

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.5699/MODELANGREVI.107.3.0681

'The age of a mistaken nationalism': histoire croisée, cross-national exchange and an Anglo-French network of periodicals — [Source link](#)

Birgit Van Puymbroeck

Published on: 01 Jan 2012 - Modern Language Review (2012)

Topics: Nationalism

Related papers:

- [Reading Literature/culture: A Translation of "Reading as a Cultural Practice"](#)
- [Modernist Literature and European Identity](#)
- [Reading Pierre Bourdieu in a dual context : essays from India and France](#)
- ['L'ascension sociale' and the return to origins: reconstructions of family and social origin in the writings of Albert Camus, Annie Ernaux, Didier Eribon and Édouard Louis.](#)
- [Gender, politics and fiction in 1930s France](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/the-age-of-a-mistaken-nationalism-histoire-croisee-cross-3fhumq3flz>

‘The Age of a Mistaken Nationalism’: *Histoire Croisée*, Cross-National Exchange, and an Anglo-French Network of Periodicals

Author(s): Birgit Van Puymbroeck

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (July 2012), pp. 681-698

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5699/modelangrevi.107.3.0681>

Accessed: 21/02/2013 09:13

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 AGE OF A MISTAKEN NATIONALISM’: *HISTOIRE CROISÉE*, CROSS-NATIONAL EXCHANGE, AND AN ANGLO-FRENCH NETWORK OF PERIODICALS

In an open letter to Ford Madox Ford’s *Transatlantic Review*, T. S. Eliot argued that ‘The more the contact, the more free exchange, there can be between the small number of intelligent people of every race and nation, the more likelihood of general contribution to what we call Literature.’¹ Both Ford and Eliot aimed to create a cross-national literary space in their respective magazines: the *Transatlantic Review*, published in Paris, London, and New York from January to December 1924, and the *Criterion*, published in London from October 1922 to January 1939. Nevertheless, they had divergent ideas as to how to put their cross-national projects into practice. Whereas Ford envisioned a supranational literary space that was bound by neither national identity nor language, Eliot balanced international and national concerns by introducing a European idea to a predominantly English audience. This essay aims to refine our understanding of cross-national interaction in early twentieth-century periodicals by using the analytical toolbox associated with Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann’s concept of *histoire croisée*.² It argues that the framework of *histoire croisée* allows for a more nuanced sense of processes of internationalization than Pierre Bourdieu’s nationally inspired field theory and accounts for the selected magazines’ varying degrees of success by integrating both methodological perspectives. While the *Criterion*, despite its European ambitions, catered for a predominantly British audience, the *Transatlantic Review* lacked a well-defined national readership, thus failing to acquire symbolic capital in Britain, France, and the United States. The article first offers a theoretical synthesis, before applying theory to practice.

‘*Histoire croisée*’ as a Cross-National Approach

In her study *Pour sortir du chaos*, Anne-Rachel Hermetet compares and contrasts the cross-national ambitions of three inter-war periodicals: the French monthly *Nouvelle Revue Française* (abbreviated as *NRF*), the Italian *La Ronda*, and the British *Criterion*.³ While extensive in its discussion

¹ T. S. Eliot, ‘Communications’, *Transatlantic Review*, 1 January 1924, p. 96.

² Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, ‘Beyond Comparison: *Histoire croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity’, *History and Theory*, 45 (2006), 30–50.

³ Anne-Rachel Hermetet, *Pour sortir du chaos: trois revues européennes des années vingt* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2009).

of the individual periodicals and their European ambitions, Hermetet's comparative approach does not address the many intercrossings between the three inter-war periodicals and their respective *aires culturelles*. As Werner and Zimmermann point out, 'When societies in contact with one another are studied, it is often noted that the objects and practices are not only in a state of interrelationship, but also modify one another reciprocally as a result of their relationship.'⁴ The examination of various cultural contexts in contact, as exemplified in and by the internationally oriented periodicals of the Reconstruction era, therefore, requires scholars 'to reorganize their conceptual framework and rethink their analytical tools'.⁵

Peter McDonald, Mark Morrisson, Stephen Parker, and Matthew Philpotts respond to a call for methodological innovation by applying and adapting Bourdieu's theory of the field of cultural production to periodical studies.⁶ Bourdieu's model, indeed, provides a fruitful framework for many issues related to the study of modernist magazines, yet, in general, does not explicitly address cross-national interaction.⁷ Pascale Casanova, in her turn, seeks to extend Bourdieu's field theory to a world republic of letters.⁸ She discusses the hierarchy between the centre and the periphery, the problems of language and translation, and the tension between national and international impulses determining the world literary marketplace. However, in a similar fashion to Hermetet, she does not account for the intersections between various cultural areas, but rather treats processes of transfer from one fixed culture to another, thus ultimately never questioning the national field as such. Moreover, Casanova makes no mention of literary reviews, while many of the debates on a world republic of letters were conducted precisely in early twentieth-century periodicals.

This article aims to demonstrate that Werner and Zimmermann's toolbox of *histoire croisée* offers a promising new approach to the study of cross-national

⁴ Werner and Zimmermann, p. 35.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Peter McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Mark Morrisson, *The Public Face of Modernism: Little Magazines, Audiences, and Reception, 1905–1920* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001); Stephen Parker and Matthew Philpotts, *Sinn und Form: The Anatomy of a Literary Journal* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009); Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993).

⁷ An exception to this is Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas', in *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Richard Shusterman (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 220–28, originally published as 'Les Conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées', *Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte/Cahiers d'histoire des littératures romanes*, 14 (1990), 1–10. In Bourdieu's account, the field of origin and the field of reception remain unaffected by the process of transfer.

⁸ Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), originally published as *La République mondiale des lettres* (Paris: Seuil, 1999).

exchange in early twentieth-century magazines. Like periodical studies itself, it 'has both focus and breadth and cuts across accepted fields and structures'.⁹ By studying the transformation of contact areas in terms of mutual interaction, Werner and Zimmermann leave behind the perspective of a nation-centred history by putting processes of intercrossings at the centre of the analysis. Rather than circumscribing the relevant scenes and spaces prior to the enquiry, they identify them 'in the very process of research, as a function of the intercrossings specific to the object under study'.¹⁰ 'In this respect', Werner and Zimmermann argue, 'intercrossing can be distinguished from intermixing. While the latter emphasizes the specificity of the product of hybridization, the former is as much concerned with the novel elements produced by the intercrossing, as with the way in which it affects each of the intercrossed parties.'¹¹

According to Zimmermann, the aim of *histoire croisée* is 'to grasp the complexity of a composite, plural world in motion, and thereby to develop tools capable of addressing the fundamental question of change'.¹² *Histoire croisée* primarily offers a critique on comparative approaches and transfer studies. It regards transfers as transformations and allows for more than two actors or contexts to interact in dissimilar ways. Nevertheless, the method also implicitly engages with Bourdieu's sociology. In tune with Bourdieu, it is a self-reflexive perspective, which works with pragmatic induction and combines the long-term character of structures with the short-term character of action. However, it also fundamentally differs from Bourdieu's model in its process-related, non-deterministic, and cross-national character. Viewed from the perspective of *histoire croisée*, the world literary market does not present itself as a mosaic of neatly defined national fields, operating according to either national or universal laws in concert with respectively Bourdieu or Casanova, but as an entangled mesh of intercrossings and overlappings in which local and global concerns are mutually constitutive.

