

Cambridge University Press
 0521827515 - James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity
 Katherine Mullin
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Introduction: provoking the puritiesnoopers

The story of my books is very strange. For the publication of *Dubliners* I had to struggle for ten years. The whole first edition of 1000 copies was burnt at Dublin by fraud; some say it was the doing of priests, some of enemies, some of the then Viceroy or his consort, Countess Aberdeen. Altogether it is a mystery... As for the *Portrait*, it was refused by nearly all the publishers in London. Moreover, when the courageous review *The Egoist* decided to publish it, not one printing works in the whole United Kingdom could be found to consent to print it. It was printed in America. The sheets were sent to London and bound there. My new book *Ulysses* was to appear in the *Egoist* of London. The same old story. From the very beginning the printers refused again. It appeared in fragments in the New York *Little Review*. Several times it was taken out of circulation through the post, by the action of the American Government. Now legal action is being taken against it.

(L I: 132–3)

For seven years I have been working at this book – blast it!... No English printer wanted to print a word of it. In America the review was suppressed four times. Now, as I hear, a great movement is being prepared against the publication, initiated by Puritans, English Imperialists, Irish Republicans, Catholics – what an alliance! I ought to be given the Nobel Prize for Peace.

(L I: 146–7)

Joyce's publication history is a history of censorship. Plans to place several of the *Dubliners* short stories in the agricultural journal *The Irish Homestead* foundered when the editor refused to publish more than three, telling Joyce 'his readers had complained' (L I: 98). The collection was offered to Grant Richards in 1907, yet, after six months of wrangling, Richards also declined to publish since his printer refused to typeset 'indecent' passages. Five years later, Joyce's contract with Dublin publishing house Maunsell and Co. was similarly fated when the printer John Falconer guillotined

the entire print run. Joyce's account of his travails, 'A Curious History', appeared in *Sinn Féin* and the avant-garde review *The Egoist*, the publicity prompting Grant Richards to relent and finally publish *Dubliners* in June 1914. The belated victory, however, presaged troubles to come. Serialisation of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in *The Egoist* was impeded by the printer's refusal to typeset 'objectionable' passages.¹ The novel itself was refused by a chorus of publishers, and when Joyce agreed to publish it under the new and untried *Egoist* imprint, no fewer than seven printers declined to set the type, forcing the importation of printed sheets from the United States.² Such difficulties in turn anticipated the reception of *Ulysses*. Appearing serially in the New York Modernist magazine *The Little Review*, four numbers carrying extracts from *Ulysses* were seized by the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice. When an extract from 'Nausicaa' was confiscated in August 1920, the vice society had enough evidence to mount a successful obscenity prosecution. On 21 February 1921, *Ulysses* was officially banned from the United States. The ban was effectively duplicated in England, Ireland, Canada and Australia, uniting most of the English-speaking world in opposition.

This brief history of misadventure is a tired one. Joyce's battles against censorship have informed his critical reception to such a degree that Judge John M. Woolsey's judicial statement finding *Ulysses* not obscene was appended to many twentieth-century editions, framing the novel as a crucial social document in the war between philistine prudery and artistic freedom.³ Yet Joyce's reputation as a moral subversive lives on, since recent media appraisals continue to insist upon Joyce as an avatar of sexual freedom, or, conversely, as the author of a dirty book. Typical broadsheet headlines read 'Family upset at "Joyce the foulmouth"', 'Joyce's heir protests at sexy *Ulysses* show', 'Director of Public Prosecutions waged war on "filthy" *Ulysses*'.⁴ This reputation has positioned Joyce at the heart of a potent cultural myth still prevalent today — 'that of the visionary, self-denying artist, who works in splendid isolation and constant jeopardy of suppression by the philistine public'.⁵ Richard Ellmann's monumental biography presents

¹ Jane Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson, *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver 1896–1961* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970), 92–3.

² *Ibid.*, 114–22.

³ The Woolsey decision was appended to both the British Bodley Head and USA Random House editions until 1960 and 1986 respectively. Provision for its inclusion in the first USA edition was stipulated in the contract between Random House and Joyce. See Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship: The Trials of Ulysses* (London: Macmillan, 1998), 150.

