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Introduction

'U'ally the history of a little magazine', wrote Malcolm Cowley, 'is summarised in its format. The first issue consists, let us say, of sixty-four pages, with half-tone illustrations, printed on coated paper. The second issue has sixty-four pages, illustrated with line cuts. The third has only forty-eight pages; the fourth has thirty-two, without illustrations; the fifth never appears.'1 Cowley has in mind the short life of the magazine Broom during whose final days he served as a co-editor. Broom in fact lasted for twenty issues over the three years that it was published in turn in Rome, Berlin, and New York, but did in the end decline by stages in the way Cowley describes. He tells this tale with a light touch but all the same it highlights the serious economic and cultural plight of the 'little magazine': at once dogged by the costs of production, haunted by the threat of censorship, at loggerheads with more conventional publications, and at war with the philistinism of a prevailing business culture.

The beginning of this or other stories of other magazines would tell us why editors and sponsors embarked on this perilous course. They felt, of course, that they would make a difference; that a fight 'for purely aesthetic motives' or for 'a new sort of literature', as Cowley puts it, was worth the struggle, the quarrels, and penury. Magazines of this combative type—which Cyril Connolly termed 'dynamic' (directed 'like a commando course' against 'the enemy position')—shared this cultural ambition with the manifesto of which they were often also the vehicle, 'analogue or extension'.2 Richard Ellmann once commented that 'Literary movements pass their infancy in inarticulate disaffection, but mature when they

achieve a vocabulary. A manifesto is one way for a movement to shift from youthful grumblings to adulthood; starting a magazine in which to publish one’s manifesto enables those mature reflections to reach, hopefully, a wider audience. Janet Lyon notes how the manifesto form is linked to a critique of modernity itself, and dates its rise to the late nineteenth century. As she observes:

In the decades following the revolutionary activities of the 1871 Commune, the manifesto emerged as the signature genre for avant-garde groups announcing the birth of artistic movements. The aesthetic coteries of the historical avant-garde—from symbolists to vorticists, from futurists to surrealists—adapted the manifesto’s revolutionary discourse to signal their own radical departures from bourgeois artistic forms and practices.

That most of these groups published magazines as well indicates the close ties between the defiance of the manifesto form and the vehicle for that defiance, the magazine. Ezra Pound confirmed this association in his important essay, ‘Small Magazines’, when he noted that a magazine must have a strong editorial policy of only two or three points and that he was in favour of ‘a clear announcement of a program—any program. A review that can’t announce a program probably doesn’t know what it thinks or where it is going.’ For Pound a magazine does not only publicize the manifestos of a movement, the magazine itself functions as a form of manifesto.

Together magazines and manifestos, along with related artistic activities and forms of independent production, belonged to the institutions that sustained and promoted modernism. Richard Sheppard, discussing German Expressionism, gives the examples of ‘the café, the periodical, the back-room press, the reading evening, the little book’. Often these venues and outlets formed an urban network across which individual writers and artists moved or formed groups or associations. As such, in an active challenge to prevailing orthodoxies, they published new and experimental writing and visual art, announced a new movement and ‘became the primary centres for establishing new taste’ as Bradbury and McFarlane put it. Periodicals functioned as points of reference, debate, and transmission at the heart of an internally variegated and often internationally connected counter-cultural sphere, or what we describe below as a network of cultural formations. If they were doomed to flare and fade, powered by a sense of mission out of

---


7 Bradbury and McFarlane, ‘Movements, Magazines and Manifestoes’, 204.
all sensible proportion to their financial resources and readships, magazines belonged to a nexus out of which an ongoing campaign for artistic, intellectual, and broadly political values were launched and launched again. This was, we might say, the dialogic matrix of modernism, at times expressed as an affinity, at times posed in frank opposition to the forms of technological and commercial modernity.

The role of periodicals along these lines—servicing new writing, introducing readers to new movements in the arts across different continents, engendering debate, disseminating ideas, and challenging settled assumptions—is now well recognized in modernist studies. Periodicals, as Peter Marks has pointed out, show us how the newness of modernist forms first came into the world in tentative, exploratory, and dynamic ways. They provide, he writes, "unrivalled contemporary documentation of...ongoing literary developments, of rivalries and collaborations, of short-lived enthusiasms and failed projects and of rich and illuminating work of lasting value" and as such question and historicize the later monumentalized curriculum of a few select and familiar names.8

That the formative role of magazines is not, however, an entirely new recognition is evident from the accounts of those such as Cowley and Connolly, Bradbury and MacFarlane, and the still standard bibliographical works by Hoffman et al. and Sullivan.9 For the most part, though, it would be fair to say that magazines have represented an unexplored place on the map, or more prosaically the library shelves and basement archives of modernism, rather than a new intellectual territory busy with students and researchers. Research has been carried out upon what remains a fairly limited range of Anglophone modernist magazines: British magazines such as The Egoist, BLAST, The Criterion, and Scrutiny; American magazines such

---

as Poetry, Little Review, Others, and The Dial; and European ventures such as Transatlantic Review and transition have all warranted attention, some of it in the form of monographs upon specific magazines. Further commentary has focused on thematic clusters of magazines or on questions of gender and the role of editors, the character of magazines in particular periods, or in relation to location and geography. But even if we feel we have some available knowledge of the ten magazines listed above, scholars of modernism are increasingly aware of the vast hinterland that remains unexplored. It is easy to name magazines of interest and significance about which relatively little is known: British magazines such as Voices, Form, The Acorn, Coterie, The Apple, Venture, Seed, and Poetry and the People. In relation to questions of gender and the role of editors the struggles of Dora Marsden and Harriet Shaw Weaver at The New Freewoman/Egoist, or Harriet Monroe and Poetry are reasonably familiar—but what do we know about the Mexican-born Idella Purnell Stone and her poetry magazine Palms (1923–30), or about Epilogue, the magazine edited by Laura Riding from Majorca in the 1930s? In terms of location the fact of publishing a modernist magazine in London in the first years of the twentieth century hardly bears comment. However, the different geographical inflections given to magazines published in Ireland (Dana, Samhain, Belatsine, The Bell, Klaxon), Scotland (The Evergreen, The Modern Scot, Northern Review), or Wales (The Welsh Review, Wales) have not been sufficiently studied as part of the story of modernism in Britain and Ireland. And to this picture of regional magazines we might add the expatriate publications Epilogue, once more, or Gordon Craig's Mask, edited from Florence. One of the aims of this volume, therefore, is to venture out into this hinterland of British and Irish periodicals, hoping not only to make readers more aware of this material, but also to stimulate future research into areas, including individual magazines we have


not been able to consider here. Subsequent volumes on magazines in North America (including Canada) and Europe will add to the further exploration of the field.

