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography*. Boston, Ma.: Houghton Mifflin, 1995.
- Manley, Jeffrey, and John McGinty. "'Something Entirely Unique': Evelyn Waugh's 1948-49 Tours of North America, Part 1, Planning and Fact Finding." *Evelyn Waugh Studies*. 43.3 (Winter 2013).
- Pearson, John *The Sitwells: A Family's Biography*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace, 1978.
- Sitwell, Osbert. "The Magnasco Society" *Apollo*. LXXIX. 27. (May 1964). 378-90.
- Waugh, Evelyn. *Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder*. Boston, Ma.: Little Brown, 1979.
- . *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*. Boston, Ma.: Little Brown, 1979.
- . "Urbane Enjoyment Personified" *New York Times Magazine*, November 30, 1952. *Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*. Ed. Donat Gallagher. Boston: Little Brown, 1983. 423.

Evelyn Waugh Studies 8

Notes

1 The two versions have been interpreted differently by art historians. Panofsky, Erwin, “*Et in Arcadia Ego*: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition.” *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Garden City, New York: 1957. 295-320. Panofsky traces the development of this theme, i.e., “Et in Arcadia Ego,” between the first and second versions of the paintings by Poussin. The earlier (1627) version, housed at Chatsworth, portrays a skull atop a sarcophagus, and the Latin phrase is understood as being spoken by Death, telling us that even in Arcadia there is death, and serves as a warning against “thoughtless pleasures soon to be ended.” Panofsky concludes that in the second version, from 1637 and found in the Louvre, the admonitory *memento mori* is replaced by an elegiac meditation on a beautiful past, and the Latin phrase is spoken by the decedent in the tomb, recalling when he too enjoyed those sylvan glens (Comerford, note 2).

2 Private e-mail correspondence between Brennan and the present author dated December 7, 2015.

3 In private e-mail correspondence on October 28, 2015, between the present author and Charles Noble, Curator (Collections Documentation) at Chatsworth, the fact that the painting was at Chatsworth, and that it was likely in a bedroom in the residential quarters, was established. I am grateful to Mr. Noble for his patient responses to my inquiries on this point, and for alerting me to, and documenting, the exhibition history of the painting.

4 In private e-mail correspondence on October 28, 2015, with Charles Noble, he set forth that the only times during the relevant period that this painting was not at Chatsworth were in 1925 when it was being cleaned, later that year when it was on loan to the Petit Palais in Paris, in 1930 when it was at the Magnasco Society exhibit, and 1932 (1/4 to 3/12) when it was at the Royal Academy.

5 The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Hazel Rowland of *Apollo* magazine for retrieving and sending me a copy of Osbert Sitwell’s essay on the Magnasco Society from the May 1964 issue of that publication.

6 At this same time, Waugh was receiving instruction toward his conversion to Roman Catholicism. In his diary entry of July 8, 1930, he records having gone to Farm Street for instruction from Father Darcy (*EWD* 320). Readers will recall that in the process of religious conversion undergone by Charles Ryder, Ryder speaks of the parallel “conversion to the baroque” he experienced (*BR* 82). The baroque conversion was a step toward the religious conversion (Comerford 623-624). We can see that Waugh’s own conversion to Catholicism and to the baroque were likewise simultaneous, and conceivably interwoven.

7 <https://www.nicolas-poussin.com/en/the-louvre/>

8 There were at least ten drawings by Poussin in this exhibit, but none appears to be on a subject related to *Les bergers d’Arcadie* (Sitwell 387-89).

9 During the period from 1924 to 1932, his diaries reflect twenty-eight visits to galleries, museums or similar venues.

10 The full text of the article, as it pertains to this exhibit, is as follows:

A small but absolutely first-rate exhibition of landscapes, arranged by the Magnasco Society, is on view at Messrs. Spinks’ Galleries, St. James Street. On this occasion the Magnasco Society has to some extent cast off the trammels of a certain period of Baroque Art and attempts with a very large measure of success to illustrate the development of landscape painting in Europe. H.M. the King has lent that magnificent pair of landscapes by Rubens, *Summer* and *Winter*. The German and Dutch schools are represented with works by Lucas Cranach and Joachim Patinir; the Venetian School by Cima Tintoretto and Canaletto. Claude Lorain, Nicholas Poussin, Jean Francois Millet and Corot illustrate the development

Evelyn Waugh Studies 9

in France and the reputation of the English school is upheld triumphantly by Richard Wilson's superb *Lake of Nemi*. (D. C. Fincham, *The Spectator*, 5 July 1930, 14, accessed at <http://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/5th-july-1930/14/art>)

11 In his collection of *Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*, (Little Brown 1983), Donat Gallagher writes that in 1929 *The Spectator* published an essay by Waugh for a series on "young people under 30," thirty-three travel reviews between 1932 and 1939, as well as a number of book reviews (112). Waugh's collected letters contains letters to the editor of *The Spectator* on six occasions between 1939 and 1961. He also wrote eleven letters referring to items in *The Spectator* between 1941 and 1963. (Amory, Mark, ed. *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*. Ticknor & Fields 1980.)

12 <http://www.evelynwaugh.org.uk/styled-61/index.html>

13 The friendship evidently persisted, at least in epistolary form. Wheeler must have sent Waugh a copy of a book he edited for the Museum of Modern Art entitled *Modern Drawings*. We know this because on July 5, 1954, Waugh wrote to Wheeler thanking him for the book, and for his kindness while in Ceylon, which seems to have included "4 Roses Whisky." He congratulates Wheeler and his compatriots for their great work in "sweeping Europe clean of the artifacts of the last disastrous 50 years" and says "I pray I may live to see a time when no talk of Klee or Picasso or Léger remains on this side of the ocean." The letter is now in the Beinecke Library at Yale University. Waugh sent a first edition, presentation copy of *Love among the Ruins* to Wheeler, inscribed "with kind memories of Ceylon." (<https://www.baumanrarebooks.com/rare-books/waugh-evelyn/love-among-the-ruins/101624.aspx>)

14 In fact, on November 30, 1952, Waugh published an article about Osbert Sitwell, entitled "Urbane Enjoyment Personified," in the *New York Times Magazine*.

15 Wheeler also knew the Sitwells, who visited New York at the same time (1948-49) that Waugh was there. Wheeler organized a performance of Edith Sitwell's *Facades* at the Museum of Modern Art, to great success (Pearson 402). Since both Waugh, Wheeler, and the Sitwells were socializing with Mrs. Astor in New York, they may even have been together as a group.

16 <http://www.racollection.org.uk/ixbin/indexplus?record=VOL6204>

17 See the Davies catalogue of the Waugh Archive at the University of Texas, Austin, letter E186.

18 I explore the significance of this painting in the novel at greater length in "Great Bosh: Modern Art in *Brideshead Revisited*," but that is beyond the scope of the present essay.

Guy's Deleted Nippers, Part II: Orphaned Edits and Inconsistent Adaptations of *Unconditional Surrender*

Jeffrey A. Manley

In Part I of this article, published in the preceding issue of *EWS* (47.3), the motivation for Evelyn Waugh's post-publication change in the ending of *Unconditional Surrender* as well as the inconsistency in the implementation of and confusion resulting from that change were explored. In this part, the story continues by examining the fate of other edits he made at about the same time. These did not relate to the ending but to various matters he noted on rereading as well as points raised by Anthony Powell and other readers. The publishers were inconsistent in adopting them, as was Waugh himself in carrying them forward into *Sword of Honour*, and many appear only in one printing of the book. The translations undertaken during Waugh's lifetime reflected these changes as well as those in the ending, but after he died other translations were inconsistent. In addition, the impact that all these changes had on other adaptations of the book, such as dramatizations, are inconsistent. The only dramatization undertaken in Waugh's lifetime reflected the changed ending, thanks to his personal intervention, but afterwards, some did and some did not.