⁴ *The Guardian*, 7 May 2000; *The Daily Telegraph*, 31 July 2000; *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 May 1998.

⁵ Walter Kendrick, *The Secret Museum: Pornography in Modern Culture* (New York: Viking, 1987), 149.

Introduction: provoking the puritysnoopers

3

Joyce as an embattled literary hero, fighting against poverty, illness and meddling censors armed only with genius, self-belief and a coterie of like-minded Modernist friends. Paul Vanderham's study of Joyce and censorship perpetuates this assumption, opening with Joyce's own assertion that *Ulysses* was 'one of the world-disturbing sailors', and presenting that novel's various court trials as perilous stages on Joyce's own voyage towards literary immortality.⁶ This book will query Joyce's implicit passivity within this narrative of artistic struggle against suppression. It will unfold a hitherto ignored and marginalized aspect of the censorship debate to reveal Joyce as neither victim nor hero, but instead, and more interestingly, as an agent provocateur. What will be revealed here is Joyce's fascinating anticipation of his censorship, and his response to that threat through the creative appropriation of prevailing debates about art, morality and sexuality. Within *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses* are buried many intricate and imaginative subversions of the ideologies and strategies of those *Finnegans Wake* would label 'vice crusaders', 'puritysnooper' and 'watch warriors of the vigilance committee' (*FW* 434: 36, 254: 21, 34: 4). The complex agility of these subversions must modify the established conception of Joyce as a hapless victim of belated Victorian prudes. Instead, Joyce's fiction daringly incited the cultural conflict which would make him notorious.

I

How and when did this cultural conflict between art and the censors emerge? As Walter Kendrick suggests, 'it was when contemporary art joined in the pornographic battle' that the contest between visionary, self-denying artist and philistine public can be said to begin.⁷ The war between art and morality may be loosely dated from 1857, a watershed year critical to the history of literary censorship. The year 1857 saw the publication of Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal* and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, the former convicted, the latter acquitted of offences against public morality. In Britain, John, Lord Campbell and his Society for the Suppression of Vice successfully campaigned for the Obscene Publications Act (1857), granted after four decades of that society's efforts against 'the sale of poison more deadly than prussic acid, strychnine or arsenic – the sale of obscene publications and indecent books'.⁸ Campbell produced Dumas' *La Dame aux Camélias* in

⁶ Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, 1. ⁷ Kendrick, *The Secret Museum*, 149.

⁸ Lord Campbell quoted in Morris L. Ernst, *To The Pure: A Study of Obscenity and the Censor* (London: Cape, 1929), 116.

Parliament to support his case: the debate ‘pitted self-conscious artistry against self-righteous conventionality. Both sides were aware that the encounter was taking place on the leading edge of literary innovation.’⁹ Whilst the membership, funds and activities of the Society for the Suppression of Vice waned over the next twenty-five years, in the early 1880s, the policing of the obscene underwent a sudden revival with the rise of a late-Victorian reform movement broadly known as social purity.

Richard Brown’s groundbreaking study *James Joyce and Sexuality* compellingly argues for Joyce’s creative engagement with the new theories of sexuality emerging at the turn of the nineteenth century. He persuasively suggests that Joyce’s views of sexuality are informed by the contemporary discourses on sex flourishing as part of the *fin de siècle* ‘discursive explosion’ identified by Michel Foucault. Brown illustrates Joyce’s borrowings from such diverse contemporary writings on sexuality as anthropological investigations of global marriage customs, ‘free love’ polemics, birth control manuals, novels by Balzac and Tolstoy, plays by Ibsen and Shaw, and the ‘new sexology’ of Freud, Otto Weininger, Richard Krafft-Ebing and Havelock Ellis. Such writings are pointedly ‘highbrow’, written and read by a self-consciously progressive cultural elite. Yet, as this study will show, they existed in counterpoint with a similarly voluble and far more populist sexual discourse which, crucially for Joyce, had the suppression of sexually explicit fiction at the heart of its project. Social purity was a formidable branch of the elaborate network of moral reform which flourished at the close of the nineteenth and the early decades of the twentieth centuries. Like the urban explorers and temperance campaigners who were their natural allies, social purists were well-organised and politically active. Their crusades to raise the moral tone of the nation were both remarkably influential and sustained into the 1920s.

