Introduction

Anne Reynes-Delobel, Benoît Tadié, Cécile Cottenet

INTRODUCTION

Anne Reynès-Delobel, Benoît Tadié, and Cécile Cottenet

This special issue of *JMPS* grows out of a conference organized in October 2018 at Aix-Marseille Université, entitled "Mediating American Modernist Literature. The Case of/for Big Magazines, 1880–1960."[1] Its aim was threefold: first, to investigate a wide range of big magazines from the perspective of modernist studies; second, to illustrate, in so doing, innovative approaches and methodologies; and, third, to reflect on the connection between American modernist literature and mass-market magazines over a period of eighty years, from the emergence of industrialized journalism and the "fully-fledged magazine" (Scholes)[2] to the rise of television and the related decline of the magazine as "the major form of repeated cultural experience for people in the United States."[3] The conference was inspired by recent research on modernist periodicals, which had sought to demonstrate the importance of big magazines as a venue for literary and aesthetic innovation or, as Donal Harris puts it in his pioneering work *On Company Time: American Modernism in the Big Magazines*, to show that American modernism evolved "within rather than against the mass culture of its moment."[4]

DOI: 10.5325/jmodeperistud.11.1.v
JOURNAL OF MODERN PERIODICAL STUDIES, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2020

DEFINING BIG MAGAZINES

At this early stage in what is still a collective work in progress, based on a new set of assumptions, it is not surprising that epistemological uncertainties should attend the very effort to define big magazines as a category. What are they? What criteria have been used, or should one use, to define them? How big is big? Is the category homogeneous? Doesn't it, upon closer inspection, dissolve into a variety of contiguous or overlapping families, genera, and species? Instead of offering abstract answers to such questions, which would inevitably give rise to corresponding objections or exceptions, it is more useful to recognize that any definition of big magazines is conditioned by the methodologies through which they are approached and must, at the same time, contend with earlier theorizations emanating from critical currents or disciplines such as modernist studies, literary theory, or sociology. This also poses a difficulty, since these critical currents or disciplines rarely approached or defined "big magazines" as such, but perceived them through the various terminologies and biases inherent to their own practices, assigning to them a specific place and value within the overall literary field.

This is particularly true of modernist studies, which grew from the start out of a strong prejudice against big magazines. Such magazines were generally considered only as the rather nebulous opposite of the "little" or "small" ones that, in circular fashion, they served to define. Large distribution; expensive production values (suggested in their often being referred to as "slicks"[5]); middle-class prejudices; editorial policies dictated by financial interest; contents that, in Ezra Pound's words, "were selected rigorously on the basis of how much expensive advertising they would carry"[6]: such were their dominant traits, each one a negative image of the idealized ones of little magazines. This negativity appears fully in the opening pages of Frederick J. Hoffman, Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich's classic *The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography* (1946), which defines big magazines by exclusion—as the kind of "commercial" periodicals that would reject the work printed by the small ones.[7] The binary nature of this opposition is so perfect that to these contrasting kinds of magazines could be apportioned reciprocal shares of all the literary production of value: "the best of our little magazines" are said to have printed "about 80 per cent of our most important post-1912 critics, novelists, poets, and storytellers," whereas "commercial houses or magazines of

the past thirty years [. . .] have discovered and sponsored only about 20 per cent of our post-1912 writers."[8] What is significant here is not so much the very shaky ground on which such statistics rest as the mutually exclusive relationship that defines the two (and only two) kinds of periodicals, as though each found its identity in opposing the other and in not publishing the same authors, or at least in not publishing them at the same time. This attitude was to remain long entrenched in New Critical and Marxist approaches, that tended to present slick or mainstream magazines as the epitome of a kitsch, "money-minded" rear guard against which the experiments of a brave and penniless aesthetic or political advance guard could be highlighted. It is an attitude that New Modernist Studies have recently called into question, not only because abundant evidence suggests that many writers were involved with different kinds of magazines at the same time, but also because little magazines are now known to have often been as "money-minded" as larger ones.[9]

