

The Role of the Periodical Editor: Literary Journals and Editorial Habitus

Author(s): Matthew Philpotts

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 107, No. 1 (January 2012), pp. 39-64

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5699/modelangrevi.107.1.0039>

Accessed: 05/03/2015 23:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ROLE OF THE PERIODICAL EDITOR: LITERARY JOURNALS AND EDITORIAL HABITUS

In the winter of 1908 Paris and London witnessed one of those curious and immensely revealing instances of simultaneity which so often characterize literary history. In November of that year the small circle of friends and intellectuals around André Gide published the first issue of *La Nouvelle Revue Française*, the literary review that would rapidly become one of the leading French literary institutions of the twentieth century; the following month, the literary scene of Edwardian London celebrated the 'legendary' opening number of Ford Madox Ford's *The English Review*, including original contributions from such luminaries as Thomas Hardy, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, H. G. Wells, and John Galsworthy.¹ Notably, these two new journals occupied remarkably similar positions in their respective literary fields: both of them provided an inclusive and 'disinterested' space in which different generations of writers were able to enter into productive dialogue with one another, and both of them played a vital mediating role between modernism and tradition.² However, here the similarities end. Indeed, a diachronic comparison of the two reviews reveals trajectories which are diametrically opposed to one another. The spectacular early success of Ford's *English Review* did not last. After only fourteen issues, Ford was forced to sell the magazine and was replaced as editor in February 1910. Although *The English Review* continued to be published until the late 1930s, its oscillating political and literary positions under a succession of different editors failed to recapture the reputation established under Ford. By contrast, the *NRF* made light of what proved to be a thoroughly inauspicious, false start under Eugène Montfort in 1908. In February 1909 the review was reborn with a second opening issue, this time under the exclusive influence of Gide and his friends Jacques Copeau, Marcel Drouin, Henri Ghéon, André Ruyters, and Jean Schlumberger. The journal rapidly established itself as the dominant force among French literary periodicals and, after the interruption caused by the First World War, the *NRF* secured and sustained its position under the editorships of Jacques Rivière (1919–25) and Jean Paulhan (1925–40). More than a century after the simultaneous foundation of the two journals, the *NRF* continues to flourish, its unrivalled prestige bound up in its own history and mythology. *The English*

¹ For the most recent assertion of the opening issue's 'legendary' status see Cliff Wulfman, 'Ford Madox Ford and *The English Review* (1908–1937)', in *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines*, ed. by Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, 3 vols, 1: *Britain and Ireland 1880–1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 226–39 (p. 231).

² For a brief discussion of these similarities see Maaïke Koffeman, *Entre classicisme et modernité: 'La Nouvelle Revue Française' dans le champ littéraire de la Belle Époque* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003), p. 146.

Review, meanwhile, has been consigned for the most part to the footnotes of literary history, remembered almost exclusively for a brief and dazzling period of little more than a year under Ford Madox Ford.

The striking simultaneity in the foundation of these two reviews and their contrasting fortunes thereafter serve to highlight a host of potentially fruitful avenues for comparative research into the role and function of literary periodicals. Above all, the two cases outlined above raise a number of complexities and contradictions in the crucial role played by the editors of literary journals as highly influential agents in the literary field. In the case of *The English Review*, scholarly and critical opinion has been almost unanimous in seeing the early success of the magazine as a product of Ford's 'editorial genius', but little effort has been made to subject that success to more systematic academic scrutiny.³ As Nora Tomlinson suggests, so lacking is sustained critical analysis of the editorial role that it is difficult even to identify criteria by which success might be judged, and this is all the more important in Ford's case given his failure to sustain the initial success of the journal. If the mythical status of Ford's fourteen months in charge of *The English Review* shrouds the reality of his editorial activity, then the legendary status of the *NRF* poses a similar problem for attempts to understand the mechanisms of that success and the contribution made to it by its editors. In particular, the review is invariably associated with the figure of André Gide, whose reputation has cast a shadow over the significant roles played by much less celebrated members of the editorial team. As Martyn Cornick argues in his study of Paulhan's editorship, this is both a specific and a more generalized shortcoming in the scholarship: 'Paulhan is, quite simply, a neglected figure in French intellectual and cultural history: all too often he is treated dismissively as an *éminence grise* [. . .] without properly examining his contribution.' It is time, argues Cornick, to 'demythologise' the figures at the centre of such reviews and 'to offer a true evaluation of their contribution to cultural history'.⁴

That we still lack a formalized conceptualization of the editorial role that might act as a platform for serious comparative and typological research can scarcely be attributed to a shortage of research into literary periodicals. Literary historians have devoted considerable attention to periodical publications, and, more recently, periodical studies has emerged as a vibrant interdisciplinary field in its own right. However, that research has tended to be hindered by a number of structural factors, not least the sheer volume of

³ The exception is Nora Tomlinson, who, in her own words, 'challenges the conventional opinion that Ford Madox Ford was a great editor': 'The Achievement of Ford Madox Ford as Editor' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Open University, 1995), p. ii; subsequent reference, p. 3. Tomlinson also analyses Ford's later editorship of the *Transatlantic Review*, something beyond the scope of this essay.

⁴ Martyn Cornick, *Intellectuals in History: The 'Nouvelle Revue Française' under Jean Paulhan, 1925-1940* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), p. 5.

material and the firmly entrenched disciplinary boundaries which continue to exist, not only between different national literatures, but also between the internal, qualitative readings privileged in more traditional literary studies and the external, predominantly quantitative approaches typical of the social sciences. The result is a fragmented field of enquiry characterized by narrow thematic and historical specialisms that obstruct a productive synthesizing approach. To take the most recent example, the first volume of Brooker and Thacker's *Oxford History of Modernist Magazines* brings together a wealth of specific case studies and offers some significant theoretical insight in the editors' introduction.⁵ Yet these theoretical perspectives are only rarely taken up in the chapters dealing with specific magazines, so that those case studies stop short of a sustained and cohesive conceptualization of the distinctive properties of the periodical. Tellingly, the section devoted to editors offers discrete and predominantly descriptive examinations of individual cases and little or no reflection from a typological perspective. As Latham and Scholes have argued in relation to periodical studies, the increasing availability of an empirical corpus, often in digitized form, shifts emphasis to a new stage in the genesis of this emergent field, namely 'the creation of typological descriptions'.⁶ Acknowledging that periodicals differ substantially from other forms of publication demands 'new approaches to publications' history and criticism—approaches distinct from operations conducted as literary criticism or journalism history.⁷ Or as Latham and Scholes put it: 'This means that to address periodicals as typologically distinct and historically coherent objects, we may have to develop new scholarly methodologies adequate to the task.'⁸

My response to this challenge is to explore the theoretical potential offered by Pierre Bourdieu's sociological approach to the field of cultural production. As Peter McDonald has demonstrated, Bourdieu's model carries considerable conceptual power for our understanding of literary and publishing history 'in its ability to articulate the mediating ground between textuality and social history, symbolic value and material production'.⁹ For the literary periodical, which exists not only as a literary-aesthetic text and a material product, but also as a socio-cultural institution, such an approach holds particular promise

⁵ Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, 'General Introduction', in Brooker and Thacker (eds), pp. 1–26.

⁶ Sean Latham and Robert Scholes, 'The Rise of Periodical Studies', *PMLA*, 121 (2006), 517–31 (p. 519).

⁷ Judith Yarros Lee, 'The Future of American Periodicals', *American Periodicals*, 15 (2005), 196–201 (p. 197).

⁸ Latham and Scholes, p. 529.

⁹ Peter McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice 1880–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 20. See also John B. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010).

in its capacity to bridge the disciplinary disjunction between internal and external analysis. More specifically, Bourdieu's notion of habitus allows us to situate the editor as an agent negotiating what Brooker rightly identifies as the complex 'nexus of social, economic, and artistic relations which [find] material form in a journal or magazine'.¹⁰ For Bourdieu, habitus is a central category, a deeply ingrained but readily transferable set of attitudes which generates the perceptions and practices of individual agents in the field.¹¹ Rather than act in a calculated and conscious way, habitus predisposes agents to respond to specific situations according to this 'second nature' which is the product of lengthy processes of inculcation. The starting-point for my analysis of the periodical editor is a category of cultural agents to whom Bourdieu ascribes a distinctive type of habitus, the 'double personages'—such as gallery directors and publishers—who mediate between the aesthetic and commercial fields. Caught between the conflicting logic of two opposing fields, these double personages 'combine completely contradictory dispositions: economic dispositions which, in certain sectors of the field, are totally foreign to producers, and intellectual dispositions near to those of the producers whose work they can exploit only in so far as they know how to appreciate it and give it value'.¹² That is to say, periodical editorship depends on a dual and contradictory habitus.