This article demonstrates the ways in which the toolbox of *histoire croisée* can work together with Bourdieu's theory of the rules of art to provide a more detailed account of Ford's and Eliot's varying degrees of success in setting up a transnational periodical.¹³ Both editors based their periodicals on French model magazines, respectively the *Mercure de France* and the *NRF*, and were explicitly concerned with the problem of language for cross-national contact. They aimed to inspire a cultural dialogue across nations and were connected

⁹ Sean Latham and Robert Scholes, 'The Rise of Periodical Studies', *PMLA*, 121 (2006), 517–31 (p. 520).

¹⁰ Werner and Zimmermann, p. 38.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Histoire croisée and the Making of Global History', paper presented at the Conference 'Global History, Globally', Harvard University, 8–9 February 2008.

¹³ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

in the sense that they both published in each other's reviews: Ford contributed an article on Anglo-French collaboration to the *Criterion* entitled 'From the Grey Stone', while Eliot wrote an open letter for the *Transatlantic Review*. My article, moreover, cuts across time intervals by including not only the *Transatlantic Review* but also Ford's first magazine, the *English Review*, which he edited from December 1908 to December 1910, before it was taken over by Alfred Mond and Austin Harrison.

Anglo-French Interaction: French Model Magazines

In the *English Review*, Anglo-French interaction manifested itself from the periodical's inception. As assistant-editor Douglas Goldring recalls: 'No sooner was the coffee consumed, than Ford and Conrad started away, in a mixture of French and English, to discuss what the Review must Stand For.'¹⁴ Not only were the discussions behind the scenes conducted in English and French, the *English Review* also modelled itself on a French periodical: the *Mercure de France*. It published a wide-ranging supplement, 'The Month', that was clearly inspired by the *Mercure's* 'La Revue du Mois' (later 'La Revue de la Quinzaine') and published both modernist authors and their Edwardian and Victorian predecessors.¹⁵ Furthermore, the *English Review* echoed the *Mercure's* debate culture by organizing a literary salon on Tuesday evenings and provided a visual link with Alfred Vallette's French periodical by advertising for the *Mercure de France* in its second and third issues.

Although Ford had always had an interest in France, his knowledge of French culture was not the result of a direct contact with the country. As Ezra Pound asserts, Ford 'made himself for thirty years the champion of certain (excellent) French ideas', which he had received 'from two Americans (H. James and Stephen Crane) and a Pole (Jos. Conrad)'.¹⁶ In a similar fashion, Alan Judd argues that Ford's Francophilia was 'an inherited love' that came from his grandfather, the Pre-Raphaelite painter Ford Madox Brown, and his father, the music critic Francis Hueffer, and that was 'subsequently reinforced by contact with Conrad'.¹⁷ It may indeed have been Conrad who introduced Ford to the *Mercure de France*, given that he maintained an extensive correspondence with Henry D. Davray, the *Mercure's* expert on English literature. Moreover, Ford's indirect contact with French culture accounts for the fact that he extolled an idea of an already bygone France. As Morrisson asserts, 'Ford saw in the

¹⁴ Douglas Goldring, *South Lodge: Reminiscences of Violet Hunt, Ford Madox Ford and the 'English Review' Circle* (London: Constable, 1943), p. 24.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ *Pound/Ford: The Story of a Literary Friendship*, ed. by Brita Lindberg-Seyersted (New York: New Directions, 1981), p. 98.

¹⁷ Alan Judd, *Ford Madox Ford* (London: Collins, 1990), p. 247.

Mercure [...] an embodiment of the spirit of the Enlightenment, an age during which Ford felt, rationality and order were spread throughout the populace.¹⁸

However, the *Mercure*'s success was not easily transposed to Britain. Whereas, according to Goldring, the *Mercure* could 'find readers in remote country towns and among all classes of society', the *English Review* struggled to obtain a circulation of 1000 copies a month.¹⁹ In addition, the exchange between the *Mercure de France* and the *English Review* was neither lasting nor symmetrical. The advertisements for the *Mercure de France* were dropped after the third issue and the *Mercure*, at first, did not comment on the launch of the *English Review*. Moreover, the French review had only three per cent of its contributors in common with Ford's periodical. Four of these were French or French-speaking Belgians (Charles Baudelaire, Henry D. Davray, Maurice Maeterlinck, Émile Verhaeren). Ten were British or American authors (including Arnold Bennett, Joseph Conrad, Edmund Gosse, Henry James, and H. G. Wells), and there were stories by the Russians Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, the Japanese writer Yoshio Markino, and the Norwegian Henrik Ibsen.²⁰ The *English Review* even included a text by Voltaire to show its links to the Enlightenment, which Ford admired.

Although the relation between the *English Review* and the *Mercure de France* was not 'symmetrical', to use the terminology of *histoire croisée*, it was 'reciprocal'.²¹ By advertising in the *English Review*, the *Mercure* gained popularity in Britain. As the British poet Richard Aldington argues in his memoirs *Life for Life's Sake*, 'From its foundation in 1890 until the war, the *Mercure de France* was one of the best, if not the best, of the independent literary periodicals.'²² Furthermore, the French review commented on the *English Review*'s change of editor and proprietor in 1910. As Davray observed, 'Après un an d'existence, au cours duquel elle donna douze numéros extrêmement intéressants, *The English Review* passe en de nouvelles mains.'²³ The new proprietor and the new editor—respectively Alfred Mond, a liberal MP, and Austin Harrison, son of the famous historian Frederic Harrison—aimed to transform the *English Review* into a literary periodical that was not only artistically, but also commercially, successful. In this, Davray felt, the renewed review would be closer to the *Mercure de France* than Ford's first attempt at creating a similar English review.

¹⁸ Morrisson, 'The Myth of the Whole', p. 514.

