

Locating Modern Art in Britain

David J. Getsy

Lynda Nead, *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets, and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. 256 pp., 68 black-and-white ill., 15 color plates. \$35.

Deborah Cherry, *Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850–1900*. London: Routledge, 2000. 288 pp., 61 black-and-white ill. \$67.50; \$20.99 paper.

David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry, eds., *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, and New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001. Essays by Lisa Tickner, Elizabeth Prettejohn, Paul Barlow, Tim Barringer, Pamela M. Fletcher, Kenneth McConkey, Perry, Andrew Stephenson, Corbett, Alicia Foster, Janet Wolff, and Jane Beckett. 256 pp., 7 color ill., 84 black-and-white. \$60; \$30 paper.

Lisa Tickner, *Modern Life & Modern Subjects: British Art in the Early Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. 336 pp., 30 color ill., 120 black-and-white. \$50.

A year after opening to widespread media coverage, London's Tate Modern could boast that with 5.25 million visitors it was the most popular art museum in the world. This new, modern image of Britain, which is embodied in the creation of the Tate Modern, entailed dedicating the Tate's previous residence—the older building at Millbank—exclusively to British art. British art, it seems, can be separated readily from modern art. The highly visible distinction between British and modern is not new. One of the first serious art-historical studies of modern British art, Charles Harrison's groundbreaking 1981 *English Art and Modernism 1900–1939* (Yale, 1994 [1981]) offered a confirmation of—if not an argument for—this stereotype, foreclosing the question altogether. Recently, the issue of modern art's place in Britain has been revisited as

more scholars have begun to reject the notion that one of the most industrialized and modern countries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries failed to visually engage with modernity.

The history of art in Britain in general has come under renewed scrutiny in recent publications. These range from reconsiderations of canonical figures such as William Hogarth (*The Other Hogarth: Aesthetics of Difference*, Bernadette Fort and Angela Rosenthal, eds., Princeton, 2001) to sustained critical investigation into the political implications of the Young British Artists (*High Art Lite*, Julian Stallabrass, Verso, 2000). Two new journals (though with very different characters)—*Visual Culture in Britain* and the *British Art Journal*—have been founded in response to the growing momentum and sophistication of the field. One of the most active areas of revision within the study of British art has been the assessment of modernism in both its Victorian and early twentieth-century manifestations. Building upon earlier contributions, such as Richard Cork's 1985 *Art Beyond the Gallery in Early 20th-Century England* (Yale) and Stella Tillyard's 1988 *The Impact of Modernism 1900–1920* (Routledge), a recent crop of scholarly studies has sought to relocate modern art in Britain. David Peters Corbett's 1997 *The Modernity of English Art 1914–30* (Manchester) and Anna Gruetzner-Robbins's 1997 exhibition *Modern Art in Britain 1910–14* at London's Barbican Centre marked the beginning of this trend. They were followed by works such as Elizabeth Prettejohn's 1999 *After the Pre-Raphaelites* (Manchester) and (with Tim Barringer in the same year) *Frederic Leighton: Antiquity, Renaissance, Modernity* (Yale) as well as new titles such as Kate Flint's 2000 *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination* (Cambridge). These evaluations were bolstered by monographs and exhibitions on John Singer Sargent, Albert Moore, and John Everett Millais, among others, as well as Christopher Green's 1999 *Art Made Modern: Roger Fry's Vision of Art* at the Courtauld Institute and Richard Shone's 2000 *The Art of Bloomsbury* at the Tate Britain for its inaugural show. Building upon these studies, the current interventions by Lynda Nead, Deborah Cherry, Lisa Tickner, and the other contributors to a volume on English art from 1860 to 1914 provide compelling

arguments for the complexity of modern art in Britain.

Lynda Nead's *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets, and Images in Nineteenth-Century London* makes a strong case for the need to reassess the problem of modernity in British visual culture. At the heart of the industrialized world and as the capital of the British Empire, London could be considered the most modern of cities. Paradoxically, however, London's visual registration of modernity has been regarded as secondary to that of Paris. As seen through the eyes of writers such as Charles Baudelaire and Walter Benjamin, Paris has come to symbolize the modern metropolis. *Victorian Babylon* makes a compelling case for a shift of focus "to tell a different story of modernity" (6). Expanding upon the persistent analogies made between London and ancient Babylon by contemporary commentators, Nead characterizes the Victorian metropolis as caught in an effort to visualize its own relation to both tradition and innovation. Contrasting London to Hausmann's Paris with its triumphalist narratives of modernity, Nead argues that London's modernity "seemed to obey the spatial logic of the maze rather than that of the grid or the *étoile*, and its characteristic experience was of disorientation, as opposed to purposeful movement" (4).