However, it is not only human agents to whom we can ascribe habitus. Following one of Bourdieu's less well-known analyses—a brief discussion of what he sees as Gide's achievement in founding the *NRF*—I shall also argue that a literary journal is characterized by what we can identify as its own 'common habitus', the defining ethos which unites the members of its 'nucleus' and which acts as 'a unifying and generative principle' for their cultural practice.¹³ In turn, this simple theoretical move has three key consequences for the argument developed in this essay. First, and of broadest significance for the study of periodicals, it follows that the literary journal can be conceptualized as an agent in its own right, participating in the cultural field in the acquisition and exchange of capital in its various forms: literary, economic, and social; material and symbolic. The role of the editor, then, is to maximize the sums of capital acquired and maintained by the journal. Second, and more narrowly, the interaction between the personal habitus of the editor and the institu-

¹⁰ Peter Brooker, 'Harmony, Discord, and Difference: *Rhythm* (1911–13), *The Blue Review* (1913), and *The Signature* (1915)', in Brooker and Thacker (eds), pp. 314–36 (p. 336).

¹¹ Bourdieu defines habitus in his rather opaque terms as a system of 'durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations' (*The Logic of Practice*, trans. by Richard Nice (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), p. 53).

¹² Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: The Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. by Susan Emanuel (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), p. 216.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

tional habitus of the journal allows us to distinguish three broad typological species of editorship which correspond to particular positions occupied by periodicals in the field: the ‘charismatic editorship’, typical of an innovative position in the field, which characterizes Ford’s initially successful editorship of *The English Review* and the editorial achievements of his contemporary John Middleton Murry (*Rhythm*, *The Athenaeum*, *The Adelphi*); the ‘bureaucratic’ mode of editorship which corresponds to a more established position and which helps to explain not only the successes of the editorial team of the *NRF*, but also the longer-term failures of the editorial endeavours of both Ford and Murry; and the ‘mediating editorship’ at the centre of the field which is exemplified in this essay through T. S. Eliot’s editorship of *The Criterion*. From these typological analyses, it is clear that the ideal editor would possess a highly differentiated, multiple habitus encompassing intellectual, economic, and social dispositions which allow him to mediate the network of forces of which he is the focus. Finally, this exploration of editorial habitus at the level of both the individual and the periodical prompts explicit reflection on the notion of habitus itself and on its usefulness as an explanatory category for cultural practice. As we shall see, the case of the periodical editor lends considerable weight to a revised view of habitus which stresses both dispositional and contextual plurality.¹⁴

Charismatic Editorship: The Personal Habitus

While critical judgements on Ford Madox Ford as a man and on his wider literary career have often been mixed, there has been much greater unanimity on his achievements as a periodical editor. Certainly, Ford’s colleagues and contemporaries from *The English Review* left behind testimonies unstinting in their praise, even if their personal relationships with Ford were not always so positive.¹⁵ Wyndham Lewis, for example, overcame long-held antipathies to concede that Ford ‘was probably as good an editor as could be found for an English literary review’.¹⁶ Similar tributes would come later from a range of authoritative voices: for Ezra Pound, Ford’s *English Review* was ‘the most brilliant piece of editing I have known’; Graham Greene described Ford in his obituary as ‘the best literary editor England has ever had’; and Malcolm

¹⁴ On this revision of habitus see Bernard Lahire, ‘From the Habitus to an Individual Heritage of Dispositions: Towards a Sociology at the Level of the Individual’, *Poetics*, 31 (2003), 329–55.

¹⁵ Ford’s assistant editor Douglas Goldring later referred unequivocally to Ford’s ‘genius as an editor’. In a similar vein, Violet Hunt claimed that Ford was ‘the greatest editor, qua editor, that has ever been’. Douglas Goldring, *South Lodge: Reminiscences of Violet Hunt, Ford Madox Ford and the ‘English Review’ Circle* (London: Constable, 1943), p. 54; Violet Hunt, *The Flurried Years* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1926), p. 45.

¹⁶ Wyndham Lewis, *Rude Assignment: A Narrative of my Career Up-to-Date* (London: Hutchinson, 1950), p. 122.

Bradbury claimed that Ford ‘should serve as a model for editors of literary periodicals’.¹⁷ Perpetuated by successive biographers—even the most sceptical, Arthur Mizener, concludes that Ford was ‘an exceptional editor’ with ‘remarkable powers of selection’ and ‘a commitment to the highest standards’¹⁸—Ford’s ‘editorial brilliance’ was by the early 1980s ‘acknowledged without cavil’.¹⁹ More than anything else, this editorial success has tended to be measured by the calibre of authors Ford brought together on *The English Review*. His most recent biographer, Max Saunders, views Ford’s achievement in these terms: ‘He not only gathered together all the great talents of early English Modernism; by constellating them he created a coherent impression not of a movement so much as of a literary moment.’²⁰ And in the latest scholarly assessment of *The English Review*, Cliff Wulfman takes a similar line: ‘The lasting reputation of *The English Review* under Ford’s editorship [. . .] rests on the “discoveries” he made and the top-drawer poets, novelists, and essayists he published.’²¹ More specifically, it is Ford’s decision to publish the previously unrecognized Wyndham Lewis, Ezra Pound, and D. H. Lawrence that is seen to have secured the enduring reputation of his editorship. As Wulfman indicates: ‘Most of all, the year under Ford is remembered for his publication of three unknown writers who were to go on to become major voices in modernism.’

These tributes to Ford’s achievements provide striking confirmation of Bourdieu’s theoretical assessment of the value of a literary journal. According to Bourdieu, the table of contents of a literary journal represents ‘an exhibition of the symbolic capital available to the enterprise’, the names gathered there the most obvious indicator of the combined reputational worth of the literary resources at its disposal.²² Ford’s principal success, then, lay in his ability to acquire that capital for his journal, and again Bourdieu is able to provide insight into the mechanisms that lie behind this kind of achievement. ‘The gathering together of the authors [. . .] that make up a literary review’, writes Bourdieu, ‘has as its genuine principle [. . .] social strategies close to those governing the constitution of a salon or a movement.’ In other words, the editorial role is in no small measure a social one, and the capital available

¹⁷ Ezra Pound, ‘Small Magazines’, *English Journal*, 19 (1930), 689–704 (p. 693); Graham Greene, ‘Ford Madox Ford’, *Spectator*, 7 July 1939, p. 11; Malcolm Bradbury, ‘*The English Review*’, *London Magazine*, 5.8 (August 1958), 46–57 (p. 57).

¹⁸ Arthur Mizener, *The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford* (London: Bodley Head), pp. 167 and 169.

¹⁹ Edward Krickel, ‘Lord Plushbottom in the Service of the Kingdom: Ford as Editor’, in *The Presence of Ford Madox Ford*, ed. by Sondra Stang (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), pp. 98–108 (p. 107).

²⁰ Max Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1: *The World before the War*, p. 249.

²¹ Wulfman, p. 233; following quotation from the same source.

²² Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, p. 273; following quotation from the same source.

to the journal is to a considerable degree an index of the volume of social capital possessed by the editor.²³ In Ford's case, he was fortunate to have been born and raised in an environment which provided him with a wealth of significant cultural connections. His father was an author and music editor of the *The Times*, his maternal grandfather the Pre-Raphaelite painter Ford Madox Brown, and his uncle William Michael Rossetti. As Ford put it himself, he considered himself 'as belonging, by right of birth to the governing classes of the artistic and literary worlds'.²⁴ This not only gave Ford an immediate reserve of social capital, it also helped to generate further social exchanges, such as those mediated by Edward Garnett, another family friend. The result was that many of the established authors Ford published in the first issue of *The English Review*—notably James, Conrad, and Wells—had by that time been acquaintances, friends, and collaborators for more than a decade. In this way Ford's capacity to accumulate social capital was clearly enhanced by the 'multiplier effect' which accompanies this form of capital. As Bourdieu suggests, 'the profitability of [...] accumulating and maintaining social capital rises in proportion to the size of capital', and this is particularly true for 'the possessors of an inherited social capital, symbolized by a great name'.²⁵ Sought after by others eager to take a share of their capital, these possessors of inherited social capital find it easy to convert new acquaintances into lasting and meaningful forms of social exchange. For the editor of a literary journal scrutinized intensely by critics for the capital at its disposal, the capacity to attract new and established authors in this way is essential.

