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Editors’ Recollections

John McClelland
Victoria College, University of Toronto
Editor, 1969–1970

In the Faculty of Arts departments of the University of Toronto in the 1950s and 1960s, medievalism—an invention of the nineteenth-century romantic movement—held pride of place. Several dynamic faculty members (chief among them Bertie Wilkinson in History and John Leyerle in English) made the subject seem interesting to large numbers of students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, to the point that the Centre for Medieval Studies (CMS) could be created in 1963 out of previous informal groupings. By that time the study of the European Middle Ages had become an internationally recognized discipline, supported by learned journals (Romania and Speculum, for example) and by scholarly societies, some of which had existed for over a century (MGH, Early English Text Society, Société des anciens textes français, Medieval Academy of America, etc.).

Renaissance studies, in the sense of a discipline that crossed cultural boundaries, had no such solid footing in Toronto. The term “Renaissance” did have some currency in Art History, owing perhaps to the prestigious work of the Warburg Institute, but there it jostled with other labels such as “Mannerism” and “Baroque.” Much the same was true of Music which, as a discipline, could not decide when the Middle Ages really ended and when the Baroque really began; what was between the two was necessarily “Renaissance” (this situation was clarified by Rika Maniates, appointed to the Faculty of Music in 1965). History and the literary disciplines tended to shape their studies according to the geographical and linguistic frontiers of the nation states and resorted to labels such as Tudor or Elizabethan, the “siglo de oro,” “le seizième siècle”—or simply, like German and Philosophy, ignored the Renaissance entirely. It was only in Italian studies that the term “Renaissance/Rinascimento” had any real referential meaning. There was an almost complete lack of professional associations—the Renaissance Society of America was founded only in 1954—and the only interdisciplinary journals were the rather slim Renaissance News with, later, its companion annual

1. See pp. 53–67 for the recollections of the founding editors, Natalie Zemon Davis and James K. McConica, together with those of Germaine Warkentin.
volume, Studies in the Renaissance, and in Europe [Bibliothèque d’] Humanisme et Renaissance. Although two rival French series, Société des textes français modernes and Textes littéraires français, did chiefly publish modern editions of French works that originally appeared between 1500 and 1600, they did not limit themselves to that period.

The impulse for there to be Renaissance studies at all came from two separate but parallel sources: Paul Oskar Kristeller’s work on Ficino and Wallace K. Ferguson’s work on Erasmus, two key figures who did not fit into the nationalistic frameworks that had determined the shape of early modern studies. For Renaissance studies in Canada, it is Ferguson in particular to whom a large initial debt is owed. A graduate of the University of Western Ontario (now Western University), his The Renaissance in Historical Thought (1948) was a decisive text in actually creating the field. In the mid-1950s he was persuaded to return to his alma mater to chair the Department of History, and began to hold informal evenings at his home where one or another of the university’s younger scholars would give a presentation on some Renaissance topic. Owing to Ferguson’s prestige, intellect, energy, and congenial personality, these evenings turned into the creation of the North-Central Conference of the Renaissance Society of America (NCC-RSA) which first met at Western in 1961 and moved around various venues on an annual basis for some years thereafter (this annual conference would later become one of the sponsors of R&R).

Later events at the University of Toronto furthered this development. In 1961 Victor Graham was appointed to University College—the first time the Department of French entrusted sixteenth-century literature to a genuine publishing scholar with an international reputation (junior scholars, but at least professional seiziémites, Ted Rathé and Pierre Spriet, had begun teaching Rabelais and Montaigne at Vic around the same time); in 1962 Victoria College and the Department of History brought Jim Estes here to teach the parallel field of Reformation studies; and the year after that Jim McConica came to Toronto from Oxford and Natalie Zemon Davis joined Estes in History, a department that also added Paul Grendler in 1964. During the same years David Hoeniger had discovered the unexploited Bell Erasmus Collection in the Victoria College Library and convinced the College administration that it could form the nucleus of a research institute that came into being in 1964 as the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies (CRRS). And, largely the result of McConica’s and Davis’s indefatigable energy, the Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium
(TRRC) began to take shape as a series of informal lunches and occasional dinner meetings at the Faculty Club, followed by a paper and discussion. Taken together, these events and persons contributed to the creation of a critical mass that made Renaissance Studies in Toronto an almost inevitable addition to the university’s graduate curriculum—“almost,” because the University of Toronto administration never did become persuaded that a Centre for Renaissance Studies, exactly equivalent to the CMS, ought to come into existence, though it did have an embryonic life in 1972 under the acting directorship of Stillman Drake. (Drake had come to the University of Toronto in 1967 as director of the newly-created Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology; when the Institute was later relocated to Victoria College, that cemented Vic’s role as the *locus amoenus* for early modern studies, just as medieval studies had become identified with neighbouring St. Michael’s College.)