¹⁹ Douglas Goldring, *The Last Pre-Raphaelite: A Record of the Life and Writings of Ford Madox Ford* (London: Macdonald, 1948), p. 151.

²⁰ These figures are based on a comparison of the table of contents of the *Mercure de France* of 1905–15 and the *English Review* of 1908–15, thus allowing ample margins for historical transfer. Austin Harrison, who succeeded Ford as editor of the *English Review*, reused a number of Ford's contacts. See Martha S. Vogeler, *Austin Harrison and the 'English Review'* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008).

²¹ Zimmermann, 'Histoire croisée and the Making of Global History'.

²² Richard Aldington, *Life for Life's Sake: Reminiscences* (New York: Viking Press, 1941), p. 174.

²³ Henry D. Davray, 'Lettres anglaises', *Mercure de France*, 1 November 1910, p. 571.

If T. S. Eliot took the inspiration for a note on foreign letters and periodicals from the *Mercure de France*, his main model for the *Criterion* was André Gide's *Nouvelle Revue Française*.²⁴ Both the *Criterion* and the *NRF* were explicitly international in scope. They combined fiction with literary criticism and were part of a European network of periodicals. Jacques Rivière, editor of the *NRF* after André Gide, stated that the *NRF* attempted to be above all 'un terrain propice à la création, qu'une critique intelligente maintiendrait constamment ameubli'.²⁵ Likewise, Eliot wrote to the poet Thomas Sturge Moore that he wished to make the *Criterion* 'primarily a critical review' with some space for creative writing.²⁶ Eliot took his inspiration for the *Criterion*'s cover from the *NRF* with the title printed in large red capitals and the table of contents in black. Just as the *English Review* provided a visible connection with the *Mercure* by reproducing its supplement 'The Month', so the *Criterion* was associated with the *NRF* not only by means of its title-page design but also by Eliot's sporadic contributions to the French periodical.

Eliot had been familiar with the *NRF* from the early 1910s onwards. During a year of study in Paris, he was introduced to Alain-Fournier, one of the key figures of the *NRF* and Rivière's brother-in-law. Although the American-born writer did not meet Rivière at this early stage, he kept a regular correspondence with Alain-Fournier, who drew attention to his own *NRF* publications in his letters.²⁷ Still, Eliot did not become part of the *NRF*'s inner circle until 1921, when Gide asked him to take up the role of the *NRF*'s new London correspondent. In fact, it was Lytton Strachey who had suggested Eliot to Gide, through the intermediary of his sister Dorothy Strachey Bussy, who translated Gide's texts.²⁸ Even though Eliot contributed only six articles over six years, his contacts and experience at the French periodical came in handy when setting up the *Criterion* in 1922. As Jason Harding argues, the *NRF* provided the *Criterion* both with a 'template' and with some of its most distinguished contributors, including Jacques Rivière, Valéry Larbaud, Charles du Bos, and the regular columnist Ramon Fernandez.²⁹

²⁴ David Goldie, *A Critical Difference: T. S. Eliot and John Middleton Murry in English Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Jason Harding, *The 'Criterion': Cultural Politics and Periodical Networks in Inter-War Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Maaïke Koffeman-Bijman, *Entre classicisme et modernité: la 'Nouvelle Revue Française' dans le champ littéraire de la Belle Époque* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003); Anne-Rachel Hermetet, 'The *Criterion* et les littératures européennes, 1922–1925', in *Revue modernistes anglo-américaines: lieux d'échanges, lieux d'exil*, ed. by Benoît Tadié (Paris: Ent'revues, 2006), pp. 189–200; William Marx, 'Les deux modernismes: T. S. Eliot et la *NRF*', *Romanic Review*, 99 (2008), 57–69; Benoît Tadié, 'Au cœur de la lumière: T. S. Eliot, la *NRF* et Paris', *Romanic Review*, 99 (2008), 45–56.

²⁵ Jacques Rivière, 'La Nouvelle Revue Française', *NRF*, 1 June 1919, pp. 2–3.

²⁶ T. S. Eliot to T. Sturge Moore, 3 April 1922, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by Valerie Eliot, 2 vols (London: Faber and Faber, 1998), I, 518.

²⁷ *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, I, 26.

²⁸ Dorothy Bussy to André Gide, 28 November 1921, in *Selected Letters of André Gide and Dorothy Bussy*, ed. by Richard Tedeschi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 81.

²⁹ Harding, p. 206.

Notwithstanding Eliot's personal connection to the *NRF*, the relation between the *Criterion* and the *NRF* was complex at best and strained at worst. When Eliot solicited a contribution from Gide, the latter's agreement was only conditional: 'Ma collaboration . . . ? Elle vous est acquise en principe, mais je ne puis la rendre effective avant de connaître quelques précisions.'³⁰ In the end, Gide did not contribute to the *Criterion*. Moreover, his early reluctance and reserve were strengthened when the *Criterion* published programmatic texts by the right-wing authors Henri Massis and Charles Maurras, who opposed Gide's left-wing ideas.³¹ As Harding asserts, 'It was clear that by the time of the appearance of F. S. Flint's censorious 1928 notice of the *Nouvelle Revue Française* [. . .] the *Criterion* was on better terms with Massis's rival right-wing and pro-Catholic monthly the *Revue Universelle*' than with the supposedly politically neutral *NRF*.³² In spite of these complications, Eliot's contact with the *NRF* resulted in a relatively high number of shared contributors, including Julien Benda, Valéry Larbaud, Marcel Proust, and Paul Valéry.

However, the cross-national relations between the *English Review* and the *Mercure de France* on the one hand, and the *Criterion* and the *NRF* on the other, are not the only relations in this set of connections. In order to complete the network, one also needs to pay attention to the relations between the *Criterion* and the *Mercure de France* and between the *English Review* and the *NRF*. The *English Review* and the *NRF*, for example, originated around the same time, respectively 1908 and 1909. Both adopted an international focus, while their similarity in name hinted at a national orientation. Maaik Koffeman compares the *English Review* to the *NRF*, arguing that both magazines had the same goals: 'Dans leurs champs littéraires respectifs, *The English Review* et la *NRF* jouent un rôle comparable de médiateur entre la tradition et la modernité [. . .] elles créent un lieu où différentes générations d'écrivains peuvent engager une discussion fructueuse.'³³ Both the *English Review* and the *NRF* were products of their time and engaged with one another in so far as they belonged to the same international literary field.