Materialist modernisms and periodical codes

Two recent changes in literary studies have had an impact upon the relative neglect of magazines and modernism. The first is the improved access to digitized versions of some magazines, made possible through the use of new technologies, such as has been pioneered by the Modernist Journals Project at Brown University and in which the present project is also engaged. As Sean Latham argues of modernist criticism in this new age of digital reproduction, such 'technologies...will alter fundamentally our conception of early twentieth-century journals and their place in our critical practices' with fully searchable digital texts removing some of the constraints surrounding access to the materials, thereby 'providing a scholarly technology uniquely suited to the study of the little magazines, one capable of opening new kinds of discursive and historical networks'.

The second change follows from what can be termed the 'materialist turn' in modernist studies, which can be seen in the increased attention to questions of the text and historicity. George Bornstein, a proponent of this deepening of the textual criticism characteristic of contemporary literary studies, has argued, for example, for the importance of 'examining modernism in its original sites of production and the continually shifting physicality of its texts and transmissions'. As Bornstein demonstrates in his account of Marianne Moore's poetry, publication in magazines such as The Egoist or Poetry produces very different poetic texts, according to the

---

12 Mainly for reasons of space we have been unable to include chapters on a number of magazines in the period covered. We were unable, for example, to include magazines such as Douglas Goldring's The Trump (1910–12), Holbrook Jackson's Today (1917–24), A. R. Orage's New English Weekly (1932–49), Ronald Duncan's Townsman (1938–45), or Seven (1938–40): all magazines with an interesting take on modernism and the modern. We also decided not to include Whirls (1915–21), the Sitwells' vehicle for modern poetry, since it had more of the character of an anthology (the first issue was subtitled 'An Anthology of Verse') than a magazine and hence was on a par with the Georgian and Imagist anthologies.

13 For the website of the Modernist Magazines Project see http://modmags.cs.dmu.ac.uk/. One notable and unresolved problem facing the digitization of magazines is the issue of copyright. For Brown's Modernist Journals Project see http://dl.lib.brown.edu:8083/exist/mjp/index.xml.


specific forms of layout employed by each magazine and the juxtaposition of material alongside the poem. Bornstein thus argues that an alteration in 'the bibliographic and contextual codes changes the meaning of the poem, even though the words remain the same.' Bornstein is here following the division proposed by Jerome McGann between the linguistic codes (the semiotics and semantics of the actual words) and the bibliographic codes of a text (such matters as 'typefaces, bindings, book prices, page format'). A number of contributors to this volume analyse the bibliographic codes of specific magazines, emphasizing an important point made by McGann that in any text 'Meaning is transmitted through bibliographical as well as linguistic codes' and that these two signifying systems work together to generate the overall meaning of a text. The physical material of the magazine itself is, therefore, a crucial factor in understanding the texts and images found within its pages.

We can also make McGann's bibliographic codes more precise by discussing a particular subset, the periodical codes at play in any magazine, analysing a whole range of features including page layout, typefaces, price, size of volume (not all 'little' magazines are little in size), periodicity of publication (weekly, monthly, quarterly, irregular), use of illustrations (colour or monochrome, the forms of reproductive technology employed), use and placement of advertisements, quality of paper and binding, networks of distribution and sales, modes of financial support, payment practices towards contributors, editorial arrangements, or the type of material published (poetry, reviews, manifestos, editorials, illustrations, social and political comment, etc.). We can also distinguish between periodical codes internal to the design of a magazine (paper, typeface, layout, etc.) and those that constitute its external relations (distribution in a bookshop, support from patrons). However, it is often the relationship between internal and external periodical codes that is most significant. Advertisements, for example, constitute both internal and external codes, indicating, on the one hand, an external relationship to an imagined readership and a relationship to the world of commerce and commodities, while operating, on the other hand, in their placement on the page or position in the magazine as a whole, as part of the magazine's internal code. There is a world of difference between a magazine that only advertises bookshops or other publishers tucked away in the back pages, and the example from the front page of The Adelphi seen in Figure 1.

16 Bornstein, Material Modernisms, 99.
18 McGann, Textual Condition, 57, 67.
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Fig. 1. Cover of The Adelphi (Jan. 1935) and advertisements from Rhythm (1912–33)
The Adelphi was edited by John Middleton Murry in the 1920s and made abundant use of advertisements, ranging from 10 to 25 per cent of the total page contents.\(^9\) Not only the back and front inner pages but also the front and back covers were given over to adverts, and although many were for publishers and booksellers, others were for department stores like Harvey Nichols and Debenhams. Also prominent on the front covers from 1923 to 1925 were advertisements for chocolates and typewriters, essential items, we might say, for all writers. However, an interesting comparison can be made with an earlier magazine edited by Murry, Rhythm (1911–13). The percentage of advertisements contained in Rhythm is, overall, less than that of The Adelphi. There are no adverts in the first two issues, and then only on three of the forty-two pages of the next issue. The change of publisher in 1912 saw a modest rise in the number of advertisements, now placed in the initial pages as well as towards the end of the magazine. Adverts never averaged more than around 10 per cent of the total, however, which either testifies to a reticence by the editors or, as seems more likely given the parlous state of Murry and his publisher’s finances, an inability to attract more extensive custom.\(^{20}\) The majority of the advertisements are for cultural products—publisher’s lists, galleries, other magazines (Poetry Review, or the important Berlin magazine, Der Sturm, for example), or art suppliers (see Fig. 1). A number of adverts are from friends (the Parma Rooms was run by Ida Bakèi, under the name of ‘Lesley Moore’, who was a friend of Katherine Mansfield, a key contributor to Rhythm who indeed did have her hair scientifically combed) or professional colleagues (the Paris Ashur Galleries run by Horace Holley, a friend of Rhythm artists, Anne Estelle Rice and J. D. Fergusson).