1. The Orphaned Edits and "Reader Errata"

As noted in Part I, in addition to his changes to the ending, Waugh made other revisions to the text of *Unconditional Surrender*. Waugh entered these into the marked-up copy in 1961. There were by my count 15 of these (not including 4 added in 1962). Most involved typos, punctuation or "wordsmithing" edits intended to improve the text. There were several of a more substantive nature, though none approaching the importance of the ending. These additional edits suffered an even worse fate than the changed ending and most were marooned in the C&H Second Impression.

C&H seems to have included all of Waugh's edits, although they "fiddled" a bit with one or two. They included revisions changing "G.I." to "GSO(1)" (68), "nephew" to "brother-in-law" (83), "Father" to "Daddy" in the words of a song (135),¹ and "Mrs. Corner" to "Mrs. Warner" (159, *passim*).² Little, Brown, on the other hand, made only three non-substantive edits (apparently selected at random) and included none of the substantive revisions (except the

¹ The song was *Daddy Wouldn't Buy Me a Bow-Wow*, first popular in the 1890s. It was revived in the 1934 musical film *Evergreen* where it was sung by Jessie Matthews. According to Wikipedia, it also enjoyed a revival after WWII, although Waugh supposes that Ludovic must have overheard it when it was "sung reminiscently" by an uncle or his father "to the extraordinary little boy who was to become Ludovic."

² As noted in Part I, this change was suggested by Anthony Powell.

ending).³ They continued to ignore most of these edits, up to and including their 2012 reprint. As noted in Part I, Little, Brown reverted to the original ending therein.

Most of these edits were lost when Waugh came to make the revisions for the *SoH* recension. Because he used the unrevised Penguin copies to make his edits, these minor revisions fell out, with a few exceptions. The Penguin proofreaders caught two of Waugh's revisions that were effectively typos, and Waugh himself made two changes consistent with (but slightly different from) his earlier revisions. This means that eleven of Waugh's revisions failed to make it through to his "final version." It seems strange that he didn't notice that these other revisions were missing from the Penguin edition, but several years had passed since he made the edits in 1961, and, as noted in Part I, by 1964 he was not as sharp as he once was.

There were also four revisions in the mark-up copy that do not show up in the C&H Second Impression. These are most likely the "errata noted by readers 1962", which Waugh recorded in the front flyleaf of the book. He must have added them after the book was returned from the printer. There is no other indication in the marked-up text to distinguish these changes from others he made earlier. Nor does the mark-up indicate the identity of the readers who may have proposed these edits or their motivations for doing so.⁴

One of these edits survives in *SoH* thanks to Waugh's own efforts. In the mark-up, Waugh changed Uncle Peregrine's discussion of the etymology and pronunciation of "homosexual" by deleting the sentence "It comes from the Greek not the Latin," and substituting, "Besides the 'o' is short, *as in homeopathic*" (173; emphasis added). He later inserted this edit into the text of *SoH* in slightly different form, substituting "homogeneous" for "homeopathic" (681). What may have motivated this change is curious, since Waugh's original version appears to be correct as to both etymology and pronunciation.

Waugh also proposed to change Anzio to Salerno, a reference to the Allied landings in Italy. What may have motivated this proposal is also unclear. From the context, he is writing about actions taking place in October 1943 when Tommy Blackhouse was under orders to depart "to rehearse the Anzio landing" (12). The Salerno landings would already have taken place by that time, and reference to a rehearsal for Salerno would have been an anachronism. So, any "rehearsal" would probably have related to Anzio (which is what Waugh wrote in the original), where a landing took place in Spring 1944. As noted by Carlos Villar Flor, however, in the recent study *In The Picture: The Facts behind the Fiction in Evelyn Waugh's Sword of Honour* (Amsterdam, 2014, 94-95), the Anzio reference itself also involves a "slight anachronism." That operation "was conceived by Churchill during his convalescence from pneumonia in Marrakesh

³ A frustrated senior editor of Little, Brown told Robert Murray Davis that Waugh's frequent changes required the publisher to alter plates between printings of almost all his books. *English Language Notes* 7, Dec. 1969, 129.

⁴ It is possible that Waugh preserved copies of these reader comments (assuming they were in writing) among the correspondence archived at the British Library. But without knowing the identity of the senders, it would require a monumental effort to locate them, since the correspondence is archived by sender.

in December [1943], although it is true that General Alexander...had already thought about the possibility of a similar move in October.” It is possible that Waugh was trying to avoid one anachronism only to fall into another, as proposed by a reader. But whatever may have been the motivation for this change, it was not adopted in any edition.

Another proposal made but not adopted was the substitution of blouse for tunic as an article of military dress (143). This is just the sort of arcane point of military practice that a reader might have suggested.

Finally, there was also a proposal to change Harold Alexander’s rank to Field Marshall from the original version in which he was General (268). This reference to Alexander’s rank is made in the late Summer-early Fall of 1944 when Guy is still stationed in Begoy, Yugoslavia. Alexander’s promotion from General to Field Marshall took place only in December 1944, a point in time after the reference to his rank was made in the context of the novel. (See 291, referring to action taking place in the third week in September 1944, well past the reference to Alexander’s rank on 268.) So again, Waugh appears to have been correct the first time, and the motivation for the change is also questionable. It was not, in any event, adopted.

The upshot of all this is that the C&H Second Impression is the most nearly definitive edition of *Unconditional Surrender*. But even that contains the anomaly regarding Guy’s “children” and does not include any of the “reader errata.” There has never been a published text of either *Unconditional Surrender* or the *SoH* recension that is revised exactly as Waugh intended. In this regard, it is hard to know what he “intended” with respect to the reader errata except in the case of the pronunciation and etymology of “homosexual,” where Waugh himself actually inserted the change into the text of *SoH*.

2. Inconsistent Translations

As noted in Part I, Waugh directed that translations be made from his corrected text. His agents followed his instructions with respect to the two translations published while he was still living. The translators were sent the revised C&H Second Impression. The French translation (*La capitulation*, Paris, 1962) by Jeanne Hebert-Stevens, however, contains only a truncated version of Waugh’s changes to the ending. The reference to Guy and Domenica’s “two boys of their own” and to Domenica’s frequent childbearing are deleted but not replaced by Waugh’s language about their having no children of their own. The previous page contains Box-Bender’s question to Guy: “*Comment ça va á Broome?... Domenica? Les enfants aussi?*” (403). Without the references on the final pages to Domenica’s childlessness, this earlier reference to “children”

has a heightened potential for confusion, whereas in the English version it creates only ambiguity.⁵

The 1963 Italian translation by Remo Ceserani (*Resa incondizionata*), reflects Waugh's change ("Non hanno figli propri, ma questo non è sempre svantaggio" [410; 2013 Bompiani edition]). On the previous page, the anomaly is also preserved ("*Domenica sta bene, e i bambini?*").⁶

More recently, a Spanish version, *Rendición incondicional* (Madrid, Cátedra, 2011), was translated by Waugh scholar, Carlos Villar Flor, and Gabriel Insausti, with an introduction by Villar Flor. This used the original U.S. edition (*The End of the Battle*) as a template and, consequently, reflected the unedited ending ("*Ahora tienen dos chicos propios, Domenica, cuando no está de parto, se ocupa de la granja de Broome*" [419]). In a footnote to that text, however, Villar Flor explains in detail Waugh's revised ending as it appeared in *SoH*, as well as his motivation for the change.