In the USA, the principal social purity society was the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, the prosecutor of *The Little Review* and *Ulysses* in 1921. Founded in 1873 by Anthony Comstock, it spawned a network of affiliated vice societies across the United States, including the Boston Watch and Ward Society, the Philadelphia Society for the Suppression of Vice, the Illinois Vigilance Association and the Chicago Vice Commission.¹⁰ In Britain and Ireland, the largest purity group was the National Vigilance Association, presided over by the vice-regents of Ireland, the Earl and Countess Aberdeen. Others included the Moral Reform Union, the Gospel

⁹ Kendrick, *The Secret Museum*, 115–18.

¹⁰ Paul Boyer, *Purity in Print: The Vice Society Movement and Book Censorship in America* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1968), 5.

Cambridge University Press
 0521827515 - James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity
 Katherine Mullin
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Introduction: provoking the puritysnoopers

5

Purity League, the Social Purity Alliance, the White Cross League and the Church of England Purity Society. These organisations campaigned for a high standard of ‘purity’ in literature and art by boycotting, intimidating and occasionally even prosecuting the purveyors of sexually explicit material, and agitating for further legislation against ‘indecent publications’. In the United States, the vice societies were still more closely entangled with the state apparatus, since Anthony Comstock and his New York Society for the Suppression of Vice were granted a federal charter empowering them to police the passage of ‘obscenity’ through the mails.¹¹ Such formidable opponents had moral subversives like Joyce in their sights. Their determination to cleanse their nations of highbrow smut was matched by the determination of the liberal intelligentsia to resist and ridicule their attempts.

The tone of the conflict was summarised in Anthony Comstock’s 1883 polemic, *Traps for the Young*. Chapter XI, ‘Artistic and Classical Traps’, asserted

‘Art’ and ‘classic’ are made to gild some of the most obscene representations and foulest matters in literature, regardless of their results to immature minds... Authors whose pens seemed dipped in the sunlight of eloquence have vividly portrayed scenes of licentiousness; or satirically personated the life of the libertine and his conquests; or recorded the histories of ancient rakes; or gratified their own low-born and degraded natures by making pen-pictures of their own lascivious imaginings.¹²

This outburst explained how, to social purists, the ‘artistic merit’ defence of a morally dubious work was no defence at all, but instead compounded the crime. As the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice noted,

The grosser publications being measurably suppressed, there are appearing in their place publications of a less gross, but more insidious and equally dangerous

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 9. The distinctions between the British and American social purity movements have been outlined elsewhere. To summarise, in Britain the alliance between suffrage feminism and social purity was more pronounced than in the USA; British purity movements enjoyed a more socially inclusive constituency than their American counterparts; British purists sought more energetically to police working-class sexual disorders. Nevertheless, in many respects, social purity was an international and, particularly, transatlantic phenomenon, as British organisations like the National Vigilance Association, and United States groups like the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice communicated with each other and borrowed one another’s strategies. White Cross Armies on both sides of the Atlantic urged young men to club together and pledge themselves to chastity; social purity organisations in both Britain and America were convulsed with anxieties over ‘white slavery’ or procured prostitution; in both countries, ‘obscenity’ in all its diverse forms was vigorously pursued. See Alan Hunt, *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), especially pages 121–30 for a fuller exposition of these distinctions and similarities.

¹² Anthony Comstock, *Traps for the Young*, ed. Robert Bremner (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), 168–9.

character. This class is defended by many as 'classic' or 'artistic', and free circulation is claimed for them on these grounds. The Board cannot yield to this claim. One 'classic' for which exemption is claimed is an attempt to clothe the most sensual thoughts with the flowers and fancies of poetry, making the lascivious conception only the more insidious and demoralising. No, the 'classic' plea is misleading and fallacious.¹³

Vigilance societies on both sides of the Atlantic accordingly achieved their greatest notoriety not primarily for the prosecution of the authors, publishers and vendors of the 'grosser publications', underground pornographic classics such as *The Lustful Turk* or *Fanny Hill*, but for their onslaught upon writing with literary or avant-garde aspirations, an 'insidious' form of demoralisation. One London convention of purity societies issued a statement in 1910 castigating the modern trend for 'immoral, unhealthy and objectionable books professedly treating of the sex problem', in other words, 'serious' fiction.¹⁴ It was an onslaught forcibly brought to the attention of English and Irish publishers in 1888, when the National Vigilance Association instigated the first high-profile prosecution of a publisher of 'sex problem' novels.