Although there seems to have been no direct contact or intercrossing between the *English Review* and the *NRF*, it is not surprising that both magazines shared a number of features as they were both based on the *Mercure de France*. Gide had started out as a regular contributor to the *Mercure* and only later felt the need to start a new magazine. Once this was developed, the *NRF* and the *Mercure* were part of the same national field and competed against

³⁰ André Gide to T. S. Eliot, 16 March 1922, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, 1, 516.

³¹ The *Criterion* published Henri Massis's 'Defence of the West' in 1926 and Charles Maurras's 'Prologue to an Essay on Criticism' in 1928.

³² Harding, p. 152. For a full discussion and contextualization of the *NRF*'s politics during the twenties and thirties see Martyn Cornick, *Intellectuals in History: The 'Nouvelle Revue Française' under Jean Paulhan, 1925-1940* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995).

³³ Koffeman, p. 146.

each other for what Bourdieu calls cultural hegemony. As Richard Aldington points out: ‘Immediately after the war [the *Mercure*’s] place was taken by the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, which had been in unsuccessful rivalry since 1907, under the inspiration of André Gide.’³⁴ This view is confirmed by Jean Paulhan, the *NRF*’s editor after Gide and Rivière, who wrote to Roger Martin du Gard:

Le *Mercure* n’a pas cessé de nous tomber dessus (et en particulier de s’attaquer à Gide dès qu’il en avait l’occasion) avec la plus parfaite déloyauté. Je ne vois pas pourquoi nous serions condamnés à toujours encaisser sans jamais riposter [. . .] Le *Mercure* est un lion gros et gras, qui avait, il n’y a pas quatre ans, trois fois plus d’abonnés que la *NRF*, qui augmente chaque mois son tirage et qui est, avec tout cela, hargneux.³⁵

While this example of national rivalry can best be explained by referring to Bourdieu’s model, the latter remains silent on the processes of cross-national exchange. However, when we extend Bourdieu’s view both historically (beyond a single point of intersection) and geographically (beyond the nation) in accordance with the framework of *histoire croisée*, we notice not only that all four magazines advocate a disinterested literature, international standards of excellence, and a wider European perspective, but also that these similarities stem from a complex interplay of various transfers and interactions: from the *Mercure de France* to the *English Review* and back, to the *NRF*, and via the *NRF* to the *Criterion*. Hence, the *Criterion*’s extensive review of reviews section can be traced back to the original feature in the *Mercure* via the *NRF*, which at its origin—and despite the struggle for cultural hegemony—contained a similar column. Indirect and direct interaction, furthermore, overlap given that the *Criterion* also discussed the *Mercure de France* and the *NRF* in this precise section. I argue that it is this intricate, dynamic, and multiform process that Bourdieu’s theory fails to account for and that Werner and Zimmerman’s method of *histoire croisée* uncovers.

Processes of Acculturation: Language and Translation

In Ford’s mind, the *Mercure de France* embodied the spirit of the Enlightenment. The drawing of a winged Mercury depicted on its front page, as well as the inscription ‘fondé en 1672’, linked the *Mercure* to its predecessor, the *Mercure Galant*, published in Paris from 1672 to 1724, with an interruption from 1674 to 1677, after which it appeared as the *Nouveau Mercure Galant*. Morrisson argues that the *Mercure de France* thrived on ‘a sense not only of public space, but also of a cohesive French culture—an achievement that Ford

³⁴ Aldington, p. 159.

³⁵ Jean Paulhan to Roger Martin du Gard, 6 July 1927, in *Choix de lettres*, ed. by Dominique Aury and Jean-Claude Zylberstein, 2 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), 1, 124.

wished to emulate in England'.³⁶ This cultural cohesion, according to Ford, was both the cause and effect of the French people's precision with language. He believed that 'In the end, the relative values of civilizations come down always to being matters of scrupulosity of language.'³⁷ Ford wanted to bring literature into contact with the 'life of the people'.³⁸ In this, language played a crucial role. Just as the *Mercure's* editor, Alfred Vallette, had wanted to avoid verbosity in his periodical, so Ford aimed to modernize the English language by including slang words and colloquial expressions. In a letter to H. G. Wells, he argued that rather than 'increas[ing] our vocabularies with obsolete words', we must cultivate a sense of everyday language.³⁹

Despite Ford's assertion that he wanted to write in the language of the 'cabmen round the corner', the *English Review* was not a uniformly English-language magazine.⁴⁰ It contained many foreign contributions and published articles, stories, and poems in both French and German. A potential explanation for this seeming inconsistency in Ford's policy is that he preferred to illustrate, rather than imitate, the French precision of language. As Cyrena Pondrom argues, 'Ford urged the English poet to write "exactly as he speaks" and pointed to France and Germany for models of such poetic diction.'⁴¹ While at first sight there seems to be no transformation operated on the French and German texts, they are of course transformed by the context in which they appear: a predominantly English-language journal. However, Ford's translation policy begs qualification as he did not oppose all translations. Russian texts, for example, were translated by Constance Garnett, the wife of the writer Edward Garnett, and a translation of Émile Verhaeren's poem 'La Prière' was published two issues after the original version had appeared in the *English Review*.⁴²

Ford's language policy in the *English Review* and the *Transatlantic Review* is part of a cultural ideology in which multiple languages and literatures are integrated into a multifaceted whole. The transformation performed on the individual texts is minimal, but nevertheless has consequences that affect the entire review. Ford's inclusion of foreign languages not only restricts the potential audience, as the reader is required to master multiple foreign

³⁶ Morrisson, 'The Myth of the Whole', p. 514.

³⁷ Ford Madox Hueffer (Ford), *Between St. Dennis and St. George: A Sketch of Three Civilizations* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), pp. 69, 205.

³⁸ Ford Madox Hueffer (Ford), 'The Functions of the Arts in the Republic', *English Review*, 1 March 1909, p. 797.

³⁹ Ford Madox Ford to H. G. Wells, undated letter presumably from 1903, in *Letters of Ford Madox Ford*, ed. by Richard M. Ludwig (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 19.

⁴⁰ Ford Madox Ford, 'On Impressionism', in *The Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford*, ed. by Frank MacShane (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), pp. 33–55 (p. 49).

⁴¹ Cyrena Pondrom, *The Road From Paris: French Influence on English Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 14.