Circulation—of people, waste, vision, and images—is the core theme of *Victorian Babylon*. Divided into three parts, Nead's study examines the fraught attempts to impose or suppress circulation within the urban framework. First she examines the process of redrawing and remapping London in the mid-nineteenth century. London was enduring an upheaval as new sewers and subways cut through the city. Mapping projects fed upon and fueled the desire for greater circulation and freedom of movement throughout the metropolis. In addition to examining these schematic visualizations of the evolving London topography, Nead tracks the shifts that occurred in experiential visualizations. Movement became both easier and more complex within the city. For instance, Nead challenges the assumption of women's invisibility in urban life. She argues that women capitalized upon the possibilities of urban circulation and played a central role in the social life of the

streets. Questioning the seemingly rigid divide between “respectable” women and the rest of the urban social world, Nead argues that women of all types moved through the streets of London, experiencing the “pleasure and danger” of the street and experimenting with the boundaries of social identity. Nead argues that Victorian London cannot be simply categorized through myths of strict social stratification and gender division. Within these structures, a great deal of play and confrontation occurred as part of modern daily urban life.

In a related theme, Nead examines the role of gas lighting and the access it allowed to the city at night. She takes as her central case study the rise and fall of Cremorne Pleasure Gardens, made popular by its spectacular use of gas lighting. With its dazzling nighttime amusements, Cremorne became “a testing ground for metropolitan identities and behaviours” on a huge scale (120). As Nead demonstrates through a discussion of posters, newspapers, and paintings, the pleasure gardens were characterized—by both detractors and supporters—in terms of the visual and the spectacle. Nead concludes this section with an analysis of James McNeil Whistler’s 1875 painting *Nocturne in Black and Gold: The Falling Rocket*, which depicts one of the nightly fireworks displays at Cremorne and which later became famous in the Whistler v. Ruskin trial of 1877–78. Whistler sued the eminent art critic for libel after Ruskin derided him for “flinging a pot of paint in the public’s face.” Nead argues that Whistler drew upon the modernity of Cremorne’s spectacle for his painting and that, in the subsequent trial, the moral ambiguity of Cremorne played a decisive role for the jury. She then argues that attempts to suppress the circulation of obscenity in London were an concomitant effect of London’s modernity. Focusing on the infamous purveyors of “obscenity” on Holywell Street in the heart of London, Nead contends that the moralistic attacks and campaigns reflected an anxiety about urban modernity. Holywell Street functioned as a highly visible symbol of the “pleasures and dangers” available on the streets of Victorian London on a daily basis.

Victorian Babylon establishes a useful alternative account of the visualization of

metropolis and modernity. Couched in its historical accounts is a polemical case for the reexamination of the definitions and presumptions that form the bases of many narratives of the modern. Nead complicates and challenges the primacy given to Paris by choosing not to accept it as the unequivocal standard. This is admirable, but equally useful would have been a more extended discussion of how London forces us to reexamine the clichés of Parisian modernity. Though her intention is clearly stated in the introduction, the implications of her argument are often left implicit in the book as a whole. Despite its understatement, however, there is no doubt that *Victorian Babylon* demands and supports a redefinition of the models of modernity. Consequently, the book has implications far beyond the study of Victorian art. Nead avoids extensive visual analysis of the works in question and includes few “high art” pieces in her study. While some may regret these absences, such decisions form an implicit argument for a reassessment not only of the topic of modernity but also of the methods used to examine it. Her extensive range of sources, from the *Illustrated London News* to Whistler, indicates an allegiance to the broader study of visual culture and amounts to an argument in its favor.

Deborah Cherry’s *Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850–1900* argues in tandem with Nead’s study for the reassessment of the role of women in Victorian culture. Cherry uncovers a wealth of material testifying to an active feminist culture among artists in Victorian England. The book establishes a strong link between women artists and feminist politics during this period by analyzing the social networks and spatial contexts that they created for themselves to circumvent the male-dominated art world. As does Nead, Cherry argues that women actively occupied, transformed, and moved through urban spaces. She deploys an impressive array of facts to prove that art, in conjunction with a burgeoning visual culture in London, provided a degree of economic and social independence that facilitated the creation and growth of associations among women.