Comparing the periodical codes in this respect points up a significant difference between these two magazines. That Murry found adverts for a range of commodities more acceptable in the later Adelphi indicates how external relations to the economic realities of magazine publishing impinged upon it, altering the periodical codes displayed in the adverts, and thus changing the meanings of the magazine overall. Attention to these and other periodical codes interestingly returns us, assisted by a more robust analytical apparatus, to the claim made at the start of this Introduction by Malcolm Cowley that ‘the history of a little magazine is summarised in its format’.

A further relevant aspect of the materialist turn in modernist studies concerns the question of historicity. In this volume Ann Ardis argues that modernist studies needs both to historicize the conventions of modern literary history and to distance itself ‘from the interpretative and evaluative paradigms through which the study of early twentieth-century literature and art was institutionalized in the 1920s, ’30s

\(^9\) For example, Adelphi 11:2 for 1924 has 90 pages, with around 10 1/2 full pages devoted to adverts; 1:7 for 1923 has 110 pages in total, with 23 devoted to advertisements.

\(^{20}\) Murry was almost bankrupt by the collapse of the paper on two occasions; see Anthony Alpers, The Life of Katherine Mansfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), ch. 7 for details.
and beyond'. In particular, this recommends us to decentralise, but not to dismiss, the works comprising the established modernist canon, to critique the terms of canon formation, and to resituate its authors and texts in the broader originary field which Ardis describes as 'the work of the modernist avant-garde, as published in its original material historical context(s)'.

The Modernist Magazine Project, of which this and two further volumes are a central part, was conceived much in this spirit. Our general aim has been to elaborate upon what Michael Levenson described as a 'micro-sociology of modernist innovation, within which small groups of artists were able to sustain their resolve...to create small flourishing communities'.21 'Little magazines', as suggested above, were a key context and vehicle for such innovation, resolve, and expressions of community: a meeting point for both major and minor contributors to artistic modernism. To this end, the following chapters aim to illuminate the rich, miscellaneous contents of the magazines, examining the role of editors, sponsors, and patrons, and the relations between readers, advertisers, printers, censors, and an emerging mass press. These multiple relationships shaped both individual magazines and groups of magazines in the dialogic network of modern arts and ideas.

Modern, modernist, avant-garde

Such an historicizing and materialist approach brings its own interpretative strategies and agenda. Periodical study is well established in Victorian Studies but there is a thrill for many critics and scholars of modernism in entering a largely under-researched archive of original documents.22 It would be foolish, however, to suppose that this material yielded its significance to a supposedly objective gaze. There are questions at the outset, and only touched on above, of definition and method. First of all, the terminology of the 'modern', 'modernist', and the 'avant-garde' clearly shadows any recent research in the field.23 In one commonly accepted move, the singular authority of the largely Anglo-American and male

22 The Research Society for Victorian Periodicals (RSVP; http://www.rsvp.org) has been in existence since 1968.
modernist canon has been placed ‘under erasure’; that is to say, acknowledged as a institutionalized cultural phenomenon while at the same time dispersed into the settings and relationships out of which it emerged. The poststructuralist concept of ‘difference’ has been accordingly evoked to dispel the hierarchies of high and low and their associated vocabularies of elite or minority and mass or popular. The result of this cultural deconstruction, however, can seem to have merely replaced a former hierarchy with a flat plateau of newly expandable, rhizomatically branching modernisms. A pluralist recognition of different modernisms, that is to say, once it has questioned the selective attribution of cultural value bestowed upon an established orthodoxy, is prone to substitute a paradoxically undifferentiated plane of difference for distinctions of value. A more historicized and materialist deconstruction will seek to disclose how different modernisms are marked by the accents of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and region, and, as indicated above, will investigate the relations between artistic forms, techniques, and strategies and prevailing social and economic conditions.\textsuperscript{24}

A further, suggestive position, adumbrated by Ann Ardis, would seek to retain the antagonism towards dominant forms and values associated with ‘avant-garde cultural politics’ and deploy the category of the ‘modern’ as a term encompassing both this combative impulse and an experimental but latterly ‘normalized’ modernism.\textsuperscript{25} A similar distinction was drawn by Raymond Williams’s proposal that we understand the largely ‘retrospective’ labels ‘modernism’ and the ‘avant-garde’ as designating, firstly, ‘alternative, radically innovating experimental artists and writers’ who ‘proposed a new kind of art for a new kind of social and perceptual world’ and, secondly, ‘fully oppositional groups’ aggressively determined on ‘a breakthrough to the future’ by way of a militant ‘creativity which would revive and liberate humanity’.\textsuperscript{26} This thinking has the double advantage of bringing a politicized investment and historicized self-consciousness to the conception of plural modernisms laid across a stratified, synchronic field of ‘difference’. It enables us to recover both the energies of a range of internally harmonious and discordant


\textsuperscript{25} Ann Ardis, ‘The Dialogics of Modernism(s) in the New Age’, \textit{Modernism/Modernity}, 14:3 (Sept. 2007), 428 n. 6, 427 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{26} Williams, \textit{The Politics of Modernism}, 51.
'dialogic' voices and the specificities of a variegated material cultural history (the 'modern') in which they took part.

Periodical studies in this respect brings a new focus to these questions of analysis and the 'distinctions between 'modernism', the 'modern', and the 'avant-garde'. The words in our own series' title 'Modernist Magazines' would seem to opt for one term. While in itself this simplifies the complexity of usage, it oversees a reflection on this very category and serves to introduce a set of case studies of magazines which participated in the making of a 'modernist' cultural aesthetic and the institution of modernism. For this specific history the 'modern' is too capacious a term, and for this present British-based history, the 'avant-garde' makes too infrequent an appearance. We see this history, nonetheless, as a complex process built upon singular, joint, and opposed contributions expressing sometime avant-gardist, modern, anti-modern, and anti-modernist positions. Our judgement over what to count as a 'modernist magazine' has centred upon an understanding of the dominant character of a magazine, of how it contains sufficient material to constitute some version of modernism or significant discussion of modernism, or is closely related to other important contemporary cultural formations or attitudes towards the newness of social modernity. This project, it is useful to emphasize, is not about periodical culture per se, but about how modernism emerged in particular forms of periodical and how modernism itself impelled into being certain, very diverse, types of publication. A number of other types of periodicals and publications, including mass-market magazines, the mainstream press, and printers and small presses, also played a part in this. Our survey is inevitably limited, therefore, but, we hope, sufficiently comprehensive and suggestive to inspire other studies.

