

Graham Thompson, University of Nottingham

The Seriality Dividend of American Magazines

Modern printing. What does that mean to you? Do you see thousands of men and women preparing copy,—authors, editors, reporters? Do you see thousands of men and women setting type, and thousands more distributing it? Do you see thousands of people reading proof, correcting forms, making ready the presses day and night, week in and week out? Do you see an army of artists, photographers, engravers, and designers making pictures, ornaments, title-pages, covers, initials, type faces, borders, stamps, grounds, and dies? Do you see men cutting logs, gathering rags, transporting materials, running the great paper mills, casting type, making brass rule, grinding inks? Do you see the keen-eyed folk watching the marvelous machinery,—machinery that makes type and sets it, machinery that prints paper by the mile every hour of the twenty-four? Do you see the thousands of men running trains, driving teams, guiding steamboats and automobiles to distribute the enormous product?¹

Critics of nineteenth-century American magazines would probably have to answer “no” to all but the second of Henry Turner Bailey’s questions. Much more visible to us are the readers who consumed magazines, and whose collective desires were the new markets publishers created and serviced. The great digitization of magazines over the last 25 years has consolidated the significance of reading; it has turned critics into vicarious readers for whom facsimile pages help recreate the experiences of nineteenth-century pioneer readers. One result is a much deeper understanding of the cultural work magazine consumption performed; another is that we know much more about the social and cultural contexts and media histories of which readers and magazines were part.² This work is clearly important. But it does not amount to the history of magazines. For Bailey, periodicals must first be made. And the

rhythm of seriality that distinctively marks the appearance of dailies, weeklies, and monthlies is set by the operations of a print world working “day and night, week in and week out” and “every hour of the twenty-four,” with astounding results: “a newspaper, daily, for each family of four persons in the United States, a weekly periodical for each couple, and a monthly magazine for each individual.³” Bailey’s obvious wonderment suggests there is a bountiful story to tell about material creation and supply that began with rags and wood pulp in a paper mill and ended with the postal service, the bookseller, or the distribution agent. Neither the complexion of this pre-consumption history nor its significance are yet understood. What do we miss, then, when we ignore the capacious pre-consumption seriality of Bailey’s modern printing? The following is an initial, and necessarily compressed, attempt to enter Bailey’s world and offer suggestions for ways ahead.

I start with the idea that the pre-consumption cycle of material creation and supply exerted powerful effects as periodicals journeyed from paper mill to reader. So powerful were these effects that they generated what I call a seriality dividend, a return on financial and cultural investment whose impact went beyond the significance of individual or groups of periodical titles, or their content, and turned the periodical into a cultural form of such significance that it produced effects larger than the sum of its parts. Periodicals were both symptom and cause of a mass culture gradually gathering momentum during the nineteenth century. The sophisticated assembly and coordination of components required for their circulation made periodicals one of the engines driving cultural change. Collaboratively created by the actors Bailey imagines, serially and perpetually published, periodicals had the potential—if not on their own always the kinetic—energy to organize the various specialized elements of production that bequeathed mass culture to America. This is not to say that the seriality dividend was inherent to the periodical form; fundamentally, the dividend I discuss here resulted from mechanical and technological changes that altered the possibilities for

seriality and the effects seriality could generate. The United States only reached a point where these changes gathered sufficient momentum in and after the 1830s. Periodicals in general, then, became prosperous cultural forms in the nineteenth century because their serial production generated a capacity and scale that other forms, including books, could not match. The seriality dividend consolidated the periodical as a cultural form with structural significance.

My broader claim is that the seriality dividend affected many periodical sectors, but to consider the impact of seriality across all these genres is a task beyond the scope of an essay. Instead, I focus on literary periodicals and their relation to literary culture more generally to establish how attending to Bailey's world changes our understanding of this field of activity. My more specific contention is that the dividend from magazine seriality helped establish the infrastructure—the publication outlets, jobs, careers, connections, and networks—that allowed literary culture to develop in America's major geographical centers. The significant geographic pull of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago to nineteenth-century literary culture meant these cities became the kinds of core locations that Heather Haveman argues were increasingly central to magazines aimed at “universalistic,” or national and international, markets; magazines, that is, looking to expand their appeal and serve more consumers and for whom securing sufficient production capacity would become vital. These were the locations where one would expect the seriality dividend to exert its effects most powerfully.⁴

I use literary in a broad rather than narrow sense because many titles in this genre included fiction and poetry alongside non-fiction. Other genres—and political, religious, and social reform periodicals in particular—swelled the numbers of titles and copies in circulation in the nineteenth century. But after religious and general interest titles, literary periodicals were the most prevalent genre before the Civil War. They were also

disproportionately represented in the list of highest circulating magazines. In 1850, literary and miscellaneous titles accounted for one-sixth of all the newspapers and periodicals printed and outnumbered copies printed of religious titles by more than two to one.⁵ And the magazines at the heart of the 1890s advertising revolution described by Richard Ohmann—*Munsey's* and the *Ladies' Home Journal*, for example—were also predominantly literary in character. Fiction, poetry, and general literature remained the largest sector of the book market until well into the twentieth century and the high degree of cross-fertilization between literary magazines and books ensured an important reciprocal relationship between these distinct print mediums.⁶ The literary domain cannot tell us everything about nineteenth-century seriality, but examining this domain with an eye to material production can provide a case study for how others might assess the impact of seriality elsewhere—on political, religious, and reform organizations, for example—or, more generally, on the relationship between print form and cultural organization.