Let us now look at another, and earlier, example: Hornell Hart's survey of "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests," which constitutes an important part of the seminal study *Recent Social Trends in the United States* commissioned by Herbert Hoover during his term as US president (1929–1933).[10] Hart offers a more nuanced picture of the magazine field, although—or because—he does not investigate magazine literature from an aesthetic point of view but from a sociological one, as an indicator of social trends and practices. In order to assess the evolution of public opinion regarding prominent issues of the time, such as religion, divorce, prohibition, birth control and disarmament, he divides the magazine field into four main groups: (a) scientific and technical periodicals, "with circulation usually ranging below ten thousand"; (b) "intellectual magazines" like the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Forum*, the *Nation* and the *Outlook*, that are "likely to appeal to college graduates and professional groups" and "measure their circulations only in tens of thousands"; (c) "mass circulation" magazines like *The Saturday Evening Post, Collier's*, the *Literary Digest* and the *American*, that "have extended their appeal to a wider group," with print runs of over a million copies; this category also includes "the leading women's magazines," which are "comparable in circulation and in intellectual caliber," as both kinds are "of interest to persons with a high school education as well as to college graduates"; (d) a last and "less ambitious" group of periodicals, "devoting themselves to sensational fiction, "confessions," motion picture gossip and the like."[11]

This classification is interesting for several reasons. First, because little magazines are conspicuously absent from it: they were, presumably, too recent and short-lived to be taken into account, their circulation too small to matter. Thus, what is paramount for modernist studies is simply invisible to the eye of the sociologist. Second, because it anticipates the kind of large-scale surveys that have recently been encouraged by the rise of digital research. And lastly, because it provides a carefully differentiated model of the magazine field and suggests that any such model rests on the manipulation of a number of heterogeneous parameters. For Hart, the big magazines (which he calls "leading general magazines"[12]) are those that have a strong impact on public opinion and either reflect or impel "changing social attitudes and interests." Although circulation is cited as an important parameter in defining this category, it is not the only one and intersects with others, such as a magazine's dominant subject, its institutional prestige, its "ambition," its "appeal" to various social classes or the level of education of its readership. According to this combination of criteria, the big magazines correspond to the second and third categories, the first one being excluded for its insufficient circulation, the last for its insufficient ambition.

As we can see from these examples, the divisions between different kinds of periodicals, big and small, are neither absolute nor objective, but depend on pragmatically assembled parameters, corresponding to what one is looking for in the magazine field.[13] These parameters reflect both the epistemology of a given discipline and the taxonomic intentions, or intuitions, of researchers, as Donal Harris creatively demonstrates when, working out of modernist studies, he groups, under the term big magazine, "an eclectic range of periodical genres" whose common characteristic "is a conscious effort to expand their readerships by way of their textual and visual styles rather than their content."[14]As his work shows, the taxonomic ambiguities of magazines are in reality not so much a problem as an opportunity for periodical studies. They enable scholars to assemble their parameters in new ways and to formulate new conceptions of "bigness." Thus, neither Harris's book nor the articles in this issue of the *JMPS* take the idea of "bigness" for granted but, on the contrary, they reflect on, and remodel, the category at the same time as they shed light on individual magazines. In so doing, they make us see hidden connections between periodicals and help to overcome the binary paradigm on which earlier modernist studies had, in Pound's wake, been predicated.

MODERNIST STUDIES AND THE TURN TO BIG MAGAZINES

Reconsideration of the institutional overlap of literary modernism and mass-market magazines emerges as an illustration of the ongoing intersections and engagements in the broadening, transdisciplinary fields of print studies, digital studies, and modernist studies. Over the last decade, attention to the materiality of print and understanding of magazines as "interconnected networks of meaning . . . that elude stabilizing concepts like author intention, and even textuality"[15] have aimed for the breadth of scope and for an expanded sense of the canon of modernism, while digital technology and data-driven practices have enabled new methods of reading and interpreting periodicals,[16] and thus developed "a dynamic view of the institutional and political networks in which modernists organized themselves and debated the idea of modernism as it was emerging."[17] At the same time, the reorganization of modernist studies around theoretical and conceptual topics (such as "high" and "low," "hard" and "soft," race, imperialism, fashion, or visual culture),[18] and the recontextualization of modernism on a global scale[19] have led to a proliferation of meanings for *modernity* and *modernism* which in turn invites careful attention to the convergences between these phenomena, but also to their dissonances and contradictions as they change and vary in different historical moments and spatial or virtual locations. The importance of magazines in the increasingly complex "media ecology"[20] of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century makes them one of the privileged sites for examining the tensions between modern, modernity, modernism, and modernization.[21]

