

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The eighteenth-century review journal as allegory: Smollett's *Critical Review* and the work of criticism

Journal Item

How to cite:

Jones, Richard J. (2019). The eighteenth-century review journal as allegory: Smollett's *Critical Review* and the work of criticism. *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 60(1) pp. 45–63.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2019 University of Pennsylvania Press

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1353/ecy.2019.0004>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

The eighteenth-century review journal as allegory: Smollett's *Critical Review* and the work of criticism

Richard J. Jones

In an advertisement for the first number of the *Monthly Review* in 1749, the bookseller Ralph Griffiths describes a “periodical work, whose sole object should be to give a compendious account of those productions of the press, as they come out, that are worth notice”.¹ Griffiths’s modest aim is “to be serviceable to such as would choose to have some idea of a book before they lay out their money or time on it”. This is the beginning of book reviewing as we might think of it today. Although books were reviewed before the *Monthly Review*, the periodicals that did so (notably in France in the seventeenth century) did not have such a comprehensive aim.² As Antonia Forster puts it, in her account of early review journals, it was Griffiths who “could see that the expanding book market was simultaneously creating a market for a tool to enable readers to grasp it”.³ When the *Critical Review* began publication in 1756, several years after the *Monthly Review*, it claimed to offer what was, in effect, a refinement of this tool: “This Work will not be patched up by obscure Hackney Writers, accidentally enlisted in the Service of an undistinguishing Bookseller,” writes its founding editor, Tobias Smollett, in the proposals, “but executed by a Set of Gentlemen whose Characters and Capacities have been universally approved and acknowledged by the Public”.⁴ The tension between the market place and the kind of public service offered by a “Set of Gentlemen” is one way in which the review journals of the eighteenth century might be understood.⁵ Whilst accepting this, my approach here is to return attention to the comprehensive aim of what Griffiths called his “periodical work” – in other words, the attempt to “register all the new Things in

general, without exception to any, on account of their lowness of rank, or price".⁶

My argument is that eighteenth-century reviews, such as those found in the *Monthly Review* and *Critical Review*, seek to reveal this "work" – in the sense of the work that a periodical does – even if, in their particular instances, they might be seen to fail. Another way to put this is that eighteenth-century review journals can be shown to create an allegory from the fragments out of which they are composed.

This article will focus on the *Critical Review*. Like its predecessor, the *Monthly Review*, the *Critical* was published regularly over a long period – from 1756 until 1817 (the *Monthly* kept going until 1845). The success of both Reviews tells us something about the business acumen of their founders: Griffiths, at the *Monthly*, and Smollett, with his "Set of Gentleman", including, notably, the printer Archibald Hamilton, at the *Critical*.⁷ It also suggests, however, the growing relevance of a new mode of writing: that is to say, writing in the form of extracts, abridgements and compilations. In this respect, the review journals resemble what Barbara Benedict has described as "the genre of the age of mass print": the literary anthology.⁸ For Benedict, the editors of eighteenth-century anthologies were engaged in creating a new kind of reader: one with "the identity of the 'expert' who reads in order to enjoy the play of imagery and language, and who can judge beauty".⁹ As we will see, the "Set of Gentlemen" at the *Critical Review* aimed at a similar outcome. For Leah Price, the anthologies contributed to new rhythms of reading: readers were trained to "to pace themselves through an unmanageable bulk of print by sensing when to skip and where to linger".¹⁰ Such reading was demonstrated by the review journals – and perhaps even accomplished by them, allaying the readers need to consult the

object of the review itself. (How many readers of a review of a book, we might ask, in Giffiths' terms, went on to "lay out their money or time on it"?) Such considerations inform the seriousness of the endeavor of the *Critical Review* and "language of noble purpose" that informs it.¹¹ Price argues that the anthologizing mode of reading and writing has had far reaching influence on other literary forms – notably, the novel. One reason for focusing on the *Critical Review* is that its founding editor, Tobias Smollett, was deeply engaged in this wider work of literature. For him, the *Critical Review* is not merely a tool that registers publications that exist outside of it – it is itself a publication within the literary world that it reveals. As Smollett worked on the *Critical Review*, he also worked on novels, historical projects, plays and translations. Much of this writing involved reading expertly. His novels can be described as a collection of "disjecta membra";¹² his historical projects are no different.¹³ My suggestion here, then, is that the review periodical – a form that is often situated in the shadows of other literary forms – was itself such a creative task.¹⁴

So far I have suggested that what a review journal does is reveal "periodical work". In putting it this way, I am drawing attention to the experience of the reader (as part of that work) – my approach is thus phenomenological. The claim of Griffiths, and then Smollett, to register "all new Things" in their Reviews is (as editorial comments begin to note) an impossible one – nevertheless the reader is able to experience it. Just as each number of the *Critical Review* is later bound into a multi-volume work, so that "work" can always be found in each individual number. The "Work", says Smollett at the end of his proposals for the *Critical*, "will be comprehended in a Pamphlet of six Sheets, to be published in the First Day of every Month, and the first Number to

make its Appearance on the first Day of February 1756".¹⁵ The only way, however, for the "Work" to be comprehended in six sheets is to offer it up as an image – or, to draw on Smollett's words, for it to make an "Appearance". Brenda Machosky has written about allegory in similar terms, describing it as "the appearance of one thing in another thing which it is not".¹⁶ For Machosky, allegory is a "structure of appearance", rather than of meaning, "re-presenting" the poet's experience with the inexpressible.¹⁷ Allegory is a useful concept for thinking about review journals because it redirects our attention away from the judgments that they make (and the critical principles that inform them) to the work of art that they offer. As a term, allegory is rooted in the *agora* (marketplace) from which the review journals arise.¹⁸ Its notion of "speaking other" (*allegoria*) reflects the way that its writers use quotations from other people's texts to create their own. This notion of allegory reaches back beyond the eighteenth-century preoccupation with fables or the personification of virtues and qualities. It is the allegory that Walter Benjamin describes, in his work on the seventeenth-century German *Trauerspiel*, as marked by a mourning for the loss of what is complete.¹⁹ My suggestion is that allegory has much in common with the "anthologizing" mode that is engaged in disclosing an image of such (in)completeness. The work of the review journal, we might say, is not any one particular review (which is itself a collection of extracts or fragments) but a new work that appears amongst the ruins of the old.²⁰

