

attendance were shaped by shifts as “exceptionalist” as those examined by Carole Shammass, Sarah Deutsch, and Elizabeth Clark-Lewis.

Barbara Ryan
National University of Singapore

Fostering Periodical Studies

TO THE EDITOR:

Regarding Sean Latham and Robert Scholes’s essay “The Rise of Periodical Studies” (121 [2006]: 517–31), I would like to note that the “minor press” (518) that published *American Periodicals* for twelve years was the University of North Texas Press; the journal’s stalwart editor was James T. F. Tanner; the president of its sponsoring organization, the Research Society for American Periodicals, at the time of the journal’s inception was Robert J. Scholnick; and the founder of the organization at whose convention the research society was created, the American Literature Association, is Alfred Bendixen.

Also warranting acknowledgment are those working at research libraries who have steadily and steadfastly acquired (and continue to acquire) the original—sometimes rare, even unique—magazines and newspapers in the first place. They make possible the digitizing Latham and Scholes mention—and have long made possible the scholarly pleasure of reading the actual artifact and thereby coming as close as possible to the experience of the periodical’s original readers.

Richard Kopley
Penn State University, Worthington Scranton

Reply:

Richard Kopley properly acknowledges the significant contributions of the scholars, editors, and researchers who built the intellectual institutions that have made possible “the rise of periodical studies.” As we note in our essay, *American Periodicals* (among other journals) is a vital part of this infrastructure, though its mission and its close association with the American Literature Association mean that its perspective is—quite rightly—limited to a particular sector of literary

studies. As our survey of digitizing projects makes clear, however, critical work on magazines now extends across national borders and intellectual disciplines, creating a space for new kinds of inquiry that significantly extend what was once considered a relatively narrow field of specialization.

This field is just now taking shape, largely because of the stunning changes in the reproduction and dissemination of archival materials made possible by digital technologies. It is only thanks to the efforts of rare book rooms and the librarians who staff them, however, that the fragile remnants of periodical culture survived into the digital age. What we call the “hole in the archive” (520) emerged primarily in general collections where magazines were stripped of advertising before being bound and assigned increasingly rare shelf space. This problem, by the way, was first reported by Ellen Gruber Garvey in 1999 (“What Happened to Ads in Turn-of-the-Century Bound Magazines, and Why” [*Serials Librarian* 37.1 (1999): 83–91]), though we learned of this only after our article was in print.

In many cases, the hole in the archive is visible only because rare book curators preserved intact issues of old magazines, allowing scholars to recognize the damage that had been done. Often, these surviving issues were part of private collections, such as the personal libraries and papers of writers, critics, and artists. Unfortunately, library catalogs almost never provide the information necessary to determine whether or not a number or a volume is genuinely complete, advertisements and all. Those involved in periodical studies should strongly encourage their libraries to undertake this urgent bibliographic task so that we can see how badly damaged our archives are, while gratefully acknowledging the diligent work of those who have fully preserved this crucial segment of print culture.

Sean Latham
University of Tulsa

Robert Scholes
Brown University

Shakespeare at Oxford?

TO THE EDITOR:

Is it not time now for more scholars of Renaissance literature to consider the possibility