Beyond the Frame argues that women artists played a key role in the history of feminist

politics. Cherry raises the stakes of her argument by discussing women artists within the framework of imperialism. Middle-class women used art as a means of justifying travel to and exploration of Algeria. Within this “Other” culture, the hegemonic structures of colonialism afforded women the opportunity to experiment with social and subjective positions not possible at home.

Beyond the Frame successfully balances a critique of these women and their colonialist prejudices and practices with an analysis of how they articulated a pro-active (albeit white and privileged) feminist position through art. In an extended discussion of the public reception of Harriet Hosmer’s 1862 sculpture *Zenobia*, Cherry contends that Hosmer’s statue provided a flash point at home for debates about the role of women’s rights and investigates the discourse of race that underwrote these arguments. *Zenobia* “negotiated the sexual politics of vision, images of slavery, criminality and street women, the invisibility of Queen Victoria, a crisis in the British monarchy, women’s rights, and women’s art” (141). Linking all of these issues was the emerging public debate on the issue of women’s “authorship and authority.” From these mid-Victorian models, Cherry proceeds to examine the evolution of feminist “tactics and allegories” up to the turn of the century, discussing the tensions between individual professional success and the increasingly public suffragist movement. She argues that, by the end of the nineteenth century, there was a recalcitrance on the part of some feminist-inclined artists to embrace new developments in painting. As the direction of modern painting increasingly turned to the depiction of urban daily life and mass cultural spectacle, the new subjects for painting were seen as counterproductive to a feminist agenda. “While the ‘new painting’ visualised independent female performers of the music hall, it could not accommodate platform women, professionals, or feminist campaigners” (187). Cherry proposes the genre of portraiture as an unacknowledged site of feminist visual articulation.

At times, Cherry’s exhaustive recounting

Reviews

of facts and historical data threatens to bury the argument she pursues. This density of information is the result of Cherry's dual emphasis on recovering the history of women artists and mobilizing an argument about feminist politics with that material. From both perspectives, *Beyond the Frame* makes an important intervention into the studies of colonialism, the history of feminism, and visual culture in Britain. Attending to the interplay of the race, class, and gender, Cherry uncovers an active and contentious feminist heritage formed at the conjunction of visual culture, women's visual production, and suffragist politics. *Beyond the Frame* is not, however, a heroic narrative of the roots of feminist art. Instead it offers a considered look at these origins while not shying away from criticizing the colonialist dynamics that fostered certain feminist practices.

The location of modern art in Britain is addressed most directly by David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry's anthology *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*. The essays were largely drawn from papers given at the 1997 conference "Rethinking Englishness: English Art 1880–1940" held at the University of York (which also spawned the forthcoming anthology from Yale, *The Geography of Englishness: English Art and National Identity, 1880–1940*). The editors chose not to include here the contribution by Charles Harrison, whose own book on English art provides a recurring reference point and foil throughout this anthology. Published in 1999 in the journal *Modernism/Modernity*, Harrison's contribution effectively challenged the categories of investigation upon which the conference was premised.¹ As such, it is an essential text to be read in conjunction with his earlier book and with *English Art 1860–1914*. Without a doubt, the choice to exclude Harrison's contribution increases its importance by lending it the authoritative aura of the unjustly censored (and Harrison does not fail to capitalize on this situation). Corbett and Perry's volume, however, is more consistent for this unfortunate state of affairs. To include Harrison's denigration of art in England would have made the rest of the anthology appear to be a series of critical reactions to and refutations of it.² Harrison was right to attack the

notion of "Englishness" as a stable or even useful category and to challenge the methodological presumption that contextualization is an adequate means of argument. However, once these notions are extended to the degree he advocates (however polemically), the investigation into the different problems posed within other contexts becomes handicapped. In contrast, the contributors argue against an exclusive definition of modernism and question the traditional criteria for ascribing artistic value and quality (for, in the end, this is what Harrison's definition of valid modernism amounts to). As Corbett and Perry put it, "There is no reason to assume that an account derived from the circumstances of one culture will adequately describe the conditions of another" (1).