In 2010, a Russian version was published (*Bezogovorochnaia Kapituliatsia*, Moscow, AST Publishers). This was translated by Iu. Fokina and reflected the original ending ("*Teper u Gaia s Domenikoi uzhe svoyikh mal'chishek dvoye*" [381]). Although the text is annotated (primarily explaining historic, literary or geographic references), there is no explanatory footnote about the changed ending.⁷ An earlier 1977 Soviet Russian translation, although entitled *Ofitsery i dzhentl'menyi*, contained all three volumes and seems to have used *SoH* as its text (with certain politically motivated additional abridgements); this Soviet translation reflected the revised ending as it appeared in *SoH* ("*Zhal, chto u nikh nyet svoyikh deteyi*" [615]). The new Russian edition of volume 3 also restored passages deleted by the Soviet version such as the story of the Jewish refugees.⁸

⁵ The French translation was published by Éditions Stock, and there is a reference in the A.D. Peters & Co. archive at the University of Texas to a copy having been forwarded to Waugh (letter dated 11 October 1962). No copy of the French edition survives at UT, however, so Waugh may have passed it on to a Francophone friend. I have found no record of Waugh's ever having noticed the failure of the French translator to follow his exact instructions. The translation was republished most recently in 2014 by Éditions Robert Laffont, S.A., in a paperback edition referring to the original 1962 translation with no revisions indicated.

⁶ The French and Italian translators also included other changes from the second C&H printing, such as the substitution of "Mrs. Warner" for "Mrs. Corner" and the corrected description of Guy as Box-Bender's brother-in-law ("*beau-frère*," p. 114 of French version, and "*cognato*," p. 118 of the Italian) rather than nephew as in the first printings.

⁷ The Russian translator was apparently working from the text of the Penguin edition. She noted a typo in a Latin phrase used in the funeral service of Guy's father ("*via mutatur*" in Penguin should read "*vita mutatur*"). Waugh himself missed that one when he marked up the Penguin text for the *SoH* recension, and it has crept into the "final version" (*SoH*, 602). He did, as noted previously, catch the Penguin typo on p. 136 ("with a shadow of ridicule" should be "without a shadow of ridicule," *SoH* 682; emphasis added). The Russian translator, however, follows the Penguin misprint and describes Virginia's laughter as a "little bit mocking" (*chutochku izdevatel'skii* [214]).

⁸ The new Russian version also indicates publication with permission of the copyright holders. The earlier edition was printed without their approval and with no payment of royalties, consistent with Soviet Russian practice at the time. See *EWNS* 14.2 (Autumn 1980), 5 ("EW and the Russian Translations").

A West German translation was published in 1979 (Hamburg, Albrecht Knaus Verlag). It was translated by Werner Peterich and entitled *Ohne Furcht und Tadel*, literally *Beyond Fear and Blame*, a description frequently used in connection with a heroic knight. This version, like the Soviet one, was also based on the *SoH* recension and reflected the revised ending (“*Schade dass die selber keine Kinder haben*” [781]).

3. Non-print Versions Vary

There have also been at least four dramatizations of *SoH*. The BBC did a three-part TV version in 1967 and two radio series—one in 1974 and the other in 2013. As noted in Part I, Waugh was himself involved in the negotiations leading up to the rights for the BBC TV film and intervened to assure that the writers used the revised version of the ending. In this instance, Waugh was successful. The script for the TV film, by Giles Cooper, modifies Box-Bender’s question to Guy about his family: “Domenica all right—and *the child?*” (emphasis added) and also has Box-Bender explain to Elderberry in answer to his question as to whether Guy and Domenica have any children: “None of their own, just the one boy.”⁹ Gene Phillips has written that Laura Waugh told him that “Waugh looked the script over and seemed pleased with it” (Gene Phillips, *Evelyn Waugh’s Officers, Gentlemen and Rogues* (1975), 140).

In the two BBC radio series, the record is mixed. The 1974 version was adapted by Barry Campbell in 11 episodes. No written communication could be found in the BBC files of any correspondence between Campbell and Waugh’s agents or publishers about the variant endings and, unfortunately, he got it wrong. His script for Episode 11 contains an almost verbatim copy of the dialogue between Box-Bender and Elderberry about Guy and Domenica’s children (“two boys of their own”) as it appears in the original C&H and the later Penguin editions.¹⁰ On the other hand, the 2013 BBC Radio 4 series of 7 episodes dramatized by Jeremy Front used the revised ending (“no children of their own”).¹¹

In 2001, U.K. Channel 4 broadcast a two-part, 191-minute serial adapted for TV by novelist William Boyd. This film ends in a scene where the actor playing Guy (Daniel Craig) meets his boy (Trimmer’s bastard) in rural England *circa* 1945 with his sister Angela looking on. There is no suggestion of Guy’s remarriage or additional children (although those events would

⁹ BBC Written Archives Centre, TV Drama Scripts, Microfilm Film File 230/231, Theatre 625, *Sword of Honour*, Part 3, 110-12. (Adapted for TV by Giles Cooper.)

¹⁰ BBC Written Archives Centre, Microfiche File: *Sword of Honour* (1974), Episode 11, 37. This radio series was rebroadcast several times, most recently in 2008.

¹¹ MP3 download of programme from BBC Radio 4.

have occurred later). The concluding Epilogue from the novel with Box-Bender, Guy and Elderberry at Bellamy's in 1951 is not included in the C4 version.

There have also been at least three audio recordings of the text of *Unconditional Surrender*. An unabridged version (issued on 8 audiocassettes; 9:30 hrs.), read by Christian Rodska, uses the original ending as it appeared in the C&H first printing ("two boys of their own"). At least one of the other versions is abridged; issued in 1997 by Penguin Audiobooks (2 audiocassettes; 3 hours), it was edited by Neville Teller and read by Robert Powell. The other, issued by Books on Tape, Inc. in the U.S. (6 audiocassettes; 9 hrs.) in 1992 under the title *The End of the Battle*, is read by David Case. It is not known to me which endings were used for these latter two audio versions, although since the 3-hour abridgement was done by Penguin, a good guess would be that the original ending would have been used for that (if indeed the epilogue was even included in the abridgement). In any event, the potential additional confusion made possible by these audio formats of the books is obvious.

Conclusion

The *Complete Works of Waugh* project will hopefully be able to address this problem and come up with a definitive edition of the work. They have announced an intention to publish individual copies of the war trilogy.¹² The text of volume 3 will no doubt show the changes Waugh made in the individual volumes as well as in the final recension. Whether it will be the format Waugh preferred is more difficult to say. His intention, as noted in Part I, seems to have been that the individual volumes would eventually fall out of print and be replaced by the single volume recension he had produced as a "final version." Readers, however, appear to have opted for smaller individual volumes, if the publishers' actions are anything to go by. Indeed, had he lived, Waugh himself may well have had second thoughts about his hefty tome replacing the more popular (and possibly more profitable) multiple smaller volumes. As a former publisher, it is hard to believe that he would have had any objection to the continued issuance of the trilogy in individual volumes, updated to reflect his edits, if that proved to be what the public preferred.

¹² Web: University of Leicester/Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh/About/Volumes (viewed 21 August 2016).