Defining 'littleness'

If the term 'modernism' signals an indicative and not exclusive terrain, the companion term 'magazine' raises questions of its own. The starting point here is the subgenre of the 'little magazine', often thought to be short-lived, committed to experiment, in constant financial difficulties, and indifferent or directly opposed to commercial considerations. A description along these lines was sketched out in Hoffman, Allen, and Ulrich's The Little Magazine, published in 1947 and is still a
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common source of reference. Their account attributes two leading features to the corpus of ‘little magazines’. Firstly, that they live ‘a kind of private life . . . on the margins of culture’ as ‘sponsors of innovation’, and have often ‘raised defiantly the red flag of protest and rebellion against tradition and convention’. 28 Secondly, ‘A little magazine is a magazine designed to print artistic work which for reasons of commercial expediency is not acceptable to the money-minded periodicals or presses.’ 29 Such magazines are ‘noncommercial by intent’ and ‘appeal only to a limited group, generally not more than a thousand persons’. In this respect ‘little’ does not refer to size, contents, or lack of payment to contributors, but ‘designated . . . a limited group of intelligent readers’. The contributors to ‘little magazines’, at odds with convention and tradition, are therefore mirrored by a readership willing to learn about ‘the particular schools of literature that the magazines represented’. 30

We might note that ‘reasons of commercial expediency’ and ‘noncommercial intent’ are not the same thing, and wonder whether a group of writers and artists on the margins is the same company who would mount, in Williams’s description above of the avant-garde, a ‘breakthrough to the future’ of liberated humanity, 31 but these are the kind of contradictions and compromises of rhetoric with economic and political reality in which the ‘little magazine’ was embedded. Dora Marsden, editor of the New Freewoman/Egoist, pointed to just such a contradiction when appealing for money from readers and supporters: ‘The fact that practically all papers are sold below cost is the reason why the English Press has to be subsidised by advertiser or capitalist, and in consequence laid open to corruption.’ 32

Another important aspect of Hoffman’s definition of ‘little’ is the focus upon the readership as ‘a limited group of intelligent readers’ (emphasis added). This indicates the New Critical heritage behind Hoffman’s volume and the influence of a related modernist critical orthodoxy. T. S. Eliot, for example, in his 1926 article, ‘The Idea of a Literary Review’, noted that a review’s heterogeneous content should ‘resolve into order’ for the ‘intelligent reader’. It will reach to the assumed ‘interests of any intelligent person with literary taste’ or ‘the man of general culture’. 33 Recent work by Mark Morrisson has stressed a contrary tendency in certain modernist magazines, an impulse ‘to enter into what we now call the public sphere, rather than to create magazines to cater to a small elite’. 34 Chapters in this volume on

29 Ibid. 2.
30 Ibid. 2–3.
31 Williams, Politics of Modernism, 51.
34 Morrisson, The Public Face of Modernism, 17. Another drawback with Hoffman’s definition concerns the historiography of the term ‘little magazine’, which he suggests only starts during the First World War. This ignores earlier instances of its usage and, crucially, its roots in continental Europe. F. W. Faxon’s guide to ‘Ephemeral Bibelots’ of 1903 makes much use of the term to describe
magazines such as *Time and Tide* or *New Writing* confirm Morrissom's insight that certain, though not all, publications, sought out more than a minority of intelligent readers.

A more recent definition by Churchill and McKible echoes, yet broadens, the features identified by Hoffman:

little magazines are non-commercial enterprises founded by individuals or small groups intent upon publishing the experimental works or radical opinions of untried, unpopular or under-represented writers. Defying mainstream tastes and conventions, some little magazines aim to uphold higher artistic and intellectual standards than their commercial counterparts, while others seek to challenge conventional political wisdom and practice.35

Both Hoffman's account and this description would embrace modernist innovation and avant-garde cultural politics as distinguished above. In general, however, they both incline to the latter and indeed Hoffman had suggested that 'advance guard' might be a better name than 'little magazine'.36

Many British and Irish magazines, it must be said, meet Churchill and McKible's description: amongst the most well known would be *BLAST*, *The Egoist*, and *Rhythm*. Most of the magazines discussed in this and future volumes are devoted to a conception of the new, even where a valued art and literature belongs to the past and is thought due for renewal: they struggle financially, and are, at their most successful, advocates of an adversarial minority cultural position who find a supportive, independently minded readership. At the same time, however, many key magazines like *The New Age*, *The Athenaeum*, and *Criterion* do not conform to the type delineated above. Some claim, or are given, different identities by the more neutral sounding 'periodical' or 'journal', some take on the more traditional subhead of 'quarterly' or 'weekly', and some present themselves as more popular 'papers' or as more highbrow and academic, 'literary' or 'critical

chapbooks and hundreds of other such publications before 1900. One clear European antecedent for the term is found in René de Gourmont's essay and bibliography of *Les Petites Revues*, published in a 1900 edition by the Bookshop of the *Mercure de France*.


36 Hoffman, *Little Magazine*, 3. Of interest in this respect are the earlier accounts by Ezra Pound in his essay on 'Small Magazines' (1910) and William Carlos Williams's 'The Advance Guard Magazine', *Contact* (Feb. 1932, Second Series 1, no. 18), 86–90. Williams's essay comprises brief notes on a dozen or so American-based 'small magazines' motivated in their reaction to Europe and the national monthlies by 'a desire for conscious self expression' (87). Innovations in verse were, he says, 'to the forefront' (ibid.). Most magazines, however, in Williams's view, soon failed on one count or another. He ends interestingly with the comment that the "small magazine" ... represents the originality of our generation free of an economic burden" and the maxim that "The measure of the intelligent citizen is the discretion with which he breaks the law" (89–90).
reviews'. Even as 'little magazines' a number are on occasion, by instinct, or on principle, more conservative in form and content (New Numbers); some have more stable subscription lists (Century Guild Hobby Horse) or large readerships (New Writing); others acquire the sponsorship of individuals, publishers, or institutions (Egoist, Criterion, Close Up, Tyro); many welcomed commercial advertising (Life and Letters; Adelphi) and some survived for a longer period than the stereotypical fugitive magazine (The New Age, The Mask). The 'little magazine' and companion small press, it should also be said, has survived longer than the cut-off point of the 1930s so often suggested in critical accounts, and even into the age of the Internet.37