So there was no “CRS” dispensing graduate courses and PhDs, but there was the CRRS to facilitate research and the TRRC where the results of that research might be presented at least orally. And, most significantly, the first issue of *R&E*R (not yet bilingual) appeared in October 1964. At first simply a four-page mimeographed (does anyone still remember mimeography?) news bulletin listing items of interest to the Renaissance studies community, *R&E*R quickly developed into a research tool. Davis and other faculty members regularly published information revealing the not inconsiderable holdings in various early modern fields lying largely dormant and undisturbed in local libraries both within and without the University of Toronto.

By the late 1960s Renaissance studies had become an established concern within the University of Toronto. Quite a number of young scholars—most of them eager to publish—had been appointed to the university, and Victoria College’s CRRS had become the focal point for early modern research and communication. By 1969, Hoeniger, who had relinquished the directorship of the CRRS to Harry Secor and had moved on to be head of English at Victoria College, realized the advantage to all interested parties and entities of there being a journal with more obvious *gravitas*. In the spring of 1969 he invited Jim Estes and me to oversee the transformation of *R&E*R into a properly printed scholarly publication. Other commitments prevented us from assuming this task for more than a few months and a couple of issues (6.1–2), but we did succeed in having production of the journal undertaken by the University of Toronto Press, with the result that *R&E*R assumed a more solid, serious
appearance that began to encourage subscriptions from libraries across the continent and in Europe.

The two numbers under Estes’s and my editorship and in the new format continued the bibliographical focus of the previous volumes; under the new editors, Julius Molinaro and Rika Maniates—founding editors of the journal in its new form—the journal acquired the look it would have for many years thereafter and entered full adulthood. *R&R* 6.3 (1970) eschewed bibliography and contained instead three analytical articles by scholars of note: Stillman Drake, R. J. Schoeck, and none other than Marshall McLuhan. The next volume (7.1) contained a second article by McLuhan as well as a piece by a much younger scholar and added for the first time a lengthy series of book reviews. *R&R* stood now on the same ground as its more illustrious peers and was ready to move forward to become the journal it is today.

*R&R*’s growing international reputation was owing in large part to the increasing scholarly prestige of the CRRS, which had assumed the major sponsorship of the journal by subsidizing it financially with a yearly contribution of $800. There were also seemingly extraneous factors that abetted the journal’s and the Centre’s foreign recognition. Events in Europe in 1968 opened previously close-minded English and Continental universities to the style and high quality of North American humanistic research; and the introduction of wide-bodied jets in 1970 made trans-Atlantic travel both faster and cheaper. It became both possible and fashionable for European professors to visit North American universities and attend North American conferences. *R&R* and the CRRS certainly benefitted from the increased exposure that resulted, and by 1972 the journal had expanded its sights beyond Toronto and southern Ontario. Articles by both US and European scholars began to appear in *R&R* (albeit initially papers delivered at regional conferences) and by 1974 non-Canadian academics of established reputation were choosing the journal as a reputable place to publish original, highly erudite articles.

One more significant development needs to be noted. The final step in the process necessary to institutionalize Renaissance studies in Canada was the creation of a learned society. Organizing meetings initiated by Hoeniger and Eva Kushner led to the creation of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d’études de la Renaissance (CSRS/SCÉR) in 1976, a full-fledged member of the umbrella group, the Learned Societies of Canada / les Sociétés Savantes du Canada. CSRS/SCÉR adopted *R&R* as its journal, making
it into a bilingual vehicle for the publication of Renaissance scholarship. Vol. 13, no. 1 of Renaissance and Reformation (1977) thus became vol. 1, new series / nouvelle série of Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme. With the institutional underpinning provided by the new official Society, R&R achieved the full international status it has continued to enjoy.
I was asked to be the editor of R&R by David Hoeniger, an active member of Victoria College’s Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies (CRRS) and of the English Department. I served as editor from 1970 to 1976. My primary concern was to improve the design of the journal if possible, and for this reason I turned to the University of Toronto Press for advice. UTP became our official printer and suggested a design we considered appropriate. It was not very different from the journal’s previous format, but it represented a change—we hoped for the better. I was now fully occupied with producing our first issue. Our task was to attract the work of well-known scholars and their followers, anxious as we were to add to the list of subscribers. To produce three issues a year proved to be a full-time job.