Over the last fifteen years, increased scholarly interest in the ways modern magazines mediated—and remediated—their content through intermedial relationships with other print media and electronic technologies (including film, radio, and phonography) have unsettled fixed notions like autonomy, intention, popular and highbrow, old and new, and revealed productive transactions between commerce and culture at local, national and transnational scales. This movement has invigorated concern for and work on modernist representations in several ways. First it has shaped a new understanding of the formation of the institutional and spatial contours and focal points of modernism, raising questions about the regulation of cultural and linguistic agency. Second, bringing into focus writers and practices that have been for a long time beyond the ken of modernist studies, it has encouraged investigation of the canonization process of "high

modernist" writers and precepts, as well as reexamination of the primacy of aesthetic considerations in judging texts and periodicals. Lastly, by demonstrating how newer technologies of scholarship can combine close- and distant-reading processes to highlight how individual texts relate to networks of intersecting texts carrying aesthetic and political debates between distant, heterogeneous—and often instable—communities and over vast distances, recent research in modernist studies has aimed at fostering a new culture of reading and writing about modernism, thus repurposing modernist writers' eagerness to think of their books as reaching audiences in a distant future.

The last few years have seen several efforts at mapping a broader view of early twentieth-century print culture. For instance, focus on the cheap reprints that made modernism part of the cultural mainstream have enlarged our understanding of the dissemination of Anglo-American modernism in Europe and the United States, and provided us with yet another useful vantage point from which to examine its impact across different cultures.[22] At the same time, in the wake of major publications, such as the three-volume *Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Little Magazines*, the two-volume *L'Europe des Revues*[23] and the online *Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, work on "little magazines" has continued to enrich and enhancecurrent discussion on modernism and the media ecology of modernity. Recent investigations include the study of late nineteenth-century American little magazines. Sometimes referred to as "ephemerals" or "fadazines," these unconventional, noncommercial publications participated in the emergence of a professional-managerial class, had an established place at the newsstand, and yet defiantly claimed that they were different from other mass-market magazines. In an essay published in 2015, Kirsten MacLeod argues that this difference was a matter of form rather than content, and that these magazines derived much of their cultural capital through the remediation of other forms. In light of the fact that many of their editors and contributors pursued careers in mainstream magazines, advertising, and publishing, or new media, she concludes that "[T]he little magazine was central to the sociomorphosis of the period for a class that, broadly speaking, had a keen interest in expressing itself in print."[24]

As this example indicates, deconstruction of binary categories—such as "high" and "low," "literature" and "journalism"—focus on remediation and networks, and emphasis on texts as processes, permeate periodical studies, encouraging even greater awareness of the fact that periodicals of

all kinds are therefore worthy of serious consideration. Significant critical and methodological advances in this area were made by feminist and gender periodical scholars who have examined the contributions of modernist writers to mainstream and commercial magazines across a variety of genres and modes of writing.[25] Their insightful forays into such issues as authorship, celebrity, and performance have contributed to deemphasizing the rhetoric of high-modernist discourse and to uncoveing the myriad ways in which these writers engaged with both the politics of modernism and the culture of modernity. This, however, is not an easy task. Commercial magazines are often the sites of contradictory impulses for writers who want both recognition and remuneration. As Manushag N. Powell stresses, it is the task of academic readers to make contradictions "mutually informing."[26] Donal Harris's 2016 exploration of American modernism in big magazines brings further evidence of the influence of mass-market magazines on the writers' perception of themselves as authors or professional writers. His analysis also provides keys to differentiate literary experimentation from the innovations happening in these periodicals. For instance, he locates signs of Hemingway's modernity not in his so-called "journalistic" style but in a form of "overabundance" which is a defining feature of commercial magazines. As a paradoxical result, Harris explains, by midcentury "modernist difficulty is no longer difficult because it is everywhere,"[27] and therefore nowhere. One of our aims in this issue of *JMPS* is to pursue Harris's examination of big magazines' search for a "house style" or personality through their collaboration with modernist authors, and its reciprocal impact on these writers' self-presentation.