⁴² Émile Verhaeren, 'La Prière', *English Review*, 1 March 1909, pp. 609–10; Émile Verhaeren, 'La Prière', trans. by Osman Edwards, *English Review*, 1 May 1909, pp. 200–01.

languages, but also implies a differentiation between cultures, since some texts are translated while others are considered to be *above* translation. Joseph Conrad, for instance, wrote in a letter to Henry D. Davray that Anatole France's story 'Les Étrennes de Mlle Doucine', published in the *English Review*, would not be 'profané par un traducteur!'.⁴³ Ford's decision to publish French texts in French worked in a 'structured' and a 'structuring' fashion, corresponding to Werner and Zimmermann's method of *histoire croisée*. Ford not only responded to an already existing audience, which comprised the European intelligentsia that could speak English, French, and German, but also challenged his readers to conform to the magazine's multilingual standards. Ford argued in the April 1924 issue of the *Transatlantic Review*: 'if any gentleman cannot read enough of French to appreciate the relatively simple prose with which we present him he had better—oh, go and learn it'.⁴⁴

Ford's inclusion of French texts in the *English Review* set an important example. It contributed to John Middleton Murry's inclusion of French authors in his periodical *Rhythm* (1911–13) and may have had an influence on the bilingual *Anglo-French Review* (1919–20), edited by Henry D. Davray and James Lewis May, which had about thirty contributors in common with the *English Review*.⁴⁵ However, the *English Review* was not the first or only multilingual magazine. From 1896 to 1898, Fernand Ortman edited *Cosmopolis: An International Review*, which consisted of three parts, written respectively in French, English, and German, and which was published in London, Paris, Berlin, and St Petersburg.⁴⁶ In the same manner, Ford's second magazine, the *Transatlantic Review*, combined English and French texts. Here, as in the *English Review*, Ford stressed the importance of a cultural union between an anglophone and a francophone community. In *A Mirror to France*, published shortly after the last issue of the *Transatlantic Review*, he wrote:

if I could have my way, I would introduce a conscription of the French language into the Anglo-Saxon country and a conscription of the English language into France, so that every soul from the Golden Gate to the Alpes-Maritimes was transfused with the double civilisation. For it is only through language that comprehension and union can arise, and it is only by the careful and strained attention to the fine shades of language in common use that comprehension of language can be reached.⁴⁷

⁴³ Joseph Conrad to Henry D. Davray, 9 October 1908, in *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*, ed. by Frederick R. Karl and Laurence Davis, 9 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), IV, 141.

⁴⁴ Ford Madox Ford, *Transatlantic Review*, 1 April 1924, p. 201.

⁴⁵ Marysa Demoor, 'John Middleton Murry's Editorial Apprenticeships: Getting Modernist "Rhythm" into the *Athenaeum*, 1919–1921', *English Literature in Transition, 1880–1920*, 52 (2009), 123–43; Birgit Van Puymbroeck, 'Anglo-French Relations in the *Anglo-French Review*: "Bien en Advienne"', *English Literature in Transition, 1880–1920*, 55 (2012), 69–93.

⁴⁶ Laurence Davies, "'Don't you think I am a lost soul?'" Conrad's Early Stories and the Magazines', *Conradiana*, 41 (2009), 7–28.

⁴⁷ Ford Madox Ford, *A Mirror to France* (London: Duckworth, 1926), p. 42.

In contrast with Ford's insistence on Anglo-French unity, T. S. Eliot envisioned a wider European network of collaboration for which translation was a prerequisite. While it was possible to know the intricacies of one foreign language, he argued, it was 'impossible to understand the language, the literature, and the people of more than one foreign country equally well'.⁴⁸ Eliot explicitly stated that a cosmopolitan review needed to extend beyond France and asserted in a letter to Richard Aldington that, although he was 'gallophile in essentials', the French hegemony of Europe needed to be checked.⁴⁹ The *Criterion*, indeed, aimed to '[bring] together the best in new thinking and new writing in its time, from all the countries of Europe' and promoted large-scale European collaboration.⁵⁰ This was exemplified by the 'Five Reviews' Award: every year, a jury of three national experts selected the best fictional work submitted to one of the participating periodicals for translation and near-simultaneous printing in the other four reviews. The reviews were the British *Criterion*, the French *NRF*, the Spanish *La Revista de Occidente*, the Italian *Nuova Antologia* and the German *Die europäische Revue*.⁵¹

Translation played a key role in the wide and rapid circulation of ideas across Europe. This is made clear in 'The Unity of European Culture', where Eliot notes that the *Criterion* 'was primarily designed for English readers' and that 'therefore all foreign contributions had to appear in an English translation'.⁵² Only Jean Cocteau's article 'Scandales' was published in French, and this was due to a misunderstanding. As Eliot explained in a letter to Rollo Myers, the sole reason why he had not had the text translated was that he assumed it was to be published in Cocteau's book *Call to Order* and he did not want to republish it. This, however, was a mistake and Eliot tried to 'shove it [the story] in in French'.⁵³ Moreover, translation often posed a challenge as some texts or terms could not be easily transposed from one language to another. F. S. Flint, for example, wrote that Jean Paul Fargue's review *Les Feuilles libres* was 'inaccessible to a foreigner', since it contained 'something exquisitely French that only the French can appreciate'.⁵⁴ Roger Fry admitted that the rhythmic effect of his translation of Mallarmé's *Hérodiade* had ended up 'inevitably

⁴⁸ T. S. Eliot, 'The Classics and the Man of Letters' (1942), in *Selected Prose*, ed. by John Hayward (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), pp. 223–39 (pp. 234–35).

⁴⁹ Eliot to Richard Aldington, 4 May 1923, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, II, 122.

⁵⁰ T. S. Eliot, 'The Unity of European Culture' (1946), in *Selected Prose*, ed. by Hayward, pp. 242–44 (p. 242).

⁵¹ Eliot comments in the *Criterion*: 'It is obvious that such an enterprise [the Five Reviews' Award] is sympathetic to a review like *The Criterion*, which has always tried to make known in England the best of foreign thought and literary art' (T. S. Eliot, 'Commentary', *Criterion*, 1 July 1929, p. 577).

⁵² Eliot, 'The Unity of European Culture', p. 242.

⁵³ Eliot to Rollo Myers, 5 November 1925, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, II, 779–80.