The seriality dividend helps tell a story of consolidation that runs slightly against the grain of those complex and unpredictable print developments the most important books about nineteenth-century print culture of the last fifteen years have helped us understand. Trish Loughran, for instance, has shown that local and regional reading publics proliferated during the nineteenth century; that the long haul to centralized literary production in the major publishing centers also saw what she describes as “simultaneous experiences of *disintegration* and national fragmentation,” whose material evidence often evades retrospective impulses to flatten and unify national development. In the first half of the century, Meredith McGill finds an “exuberant understanding of culture as iteration and not origination,” where reprinting dominated for perfectly sound business and cultural reasons and not because of “the misfirings of a system in a primitive stage of development.” According to Leon Jackson, the social disembedding of authorship rather than its professionalization in a unitary marketplace

was the most significant transformation in nineteenth-century authorial activity; the result was the persistence of many different authorial economies.⁷

As brilliant as they are wholly convincing, these studies remain relatively quiet about the relationship between the periods they examine (which end in 1870, 1853, and 1865 respectively) and what follows at the end of the nineteenth century; they focus more on the history at hand, and are conscious that history's participants did not know their futures. But one is left wondering quite how mass print culture emerged from such disintegration, fragmentation, and proliferation. If reprinting, for example, lost significance after the early 1850s, as McGill argues, did the centralizing and integrationist impulses that replaced it only emerge at that point? Were they not also stirring during the previous 20 years? Despite the complexities and nuances these studies discuss, consolidation ultimately proved a more powerful force than dispersal; diachronic convergence across the century eclipsed the commotion of synchronic experience. While other experiences may have been pervasive in the nineteenth century they did not prove to be as significant as the consolidation that, despite the differing fortunes of individual titles, meant by century's end the magazine could claim to be the first and most significant mass cultural form.

Analysis of seriality itself has largely concentrated on the writing and reading of literary narratives. And it features more prominently in discussions of British literature largely because serial publication dominated the writing careers of canonical and popular novelists.⁸ Linda Hughes and Michael Lund treat Victorian seriality primarily as a metaphorical or analogous form, whose structure represents to readers the shape of their nineteenth-century lives: a gradualist understanding of time; an endurance and patience required to sustain the Victorian home; a belief in personal and national growth whose results were rounded individuals and empire. In short, the serial was middle-class culture made manifest; it was a form "attuned to the assumptions of its readers."⁹ The problem with this

serial-as-analogy argument is that it is hard to imagine exactly how readers' assumptions made serialization pervasive; the capability to produce and distribute serially had first to be in place. Serialization did not follow readers' assumptions; serialized production created serial forms and readers. The nineteenth-century reader no more chose to consume the serial form because it matched their assumptions than we choose to consume television or the internet because they match ours; these forms antecede our assumptions. The serial is not an analogous form; it is a form that continues in print the seriality of its material production.

There are clear parallels with the British example where seriality appears in studies of nineteenth-century American literature. The emphasis remains on seriality's cultural consequences or the cultural conditions seriality manifests. Lund, for instance, has argued that at the heart of an "American effort to shape and exhibit a national character was the novel as a unique art form and the periodical as the place of its publication." For Patricia Okker, "the magazine novel ... encouraged readers to see themselves as part of a larger social community, one shared by other readers, editors, and writers."¹⁰ More recent treatments follow a similar pattern of aligning serial form with cultural effects. The repetition of the figure of the damaged female in serials by E. D. E. N. Southworth, Anne Stephens, and Laura Jean Libbey declares the psychic damage and incoherence of Reconstruction life, according to Dale Bauer; in plot resolutions that suggest a more coherent future, "readers find themselves living for the clue to that coherence, hoping that they will find it in the next installment." Christopher Looby reads George Lippard's *The Quaker City* as an instance where "part publication served as an expressive form"; what Lippard expressed was a belief that democratic possibility "absolutely requires that the future be unknown and undetermined" and that part publication fulfills this remit.¹¹ While emphasizing the significant cultural effects of writing and reading serially there is little sight of Bailey's world of print in any of these accounts.

This is surprising given the emphasis either side of the Atlantic on the material form of the nineteenth-century magazine. Magazine scholarship has fallen into what one might call the “was issued” syndrome, where the word “issued” condenses as it puts aside the practices and events so evocatively imagined by Bailey. To take a couple of examples at random, what exactly does “issued” require to happen when Patricia Okker tells us that Susanna Rowson’s *Sincerity* was “issued serially in the Boston Weekly Magazine in 1803–04”? Or when Haveman writes that “large publishing houses operating industrial presses issued many magazines with print runs in the tens of thousands”?¹² What exactly are the moving parts whose co-ordination allows “issued” to be used in the past tense? In a single paragraph where she defines serial publication, Laurel Brake iterates habitual phrases that similarly condense absent material activity. These phrases include: “were issued”; “were issued serially”; “were published”; “were distributed.” When Brake writes that the material elements of periodicals “have been disciplined and stripped out” so that the “‘timeless’ format of the volume text has been normalised,” she has in mind not the stripping out of Bailey’s material world of print but the magazine’s own wrappers, adverts, illustrations, and editorial matter.¹³ These observations are not meant as criticisms of the treatment of magazine materiality, but they do illustrate that materiality is often conceived in quite limited ways. Most criticism proceeds as if materiality begins only from the moment a magazine exists in its published format. But as well as being themselves material objects, magazines were also shadow forms; they were the imprint of a material realm to whose significance the word “issued” hardly does justice.

What “issued” involved was the succession of jobs and processes Bailey sets out. Each issue of a magazine required paper, type, ink, machinery, and transport in addition to content. The material realm that shaped how magazines were “issued” was changing rapidly by the 1830s. After the first paper-making machine was built in America in 1817, for example, others quickly spread through the Union from early pioneer factories—Joshua and

Thomas Gilpin in Delaware; Smith, Winchester in Connecticut—which adapted and improved cylinder and Fourdrinier designs to bring them up to the standards required to reliably and profitably produce paper in the quantities demanded by the new paper age. Over the course of 80 years after 1820, the number of paper mills increased fivefold to just over 1,100. The number of mills still making paper by hand declined year on year from the mid-1820s to under 25—less than five percent of the total number of mills—by the early 1850s.¹⁴ The effect on paper production was exponential. From just 3,000 tons per year in 1809, the amount of paper produced rose to over two billion tons by 1900 and four billion tons by 1909.¹⁵

In 1856, Samuel P. Taylor, who would later give his name to a California state park, installed the first paper-making machine west of the Mississippi with the help of proceeds from his gold prospecting success. He ordered the machine from Smith, Winchester. In the absence of a railway route, the Connecticut firm shipped it to him using the scenic route: “via ox-cart to New London, Connecticut; via sail-boat to the Isthmus of Panama; via donkey drawn skids across the Isthmus; via sail-boat to Yerba Buena (later called San Francisco), California; via donkey drawn skids to the pulp forests.”¹⁶ By the turn of the decade, Taylor’s Pioneer Mill was producing six tons of paper a week; its customers included the local *Daily Evening Bulletin*, the *Daily Alta California*, the *San Francisco Morning Call*, and the *California Farmer*. What this part of the Californian print industry “issued” only resulted from the impetus of a machine-driven seriality; the object readers held in their hands was the outcome of a much longer material process whose seriality put the *Daily* in the *Daily Evening Bulletin* and the *Daily Alta California*.