The 'little magazine' is, then, '[d]iverse in size, agenda and longevity' as Churchill and McKible put it.38 This diversity and the internal tensions on occasion of format and content is brought out particularly well in Edward Bishop's attention to the 'bibliographic environment' or what we have termed the 'periodical codes' of a range of magazines from The Yellow Book and The Savoy to The Criterion. Thus, the controversial topics of the sex war, masturbation, and homosexuality discussed in Dora Marsden's Freewoman appear in a 'deeply conservative' format which claims a seriousness through its use of 'heavy titling and solid blocks of print' much like the Times Literary Supplement.39 But as the more literary Egoist, known amongst other things for its publication of Joyce, the magazine dropped the subtitle 'an individualist review' and the heavy, barbed Latin Antique typeface for 'the more slender and elegant Cason, with Garamond italics for the leading article'. In the end, under the editorship of Harrier Shaw Weaver and T. S. Eliot (as assistant editor), Bishop argues, it became 'more refined' in appearance and content, losing 'some of the punchy, bull-dog quality' of earlier editions.40 The American Little Review, perhaps a more consistently cutting-edge publication and also known—and subject to legal censure—for its publication of Joyce, was pointedly amateur: 'the cover is not a cover, it is at first just a paste-on label or the table of contents in a colour patch stencil on to the flimsy paper,' seldom centre exactly, and not bothered by the occasional bit of overspray at the sides.41 It was committed to experiment

37 The view of the short life of the 'little magazine' is summed up succinctly by Edward Bishop: 'The little magazine flourished for about forty years, from 1895 to 1935.' 'Recovering Modernism—Format and Function in the Little Magazines', in Willison, Gould, and Cherniak (eds), Modernist Writers and the Marketplace, 287. But see David Miller and Richard Price, British Poetry Magazines 1914-2000: A History and Bibliography of 'Little Magazines' (London: British Library Publishing, 2006). A notable example of an Internet magazine is Jacket accessible on http://jacketmagazine.com/00/home.shtml. Jacket was established by John Tranter in 1997. It is committed, like many traditional 'little magazines', to new poetry and new poetry criticism but has no advertising, is distributed free to readers across the world, and makes all its back issues permanently available. Jacket uses the technology of the Internet, says Tranter, in terms reminiscent of an earlier avant-garde impulse, to pull capitalism 'inside out'.
39 Bishop, 'Recovering Modernism', 300.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid. 307.
in the arts and provocatively declared its intention to make ‘no compromise with the public taste’. At the same time, it welcomed advertising (for, amongst other things, Goodyear tyres, restaurants and tea-shops in Greenwich Village, or the prize-winning popular fiction *Diane of the Green Van*). Its periodical codes would seem to conflict with its uncompromising cultural politics, but in essence it simply used the economic means at hand for its own ends rather than be used by them. In Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, in knowingly exploiting the meagre resources of ‘economic capital’ available to it, *The Little Review* accumulated significant ‘symbolic value’.

A third example, *Poetry* (Chicago) in Bishop’s account, declared its conservatism in its ‘black letter typeface with the initial capital letters set off in red’ and ‘the device (also in red) of a scroll and pen’ on its title page. Though under Ezra Pound’s influence *Poetry* was the first to publish the Imagists, its editor Harriet Monroe was, to his lasting frustration, cautious about Eliot. It nevertheless enjoyed a degree of ‘economic capital’, through its Chicago backers and in the eyes of contributors, since it paid $10 a page, whereas *The Little Review* paid nothing. Only with Eliot’s *Criterion*—launched with the financial backing of Lady Rothermere and subsequently published at a loss by Faber and Gwyer—did economic and symbolic or cultural capital coincide. This was fitting, we might think, given Eliot’s skill in achieving the best economic and cultural advantage in the publication of his *The Waste Land* in *The Dial*.

All of these magazines, whether more conservative or more radical, earned a reputation as supporters of ‘modernism’, whether in its more formally experimental or culturally combative modes. Some other magazines which included modern or new writers were not at all ‘little magazines’. H. L. Mencken’s *Smart Set*, for example, seems closer to mass-market American magazines such as *Vanity Fair* or *The New Yorker*, but included work by Conrad, Pound, Joyce, Lawrence, and Scott Fitzgerald. Other magazines, amongst those considered in this volume, such as *Form* or *The London Mercury* were non- or anti-modernist, though they were engaged in determining questions of literary, artistic, and moral value and in promoting a rival notion, for or against, of what it was to be modern. In the case of *The London Mercury*, seen by Middleton Murry as an arch-rival to his own *Adelphi* and fellow progressives, this meant that its editor J. C. Squire did regularly review and debate with tendencies he opposed. The non- or anti-modernist therefore gave definition to the modernist, just as the latter gave definition to the more radical avant-garde. Others attempted to blast both modernist and
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anti-modernist positions. One minor example is *The London Aphrodite* (1928–9), started by two Australians in London, Jack Lindsay and P. R. Stephensen, as a deliberate retort to *The London Mercury*. An initial manifesto, however, attacked both Squire’s magazine and the camp he opposed: ‘We stand for a point of view which equally outrages the modernist and the reactionary,’ proclaimed the first issue. Both camps, however, outlived the assault by the *Aphrodite*. The fuller picture, therefore, confirms the need to view magazines and the variety of trends comprising ideas of the modern as a lively congress of opinion and exchange rather than a flat segmented map or set of inflexible hierarchies. Clearly the juxtaposition Hoffman implies between the ‘little’ magazine and its larger rivals simply will not capture the nuanced distinctions evident in the periodical culture of modernism.