Works Cited: Part II

- Campbell, Barry. *Sword of Honour*. (Script for Radio Adaptation). Microfiche. BBC Written Archives Centre: fiche *Sword of Honour* (1974), Episode 11.
- Cooper, Giles. *Sword of Honour*. (Script for TV Adaptation). Microfilm. BBC Written Archives Centre, TV Drama Scripts: Film File 230/231, Theatre 625, *Sword of Honour*, Part 3.
- Front, Jeremy. *Sword of Honour*. (BBC Radio 4 Adaptation). MP3. 2008.
- Phillips, Gene. *Evelyn Waugh's Officers, Gentlemen and Rogues*. Chicago: Publisher, Nelson-Hall, 1977.
- U of Leicester/*Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh/About/Volumes* (Web: viewed 21 August 2016).
- Villar Flor, Carlos and Donat Gallagher. *In The Picture: The Facts Behind the Fiction in Evelyn Waugh's Sword of Honour*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014.
- Waugh, Evelyn.. *Bezogovorochnaia Kapituliatsia*, Trans. Iu. Fokina. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Astrel, 2010.
- . *La capitulation*. Trans. Jeanne Hebert-Stevens. Paris: Lafont, 2014.
- . *Ofitseryi i dzhentl'menyi*. Trans. P.N. Paveletskii and I. A. Razumnii. Moscow: Voenizdat, 1977.
- . *Ohne Furcht und Tadel*. Trans. Werner Peterich. Hamburg: Fischer, 1979.
- . *Rendición incondicional*, Trans. Carlos Villar Flor and Gabriel Insaust. Madrid: Cátedra, 2011.
- . *Resa incondizionata*. Trans. Remo Ceserani. Milan: Bompiani, 2013.
- . *Sword of Honour*. London: C&H, 1965.
- . *Unconditional Surrender*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.

---. ---. Leather binding. *Evelyn Waugh Collection*. Austin: Harry Ransom Center, U of Texas, London, 1961.

---. ---. London: C&H, 1961.

---. ---. New York: Back Bay (Little, Brown), 2012

---. ---. Second Impression. London: C&H, 1961.

REVIEWS

Still No Apologies

Evelyn Waugh, by Ann Pasternak Slater. Devon: Northcote House, 2016. 325 pp. £35, \$59.95, hardback.

Reviewed by Robert Murray Davis

Ann Pasternak Slater's critical book on Evelyn Waugh has justly received favorable attention on both sides of the Atlantic, and for that matter the Pacific, some of it by people well known to members of the Waugh society, including Chip Long in EWS 47:2 (Autumn 2016).

My interest in the book was whetted by Dr. Slater's comment that I probably wouldn't like it. This was not a challenge but a resigned acceptance of what she took to be a fact.

Having read the book, I find several reasons not just to like it but to applaud it. For one thing, it mentions no theorists at all; for another, the critical approach does pretty much what I would do, though perhaps not as well as she does it; for a third, I learned something from almost every chapter.

Dr. Slater is particularly sharp in tracing elements in the novels to children's books, most obviously in the epigraphs to *Vile Bodies*, and in ferreting out books like Haile Selassie's autobiography.

This research is one reason that she is able to establish some of the contexts—literary, social, spiritual—within which Waugh produced his fiction. She is particularly astute in tracing leitmotifs within individual books and in Waugh's work as a whole. And unlike many critics, she is critical, applauding when she approves of Waugh's performance, condemning when she thinks it falls short of producing the desired effect.

Although Dr. Slater uses biographical fact to show how Waugh clarifies and enriches the material in fictional form, she rarely regards fact as more authoritative than the fictional world he has created. Her interweaving of fact and fiction in the war trilogy is particularly rich. However, neither *The Loved One* nor *Helena* seems amenable to this treatment, and as a result the emphasis falls more on life than on art. These chapters are interesting, but they don't seem to fit well in the carefully constructed plan of the book.

That aside, and not very far aside, the book is a genuine contribution to our understanding of Waugh's fiction. And when one compares it to the mid-1950s pamphlet by Christopher Hollis in the previous *Writers and Their Work* series, we can see how far appreciation of Waugh as artist has progressed.

Rising Returns

Decline and Fall: TV Adaptation of Evelyn Waugh's Novel, BBC One (Three Episodes: 31 March, 7 & 14 April 2017); Acorn TV (video streaming from 15 May 2017), Script by James Wood, Directed by Guillem Morales, Produced by Tiger Aspect Drama and Cave Bear Productions for BBC.

Reviewed by Jeffrey A. Manley

In 2016, the BBC commissioned an adaptation of Waugh's first novel *Decline and Fall* to mark the 50th anniversary of his death. The first thing to note about the resulting TV series is that it remains loyal to Waugh's plot, characters and dialogue throughout all three episodes. Disastrous results such as the 1965 Hollywood version of *The Loved One* and the first film adaptation of *Decline and Fall* in 1968, as well as the 2008 remake of *Brideshead Revisited*, have been avoided. The TV versions written by novelist William Boyd of *Sword of Honour* (2001) and *Scoop* (1997), as well as the film version of *A Handful of Dust* (1988), were good "up to a point" but suffered from time constraints causing much of the story and many of the characters to be lost. The best example and probably the masterpiece of these TV adaptations is, of course, Granada TV's 11-hour series of *Brideshead Revisited* in 1981. Indeed, the success of that series can be given much of the credit for having restored Waugh's popularity as a writer after the decay that had set in during the 1960-70s when much of his work had fallen out of print. *Decline and Fall* is missing the nostalgia and drama of Granada's masterpiece, but for a comedy, it is about as faithful to the original as can be expected while still delivering the laughs.

The importance of the laughter is spelled out in Waugh's note to the original UK edition of 1928. The note urges the reader to "Please bear in mind throughout that IT IS MEANT TO BE FUNNY." That admonition was written to address concerns of the publishers when the first edition was issued that some of the contents might be taken as "shocking." His original publisher Duckworth turned it down, although Anthony Powell, who worked at that firm and introduced Waugh to it, later explained that this had more to do with Waugh's unapproved courtship of Evelyn Gardner, related to one of Duckworth's directors, than to any of the book's contents. Controversy continued at Chapman and Hall where Waugh took it next, and they insisted on modifications. Waugh agreed and the introductory note was part of that effort. The original text was restored when Waugh edited the 1962 edition, and the introductory note was dropped.¹

The adapters of the BBC film clearly got Waugh's message. Even in the darker portions of the story, they consistently preserve what humor they could find and add, with considerable success, some of their own. What omissions are made are usually for purposes of avoiding extended dialogue, such as in Part 1 where Philbrick's backstory is told in three different versions, extending over several pages. That is one point where the book itself rather drags. The

¹The "Author's Note" did not appear in the US edition of the book.

thought is not dropped entirely, as the other characters briefly discuss with one another the fact that Philbrick has been distributing differing versions of his past life. Another modification is more noticeable. Waugh's hilarious description of the Llanabba Silver Band does not translate to the screen: "Ten men of revolting appearance were approaching from the drive...." The band is there on the screen and consigned to its tent, but to look at them doesn't convey the humor that flows from Waugh's written description. Their petty squabbling in the pub over division of their fee also falls away.

Another modification actually comes off better than the original. The scenes with Chokey at the sports day were always going to be awkward and are somewhat cringe-making even on the page when read today. The scriptwriters play it straight and have an actor (Chike Okonkwo) who both looks and speaks the part brilliantly, using the dialogue right off the page. Given that this racist dialogue is not only not particularly funny but potentially embarrassing, the script adds an element to Dr. Fagan's dialogue to make it work. Understanding that he needs to be polite to Chokey whilst sucking up to Margot Beste-Chetwynde, he answers several of Chokey's rhetorical questions repeatedly with the phrase "He do. He do." As played by veteran actor David Suchet, this line is delivered perfectly, down to just the right amount of toadying body language. It comes across as one of the funniest lines in the film and saves the scene.