A cornucopia of other mechanical and technological inventions, improvements, and failures affected periodical publication. The nineteenth century saw transformations in each stage of the production process, from typesetting, printing, and ink making, to binding,

illustrating, and distribution. We do not have to idolize technology for its own sake, or see it as determining periodical output, to take its role in periodical culture more seriously. To do so might mean downgrading the emphasis on particular titles or individuals and to take what, in business terms, is a more vertical approach to the publishing industry. Samuel Taylor supplied paper for several different titles; printers worked for many different clients because many publishers, unlike Harper & Brothers, could not afford their own manufacturing facilities. Like writers, illustrators, and editors these ancillary trades worked for many different paymasters. If the emphasis in periodical scholarship has so far favored the aesthetic and cultural there is good reason to shift that emphasis to the economic and material.

Such a shift can help recalibrate existing research problems. Take the issue of periodicity itself that, as in the case of the *Daily Alta California*, is a quality often displayed in periodical titles. The repetition of publication cycles—daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly—can lead to a simultaneity of consumption that potentially helps establish social bonds and collective experiences; the competition of periodical time cycles against one another can also produce disturbingly asynchronous experiences, especially when periodicals proliferate as they did in the nineteenth century. Periodical publication also produces the gap, or pause, between issues. For Mark Turner, this is the space in which meaning resides: the “pause is when the interaction and communication occurs, and that period of waiting and reading is the link between the past and the future.”¹⁷ This argument takes on a different complexion when one looks at the period before consumption. In the cycle of production, no such gap or pause exists. The steam press printing the *Daily Alta California* would have been active when many of its next morning’s readers were fast asleep; so would the ships transporting the “steamer edition” of the paper to the Atlantic States, Europe, South America and the West Indies.¹⁸ While publication date was important, editors often planned and allocated material several weeks or months in advance and worked on different issues simultaneously. The pause,

break, or space was a significant nineteenth-century temporality for readers who recurrently consumed discrete print objects; for the characters Bailey imagines, the non-stop seriality of periodical production was significant because the businesses for which they labored were active round the clock.

Juxtaposing these two temporalities can help us consider not just the consequences of the pause for readers, which is Turner's emphasis, but also how the pause operates as a function of production. The pause in a serial's appearance provides the time needed for it to become a valuable object of exchange. After all, there are other ways to make and circulate the content that would appear in a periodical: illustrations, essays, stories, advertisements, editorials could all exist in freestanding form; they could be printed and distributed separately across the course of a week, or month, or quarter. Such a publication schedule would more analogously match the non-stop production process, but it would not achieve what periodical publication achieves: the tidy packaging and organization of material into an object that needs distributing and buying just once in each cycle. The pause allowed publishers one point of exchange rather than several, and its length varied in proportion to the perishability of a publication's contents and container. Daily newspapers used the cheapest inks and paper and became obsolete most quickly; the monthlies and the quarterlies spent most on paper, illustrations, and contributors and were most regularly bound in volume form for posterity. The pause draws our eye from the labor of production to the object of consumption; it is also a faultline whose artificiality allows the recuperation of that labor. This is not to downplay the cultural function of the periodical press but to stress that the cultural function is also an economic and technological function. By adding together the temporality of production and of consumption, then, we can see that periodicals played continuity and pause against one another in a complex polyrhythm.

The combination of economic, technological, and cultural functions helps explain why periodicals were more significant than books in the consolidation of nineteenth-century publishing. Scale was important. Besides their periodical output, Bailey estimates that each year modern printers produced “15,000 new books, averaging 150 pages each, in editions averaging 2,000 copies; a total of 4,500,000,000 pages of reading matter,—enough to give four books of 150 pages each to every man, woman, and child in the United States.”¹⁹ This is a conservative estimate. According to the Census of Manufactures, 161 million books and pamphlets were printed in 1909. At an average of 150 pages each, and treating all pamphlets as books, this would give a figure of 26 billion printed book pages. In comparison, however, the circulation of monthly magazines alone grew from 4 million at the end of the Civil War to 18 million in 1890, and 64 million in 1905.²⁰ Monthlies varied in length from a few dozen to 150 pages. An average of 75 printed pages per issue would mean 57 billion monthly magazine pages were printed in 1905. Add in dailies, weeklies, and quarterlies to these monthly figures and the number of printed periodical pages dwarfed the number of book pages. In 1909, printers turned out 11.7 billion copies of books, pamphlets, and periodicals. Of these, periodicals accounted for 98.6 percent.²¹

Periodicals also became more valuable than books to the printing and publishing industry. Of the total value of the industry by 1914, newspapers accounted for 35 percent, non-newspaper periodicals 17.5 percent, job printing 30 percent, and books and pamphlets just 10.7 percent. In 1860, books had contributed 30 percent.²² The great boon to newspaper and periodical value in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century came from advertising, a source of income books struggled to exploit. Newspaper revenue from advertising was nearly twice as much as sales revenue; for other periodicals, advertising had outstripped sales and subscription revenue by 1914.²³ The industry also remained remarkably concentrated. The eight states of the North Atlantic region consistently accounted for almost one-half of

newspaper and periodical value between 1880 and 1905. Although the proportion of all periodical titles published in this region fell from 30.9 to 22.8 percent during the same period, the region's contribution to the total industry value fell only by just over 1 percent while the proportion of the national wage bill and capital expenditure increased. The number of copies circulated per issue to each inhabitant remained twice the national average. And the circulation of periodicals in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, and Massachusetts fell from only 69.1 percent in 1880 to 64.2 percent in 1905 despite the greater area, rapidly increasing population, and immense increase in manufacturing activity in other states.²⁴