In her contribution to the anthology, Lisa Tickner confronts these problems in what is arguably the essay with the most methodological importance. Tickner makes a concise and compelling case for a reopening of the question of modern art in Britain, calling for attention to the relation between individual agents and the cultural, economic, and ideological factors determining the field in which the agent acted (or attempted to do so). From this perspective, both art and the writing about art can be examined for their relevance at a given moment. The most successful essays in the book take up Tickner's challenge through a dual emphasis on the specifics of the local context and a direct confrontation with existing definitions of modernity. In his essay, "Millais, Manet, modernity," Paul Barlow offers an extensive comparison between the much-maligned late works of John Everett Millais and the sanctioned modernism of Edouard Manet. Noting that "The distinction between academic and avant-garde becomes conflated with that between the Victorian (© Britain) and Modern (© France)" (52), Barlow argues for closer attention both to the rhetoric of the art-historical evaluation of modernity and, specifically, to Millais's participation in the debates surrounding painting's role in modern life. Elizabeth Prettejohn convincingly connects Frederic Leighton's agendas and strategies with those commonly attributed to modernism. Despite Clement Greenberg's disapprobation of Leighton, she compelling-

ly uncovers a number of deep affinities between the two. Prettejohn, Barlow, and other contributors such as Pamela Fletcher and Tim Barringer attack the notion of rigid antagonism between the academic and the avant-garde. Other contributors such as Corbett and Andrew Stephenson address artists who are more readily compatible with Francocentric narratives of modern painting. In his ambitious interpretation of Sickert's music-hall scenes, Corbett contends that Sickert's engagement with modernity "both seeks to use the diagnostic possibilities of the visual to understand and determine the realities of contemporary experience, and attempts self-reflexively to understand the limitations and range of those possibilities" (158). By drawing out the complexity of Sickert's project, Corbett's essay provides the clearest case in the anthology for the unacknowledged sophistication of modernist art in Britain. Stephenson demonstrates that Whistler—perhaps of all artists working in Britain the one who has been most successfully assimilated into modernist narratives—pitched his avant-garde persona differently within British and French contexts, revealing the range of available modernist trajectories and identities at that time.

The essays in *English Art 1860–1914* do not offer a homogeneous modern trajectory for Britain; such a project was not the volume's intention. Instead, they present a range of views on modernity that, together, challenge the exclusive modernist canon. The volume sheds light on artists such as Sickert and Leighton, providing a complexity that deserves future study and discussion, even in that testing ground that Harrison uses to justify his rejection of British art—the introductory survey course. For any student of modern art, *English Art 1860–1914* will prove essential reading for understanding the character and diversity of visual expressions of modernity.

Like Corbett and Perry's anthology, Lisa Tickner's *Modern Life & Modern Subjects: British Art in the Early Twentieth Century* presents an ambitious intervention that will become a standard reference in the literature on modern art. Tickner presents detailed studies of individual works by Sickert, Augustus John, Wyndham Lewis, Vanessa Bell, and David Bomberg, covering a range of divergent

modernist practices. In each detailed and nuanced chapter, Tickner's compelling narrative weaves close examinations of art objects with investigations into artistic agency, cultural determinants, and historiography. The result is not just an important historical reassessment of British art, but also a challenge to art-historical practice. Always keeping a keen eye on the paintings she studies (even if no longer extant), Tickner incorporates formal analysis, biographical material, cultural analysis, philosophically informed interpretation, and social critique, allowing each perspective to cross-fertilize the others.

The first chapter discusses Walter Sickert's *Camden Town Murder* paintings in relation to both his modernist aspirations and to the tabloid crime that focused his attentions in 1908-1909. From Tickner's analysis and Corbett's essays (both in the above anthology and in *Modernism/Modernity* (2000)), Sickert emerges from the recent reevaluation of modernity in British art as an exemplary yet inadequately acknowledged figure. Tickner relates Sickert's struggle with materiality and facture to his chosen subject matter: the murder of a prostitute in 1907. As with Sickert's paintings, Tickner negotiates the consonances and dissonances between, on the one hand, his formal and pictorial strategies and, on the other, the referential, contextual, and social content of his paintings and of modernity. Throughout, Tickner neither reduces works of art to either of the two positions nor accepts their mutual exclusivity.