It was not long before an opportunity presented itself that requires some background information. In 1948, at a special dinner meeting at the American Consulate in Toronto marking the appointment of a new consul general, my wife and I met Marshall McLuhan and his wife, Corinne. The dinner conversation was taken over, as it usually was, by Marshall (all his friends called him by his first name—it also sounded like a surname) who gave a lecture on advertising on Li’l Abner, a very popular comic strip at the time. Few realized that this was McLuhan lecturing on his theories of communication and on his famous probes. This first meeting with the McLuhans developed into a friendship that lasted until he died from a stroke in 1980.

Sometime in the early 1970s, Marshall was taken to hospital for urgent medical attention. I would visit him and our conversation invariably centred on his work. During one of my visits he asked me about my work and I said I had just been appointed editor of R&R and was thinking about material for the first issue. He was very interested and told me he had written his doctoral thesis at Cambridge on Thomas Nashe and he planned to have it published. He suggested I look it over and use any material from it that I found useful. I took the thesis and found a chapter that would indeed be suitable.

I divided it into two parts—the first I titled “Cicero and the Renaissance Training for Prince and Poet” for use in my first issue of the journal, and the second part, which I entitled “Ciceronian Program in Pulpit and in Literary
Criticism,” I placed in my second issue. We managed somehow to find a financial sponsor for that number in Alitalia (its name appeared in large letters on the back cover); this never happened again. A note at the end of Marshall’s second article announced that this was the first of two articles soon to be published in From Cicero to Joyce by McGraw Hill. Marshall’s thesis, completed in 1934, was published many years later in 2005 by Gingko Press in Corte Madera, California, edited by W. Terrence Gordon, author of many books on McLuhan. The title of the book was changed to The Classical Trivium: The Place of Thomas Nashe in the Learning of his Time. Marshall was pleased to accept our invitation to become a member of the editorial committee. I should note here that the McLuhan friendship led to the publication of The Letters of Marshall McLuhan, edited by my wife Matie Molinaro (who became his literary agent), his wife Corinne McLuhan, and William Toye, and was published by Oxford University Press in 1987.

In my first issue we also published an article by Stillman Drake on “Early Science and the Printed Book: The Spread of Science Beyond the Universities.” Drake was a leading scholar in his field who came from a successful career in business. An article by R. J. Schoeck on “The Collected Works of Erasmus” announced the beginning of a multi-volume series on Erasmus’s correspondence. This first issue set the pattern for the quality of the material published in subsequent numbers of the journal. At this point we added a business manager, book review editor, and editorial board to our staff. It was then simply a question of finding contributors and book reviewers. This was not difficult, as there were many scholars looking for journals that would accept their articles in order to enhance their credentials for promotion. Marshall was pleased to contribute another article in 1974 on “Francis Bacon: Ancient or Modern.”

I would like to cite for special recognition the public relations talent of Natalie Zemon Davis, who created the journal, and finish by quoting Richard “Dick” van Fossen, who followed me as editor, who noted that in seven years the journal had developed from an information bulletin for the Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium into a viable scholarly publication of its own. That was our aim. R&O was now ready for a new editor; it began its evolution into a strong presence on the international scholarly stage.
Editors' Recollections

Glenn Loney
University of Toronto
for the late Richard “Dick” van Fossen
Editor, 1976–1985

Dick van Fossen was editor of R&R from 1976 until 1985. Unfortunately, Dick passed away in 2009 and so is unable to provide his recollections directly. I assisted him with the journal in a variety of roles, beginning in 1979 as editorial assistant and moving on later to assistant and associate editor to support Ken Bartlett and Francois Paré, and so I can perhaps provide a proxy view of the development of the journal during Dick’s editorial tenure.