Equally complex is the distinction between the minority ‘little magazine’ and mainstream publications and their respective relations to dominant cultural attitudes, mores, and economies. It is a mistake clearly, given the above, to see this relation as a static binary opposition of distinct, homogenous areas. If mainstream or hegemonic culture, by definition, exercises power it does so for the most part by gaining consent and through strategies of exclusion, negotiation, or assimilation. Magazines in their turn, existing on the margins, and as part of a stratified counter or subaltern public sphere, contest, appropriate, and negotiate with this dominant realm. The chapters by Ardis, Dowson, and Morrissin, in particular, draw on Jürgen Habermas and others to explore the notion of the public and counter public sphere. We need a flexible and dialogic version of this distinction between spheres to understand the dynamic of the avant-garde and the relative stability, over time, of a ‘normalized’ modernism, overtaken, side-stepped, or made new again by its inheritors. We need to appreciate too the play of ‘symbolic capital’ accumulated by conspicuously non-commercial magazines against the hard-nosed economic capital which structures their very form and determines their survival. In addition we should note how ‘symbolic capital’ might accrue to a commercial publication that includes the avant-garde as a marker of its own ‘being modern’.

**Cultural formations**

Discussion along these lines, informed by Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu, clearly assists us in framing the heterogeneous field of modernism in magazines. So too, we believe, does the work of Raymond Williams and his elaboration of the concepts of

46 This aspect is seen in the publication or discussion of avant-garde figures such as Stein and Joyce in American mainstream magazines such as *Vanity Fair* or *The New Yorker*.
hegemony and formations. Williams's distinction between 'dominant', 'residual', and 'emergent' cultural tendencies or practices has at the outset a flexibility that other more static identifications of the unitary character of cultural epochs or binary distinctions do not have. '[T]he complexity of culture', Williams writes, 'is to be found...in the dynamic interrelations at every point in the process, of historically varied and variable elements.' The 'residual' he describes as that which 'has been effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process, not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present'; 'emergent' emphasizes how 'new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationship are continually being created'. At the same time both the 'residual' and 'emergent' are defined in their variable relations with the dominant, itself responsive to change. Thus 'some part' or 'some version' of a residual cultural element 'will in most cases have had to be incorporated if the effective dominant culture is to make sense in these areas'. Similarly, of the new meanings and practices associated with the 'emergent', Williams writes how 'it is exceptionally difficult to distinguish between those which are really elements of some new phase of the dominant culture...and those which are substantially alternative or oppositional to it, emergent in the strict sense, rather than merely novel.'

Williams's model of a stratified cultural order in the process of change has a number of advantages for the study of periodical culture. In general, it offers a way of describing the relation of magazines to a hegemonic mainstream as an active and changing set of relationships, but also helps us identify 'residual' and 'emergent' emphasises within single magazines or across the career of a changing title, group, or generation. Williams's terms therefore provide us with a cultural vocabulary, or the beginnings of a such a vocabulary, for describing, for example, the coexistence in The English Review of the established Thomas Hardy and Henry James along with the 'emergent' Pound and Wyndham Lewis; for situating the differences between the contemporaneous 'residual' features of The Athenaeum and the 'emergent' avant-gardist BLAST; for tracking the changes which took Rhythm from its experimental first phase of 'Bergsonian modernism' to its life as the more conventionally Georgian Blue Review; and for investigating the 'novel', 'alternative', or 'oppositional' features of the politically radical Cambridge Left, Left Review, and Poetry and the People in the 1930s, or of the several magazines edited by Scottish poet and polemicist C. M. Grieve (Hugh MacDiarmid). Many of these examples are taken up in the following chapters.

48 Williams, Marxism and Literature, 131.
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The second related term introduced by Williams is that of 'cultural formations'. The term is a useful one in that it serves to connect a general social history of culture to specific cultural productions, styles, and forms (such as the many 'movements' or 'isms' which appeared increasingly in the modern period). A cultural formation is a formal or informal association of individuals engaged in some nature of cultural production which in turn sets them in different relations with broader trends in society. Williams discusses three artistic groupings in detail in these terms: William Godwin and his Circle, the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and Bloomsbury, and we can readily see how this description might apply to some of the magazines of the 1930s, as above, or to the critical movement associated with the magazine Scrutiny (see Chapter 33). The emphasis on the group and the companionship, collaboration, and friction across artistic debate and social identities this involves is crucial to our understanding of how magazines work and how they encapsulate dialogic features in modernism(s) at large.

Williams's discussion is suggestive, therefore, on a number of counts, particularly in its emphasis on the social relations of even relatively informal modes of cultural association and production. Even in Williams's main examples, however (the 'relatively simple' Pre-Raphaelites and the 'relatively complex' formation of Bloomsbury), he introduces a typology 'in bare outline' which remains at many points in need of elaboration and concrete demonstration. One general issue concerns the variety and scale of cultural formations: guilds or professional associations; the loosely organized and short-lived independent groupings of friends and associates we often see with 'little magazines'; and 'Schools' or 'movements' such as Futurism or Surrealism. The most important and useful analytical guide across this wide field is the distinction Williams draws between a formation's internal organization as a group and its external relations, both proposed and actual, to other organizations and to society more broadly. 'Little magazines' often belong to the type of 'independent formations' whose internal organization is 'not based on formal membership, but organised around some collective public manifestation, such as an exhibition, a group press or periodical, or an explicit manifesto'. This collective manifestation would distinguish those magazines produced by and representing a group agreed on a common literary or artistic taste or set of values, from a more individual production (one thinks of the difference between the cultural formation linked to Scrutiny and a magazine such as Lewis's Enemy). Not

52 See Marxism and Literature, 115–20; Culture, 56–86; and 'The Bloomsbury Faction', 148–69. For a detailed analysis of this notion see David Peters Corbett and Andrew Thacker, 'Raymond Williams and Cultural Formations: Movements and Magazines', Prose Studies 16:2 (August 1993), 84–106. Francis Mulhem argues in his study of Scrutiny that magazines comprise a set of practices in a specific historical bond to other histories in a general historical conjuncture. Scrutiny he sees 'not as an expression of a master-subject (Leavis) but as a play of many voices, within the ideological formation of which Scrutiny was the organizer and bearer'. The Moment of Scrutiny ('Preface', p. ix).
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all magazines, that is to say, embody a cultural formation. Sometimes, too, more than one manifestation (exhibition, press, periodical, manifesto) will be associated with a particular group (the Vorticists and BLAST); sometimes, indeed most often, a group will do no more than found a magazine, unaccompanied by other events or even by a manifesto.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, says Williams, a change occurred in the nature of certain cultural groups: some became not only internally structured as a 'working organization', but started to cohere around 'some much more general programme, including many or indeed all the arts, and often additionally, in relation to this, some very general cultural (and often "political") position'. As examples he cites Futurism and Surrealism, groups working across various media, but also espousing general positions on the nature of society. At this point, the analysis of cultural formations, suggests Williams, requires us to attend not only to their internal organization but to their external relations to the wider world. He distinguishes between three types of such external relations: 'specializing' (which seek to support work in a particular medium or style); 'alternative' (which provide for forms of work excluded by present institutions); and 'oppositional' (which directly oppose existing institutions and the social and political conditions which uphold them). All of these types can be explained by the increased diversity and specialization encouraged by a liberal market economy and associated class relations: either to occupy a niche position (specializing) or to set themselves against 'the practices and values of a "commercial" and "mechanical" civilisation' (alternative and oppositional).

