



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

on the feminist debates, and their fiction and poetry enact in various subtle ways the mutable contents of the “imaginary space” of feminist periodicals.

Despite its inattention to such matters, and to the sizeable body of relevant work produced by literary critics and scholars of modernism, Delap’s study has a good deal to offer modernist studies: not only does it carefully parse some of feminism’s genealogies, but also, and especially, it isolates periodicals as diffuse sites of dramatic and fertile exchange—loci where ideas are mutually created and continually transformed. *The Feminist Avant-Garde* gives a shape to that kinetic activity by reflecting its effects in first-wave feminism and, by extension, in the avant-garde cultures connected to feminism’s efflorescence. This constitutes a valuable historical contribution to future theorizations of little magazines in general, and to the ongoing study of the transient collectives that permeate modernist production.



Robert Scholes and Clifford Wulfman, *Modernism in the Magazines: An Introduction*. Princeton: Yale University Press, 2010. 352 pages, illustrated. \$40.00 (cloth).

*Patrick Collier*  
Ball State University

Don’t be deceived by the straightforward title. It is difficult to imagine a book that covers as much ground as successfully as *Modernism in the Magazines: An Introduction*. Robert Scholes, who among his countless accomplishments is the founder of the Modernist Journals Project, and Clifford Wulfman, coordinator of Library Digital Initiatives at Princeton and the Modernist Journals Project’s first technical director, address this book to active scholars of modern periodical studies, to college and university faculty interested in pursuing early twentieth-century magazines as researchers and teachers, and to graduate and advanced undergraduate students wholly new to the field. These multiple audiences require multiple, overlapping agendas, which I will group for convenience under three large headings: literary history, advocacy, and methodology. That is, Scholes and

Wulfman demonstrate and probe the centrality of magazines to the history of modernism, offering a set of engaging, brief accounts of modernist interactions in a set of key magazines; advocate for scholarship and teaching that places magazines at the center of modernist studies and for the many resources still needed to make them optimally accessible; and sketch out and model a set of theoretical bases and critical protocols for periodical studies. Straddling these three categories uneasily are the book's most surprising features: an opening chapter declaring Ezra Pound "Founder of Modern Periodical Studies" and a 103-page appendix offering a complete edition of Pound's 1917 *New Age* series "Studies in Contemporary Mentality," a characteristically acerbic survey of the London periodical universe at that historical moment. I shall have more to say about Pound's problematic role here shortly, but my first duty is to endorse this impressive book. As theoretical treatise and practical call-to-action, how-to guide and exemplar, *Modernism in the Magazines* will prove indispensable to the growing cadre of modernist scholars and their students who are taking on the project of mapping and theorizing the vast and varied world of early twentieth-century print culture.

The book offers much to each of its audiences. In chapters titled "Modernity and the Rise of Modernism: A Review," "How to Study a Modern Magazine," "Modernism's Other: The Art of Advertising," and "On or About December 1910," Scholes and Wulfman primarily address students and faculty new to modernist periodicals. And they say almost everything one would want these readers to hear about the study of periodicals: we must read magazines as primary texts rather than as neutral vehicles of data; we need to read advertisements closely, with vigor, pleasure, and consciousness of the limits of what they can show us; we must both entertain the notion of a magazine as a coherent text and pay heed to its dialogic, heteroglossic nature, which lies both in the multiple voices within its pages and in its embeddedness in networks of other publications; we must maintain a constant dual focus when studying magazines, toggling between close reading and external, historical research. The authors are particularly insightful on magazine advertisements, observing that time has changed the very nature of these texts: once resolutely rhetorical and instrumental artifacts, geared to activating consumer desire for the commodities that stood behind them, period advertisements are for us not only historical but also aesthetic artifacts—objects that we can admire for their cleverness and design, and situate within the rhetorical and artistic practices surrounding them, precisely because they have lost their initial

claims on us. The authors urge us to consider such advertisements as “antiques, in which craft has become art thanks to the passage of time” (141), and to unpack the “symbolic juxtapositions” created in the dialogue between and among advertisements and text. They model this practice by reading wartime advertisements for Swift brand meats, Kodak cameras, Murad cigarettes, and Studebaker cars, contrasting realistic and impressionistic visual vocabularies with straightforward and more playful evocations of patriotism.