Dick had a very busy life as a scholar, teacher, and associate dean at the University of Toronto Mississauga, or Erindale College as it was then known. He ran the journal out of a small back room of his decanal office and put what time he could to the multiple tasks of editing, assisted at a distance on the French side by Robert Melançon, Claude Sutto, and Pierre Louis Vaillancourt. During his time, submissions were increasing in number, coming in from all parts of North America and increasingly from Europe as well. The connection with the Renaissance Society of America helped increase the journal’s reach, but as a junior scholar at the time what impressed me most was the mutual support between the journal and the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d’études de la Renaissance, and how the mingling of younger and more senior Renaissance scholars one saw annually at the Learned was also reflected in the pages of R&R.

There were, of course, challenges during that period. Foremost was the publishing schedule, as others will mention. Our Canada Council grant required/allowed four issues per year, but we were behind in our schedule, which meant that catching up required publishing more quickly and at a cost that was more than our grant covered. Dick would look sorrowfully at the increasing gap between the series number and the “date of issue,” and would lament that earlier editors had already used the renumbering gambit of “Old Series” and “New Series.” Fortunately for our financial well-being, the granting agency paid more attention to the number of issues per annum than to the quirks of issue numbering that so frustrated Dick’s business-like sense of order.

Other challenges during those years involved the content of the journal. One of R&R’s most admirable features was also its greatest challenge for an
editor: the journal’s scope ranged over the geography of Europe and the British Isles, over historically relevant activity in the Americas, while covering history, politics, all aspects of culture, religious and church developments, over a period spanning four hundred years—and it was bilingual! Submissions were increasing and were of good quality, but it was always difficult to assemble every issue with a diversity of articles reflecting the range of the journal’s mandate and its supporting organizations. French submissions were always welcome but not numerous, as our Quebec colleagues were feeling quite hard pressed during those years.

However, in spite of these challenges, the journal prospered under Dick’s editorial leadership. As Dick was contemplating retirement from both the university and the journal, it came time for our regular Canada Council review prior to the decision about whether to renew our grant in support of learned journals. We collected all the required data, sent in the report on our operation, accompanied by multiple copies of the issues we had completed under the prior grant, and received back the ringing stamp of peer approval that Dick had anticipated: we were deemed “a solid, significant and good quality second-flight journal with broad international reach.” I myself, being quite junior at the time with less perspective on something so close at hand, was a bit surprised that the little operation that had started as a broadsheet and was run out of Dick’s back office would be deemed such a significant and serious endeavour, but Dick just smiled his knowing half-smile and said that he knew it all along. I know he was very pleased to have been the editor of R&F during those years, and would extend gratitude, congratulations, and best wishes to everyone involved with the journal before, then, and since.
Kenneth R. Bartlett
Victoria College, University of Toronto
Editor, 1985–1990

It is a pleasure to contribute to the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of *ReR*. I had the honour of serving as editor of the journal from 1985 until 1990, succeeding the late and much lamented Dick van Fossen.

The journal was in a very healthy editorial and academic position when I assumed the editor’s chair, and I had the assistance of extremely talented senior academic colleagues: Claude Sutto (Directeur adjoint); Glenn Loney (associate editor); Thomas Martone (book review editor) and Pierre-Louis Vaillancourt (Responsable de la rubrique des livres). But, we also inherited serious challenges in a challenging time.

The publication schedule was seriously compromised, with our publication date falling years behind, largely the consequence of a lengthy postal strike: that was the first challenge we had to address. Then, we were informed that the space provided by University of Toronto Mississauga (then Erindale College) had to be vacated, as it was contingent on Dick’s position as editor; however, Victoria University generously found storage and office space on the third floor of an old house that stood on the site of the present Rowell-Jackman Hall. Although crowded, that rather bohemian attic room became the nerve centre of the journal and a stimulating intellectual environment. Then SSHRC (through its aid to learned journals program) began a review that threatened the very existence of small-circulation scholarly periodicals. Fortunately, we not only survived but emerged stronger by moving to electronic typesetting from disks (then cutting edge) at a commercial printer and galvanizing support from our sponsoring institutions and many subscribers. At the end of my stewardship, I felt I could confidently pass the editorial chair to my talented colleague, François Paré.