More pertinently to this essay's argument, periodicals also required a different publication and printing rhythm. Compare, for instance, the printing of a bestselling novel with a widely circulating monthly magazine. For the novel, once the type was set and stereotype plates produced, keeping up with demand could be challenging but was largely restricted to a few trades. As John Jewett wrote when advertising *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in 1852: "Three paper mills are constantly at work manufacturing the paper, and three power presses are working twenty-four hours per day, in printing it, and more than one hundred book-binders are incessantly plying their trade to bind them, and still it has been impossible, as yet, to supply the demand."²⁵ The novel sold 310,000 copies in its first year of publication. By 1852 the circulation of *Harper's New Monthly* had reached 100,000. Each issue of *Harper's* was shorter than *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, although its 144 pages of double-column, narrowly spaced type still contained approximately 135,000 words to the 180,000 words of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. In addition to the paper supply, printing capacity, and binding facilities required to supply the magazine, each month *Harper's* had to commission enough fresh content, set enough fresh type, and engrave enough fresh illustrations to produce four times more copies than Stowe's overstretched publisher managed in that first year. And while there

were no further printings of Stowe's novel until 1863, *Harper's* appeared month in and month out.²⁶

The organization, complexity, and speed involved in the publication of *Harper's* made the publication of a novel child's play in comparison. Successful magazines had to organize and integrate unprecedented levels of serial production. They were responsible for the organization and integration of supply chains of raw materials and manufacturing capacity; labor markets of industrial, artistic, and management labor; and systems of distribution and transport. The regular and perpetual nature of this coordination went beyond anything required for other literary forms. A delay of days, weeks, or even months did not necessarily matter to most novels; with magazines, the publication date was time-critical and the number of artifacts published for each issue only increased the pressure. The structures required to maintain this level of production needed to be secure and as friction free as possible. Large publishing firms could keep as many elements as possible in-house to reduce drag; smaller organizations relied on well-oiled networks of cooperation between the different stages of production. As the writer for the 1905 *Census of Manufactures* remarked, when considering the industries grouped together by the Census, one "often develops anew the fact that many industries are so closely related as to be interdependent. This is true of the printing and publishing and the paper and pulp industries."²⁷

As a result, it was periodical not book publishing that demanded and adopted new means with which to beat out print rhythms in the nineteenth century. Richard Hoe, the New York City print machine manufacturer, set his first revolving cylinder press to work at the Philadelphia *Ledger* offices in 1846. When Hoe turned his attention to perfecting a method for printing on both sides of a paper roll the first of his machines printed the New York *Tribune*. As well as producing faster machines—by the end of the century, Hoe's double sextuple press could produce 48,000 copies per hour of a cut and folded 24-page

newspaper—the industry also began providing machines better equipped for printing illustrations and color. In 1886 Hoe created a rotary press specifically for the *Century* magazine that delivered the fine print work required by Theodore Low De Vinne, the magazine’s fastidious and skilled printer. This development eventually led to Hoe’s Rotary Art Press, which the *Century* used for all its illustrations. As Hoe pointed out, the development of color printing gradually found its way into the weekly and monthly magazines. Where once it had been impossible to print half-tone illustrations on both sides of the sheet, “in the latest presses, such as used by *Collier’s Weekly*, the finest half-tone work is done on a perfecting press printing on a roll of paper.”²⁸ Book publishers, by contrast, largely stuck to slower Adams presses that printed sufficiently quickly for their less demanding needs and provided what they considered the quality standards valued in books.

One can see the distinctions between magazine and book printing priorities at Harper & Brothers, which produced both forms. In December 1865, Alfred Guernsey, editor of *Harper’s New Monthly*, explained why the firm stopped printing illustrations using lithographic and copperplate methods, which could only generate 300 copies per day: slowness “renders both of these methods unavailable where a large number are required within a short time, as in this Magazine. Of this present sheet 125,000 copies will probably be printed. To print a single page of the cuts, at the rate of 300 a day, would require a man and a press 417 days—that is, the working time of sixteen months. But there will be scattered through this Num-ber cuts which would fill at least sixteen pages. To print these separately would take a single press 256 months—twenty-one years and four months.”²⁹ Guernsey goes on to further detail the impossibility of this situation for a monthly magazine, but one gets the point. New technology is needed to keep up with the magazine’s circulation numbers. The solution was electrotyping.

And when it came to printing *Harper's Weekly*, the company's newest and fastest presses were reserved for that task. Harper's had 35 Adams presses, of which, according to Guernsey, "at least eight are always at work on the Magazine, and twice as many in certain parts of the month." But to get the weekly printed in two days, help was required from four rotary presses—three "working at once upon the same pages, triplicate casts being provided," while another was kept on standby in case of a breakdown or accident—and one Hoe Rotary Press, the fastest of the company's machines. According to Guernsey, "this press works 5000 sheet an hour; and as it is run without stopping from the moment it commences a Number, it prints the regular edition of one side of the Weekly in about twenty-four hours; the three cylinder presses being at the same time at work upon the other side."³⁰ It was because of their use of technology that the magazines "were the true life nerve of the enterprise" at Harper & Brothers, especially after the Civil War when the firm published new titles such as *Harper's Bazaar* and *Harper's Young People*.³¹

This snapshot of the Harper operation gives a sense of the close connection between periodical publishing and new print technology. There were also knock-on consequences for industries supplying printers and publishers. As Judith McGaw has shown, road and canal building allowed hinterland paper makers in Berkshire, Massachusetts, to take advantage of shorter and cheaper transportation times to New York City and so service the consolidation of the publishing industry through the nineteenth century. A mill building boom in Lee during the 1840s, for instance, resulted from demand for paper to print New York dailies and weeklies including the *Herald* and the *Tribune*. The products of the New York publishing industry then circulated to the paper makers in a feedback loop that reinforced the relationship between periodicals and new technology: "The expanded and increasingly specialized journalism that paid for investments in paper-making machines simultaneously supplied mill owner with information they needed when deciding to buy machines. ... From

New York came the *Scientific American*, with its regular descriptions of newly patented machines, and the *New York Journal of Commerce*, which specialized in Wall Street reports and merchants' activities. *The Bankers Magazine and State Financial Register*, published in the same city, offered news of special concern to bank note paper-making technology, such as dandy rolls for watermarking bank note paper."³² Demand for fine paper from the region continued, but it was periodicals that increasingly prompted and advertised innovation. Newspapers and periodicals consumed almost one-third of the entire output of US paper mills by 1905.³³