However, there is more to the social role of the editor than the passive inheritance and acquisition of capital. For Bourdieu, social capital does not function as a 'natural' or 'social given', acquired once and for all and then retained by its holder. Rather, it is 'the product of an endless effort at institution', of 'investment strategies' which transform otherwise contingent human relations into more durable relationships of mutual obligation. As such, 'the reproduction of social capital presupposes an unceasing effort of sociability', but such effort is profitable only if accompanied by specific competences and dispositions. In other words, a particular kind of 'literary sociability' is an essential skill of the successful periodical editor, who establishes and nurtures networks in which the submission and selection of appropriate manuscripts are fostered. In Ford's case, his was a dynamic and energizing presence on the

²³ Bourdieu defines social capital for an individual agent as 'the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and of the volume of capital (economic, cultural or symbolic) possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected' ('The Forms of Capital', in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. by John Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), pp. 241–58 (p. 249)).

²⁴ Ford Madox Ford, *Return to Yesterday* (London: Gollancz, 1931; repr. Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1999), p. 16.

²⁵ Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', pp. 249–50; following quotations from the same source.

London literary scene, a charismatic and engaging personality who relished ‘practising his power of spellbinding on a fresh audience’ and who ‘thrived on the company of outstanding artists’.²⁶ Ford also appears to have been capable of genuine sensitivity and kindness towards his contributors, part of an apparently deep-seated altruism which helped to foster and promote the new talent which, as we have seen, secured the reputation of his editorship. Above all, Ford’s generosity of spirit was allied to the keenest of literary judgements. Indeed, if all accounts of Ford’s editorship mention without exception his openness and apparently carefree sociability, then they also insist on his speed and acuity in assessing new manuscripts.²⁷ As Mizener suggests, Ford ‘could measure the quality of an unknown writer almost at a glance without personal or social prejudice’.²⁸ The same advantages of birth and upbringing that had endowed Ford with a wealth of social capital had also provided him with an unrivalled intellectual and aesthetic training, cultural capital which enabled him to concentrate his social effort on contributors who would enhance the quality of the *Review*.

A comparison with the editorial successes of Ford’s Modernist contemporary John Middleton Murry reveals many of these same elements at work. It is clear first and foremost that Murry also succeeded in gathering and mobilizing a wealth of social capital in his periodical publications. In Murry’s case he did not enjoy the inherited social advantages which benefited Ford, nor does he seem to have exercised the same natural comfort and easy charm in social exchanges. However, as F. A. Lea suggests, Murry’s success in founding his first editorial venture, *Rhythm*—mobilizing through the Fauvist painter John Duncan Fergusson such talents as Pablo Picasso, Anne Estelle Rice, and Othon Friesz—suggests he was ‘a much more positive and enterprising person than he himself would have us believe’.²⁹ In turn, the ‘overnight success’ of *Rhythm* made Murry ‘something of a literary phenomenon’,³⁰ and thereafter he proved himself remarkably adept at winning and maintaining the respect of the intellectual circles in which he found himself increasingly in demand. It was these networks that allowed Murry to achieve his greatest success, his revival of *The Athenaeum*, the struggling Victorian journal to which he was appointed as editor in 1919.³¹ From his closest circle and from his *Rhythm* days,

²⁶ Saunders, pp. 246 and 249.

²⁷ For discussion of Ford’s editorial method in selecting manuscripts see Mizener, pp. 167–69, and Saunders, pp. 246–49.

²⁸ Mizener, p. 167.

²⁹ F. A. Lea, *The Life of John Middleton Murry* (London: Methuen, 1959), p. 25.

³⁰ Marysa Demoor, ‘John Middleton Murry’s Editorial Apprenticeships: Getting Modernist “Rhythm” into the *Athenaeum* 1919–1921’, *English Literature in Transition 1880–1920*, 52.2 (2009), 123–43 (p. 126).

³¹ See Oscar Wellens, ‘“The Brief and Brilliant Life of *The Athenaeum* under Mr Middleton Murry” (T. S. Eliot)’, *Neophilologus*, 85 (2001), 137–52.

Murry drew his wife Katherine Mansfield and their long-time collaborator D. H. Lawrence, together with Samuel Kotliansky, who acted as a rich source of translated Russian literature. From his wartime service in military intelligence at Watergate House came Murry's assistant editor J. W. N. Sullivan, and also the critics J. T. Sheppard and D. L. Murray. Most importantly, Murry was able to call on the assorted talents he had met at Garsington Manor under the patronage of Lady Ottoline Morrell. These included many of the best-known members of the Bloomsbury set—Virginia and Leonard Woolf, E. M. Forster, James and Lytton Strachey, Clive Bell, and Roger Fry—together with Bertrand Russell, T. S. Eliot, and Aldous Huxley. If the gathering together of established names gave Murry's journal an immediate infusion of symbolic capital, then like Ford he could also lay claim to the long-term profits which accrue from a well-judged investment in lesser-known names. This point is made by Lea: 'Under his editorship, *The Athenaeum* was to publish, as Frank Swinnerton recalls, "a truly astonishing number of articles and reviews and letters written by men and women who have since taken leading places in the literary world"—and, he might have added, taken leading places largely through its agency.'³² Like Ford, Murry concentrated his social capital by combining it with the literary judgement which came from his training and experience as a highly regarded literary critic. While even the most sympathetic judges have had to acknowledge the unevenness of some of Murry's criticism, it is clear that he was capable of offering 'penetrating insights into the work of writers for whom he felt a particular sympathy', that he was apt to be 'uncannily perceptive' as a reader of literature.³³ Clearly, these skills enabled Murry to exercise appropriately sharp and assured judgement on the manuscripts he read as an editor and on the potential contributors he encountered.

Most striking in Murry's editorial successes is that he allied this keen literary judgement with a remarkable strength of editorial purpose. In each case, Murry's stewardship of his journals was driven by a clear and specific editorial vision, a personal habitus imposed on the periodical as a sense of mission. In the case of *Rhythm*, this was a powerful confluence of the young Murry's study of Henri Bergson, his personal fascination with Fergusson and his Parisian contemporaries, and the thrill of the first Post-Impressionist exhibition at London's Grafton Gallery. The result was the principle of rhythm as 'the ideal of a new art', which found expression in his editorial manifestos and in the high-quality artwork which was published in the journal.³⁴ *The Adelphi*,

³² Lea, pp. 65–66.

³³ David Goldie, *A Critical Difference: T. S. Eliot and John Middleton Murry in English Literary Criticism, 1919–1928* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 10–11.

³⁴ See Brooker, pp. 324–26. For the most recent study of *Rhythm* see Faith Binckes, *Modernism, Magazines, and the British Avant-Garde: Reading 'Rhythm', 1910–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

founded by Murry in 1923 as ‘an assertion of faith’, was similarly driven by a strong personal sense of mission, this time part of the mystical revivalist fervour which overtook Murry following Katherine Mansfield’s death.³⁵ If *The Athenaeum* seems at first glance an exception, in that Murry was appointed to an existing institution, the purpose Murry brought to the role was entirely consistent with his other editorial projects. His letters are full of his wholehearted commitment to the post and his desire to make a success of the magazine.³⁶ According to Virginia Woolf, Murry apparently exuded ‘a state of high exaltation’ in the role, displaying in his attitude to the journal the ‘jealous partiality of a parent for his offspring’. That personal investment in the post also drove Murry to an exhausting and uncompromising workload, and that personal drive was a central factor in the remarkable initial success which Murry achieved with these three different literary magazines. Significantly, Ford seems to have been driven in his career by a similar sense of idealism and devotion, a consistent sense of editorial purpose which Krickel defines as ‘a vision, a belief, a faith in regard to the value, the necessity even, of fine writing’.³⁷ Specifically in the case of *The English Review*, Ford felt a sense of personal mission in his desire to establish a form of publication which he perceived to be otherwise absent in the English literary sphere.³⁸ This capacity not only to define and enunciate effectively the core ethos of the journal, but also to identify so fully and personally with it, is the final element in the successful formula which Murry and Ford found as editors.