Chapters titled “Rethinking Modernist Magazines: From Genres to Database,” “The Hole in the Archive,” and “Modernism in the Magazines: The Case of Visual Art” are addressed (though not always consistently) to a more expert audience. The visual art chapter offers something of a revisionist genealogy of modernism, retracing English debates about the proper aims and methods of modern art among writers active at A. R. Orage’s *The New Age* and John Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield’s *Rhythm*, with a side glance at the more familiar working-out of these issues in Wyndham Lewis’s *Blast*. *The New Age* and *Rhythm*, Scholes and Wulfman suggest, were essential in setting the terms of debate between multiple modern schools, notably the more figural modernism favored by Walter Sickert and the (ultimately victorious) abstraction of Picasso, Lewis, and Gaudier-Brzeska. *The New Age* was the first magazine to feature a “reasoned defense of Picasso” in England, while *Rhythm* was the first to reproduce one of Picasso’s works (86, 91). *Rhythm*, as well, gave the English art cognoscenti a native movement (the “Rhythmists”) that predated Lewis’s noisier Vorticists. While the larger outlines of this account are familiar (from Scholes’s 2006 *Paradoxy of Modernism* and Faith Binckes’s excellent essay on *Rhythm* in *Little Magazines and Modernism: New Approaches*),<sup>1</sup> the chapter amply demonstrates that careful attention to neglected magazines can clarify, qualify, and sometimes unseat what we think we know about modernism. The chapter argues powerfully for a careful rethinking of the role of visual art and its tight imbrication with literary modernism in magazine culture. Tucked amid this mini-history is a nifty theoretical discussion of mechanical reproduction of art works in magazines, and the difficulty of disentangling one’s subjective experience of original masterpieces (aura and all) from the reproduced images one has seen of the same works.

Of the more methodological chapters, “Rethinking Modernist Magazines” is perhaps the most useful to scholars currently practicing

periodical studies, as it smartly problematizes many of the terms, practices, and assumptions that have long informed our treatment of modernist periodicals. The authors revisit the descriptive categories devised by such predecessors as Alvin Sullivan and Frederick Hoffman, Charles Allen, and Carol Ulrich, pointing out the slippages among their terms and offering alternatives. Among the most valuable insights here is the severely deforming imprecision of “little magazines” as a category. As Scholes and Wulfman show, “little” refers in some cases to circulation, in some cases to number of pages, and in some cases to surface area of those pages. And it usually connotes both elitism and literariness, thus mixing evaluative and descriptive meanings. “We must learn to stop talking, writing, and thinking as if the category of ‘little magazines’ represented something real in the textual world,” Scholes and Wulfman write, urging us instead to characterize magazines more precisely via categories such as duration, amount of advertising, circulation, types of content, and range of contributors (59–60). Also subjected to this careful treatment are such seemingly straightforward terms as “magazine,” “periodical,” and “literary.” Even more explicitly than “little,” “literary,” when attached to the word “magazine,” “combines a generic and a qualitative signification,” and may misrepresent an individual magazine’s total contents or divert our attention from literary works that appear in “non-literary” magazines (61, 53). The authors also argue at length, and convincingly, for the need to extend our inquiries to large-circulation, commercial magazines. This focus is extremely welcome, and underscores Karen Leick’s observation that modernism was only fleetingly the marginal phenomenon it often advertised itself to be; mainstream journalism conveyed modernism itself, and commentary about it, copiously almost from the start.<sup>2</sup>

In a strong thread throughout these methodological discussions, Scholes and Wulfman insist on the need to tread carefully, and with heightened awareness, when devising categories, so as not to silently reassert the old high/low binary and its apostasies. The careful reading of periodicals, they write, requires

perspectives that are difficult to achieve . . . informed by scholarship, if not precisely by criticism (indeed, in a way that is precisely *not* informed by criticism, because criticism is motivated by argument and perspective, and we are trying to develop a way of reading that suspends judgments). (66–67, emphasis original)

I could not agree more. It is surprising, then, that the authors nonetheless allow the rubric of “modernism” itself to frame the emergent field so thoroughly. Scholes has, here and in *Paradoxy*, crafted a definition of modernism that is inclusive, perhaps to a fault. Here, most broadly, “Modernity is a social condition. Modernism was a response to that condition” (26); more specifically, modernism is not solely a set of formal innovations, but rather inheres in the apparent struggles between representation and abstraction, modernization and nostalgia, the country and the city, the haunted study and the mass market. Modernism expands under this paradigm to include even the patent medicine Santogen, which, by offering itself as an antidote to the ailments of “our present mode of living,” becomes “a form of modernism—a chemical response” to modernity (184). One could be forgiven for reading in this approach—and others like it—an assumption that if we as scholars find something interesting, that something must be some kind of modernism. But if we are really concerned with “developing a way of reading that suspends judgments,” it is fair to ask what sort of blind spots are created when modernism, however defined, continues to dominate the critical foreground. As Maria Diczenco and Lucy Delap recently argued, modernist studies’ “preoccupation with the status of authors, literary production, cultural criticism, formal experimentation, and aesthetic value makes it a problematic point of departure for understanding developments in the social and political spheres,” particularly if our objective is to study “underexplored issues, genres, artifacts, new media forms, and patterns of circulation.”<sup>3</sup>