Book printing, on the other hand, remained dedicated to older methods. De Vinne wrote that "the stubborn refusal of American book-printers to use for fine bookwork any other form of press than the Adams was a great hindrance to the development of engraving on wood." Nor were De Vinne's motives financial. His quest was for the finest quality printing and illustrating he could achieve for his magazines. He castigated "old-fashioned book-printers" who had to be persuaded to give up printing on damp paper even though it hindered the better reproduction of engravings. And just as the Harper firm used its newest and fastest printing machine for its magazines, so Hoe's machine at the *Century* "prints that and nothing else, for its large regular editions keep it fully employed."³⁴ It was *Scribner's*—*Century's* predecessor—claimed De Vinne, that "pushed experiments to the extreme."³⁵

This evidence supports critics who have rightly concluded that periodical publishing became more significant than book publishing in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. For Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, "the most distinctive characteristic of American printing is the superior role of the periodical press, of newspapers and magazines, over books." So important were periodicals to publishers that "there was hardly a leading firm which could get along without magazines." Richard Ohmann argues that "book publishing was the last culture industry to attain modernity" and found itself crowded into "a smaller corner of

leisure time and of the market” as its “share of all manufacturing value declined from 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent.” And Carl Kaestle and Janice Radway open their volume on the history of the book in America by acknowledging that book production did not undergo the same transformation as periodical production because “books were not repeatable, periodical items, despite publishers’ attempts to market several books by the same author as a set or to group similar pieces of fiction in a series or ‘library.’”³⁶ Book publishers were forced to innovate, as they did with cheap paperbacks in the 1840s, but this was often a reaction to periodical developments. The paperbacks were a response to weeklies like *Brother Jonathan* and the *New World* printing fiction at a fraction of the cost of existing books. As the founder of *Scribner’s*, Josiah Gilbert Holland, wrote, the periodical “is the pioneer: the book will come later.”³⁷ Effecting faster, better quality, and more visual seriality was a key goal of nineteenth-century periodical publishing.

When thinking about the effects of seriality on American literary culture more generally, it is worth noting that in Bailey’s world of modern printing the book, and certainly the novel, plays a secondary role. Of the novel and its seriality, Bailey says nothing; instead he writes briefly about one well-made and one poorly made example of novel publication. In terms of cultural reputation, however, it is the nineteenth-century book, and most especially the novel, that reigns in literary histories of the century. Jared Gardner has written about the promise of early American magazines and the potential they offered for Americans to understand the world around them and what it meant to be an American in alternative ways. In his later work, for example, Charles Brockden Brown devoted himself, Gardner argues, to “defining the periodical as the space in which unstable texts, fragments, and anonymous diatribes can be made stable, ordered, and organized without the totalizing narratives and central consciousness of the conventional novel.”³⁸ By the 1820s, however, the magazine was beginning to lose the battle with the novel. The early magazines crafted alternative literary

models: they were anthologizing, miscellaneous forms, a kind of anarchy kept under control by the figure of the editor. Ultimately the tyrannous book and the novel, with its totalizing narratives and central consciousness, supplanted the chaos of magazines; novels rather than magazines became increasingly central to the literary marketplace and to the national imagination.

There is another way to see the development of magazine and novel. The novel may have won out in terms of prestige but what if it did so not because the magazine followed a separate line of development and accepted its lot as an inferior artistic product? What if instead the magazine moved in tandem with the novel, as Gardner argues it did in the eighteenth century, but dedicated itself to a different task: providing the infrastructure and capacity of a broader literary culture in whose ambit the novel's reputation could prosper? Or, to put it another way: What if the magazine triumphed over the novel? Not because its literary qualities were superior, nor because it was more valued, but because its serial format provided the material underpinning that allowed many other forms and institutions, including the novel, to flourish.

Rather than seeing the 1820s as a hiatus, then, we might see American magazines taking breath in the 1810s and 1820s. The effort of producing a serial literary culture was stymied not because the novel offered a better model than fragmented magazines. Clearly the miscellaneous quality of magazines lived on well into the nineteenth century in ways that make the odd juxtaposition of content seem erratic and incoherent to a contemporary reader. And the combination of fiction, poetry, essays, reviews, and editorials made magazines literary in the widest sense. What mattered more to the success or failure of the magazine in the early decades of the nineteenth century was the absence of the material means to sustain serial production and circulation; the literary culture that might take root because of this sustainable seriality was similarly deferred. When the material means necessary to sustain

seriality caught up in the 1830s and 1840s—with the arrival of machine-made paper, steam printing, a critical mass of skilled labor, railroads, and postal reform—the components were in place to fire up the magazine engine.

The magazine came into its own at this point. The bare figures suggest that magazines survived longer than ever before. Those founded between 1841 and 1860 were more than twice as likely to last over twenty-five years compared to those founded between 1801 and 1820.³⁹ The seriality of magazine consumption now continued the seriality of material production set in motion by the organization and integration of different stages delivering rags to readers in the form of the magazine object. The capacity and scale of periodical productions was transformative. Meredith McGill suggests structural changes—the integration of regional markets, innovative publishing practices, and a reliable network of railways and roads—helped put an end to the culture of reprinting in the 1850s. But in terms of book and magazine content, it was unlikely that a preponderance of reprinting over origination would be able to fill the space available. While Harper & Brothers still published more reprinted than original books during the 1850s in the field of general literature, the situation was reversed for non-fiction. The situation for fiction also changed as the century wore on. Weekly and monthly magazines were the most obvious and popular destinations for the new hands originating American writing of all stripes: essays, poetry, reviews, sketches, as well as fiction. Syndicated newspaper publishing after the Civil War innovatively and efficiently created new markets and rewards for fiction and established a beachhead for later mass-market publishing houses. Virtually every American writer of note in the second half of the nineteenth century—and many more now long forgotten—wrote for magazines.