In the second episode there is less opportunity for laughter in Waugh's original. Otto Silenus is given more lines and helps to add some humor, but Waugh's opening sequence of Book 2, where he satirizes both modern architecture as well as overzealous preservation of what is old for its own sake, is lost.² Also gone are most of the frequent, brief written elements of the modern style that show that the new house is trying too hard to succeed simply as something new. On the screen, the house, outside and in, looks like Waugh's description of King's Thursday. It is a modern, cold, concrete structure, but there's nothing particularly funny about that, and this is not helped by the fact that the house is furnished and decorated rather tastefully and doesn't look at all uncomfortable. As with the Llanabba band, it is Waugh's written satirical narratives that provide the comedy for this theme, and they cannot be conveyed visually. The writers redeem this element somewhat by making more than Waugh did of Otto's refusal to build staircases that will spoil the interior contours of his design.

The final episode is more of a challenge. It begins well enough with Paul's arrest in the hotel restaurant. In the book, this scene is not exactly a laugh riot, as Alastair Digby-Vane-Trumpington keeps making dismissive comments to the police inspector. That dialogue survives but is followed by a hilarious argument, not in the book, among Paul, Alastair and Peter Beste-Chetwynde about what Paul should order from the menu to be brought to the table and ready for

² The adapters provide a brief nod to Waugh's satire of historic preservation. Otto refers the guests at Margot's party to a small painting of the old King's Thursday (which looks rather ordinary as these things go) and informs them that its destruction was no loss as the house was "unfit for habitation."

him to eat upon his expected return after he has sorted out the police. It's like a scene from the Marx Brothers or Abbott and Costello.

The biggest hurdle in this episode is the death of Mr. Prendergast. In the novel this is revealed to Paul and the reader as Philbrick explains the details to Paul in chapel to the tune of "Oh God Our Help in Ages Past." That's mildly funny on the page because you have time to think about it as you put the words to the familiar tune but probably wouldn't come across on film. The adaptation comes up with an even funnier alternative, which builds up from Paul's earlier encounters with the mad prisoner who has visions and then the Prison Governor's decision to provide the madman with carpenter's tools. This culminates in a brilliant sight gag revealing Prendy's fate that wouldn't work at all on the page. So it's a perfect pay off for changing the book. But even so, the writers aren't finished; they preserve Waugh's own gag with the hymn by using it for another purpose.

The concluding scenes from the novel are truncated and streamlined in the film. Among scenes omitted is Paul's trip to Corfu where he comes to terms with his "death." This also eliminates his chance meeting there with Otto and Otto's speech on people being static and dynamic, using "the big wheel at Luna Park" as his example. Otto has previously been given a few sentences relating to the static/dynamic dichotomy in Episode 2 of the film, but the illustration using the wheel is assigned in the film to Philbrick in Episode 3 just before Paul leaves prison. And he uses a Ferris wheel for his illustration, not the sort of "joy wheel" described by Otto.³ The static/dynamic theme is preserved but not at all in the way it is conveyed in the book, which is too bad, because although there is an element of comedy in it, Waugh probably had a serious intent as well, and this is lost in Philbrick's sentimental recitation.

There are also some minor changes that seem gratuitous. For example, in the novel one of the young women recruited to be shipped to South America to work in Margot's warehouses is Jane Grimes, Capt. Grimes' estranged wife. Waugh must have intended this as an added bit of irony in connection with Grimes' employment in aid of Margot's scheme. This young lady is renamed Jane Jenkins in the TV film. It may be due to another change which has Paul meet Grimes in London at the interview of the new recruits rather than earlier on a visit to King's Thursday. This is when we learn that Grimes has survived his fake suicide and signed on to Margot's enterprise. A meeting with his wife in London at that point could have created unintended complications outside the scope of the story. In another example, Peter Beste-Chetwynde matriculates at Cambridge in the TV film rather than Oxford in the book. This removes him from the final scene in the book where he meets with Paul after he has become a member of the Bollinger Club and a student at Scone College where the club convenes in his rooms. Again, Waugh seems to be aiming at an additional level of irony by sending Peter to

³ The joy wheel, which still exists at Luna Park in Sydney, was flat and spun around like a huge phonograph record, using centrifugal force to provide thrills, just as Otto describes it in the book (Penguin, 2011, 280-81). A Ferris wheel does not have the same effect at all and does not work as an example of separating static from dynamic persons by their placement on the wheel, rendering Philbrick's speech in the film a nonsense.

Oxford and joining him to the Bollinger. What's wrong with that? This may have been changed due to time constraints preventing that last meeting in the film.

Another decision faced by the scriptwriters was how to have the actors pronounce Beste-Chetwynde. Waugh doesn't give any hints, except perhaps that Margot's black boyfriend is named Solomon Cholmondley, which the English pronounce "Chumley." Taking that possible hint, and bearing in mind that there is a multitude of upper class English names with such eccentric pronunciations (most notably, Featherstonehaugh is pronounced "Fanshaw"), the filmmakers elected to use the pronunciation "Beest-Cheating." A *Guardian* columnist (Peter Bradshaw) commented: "a sly, almost subliminal joke there, for those classy enough to know the rule. But that's English for you: knowing how to, for example, say Magdalen College and when and where to spell it with an "e" on the end."⁴ Another critic (Alex Larman), writing in in *The Guardian* several years ago, thought the name was pronounced "Beast Chained".⁵ One wonders how Waugh pronounced the name when he read the book out or whether such a reading was ever recorded?

Overall, the script has to be given very high marks for both preserving the original plot and retaining (and even improving upon) Waugh's humor. This must be largely to the credit of scriptwriter James Wood whose previous work includes the TV comedy series *Rev* which ran for three seasons on BBC. The same can be said of the characters. None of the important characters is lost. Cuts must have been tempting for the sake of economy because the novel is full of characters who appear only briefly, but very few have been lost.⁶

By the same token, new characters extraneous to the novel are very few. In Episode 2, there is a new character listed as "Tom (reporter)." He is a gossip columnist who has been banned by Margot from her parties for past indiscretions. He first appears in the scene that follows Margot's recitation of the themed parties she has been attending, which is based on the famous and oft-quoted party paragraph from Waugh's next novel *Vile Bodies* (Penguin, 123: "Masked parties, Savage parties, etc."). Tom himself seems to have stepped out of that novel and his name may be an allusion to Tom Driberg, an actual gossip columnist who contributed to

⁴ "Staring at Social Media on Your Mobile? Don't Be Surprised if It's Stolen," theguardian.com, 5 April 2017. The "Beest-Cheating" pronunciation is not entirely original to this adaptation. In a 2005 article in *EWNS*, Robert Murray Davis notes a previous suggestion of that pronunciation by an unnamed US critic, but himself asserts that it should be pronounced "as any American would." See footnote 9, *infra*. He is probably referring to Gilbert Highet who hypothesized half-jokingly in a 1962 essay that it was "doubtless pronounced 'Beast-Cheating'" [*sic*]. *The Anatomy of Satire* (paperback ed.), Princeton, 1974, 193. That pronunciation was also later adopted without explanation in 1987 by George McCartney in *Confused Roaring: Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition* (rev. ed.), New Brunswick, 2004, 15.

⁵ "Waugh's Declaration of Comic Intention," theguardian.com, Books Blog, 20 March 2008.

⁶ Miles Malpractice, Lord Parakeet and David Lennox are dropped. The publishing history of this group is more interesting than their minimal contribution to the story. The first two were names substituted in later printings for characters originally named Martin Gaythorn-Brodie and Kevin Saunderson. Those names were deemed too close to Waugh's friends Eddie Gaythorne-Hardy and Gavin Henderson on whom these characters were based. David Lennox is a photographer and is clearly based on Cecil Beaton, but name identification was less likely in that case. Martin Stannard, *Evelyn Waugh: The Early Years*, 161.