1 The first number of the *Critical Review*

Proposals for the publishing the *Critical Review* appeared in a number of editions of the *Public Advertiser* in December 1755.²¹ They were given the grand

title of “PROPOSALS *for publishing Monthly,*/ THE Progress or Annals of LITERATURE and the LIBERAL ARTS”. As James Basker has shown, in his work on Smollett’s role as critic and journalist, the proposals bear the marks of a previous scheme to establish an English Academy of the belles lettres.²² Given that the *Critical Review* was, as Basker puts it, “the only concrete result of Smollett’s academy proposal”, it is perhaps possible to read in its lofty description some acknowledgement of failure. The insistence, for example, that the “Work will not be patched up by obscure Hackney Writers, accidentally enlisted in the Service of an undistinguishing Bookseller” (i.e. Griffiths) but “executed by a Set of Gentleman” belies the *Critical Review*’s existence as another form of *Monthly Review*, making its “Appearance”, as we have noted, in “a Pamphlet of six Sheets” and advertised within the crowded pages of the *Public Advertiser*. For Smollett and his set of gentlemen, the “noble Art of Criticism” had been “reduced to a contemptible Manufacture subservient to the most sordid Views of Avarice and Interest, and carried on by wretched Hirelings, without Talent, Candour, Spirit, or Circumspection”. They aimed, however, to set themselves apart:

Urged by these considerations, they have resolved to task their Abilities, in reviving the true Spirit of Criticism, and exert their utmost Care in vindicating the Cause of Literature from such venal and corrupted Jurisdiction.

Such language reveals the germ of a narrative that is to be played out across the monthly issues of the new journal. With “Learning and Ignorance, confounded in the Chaos of Publication”, a set of gentleman aim to vindicate the “Cause of

Literature” and revive the “Spirit of Criticism”. Viewed this way, the *Critical Review* has much in common with another text on which Smollett had been working for a number of years (and which was eventually published a few months before the proposals in the *Public Advertiser*): a translation of Cervantes’ *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*.²³ This association was picked up by one of Smollett’s early critics, John Shebbeare, who, directing his remarks to Smollett in 1757, observed how, “like a true Champion, the Knight of *La Mancha*, you arrive to rescue the Charms of Literature from the avaritious Hands of the hireling Necromancers in the *Monthly Review*.”²⁴ With the project itself framed as a “Progress” or “Annals”, it is possible that allegorical qualities were not lost on other early readers.²⁵ The *Critical Review* was marked by “the appearance of one thing in another thing which it is not”.

Like the *Monthly Review* before it, the *Critical Review* aimed at completeness. To the range of “Performances” that it considered, it added works of art and foreign publications.²⁶ For Smollett, what mattered was the “Detail” of these performances (something that he described as “succinct and faithful”) – nevertheless, he placed this in relation to a bolder work. The first paragraph of the proposals, printed in the *Public Advertiser*, draws its sense from the heading that precedes it. It is thus the “Progress or Annals of LITERATURE and the LIBERAL ARTS” that is published

in a succinct and faithful Detail of all the Performances on the Subjects of Theology, Metaphysics, Physics, Medicine, Mathematics, History, and the Belles Lettres; which shall occasionally appear at Home or Abroad; together with an accurate Description of every remarkable Essay in the

Practical Part of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, that may do Honour to modern Artists of this or any other Kingdom.²⁷

On the one hand, it is the “Detail of all the Performances” that calls for the reader’s attention; on the other, it is the “Progress or Annals” that are published *in it*. In the rest of the proposals, Smollett moves between the work of the detail (“they will not invidiously seek to wrest the Sense, misinterpret the Meaning, or misquote the Words of any Author”) and the work of the heading that appears in the detail (“their favourite Aim is to befriend Merit, dignify the Liberal Arts, and contribute to towards the Formation of a public Taste, which is the best Patron of Genius and Science”). The method of the “Set of Gentlemen” is described:

They pretend to delineate the Plan of every Work with Accuracy and Candour; to point out the Excellencies; hint at the Defects; and whenever they signify their Disapprobation; they promise to illustrate their Censure with proper Quotations, from which the Reader may appeal to his own Understanding.

The *Monthly Review* was also made up of “proper quotations” (although not all authors were keen on them).²⁸ For Smollett, they were an important part of revealing how the reader’s “own Understanding” was present in the work. The presence of quotations in the reviews demonstrated an empirical method (the reviewers, writes Smollett, “will not presume to decide upon the Merits of a Work in an arbitrary Sentence unsupported by Evidence”) but they also offered a glimpse of another “Understanding”. This new work (the reader’s own

understanding) might be said to make its appearance in the “Detail of all the Performances”. In some respects, this is what Smollett means when he refers to the “Formation of a public Taste”. Such a formation is revealed by “proper Quotations” – but it is a “Formation” that should be understood as both process and structure.²⁹

In the proposals, Smollett is careful to observe that his set of gentlemen will not “exhibit a partial and unfair Assemblage of the Beauties and Blemishes of any Production”. Even so, the Critical Review is necessarily engaged in exhibiting “assemblages”. The first number, for example, contains seventeen articles, covering a wide range of subject matter: education, medicine, science, religion, travel, fiction, theatre, history, foreign publications, and “*Performances in Painting and Sculpture now in hand, or lately finished*”. About eighty of the ninety-six pages of this number are composed of “proper Quotations” – a feature that is easy to spot because of the convention of running quotation marks along the left margin. The quotations are intended to be representative of the work under review.³⁰ So, in the first article, a review of a work on British education (and, appropriately enough, the false taste that arises from it), a two-page quotation is introduced by noting how “Mr. *Sheridan’s* stile, and his manner of writing, will be best seen by a specimen”. Similarly, extracts from Thomas Birch’s *The History of the Royal Society* are offered as “a specimen of the work itself, and of the scrupulous caution and judgment with which the first founders of the society proceeded in their enquiries”.³¹ Such quotations are meant to encourage the reader to make their own judgment: “But that the reader may judge for himself,” Smollett writes in a review of the play *The Apprentice*, “we shall transcribe part of the scene in which he [the “Hibernian”] makes his

appearance”.³² Notably, at the end of the first number, Smollett adds a note, “TO THE PUBLIC”, which transforms the entirety of his project into such a “Specimen”:

If we have in this Specimen commended too lavishly, or condemned too severely; if we have omitted beauties, and exaggerated blemishes; if we have afforded any reason to doubt our taste or integrity; we profess ourselves open to conviction and reproof; and should any person take the trouble to demonstrate our errors and misconduct, we will endeavour to improve by his censure, and kiss the rod of correction with great humility.³³

By referring to the first number of the *Critical Review* as a “Specimen”, Smollett treats it as if it was itself a “proper Quotation” and a prompt to the reader’s “own Understanding”. In this way, he aligns the *Critical Review* with the *The Universal Visitor*, a “periodical pamphlet proposed to be continued monthly” that had itself been the subject of one of the first reviews.³⁴ Importantly, Smollett directs the attention of his reader towards the structure of his work: the reader will, he hopes, “excuse any little defects that may appear in the disposition of the articles that compose this first Essay”; the set of gentlemen have, he says, “been more studious to cater variety for our guests, than to arrange the dishes of the entertainment”. What the reader is invited to consider, at the end of the first number of the *Critical Review*, is a further “assemblage”, or, to use another of Smollett’s words, a “formation”, of various parts.

One of the faults a reader might have found with the first number of the *Critical Review* was that it was not as comprehensive as it claimed to be. As

Basker notes, according to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, there were 137 new titles published in January and February 1756 – the *Monthly Review* managed to include 59 of them; the *Critical Review* only sixteen.³⁵ Smollett perhaps anticipates such fault-finding by appending a note: “*The ARTICLES omitted in this Number will be taken notice of in the next*”.³⁶ As the year went on, the coverage increased, partly by way of a “Monthly Catalogue” (introduced in June 1756), a section that included shorter notices and accounts of “minor” works.³⁷ Even so, the pursuit of completeness was a failing cause, giving rise to occasional pleas for help, such as that at the very end of the first number: “Far from thinking ourselves infallible in the art of criticism, we shall thankfully acknowledge any hints or assistance we may receive from the learned and ingenious of every denomination”.³⁸ In this sense, the comprehensive work of the *Critical Review* could be seen to be more imaginary than actual. Readers were invited, like the readers of anthologies, to participate in this imaginary work – by continuing a form of reading that involved making selections and collecting them together.³⁹ The *Critical Review* revealed an image of this work (such participation was in itself imaginary) and thus disclosed itself in what it was not – that is, to use Smollett’s words, in “a partial and unfair Assemblage of the Beauties or Blemishes”, which was, additionally, found in the market place. As an image, the *Critical Review* could be seen to be a contribution to what Pasanek and Wellmon have described as “The Enlightenment Index” – a work which sought to limit bibliographical excess but which, nonetheless, “insofar as it was to be imagined unified and whole was to be assembled from constitutive textual and paratextual elements”.⁴⁰ Unsurprisingly, some of the authors who provided these constitutive elements were alert to what this meant for their own ambitions.

Joseph Reed, for example, responds to Smollett's review of his play, *Madrigal and Trulletta*, in 1759, by citing Smollett's account of the *Critical Review's* practice ("We shall extract one Scene, which we believe our Readers will be as well, if not better, contented with, than the whole Tragedy") and then observing: "I must here do you the Honour of acknowledging that you have been Conjuror enough, to pick out the dullest Scene in the whole Play".⁴¹ Reed complains that Smollett's conjuring has transformed his work into something else. Like each of the quotations that can be found on the pages of the *Critical Review*, the scene from Reed's play is a small part of a mosaic (or an "assemblage", or, to use Benjamin's term, a "constellation") that brings another work into appearance.⁴² This is the "work" of *Critical Review*, the revival, as Smollett puts it, of the "true Spirit of Criticism" – but a revival that perhaps comes at some ontological cost.⁴³

2 The first volume of the *Critical Review*

By September 1756, the *Critical Review* had reached its seventh number. Unlike the previous numbers, the seventh was advertised as being part of a volume. The *Public Advertiser* announced the publication of "No. VII being the first Number of the Second Volume, of/ THE CRITICAL REVIEW; OR ANNALS of LITERATURE. For AUGUST 1756". It went on to note how "the first Volume complete, in six Numbers, with a copious Table of Contents, Index, General Title, and Preface to the Work" could be obtained from the publisher Robert Baldwin, "Price 7s. handsomely bound and letter'd".⁴⁴ The publication of this volume, in August 1756, suggests one of the ways in which "the Work" of the *Critical Review* appeared amidst the ruin of its parts. In the new preface, Smollett acknowledged how its previous publication had been accompanied by "virulent invective, slanderous

insinuation, and other low arts of malice” but he nevertheless presented the volume as marked by success: “THE CRITICAL REVIEW having passed through a series of numbers with uninterrupted success, the authors beg leave to present it in the form of a volume, together with their warmest acknowledgements to the public, for the candour and indulgence with which it has been received”.⁴⁵ The paratextual elements noted by the *Public Advertiser* contributed to the appearance of the work in this successful new form: the “General Title”, for example, included epigraphs from Shakespeare and Homer, and the table of contents and index invited new ways for readers to engage with the text and might even have suggested new (alphabetical) arrangements of material. The *Critical Review* is thus engaged in drawing attention to the ways in which it is made to appear. This is particularly clear in the preface to the second volume, published at the end of 1756, which had to negotiate the way it was made up of five volumes instead of the usual six (because the project had begun with a combined number for January and February):

The proprietors think it needless to make an apology for concluding this Second volume in five numbers; as every person will at once perceive the propriety of beginning the Third with the new year. The difference of five or six sheets will hardly appear in the binding, *a great book* (according to the *greek* proverb) *may be a great evil*, an adage, which some brother critics would do well to consider; and the proprietors are resolved to avoid supplements, as an unnecessary incumbrance on their readers. They will take care to leave no matter for such a clumsy appendage, which the work drags heavily along, like a huge mortified excrescence.⁴⁶