Scale also generated the internal capacity in which communities of other artful creators such as engravers, illustrators, and designers could thrive. The visual appeal of a magazine helped distinguish it from competitors and for some magazines was as important as

literary content. No two copies of *Godey's Lady's Book* were the same because of the army of female colorists who hand-tinted the magazine's fashion plates. John Sartain, one of the leading mezzotinters of the period, started his own magazine in 1848, *Sartain's Union Magazine of Literature and Art*, to showcase the finest artwork.⁴⁰ Magazines like *Harper's Monthly* prided themselves on the quantity and quality of their illustrations. So much so that "an entire group of artists and engravers collected around the Harper publishing firm," working mainly for the many magazines.⁴¹ The availability of woodblock engraving talent allowed specialization in the art down to the level of individual illustrations: "Sometimes a single engraver executes an entire block," the magazine reported; "quite as often, in large establishments, several are engaged, each doing the part for which he has a special taste or aptitude. One, for instance, will engrave the faces and figures, another the strong fore-ground, and another the delicate back-ground."⁴² The transition from lithography, to wood, steel, and mezzotint engraving, to chromolithography and photography, provided work for succeeding generations and growing numbers of artists.

Most importantly of all, the seriality dividend generated a magazine momentum that was sustainable beyond individual producers and magazine titles. An infrastructure developed capable of meeting shorter deadlines and servicing more—and more distant—consumers. Producers and titles came and went but the impetus and capacity of seriality generated a critical mass on the production side capable of withstanding localized upheavals in the magazine industry, even during periods of wider economic downturn. The panic of 1857 saw the bankruptcy of George Palmer Putnam, who had already given up ownership of the flagship *Putnam's Monthly Magazine*; the magazine's new owners, Dix & Edwards, also went out of business that same year, as did other publishers such as John P. Jewett and Fowler and Wells. Disastrous for those involved, these failures did not slow the forward momentum of the magazine industry more generally. Magazines were bought and sold,

renamed and rebranded, and took on new lives under different hands. In 1870, *Scribner's Monthly* absorbed the second version of *Putnam's Monthly*, which had been revived in 1868, before becoming the *Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine* after a change of ownership in 1881. None of this upheaval affected the popularity of the magazine. By the end of the nineteenth century it was the form of the magazine rather than specific titles that reigned supreme.

One consequence was that the magazine provided a breeding ground for whole new literary forms. Writers invented the short story in the multiplying pages of magazines. The inheritors of Washington Irving, including Catherine Maria Sedgwick, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Edgar Allan Poe, all reworked sketch and tale traditions in their magazine writing in the 1830s and 1840s; Herman Melville followed in the 1850s; later, the realism of Rebecca Harding Davis, the local color writing of Rose Terry Cooke and Sarah Orne Jewett, and work by Mark Twain, Charles Chesnutt, and Stephen Crane all appeared first in national and regional magazines. This was as true in Britain, France, and Russia as it was in the United States. From George Eliot to Joseph Conrad, Guy de Maupassant to Emile Zola, Leo Tolstoy to Anton Chekhov, the short story established its formal and contextual features and idiosyncrasies in the space created by serial magazine publication. If Poe was the first critic of short-form writing in his essays on the “single effect” in the “tale proper” for *Graham's Magazine* and *Godey's*, in the *London Saturday Review* of 1884, Brander Matthews first expounded what he developed the following year in an article for *Lippincott's Magazine*: “The Philosophy of the Short-Story.”⁴³ More than any other literary genre, the short story is a magazine form. Unlike the novel that goes alone into the world, or the poem with an oral tradition that long predates the magazine, or the play that comes to life on stage, the short story is a form that cannot circulate alone; a cuckoo genre, it was born, raised, and grew to maturity in the nineteenth-century magazine nest.

Even the novel relied on the magazine in various ways. *Harper's New Monthly* was not alone in promoting its own books, either through advertisements or reviews in its "Literary Notices" section. Large publishing houses with book and magazine stables used the magazine's reach to generate sales for novels. While novels could not champion their form except through example, nowhere was the novel promoted more vigorously than in the magazine. The nineteenth century may have invented the idea of literary genius and the celebrity author, in part to invest the authors themselves with a different kind of seriality dividend, but none of this would have been possible without the fundamentally much more flexible and generative qualities of the magazine. Reviews and essays on novels and novelists made, cemented, and diminished the reputations of works and their writers. For some writers, Charles Fredrick Briggs or George William Curtis for example, editing magazines offered a way to extend a literary career when their own work no longer sold. In this situation, and when authors were writing and editing at the same time—William Dean Howells or James Russell Lowell, for instance—magazines were the active gatekeepers of taste, quality, and prestige. It is no coincidence that John William De Forest delivered the "Great American Novel" to posterity in the pages of *Nation* magazine.⁴⁴

Seriality also acted as a guarantor of futurity for magazines, and any form that has pretensions to significance in a literary culture needs first to secure its future. It may grow from traditions but it must also leave a legacy and have influence; it must become its own tradition. Magazines achieved this in ways that supplemented existing modes of literary seriality. All novels, of course, can be considered serials in the sense that they present language in a sequence, rely on narrative form, and respond intertextually to earlier writing; some even resuscitate characters or locations for the sake of continuity and connection. Such effects make seriality a literary conversation that takes place across or above the level of individual texts. Magazines also undertake this kind of novelistic seriality, in part because it

is inherent to representative and literary language. Yet where novels relish their own boundedness—most evidently in their unique titles and the importance of volume publication—magazines relish their own repetition with recurring titles, with common sections across issues, and by serializing with strict adherence to time. Novels may repeat themselves through genre, but this is a repetition at the level of literary content rather than at the level of the container carrying that content. A magazine serial has a next issue at some predictable point in the future. When magazines failed and disappeared there were always other magazines to sustain the serial effect; structures existed to ensure print objects would appear the next day, week, or month. Achieving timely publication was the goal to which material production was coordinated. Publishers tried to imitate the repetitive qualities of magazine seriality with the common format of cheap paperbacks, or with publishers' series. But the words "to be continued" spell out the magazine's not the novel's genetic code.