⁵⁴ F. S. Flint, 'Foreign Reviews', *Criterion*, 1 October 1927, p. 383.

different' from the original,⁵⁵ while Eliot himself questioned the various uses of the term 'classicism' on both sides of the Channel, thus illustrating Werner and Zimmermann's concept of transfer as transformation. Eliot wrote:

One of the points to be cleared up is this: whether the term 'classicism' can be used in England as it can be used in France; and whether, in either country, it can be applied strictly to literary or art criticism; or whether it has meaning only in relation to a view of life as a whole.⁵⁶

The concept of classicism deserves further critical attention, not only because it is fundamental to the *Criterion*, but also because it relates the *Criterion* to the *NRF*. Werner and Zimmermann argue that, 'while [comparative approaches and studies of transfer] mainly take the perspective of "re-establishment/rehabilitation" of buried reality, the stress laid by *histoire croisée* on a multiplicity of possible viewpoints and the divergences resulting from languages, terminologies, categorizations and conceptualizations, traditions, and disciplinary usages, adds another dimension to the inquiry'.⁵⁷ In other words, the toolbox of *histoire croisée* helps to draw attention to the different connotations of terms within their respective *aires culturelles*. This is, for example, illustrated by the *Criterion*'s and the *NRF*'s different uses of the notion of classicism. Indeed, Eliot seems to answer his own question when he writes that 'The weakness from which the classical movement in France has suffered is that it has been a critique rather than a creation.'⁵⁸ He further adds that 'A new classical age will be reached when the dogma, or ideology, of the critics is so modified by contact with creative writing and when the creative writers are so permeated by the new dogma, that a state of equilibrium is reached.'⁵⁹

While one can discern clear differences between the uses of classicism on both sides of the Channel,⁶⁰ it would be wrong to suggest that there is only one British and one French use of 'classicism'. In 1909 Henri Ghéon distinguished between two French concepts of classicism in his article 'Le Classicisme et M. Moréas'.⁶¹ Whereas Moréas's notion of classicism was associated with the ancient Greeks, Racine, and an art of imitation, a new classicism would take into account all of the international influences that French literature had undergone in recent years, thus illustrating Bourdieu's theory of the inevitable conflict between generations in the national field. However, there are also significant contemporary differences that call for a

⁵⁵ Roger Fry, 'Mallarmé's *Hérodiade*', *Criterion*, 1 January 1923, p. 119.

⁵⁶ Eliot, 'Commentary', *Criterion*, 1 September 1927, p. 194.

⁵⁷ Werner and Zimmermann, p. 32.

⁵⁸ T. S. Eliot, 'A Commentary', *Criterion*, 1 April 1924, p. 231.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

⁶⁰ According to William Marx, 'classicism' is embedded within a polemic history of revolution and counter-revolution in France, while an Anglo-Saxon tradition uses it to denote a specific strand in literary thinking, which has always marked (a part of) English literature (pp. 66–67).

⁶¹ Henri Ghéon, 'Le Classicisme et M. Moréas', *NRF*, 1 July 1909, pp. 492–503.

cross-national perspective. In his 1926 essay 'The Idea of a Literary Review', Eliot, for instance, cites Charles Maurras and Julien Benda in one breath as French representatives of the classicist movement.⁶² This is striking, not to say odd, given that Benda strongly opposed Maurras and his Action Française movement in *La Trahison des clercs*, published in 1927. Eliot explains his view in his essay 'The Idealism of Julien Benda':

M. Benda attacks Maurras and the 'neo-classicists', for instance, on the ground that their neo-classicism is itself a form of romanticism. I think he is right, though the charge does not seem to me to be nearly so deadly as he seems to suppose. What he does not see is that his own brand of classicism is just as romantic as anyone else's.⁶³

Histoire croisée 'places emphasis on what, in a self-reflexive process, can be generative of meaning', that is, rather than fixing the meaning of concepts beforehand, the method aims to highlight the various meanings concepts acquire within the transfer process.⁶⁴ Hence, David Goldie observes that while the *Criterion* did not originally refer to classicism to position itself within a literary discussion, it later became involved in a debate that pitted classicism (exemplified by the *Criterion*) against romanticism (represented by John Middleton Murry's *Adelphi*), thus recreating the polemic that characterized French cultural debate.⁶⁵ In his article 'Romanticism and the Tradition', published in the *Criterion*, Middleton Murry provocatively wrote: 'the tradition of Romanticism [. . .] in the present condition of the European consciousness is of more immediate importance to ourselves [than Classicism]'.⁶⁶ Moreover, a more nuanced vision gradually made its way from Britain to France. In 'De l'esprit classique', published in 1929 in the *NRF*, Ramon Fernandez argued: 'On ne cherche pas à savoir qui a raison du classique ou du romantique, ni si ces mots ont été correctement définis, mais comment on peut se débarrasser d'une antithèse dont tout le monde presse le caractère factice'.⁶⁷

If Eliot positioned himself as a classicist who believed in objective standards of excellence, Ford can be said to have adopted a romanticist viewpoint. In 'The Function of Criticism', Eliot writes that 'the difference [between both positions] seems to me rather the difference between the complete and the fragmentary, the adult and the immature, the orderly and the chaotic'.⁶⁸ While classicism believes in intellectual, moral, and aesthetic criteria that transcend the subjectivity of the individual, romanticism claims that knowledge is only

⁶² T. S. Eliot, 'The Idea of a Literary Review', *Criterion*, 1 January 1926, p. 5.

⁶³ T. S. Eliot, 'The Idealism of Julien Benda', in *The New Republic Anthology, 1915-1935*, ed. by Groff Conklin (New York: Dodge, 1936), pp. 293-300 (p. 299).

⁶⁴ Werner and Zimmermann, p. 32.

⁶⁵ Goldie, p. 97.

⁶⁶ John Middleton Murry, 'Romanticism and the Tradition', *Criterion*, 1 April 1924, p. 273.

⁶⁷ Ramon Fernandez, 'De l'esprit classique', *NRF*, 1 January 1929, p. 43.

⁶⁸ T. S. Eliot, 'The Function of Criticism', *Criterion*, 1 October 1923, p. 34.

possible via the personal, the subjective, and the experiential. According to this logic, Ford's *Transatlantic Review* is marked by romanticist notions: it offers a personal account of inter-war Europe by focusing on Anglo-French relations.⁶⁹ Unlike Ford, who advocates a mixture of English and French, Eliot wanted to exchange copies 'with the whole world in view, not merely one country or language by itself'.⁷⁰ It is clear that the framework of *histoire croisée* takes into account this large-scale European exchange not only by allowing for the interaction between more than two cultural contexts, but also by drawing attention to the different contexts in which terms and texts circulate.