Fifty years of publication is a milestone and an achievement for any journal. It is time to recognize why and how *ReR* managed to thrive and grow continually in reputation. First, *ReR* is the voice of a very active and engaged community of scholars who individually and collectively made Canada a world leader in research and research communication in our field. Second, it has always been aggressively bilingual, soliciting the best work of these colleagues in both languages. Third, it is self-consciously multi-disciplinary, publishing articles, reviews, and conference proceedings that attest to the vigour and rigour
of our work but in a way that is accessible to our entire, broad community. Finally, it is a vehicle for Canadian research from coast to coast. From its inception, the copyright on the journal has been held by a collective of groups and institutions that represents both wide geographical areas and diverse interests. Although founded at the University of Toronto and associated for many years with Victoria University, Re-R speaks for all scholars, students, and merely interested readers committed to extending our knowledge of the Renaissance and Reformation, broadly defined.

I congratulate Re-R on fifty years of active, productive, and stimulating life. I have every confidence that the next half century will prove equally remarkable and rewarding.

François Paré
Université de Waterloo
Directeur, 1990–2000

L’heure du grand ménage était arrivée. Il y a quelques années, à la suite d’un réaménagement de l’espace au département d’études françaises de l’Université de Waterloo, je me suis installé dans un bureau dont la taille plus petite ne me permettait plus de loger les séries complètes de périodiques auxquels j’avais été abonné depuis longtemps. Sur les rayons de ma bibliothèque personnelle, ces collections représentaient des tranches de ce qu’avait été et continuait d’être ma vie de chercheur universitaire. On y voyait ma découverte des littératures francophones au milieu des années 1980, mon intérêt passager pour l’histoire littéraire néerlandaise, ou encore le rôle fondateur qu’ont joué les études sur la Renaissance dans ma carrière universitaire. Cependant, mon pauvre bureau n’était pas un musée et ma vie n’était pas encore une archive. À contrecœur, j’ai donc pris la décision d’envoyer au recyclage le plus gros de ma collection de périodiques, sachant bien que les articles dont j’aurais éventuellement besoin seraient disponibles en ligne. Ce réaménagement, plus important qu’on ne le croit, n’a rien de très original. Les bibliothèques universitaires se départissent elles aussi en ce moment de ce qui, aux yeux de tous, est devenu la forme-même de l’encombrement. Pour nous qui avons dans notre mire la culture lettrée de l’Ancien Régime, de tels gestes ressemblent à la fin d’une époque décisive, sans pour autant que nous puissions voir s’ils peuvent constituer, comme une
épuration du passé, le commencement de quelque chose d’autre. Une nouvelle tranche de vie, un paradigme que nous n’avons pas su voir venir.

En effet, au moment où j’ai pris la direction de Renaissance et Réforme / Renaissance and Reformation en 1990, la publication de nos recherches sur papier, dans un format qui ressemble en tous points au livre, semblait être la voie royale, celle qui nous avait interpellés très tôt dans notre carrière et qui restait centrale à la poursuite des savoirs en sciences humaines. Car la revue que j’étais appelé à diriger pendant quelque temps tirait sa légitimité de l’histoire même du livre, de son incroyable prestige sur plus de 500 ans. Est-il possible d’écrire sur la Renaissance sans se pencher sur cet effet de miroir ? Et, en même temps, la pluridisciplinarité de la revue, une pluralité à la fois institutionnelle et épistémologique, s’appuyait sur une ouverture vertigineuse à l’égard de presque tous les savoirs et les discours présents en Occident entre 1400 et 1750. À plusieurs reprises pendant les dix années où j’ai reçu et préparé les textes, communiqué avec leurs auteurs et avec ceux qui assuraient la distribution de notre périodique, je m’émerveillais devant l’effort de continuité qui animait nos recherches sur la Renaissance. Nous étions tous là comme à l’époque de Guillaume Budé, de Francis Bacon ou de Marie de Gournay. Notre travail coulait de source. Du même souffle, nous oublions peut-être, et moi le premier, l’historicité des savoirs et leur dépendance relativement récente envers les cultures de l’imprimé. Déjà, au moment de quitter Renaissance et Réforme en 2000, je me rendais compte qu’un virage fondamental s’annonçait, qui nous forcerait éventuellement à revoir notre regard sur la période étudiée et sur l’idéal même du livre. Aujourd’hui, le travail se déploie hors des balises tracées par la Renaissance. Apprendre ces nouvelles épistémès sera notre plus grand projet. Merci à tous ceux et celles qui ont travaillé à cette belle revue au cours des années. Bon anniversaire !
It was a great pleasure to serve as editor of *R&R* during a formative period of transition.