The timely seriality one finds with the magazine can only occur when the container is separated from the hands of a single author. The novel has proved an incredibly flexible form, but no novelist can write a new novel each week or each month. The generation of magazine content therefore relied on the extension of contact networks. Literary magazines published blind submissions, but they commissioned much more of their weekly or monthly content from large numbers of contributors. The beauty of these content-generating social networks was that as new writers published in a magazine so the network automatically added a new node and broadened its membership. Perry Miller's *The Raven and the Whale* began charting the machinations of these talent-pool networks as long ago as the 1950s, if not quite in the language of the network we use today. In the United States these networks were often regional and clustered in the important publishing cities: New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and later Chicago. Only recently have critics begun to take up the significance of networks to the development of literary culture in America. But so far authors tend to

dominate our understanding of networks and there is still much more work needed to bring into this discussion the material networks of production.⁴⁵ The seriality dividend of the magazine outperformed other cultural forms in establishing, maintaining, and extending the vital infrastructural networks of American literary culture through the nineteenth century. It is difficult to conceive of transcendentalists without *The Dial*; Young America without the *Literary World*; women writers of the 1850s without the *New York Ledger*; or post-Civil War realism without the *Atlantic Monthly*. It was in the magazine that editors, agents, publishers, reviewers, thinkers, manufacturers and distributors came together with writers to give words and ideas material form and to literally make American literature.

Addressing the pre-consumption journey of magazines helps us tell new stories about the significance of different stages in the process of magazine production: how the raw materials were made and supplied; how manufacturers used machines and technology; who labored at those machines and who else labored in the service of magazine seriality; how systems of distribution and transport improved, failed, or interacted with producers and consumers. We can isolate these stages but also bring them into juxtaposition and help assess the degree to which stages were integrated over the course of the nineteenth century, how specialized trades and professions emerged or disappeared, how imaginative artists produced content within this framework, and how these processes changed over time. Prioritizing the collaborative nature of serial magazine production also brings into visibility often neglected figures—paper makers, engravers, engineers, and editors—who contributed to the material production of magazines.

Emphasizing collaboration and material creation does not mean giving up on writers or the literature they produced, though it may require different approaches to both. One trade among the many trades required to deliver magazines to the hands of readers, writers were nevertheless key producers whose experiences can illuminate literary culture if we let them.

However, the understandable dismantling of myths of authorship and the decentering of authorial agency have too readily detached writers from the material practicalities of the writing life and left us with relatively limited tools for discussing literary activity and creativity in the collaborative magazine world. Reconnecting writers to the sequence of material creation in which they were once embedded can help make up this deficit.⁴⁶ By taking what I call a writer's-eye view of magazine publishing we can begin to ask: What did it mean to be a magazine writer in the nineteenth century? How did writers understand, anticipate, and adjust to the magazine form? How did they see their role in relation to the other elements of magazine making? Under what circumstances did editors judge writers' work? In short, and in line with the thrust of this essay, what is the ante-consumption history of magazine writing?

The evidence to answer these questions will sometimes lie beyond the literature writers produced; at other times the literature will itself be the evidence. Whether the right hermeneutic tools are available to assess such literary evidence is moot. This essay shares a dissatisfaction with well-established and sophisticated methods of cultural, historical, or ideological interpretation that has become evident during the last 20 years.⁴⁷ If we have entered a hermeneutic endgame then hermeneutics has only itself to blame for proliferating ever increasing degrees of complexity and abstraction in its arsenal of critical weapons. When hermeneutics has become the default position, or criticism's common sense, then it has outlived its useful purpose. Prioritizing production rather than consumption, the makers of magazines rather than their readers, is in part a provocation to interpretation's methods. And yet asking how literature is made is in some way always to ask what literature means. Embedding writers in the material creation of the magazines central to the development of literary culture in the nineteenth century need not be a confinement; any convincing critical approach should remain open to the aesthetic surprises writing adds to that literary culture. If

literature is the evidence of its own making then literary interpretation of some kind is still necessary to understand a literary culture that was never just “there.”

By recognizing the part magazines played in creating this literary culture we can ask questions that potentially rewrite existing narratives about the nineteenth-century. How different is the history of American literature if the main protagonist is the magazine rather than the nation, the novel, or the author? What was the significance of non-fiction? What happens to the chronology of American literature? Who become the most significant writers? And what new stories are there to tell about literary life? It is difficult to imagine a world where people argue over whether *Putnam's Monthly* was a better or more important magazine than the *Atlantic Monthly*, the way they might over the relative merits of particular work or writers. In part this is because we can better measure the significance of magazines by their collective rather than their individual impact. Individual magazines were important to particular literary groups and circles, but the seriality dividend of the magazine form generated sufficient capacity, innovation, debate, visibility, and circulation to sustain the passing of these groups and titles; magazines ensured that literary culture always had somewhere next to go. If the novel acquired the greatest literary prestige in the nineteenth century, it was the ornament on a building with deep foundations. To the consolidation of literary culture in the nineteenth century, the magazine was economically, materially, and serially central.

¹ Henry Turner Bailey, “An Analysis of Modern Printing,” *The Printing Art* 9 (1907): 153.

² For some recent examples, see Jennifer Phegley, *Educating the Proper Woman Reader: Victorian Family Literary Magazines and the Cultural Health of the Nation* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2004); Mark J. Noonan, *Reading the Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine: American Literature and Culture, 1870-1893* (Kent: Kent State

University Press, 2010); and Cynthia Lee Patterson, *Art for the Middle Classes: America's Illustrated Magazines of the 1840s* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010).

³ Bailey, "An Analysis of Modern Printing," 153.

⁴ Heather Haveman, *Magazines and the Making of America: Modernization, Community, and Print Culture, 1741-1860* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 71–74.

⁵ Haveman, *Magazines and the Making of America*, 45, 30. Literary magazines accounted for less than one tenth of magazine titles in 1860, but at least 3 of the 14 magazines with circulations over 100,000 contained substantial literary content. *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850* (Washington: Robert Armstrong, 1853), lxv.

⁶ General literature, essays, poetry, drama, and fiction accounted for 24.5% of new book titles and editions in 1880; 32.2% in 1890; 34.9% in 1900; and 32.2% in 1910. See Michael Winship, "The Rise of a National Book Trade System in the United States," in *A History of the Book in America, Volume 4— Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880–1940*, ed. Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A. Radway (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 60–61.

⁷ Trish Loughran, *The Republic of Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770–1870* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 3; Meredith McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 4; Leon Jackson, *The Business of Letters: Authorial Economies in Antebellum America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008).

⁸ In addition to dozens of articles on seriality in *Victorian Periodicals Review*, see John Sutherland, *Victorian Novelists and Publishers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976); Carol A. Martin, *George Eliot's Serial Fiction*, (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1994); Graham Law, *Serializing Fiction in the Victorian Press* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000); David Payne, *The Reenchantment of Nineteenth-Century Fiction:*

Dickens, Thackeray, George Eliot, and Serialization (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Catherine Delafield, *Serialization and the Novel in Mid-Victorian Magazines* (London: Routledge, 2015).