Although the proprietors at the *Critical Review* wished to avoid the kind of yearly supplement published by the *Monthly Review*, they had included a similar “clumsy appendage” with an earlier number. (A note on “A LIST of PAMPHLETS &c.”, provided in April, advised that it “is given gratis, being printed on an additional quarter of a Sheet; and there are some Pamphlets mentioned in it, which will be taken father notice of”.)⁴⁷ The pursuit of completeness necessarily meant that the *Critical Review* was involved in a form of supplementary publishing. Rather than describe the work as another “huge mortified excrescence”, however, the proprietors allowed the printed volume to reveal itself otherwise: for example, it is observed that, “The third volume will be printed on an elegant new type, which will comprehend a greater quantity of matter within the same compass, and still be as legible and pleasant to the reader.”⁴⁸

When a new section, the “Monthly Catalogue” was added to the *Critical Review* in June, it anticipated the way that the first volume would later be gathered together. By introducing the catalogue with a prefatory note, “To the PUBLIC”, and an epigraph (from Martial), and by dropping the type size down a point from the “main body”, Smollett effectively offered it up as another “specimen”.⁴⁹ When the first volume was put together, a month or so later, it made more use of such features – and the whole was similarly offered to the “judicious” reader to consider how far the original aims had been pursued.⁵⁰ In the note to the new “Monthly Catalogue”, Smollett rehearses his claims for completeness: the catalogue is intended to “render our work more compleat and entertaining” and thus to “permit very few productions to escape our observation”. Even though the articles it contained were shorter than those in

the “main body”, the section is forced to conclude, like the first number of the *Critical Review* itself, with a note that “The Catalogue with Remarks [is] to be continued”.⁵¹ For Smollett, what is most striking about the Catalogue, apart from its incompleteness, is its materiality: “We must desire our readers to consider our monthly Catalogue”, he writes, “as the *impedimenta exercitus*, or baggage of our army, which may be found useful, though a little *heavy*”. This materiality is reflected back onto the gatherings of the *Critical Review* as it is assembled into numbers and then volumes (and potential additional supplements). The brevity of the articles in the “Monthly Catalogue” also suggests the way that the longer articles, in what was now referred to as the “main body”, resembled them – that is to say, the kind of advertisements that might be found listed in the *Public Advertiser*.⁵² Beginning the “Monthly Catalogue” with an epigraph is intended to align it with a more ambitious (less “heavy” and less commercial) work. Nevertheless, the quote chosen from Martial, “*Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura*” (“There are good things [that you read here], and some indifferent, and more bad”)⁵³ returns attention to the assemblage itself. Similarly, the epigraphs later chosen for the “General Title” (from Shakespeare, “*Nothing extenuate,/ Nor set down aught in malice*”, and Horace, “*Ploravere suis non respondere favorem/ Speratum meritis*” [“[They] lamented that the goodwill hoped for matched not their deserts”])⁵⁴ despite declaring their place in a bolder scheme, reveal themselves to be yet more “proper Quotations”. It is perhaps fitting, in this regard, to continue the quote cut short by Smollett’s editing of Martial: “Not otherwise, Avitus,” the epigraph might have continued, “is a book made”. The *Critical Review* reveals itself to be such a book.

One way to describe the first volume of the *Critical Review* would be as a text that registers its own mediation. Situating her work by way of Clifford Siskin, who considers how writing in the eighteenth century involved a self-reflexive concern about writing,⁵⁵ Christina Lupton has sought to explore “the phenomenological question of what happens when mediation registers in discourse”.⁵⁶ We might find one answer in the way that Smollett, in a later volume of the *Critical Review*, explains what he calls “a catalogue of typographical errors” and then disowns his control of them:

The gentlemen chiefly concerned in the *Critical Review*, live at a considerable distance from the press; and sometimes the printer has been so hurried towards the latter end of the month by their sending in the copy so late, that he could not possibly furnish them with proof sheets for their correction. The authors have likewise been retarded by other unforeseen, though necessary avocations: but they flatter themselves, they have now made such regulations as will prevent all such obstructions for the future.⁵⁷

The gentlemen of the *Critical Review* appear powerless in the face of the technologies of print.⁵⁸ A similar struggle for control appears in an earlier remark, in the first volume, in which Smollett notes that a correspondent should “correct a mistake under which he seems to lie, in affecting to suppose, that the Critick of the *third Letter* [Smollett himself], is Mr. *Baldwin’s* author, whereas, in fact, Mr. *Baldwin* is no more than the said critick’s publisher”.⁵⁹ The reader who picked up the first volume of the *Critical Review* would thus have encountered

some of these questions of power. The *Critical Review* does not just represent a world to us – it announces its place in that world as even more paper and more print. (The importance of paper to Smollett’s reviewing practice is perhaps suggested in the way that a medical controversy is later settled by remarking on “the beauty of the paper and print” of one of its publications.)⁶⁰ As an object made of paper and print, the *Critical Review* sets limits on what can be achieved; but it thus reveals itself as a “periodical work” without end. In this way, Smollett, in the preface to the first volume, admits that the “confined nature of the plan would not admit of minute investigation”.⁶¹ However, he notes how his set of gentlemen have nevertheless “endeavoured to discover and disclose that criterion by which the character of a work may at once be distinguished, without dragging the reader through a tedious, cold, inanimated disquisition, which may be termed a languid paraphrase rather than a spirited criticism”. Because the *Critical Review* cannot go on for page after page, or achieve the completeness of what Smollett calls a “languid paraphrase”, it discloses instead an image of the work of criticism (“the criterion by which the character of a work may at once be distinguished” or what Smollett similarly describes as the “essence of near 120 British performances in the small compass of six numbers”). In drawing attention to how this image is mediated (in a gathering together of various parts), the *Critical Review* presents itself as allegory. It is not a “partial and unfair Assemblage of the Beauties or Blemishes of any Production”, such as you might find in the *Public Advertiser* or the *Monthly Review* – both, unquestionably, for Smollett, works of the market place. Nor is it a work limited by where its authors live, the availability of page proofs, and the size of its type. And, yet, of course, this is exactly what it is.