It is this common formula that I have chosen to term the charismatic mode of journal editorship, a deeply personalized realization of the editorial role where the combined capital accumulated by the post-holder is validated largely in their own name and persona. We have seen, for example, how both Murry and Ford functioned as the focus of multiple social networks which concentrated social capital into the name of their journals and also how their personal literary tastes and judgement defined their journals. The result in both cases is a personal myth or aura surrounding the individual agent’s performance of the editorial role, in which the wider journal is subsumed. From a typological perspective, we might make a number of further observations about this form of editorship. First, charismatic editorship is defined by the subordination of the common institutional habitus of the journal to the personal habitus of the editor. The former is not only aligned with the latter, it comes to be wholly determined by it. Second, this relationship between the

³⁵ See Michael H. Whitworth, ‘The Enemies of Cant: *The Athenaeum* (1919–21) and *The Adelphi* (1923–48)’, in Brooker and Thacker (eds), pp. 364–88 (p. 377).

³⁶ See Wellens, pp. 138–39.

³⁷ Krickel, p. 98.

³⁸ See Mark Morrisson, ‘The Myth of the Whole: Ford’s *English Review*, the *Mercure de France*, and Early British Modernism’, *English Literary History*, 63 (1996), 513–33.

personal and institutional habitus generates a profound personal identification on the part of the editor with the journal and its core ethos. This personal stake is often realized in a sense of mission and also of devotion and exhilaration which can overwhelm more rational considerations, with potentially damaging consequences for the individual. Third, the charismatic form of editorship is necessarily predisposed to be short-lived, its personalized intensity and dynamism likely either to burn out in the collapse of the journal project or else undergo routinization into a more bureaucratic form. Because this form of editorship rests on capital in a personal embodied state, the capital accumulated by the journal is not easily transferred to a new post-holder. For these reasons, we would expect this form of editorship to be associated primarily with instances of the prototypically little magazine or only with the initial foundation phase of larger review journals. In other words, it typically underpins the heretical position of a newcomer in the field. Finally, charismatic editorship can be readily aligned with other manifestations of what Bourdieu identifies as the charismatic image of artistic activity. As such, it privileges the 'poetic' dimension of editorial activity, emphasizing the 'autonomous' principles of the literary field itself and the aesthetic and creative dispositions perpetuated in myths of 'pure' and inspired artistic genius. Crucially, such a perspective necessarily represents only a partial view of editorial activity which obscures its full sociological and material conditions. It is to these aspects of the editorial habitus that I shall now turn my attention.

Bureaucratic Editorship: The Institutional Habitus

For the *NRF*, it was André Gide who performed this charismatic editorial function. Well connected, financially independent, and with a growing literary reputation of his own, Gide brought to the *NRF* much of the social, economic, and symbolic capital required to launch the venture successfully. In the first two years of the journal's existence, it was also Gide who defined its position and profile in the field, through his often polemical contributions to the review. The common habitus of the journal was effectively Gide's habitus, and the other members of the founding team willingly submitted to his greater experience and reputation. However, as Cornick suggests, Gide 'was too infrequently in Paris to assist with the month-to-month and day-to-day running of the review',³⁹ and after 1910 Gide dramatically reduced his direct involvement with the journal. Significantly, Koffeman identifies this as a pattern which had also characterized Gide's involvement with previous periodical projects: 'Nous retrouvons ici le mécanisme qui conditionnait ses rapports avec *L'Ermitage* et *La Revue des Blanchés*: Gide s'intéresse davantage

³⁹ Cornick, *Intellectuals in History*, p. 18.

aux nouveaux départs qu'à l'effort soutenu.⁴⁰ Strikingly, the same might be said of Ford and Murry: between them, they held the post of editor on seven different literary periodicals, and many of those enjoyed successful initial phases, but on only one occasion did either of them occupy the post for longer than two years. For all their commitment and sense of purpose, neither Ford nor Murry seems to have paid much attention to the day-to-day practicalities which sustain a magazine. Moreover, both were positively inept when it came to the financial side of their journals. Stories abound about Ford's eccentric and often shambolic working methods—according to Goldring, he was 'more childishly incapable than any man I have ever met'⁴¹—but it was his self-confessedly idealistic and impractical approach to commerce which sealed the fate of his editorship of *The English Review*. Tomlinson offers a neat summary: 'Cultural journals are not produced to make their editors rich, but Ford, by his wilful inconsistency over payments and his lack of sound accounting practice, brought the review perilously close to extinction.'⁴² Murry went one step further. Having infamously failed to understand the terms of 'sale or return' with the first publisher of *Rhythm*, he was left with a sizeable personal debt on the many unsold copies of the journal's first four numbers. When the magazine's second publisher folded, Murry had little choice but to declare himself bankrupt, though not before he and Mansfield had spent an exhausting and futile year trying to maintain the journal and pay off the money in instalments.

These cases demonstrate just how vulnerable the charismatic mode of editorship can be, dependent as it is on the personal habitus of a single editor. And it was not only in the financial domain that this vulnerability was felt in the editorships of Murry and Ford. In addition to Ford's 'inability to organize' and his 'monumental ineptness over money', he also demonstrated an 'excessive tendency to quarrel with important contributors and supporters'.⁴³ Indeed, in close succession in the first half of 1909 Ford contrived to fall out with Arnold Bennett, Edward Garnett, H. G. Wells, his long-time mentor Joseph Conrad, and his business partner Arthur Marwood. In Marwood's case the trigger was an allegation that he had made improper advances to Ford's estranged wife Elsie. As Wulfman suggests, Ford's personal life was making a major contribution to the deepening crisis affecting *The English Review*: 'Most disastrously of all, Ford had taken up with Violet Hunt [. . .]. Ford was shunned in many respectable circles and support for his journal cooled.'⁴⁴ As for Murry, the impact of his personalized form of editorship took a variety of

⁴⁰ Koffeman, p. 44.

⁴¹ Goldring, p. 22.

⁴² Tomlinson, pp. 100–01.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁴⁴ Wulfman, p. 235.

forms, but it invariably brought negative consequences for his journals. In the case of *The Athenaeum*, Katherine Mansfield's worsening illness gave Murry little choice but to give up the editorship in 1921, a personal decision which led directly to the closure of the journal. As far as *The Adelphi* is concerned, it seems to have been Murry's intensely personal and increasingly idiosyncratic vision for the journal which alienated readers and contributors, thereby squandering its apparently remarkable initial success.⁴⁵ The story of *Rhythm* and the two journals Murry launched immediately thereafter, *The Blue Review* and *Signature*, is even more fraught and personalized. In the case of *Rhythm*, there were tempestuous relationships with some of Murry's core contributors, notably Henri Gaudier-Brzeska and his closest collaborator Lawrence, whose personal life was for some time entwined with that of Murry and Mansfield. More so even than *Rhythm*, the latter two magazines were personal indulgences which relied heavily on the co-operation of Mansfield and Lawrence and which were scarcely viable even in the short term. In the case of these journals, it is difficult not to see Brooker's summary as a damning verdict on the perils of charismatic editorship: '*The Signature* brought the uneven, sometimes utopian, sometimes catastrophic adventure of these three magazines and three publishers, heavy debts, and bankruptcies in a period of less than three years to an end.'⁴⁶

What protected the *NRF* from this kind of fate was an editorial set-up which was from the outset a collective endeavour.⁴⁷ This not only spread responsibility and risk across the editorial team, but it also made available a wider range of editorial dispositions than those at the disposal of such prototypically charismatic editors as Ford or Murry. If Gide alone had the kind of reputation which could bring symbolic capital to the review, Drouin, Ghéon, Ruyters, Schlumberger, and Copeau all brought their own valuable capital in the form of literary experience, editorial competences, and established cultural connections. Crucially, the dispositions of the founding group were also supplemented in the early years by two new additions who brought with them essential professional and commercial competences: Gaston Gallimard, who directed the journal's own publishing imprint, the Éditions de la *NRF*, from its foundation in 1910; and Jacques Rivière, who was appointed to the post of editorial secretary of the journal in 1911. In his concern for

⁴⁵ The first issue of *The Adelphi* is said to have sold a scarcely credible 18,000 copies. Thereafter, the journal sold an average of around 4000 copies as a monthly and fewer than 2000 as a quarterly. See Whitworth, pp. 379–82.