The trial of Henry Vizetelly both inaugurated and exemplified that conflict between social purity moralism and artistic integrity which would later overshadow Joyce's travails with so many reluctant publishers. Vizetelly specialised in translations of novels by Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Balzac, Flaubert and Zola, and had founded the Mermaid Series of Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists, all unexpurgated and under the general editorship of the sexologist Havelock Ellis. He was well aware that 'English literature, like English journalism, was under the thumb of Mrs Grundy', yet his cautiously expurgated editions of Zola's *La Terre* and *Nana* aroused the purists' wrath.¹⁵ Vizetelly personified what many social purists dreaded; his decadent foreign fiction polluted the nation whilst, as Anthony Comstock alleged, sheltering behind the terms 'Art' and 'classic'.¹⁶ These objections were first taken up in the House of Commons by the stalwart social purity

¹³ New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, 'The Semi-Classic', *Annual Report* 8 (1882), 6. The 'classic' specified was probably Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, issued in a cheap edition a year earlier.

¹⁴ Statement of the Committee of Representatives of London Societies Interested in Public Morality, delivered in January 1910 and quoted in Samuel Lynn Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 293.

¹⁵ Mrs Grundy was, of course, the Victorian personification of the prudish censor. Vizetelly quoted in Edward de Grazia, *Girls Lean Back Everywhere: The Law of Obscenity and the Assault on Genius* (London: Constable, 1992), 42.

¹⁶ See 'A Judicial Murder', in de Grazia, *Girls Lean Back*, 40–53 for a fuller account of the Vizetelly trials.

MP, Samuel Smith. Pointedly erasing cultural hierarchies, Smith mounted a pre-emptive strike against the 'artistic merit' defence, grouping Zola together with 'penny dreadfuls', quack remedies for sexually transmitted diseases, erotic postcards and lurid tabloid divorce-court reports. He alleged that certain shops in London were supplying 'young girls' with copies of *Nana*, in league with 'houses of the worst class to which the girls, when their minds were sufficiently polluted and degraded, were consigned'.¹⁷

Vizetelly retaliated with the classic 'artistic merit' defence, publishing and sending the Home Secretary an eighty-page pamphlet of 'obscene' passages from the Bible, Chaucer and Shakespeare.¹⁸ This defence failed, and he was fined £250 and ordered to pay the Association's costs. In spring 1889, Vizetelly was once more dragged through the courts by the National Vigilance Association, this time accused of publishing more 'obscene' foreign classics, including eight more Zola novels and a translation of *Madame Bovary*. Nearing bankruptcy, sixty-nine years old and failing in health, he pleaded guilty and, unable to pay another fine, served three months imprisonment with hard labour, a sentence which almost certainly contributed to his death shortly after his release. For the National Vigilance Association, however, Vizetelly was a pornographer and his second conviction a triumph. In 1889, they published Samuel Smith's Commons oratory in a pamphlet prefaced with an appeal for 'a healthy public opinion' necessary 'to enable this Association to set the law in motion'.¹⁹

One Home Office official described the Vizetelly trials as 'epoch-making', and certainly they highlighted the rising power of the purity associations.²⁰ For printers like John Falconer and publishers like Grant Richards and George Roberts, the Vizetelly case functioned as a cautionary tale; his example, as the National Vigilance Association hoped, deterring many from issuing 'sex problem' fiction. Organisations such as, in Britain and Ireland, the National Council for Public Morals, the Pure Literature Society and the Forward Movement for Purity, and in the USA the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, the Boston Watch and Ward Society and the Women's Christian Temperance Union Department for the Suppression of Impure Literature kept the threat of financially crippling

¹⁷ National Vigilance Association, *Pernicious Literature* (London: National Vigilance Association, 1889), 6, 8, 11.

¹⁸ Henry Vizetelly, *Extracts Principally from the English Classics, showing that the legal suppression of M. Zola's Novels would logically involve the Bowdlerising of some of the greatest works in English Literature* (London: Vizetelly and Co, 1888).