3 Speaking other

By describing the aims of the *Critical Review* as a “spirited criticism” rather than a “languid paraphrase”, Smollett was using the language of translation. Up until 1756, when he penned the preface to the first volume of the *Critical Review*, Smollett had been engaged in such work. In the note he attached to his translation of *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*, published in 1755, Smollett notes the number of years he has spent in “revising and correcting it for the press”.⁶² For at least some of this time, he had also worked on translations of Le Sage’s *Gil Blas* (1748) and *The Devil Upon Crutches* (1750), Voltaire’s *Micromegas* (1752) and sections of the *Journal Oeconomique* (1754). For Smollett, perhaps following Dryden’s well-known advice that a translator “who copies Word for Word, loses all the Spirit in the tedious Transfusion”,⁶³ what was important about this work was the “spirit and ideas”. In the note to *Don Quixote*, he explains:

He has endeavoured to retain the spirit and ideas, without servilely adhering to the literal expression, of the original; from which, however, he has not so far deviated, as to destroy that formality of idiom, so peculiar to the Spaniards, and so essential to the character of the work.⁶⁴

The risk run by a translation – that it might end up as a servile adherence to “literal expression” – seems also to inform Smollett’s understanding of the work of the *Critical Review*. Thus, as we have seen, in the proposals for the *Critical Review*, Smollett aims at “reviving the true Spirit of Criticism” in the face of the

“contemptible Manufacture” to which the “noble Art of Criticism” had been reduced. Nevertheless, he aims at presenting “a succinct and faithful Detail of all the Performances”. As we have seen, John Shebbeare, spotted the Quixotic quality of these critical ambitions. Notably, in the same pamphlet, he also dismissively refers to Smollett’s translation of *Don Quixote* as a “transcription”.⁶⁵ The reason for this is the perception that Smollett had made use of earlier translations of *Don Quixote* to prepare his own. Rather than following Shebbeare’s logic (which made Smollett into the kind of “wretched Hireling” he claimed not to be), it is possible to see Smollett’s use of other texts, in the preparation of *Don Quixote*, as a precursor to the kind of practice pursued by the *Critical Review*. For example, in the first chapter, he includes a footnote quoting the various ways that different translators had tackled the phrase “gripes and grumblings”:

Gripes and grumblings, in Spanish *Duelos y Quebrantos*: the true meaning of which, the former translators have been at great pains to investigate, as the importance of the subject (no doubt) required. But their labours have, unhappily, ended in nothing else but conjectures, which for the entertainment and instruction of our readers, we beg leave to repeat.⁶⁶

In an account of eighteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*, Julie Hayes sees this discussion as “a fine satire on translator’s notes”, observing how it contributes to “a wonderful palimpsest of versions and revisions that foreground Smollett’s writerly verve and allow us insights into his reading process”.⁶⁷

Smollett’s translation of *Don Quixote* can thus be seen to expose “verve” and

“spirit” through an assemblage of other people’s texts – in other words, through the kind of practice his readers would later encounter in the *Critical Review*.

The notion that the *Critical Review* served to reveal “Spirit” through works that appear otherwise might make it sound as though it anticipated Hegel’s discovery of the origins of the “work of art” (in “Geist” or “Spirit”).⁶⁸ Viewed this way, it describes the appearance of something complete and entire in a work that proceeds by fragmentation and instalment. It is partly the continuation of the work over time and the fact that the texts it reviewed were available to consult, reprint and build upon (in other words, the developing print technologies of the mid-eighteenth century) that allowed this appearance of “Spirit” to take shape. Smollett, of course, might not quite have put it this way – but he did find himself engaged in a seemingly endless process of mediation and continuation in almost all of his literary work. His project to write a history of England, for example, begun at the same time that he founded the *Critical Review* (of which the “annals” might be seen to be a form of continuation themselves), started with a four-volume quarto edition before being reprinted in weekly instalments (making eleven volumes octavo) and then completed by a “Continuation”, published in what became five more octavo volumes, bringing the history repeatedly up to date.⁶⁹ (As one commentator noted, Smollett was “famous for his stories, Histories, and His continued Continuations of His Complete Histories”).⁷⁰ Similarly, when he established the *British Magazine* in 1760, Smollett decided to publish a novel, *The Life and Adventures of Launcelot Greaves*, in the form of monthly instalments.⁷¹ The *Critical Review* might not have offered itself up as a novel or a history but it did present itself as another narrative of serial publication – both in terms of way it registered its materiality

and the “progress or annals” that it disclosed. As with translation work, there is a sense in which a review must always “come after” (that is, be a serialization of) an original. This idea, that translation is engaged in continuing the “life” of the work of art can be found in Walter Benjamin’s writings on translation.⁷² It is perhaps also evident in the palimpsest of previous translations that Smollett constructs for *Don Quixote* and in his note, prefixed to the work, that it has been conducted “with that care and circumspection, which ought to be exerted by every author, who, in attempting to improve upon a task already performed, subjects himself to the most invidious comparison”.⁷³ In setting up and contributing to the *Critical Review*, then, Smollett might be said to have engaged himself in yet more work of continuation, translation and comparison. It was through such work that he hoped to reveal the “spirit of criticism” itself.

When Don Quixote enters a printing house in the second part of his story, he comes across a book pertaining to be that very second part. This is the sequel to *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha*, purportedly by Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda, published in 1614 (before Cervantes own sequel, published in 1615) and which Don Quixote has already been reading at a nearby inn.⁷⁴ This famous moment suggests the way that Don Quixote confronts not only his own literary existence but also the technical and material circumstances that support it (the book, for example, is discovered undergoing correction in the printing house).⁷⁵ For Smollett, conjuring up the spirit of Cervantes in his proposals for the *Critical Review*, such a situation seems entirely fitting.⁷⁶ Notably, in attaching a quotation from *Othello* to the first volume (and entire work) of the *Critical Review*, Smollett selects another heroic but deluded figure. “Speak of me as I am”, says Othello in the line before the one Smollett chooses,