Before my term, during which I was affiliated first with the University of Guelph and later with Ryerson University, the journal had fallen more than two years behind in its publication schedule, as journals are sometimes wont to do. Eventually of course such a situation annoys subscribers and worries us all, including periodicals librarians, and affects the subscription base, so my first priority as editor was to assess the causes of the situation and then put in place a plan to catch up in a way that did not jeopardize the quality of the work being published.

It became clear that with the subventions of our university sponsors, including the University of Guelph in the day, the budget would readily support the appointment of a (modestly) paid managing editor on a part-time basis, and after some interviews I appointed *R&R*’s first managing editor, Michael O’Connor, who was also affiliated with the University of St. Michael’s College. He was succeeded as managing editor by Pascale Duhamel, then affiliated with PIMS. Michael and then Pascale whipped our business processing times into shape and made life-saving contributions to the journal’s future. By the time I completed my term we had published the backlog of issues (eight of them) all the while continuing to publish “in the present,” as it were.

Having a critical look at the flow of proposed articles that we were receiving, it also became clear to me that *R&R* would be strengthened by rethinking its scope. Over time the journal had become primarily a journal about early modern English and French literary studies. So the team and I worked to communicate with the scholarly community in Canada and beyond that the journal would welcome articles from a much broader range of disciplines and topics, and we commissioned a number of special issues on topics beyond literary studies to galvanize new attention from the community of early modern scholars. In this we succeeded.

About the same time, I worked to renew and expand the editorial board to put into action my desire to expand the focus of what we were publishing. A handful of the editorial board members had retired but were still on
the masthead, and one had left this mortal coil. So I recruited across Canada and internationally. New members appointed during my term included Rolena Adorno, Mark Thornton Burnett, Hélène Cazes, Paul Cohen, Denis Cosgrove, Julie Hardwick, Elizabeth Harvey, Margaret Healy, Margaret King, Frank Lestringant, Anthony Pagden, Richard Waswo, and Joanna Woods-Marsden.

I was keen that R&R would publish strong work, and multidisciplinary work whenever possible. I was keen that we would respect the balance of work published in English and in French. I wanted to publish emerging scholars and well-established ones in some kind of balance that would promote new work and the journal at the same time.

As a part of renewing the energy and reach of the journal, I also commissioned a refresh of its look and feel. Together with some members of the editorial board and the managing editors we proceeded toward a successful new look. We changed the colour of the ink on the cover page, for example; the older purplish one (see above cover) was a specially-created colour that cost extra to mix up for each run of the journal, so we moved to the current cream-coloured paper (see below cover), which is less expensive and in my view more beautiful too. We chose a heavier-weight paper. We redesigned the font and the look of the page and the table of contents. An editor who makes such changes solo is an unwise editor, and the major revamps were approved at an annual meeting of the major society that sponsors the journal.

The managing editors worked hard to improve the visibility of the journal among scholars, and we began to exchange advertisements with other scholarly publications. And within the careful limits of R&R’s budget, they travelled to the occasional Canadian or Renaissance Society of America conference to represent us, to meet and encourage authors to make submissions, and so forth.

We succeeded in receiving two SSHRC grants to support the journal during the term. Each of those grants, along with a stabilized subscription base and subventions from generous universities, allowed the journal to operate in the black financially. No deficits.

During my tenure as editor we made some progress, but not as much as I would have hoped for, toward going entirely electronic in our publishing. For complicated mostly-technical reasons having to do with the hosting of the journal, such a move proves to be more difficult for smaller journals than might be expected; or at least that was the case before 2010.
And while I was editor *R&R* had its fortieth anniversary. Among its founders is the eminent scholar Natalie Zemon Davis; it was a great pleasure to secure her permission to name the Natalie Zemon Davis Prize in her honour for the best paper published annually in the journal.