Waugh's character Mr. Chatterbox in *Vile Bodies*. These allusions are clever Wavian in-jokes but don't add much to the story or the humor. None of the UK critics seemed to notice them or, if they did, considered them unworthy of comment.⁷

The acting and casting are nearly faultless. Jack Whitehall as Paul Pennyfeather plays the part just as it is in the novel. He's naïve and colorless and has few of the punchlines but manages through body language and facial expressions to convey that he is not entirely clueless. Watch his expression when the loaded pistol is handed over by Philbrick to start the race. In the last episode there is a clever build up to Prendy's demise, as noted above. Paul is forced to consort with the mad prisoner, with ever more pained expressions in these encounters, climaxing in the scene where the Governor hands over the tool kit. It may have helped to know what was coming through familiarity with Waugh's book, but Whitehall gets it just right. Margot is played by American actress Eva Longoria. Her nationality is changed from South American (as written by Waugh) to plain American, making it possible to avoid having her speak with a Latin American accent.⁸ This modification is itself ironic since Longoria comes from a Latino family in Corpus Christi, Texas, and could probably have handled a Latin American accent with little or no difficulty, but it doesn't really matter. Her lines (like Paul's) aren't really very challenging as written in the novel, and she portrays Margot very much as she is written by Waugh.

It is in the secondary roles that both the book and the script develop the humor on which the success of the story depends. David Suchet was a brilliant choice for Dr. Fagan and never makes a false step or utters a wrong intonation. As noted previously, he delivers the funniest line in the film flawlessly. Most of his dialogue (except for "He do. He do.") comes right out of the book. Douglas Hodge gets Captain Grimes just right. He does suffer from playing the one role that was the most memorable performance in the 1968 film adaptation of the book. This was entitled *Decline and Fall...of a Birdwatcher* and was overall forgettable except for Leo McKern's performance of Capt. Grimes.⁹ It was before McKern appeared in the long running *Rumpole of the Bailey* series based on John Mortimer's books. Rumpole and Grimes have a good deal in common physically, and McKern seemed to be the definitive performer in both roles. But Hodge has nothing to apologize for. His performance was up to the same standard and may have been closer to Waugh's original than McKern's. Vincent Franklin and Stephen Graham play

⁷ One UK critic did note a similarity between the musical score for this adaptation and that of the 1981 Granada TV version of *Brideshead*. A US critic (Tobias Grey) in the *Wall Street Journal* (14 May 2017) thought that Tom the reporter was based on the recent case of Mazer Mahmood who similarly used a disguise to gain access to events for over 20 years, dredging up stories from unsuspecting guests for the tabloids. He was finally stopped when he was sentenced last year to 15 months for conspiring to pervert the course of justice.

⁸ Margot's son Peter explains to Pennyfeather that his mother is from California but her family originally came from Venezuela. At one point in prison, Pennyfeather recalls her longingly as a "beautiful Latino woman."

⁹ For a detailed historical discussion and assessment of the 1968 film, see Robert Murray Davis, "Up to a Point, Mr. Foxwell: The Adaptation of *Decline and Fall*," *EWNS* 36.2 (Autumn 2005), 1. Professor Davis thought it not the worst adaptation of a Waugh novel (that prize having hopefully been retired by Tony Richardson's 1965 *The Loved One*), but one that suffered many lost opportunities in its transfer from page to screen. His catalogue of the modifications of the story and the dialogue in that earlier film version make those applied by the makers of this later one seem relatively modest by comparison.

Prendergast and Philbrick pretty much as written by Waugh, but both these parts are less well defined than Grimes and Dr. Fagan. Philbrick, particularly, always seemed to me to be a bit of a muddle on the page, and the scriptwriters haven't really sorted him out. Graham conveys the South London wide-boy flawlessly (perhaps taking a cue from *Only Fools and Horses*) but we still don't know much about the inner Philbrick.

Some of the cameo performances are also noteworthy. In particular, Kevin Eldon as Mr. Levy, the schoolmaster recruiter, delivers Waugh's dialogue in his interview of Pennyfeather word for word from the novel but makes it even funnier, with perfect timing and delivery. Anatole Taubman as Otto Silenus makes more out of his character than Waugh did. He manages to be both cringing and haughty at the same time and helps to carry much of the comedy in Episode 2 that threatened to drag somewhat in the novel. Lady Circumference is a bit of a disappointment. As played by Ashley McGuire she looks and dresses the part (down to the Tyrolean hat) but needs to sound like one of the "huntin' and shootin'" characters out of P. G. Wodehouse, from whom Waugh seems to have borrowed her dialogue. She starts out with the right accent for the first few lines but then drifts off into more neutral speech. The director let us down here. He should have watched some of the old Wodehouse TV series for inspiration to get Lady Circumference's speech to be a bit more over the top. The Chief Warder in Episode 3 also did a fine job. As played by Paul Higgins, he makes the prison staff humor comparable to that achieved in the classic BBC *Porridge* series (most notably, Mr. MacKay, the Scottish Principal Officer).

In general, high marks should go to the casting and wardrobe crews. There are no examples of actors playing in roles where they don't belong or wearing costumes that seem out of either character or period. There are even some bits of casting that go beyond the demand of the role itself to make other comments. For example, the two dons from Scone College are played by veteran actors who made a lasting impact from roles they played in the Golden Age of period TV drama series in the 1980s. These are Nicholas Grace, who was Anthony Blanche in the Granada TV series of *Brideshead Revisited*, and Tim Pigott-Smith, who played Ronald Merrick, the flawed policeman in *The Jewel in the Crown* (also a Granada production). Pigott-Smith portrays Junior Dean Sniggs who appears in both the opening and closing scenes, chortling over the penalty-inducing activities in which the Bollinger Club are engaged. Sadly, Pigott-Smith died a few days before the final episode of this series aired, and this will have been one of his last performances.

The settings are worthy of period TV films from that same Golden Age. The filming was done in Wales and Hampshire. Winchester stood in for Oxford and Cardiff for London but nobody noticed. I haven't seen any reference to the film location used for King's Thursday but it looked authentic—a scaled-down version of the University of London's Senate House. The detail of the costumes is extraordinary. For example, in the novel Waugh casually writes of the "broad arrow" on the prison clothing issued to Pennyfeather. I never understood what that referred to. It is apparently a sort of logo used on H. M. Prison Service clothing to distinguish it

from civilian dress. Sure enough, an arrow design clearly appears on the clothes worn by the prisoners. I then noticed that in Waugh's illustration for the book entitled "Grimes was of the immortals" the same mark appears on the prisoners' clothes.

The British reviews of the series were overwhelmingly favorable. *The Spectator* published two positive reviews, and the series was also praised in *The Tablet*, *Guardian*, *The Times* and *Sunday Times*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Mail*, *Daily Express* and several tabloids. The cast and crew were also widely interviewed and quoted in both the print and broadcast media. Dissenting voices were heard from *The New Statesman* and *Radio Times*, but they were distinctly in the minority. The *TLS* published a mixed review by Robert Douglas-Fairhurst, Professor of English Literature at Magdalen College, Oxford. Referring to some of the modifications discussed above and other similar examples, he thought the adaptation was "far too busy explaining Waugh's novel to listen to it properly."¹⁰ There may be some truth to that, but the filmmakers were mostly motivated to assure that their version would preserve both the story and the humor and made the judgment that what Waugh had written in some cases wouldn't work in a dramatization. This is, of course, always a problem with adaptations to another medium, and in this case the adapters got it right in almost every case that mattered.