⁹ Linda K. Hughes and Michael Lund, *The Victorian Serial* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1991), 4.

¹⁰ Michael Lund, *America's Continuing Story: An Introduction to Serial Fiction, 1850-1900* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 107; Patricia Okker, *Social Stories: The Magazine Novel in Nineteenth-Century America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003), 160.

¹¹ Dale M. Bauer, "Serial Women Writers and Racial Intimacy," *Arizona Quarterly* 72.1 (2016): 21; Christopher Looby, "Lippard in Part(s): Seriality and Secrecy in *The Quaker City*," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 70.1 (2015): 34.

¹² Okker, *Social Stories*, 32–33; Haveman, *Magazines and the Making of America*, 108.

¹³ Laurel Brake, *Print in Transition, 1850-1910* (London: Palgrave, 2001), 30, 27–28.

¹⁴ A. J. Valente, *Rag Paper Manufacture in the United States, 1801–1900: A History, with Directories of Mills and Owners* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2010), 11, 40.

¹⁵ United States Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial times to 1970 Volume 1* (Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1975), 545.

¹⁶ R. H. Clapperton, *The Paper-making Machine: Its Invention, Evolution and Development* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967), 349.

¹⁷ Mark W. Turner, "Periodical Time in the Nineteenth Century," *Media History* 8 (2002): 194.

¹⁸ Originally a weekly, the *Alta* became a daily newspaper in 1850.

¹⁹ Bailey, "An Analysis of Modern Printing," 158.

-
- ²⁰ *Census of Manufactures, 1914, Volume II: Reports for Selected Industries and Detail Statistics for Industries, by States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), 644; *Census of Manufactures, 1905: Printing and Publishing* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907), 46.
- ²¹ *Census of Manufactures, 1914*, 644, 648.
- ²² *Census of Manufactures, 1914*, 644, 648; *Preliminary Report of the Eighth Census, 1860* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1862), 174
- ²³ *Census of Manufactures, 1914*, 640–41.
- ²⁴ *Census of Manufactures, 1905*, 30, 42.
- ²⁵ *Norton's Literary Gazette* 2 (1852): 73.
- ²⁶ Claire Parfait, *The Publishing History of Uncle Tom's Cabin, 1852–2002* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 212–215.
- ²⁷ *Census of Manufactures, 1905*, 31.
- ²⁸ Robert Hoe, *Short History of The Printing Press* (New York: Robert Hoe, 1902), 31, 47, 72, 88.
- ²⁹ “Making the Magazine,” *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 32 (December 1865): 10.
- ³⁰ “Making the Magazine,” 23, 25.
- ³¹ Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, *The Book in America: A History of the Making and Selling of Books in the United States* (New York: Bowker, 1951), 218.
- ³² Judith A. McGaw, *Most Wonderful Machine: Mechanization and Social Change in Berkshire Paper Making, 1801–1885* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 125.
- ³³ *Census of Manufactures, 1905*, 31-2.
- ³⁴ Theodore L. De Vinne, “The Printing of ‘The Century,’” *Century Magazine* 41 (November 1890): 93.
- ³⁵ Theodore L. De Vinne, “The Growth of Wood-Cut Printing. II,” *Scribner's* 20 (1880): 39.

³⁶ Lehmann-Haupt, *The Book in America*, 154, 214; Ohmann, *Selling Culture*, 22; Kaestle and Radway, *A History of the Book in America*, 11.

³⁷ “Topics of the Time,” *Scribner’s* 5 (1873): 636.

³⁸ Jared Gardner, *The Rise and Fall of Early American Magazine Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2012), 21–22.

³⁹ Haveman, *The Making of American Magazines*, 29. 314 of 2,985 magazines founded between 1841 and 1860, or 10.5%, lasted more than twenty-five years; in the earlier period, the figure was 21 of 491, or 4.3%.

⁴⁰ For more on the “Philadelphia pictorials,” which included *Godey’s* and *Sartain’s* as well as *Graham’s Lady’s and Gentleman’s Magazine*, *Peterson’s Magazine*, and *Miss Leslie’s Magazine*, see Patterson, *Art for the Middle Classes*.

⁴¹ Lehmann-Haupt, *The Book in America*, 307.

⁴² “Making the Magazine,” 11.

⁴³ Poe published a two-part review of Hawthorne’s *Twice-Told Tales*. See *Graham’s Magazine*, April 1842, 254; May 1842, 298-300. He then updated and supplemented this review when Hawthorne published *Mosses from an Old Manse* in 1846. See *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, November 1847, 252-256. The reviews were all published anonymously. Brander Matthews, “The Philosophy of the Short-Story,” *Lippincott’s Magazine of Popular Literature and Science*, October 1885, 366–74.

⁴⁴ John DeForest, “The Great American Novel,” *The Nation*, January 9, 1868, 27–29.

⁴⁵ Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale: The War of Words and Wits in the Era of Poe* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1956). See also David Dowling, *The Business of Literary Circles in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011) and Eliza Richards, *Gender and the Poetics of Reception in Poe’s Circle* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002). For a summary of transatlantic treatments of the connection between

periodicals and networks see, John Fagg, Matthew Pethers, and Robin Vandome,

“Introduction: Networks and the Nineteenth-Century Periodical,” *American Periodicals* 23 (2013): 93-104.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of “embedded authorship” and how this works in practice see Graham Thompson, *Herman Melville: Among the Magazines* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2018).

⁴⁷ Important landmarks include Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, “Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, You’re So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction is About You,” in Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (ed.), *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 1–37; Isobel Armstrong, *Radical Aesthetic* (Malden: Blackwell, 2000); Bruno Latour, “Why has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern,” *Critical Enquiry* 30.2 (2004): 225–248; Stephen Best and Sharon Marcus, “Surface Reading: An Introduction,” *Representations* 108.1 (2009): 1–21; Graham Harman, “The Well-Wrought Broken Hammer: Object-Oriented Literary Criticism,” *New Literary History* 43.2 (2012): 183–203; and Rita Felski, *The Limits of Critique* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2015).