⁴⁶ Brooker, p. 323.

⁴⁷ On the management of the review in its founding years see: Auguste Anglès, 'Le Fonctionnement de la *NRF*', *Bulletin des Amis d'André Gide*, 12 (1984), 11–28; Alban Cerisier, *Une histoire de 'La NRF'* (Paris: Gallimard, 2009), pp. 127–206; and Koffeman, pp. 41–59. The most comprehensive treatment of the journal's founding years is August Anglès, *André Gide et le premier groupe de 'La Nouvelle Revue Française'*, 3 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1978–86).

bureaucratic detail, Rivière ensured that there was always an editorial figure prepared to take leadership in the essential but more mundane work which sustains a literary review. For his part, Gallimard brought a vital new set of dispositions to the journal. As Koffeman puts it: 'Plus que les rédacteurs de la revue, il a le sens des affaires; il saura faire des Éditions de la *Nouvelle Revue Française* une grande institution littéraire qui marie le prestige littéraire à la réussite commerciale.'⁴⁸ And so it proved. The review's publishing imprint rapidly developed a symbiotic relationship with the journal itself, providing abundant opportunities for mutual self-publicity as the reputations of the two institutions helped to establish and then reinforce one another. From this point on, the editorial team adopted more active entrepreneurial strategies which enabled the journal to acquire a dominant position in the field. In this context, August Anglès provides an extremely telling insight into the characteristics sought by Gide and his colleagues in the new director of their publishing imprint: 'Assez fortuné pour attribuer à l'apport de capital et assez désintéressé pour n'escompter de profits qu'à long terme, assez avisé pour conduire une affaire et assez épris de littérature pour placer la qualité avant la rentabilité.'⁴⁹ Gallimard fitted the bill for that particular post, but this specification also hints at the contradictory and conflicting dispositions required more generally in the management of literary periodicals. In the case of the *NRF*, this was not borne by a single individual but shared across an editorial team which, in turn, provided for essential continuity in the leadership and management of the journal through the bureaucratic dispositions they brought to bear.

This was the framework within which subsequent editors of the *NRF* functioned, and it is telling that when the review was re-established after 1918 its two highly successful editors—Jacques Rivière and Jean Paulhan—emerged from within this established structure. Even before his appointment, Rivière had already been a regular and valued contributor to the journal, 'une recrue modèle' as Cerisier puts it.⁵⁰ In other words, he was already part of the nucleus which shared the common habitus of the journal before he was appointed to its editorial staff. Similarly, Paulhan's first direct association with the journal dates as far back as 1912 and 1913, when he unsuccessfully submitted manuscripts for publication.⁵¹ By the time Paulhan became editor-in-chief after Rivière's death in 1925, he was very much an insider, wholly familiar with the successful editorial principles and structures established under the former's stewardship. Among these was the carefully maintained compositional 'balance' of each individual issue, but Rivière's more pragmatic editorial legacy

⁴⁸ Koffeman, p. 110.

⁴⁹ Anglès, *André Gide et le premier groupe*, I, 364.

⁵⁰ Cerisier, pp. 182–91.

⁵¹ On Paulhan's earliest connections to the *NRF* see Cornick, *Intellectuals in History*, pp. 14–17.

also included the strict monthly schedule which ensured each issue appeared on the first of the new month and which Paulhan seems to have applied even more rigorously and obsessively than his predecessor. In the early stages of his editorship, Paulhan also reinstated the collective committee structure which was part of the founding legend of the journal. Through that collegial process Gide, Drouin, Gallimard, and Paulhan's mentor Schlumberger all exerted a continuing influence on the direction of the review. As Cornick notes of both Rivière and Paulhan: 'It was difficult for them as editors to ignore the preferences and tastes of the remaining founders of the review, particularly André Gide and Jean Schlumberger, and still less could they exercise their editorial choices in a vacuum, because both were submitted to the commercial exigencies of Gaston Gallimard.'⁵² This is not to say that Rivière and Paulhan did not bring their own considerable intellectual abilities to bear, nor that their editorships lacked a charismatic and increasingly personalized dimension of their own. However, for all their own talents as critics and writers and for all their own individual contributions as editors, Rivière and Paulhan remained constrained by the institution they served, their selection of material not least 'determined by the intrinsic logic of the review, by its periodicity, by its "mechanics"'.

This is what I understand as the 'bureaucratic' mode of editorship, the theoretical complement of the charismatic mode elaborated above. As the name suggests and as the example of the *NRF* makes clear, this is a form of editorship where the capital associated with a journal rests not with the individual personality of the editor but in the institutional structures of the journal. Again, we can elaborate some key typological features. First, instead of the editor's personal habitus defining that of the journal, it is the common institutional habitus of the journal to which the editor subordinates his own. Second, whereas the charismatic form of editorship privileges autonomous, poetic dispositions on the part of the post-holder, the bureaucratic form places a particular emphasis on the 'heteronomous' dimension of the editorial role, that is, on the professional, administrative, and commercial competences which originate outside the internal logic of the literary field itself. Finally, while charismatic editorship is predisposed to be short-lived, the bureaucratic mode is much more likely to ensure continuity and reproduction of the editorial role between successive post-holders. For this reason, and because of its frequent reliance on a well-developed managerial infrastructure, the bureaucratic form is more likely to be associated with long-standing review journals than with little magazines. As such, it typically corresponds to a more established position in the field. As we have seen in the cases of Ford and Murry, the neglect of this bureaucratic dimension can be catastrophic for the survival

⁵² Cornick, *Intellectuals in History*, p. 12; following quotation from the same source.

prospects of a literary journal. However, an overreliance on the bureaucratic form of editorship carries its own dangers, not least that the journal will lose its distinctive cultural mission and the risk-taking edge which attracts symbolic capital in the literary field. And in the case of the *NRF*, it is striking that the bureaucratic mode was invariably complemented by elements of more charismatic editorship. In the earliest years of the review, for example, the more bureaucratic style of Schlumberger and Rivière alternated with the more dynamic and charismatic leadership of Gide and Copeau. In the longer term, Gide's legendary status as a detached but continuing source of symbolic capital allowed successive editors to privilege professional dispositions, and it is telling that none of the new editorial appointees brought with them to the post substantial levels of personal symbolic capital. Increasingly, that symbolic capital resided in the myth or aura of the journal itself, and this is typical of the most established review journals which occupy dominant positions in their respective national fields. With the charismatic function secured in the myth of the journal itself and often in earlier, 'legendary' editorial figures, the bureaucratic dimension can afford to take precedence in the present.

Mediating Editorship: The Multiple Habitus

As this analysis suggests, the successful realization of the editorial role depends on a complementary mixture between charismatic and bureaucratic dispositions. Or, to put it another way, the ideal editor is at once a charismatic poet and a bureaucratic professional. As such, this ideal editor combines not only a wide range of differing competences but—and this is the crucial point—dispositions which are intrinsically opposed to one another. As one might expect, it is rare enough that a single individual has the opportunity to acquire the full set of competences demanded of a periodical editor: the literary judgement to assess and select contributions; the creative feel to compose what is an aesthetic object in its own right; the social skills to establish and sustain networks of contributors; the managerial and administrative competences to maintain the smooth running of a complex cultural institution; and not least the commercial sense to keep the venture afloat. However, if we understand these editorial dispositions as habitus, that is, as shaped and given value by the logic of the literary field, there is a further obstacle. In the literary field it is positions closest to the autonomous pole—positions most distant from commercial gain—that attract the greatest symbolic profits. Informed by the logic of this 'economic world reversed',⁵³ the literary field values the charismatic and poetic dimension of the editorial role rather more highly than

⁵³ See Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Field of Cultural Production; or, The Economic World Reversed', in *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), pp. 29–73.

the bureaucratic and professional dimension. Functioning in turn to shape perceptions and practices, the ingrained logic of the literary habitus promotes a disincentive for the acquisition and application of 'economic' dispositions, and it is this mechanism that we see at work in the failed editorships of Ford and Murry. The former, in particular, offers compelling evidence of the symbolic power exercised by the poetic aspect of this dual editorial habitus. Ford's catastrophic neglect of fundamental professional competences was no fluke: rather it has to be understood as an integral component of his ingrained 'poetic' persona and one which, most tellingly, did little harm to his reputation among critics and scholars for editorial 'genius'. It is for these reasons that the combination of intellectual and economic dispositions in a single literary editor is so rare.