In her second chapter, Tickner situates the equivocal modernity of Augustus John in relation to his pursuit of a bohemian and gypsy lifestyle, arguing that the tramp presents the possibility of a modern artistic identity comparable to the *flâneur*. Hunting down sources and contexts in the popular culture of "tramping," Tickner makes an argument for John's (ultimately unsuccessful) engagement with modernity through his rejection of urban spectacle and commo-

dification. In her discussion of Wyndham Lewis's lost 1912 painting *Kermesse* for the Cave of the Golden Calf, Tickner argues that Lewis directed his avant-garde agenda through references to the popular culture of dance. Focusing on a popular working-class dance performance known as the "apache," Tickner sees Lewis as drawing upon its violent sexuality and conflating it with the formal aggression of Vorticism. Both formally and in terms of its cultural relation to dance, *Kermesse* staged an encounter between violence and sexuality in which the power of heterosexual masculinity was the core



theme. Tickner contends that Lewis's move toward abstraction was intimately bound up with a "crisis in relations between masculinity and representation" (115). The dramatization of sexual relations in popular dance afforded Lewis the opportunity to address this crisis and make his version of modern art a confirmation of heroic (albeit anti-humanist) masculinity.

Tickner's chapter on Vanessa Bell's *Studland Beach* offers a challenge to the formalism of Bloomsbury aesthetics. Even though Bell, like her Bloomsbury colleagues, took the autonomy of "significant form" as a guiding concept, Tickner reads the ca. 1912 painting through Bell's own history. She grounds her reading of the painting in an analysis of Bell's biographical information and the trope of the beach. Again, Tickner masterfully inte-

grates a formal reading with this contextual material, seeing in the radical simplification of Bell's painting both an adherence to the orthodoxies of formalism and an expression of Bell's subjective associations with the beach.

She formulates a similar interpretation of David Bomberg's 1913-14 *In the Hold* by relating Bomberg's radical pictorial style to other artists who drew upon Jewishness (especially Mark Gertler) as well as to the Jewish culture of London's East End. As with Sickert, John, Lewis, and Bell, she looks at biography and cultural determinants to conclude that Bomberg's Jewishness is the vexed nexus where pictorial strategies, subjective histories, and cultural contexts collide. Bomberg referenced the Jewish diaspora while ordering and subsuming it under an arbitrary formal structure to the point of near illegibility. Tickner contends that Bomberg pursued near abstraction and narrative suppression as a formal analog for the unrooted experience of the diaspora. Seen within the context of debates about Jewishness and Jewish art in the 1910s, Tickner sees *In the*

Hold as "hinting despite its best intentions at the stereotype of the wandering Jew outside the time and space of European modernity" (183).

In each of the chapters, Tickner's analysis reads the contextual through the formal, and vice versa. Eschewing any opposition between detailed formal analysis and social or cultural interpretation, *Modern Life & Modern Subjects* offers a methodological prescription

Vanessa Bell. *Studland Beach*, ca. 1912. Verso: *Group of Male Nudes* by Duncan Grant. Oil on canvas. 30 x 40 in. (76.2 x 101.6 cm). Copyright 1961 Estate of Vanessa Bell and Tate, London 2001. Courtesy of Henrietta Garnett.

for the practice of art history. The paintings she discusses are not the result of mere cultural forces, artistic intention, or formal strategies, but a blend of all three. The book draws on the subjective and the biographical without losing sight of the importance of material and cultural determinants. Tickner successfully employs this method to refute the myth that there was no sophisticated or complex modernism practiced by British artists.

Modern Life & Modern Subjects and all the other books under discussion make the case that British art complicates and challenges persistent clichés of modern art. Each, as well, makes an argument that has implications for the method and direction of the study of the history of modern art. Whether it be through the rewriting of the tropes of urban modernity, the relationships among feminism, visual art, and colonialism, or British artists' innovations into pictorial practices and subject positions, these books argue that the history of modern art looks different, but no less varied and complex, from across the Channel.

David J. Getsy is the Samuel H. Kress Foundation Fellow in the History of Art, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London. He specializes in the history and theory of nineteenth- and twentieth-century sculpture and has articles on British art forthcoming in *Visual Culture in Britain*, *Documents* and the *Sculpture Journal* (all Spring 2002).