However, current scholarly research on popular magazines extends its reach into other directions as is indicated by the *Future States* project which aims at exploring the projection of modern national identities in magazines from the late-nineteenth to mid-twentieth century with a view to providing a permanent online resource for magazine researchers. The project's emphasis on the role of global communication and information technologies stresses an understanding of modern magazines as media inviting innovative forms of interaction and linking. Since the inception of the Modernist Magazines Project in 1996, it has become increasingly clear that magazines can also be seen "as a kind of data that [can] be linked to other data." MJP's digitized corpus is an apt field for what Sean Latham and Jeffrey Drouin call a "medium data" approach combining close reading and big data to "reshape what modernism might mean."[28] Owing to the sheer

vastness, intensely heterogeneous nature and formal discontinuities of the commercial periodical field, we are convinced that this approach can contribute to a shared critical discourse and a shared set of methods for gaining a clearer sense of the place of literary modernism within the mass market periodical scene. As Brooks Hefner and Ed Timke convincingly demonstrate in one of the essays collected here, innovative data-driven investigation of circulation information is useful for periodical history, modernist studies, and modernist periodical history.

The new possibilities provided by the medium media approach will no doubt sharpen our understanding of the rhythms of periodical production which are, as James Mussell has argued, crucial to the way magazines mediate their content: "Magazines," he explains, "are predicated on repetition, where novelty is tempered by formal features such as layout, typeface, certain features or articles, even the recurrence of the name itself. Seriality was part of the way these publications slotted into the lives of readers . . . also helping provide the rhythms that structured everyday life."[29] Connecting this statement with a point raised by Leon Whipple in an article on *The Saturday Evening Post* published in 1928 encourages close examination of the impact of magazine seriality on public discourse and national consciousness. Whipple describes George Lorimer's magazine as "a magic mirror; it not only reflects, it creates us . . . by blunt or subtle devices it molds our ideas on crime, prohibition, Russia, oil, preparedness, immigration, the World Court. Finally it does queer things to our psychology by printing tales that deceive us with a surface realism but are too often a tissue of illusions. This bulky nickel's worth of print and pictures is a kind of social and emotional common denominator of American life."[30] Considering that seriality is part of the "devices" used by magazine editors and publishers to change things without appearing to change them so as not to traumatize their readers has several implications for scholars of literary modernism. The issue of seriality draws attention to the selection and manipulation of authors and texts, and their remediation in an environment which often challenges our assumptions about permanence and exceptionality. This in turn signals the crucial role played by such mediators as editors-in-chief, literary agents, advertisers and marketers in the production and consumption of modernism. Besides, analysis of periodicity involves taking into account the impact of modernist production on competing rhythms of seriality and related modes of presentation and contextualization.[31]

Whipple's deliberate omission of art and literature in his appreciation of one of the middlebrow "slicks" characterized by its deep affiliations with literary modernism is quite intriguing. Does it cancel out the impact of the latter on the shaping of American life? Or does it suggest that modernism was already so well acclimatized to middlebrow periodical culture as to be "everywhere and nowhere"? Only thorough investigation can elucidate these questions. Another intriguing aspect of the question of periodical seriality lies in the notion of "novelty" which, as Michael North has demonstrated in a book published in 2013,[32] was retrospectively and dogmatically attached to the history of aesthetic modernism by literary criticism in the 1950s. North's analysis confirms prior views[33] that modernist writers were not so much concerned with how to "make it new"—as the famous catchphrase of Ezra Pound would have it— as with making it new *again* by dint of a reappropriation and reevaluation of the past in light of their present time. Investigating modernism's paradoxical modernity in relation to the issue of the "seriality dividend"[34] of American big magazines might enable us the better to underline shifting understandings of periodical practices and modernist experiments within a public culture already marked by an obsession with "now-ism" and simultaneity.

The periodicals examined across the seven articles in this special issue engaged with modernist literature from the 1920s to the 1960s; and all articles but one focus on American big magazines in the US. While they discuss the notion of "big" magazines and point to the heterogeneity of the periodicals categorized as such, they also seek to demonstrate the usefulness of this categorization that has recently grown out of periodical and modernist studies, and help us to account for the creation, distribution, and consumption of modernist texts. As already noted, the definition of big magazines is conditioned by the methodologies used to consider them, and certainly this special issue presents a diverse range of approaches.