However, there are exceptions. Perhaps the most notable is another contemporary of Murry and Ford in the London periodical field, T. S. Eliot, who founded *The Criterion* in 1922 and then edited the journal until its closure in 1939. Eliot's intellectual credentials, as a Nobel Laureate and one of the foremost critics of his generation, scarcely need elaboration here. But what is often obscured by Eliot's subsequent public image is the very pragmatic context in which his early career developed and the importance precisely of professional and economic dispositions in his success. Indeed, when Eliot founded *The Criterion* he was still working full time at Lloyds Bank. 'Scrupulous beyond the custom of editors',⁵⁴ Eliot clearly brought professional competences to bear on his editorial role, but his commercial experience yielded other benefits too. When in 1925 Faber and Gwyer was looking for someone who might help the company to identify young literary talent, the attention of the newly founded publishing firm fell on Eliot. Yet it was not Eliot's literary judgement that apparently attracted Geoffrey Faber, but rather his 'qualifications as a man of business'.⁵⁵ As Faber's friend Frank Morley put it: 'I am not sure that Eliot's best qualification to become a publisher wasn't the fact that he had worked in a bank.'⁵⁶ Crucially, Eliot also seems to have applied an astute commercial sense to his activities in the literary field, understanding it as an intensely competitive market which demanded strategic positioning. As Patrick Collier has argued recently, the picture of Eliot which emerges from his letters is that of 'a savvy publicist', 'a skilled and pragmatic viewer and manipulator of the London journalistic scene'.⁵⁷ The young Eliot in particular seems to have been an 'energetic self-promoter' who quickly and aggressively

⁵⁴ Herbert Howarth, 'T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*: The Editor and his Contributors', *Comparative Literature*, 11 (1959), 97–110 (p. 98).

⁵⁵ Agha Shahid Ali, *T. S. Eliot as Editor* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986), p. 49.

⁵⁶ F. V. Morley, 'T. S. Eliot as Publisher', in *T. S. Eliot: A Symposium*, ed. by Richard March and Tambimuttu (London: Poetry London, 1948), pp. 60–70 (p. 62).

⁵⁷ Patrick Collier, 'T. S. Eliot in the "Journalistic Struggle"', in *Challenging Modernism: New Readings in Literature and Culture 1914–1945*, ed. by Stella Deen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002),

played the market for literary essays after his arrival in London in 1914, so that he steadily worked his way through ever larger and more lucrative publications until he was writing for London's most prestigious periodical, the *Times Literary Supplement*. Through this 'rapid upward mobility', Eliot began to accumulate both economic and symbolic capital, but significantly he also seems to have appreciated the inverse relationship which exists between these two conflicting forms of capital. When offered a post by Murry as assistant editor on *The Athenaeum* in 1919, Eliot turned the offer down, fearing that he might become too closely associated with literary journalism to the detriment of his reputation as a poet. Eliot's clear understanding that symbolic capital in the literary field derives from exclusivity and scarcity emerges in a letter to his brother Henry from April 1919: 'My reputation is built on writing very little, but very good, and I should not add to it by this sort of thing.'⁵⁸

In many respects Eliot's was a typically charismatic realization of the editorial role. There is no doubt that he was driven by an intense sense of personal mission. In Herbert Howarth's words: 'I doubt whether anyone has been so resolved as Eliot to have his own periodical and control it purposefully. [...] Ambition drove Eliot [...] the honourable, desperate, and irremediable ambition to pursue and cry a conviction.'⁵⁹ As with Murry and Ford, Eliot's commitment to his journal was intense and punishing. 'I wish to heaven that I had never taken up *The Criterion*,' wrote Eliot in March 1923. 'I have not even time to go to a dentist or to have my hair cut. [...] I am worn out. I cannot go on.'⁶⁰ And such was the dominance of his personal habitus that *The Criterion* became 'Eliot's autocracy', a forum which discussed 'just about anything that Eliot wished'.⁶¹ But if it is true that 'the great magazines have always been edited by autocrats',⁶² it helped in Eliot's case that this power did not blind him to operational and strategic necessities. As Jason Harding observes, Eliot carefully positioned his journal so that it addressed 'an elite of writers, critics, and patrons of the arts—a choice readership who might advance Eliot's social and literary career. In other words, *The Criterion* sought to acquire the prestige Pierre Bourdieu has termed a *capital symbolique*'.⁶³ More pertinently, though, Eliot also understood that this symbolic capital could be traded for

pp. 187–211 (p. 197). The discussion in the remainder of this paragraph draws on Collier, pp. 198–99.

⁵⁸ *Letters of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Valerie Eliot, 1: 1898–1922 (London: Faber and Faber, 1988), p. 283.

⁵⁹ Howarth, 'T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*', p. 98.

⁶⁰ Letter to John Quinn, 7 March 1923, cited in Donald Gallup, 'T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound: Collaborators in Letters', *Atlantic Monthly*, January 1970, p. 58.

⁶¹ Ali, pp. 50 and 73.

⁶² The words are Allen Tate's, cited by Herbert Howarth, *Notes on Some Figures behind T. S. Eliot* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1965), p. 250.

⁶³ Jason Harding, 'The Idea of a Literary Review: T. S. Eliot and *The Criterion*', in Brooker and Thacker (eds), pp. 346–63 (p. 349).

the economic capital needed to sustain the journal. When Faber and Gwyer took on the ownership and subsidy of the journal in 1927, this was clearly the calculation made by the publishers. As Morley notes: 'Faber & Gwyer were prepared to lose larger sums on experiments of less importance; for though the business value of *The Criterion* was indirect, an indirect return was assuredly there.'⁶⁴ More explicitly, Eliot himself had anticipated five years earlier how the reputation of a journal could be exchanged for a financial return: 'Unless I can edit a paper that pays, or else that is so "important" in some way or other that rich ignoramuses will feel that they MUST subsidize it, I don't see how I can ever earn more than £150 per year maximum.'⁶⁵ Yet, Eliot's capacity to reconcile economic and intellectual dispositions was not simply a pragmatic mechanism through which he secured the viability of his journal. He also found a way in which to synthesize his multiple roles, so that the more commercial positions he adopted in the field actually enriched the quality and range of his own poetic output. Suman Gupta, for example, stresses that Eliot's activities as a publisher were an essential component in his contribution to literary Modernism, shaped by 'his conviction that the critic and the poet should exist together in one person'.⁶⁶ In a similar vein, Howarth highlights the productive interaction between Eliot and his contributors, demonstrating in the process 'the dynamic effects which the conscientious editing of *The Criterion* had on Eliot the poet'.⁶⁷

At its most effective, then, editorial habitus is not simply characterized by a duality of intellectual and economic dispositions; rather it mediates actively between the charismatic and bureaucratic modes of editorship, between the editor as poet and the editor as professional. Indeed, mediation between the extremes of the literary field emerges as the cornerstone of Eliot's editorial practice. In his programmatic editorial statements Eliot renounced narrow and dogmatic sectarianism, adamant instead that the journal publish a breadth and variety of intellectual and ideological positions.⁶⁸ Insisting only on 'reason' and quality as selection criteria, Eliot's journal was to be 'neither an indifferent miscellany, nor the organ of one programme or policy of passion or prejudice. Individually, the various contributors (including the editor) inevitably have their own passions and prejudices; as a whole, *The Criterion* is quite disinterested'.⁶⁹ Putting this programmatic disinterestedness into practice, Eliot's editorship positioned him as a mediating agent not only between

⁶⁴ Morley, pp. 64–65.

⁶⁵ Eliot to Ezra Pound, November 1922, in Eliot, *Letters*, p. 593; cited by Collier, p. 197.

⁶⁶ Suman Gupta, 'In Search of Genius: T. S. Eliot as Publisher', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 27 (2003), 26–35 (p. 26).

⁶⁷ Howarth, 'T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*', p. 98.

⁶⁸ See, for example, T. S. Eliot, 'The Idea of a Literary Review', *The Criterion*, 4 (January 1926), 1–6.