This brings me back to Pound, the putative founder of modern periodical studies. “We must recognize Pound as a founder or progenitor” of our work, Scholes and Wulfman tell us. “We are only catching up to him now. . .” (6). The methods outlined in “How to Read a Modern Magazine” are framed as “a way to get into the domain of periodical studies by refining the pioneering steps of Ezra Pound,” who teaches us “how to read a single magazine, looking at everything from advertising to fiction to editorials, and how to read a whole set of magazines as a way of understanding the ‘mentality’ or culture represented in them” (144). But the critical persona on display in “Studies in Contemporary Mentality” is not one that all scholars would seek as a model for themselves or their students. Pound’s staccato style of assertion and quotation and his obsessive name dropping in “Studies in Contemporary Mentality” will confuse today’s undergraduates, probably just a little more than it confused

his initial readers. Here we also find Pound describing the theological *Hibbert Review* as marked by “facile imbecilities and crankism” (233); remarking on the ability of many English journalists to “write long articles . . . without in an egregious way displaying any of their particular mental limitations or their stupidities” (237); labeling the readership of *The Family Herald* as “the verminous level” based on an advertisement for lice powder (271); and stereotyping readers of *The Quiver* with the hypothesis that among them “individual differences . . . are so faint as to be imperceptible” (265). This penchant for labeling and icky generalization is not a habit of mind we should emulate or encourage. And if, as Scholes and Wulfman assert, “the Pound of the first three decades of the twentieth century” was not the fascist Pound but “a different figure . . . a literary and cultural critic of enormous energy and biting wit,” one can nonetheless see Pound’s future here, in his hyperbolic disdain for ordinary readers and workaday writers (vii).

Most crucially, the dual emphasis on Pound and modernism marks a tenacious residue of conservative scholarly approaches that, in my view, need to give way if we are truly to treat periodicals as “autonomous objects of study,” as Scholes and Sean Latham advocated in an important *PMLA* article in 2006 (517–18).<sup>4</sup> The “author studies” model, still robust in modernism, as evidenced by the vitality of such institutions as the Woolf and Joyce societies and their attendant publications, is a particularly poor fit with periodical studies. Marrying periodical study with author-based protocols threatens to reduce the periodical to a rich source of data that can be used to contextualize the work of the primary author, placing us back in an older historicism in which periodicals are, to quote Scholes and Latham again, “treated as containers of discrete bits of information” (518). Clearly Scholes and Wulfman, on balance, do not advocate this sort of treatment, and thus it is surprising to find Pound canonized anew here. “The lesson [Pound] leaves with us,” the authors write, “is that to understand modernism we must follow its workings in both the ‘free’ magazines and those that are bound to the marketplace” (25). But our understanding of periodicals and their networks will always be limited if we make them share the stage equally with Great Authors, and our studies of early twentieth-century print culture will always be narrowed if our primary objective remains “to understand modernism,” however defined.

These methodological disagreements, however, do not compromise my sense of the value of *Modernism in the Magazines*, to which I shall be

returning again and again as an aide to teaching and research. The book places scholars of early twentieth-century print culture in further debt to Scholes, who has been blazing trails for us since *The Nature of Narrative* (back when one still had to argue for modernism as a valid aesthetic project) and to Wulfman, whose work on the Modernist Journals Project has made so many current projects possible. Their book is a miracle of breadth and accessibility, and will remain current for many years to come.

## NOTES

1. See Faith Binckes, "Lines of Engagement: *Rhythm*, Reproduction, and the Textual Dialogues of Early Modernism," in *Little Magazines and Modernism: New Approaches*, ed. Suzanne W. Churchill and Adam McKible, 21–34 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), and Robert Scholes, *Paradoxy of Modernism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

2. Karen Leick, "Popular Modernism: Little Magazines and the American Daily Press," *PMLA* 123, no. 1 (January 2008): 125–39, 312.

3. Lucy Delap and Maria Dizenzo, "Transatlantic Print Culture: The Anglo-American Feminist Press and Emerging 'Modernities,'" in *Transatlantic Print Culture 1880–1940: Emerging Media, Emerging Modernisms*, ed. Ann Ardis and Patrick Collier, 48–65 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 50.

4. Sean Latham and Robert Scholes, "The Rise of Periodical Studies," *PMLA* 121, no. 2 (March 2006): 517–31.



Adrian Bingham, *Family Newspapers? Sex, Private Life, and the British Popular Press, 1918–1978*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. 320 pages. \$99.00 (cloth).

Lee Garver

Butler University

Throughout the twentieth century, sex was—just as it is today—a powerful marketing tool in the selling of newspapers in Great Britain. The prospect of reading about the private indiscretions of the rich and famous, the opportunity to see provocative photographs of scantily clad or fashionably dressed women, and the thrill of following serial features about scandalous sex crimes and purported international prostitution rings have long proved to be irresistible lures for potential subscribers. Any newspaper publisher