We chose to organize the essays moving from a macroperspective—Mark Morrisson, Brooks Hefner and Edward Timke, Fabio Guidali and Irene Piazzoni—to a microperspective, with essays either focusing on one specific periodical (Bartholomew Brinkman on *The Crisis*), or on singular cultural arbiters who, either mediated or mediating in the pages of *The Saturday Evening Post* (Adam McKible) or *The New Yorker* (Mathilde Roza), sought to participate in, or struggled with the modernization of US literature. Ultimately, in her examination of the ambivalent role of *Vogue* in

mainstreaming William Faulkner, Yuko Yamamoto highlights the extent to which women's magazines contributed to shaping a popular modernism.

"Beyond Little Magazines: American Modernism and the Turn to Big Magazines," Mark Morrisson's historiographical *overture*, convincingly makes the case for the study of big magazines in relation to American modernist literature, reminding us of the original conceptual framework from which the field of periodical studies recently emerged. Among the several factors explaining the occlusion of big magazines in literary scholarship, Morrisson sheds light on the restructuring of literary studies and academia following World War II that ultimately led to the privileged position of little magazines in the study of modernism. His review of the founding scholarship on magazines (Hoffman and Allen; Scholes and Latham; Lawrence Rainey) is enlightening for both knowledgeable and less specialized scholars. The article demonstrates how the turn to "big magazines" within print culture is also a turn to "modernity," made possible by contemporary scholars' understanding of the deconstruction of the high/ low divide, the role of the bibliographical code (McGann), the consideration of literature in its relation to commodity capitalism, and the introduction of the "middlebrow" (Rubin; Jaillant; Hammill and Smith, 2014). Ultimately, the study of big magazines is dependent on technological innovations and methodologies, including the digitization of large archives.

The second article, "Beyond Little and Big: Circulation, Data, and American Magazine History," precisely illustrates Morrisson's claim that data-driven research may help to further abolish the low/ high divide and provide for more "supple" explorations of periodicals. Stating that categorization of periodicals can "flatten out realities and obscure complexities,"Brooks E. Hefner and Edward Timke emphasize how an essential component in our conceptualization of periodical culture, circulation figures, has repeatedly been left out of most histories, due to their fuzziness. Using several case studies, the authors demonstrate the usefulness of their innovative Circulating American Magazines database to refine our understanding of circulation, and through this, of the scope of specific magazines. Granular attention paid to circulation may reveal more nuanced visions of particular markets—North *vs.* South, East *vs.* West—along with new interpretations of the relationship between titles, or between titles and authors.

Continuing within a macroperspective, Irene Piazzoni and Fabio Guidali take us across the Atlantic to consider the rise in Italy of large-circulation

middlebrow publications, the *rotocalchi*, in the interwar years, and their role in mediating US literature in spite of the constraints of censorship or monitoring by the Fascist regime. The boom in translation of US fiction between the 1920s and early 1940s, as in other Western European countries, the proliferation and the appeal of these magazines, were vectors for the rise of Italian modernity. Yet again, the overlapping of categories—high quality, middlebrow, and women's magazines—raises questions regarding the validity of an ever-finer categorization of periodicals. By looking at the intermedial relations between these magazines, the movie industry and book publishing, through the figure of Elio Vittorini and his relationship with publishers Bompiani, Rizzoli, Mondadori or Einaudi, Guidali and Piazzoni clearly vindicate the idea that periodicals are part of the same economy, or ecology, of print culture as books, as Laurel Brake had insisted for the Victorian era.[35]

Using both macro and microanalysis, Bartholomew Brinkman in "'The Strong Matter of Unknown Names': Modeling Topics and Cross-Reading Poems in *The Crisis*" combines distant reading through data mining with close reading, emphasizing the value of reading across multi-year runs and a "dialogic cross-reading" approach. Again, this speaks to the importance of such projects as the Modernist Journal Project which digitized *The Crisis*, allowing for this study of 149 issues published between 1910 and 1922. Brinkman here uses topic modelling to complexify our understanding of poetry in the NAACP's magazine, looking at how "strong matter," that is, "the topics, discourse, and ideological currents," is shared across issues, texts, and authors. Specifically, he aims to show that certain poems which might appear to be "race-neutral" actually entered into dialogue with other content in the magazine, thus participating in the larger racial discourse in which *The Crisis* partook.