and shortly before his tragic death. It is part of the argument of this article that Smollett cannot “speak of things as they are” – that the revival of the “noble Art of Criticism” has to proceed, Quixote-like, through that which it is not. Perhaps the best example of this kind of “other speaking” can be found in Smollett’s final novel *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771). This novel, which includes a representation of Smollett as a character within it,⁷⁷ is constructed, like the *Critical Review*, out of the words of other people. The letters which make up *Humphry Clinker*, or, indeed, Smollett’s epistolary travel book, *Travels through France and Italy* (1766), resemble the ongoing series of articles in a review periodical. In *Humphry Clinker*, Smollett allows the words to speak otherwise: the servant Winifred’s poor spelling (“We were yesterday three kiple chined, by the grease of God, in the holy bands of mattermoney”)⁷⁸ must be voiced one way but, considered in terms of the material arrangement of type on the page, speaks of something else. The polysemous qualities of this form of writing reflect the way that the *Critical Review* gives rise to the image of the “noble Art of Criticism”. Just as Humphry Clinker is himself finally revealed otherwise (and whose “expedition” might refer to both a journey and a form of “energy” or “spirit”),⁷⁹ the *Critical Review* discloses itself as both image and parts. It offers an Enlightenment image of completeness and nobility with a baroque return to the partial and incomplete.⁸⁰

It is the attention drawn to the partial, fragmentary and material that makes the work of the *Critical Review* – and perhaps its associated review journals – allegorical. This is because it cannot be said to privilege the “work” or the “spirit” of criticism above the “work” that discloses it.⁸¹ To put this ontologically, the *Critical Review* appears both as what it is and in what it is not.

This is a description of a review periodical as a work of art rather than, perhaps, say, a work of criticism (it is an example of the “noble Art of Criticism”, as Smollett put it). As a work of art, the *Critical Review* brings about a self-conscious combination of those features that posit it as an object in the marketplace and those that resist speaking of an object at all. In some ways, this might be seen as another form of assemblage to add to the gatherings and assemblages of material out of which the *Critical Review* is composed.⁸² It reflects the way that the *Critical Review* might be seen to be didactic (though the range of critical positions expressed in it are broad)⁸³ and open (in that it seeks to leave “proper Quotations” to the readers own understanding). For Smollett, setting up the *Critical Review* in 1756, and contributing to it for the next ten years, it must have seemed as though the “work” in which he was engaged was endless – just as his work on translations, history and fiction involved relentless supplementation and continuity. If something had been lost, then it was a wholeness that did not require this kind of work of assembly – perhaps something that might have been possible in a time before the bibliographical excesses of the mid-eighteenth century.⁸⁴ Like Don Quixote, pursuing a lost age of chivalry, Smollett and his set of gentlemen at the *Critical Review*, worked to disclose this wholeness as an image. This is the “work” of the *Critical Review* – a “periodical work” that, in marking its own mediation, returns attention to the technologies to which all, including the reader, must be subject. And thus, in the very loss of its power, the “noble Spirit of Criticism” is revived.

¹ *Monthly Review* 1 (1749). The advertisement is bound into the volume after the table of contents in Griffith's own set (now in the Bodleian Library). See Antonia Forster, "Review Journals and the Reading Public", in *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. Isabel Rivers (London and New York, 2001), 171–90, 172–4.

² For some account of this, see Frank Donoghue, *The Fame Machine: Book Reviewing and Eighteenth-Century Literary Careers* (Stanford, 1996), 20–22.

³ Forster, 172.

⁴ *Public Advertiser*, 19 December 1755.

⁵ See Donoghue, 16–55.

⁶ *Monthly Review* 1 (1749), 238.

⁷ For an account of this "Set of Gentlemen", see James G. Basker, *Tobias Smollett: Critic and Journalist* (Newark, London and Toronto, 1988), 43–45.

⁸ Barbara M. Benedict, "The eighteenth-century anthology and the construction of the expert reader", *Poetics* (2001), 377–97, 378. In *The English Novel in the Magazines 1740–1815* (London, 1962), Robert D. Mayo comments how all "reviews were to some extent surrogate miscellanies" (141).

⁹ Benedict, 382.

¹⁰ Leah Price, *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel* (Cambridge, 2000), 4.

¹¹ Basker, 32.

¹² See Mark Blackwell, "Disjecta Membra: Smollett and the Novel in Pieces", *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 52 (2011), 421–42. Blackwell evocatively describes Smollett's novels as "less integral, organic wholes than reversible, rearrangeable assortments of components, provisionally cobbled together but always at risk of adding or losing a piece" (438). Also see Annika Mann, "Waste Management: Tobias Smollett and Remediation", *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 25 (2012), 359–82. Mann explores how Smollett creates texts that are "hyper-readable" and "impossible to consume" (371).

¹³ In putting together *The Complete History of England* (1757–8), for example, Smollett notes that he "collects his materials from the most authentic historians, to whose works he refers in the margin". See "Plan of The Complete History of England", reprinted at the beginning of the first volume.

¹⁴ Iona Italia suggestively places the rise of (now neglected) periodical writing alongside the rise of novels; see *The Rise of Literary Journalism in the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York, 2005), 1–22, 7.

¹⁵ *Public Advertiser*, 19 December 1755.

¹⁶ Brenda Machosky, *Structures of Appearing: Allegory and the Work of Literature* (New York, 2013), 1. Machosky takes a phenomenological approach to the study of allegory. Setting aside traditional understandings of allegory (as a “structure of meaning”), Machosky argues that allegorical works “go ‘beyond meaning’ by staying within their own structure, not seeking a transcendent position outside of it” (1–2). They thus offer a “structure of appearance”.

¹⁷ Allegory declares that it cannot say what it means. According to Machosky, the reader’s experience of this “becomes part of the work of art” itself. Drawing from Paul de Man, Machosky describes the tendency to devalue this experience in favour of the “interpretation” or “judgment” of art. This is a dilemma, entirely appropriate to a review journal, of “mediation” – in other words, an apparent choice between truth and method, or, as Machosky puts it, the work of literature (for which allegory stands in) and the work of aesthetics or philosophy; see Machosky, 20–3.

¹⁸ For a useful discussion of the origins of this term, see Rita Copeland and Peter T. Struck’s introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory* (Cambridge, 2010), 1–12.