¹⁰ "Vile Buddies: Putting Waugh's Grotesques on the Small Screen," *TLS*, 14 April 2017, 19. The modification that seemed to have most bothered Prof Douglas-Fairhurst was the scene where the scriptwriters felt the need to explain what Grimes means by being "in the soup." Rather than spell out his taste for schoolboys, the filmmakers have him get caught by Dr. Fagan *in flagrante* with a chauffeur in the toolshed. That may well have been one modification too far and could possibly have been better conveyed as Waugh had done it by showing Grimes' obvious favoritism toward certain boys (*e.g.*, Clutterbuck). However, pederasts are treated as a more serious and sensitive problem today than they were when Waugh wrote the story, and one can imagine that the producers might have drawn the line on this point to avoid overloading the switchboard (or internet server) if the script had been too explicit for current standards.

Bats in the Library

The Weight of a World of Feeling: Reviews and Essays by Elizabeth Bowen, Allan Hepburn (ed.), Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2017, 450 pp., \$49.95.

Reviewed by Jeffrey A. Manley

This is the most recent in a series of the collected writings of Elizabeth Bowen, a contemporary of Evelyn Waugh and admirer of his works. The collections are edited and introduced by Allan Hepburn, who is Professor of 20th-Century Literature at McGill University. Previous volumes have included stories, interviews, broadcasts, and essays. Bowen was Anglo-Irish and grew up in a country house in County Cork known as Bowen's Court. Although she made frequent visits back to her home, she spent her professional life in Oxford (though not as a student) and London. She and her husband lived in Oxford in the early 1930s where she made many friends, including several in Waugh's circle. These included Cyril Connolly, Maurice Bowra, David Cecil, and L. P. Hartley as well as Waugh himself. During the 1930s-40s she operated something of a salon in her house at Clarence Terrace in Regent's Park.

In a 1953 essay in the *New Republic* entitled "English Fiction at Mid Century," Bowen prominently cites Waugh as one of those writers, along with Graham Greene, who had "begun to be prominent in the thirties [and] emerged from the war years to become still more so." Prof. Hepburn, in a note to that article, mentions her friendship with several of the writers whose work she cites, including Evelyn Waugh (*People, Places and Things: Essays by Elizabeth Bowen*, Ed. Allan Hepburn, Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2008, 323, 452).

Bowen also records a visit Waugh made to Bowen's Court:

In the library, I recollect Evelyn Waugh, scooping desultorily, a little crossly, at a bat which had shattered the evening for me by flying in—I cannot stay in a room with a bat: I cannot endure them. (*Idem.*, 146)

This visit is recorded by Waugh in an imprecisely dated letter he later sent to Bowen, thanking her for the "delightful stay." He does not mention the bat. The letter is noted by Prof. Hepburn, who places the visit in 1931-32 (*Idem.* 436, n. 3; and Elizabeth Bowen Collection, Harry Ransom Center, Series 2: Correspondence 1923-1969, Box 12, Folder 1). Most likely, the visit was in September of 1931 when Waugh is recorded as having visited Pakenham Hall in County Westmeath, about a 2- 1/2-3-hr. drive from Bowen's Court (Martin Stannard, *Evelyn Waugh: The Early Years*, 291).

Bowen is best remembered for her short stories and novels, particularly *The Death of the Heart* (1938) and *The Heat of the Day* (1949), both of which have been adapted for TV. But with the need to support the upkeep of Bowen's Court as well as the house in Regent's Park, although her husband worked full time, she needed to maximize their income from her writing.

She began eagerly to seek opportunities to write for literary journals and popular magazines. Her short stories also frequently appeared in magazines and her biographer, Victoria Glendinning, says that she became adept at writing non-literary “feature” articles, particularly for the better paying American magazines such as *Holiday*, *Vogue* and *Glamour* (*Elizabeth Bowen: Portrait of a Writer*, London, 1977, 204). Waugh dabbled in that sort of journalism, writing several major articles for the well-paying *Life* magazine, but he could hardly be said to have become a dedicated writer of feature articles.

Beginning in 1935, when she and her husband moved from Oxford to London, her book reviews began to appear. Her first regular reviewing assignments were at the *New Statesman* where her reviews (mainly of fiction) appear frequently in the late 1930s. She also wrote occasionally for *The Listener* and *The Spectator* and for a magazine called *Purpose* that appeared every other month. Her “most sustained critical enterprise,” according to Prof. Hepburn, was a weekly book review column for *The Tatler* that she wrote for 13 years between 1941 and 1958 (with a break in the early 1950s). Her fees from *The Tatler* were an important, steady source of income, representing about 25% of her earnings in this period (*WWF*, xix-xx).

She saw herself as more of a reviewer than a critic, and her biographer describes her as “a notoriously kind reviewer of novels” (Glendinning, 117). Prof. Hepburn disagrees, and in his introduction offers an analysis of her reviews, showing that she was not always a soft touch. For example, she never found much to like about George Orwell, and “treated Evelyn Waugh’s novels with reservation rather than exuberance,” even though they were on friendly terms (*WWF*, xxiii).

She reviewed 5 of Waugh’s books during her years at *The Tatler*, four of which are included in the collection under review. None of these seems to have come to the notice of Waugh’s bibliographers, nor were any included in Martin Stannard’s *Critical Heritage* collection. The first, and probably the most favorable and detailed, was a review of his 1942 novel *Put Out More Flags* (141-43). Bowen begins with a dismissive summary of the wartime novels produced up to the time of her review:

...of which there have certainly been a number, but these have struck me as being inhibited. On the whole, our novelists have played safe; they appear to have imagined into existence a censorship such as never was, or could be. Against this, they are anxious not to offend. Consequently, they work hard to be bright, and at the same time to represent all their English characters as being, in wartime, inflexibly noble.

In reality, notwithstanding the war, Bowen perceives England as continuing to be a “diversified society, full of crooks, cranks, rakes, sillies and egotists.” She finds Waugh’s novel, populated with the likes of Basil Seal and the Connollys, a welcome relief. Waugh’s characters fall into line with those in his earlier novels: “a race perceptibly growing up. And either they

have been growing more like us, or we have been growing more like them. Either we have become more extraordinary or Mr. Waugh's characters have become less so." She concludes that "the book is implicitly somber and brilliantly funny," and that no "living novelist writes better than Mr. Waugh." The book is "our first war novel because...it is the first grown-up and serious one... Mr. Waugh has spoken--though with apparent lightness--the truth."

The next of Waugh's novels to appear is *Brideshead Revisited*, and it is the next that Bowen reviews (193-96). Again, she is positive, but less effusively so. She sees it as his first attempt "to write a great book and...he has done so." She resorts to the description Waugh wrote, on the front dust wrapper flap of the book's UK edition, of "his general theme...at once romantic and eschatological." Seeing eschatology as the science of the four last things—death, judgment, heaven and hell—she considers how Waugh's story has addressed those questions. She also notes that in this novel "time...is more than an element; it is a dramatic factor of which Mr. Waugh has made the boldest romantic use."

In her conclusion, she describes the book as a "masterpiece" and harks back to Waugh's intentions in his ambitious dust wrapper blurb. She agrees that he has satisfied her as the sort of reader he describes as one who has "the leisure to read a book word for word for the interest of the writer's use of language." For the other sort of reader, those he identifies as interested in his religious theme (*i.e.*, those looking for "more solid comfort than rosy memories" given the "black forebodings" of the future), Bowen does not wish to pronounce, as that is a "matter of private life." So, as an Anglo-Irish Protestant, she didn't especially care for the "solid comfort" offered by the novel's religion (about which she was polite enough to say almost nothing). But she did like the "novel's wording" and considers "its textures, its beauty, and the faultless workings of its concealed mechanics [to be] a delight."