I enjoyed the opportunity to edit *R&R* for five years; to serve its readers and the academy of scholars.
Renaissance and Reformation

DUNN-LARDEAU « Le bonheur selon Érasme » Avant-propos; DUHL Le plaisir des sens comme source de bonheur dans les Stultiferae naves de Josse Bade et l’Éloge de la Folie d’Érasme; BIETENHOLZ Felicitas (eudaimonia) ou les promenades d’Érasme dans le jardin d’Épicure; BARKER Implied Ethics in the Adagia of Erasmus: An Index of Felicitas; DUNN-LARDEAU Érasme, pédagogue du bonheur, dans les Colloques
The occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of ReR is a special opportunity for all of us to reflect on the accomplishments and future of our journal. My personal recollections carry me back to the early 1980s when, as a graduate fellow at the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies (CRRS), I recall Konrad Eisenbichler, then CRRS Curator, wading through the journal’s membership lists and financial accounts. This led inevitably to conversations not just on the business of running a journal but also on the realization of its vision as an academic enterprise. Several years later I edited a special issue for the journal, *Confraternities in the Renaissance / Les Confraternités à la Renaissance* (13.1, 1989), which presented some of the groundbreaking deliberations of a conference that led to the formation in the same year of the Society for Confraternity Studies. Skipping ahead, in 2001 I worked as the Director of the CRRS with Richard Hillman to provide a home for the journal within CRRS Publications so that future editors could have a measure of stability in the production and management of the journal and thereby be free to focus their attention on scholarly matters. Most recently, I was deeply honoured by the invitation in 2009 by the four copyright holders to become the eighth editor of the journal, and accepted with great enthusiasm.

Such personal recollections bring to mind the constant juggling act that our community faces between short- and long-term decisions and their impact, between business considerations and academic goals, in realizing a shared and ambitious academic vision with limited means. As editor of the journal, I have been guided by the longstanding hallmarks of our journal, a bilingual publication of high academic standards with an international readership and proactive support for inter- and multi-disciplinary discourse. To this profile I would add an implicit concern for nurturing Canadian scholarship within a global community, support for emerging fields of inquiry, and the engagement of the next generations of scholars. While there is always more work to be done,¹ I am pleased to look back over the past five years and find the high quality and richness of what we have published.

¹. Future considerations for the journal are offered in the editors’ preface to this special issue.
Offering a proper analysis of the journal’s contents is beyond the scope of these recollections and, in any case, must wait on the development of a refined system to track the profile of our authors and the subject matter of their submissions. That said, there are key trends that rise to the surface when perusing the twenty-two issues or 113 articles published during my first term as editor. The most prominent aspect is that the past weighting of the journal toward English and French literary studies has readjusted. Indeed, if we look at the articles that were awarded the Natalie Zemon Davis Prize from 2009 to 2013, we get a glimpse of an impressive range in methodologies and subject matter. You might recall Sandro Landi’s “Décrire et gouverner l’opinion. Pour une phénoménologie de la correspondance publique de Machiavel” (32.3, 2009), Sally Hickson’s “Gian Cristoforo Romano in Rome: With some thoughts on the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and the Tomb of Julius II” (33.1, 2010), Emily Butterworth’s “Scandal in Rabelais’s Tiers Livre: Divination, Interpretation, and Edification” (34.4, 2011), Ryan Hackenbracht’s “Mourning the Living: Surrey’s ‘Wyatt Resteth Here,’ Henrician Funerary Debates, and the Passing of National Virtue” (35.2, 2012), and Junhyoung Michael Shin’s “The Passion and Flagellation in Sixteenth-Century Japan” (36.2, 2013). Such breadth in groundbreaking research, often achieved through interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approaches, is well aligned with the goals and aspirations of the journal.

The editor has the privilege and responsibility of shaping the profile of the journal and has well-established tools to achieve the desired ends. For my part, the assignment of special issues has been most helpful, particularly in identifying topics of current interest to Canadian scholars and supporting their national or international networks by offering a platform for publishing their research. Judicious use of special issues may also reinforce the desire of our community for innovative work across disciplines. Thus, for example, growing interest in early modern communication is brought to the fore in Things Not Easily Believed: Introducing the Early Modern Relation (34.1–2, 2011), co-edited by Germaine Warkentin and Thomas Cohen. Similarly, the reading of translation as a gendered practice is explored in Women’s Translations in Early Modern England and France: La traduction au féminin en France et en Angleterre (XVIe et XVIIe siècles)” (35.4, 2012), edited by Marie-Alice Belle. Both special issues draw primarily on scholarship by Canadian authors, whereas the others reflect our commitment to international conversations in such areas as early modern
science, book history, material culture, and Neo-Latin literature. Special issues also afford an opportunity to give new scholars a more substantial role. Following my own experience of some twenty-five years ago with respect to the thematic issue on confraternities, I particularly enjoy working with the new generation of Canadian scholars such as Alysia Kolentsis and Katherine Larson, who co-edited *Gendering Time and Space in Early Modern England* (35.1, 2012).