¹⁹ Walter Benjamin connects “mourning” and “allegory” in *Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels* (1928), translated as *The Origin of the German Tragic Drama* by John Osborne (London, 1977). For Benjamin, “mourning is the state of mind in which feeling revives the empty world in the form of a mask, and derives an enigmatic satisfaction in contemplating it” (139). Allegory thus belies a lost connection with the world. It reveals a historical “landscape” that is “untimely, sorrowful, unsuccessful” (166) rather than an image of the timeless, transcendent, or whole.

²⁰ In *The Origin of the German Tragic Drama*, Benjamin describes how “Allegories are, in the realm of thoughts, what ruins are in the realm of things” (178).

²¹ See *Public Advertiser*, 19, 24 and 30 December 1755.

²² See Basker, 17–28 and 31–2.

²³ Smollett seems to have begun work on his translation of *Don Quixote* in 1748; see his letter to Alexander Carlyle, 7 June 1748, in Lewis M. Knapp (ed.), *The Letters of Tobias Smollett* (Oxford, 1970), 8. The *Public Advertiser* notes its publication on 26 February 1755.

²⁴ John Shebbeare, *The Occasional Critic, or the Decrees of the Scotch Tribunal in the Critical Review Rejudged: etc.* (London, 1757), 9.

²⁵ Curiously, Italia picks out some metaphorical treatment of periodical editors as “insects” to suggest the way in which they worked in a “mock genre”; see Italia, 22.

²⁶ Basker notes these new features; see Basker, 63.

²⁷ *Public Advertiser*, 19 December 1755.

²⁸ For some discussion of whether quotations helped or hindered sales, see Basker, 70–71. On the practice of the *Monthly Review*, see Donoghue, 27–8.

²⁹ This view of “formation” is informed by Benjamin’s notion of allegory as a “constellation” of fragments; see Benjamin, *Origin of the German Tragic Drama*, 34–6.

³⁰ Discussing the relationship of anthology to the novel, Price draws out the contradiction involved in such representative extracts: “The anthology’s ambition to represent a whole through its parts is always undermined by readers’ awareness that the parts have been chosen for their difference from those left out” (6).

³¹ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 2, 44.

³² *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 81.

³³ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 96.

³⁴ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 85–8.

³⁵ For an account of the early coverage of the *Critical Review*, see Basker, 59–62.

³⁶ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 96.

³⁷ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 480.

³⁸ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 96. Basker notes that this appeal, particularly addressed to “the Gentlemen of the two Universities”, seems to have brought Thomas Francklin to the *Critical Review* in March (44, 56). The *Critical Review*

occasionally includes thanks for corrections from its readers. In the September number, it asks that those who “are disposed to communicate their observations occasionally, on new performances, could they be certain that the same articles are not already discussed by the Proprietors and Undertakers of the REVIEW”; see *Critical Review* 2 (1756), 192.

³⁹ Benedict suggests how readers of early anthologies were led to re-enact the choices that had been made in them; see Benedict, 385–9. The idea of an “imagined community” of readers and critics draws on Benedict Anderson’s concept of the “nation” as an “imagined political community”; see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, revised edition (London, 2006), 5–6.

⁴⁰ Brad Pasanek and Chad Wellmon, “The Enlightenment Index”, *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 56 (2015), 359–82, 363. For Pasanek and Wellmon, the “term ‘Index’ names less an actual map of some real print universe than indicates the historical consciousness of the complex and comprehensive interrelation of printed things” (366).

⁴¹ Joseph Reed, *A Sop in the Pan for a Physical Critick: in A Letter to Dr SM*LL*T* (London, 1759), 9–10.

⁴² For Benjamin, the mosaic or “constellation” is a way of talking about a fragmented image. In terms of writing, it is associated with the medieval (digressive) treatise. Discussing the connection of such an image with allegory, Machosky puts it this way: “Truth does not show itself in the material (the ceramic pieces), nor does truth pretend to show itself in the completed image (the mosaic), but it pretends to represent itself in the assemblage of pieces that form an image”; see Machosky, 66.

⁴³ One way of evaluating this cost would be to consider Reed’s view that his play had been changed into something else. In so far as the *Critical Review* is perceived as asserting a judgment, the “true Spirit of Criticism”, which is neither a particular judgment nor a totality, cannot be experienced as such.

⁴⁴ *Public Advertiser*, 2 September 1756. Baldwin’s name on the first numbers of the *Critical Review* appears to have been a cover for the real proprietorship of Smollett and Archibald Hamilton; see Basker, 32–3.

⁴⁵ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

⁴⁶ *Critical Review* 2 (1756), Preface.

⁴⁷ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 289.

⁴⁸ *Critical Review* 2 (1756), Preface.

⁴⁹ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 480.

⁵⁰ “The judicious reader will perceive that their aim has been to exhibit a succinct plan of every performance; to point out the most striking beauties and glaring defects; to illustrate their remarks with proper quotations; and to convey these remarks in such a manner, as might best conduce to the entertainment of the public”; *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

⁵¹ The “Monthly Catalogue” had managed to address just nine additional works; see *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 480–4.

⁵² A note in a later number of the *Critical Review*, observing “a strange famine in the land of literature”, reveals the way that articles originated in the *Public Advertiser*: “in vain does the eye run over the last page of the Public and Daily Advertisers: nothing is there to be seen but new editions of Brown, Hervey, &c. without one new performance to attract the attention, laughter, or indignation of the public”; *Critical Review* 4 (1757), 257.

⁵³ The epigraph is drawn from Martial’s *Epigrams*, Book 1, 16: “*Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura/ quae legis hic: aliter non fit, Avite, liber.*” (“There are good things that you read here, and some indifferent, and more bad. Not otherwise, Avitus, is a book made”). See Martial, *Epigrams, Volume I: Spectacles, Books 1–5*, ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 52–3.

⁵⁴ The first epigraph is from Shakespeare’s *Othello*: it is one of the last lines of Othello at the end of Act 5. The second is drawn from the end of the following passage in Horace’s *Epistles*: “Romulus, father Liber, Pollux and Castor, who, after mighty deeds, were welcomed into the temples of the gods, so long as they had care for earth and human kind, settling fierce wars, assigning lands, and founding towns, lamented that the goodwill hoped for matched not their deserts”; see Book 2, Epistle 1 in Horace, *Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1926), 396–7.