Race and racial stereotyping are also at the heart of Adam McKible's "Young Black Joes and Old Negroes: Recontaining Black Modernity in the *Saturday Evening Post*," which evinces how one of the most culturally significant magazines of its time registered black national modernity and recontained it through traditional racist tropes. Focusing on Irving Cobb, the article analyzes how the Southern white author, in collaboration with Editor George Horace Lorimer, helped to modernize racist stereotypes, and in so doing, strengthen white supremacy. Through close readings of Cobb's fiction, McKible presents a nuanced analysis, attesting the ambiguities of his characters caught between the figures

of the Old and the New Negro. Exploring the "middlebrow" adds an important dimension to the study of American magazines, as well as to literary history.

From Lorimer's mass-circulation *Saturday Evening Post*, the focus of the next article shifts to the role played by author and literary critic Robert Coates in mediating modernism in the "smart" magazine, *The New Yorker*. In "*The New Yorker* and the Experimental Modernist Writer: The Career of Novelist, Critic, and Short Story Writer Robert M. Coates," Mathilde Roza qualifies the commonly held assumption that in spite of its commenting on modernist literature and art, *The New Yorker* failed to promote high modernism in its pages. Spanning the late 1920s through the late 1940s, the article considers the background of personal networks which afforded Coates a privileged vantage point from which he actively defended avant-garde works in the columns of the magazine. Aside from his appreciation of Gertrude Stein and Nathaniel West, Coates perfectly embodies the back-and-forth movement across avant-gardist little magazines such as *Gargoyle, Broom, Secession* or *transition* and big or "bigger" magazines.

From "big" to "bigger"? The final essay concentrates on quasi-giants, *Vogue*, in its US edition, and William Faulkner, examining how the great woman's fashion magazine acted as a popularizer of modernism from the interwar to the postwar years. In "When Faulkner Was in *Vogue*: The American Women's Magazine Fashioning a Modernist Icon," Yuko Yamamoto highlights the extent to which the magazine's coverage of Faulkner reflects the evolution of the author's changing status in popular, as well as in literary culture. This, in turn, leads us to reconsider *Vogue*'s relation to literary and artistic modernity. Yamamoto suggests new avenues of research into the *Vogue* archive, which has already spurred interesting scholarship on both sides of the Atlantic.[36]

Ranging from macro to microanalysis, these articles illustrate and analyze how big magazines mediated, mainstreamed, commented on, and sometimes misrepresented modernist literature while still reviewing its most important texts and proponents. As Mark Morrisson writes, the turn to big magazines can help to reconceptualize modernism as an operative concept in periodical studies. Our hope is that the discussion will expand, on both sides of the Atlantic, to include case studies in other national contexts, and draw on methodological approaches deriving from other scholarly traditions.

ANNE REYNÈS-DELOBEL is an Associate Professor of American Literature at Aix-Marseille Université and a member of the Research Center on the Anglophone World (LERMA UR 853). Her research focuses on American modernisms and the international avant-gardes, and more specifcally on their transatlantic circulation in the interwar period. She is the author with Mary Ann Caws of *Glorieuses modernistes. Art, écriture et modernité au féminin* (Presses universitaires de Liège, 2016). She has edited with Céline Mansanti "Early American Surrealisms, 1920–1940, *Miranda* 14, 2017, and with Deborah Clarke «Transnationalism and Modern American Women Writers», *E-rea* 16.2, 2019. The current president of the Kay Boyle Society (ALA and SSAWAA), she has recently translated Kay Boyle's *Year before Last* (1932) into French (as *Fuir devant demain*, UGA Editions, 2019).