Williams's emphasis is upon the social relations and public manifestation of forms of cultural production, of which magazines are but one example. Analysis of a wide range of magazines such as in the present volume demonstrates a landscape of perhaps more gradations than Williams's tripartite structure of specializing, alternative, and oppositional positions can easily capture. Some magazines can clearly be linked to fully formed cultural formations in which explicit positions are taken on the cultural or political issues (often found in the editorial statements and common in Left magazines of the 1930s); other magazines are linked to groups with an informal internal organization but who retreat from any active external relations to the wider world (Ricketts and The Dial; Graves and The Owl); in some others, such as The Signature, edited by Murry and Lawrence, the intended oppositional relations to the wider world (in this case the First World War) are neither truly shared nor executed: hampered both by the lack of a more coherent internal organization and by the magnitude of the ambition.

Williams refers to magazines as one kind of 'collective public manifestation' around which an informal group might organize itself. To study magazines more extensively, however, helps expand our understanding of the broad concept and
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actuality of cultural formations. Firstly, it shows us how we need a vocabulary for
the embryonic, modest, or limited examples as well as the ‘simple’ and ‘complex’
formations Williams identifies, where the latter have a more manifestly shared
internal life and public profile. Secondly, it reveals how formations change over
time: encompassing the often characteristic relations between magazines of imita-
tion, rivalry, and competition or of their amalgamation, evolution, and decline.
Part of this process and the character of the formation includes too the changing
role of advertising and the fluctuation and segmentation of readerships and general
relations of production.

What throughout is of interest is the relation between these ‘internal’ and
‘external’ worlds; between, in other terms employed in this volume, the counter-
cultural or subaltern and the public sphere, for it is this which determines the
well-formedness of a cultural formation and the position it takes as ‘specializing’,
‘alternative’, or ‘oppositional’. These terms too, in practice, prove less compartmen-
talized than an abstract schema can easily comprehend, and are complicated also by
the social relations of the group and the dominant social hierarchies of the broader
society. Williams concentrates in this respect in his three most developed examples
on social class and class ‘fractions’ to describe, for example, the, in some ways
dissenting, in some ways conformist, position occupied by both the Pre-Raphaelites
and Bloomsbury within and against a dominant English middle-class formation.
However, the lesson of the magazines themselves emphasizes the importance of
questions of gender, ethnicity, region, and nationality as well as social class, and
these are factors brought out in subsequent chapters.

Williams does indeed comment, briefly and interestingly, on nationality and on
the avant-garde in general as a ‘paranational’ formation.58 This phenomenon he
associates with immigration to the metropolis and with a metropolitan-based dis-
sident artistic culture. Paranational ‘avant-garde formations of this type’, he writes,
express a ‘consciousness and practice . . . developing in the directions of metropoli-
tan and international significance beyond the nation-state and its provinces, and of
a correspondingly high cultural mobility’.59 ‘This speaks to a contemporary critical
agenda on ‘transnationality’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ and alerts us to the mobility
of individuals, ideas, movements, and magazines across national borders.60 Some
obvious examples come to mind: The Little Review which shifted from Chicago
to New York and Paris, and the transatlantic magazines Broom and Secession,
which migrated respectively across European sites (Rome, Berlin, Vienna, Berlin,
Florence) and New York. The metropolitan scene of London conformed to some of
the features Williams outlines, but the British situation generally did not produce
mobile avant-garde movements or magazines of this type. Ford Madox Ford’s

58 Williams, Culture, 83–4.
59 Ibid. 84.
60 See, for an original approach to this theme, Rebecca I. Walkowitz, Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism beyond the Nation (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).
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_Transatlantic Review_ (considered in Volume 2 of this series) was edited from Paris, while _Close Up_ was edited in Switzerland, printed in Dijon and then England, and networked through its various contacts across cinema cultures in Berlin, Moscow, Paris, New York, and London. Gordon Craig’s _Mask_ and Laura Riding’s _Epilogue_ were produced respectively in Florence and Majorca—away in fact from the major metropolitan centres. These were also, it has to be said, exceptions, which did not exhibit the literal mobility of some transatlantic and many ‘paranational’ European magazines. At the same time, many British-based writers and artists were very aware of European developments—from the 1880s onwards by way of the conduit of Paris—and this influenced the contents of magazines as different in other ways as _The Savoy, New Age,_ and _Rhythm_. The design, editorial team, reviews, and advertising of the latter were also a clear indication of its international ambitions. Many magazines from the mid-1920s and in the 1930s, including _The Criterion, New Coterie, Close Up, European Quarterly, and New Writing_, were also consciously European or internationalist in their outlook and in their contributors. Throughout this history, too, Irish, Welsh, and Scottish magazines present a variously inflected relation to their own national cultures, to Europe, and to a dominant English modernism, calling on residual and emergent features to discover an alternative or oppositional stance.

The differences and similarities at the national and transnational level call for a geocultural analysis of the intricately dialogic and migratory character of modernism as an international or paranational formation. Williams’s thoughts sketch a compelling perspective upon these criss-crossing networks. At the same time, as Williams reminds us, ‘no full account of a formation can be given without attending to individual differences inside it.’ Both the common and more specific or individual histories belong to the dramatic social, cultural, and economic narrative of twentieth-century modernity. We hope that the case histories of this and subsequent volumes will aid our understanding of both the material detail and dynamic relations of modernisms and modernity.