She also wrote about her reaction to the novel in a letter to Charles Ritchie, a Canadian diplomat with whom she had a long-running affair. This is quoted in her biography by Glendinning:

'I haven't had such a reaction to any (contemporary novel) for a long time...As a whole it did seem to me superbly and triumphantly romantic, with that sort of shimmer of the past (or rather, the shimmer one's own feeling can cast on the past over it all.' She thought it stirred up 'overpowering sensuous emotion,' like parts of Proust, and captured 'the climate of love.' (169)

Bowen's bibliography also mentions a review of *The Loved One*. This was in *The Tatler* dated 17 March 1948. Unfortunately, that review is not included in this collection. It is a pity because Bowen was greatly interested in the United States and spent much of her post-war life there, particularly after her husband died in 1951. Her assessment of Waugh's depiction of American society would be interesting. This review as well as the last two may be the ones Prof.

Hepburn had in mind when he described Bowen's assessment of Waugh as more reserved than exuberant.

She describes *Officers and Gentlemen* (191-93) as a "Waugh novel rather than a war novel." It is more about the characters and the author's judgments relating to them than the actions in which they are involved. It is such actions that in the average war novel "tend to submerge all else." Moreover, the book is "a comedy which incorporates what is tragic without a jar to feeling or flaw in taste. I am certain no writer other than Evelyn Waugh could have brought this off." As others have commented, the absence of Apthorpe is to be regretted, but there are compensations in the persons of "Jumbo" Trotter, Major Hound and Ludovic, not to mention Julia Stitch. "The dialogue in this novel is Mr. Waugh's at his most perfect. But the masterpiece is the Crete end. We have no more formidable novelist than this."

The final Waugh novel she reviewed is *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* (1957; 314-16). In her detailed summary she mentions that Waugh had himself undergone a similar hallucinatory episode as that described in the novel. She concludes:

The devastating and racking funniness of *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* comes from Mr. Waugh's genius for sheathing terror in mirth. Handled otherwise, this would have been one more 'case' story, or a contrived and over ingenious fantasy. As it is we are given pure entertainment, the better for getting the reader under the skin...

The next year her arrangement with *The Tatler* ended. Afterwards, she relied less on reviewing than she had previously. In this period, she was spending an increasing amount of time in the US where she took on lecturing and teaching positions at various colleges and universities.

Waugh himself also reviewed at least one of Bowen's books. This was *Collected Impressions* (1950), a collection of her articles and book reviews. His review, entitled "The Happy Critic," appeared in *The Tablet* (reprinted in *Essays, Articles, and Reviews*, 190). Waugh wrote that the collection

...represents an active and discerning mind healthily and happily at work.... Miss Bowen is unassumingly at ease with the whole of European literature and with most of Irish and English social life. Our general impression is that, unlike most of her colleagues, she likes books.... She is one of the few good moralists at work today, and therefore anything she says has particular value, quite apart from the subject she discusses.

He goes on to question her taste for D. H. Lawrence (not one of his own favorites) and to note that she seems in her writing to be influenced by others, naming specially Ivy Compton-Burnett and Henry James. He concludes by noting how her full and enviable life is responsible for her

“continuous artistic growth,” and he assures those who already admire her work that they will read the book “with a double zeal.”

Their correspondence was not extensive. Only seven letters survive. Five of these are from Waugh and are archived at the University of Texas. In several of these he mentions enjoying her books. They include friendly appraisals of *Friends and Relations*, *The Last September* and *The Little Girls*. The most interesting is the one dated 12 September 1948, in which he wrote to say that he had read *The Death of the Heart* for the first time (about 10 years after publication) and was “completely entranced,” finding it a “magnificent book, masterly and unique,” and a work of “genius.” He is so full of the book and his gratitude to her for having written it that he “has to sit down like a bobby-soxer and pour out my praise.” He doesn’t mention her review of *The Loved One* from earlier that year. Another undated letter from the 1930s is sent from Madresfield Court and tells her how daring she is for having read *Black Mischief* and for having liked it as well (Elizabeth Bowen Collection, Harry Ransom Center, Series 2: Correspondence 1923-1969, Box 12, Folder 1). There are also two letters from her in the Evelyn Waugh Papers at the British Library dated 1948 and 1955.

The collection of book reviews and essays in the volume under review is well produced and edited. There are also several other reviews in the collection that would be of interest to Waugh fans. These include several of Anthony Powell’s novels, as well as those of Graham Greene. Writers such as Cyril Connolly, George Orwell, Ivy Compton-Burnett and Rose Macaulay are also reviewed. The quality of the production (printing, paperback binding, and paper) is high. The introduction and notations are useful and well written. My only reservation relates to the arrangement of the reviews. Rather than a strict chronological presentation, Prof. Hepburn separates the few essays that are not strictly book reviews from the reviews themselves, and further separates the reviews into those done for *The Tatler* on a regular basis and then all others. This creates four separate chronological runs of reviews and is very confusing. The separation of the book reviews from the essays may be advisable, but the reviews themselves should be bunched into one chronological section.

NEWS

John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest

Submissions are still welcome for the John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest. Essays (normally limited to 20 pages or 5000 words) are invited on any aspect of Waugh's life or work and will be judged by the *Evelyn Waugh Studies* editorial board. The winning essay will be published in the journal, and the author will receive a prize of \$500. Deadline: 31 December 2017. Email submissions to jpitcher@bennington.edu or Patrick.Query@usma.edu.

Five Volumes of *Complete Works* in USA

<http://evelynwaughsociety.org/2017/complete-works-of-waugh-available-in-usa/>

Anthony Burgess Centenary Conference

The Conference was held on July 2nd through July 5th, and included the launch of new editions of Burgess' work, live performances of his music, new takes on his dystopian science fiction, and discussion of a previously unpublished manuscript of a dictionary of slang, unveiled by the lexicographer Jonathon Green.

<https://www.anthonymburgess.org/event/anthony-burgess-centenary-conference/>

Beyond this event, Will Carr, the Deputy Director of the International Anthony Burgess Foundation, has extended a warm, enduring welcome to any Wavians visiting the Manchester area.

Evelyn Waugh Society

The Waugh Society has 181 members. To join, please go to <http://evelynwaughsociety.org/>.

The Evelyn Waugh Discussion List has 78 members. To join, please visit

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Evelyn_Waugh.

The Evelyn Waugh Society is also on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/evelynwaughsoc>.

The Waugh Society is providing an RSS feed: <http://evelynwaughsociety.org/feed>.

And the Waugh Society's web site has opportunities for threaded discussions:

<http://evelynwaughsociety.org/forums/>.

The Evelyn Waugh Society is seeking a new Secretary. If you are interested or would like further information, please contact the current Secretary, Patrick Query, at Patrick.Query@usma.edu.

Submission Guidelines

Essays as well as notes and news about Waugh and his work may be submitted to *Evelyn Waugh Studies* by mail or email to (jpitcher@bennington.edu, patrick.query@usma.edu). Submissions should follow MLA style and be no more than 5000 words in length. Since most readers will be familiar with Waugh's work, authors should minimize unnecessary quotations and explanatory references. All submitted essays are first screened by the Editors and if deemed acceptable for publication are then sent to Associate Editors for further review. Authors should expect to be notified of the editors' final decision within twelve weeks of submission.

End of Evelyn Waugh Studies, Vol. 48, No. 1

[Home Page](#) (Evelyn Waugh Society)

[Back Issues](#) (University of Leicester)