The Local versus the Global: Ideologies of Cross-National Exchange

Because of its simultaneous publication in three countries and its inclusion of English and French, the *Transatlantic Review* had a clear international policy. In his final editorial, Ford states: 'We desired to promote greater cordiality in international relationships so that the arts might work in a better atmosphere and we desired to provide a place for publication for such sincere commencing authors as the world might hold.'⁷¹ While the *Transatlantic Review* may seem highly selective in its inclusion of foreign literature, focusing almost exclusively on Britain, France, and the United States, Ford regarded the bonds between England and France as vital for a better understanding between all nations. In his article 'From the Grey Stone', published in 1923 in the *Criterion*, he argued that 'It is only England and France that matter to our European civilisation of today'; without these countries 'there would be no more world—not any world of Thought and the Arts. Its backbone would be gone'.⁷²

However, the *Transatlantic Review's* internationalism was difficult to manage. In spite of Ford's intention to include equal portions of American, English, and French literature, he admits that it was 'physically impossible' to include an even number of contributions from all three countries.⁷³ In addition, the review was afflicted with complications in the production process. As Stella Bowen notes, 'Everything that could possibly go wrong with

⁶⁹ Max Saunders confirms this view when he writes that Ford's aesthetics was based on a 'deep subjectivism; a provocative refusal to accept the external authority of fact over the truth of individual impressions' (Max Saunders, 'Tradition and the March of Literature: T. S. Eliot and Ford Madox Ford', in *T. S. Eliot and the Concept of Tradition*, ed. by Giovanni Cianci and Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 185–200 (p. 191)).

⁷⁰ Eliot to Herbert Read, 9 April 1924, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, II, 365.

⁷¹ Ford Madox Ford, 'Editorial', *Transatlantic Review*, 1 December 1924, p. 684.

⁷² Ford Madox Ford, 'From the Grey Stone', *Criterion*, 1 October 1923, pp. 61–62.

⁷³ Ford Madox Ford, 'Chroniques', *Transatlantic Review*, 1 September 1924, p. 299. Bernard Poli interprets Ford's decision to include French 'as a symbolic badge of intellectualism or of arty dilettantism' and observes that Paul Valéry's 'Variations sur une pensée' was the *Transatlantic Review's* only major French contribution: *Ford Madox Ford and the 'Transatlantic Review'* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1967), p. 136.

regard to the printing, paper, packing, forwarding and distribution did go wrong.⁷⁴ With the three editions in Paris, London, and New York, binding and distribution problems were tripled, without Ford being able to intervene when things went awry. In the review's third Paris issue, Ford remarked: 'It is one of the penalties of Internationalism that we are condemned to go to press with Number III before Number II is actually in circulation in either the United States or England.'⁷⁵ Moreover, Ford had lost two of his closest friends in 1924, Joseph Conrad, on whose death the *Transatlantic Review* published a special supplement, and John Quinn, who had provided financial backing. The combination of these practical and personal issues put the review in a difficult predicament and led to its premature end in December 1924.

Although Ford claimed that the *Transatlantic Review* was 'the only organ in Anglo-Saxondom' that had the double function of enhancing cordial international relationships and promoting young or unknown authors, the magazine struggled to find an audience in the periodical landscape of the early twenties.⁷⁶ While Ford had wanted to educate his readers by including multiple languages (remember the Enlightenment ideal which had attracted him in the *Mercure de France* or his language policy of 'oh, go and learn it'), his plan clearly backfired. As Bernard Poli points out, French contributors considered the review 'a purely Anglo-Saxon affair'.⁷⁷ The English did not buy it because it contained too much French and the Americans found the review too European for their liking. Ernest Hemingway, who worked as an assistant editor for the *Transatlantic Review*, wrote to Ezra Pound that Ford was running his periodical 'as a compromise', while there were no advertisers or subscribers to please or to satisfy.⁷⁸ As a result, the *Transatlantic Review* connected to neither a local nor an international community. Moreover, 'The existence of the *Criterion*, which was for sale in France and the United States, as well as England, for twelve months before *The Transatlantic Review* appeared may well have rendered Ford's new venture that much more vulnerable', as argued by Nora Tomlinson.⁷⁹

Unlike the *Transatlantic Review*, the *Criterion* catered mainly for an English public, while still being international in scope. It was read in Britain—Harding notes a small distribution of 600 to 1000 copies—and had a 'tiny but influential circulation in Europe'.⁸⁰ Eliot's decision to target a small,

⁷⁴ Stella Bowen, *Drawn from Life* (London: Virago, 1984), p. 116.

⁷⁵ Ford Madox Ford, 'Communications', *Transatlantic Review*, 1 March 1924, p. 75.

⁷⁶ Ford Madox Ford, 'Editorial', *Transatlantic Review*, 1 December 1924, p. 684.

⁷⁷ Poli, p. 136.

⁷⁸ Jeffrey Meyers, *Hemingway: A Biography* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), p. 129.

⁷⁹ Nora Tomlinson, 'The Achievement of Ford Madox Ford as Editor' (unpublished doctoral thesis, The Open University, 1996), p. 169.

⁸⁰ Harding, pp. 10, 206.

national audience proved to be wise, both in terms of Bourdieu's theory of the field of restricted production and in terms of Bénédicte Zimmermann's discussion of what constitutes the global. The *Criterion* was not only able to gain what Bourdieu terms symbolic capital and therefore cultural hegemony in the British field before extending its readership to Europe, but its rootedness in an English context—in terms of both its production and its reception—combined with a sustained European network also made it a successful transnational periodical. Eliot recognized the interplay between a local and a global context and created a magazine that was international in outlook and scope, but national in terms of its audience. As Zimmermann points out, *histoire croisée* emphasizes the 'local anchoring of the global and the local', arguing that both are always produced together.⁸¹

In its aim to become a cosmopolitan review, the *Criterion* corresponded to its model magazine, the *NRF*. In the *NRF*'s first issue, Jean Schlumberger emphasized the importance of language and national identity in the creation of a cultural vision. He wrote: 'La langue [. . .] c'est la culture. Et si l'on y ajoute française, ce n'est point en un sens restrictif ni exclusiviste, mais seulement parce que notre responsabilité se borne à ce qui se passe chez nous.'⁸² Similarly, André Gide argued in his article 'Nationalisme et littérature' that it was impossible to imagine a literature separate from a language or a nation, as the categories of nationality, humanity, and individuality inevitably overlapped:

Quoi de plus national qu'Eschyle, Dante, Shakespeare, Molière, Goethe, Ibsen, Dostoïevski? Quoi de plus généralement humain? Et aussi de plus individuel? — Car il faudrait enfin comprendre que ces trois termes se superposent et qu'aucune œuvre d'art n'a de signification universelle qui n'a d'abord une signification nationale, n'a de signification nationale qui n'a d'abord une signification individuelle.⁸³

Werner and Zimmermann's notion of *histoire croisée* accounts for these statements in that it considers the interaction between multiple levels of analysis, in this case the individual, the national, and the international. Eliot explains with regard to the *Criterion*: 'it was the assumption that there existed an international fraternity of men of letters within Europe: a bond which did not replace, but was perfectly compatible with national loyalties, religious loyalties, and differences of political philosophy' that allowed for a new type of European magazine.⁸⁴

This 'fraternity of men of letters' was symbolized by a collaboration between various European periodicals. In 'The Unity of European Culture' (1946), Eliot observed that he had tried to 'establish relations with those literary

⁸¹ Zimmermann, 'Histoire croisée and the Making of Global History'.