Methods and models

The very range and diversity of material discussed in this volume suggests how different critical methodologies might help analyse the different features of magazines. One suggestive method is presented by Franco Moretti’s use of graphs, maps, and tables to analyse or ‘model’ an extensive literary field. Though we do not have
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the space here to fully explore such a model for the study of modernist magazines a few examples might suggest a direction for future work.

One fruitful analytic tool is provided by a timeline of magazines and we offer an abbreviated version of such a device here for magazines from 1908 to 1919—a period which saw the emergence of modernism in Britain, the impact of the war, and the changed post-war environment for culture (Table 1).

This timeline, first of all, illustrates the coexistence of magazines otherwise thought of separately. Sometimes, too, unexpected magazines come into view: the year 1914, for example, highlights the coexistence of The New Age, Egoist, and BLAST, but reminds us also of other magazines published at this time such as the English Review, Poetry and Drama, and New Numbers. In 1919 London witnessed the coexistence of the Mercury, Art and Letters, Form, Chapbook, Civerie, The Owl, and Athenaeum. This alerts us to a set of synchronic relations or possibilities, a sense of the range of magazines an individual writer or illustrator could contribute to at any one time. It also indicates clusters of magazines running concurrently with an awareness of each other, in an overlapping or complimentary relation, but frequently in a relation of rivalry and competition, even if this was sometimes cooked up to boost sales. Diachronic patterns also appear, indicating the comparatively short or long lives of particular magazines. The perspective a timeline offers helps us appreciate the longevity of certain 'little magazines', for example The Mask, as well as giving us a sense of the average life cycle of the short-lived magazine (2–3 years seeming to be a norm here). We see also how production
was interrupted before picking up again in the changed world of post-war society, confirming how 1919 was a key year in the emergence of new voices. Looking back, we might question too, on this evidence, whether 1910, that key modernist year for Virginia Woolf, was as significant as 1908 or 1913 for the emergence of modernist projects.

A second approach might focus attention on a very material detail such as the price of magazines (Table 2). A number of features are worth commenting upon here. As we can see from Table 2, 25. and 6d. seems to become a fairly standard price for both quarters and monthlies. However, this drops in the 1930s to 1s. and 6d., reflecting both economic factors at play in the period and, in the case of left-leaning magazines, a commitment to making the publication more widely available. Price is, of course, conditioned primarily by economic necessities but in certain cases where a magazine was supported by private finance or patronage, the price could reflect other factors. The relative cheapness of Poetry Review, New Age, and Egoist (all 6d.), for example, indicates an attempt to gain a wider readership or help produce a counter public sphere to that of the mainstream press.

Magazines whose price stands out as expensive in comparison to the norm tell a different story. The relatively high price of The Owl, Golden Hind, Arvon, and Epilogue, for example, though they were very different kinds of publication, reveals an allegiance to an older tradition of the luxury cultural commodity (compare the price of The Dial, Hobby Horse, or Yellow Book) or the ‘Book Beautiful’ tradition, which was uninterested in reaching a large readership. T. S. Eliot’s choice of the relatively expensive price of 3s. and 6d. for The Criterion, a periodical supported by individual patronage, suggests an attempt to deliberately market the magazine as appealing to the ‘intelligent reader’, which, as we have seen, was the selective readership Eliot envisaged.

Models and statistical analyses such as this are only indicative, and much more could be made of data of this kind on, for example, subscriptions, readership, circulation, sales, advertisements, and patterns of geographical distribution. This is clearly a direction in which the study of periodical codes might usefully go.63

Structure and periodization

The present volume is organized into ten groups of magazines in sections ranging from a discussion of changes in publishing and readership in the nineteenth century to the situation after the Second World War. The discussion embraces the early nineteenth-century quarterlies and the Irish periodical The Bell which closed in 1934. Two other magazines referred to here, The Studio and Time and Tide, went
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Table 2. Prices of Selected Periodicals, c.1850–1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Germ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Yellow Book</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Savoy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pageant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Acon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evergreen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Sheep</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poetry Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry and Drama</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Mercury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Semi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Frenswoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Frenswoman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Semi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Egoist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Semi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blue Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Criterion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adelphi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Calendar of Modern Letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Monthly Chapbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coterie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Owl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bermansday Book</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tyro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enemy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Golden Hind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Decachord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3-a-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry and the People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Verse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentieth Century Verse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>8-times-a-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Poetry and Prose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bulletin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>One only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
on into the 1960s and 1970. Individual chapters on particular magazines, therefore, take us from the embryonic 'little magazine' The Germ, the organ for its short lifetime in 1850 of the Pre-Raphaelites, to the discussion in the final chapter of F. R. Leavis's Scrutiny, no longer a magazine of art and creative writing, but of criticism, which closed in 1953. This movement over a century from an artistic to a critical formation is symptomatic of the emergence, consolidation, and institutionalization of a version of predominantly literary modernism. It is a history of considerable variety, however, which at its end produced not only a canonical modernism but different claims on the relation of art, literature, and modernity. The individual chapters and the Part Introductions take up this history in detail but, in general, this is a story of the struggle to establish and maintain criteria of aesthetic and cultural value as a force in society from an embattled and combative position. While the magazines considered here were often opposed to the newness of modernity, conceived as a destructive force in the public realm of politics, mass society, and the economy, they defended and promulgated the new (which could mean a revaluation or re-instatement of the old or residual) in art and culture and saw this as the harbinger of some alternative order. Towards the end of the history considered here a more radical 'new modernism', drawing on the heritage of Romanticism and Surrealism, presented itself in Tambimuttu's Poetry London, just at a time when Scrutiny (and a generation of American magazines) had installed modernism in the academy. But Scrutiny, as well as the earlier Calendar of Modern Letters which had helped inspire it, along with the contemporary magazines New Verse and Twentieth Century-Literature and more overtly political publications, had fought in their own terms for an independent and principled creative spirit against a moribund and amnesiac society. At every point a study of the magazines renders
a seemingly homogenous and linear history back into the miscellaneous initiatives, fluid mergers, contentious factions, and strongly alternative *partis pris* which have composed it, revealing a loosely assembled cultural tradition of critical thinking: fragile and transitory, but, by that very token, testimony to an attitude of dissent and artistic innovation which is of lasting value.