⁵⁵ Clifford Siskin, *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830* (Baltimore and London, 1998), 176.

⁵⁶ Christina Lupton, *Knowing Books: The Consciousness of Mediation in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Philadelphia, 2012), 10. Lupton seeks to explore “texts that cultivate discursively the impression of understanding their own mediation”. Lupton thus develops Siskin and Warner’s account of the mediated setting of Enlightenment ideas; see Clifford Siskin and William Warner, *This is Enlightenment* (Chicago and London, 2010).

⁵⁷ *Critical Review* 4 (1757), 472.

⁵⁸ Lupton observes the “human willingness to perceive objects, and to perceive media in particular, as being beyond human control”. A text that references the “power of print” might thus be regarded as part of a struggle to reclaim control or, indeed, to renounce it. See Lupton, 16–19.

⁵⁹ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), 192. The “third letter” is a reference to the review of “*A the third LETTER to the people of England*” in the first number of the *Critical Review* (88–90).

⁶⁰ In noting “the beauty of the paper and print, a circumstance but too much neglected in the generality of modern publications”, the reviewer (most likely Smollett himself) is supporting the physician (and friend of Smollett) William Hunter; see *Critical Review* 13 (1762), 418. Notably, Hunter’s book contains an appendix reprinting material from the *Critical Review*’s earlier coverage of the dispute.

⁶¹ *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

⁶² Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*, trans. Tobias Smollett, ed. Martin C. Battestin and O.M. Brack, Jr (Athens and London, 2003), 20.

⁶³ On Dryden’s influential account of translation (originating in a passage in his “Life of Lucian”), see Battestin’s introduction to Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, xxxv–vi.

⁶⁴ Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, 20.

⁶⁵ Shebbeare comments: “What an Advantage it is in a Critic to have transcribed *Don Quixote*, tho’ it may prove a great Loss to the Bookseller who *hired* him”; see Shebbeare, 9.

⁶⁶ Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, 27. The translators Smollett has in mind are John Stevens, Peter Motteaux, John Ozell and Charles Jarvis.

⁶⁷ Julie Hayes, "Eighteenth-Century Translations of Don Quixote", in *The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, ed. J. A. G. Ardila (London, 2009), 66–75, 71.

⁶⁸ For an exploration of the allegorical structure of Hegel's influential lectures on aesthetics, see Machosky, 42–3.

⁶⁹ *A Complete History of England, from the Descent of Julius Caesar, to the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle. Containing the Transactions of One Thousand Eight Hundred and Three Years*, 4 vols., quarto (London, 1757–8) and *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, 5 vols., octavo (London, 1760–5).

⁷⁰ See the dedication to George Canning's *An Appeal to the Publick from the Malicious Misrepresentations, Impudent Falsifications, and Unjust Decisions, of the Anonymous Fabricators of the Critical Review* (London, 1767).

⁷¹ For an account of the influential culture of serial writing, see Thomas Keymer, *Sterne, the Moderns, and the Novel* (Oxford, 2002), 113–52. Keymer observes that, in Smollett's *Launcelot Greaves*, "instalments play not only on their own discontinuous mode of production but also on intervening texts and events" (122).

⁷² Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator", in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London, 1970). For Benjamin, translation "comes later than the original" and marks a (non-metaphorical) "stage of continued life" (71–2). Contrary to the views of bad translators, Benjamin writes, "translations do not so much serve the work as owe their existence to it". Translation thus reveals "the work" through acts of supplementation. Benjamin observes that, although the Romantics "were gifted with an insight into the life of literary works which has its highest testimony in translation", they "devoted their entire attention to criticism, another, if a lesser, factor in the continued life of literary works" (76).

⁷³ Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, 20.

⁷⁴ Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, 670–3 and 693 (see vol. 2, bk 4, ch. 7 and 10).

⁷⁵ For an evocative discussion of "Don Quixote in the print shop", see Roger Chartier, *Inscription and Erasure: Literature and Written Culture from the*

Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Philadelphia, 2007 [2005]), 28–41.

⁷⁶ Donoghue suggests that Smollett constructs “the narrative of his own career” through the stories of *Gil Blas* and *Don Quixote*, noting that “he adopts the stance of the Quixote upon founding the *Critical*, representing that position most completely in *Launcelot Greaves*”; Donoghue, 129.

⁷⁷ See Tobias Smollett, *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771), ed. Thomas R. Preston and O. M. Brack, Jr. (Athens and London, 1990), 122.

⁷⁸ Smollett, *Humphry Clinker*, 337. For more examples of such “dissent terms of civility” (to use Winifred’s phrase), see Winifred and Tabitha’s letters throughout.

⁷⁹ The idea of “energy” is implicit in Bramble’s order for Clinker to “follow with all possible expedition”; Smollett, *Humphry Clinker*, 164.

⁸⁰ This is Benjamin’s notion of baroque allegory, developed in *The Origin of the German Tragic Drama*. For an account of the way Benjamin worked with a “piling up of fragments”, see Jeremy Tambling, *Allegory* (London and New York, 2010), 110–21.

⁸¹ For Machosky, this would be an ontic distinction and miss the point of allegory as a “simultaneous presentation of what shows itself in itself and of what shows itself in what it is not”; Machosky, 57.

⁸² Following Heidegger’s “The Origin of the Work of Art”, Machosky observes that such a gathering is not a peaceful one. “In the work of art”, she explains “truth [or “the becoming and happening of truth”, as Heidegger puts it] is the gathering that gathers something other (which cannot itself appear) together with something made (the work that does appear)” – as such, it is marked by an unresolvable “rift” (in Heidegger’s words, by an “intimacy with which opponents belong to each other”). See Machosky, 57–8.

⁸³ Basker describes one of Smollett’s reviews as “a quarry from which could be mined material to support critical views ranging from strict neoclassical conservatism to lively ‘preromantic’ sympathies”; Basker, 94.

⁸⁴ In his entry for “Encyclopedia” in the *Encyclopédie* (vol. 5, 1755) Diderot observes the declining usefulness of books: “As long as the centuries continue to

unfold, the number of books will grow continually, and one can predict that a time will come when it will be almost as difficult to learn anything from books as from the direct study of the universe"; quoted in Pasanek and Wellmon, 372.