BENOÎT TADIÉ is a Professor of American Studies at the Université Rennes 2, whose research focuses on English and American modernism, the work of James Joyce, and American hardboiled/noir fiction. His books include *L'Exérience moderniste anglo-américaine 1908–1922: Formes, idéologies, combats* (Didier, 1999), *James Joyce/Dubliners* (Didier, 2000), *Le polar américain, la modernité et le mal* (Presses universitaires de France, 2006) and *Front criminel: Une histoire du polar américain de 1919 à nos jours* (Presses universitaires de France, 2018). He has edited the volumes *Revues modernistes anglo-américaines: Lieux d'échange, lieux d'exil* (Ent'revues, 2006) and, with Hélène Aji and Céline Mansanti, *Revues modernistes, revues engagées* (Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2011). He has also translated James Joyce's *Dubliners* into French (as *Gens de Dublin*, GF, 1994) and recently edited a collection of W. R. Burnett's fiction (in French), *Underworld: Romans noirs* (Gallimard, 2019).

CÉCILE COTTENET is a Professor of American Studies at Aix-Marseille Université, and a member of the Research Center on the Anglophone World (LERMA UR 853). Her research areas include African American studies and print culture, more specifically focusing on publishing history, and her current projects develop a transatlantic perspective on the Franco-American circulation of texts and books. She is the editor of *Race, Ethnicity and Publishing in America* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), and has published, in French, a study of the publication history of Charles W. Chesnutt (*Une histoire éditoriale: The Conjure Woman de Charles W. Chesnutt*, ENS Editions, 2012). Following on from her latest monograph, *Literary Agents in the Transatlantic Book*

Trade: American Fiction, French Rights, and the Hoffman Agency (Routledge, 2017) on the role of literary agents in the post-World War II transatlantic marketplace, she is currently coordinating a project on cultural mediators of US literature in France in the twentieth century.

NOTES

1. The conference was organized by Cécile Cottenet, Anne Reynès-Delobel, and Frank Conesa, sponsored by Aix-Marseille Université LERMA UR 853, the U.S. Embassy in Paris, Institut des Amériques, the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing, and CORPUS UR 4295, Université de Picardie. The guest editors extend their gratitude to all the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on the essays that follow.
2. Robert Scholes, "Afterword," *Little Magazines and Modernism: New Approaches*, ed. Suzanne W. Churchill, Adam McKible(Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 218.
3. Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture. Magazines, Markets and Class at the Turn of the Century* (London: Verso, 1996), 29.
4. Donal F. Harris, *On Company Time. American Modernism in Big Magazines* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 8.
5. A term which alludes to paper quality but at the same time also evokes "the sort of high finish possible only to a machine-produced commodity in an economy of maximum prosperity." Leslie Fiedler, "The Middle Against Both Ends" (1955), in B. Rosenberg & D. Manning White, eds., *Mass Culture* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1957), 539.
6. Ezra Pound, "Small Magazines," *English Journal* (November 1930), 690.
7. The little magazine, they tell us, is "designed to print artistic work which for reasons of economic expediency is not acceptable to the money-minded periodicals or presses." Frederick J. Hoffman, Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich, *The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography* (1946), 2nd ed.(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), 2.
8. Hoffman, et al., *The Little Magazine*, 3.
9. See Lawrence Rainey, *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
10. Hornell Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests," *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933), 382–442.
11. Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes," 386.
12. Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes," 382.
13. On the interactions of avant-garde and middlebrow, see for instance Evanghelia Stead, "Reconsidering 'Little' versus 'Big' Periodicals, "*Journal of European Periodical Studies* 1, no.2 (Winter 2016), 1–17.
14. Harris, *On Company Time*, 6.
15. Sean Latham, "Affordance and Emergence: Magazine as New Media," *What is a Journal? Towards a Theory of Periodical Studies*, MLA Convention 2013, Special Session 384 (December 2012).
16. Digital resources and publications for the study of modern magazines include the Modernist Journals Project (http://modjourn.org/index.html), the Modernist Magazines Project (http://www.modernistmagazines.com/), and The Blue Mountain Project (https://bluemountain.princeton.edu/index.html).
17. Jeffrey Drouin and Sean Latham, "Make It Useful: The Modernist Journals Project and Medium Data, *Modernism/Modernity* 3, Cycle 2 (Aug. 7, 2018) https://doi.org/10.26597/mod.0055
18. See Andreas Huyssen, "High/Low in an Expanded Field,"*Modernism/Modernity* 9, no. 3 (September 2002): 363–74; Douglas Mao et Walkowitz Rebecca L. Walkowitz, "The New Modernist Studies," *PMLA*, 123. 3 (May 2008): 737–48; Jean-Michel Rabaté, ed., *A Handbook of Modernism Studies* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

19. Jessica Berman, *Modernist Commitment: Ethics, Politics, and Transnational Modernism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011); Susan Friedman, *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity across Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015); Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

20. Ann Ardis, "Towards a Theory of Periodical Studies," *What is a Journal? Towards a Theory of Periodical Studies*. MLA Convention 2013, Special Session 384 (December 2012).