⁶⁹ T. S. Eliot, 'Commentary', *Criterion*, 7 (June 1928), 289–94 (p. 292).

the intellectual and economic domains, but also in three further dimensions. First, Eliot saw the primary function of a literary magazine as being 'to introduce the work of new or little known writers of talent', but he always sought to mediate that new talent with more established names.⁷⁰ The result was the journal's characteristic 'mixture of modernist provocation and polite reassurance', a 'radicalism and caution' which, in Harding's words, 'betokened the simultaneous desire to explode avant-garde incendiaries while laying down judgements of Parnassian authority'.⁷¹ Second, Eliot's journal was also a space in which writing from the ideological extremes of the inter-war period was self-consciously brought together, even if—as in the cases of Spender, Auden, and MacDiarmid—it originated from a political standpoint on the far left which was quite alien to Eliot's own. Finally, a central and distinctive feature of Eliot's editorship was his attempt to foster a productive dialogue between intellectuals across Europe, using the distinctive space constituted by cultural periodicals as a site for fruitful intellectual exchange.⁷² If less sympathetic judges have identified a damaging lack of coherence in an editorial policy which has been viewed as 'eclectic' or even 'eccentric', then others view Eliot's open-minded catholicity as his major editorial achievement.⁷³ Viewed from either perspective, a conscious attempt to mediate across and between cultural fields emerges as the hallmark of Eliot's editorial habitus.

This realization takes us back to the starting-point of this essay and the strikingly similar positions occupied by *The English Review* and *La Nouvelle Revue Française* in their respective literary fields. Ford's initial model for his new magazine was another French literary journal, Remy de Gourmont's *Mercure de France*, whose 'rational, disinterested and centrist tone' sought to foster a public space for critical exchange across a wide range of positions, both established and innovative.⁷⁴ Two years later, as Koffeman argues, the *NRF* would surely have acted as Ford's model, its core ethos of 'classical modernism' enabling it to usurp *Mercure* in this position and function in the field.⁷⁵ Thus, Bourdieu's analysis of the common *NRF* habitus can be applied equally to the editorial roles occupied by Ford and Eliot. According

⁷⁰ T. S. Eliot, 'A Message', *London Magazine*, February 1954, 16. In his short preface to the reprint edition of *The Criterion* Eliot emphasized that, when starting the journal, he 'wished to include representatives of both older and younger generations'.

⁷¹ Harding, p. 350.

⁷² In July 1928, for example, Eliot announced that the *Criterion* would co-operate with the *NRF*, *Revista de Occidente*, *Nuova Antologia*, and *Die europäische Revue* on the award of a new literary prize. The journal also included regular reviews of other European journals and a wide range of foreign contributors. Again, Eliot stressed this dimension in his preface to the reprint edition, claiming that one of his two aims had been 'to present to English readers, by essays and short stories, the work of important new foreign writers'.

⁷³ See Harding, p. 357, and Ali, pp. 144 and 148.

⁷⁴ Morrisson, p. 514.

⁷⁵ Koffeman, p. 146.

to Bourdieu, ‘in the case of the *NRF*, this unifying principle is none other than dispositions which are predisposed to occupy a median, and central, position’. Successfully occupying this median position allows the editor to accumulate the maximum capital from all areas of the field, able to recruit ‘a range of contributors as widely distributed as possible [. . .] in order to avoid lapsing into an overly marked, and therefore compromising, orientation’.⁷⁶ However, we should be careful not to view this as too passive and fixed a position, representative of nothing more than a safe and neutral orthodoxy. As Morrisson makes plain, Ford ‘saw heterodox experimentation as vital to both literary and cultural renewal’,⁷⁷ and this finds a striking echo in Cornick’s analysis of Paulhan’s editorship of the *NRF*. Defending the risks he had taken in publishing the unorthodox in both literary and non-literary domains, Paulhan himself outlined this editorial principle in a letter to Schlumberger: ‘Ever since the beginning there’s been an *NRF*-orthodoxy that has included a small element of the unorthodox. [. . .] I’m not saying the review is perfect: but, precisely because of both the “unorthodox” and literary experimentation, [. . .] it has preserved an openness toward young writers and a kind of gift for continuous renewal.’⁷⁸ In other words, Paulhan mediated the new and the heterodox with more conservative and established currents, ensuring, as Cornick puts it, that ‘the *NRF* could bend both ways’.⁷⁹ And if Paulhan emerges as the ‘extreme in-between’,⁸⁰ then Rivière too ‘was constantly trying to find a middle way between two extremes—extremes represented by Claudel and Gide in religion, France and Germany in politics, classicism and romanticism in literature’.⁸¹ Under this intrinsically dualistic editorial habitus, the *NRF* was sufficiently secure and established to avoid going the way of ephemeral avant-gardist publications, but it also did not lose its edge in the manner of more conservative and unadventurous reviews. This dynamic ‘mediating habitus’, it would seem, offers the key to editorial success.

Significantly, this editorial formula is immediately recognizable across a number of national fields in a number of successful and long-standing review journals founded in the Modernist period, such as *Die neue Rundschau*,

⁷⁶ Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, p. 273.

⁷⁷ Mark Morrisson, *The Public Face of Modernism: Little Magazines, Audiences, and Reception 1905–1920* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001), p. 47.

⁷⁸ Cited in English by Martyn Cornick, ‘Jean Paulhan and the *Nouvelle Revue Française*: Literature, Politics, and the Power of Creative Editorship’, *Yale French Studies*, 106 (2004), 37–53 (pp. 43–44).

⁷⁹ Cornick, *Intellectuals in History*, p. 39.

⁸⁰ See Anna-Louise Milne, *The Extreme In-Between: Jean Paulhan’s Place in the Twentieth Century* (London: Legenda, 2006).

⁸¹ Martin Turnell, *Jacques Rivière* (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1953), p. 58. Helen Naughton too notes ‘the striking duality within his personality’ and ‘a deep-seated inability [. . .] to renounce one alternative in order to adopt its opposite’ (Helen Naughton, ‘Temperament and Creed: A Note on Jacques Rivière’, *French Review*, 36 (1963), 474–81 (p. 474)).

Revista de Occidente, *Sur*, and *Novyi mir*. In the German field, the same formula has underpinned the success of the two further, post-1945 review journals which have sustained their standing to the present day, *Merkur* and *Sinn und Form*. In this last case, the journal's three most successful editors—Peter Huchel (1949–62), Wilhelm Girnus (1964–81), and Sebastian Kleinschmidt (1991 to present)—all understood that the established reputation of the journal, which was founded on breadth, quality, and tradition, had to be mediated with carefully judged but often high-risk innovation. Indeed, this particular editorial habitus defines a genealogy which can be traced back to Huchel's editorial mentor Willy Haas (*Die literarische Welt*, 1924–33) and from Haas back to his own principal intellectual influence Hugo von Hofmannsthal (*Neue deutsche Beiträge*, 1922–27). The 'progressive restoration' pursued by Huchel and his successors has much in common with the attempts by Haas and Hofmannsthal to achieve a productive synthesis out of the cultural antitheses of past and future.⁸² And in the figure of Hofmannsthal this editorial genealogy converges with Eliot, who, of course, pursued his own synthesis of modernism and classicism. As Howarth makes clear, Eliot's affinity with Hofmannsthal was particularly deep,⁸³ an affinity which was expressed in *The Criterion* not only in a generous essay by Max Rychner—another editor of a European review journal with whom Eliot had much in common—but also in Eliot's heartfelt response to Hofmannsthal's death: 'Pray for the soul of Hugo von Hofmannsthal. [. . .] By his patronage, his influence, and the periodicals which he affected, one of the great European men of letters.'⁸⁴ We should not be surprised that *Die neue Rundschau*, *Neue deutsche Beiträge*, *Revista de Occidente*, and the *NRF*—for which he was London correspondent—were all journals which Eliot admired and which featured regularly in *The Criterion*, nor that Eliot published work by Rivière and Hofmannsthal in the first year of his journal's existence, nor that Eliot himself was a programmatic contributor in the early years of *Merkur*.

What all the most successful of these editors share, and what Eliot typifies, is a capacity to exercise a dynamic and flexible agency from this median position in the literary field, a mediating habitus which enables the editor to evade the perils which lie at the charismatic and bureaucratic poles of the editorial continuum. Accumulating and trading in a variety of currencies across these fields, the editor acts as the 'symbolic banker' for the journal, charged with

⁸² On Huchel's definition of the *Sinn und Form* habitus see Parker and Philpotts, pp. 11–62, and on Haas's editorship of *Die literarische Welt*, see Stephen Parker, Peter Davies, and Matthew Philpotts, *The Modern Restoration: Re-thinking German Literary History 1930–1960* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), pp. 58–73. For details of Haas's relationship with Hofmannsthal see Luisa Valentini, *Willy Haas: Der Zeuge einer Epoche* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1986), pp. 71–98.