¹⁹ National Vigilance Association, *Pernicious Literature*, i.

²⁰ Edward Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1977), 207.

prosecutions uppermost in publishers' minds. Together, these vigilantes mounted an indiscriminate assault upon low and high culture, and naturally, their persecutions of novels to which others were willing to ascribe artistic merit were most widely disputed. In Britain, 'pernicious literature' included works of established literary repute by Rabelais, Maupassant and Dostoevsky and Richard Burton's translation of *The Arabian Nights* as well as novels by contemporary writers. George Moore, Thomas Hardy, H. G. Wells, D. H. Lawrence, Compton Mackenzie and Hall Caine were just a few writing fiction classed as 'The Sex Novel, an epidemic of a most objectionable or in some cases indecent form of a novel purporting to deal with the sex problem'.²¹ In the USA, the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and its allies would similarly question and in many cases ban established classics, including Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, Boccaccio's *Decameron*, Ovid's *Art of Love*, *The Arabian Nights*, Voltaire's *Candide*, Rousseau's *Confessions* and the complete works of Rabelais.²² Yet it more readily pursued modern 'sex problem' works by Gabriele D'Annunzio, Oscar Wilde, Leo Tolstoy, George Bernard Shaw, George Moore, D. H. Lawrence, Upton Sinclair, Sinclair Lewis, Aldous Huxley, Arthur Schnitzler, Theodore Dreiser, Radclyffe Hall and Joyce himself.²³

The scale and high profile of this loudly proclaimed and commercially intimidating war upon 'indecent' writing provoked two distinct stages of response, both of significant impact upon Joyce's troubled literary career. The first was the inevitable production of a climate of auto-censorship, where publishers, printers, editors, libraries and newspapers were inhibited from risking anything that might be deemed 'pernicious' by litigious vigilantes. The second was an eruption of reactive protest, as writers mobilised to defend themselves from the threat social purity posed to creative autonomy. In the decades following the Vizetelly trial, artists and vice crusaders would become increasingly polarised.

Auto-censorship was a natural response by publishers and printers not only to the legal threat posed by vigilantes, but to the considerable popular support their campaign attracted. The second edition of the National Vigilance Association account of the Vizetelly trials, *Pernicious Literature*,

²¹ Ernst, *To The Pure*, 58; Nicolas Hiley, 'Can't you find me something nasty?: Circulating Libraries and Literary Censorship in Britain from the 1890s to the 1910s', in *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France 1600–1910*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1992), 128; National Vigilance Association, *Pernicious Literature*, i.

²² Boyer, *Purity in Print*, 35, 209–10.

²³ William Coote, *The Romance of Philanthropy* (London: National Vigilance Association, 1916), 24; Hiley, 'Can't you find me something nasty?', 130; Boyer, *Purity in Print*, 15, 29, 185–7, 210.

contains an appendix quoting praise for the campaign from *The Guardian*, *The Times*, *The Whitehall Review*, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Spectator* and *The Tablet*.²⁴ Such support was substantiated when, for instance, several British newspapers orchestrated specific purity crusades themselves. In 1907, *The Daily Chronicle* mounted a letter-writing campaign against 'Sordid Fiction'; in 1909, *The Spectator* began a crusade against 'Poisonous Literature' exemplified by H. G. Wells' *Ann Veronica*, and urged readers to contribute to a fighting fund to launch private prosecutions against 'objectionable' books.²⁵ If this was the 'healthy public opinion' social purists sought, then those involved in the book trade were forced to respond. George Moore was one of the first victims of a shift in cultural climate when, five years after the Vizetelly trials, Britain's two principal circulating libraries, Mudies and W. H. Smith's, declined to stock his *Esther Waters* (1894), a portrait of a working-class single mother.²⁶ To be boycotted by the libraries was a heavy blow to any author, since their purchasing power permitted them to cover the publishing costs of a novel: often books with a print run of 50,000 would sell 10,000 to libraries.²⁷ By January 1910, the libraries were so in accord with the vice societies that a committee of 'Representatives of London Societies Interested in Public Morality' issued a statement thanking the Circulating Libraries Association for its help in 'combining to prevent the circulation of immoral, unhealthy or objectionable books'.²⁸ Such activities naturally influenced publishers and printers, who feared not only the threat of vigilante prosecutions, but also the less direct but commercially damaging effects of boycotting.