The balance of established and new authors and the range of the topics considered are particularly gratifying and also reassuring signs of the health of the journal. Yet, there are matters that received and will require ongoing attention. For example, I note the concerted effort to sustain the bilingual foundation of the journal, which is perhaps most prominently exposed over the past five years in the 26 percent of the articles that are in French. Further, there is the need for vigilance in publishing articles from the broad range of disciplines and fields studied by our community. With regard to the last, if I were to name one area for particular concern, it would be the need to increase publication of scholarship in Reformation studies to reflect one of the pillars of the journal and of Canadian research.

Much hard work is required of a team of individuals to make a journal a success and I am delighted that we made considerable progress in the ongoing battle to build a sustainable foundation for the production of the journal. Two initiatives that I happily inherited from Alan Shepard, the previous editor, come especially to mind. The best known to our community is the gap between the issue date and publication date, which has proved to be a major problem in so far as it very much affected our ability to attract submissions and to maintain subscribers. Alan cut the historical gap by more than half so that what remained was to close the gap as far as possible. While this took an aggressive campaign to proactively seek submissions and a successful application to SSHRC for substantial funding in 2011, we are now able to send issues to the printer close to the end of their respective quarter (e.g., the first issue of the year

(Winter) should go to press at the end of March or early April). This proactive response to a longstanding problem brought additional benefits in a gratifying increase in submissions and the opportunity to increase the size of a standard issue. Indeed, a typical issue is now roughly 30 percent larger at two hundred pages, with five rather than four articles and more book reviews than could be managed previously: special issues can be significantly larger.

I have an especially strong sympathy for Alan’s second initiative wherein he expressed a desire to take greater advantage of the opportunities afforded by digital publication. Through establishing a closer working relationship with Iter Inc., now specifically with Iter Academic Press, the journal was able to scan and mount the entire run (including the Bulletin) and to make it available in an improved online platform based on Open Journal Systems (OJS). The shift toward delivery of the journal in a digital format has met with considerable success as is evidenced by the 41 percent of the total subscriptions in 2013 for the online version offered by Iter. But further, by making all but the last three years of the journal freely available on OJS, the exposure of the journal has greatly increased. Indeed, in 2013, OJS tracked 57,615 visits to our website with 34,860 unique visitors from Canada (21%), the USA (25%), China (8%), Great Britain (7%), India (5%) and France (4%). During the past two years, OJS has served 2,714 unique visitors to the journal per month. Similarly, there are thousands of institutions with subscription and/or free access to the online full text through EBSCOhost, ProQuest, and Scholars Portal. That JSTOR has now approached us about online distribution through their archive is a positive sign of the profile of the journal and another avenue that we need to explore in order to make our research as accessible as possible.

Beyond the two initiatives, a handful of tasks were undertaken or started to improve the journal’s operations and the realization of its mandate. Cost-saving measures were implemented, particularly with regard to typesetting and printing, in order to allow us to freeze subscription prices since 2009. Considerable effort was made to articulate responsibilities in the production and editorial processes through written documents. Thus for example, production editors have a detailed statement of their duties, workflows are recorded, and members of the editorial board have letters stating our expectations. The

6. Iter also provides web-based subscription services and support for the editorial and production processes.
style sheet was revised, including brief abstracts in both French and English (effective 37.1) for all articles, along with new instructions to contributors. Some changes have been made in the structure of the editorial team, largely to reflect my preference for a lean management team wherein everyone has assigned duties and responsibilities. Finally, we started to work more closely with the copyright holders in order to articulate where our mutual interests might be better served if we worked together.

I would like to close my remarks by thanking the members of the team who have made the past five years such a joy for me, and such a success for the journal. My heartfelt thanks go to Hélène Cazes, Konrad Eisenbichler, Pascale Duhamel, Amyrose McCue Gill, Rosanne King, the members of the editorial board, the staff at Iter and the CRRS, and finally, the representatives of the copyright holders, who offered me this wonderful opportunity.