1. Charles Harrison, "'Englishness' and 'Modernism' Revisited," *Modernism/Modernity*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1999): 75–90.
2. Harrison's discussion tends to conflate his critique of national identity and his dismissal of modern art in England. It is unfortunate, as his discussion of the former is an important contribution to an ongoing debate about the historical and historiographic role of national identity in Britain.

Continuing the Vogue for Paris Noir

Theresa Leininger-Miller

Petrine Archer-Shaw. *Negrophilia: Avant-Garde Paris and Black Culture in the 1920s*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2000. 200 pp., 123 black-and-white ills. \$24.95 paper.

The publication of Petrine Archer-Shaw's *Negrophilia: Avant-Garde Paris and Black Culture in the 1920s* is timely, complementing a number of recent studies discussing the presence and reception of black culture in France. The book serves well as an introduction to the ways in which the white avant-garde in Paris imagined black cultures during the 1920s. Archer-Shaw, a freelance art historian and curator who lives in Jamaica, explores the "historical ambiguities and racial complexities" (9) of that place and time by scrutinizing the adaptation of black art forms in "advertisements, painting, sculpture, photography, popular music, dance and theatre, literature, journalism, furniture design, fashion and objets d'art" (9). She also investigates the avant-garde's motives in embracing black culture and proffers reasons and meanings for its interest. Archer-Shaw adapts the term "negrophilia," meaning a love of black culture, from Jean Laude's use of the word "négrophilie" in his *La Peinture française (1905–1914) et l'art nègre (1968)*. She also notes its usage in the title of an essay by James Clifford in *A New History of French Literature* (Harvard, 1989) and in the title of an exhibition of black artistic memorabilia at Amsterdam's Tropenmuseum in 1989–90.

The topic of negrophilia is a fascinating one, and this publication is the first to address so many different aspects of it at once. Yet the book, which seems to ignore much recent scholarship, reads more like a first draft or a kind of Cliff's Notes to key issues than a serious study. For such a complex subject, endnotes are surprisingly brief and few, averaging about eighteen per chapter, and consisting mostly of primary sources, but no archival material. Madden-ingly, there is no bibliography. The index, too, is short, skeletal, and idiosyncratic, although this—as well as the absence of a

bibliography—may have been the series editor's decision and not the author's. For instance, the index does not include entries for illustrations or for the few scholars the author does mention, such as Catherine Bernard, Annie Coombes, Paul Gilroy, Rosalind Krauss, Sally Price, and Jeffrey Stewart.

Further, while Archer-Shaw provides concise formal analyses for a few images (e.g., Man Ray's 1926 *Portrait of Nancy Cunard* and a 1925 photograph of Josephine Baker on the roof of the Théâtre des Champs-Élysées), many of the illustrations are not only unexamined, but not even mentioned in the text. Why bother to reproduce but not critique René Giffey's "Batoualette, very practical ashtray at drinks" (1929); Auguste Roubille's "A negro dandy and an African woman" (1902); Edward Burra's *La Minuit Chanson, Montmartre (1931)*; SEM's *Les Montparnos* (ca. 1925); a disturbing, untitled photograph of a black man whose head is enveloped in leather and whose neck is cinched by a wide iron-studded collar; or Archibald J. Motley, Jr.'s famous *Blues (1929)*? The illustrations are sketchily labeled, typically just by artist, title, and date (although a fuller list of captions appears after the endnotes). More disconcerting is the arbitrary layout of the images and the lack of a numbering system, which forces the reader to flip pages frequently trying to match up discussions with reproductions. For example, an illustration on page 15 is addressed on page 42; Delacroix's 1827 *Death of Sardanapalus* appears on page 27 but is listed on page 25; a perfume advertisement is mentioned on page 78, but is reproduced in the next chapter on page 85; and a cartoon is described on page 107 but appears on page 186! This, too, though, is likely the fault of the publisher or designer, rather than the author.

Archer-Shaw ostensibly limits her project to the 1920s, the height of negrophilia, but she begins with an overview of nineteenth-century advertising containing black imagery, and concludes by analyzing Nancy Cunard's anthology, *Negro*, of 1934. In between, with no explanation, she briefly touches on important events such as the Colonial Exposition of 1931 (and the Surrealists' response to the show), the return of the Mission Dakar-Djibouti in 1933 (incorrectly