⁸³ Howarth, 'T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*', pp. 102–06.

⁸⁴ T. S. Eliot, 'Commentary', *The Criterion*, 9 (October 1929), 1–6 (p. 5). See also Max Rychner, 'German Chronicle', *The Criterion*, 9 (July 1930), 710–16.

establishing and sustaining its reputation, effectively staking on each successive issue a portion of the capital which is invested in its existing good name.⁸⁵ It scarcely needs to be said that this is an immensely demanding task. As Eliot's example makes clear, the mediating habitus requires a feel for the game which extends across multiple domains: not only the dynamics—orthodox and heterodox—of the literary field in which the periodical originates, but also those of other national fields, not to mention the economic and political fields. This demands a diverse range of often conflicting dispositions: intellectual and literary; economic and managerial; social and personal. The ideal editor is not only a poet and a professional, but also a politician and a profiteer, a prophet and a publicist; less a double personage than a multiple personage.

Editorial Habitus and Dispositional Plurality

This multiplicity of editorial dispositions—a plurality pointedly beyond the binary of Bourdieu's 'double personage' invoked at the outset of this essay—suggests that further reflection is necessary on the usefulness of habitus as a category through which to understand and explain the practice of the periodical editor. As Bernard Lahire has argued, the notions of habitus and disposition have tended to be applied rather uncritically in sociological approaches to culture, often founded on excessively generalizing and homogenizing assumptions.⁸⁶ In particular, such analyses struggle to cope with the variation in cultural tastes which exists not only between individuals but often within the frequently dissonant cultural practice of a single individual. For Lahire, this 'intra-individual behavioural variation' can only be understood within a framework which privileges 'dispositional and contextual plurality', where dispositions can vary considerably in strength and in their capacity to motivate action, becoming activated or inhibited according to context.⁸⁷ The result is 'a more complex vision of the individual [. . .] as a bearer of heterogeneous habits, schemes, or dispositions which may be contrary or even contradictory to one another', 'a bearer of a plurality of dispositions [who] traverses a plurality of social contexts'.⁸⁸ To return to the periodical editor, the relevance of Lahire's model should be clear. Successful editorial

⁸⁵ The editor's role here mirrors that of the art trader, who, in Bourdieu's analysis, "invests his prestige" in the author's cause, acting as a "symbolic banker" who offers as security all the symbolic capital he has accumulated (which he is liable to forfeit if he backs a "loser") (*The Field of Cultural Production*, p. 77).

⁸⁶ See Lahire, 'From the Habitus to an Individual Heritage of Dispositions'.

⁸⁷ See Bernard Lahire, 'The Individual and the Mixing of Genres: Cultural Dissonance and Self-Distinction', *Poetics*, 36 (2008), 166–88.

⁸⁸ Lahire, 'From the Habitus to an Individual Heritage of Dispositions', p. 344, and 'The Individual and the Mixing of Genres', p. 186.

practice can be seen to depend not only on individuals having at their disposal a plurality of dispositions but also on the relative strength and activity of those dispositions and on the capacity of the individual to activate and inhibit those dispositions appropriately in order to accommodate themselves to the plurality of social and cultural contexts in which they have to function as editor. In other words, the intra-individual behavioural variation largely neglected by the Bourdieusian notion of habitus emerges as the key to editorial success.

However, we would be mistaken to take this as a cue to abandon the notion of habitus altogether. The idea of 'editorial habitus' as I have sought to elaborate it in this essay is not intended as a prescriptive and generalizing set of assumptions about the common dispositions of periodical editors. Rather, editorial habitus is to be understood in three complementary ways, and in each instance the interaction between disposition and context plays a key role. First, we can identify the personal editorial habitus of any specific editor—that is, the plural dispositions which derive from his or her own idiosyncratic trajectory through successive positions occupied in the field. Following Lahire, we would expect this to be a complex and contradictory habitus from which specific dispositions are activated and inhibited in the particular context of the individual's editorial practice. Second, we can distinguish the common editorial habitus of any particular periodical, its core ethos which defines its position in the field and the relevant dispositions shared by its nucleus of contributors and editors. Here, we can understand the periodical as a specific socio-cultural context in which a particular subset of dispositions is activated from the plurality of dispositions available to the group. Finally, it is possible to construct ideal types of editorial habitus, subsets of editorial dispositions which correspond in ideal-typical terms to particular positions in the field: the charismatic habitus of the innovative and heretical editor; the bureaucratic habitus of the more conservative and established editor; and the mediating habitus of the editor who seeks to occupy a dynamic position between the extremes of the field. Thus, editorial success can be seen to derive from as close an alignment as possible between these three dimensions of habitus—the personal, the institutional, and the typological—or, to put it another way, between the editor, the periodical, and the field. This alignment, understood as a context-dependent selection of dispositions, is characteristic of all the examples of successful editorship explored in this essay, be they predominantly charismatic, bureaucratic, or mediating in type.

By the same token, a lack of editorial success can be seen to derive from a misalignment between these instances of habitus, and it is striking that the Bourdieusian notion carries particular explanatory potential when it comes to understanding the failure of specific instances of editorial practice, a fate

that befell even as adept an editor as Eliot.⁸⁹ When applied in conjunction with the notion of capital, habitus helps to remind us that dispositional plurality and behavioural variation do not operate in a value-free context. Seen in this way, habitus can be understood as a constraint on the acquisition and activation of certain dispositions, a constraint which is motivated, largely unconsciously, by material and symbolic profit. As Ford Madox Ford's case demonstrates, the marked privileging of charismatic over bureaucratic dispositions in editorial activity can only be understood through the symbolic capital attached to the former, which acts as an inhibitor on the latter. As for Eliot, his case demonstrates how editorial success can, through the constraining influence of habitus, paradoxically become an obstacle to continued effectiveness in the role. If effective realization of the editorial role depends on an alignment between personal and institutional habitus, then under rapidly changing circumstances that powerful sense of mission and personal investment can soon become a stubbornly entrenched and exposed position which incurs an unsustainable loss in the capital required to maintain the journal. So it was for Eliot, his faith in a European intellectual project in the inter-war years rendered untenable by the changing political forces around him, 'the editor's helplessness' exposed 'in the face of external forces as blind as fate'.⁹⁰ Matched to the specific context of a particular periodical and a particular state of the cultural field, the narrowed dispositions of a successful editorial habitus are only reinforced by the symbolic and material profits that come with short-term success. The result is the kind of inertia which Bourdieu identifies as characteristic of habitus.⁹¹ In the longer term, when the field enters a state of extreme flux or even rupture, those inhibited dispositions can prove damagingly unresponsive.

It is to be hoped that this analysis contributes to the process of demystification demanded by scholars such as Martyn Cornick,⁹² shedding light on the mechanisms by which editors of literary periodicals, successfully or otherwise, exercise their vital gate-keeping role in the field. The scope for further comparative research into the practice of literary editors, testing and developing these insights, should be apparent. But exploring the interaction between context and disposition in this way, at the level of the individual, the institution, and the field, carries considerable wider significance, especially in those increasingly fruitful areas where literary studies are being enriched by sociological perspectives. To return to the emerging discipline of periodical

⁸⁹ Increasingly isolated and dispirited, Eliot published his valedictory 'Last Words' as an editor in January 1939, fearing that the journal had 'served its purpose' and that 'a feeling of staleness' had crept over him (T. S. Eliot, 'Last Words', *Criterion*, 18 (January 1939), 269–75 (pp. 273 and 269)).

⁹⁰ Ali, p. 144.

⁹¹ Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, p. 256.

⁹² See n. 4 above.

studies, for example, the editor and the journal have a vital role to play in a host of other cultural fields, not least in the academic field, where their role in the validation and transmission of knowledge and ideas invites comparable scrutiny. In that instance, as elsewhere in the vast institutional infrastructure which supports intellectual and cultural production, the trajectories and dispositions of individual actors are negotiated in multiple contexts with the values of the institution and of the field more generally. Viewed from this perspective, the case of the periodical editor proves exemplary in the impetus it provides to interrogate the social processes which underpin cultural practice.

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

MATTHEW PHILPOTTS