21. See Robert Scholes and Clifford Wulfman, *Modernism in the Magazines. An Introduction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Ann Ardis and Patrick Collier, eds., *Transatlantic Print Culture, 1880–1940: Emerging Media and Emerging Modernism (*Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Jessica Pressman, *Digital Modernism: Making it New in New Media*, Oxford Scholarship Online (November 2014); Faye Hammill, Paul Hjartarson, and Hannah McGregor, "Introducing Magazines and/as Media: The Aesthetics and Politics of Serial Form," *ESC* 41, no.1 (March 2015): 1–18.

22. Lise Jaillant, *Cheap Modernism: Expanding Markets, Publishers' Series and the Avant-Garde* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017).

23. Evanghelia Stead et Hélène Védrine, eds., *L'Europe des Revues Volumes I and II* (Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2008 and 2018).

24. Kirsten MacLeod, "American Little Magazines of the 1890s and the Rise of the Professional-Managerial Class," *ESC* 41, no.1 (March 2012), 65.

25. See for instance, Maria DiCenzo, Lucy Delap, and Leila Maria, eds., *Feminism and the Periodical Press* (New York: Routledge, 2006) and Barbara Green, "The Feminist Periodical Press: Women, Periodical Studies, and Modernity," *Literature Compass* 6, no.1 (2009): 191–205.

26. Manushag N. Powell, "We Other Periodicalists, or, Why Periodical Studies?" *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 30. 2, *Women in Anglo-American Periodicals* (Fall 2011): 442.

27. Harris, *On Company Time*, 188.

28. Drouin and Latham, "Make It Useful."

29. James Mussel, "'Of the making of magazines there is no end': W.T. Stead, Newness, and the Archival Imagination," *ESC* 41.1 (March 2015): 70, 72. See also "Repetition: Or "In Our Last," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 48:3 (Fall 2015): 345, 349.

30. Leon Whipple, "SatEvePost: Mirror of These States," *Survey Graphic* 59(March 1, 1928): 699.

31. Matthew Levay, "On the Uses of Modern Periodical Studies: An Introduction," *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* 9.1, Special Issue: *Seriality* (2018): v–xix, Project MUSE.

32. Michael North, *Novelty: A History of the New* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013), 144–71.

33. See for instance Jean-Michel Rabaté, *The Ghosts of Modernity* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1996) and David Ellison, *Ethics and Aesthetics in European Literature: From the Sublime to the Uncanny* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

34. Graham Thompson, "The Seriality Dividend of American Magazines,"*American Periodicals* 28, no.1 (2018): 2.

35. Laurel Brake, *Print in Transition, 1850–1910: Studies in Media and Book History*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).

36. A non-comprehensive list includes Nicola Luckhurst, *Bloomsbury in Vogue* (London: Cecil Woolf, 1998); Jane Garrity, "Selling Culture to the 'Civilized': Bloomsbury, British *Vogue*, and the Marketing of National Identity," *Modernism/ Modernity*1, no.2 (1999): 29–58; Christopher Reed, "A *Vogue* that Dare Not Speak Its Name: Sexual Subculture During the Editorship of Dorothy Todd, 1922–26," *Fashion Theory*, X/1/2 (2006): 39–71; Wood, Alice, "Modernism and the Middlebrow in British Women's Magazines, 1916–1930," Christoph Ehland and Cornelia Wachter, eds., *Middlebrow and Gender, 1890–1945* (Brill Rodopi, 2016), 39–59. On the French edition of the magazine, see also Sophie Kurkdjian, "The Emergence of French *Vogue:* French Identity and Visual Culture in the Fashion Press, 1920–-1940,"*International Journal of Fashion Studies* 6, no.1 (2019): 63–82.