Such highly organised and successful attempts to suppress 'sex-problem' fiction was unsurprisingly strenuously resisted by the cultural elite the purity movement targeted. George Moore began the fight back with an emotive protest against Vizetelly's fatal imprisonment, *The New Censorship of*

²⁴ National Vigilance Association, *Pernicious Literature*, 23–46; de Grazia, *Girls Lean Back*, 700–1.

²⁵ 'Sordid Fiction', *The Daily Chronicle*, 9 July 1907; *The Spectator* damned *Ann Veronica* for Wells' portrait of 'a community of scuffling stoats and ferrets, unenlightened by a ray of duty or abnegation' ('A Poisonous Book', *The Spectator*, 20 November 1909, 846–7). In response, purity campaigner Revd Herbert Bull proposed a fighting fund 'to be used under proper legal advice for the prosecution of those who are responsible, whether as authors, publishers or distributors, for the dissemination of poisonous literature' ('Poisonous Literature', *The Spectator*, 27 November 1909, 876). *The Spectator's* subsequent appeal eventually raised £720 18s. ('The Guarantee Fund', *The Spectator*, 25 December 1909, 1100).

²⁶ Hiley, 'Can't you find me something nasty?', 128.

²⁷ For the economic influence of the circulating libraries on the book trade, see Hiley, 'Can't you find me something nasty?', 124–30.

²⁸ Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*, 293.

Literature, serialised in *The New York Herald* where he accused the National Vigilance Association of 'judicial murder'.²⁹ When the New York Public Library banned George Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman* on Vice Society advice, Shaw retaliated by coining the term 'comstockery' which, with a curious disregard for similar zeal in Britain, he defined as 'the world's standing joke at the expense of the United States'.³⁰ In London, John Galsworthy started a debate in *The Times*, protesting 'if something is not done, there will be not a dog's chance in this country for any outspoken work of art'.³¹ In 1916, the Author's League of America formed an international petition in support of Theodore Dreiser, whose novel *A 'Genius'* was the latest victim of comstockery.³² As Dreiser himself suggested

A band of wasp-like censors has appeared and is attempting to put the quietus on our literature which is at last showing signs of breaking the bond of Puritanism under which it has long struggled in vain... A literary reign of terror is being attempted. Where will it end?³³

Such appeals were in part answered by an alternative publishing network, circulating around a number of literary journals and Modernist little magazines which were vociferous in their condemnation of purity interventions in literary experimentation, including Frank Harris' *Pearson's Weekly*, H. L. Mencken's *Smart Set*, *The Era*, *The Little Review* and *The Egoist*.³⁴ These journals and the publishing enterprises connected with them sought to circumvent social purity's stranglehold upon a cautiously self-regulating mainstream press by issuing those 'outspoken works of art' and thus defying social purity's 'literary reign of terror'.

In this climate of purity censorship and avant-garde dissidence, Joyce's sexually radical writings were of particular significance. Contemporary reviews, whether squeamish or celebratory, bore witness. *Vanity Fair* reminded readers that *A Portrait*, 'perhaps not a book for *la jeune fille*', was 'refused by publisher after publisher in London, ostensibly because of the frankness with which certain episodes were treated'; yet suggested it

²⁹ George Moore, 'The New Censorship of Literature', *New York Herald*, 28 July 1889, 5.

³⁰ Modern dictionaries still define the word in terms of its opposition to art and culture. *The American College Dictionary* (1963) gives us 'overzealous censorship of the fine arts and literature, often mistaking outspokenly honest works for salacious ones', *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1975) as 'overzealous censorship of literature and the other arts because of alleged immorality'. Cited in Kendrick, *The Secret Museum*, 147; George Bernard Shaw, 'Shaw to Comstock: You Can't Scare Me', *New York Times*, 27 October 1905, 559.

³¹ John Galsworthy, 'Library Censorship', *The Times*, 3 October 1913, 9.

³² Ezra Pound, 'The Dreiser Protest', *The Egoist*, October 1916, 159.

³³ Richard Lingerman, *Theodore Dreiser*, II: *An American Journey* (New York: Putnam, 1990), 135.

³⁴ De Grazia, *Girls Lean Back*, 122.