⁸² Jean Schlumberger, 'Considérations', *NRF*, 1 February 1909, p. 10.

⁸³ André Gide, 'Nationalisme et Littérature — à propos d'une enquête de la *Phalange*', *NRF*, 1 June 1909, p. 430.

⁸⁴ T. S. Eliot, *Notes towards the Definition of Culture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1948), p. 118.

periodicals abroad, the aims of which corresponded most nearly to my own'.⁸⁵ Cosmopolitanism, however, did not imply that the *Criterion* had no regard for a national culture. As Jeroen Vanheste points out: '[Cosmopolitanism, in combination with classicism] acknowledged and cherished the differences between the various European cultures, at the same time believing there were shared elements at its basis.'⁸⁶ Eliot affirms:

One of the ideas which characterize our age may be called the European Idea. It is remarkable first because of the variety of its appearances; it may take the form of a meditation on the decay of European civilization by Paul Valéry, or of a philosophy of history such as that of Oswald Spengler, or it may appear allied with an intense nationalism as in the work of Henri Massis. It is remarkable second in that it is primarily an appeal to reason rather than an emotional summons to international brotherhood [. . .] It is a hopeful sign that a small number of intelligent persons are aware of the necessity to harmonize the interests, and therefore to harmonize first the ideas, of the civilized countries of Western Europe.⁸⁷

If Ford's vision of Anglo-French unity can be qualified as an 'emotional summons to international brotherhood', Eliot's idea of European 'unification in diversity' was founded on a shared legacy of classical values and a common Christian tradition.⁸⁸ In 'The Classics and the Man of Letters', he argued that 'a new unity can only grow on old roots: the Christian Faith and the Classical languages which Europeans inherit in common'.⁸⁹

In conclusion, Werner and Zimmermann discuss the interaction between various levels of analysis. They argue that 'Within a *histoire croisée* perspective, the transnational cannot simply be considered as a supplementary level of analysis to be added to the local, regional, and national levels according to a logic of a change in focus. On the contrary, it is apprehended as a level that exists in interaction with the others, producing its own logics with feedback effects upon other space-structuring logics.'⁹⁰ While Ford considers the world of thought and the arts as a supranational space 'where boundaries melt away and where spheres of delimitation are not', Eliot emphasizes the close relation between the local and the global, the national and the international.⁹¹ He

⁸⁵ Eliot, 'The Unity of European Culture', p. 243.

⁸⁶ Jeroen Vanheste, *Guardians of the Humanist Legacy: The Classicism of T. S. Eliot's 'Criterion' Network and its Relevance to Our Postmodern World* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), p. 196.

⁸⁷ T. S. Eliot, 'A Commentary', *Criterion*, 1 August 1927, pp. 97–98.

⁸⁸ Eliot, 'The Classics and the Man of Letters', p. 238.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 238–39. Eliot's emphasis on the Christian faith was a later addition to the *Criterion*. As M. R. Stevens points out, there were two distinct phases in Eliot's reliance on a neo-classicist model. In the first, Europe was held together by intellectual standards, in the latter by a spiritual glue. See M. R. Stevens, 'T. S. Eliot's Neo-Medievalism and the *Criterion* Years' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Dallas, 1999), pp. 24–25. The transition can be situated in 1927–28, when Eliot became a member of the Anglican Church and the *Criterion* began to publish an increasing number of essays and book reviews on religious and theological issues.

⁹⁰ Werner and Zimmermann, p. 43.

⁹¹ Ford Madox Ford, 'Chroniques', *Transatlantic Review*, 1 April 1924, p. 198.

argues not only that ‘there is a British idea of culture and British idea of civilization, both quite distinct from either French or German’, but also that it is precisely ‘the combination of local traditions and European roots that makes up the soul of a country’.⁹² This essay contends that, as well as drawing attention to the differences between Ford’s and Eliot’s projects, *histoire croisée* offers a potential explanation for the success of the *Criterion* in comparison with Ford’s *Transatlantic Review*. While Eliot’s periodical appealed to a British audience and was rooted in both a national and a European space, Ford’s supranational magazine failed to find a sustained local audience.

As this essay further demonstrates, *histoire croisée*, as an analytical toolbox, does not supplant Bourdieu’s model of the literary field, but adds a cross-national dimension to it. It discusses transfer in terms of transformation and focuses on processes of change when multiple contexts are interrelated. Combining Bourdieu’s theory with Werner and Zimmermann’s notion of *histoire croisée* reveals that the *Criterion* was able to gain symbolic capital from its internationality by its embeddedness in a local, national field, while the *Transatlantic Review* had no legitimating (national) authority for its symbolic capital and thus could not engage in a profitable, cross-national exchange. Of course, the competences of the editors had a role to play as well,⁹³ but the magazines’ divergent formats and conceptions are equally crucial. As Zimmerman argues, ‘By placing phenomena of interrelation and mutual influence, rejection and coproduction at the heart of the analysis, *histoire croisée* proposes a shift in perspective that leads to reformulating global history lines of inquiry and thereby its aims and methodology.’⁹⁴ The framework of *histoire croisée* ultimately leads to a more nuanced sense of the cosmopolitan spaces and criss-cross relations that characterize modernism as a global movement, rooted in multiple local and national contexts. As Eliot already argued in the *Transatlantic Review*, ‘The present age, a singularly stupid one, is the age of a mistaken nationalism and of an equally mistaken and artificial internationalism.’⁹⁵ Both need to be taken into account.

GHENT UNIVERSITY

BIRGIT VAN PUYMBROECK

⁹² T. S. Eliot, ‘A Commentary’, *Criterion*, 1 September 1927, p. 194; Vanheste, p. 196.

⁹³ Matthew Philpotts uses Bourdieu’s concept of habitus to distinguish between Ford’s and Eliot’s different styles of editing, in ‘The Role of the Periodical Editor: Literary Journals and Editorial Habitus’, *MLR*, 107 (2012), 39–64. Furthermore, Ford was a notoriously bad businessman.

⁹⁴ Zimmermann, ‘*Histoire croisée* and the Making of Global History’.

⁹⁵ T. S. Eliot, ‘Communications’, *Transatlantic Review*, 1 January 1924, p. 96.