


AN ILLUSTRATED QUARTERLY
BLAKE

N E W S

Higher Prices

Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly, Volume 12, Issue 1, Summer 1978, p. 72



NEWSLETTER

LEVINE'S BLAKE CARICATURE



Just after printing and mailing *Blake* 44, Spring 1978, we noticed that the credit for reproducing David Levine's caricature of Blake (on our cover) had somehow slipped from column four of the inside-cover spread. The credit should have read: "Drawing by David Levine. Reprinted with permission from *The New York Review of Books*. Copyright © 1970 New York Review, Inc.

The New York Review

A CONTRIBUTOR IDENTIFIED

We inadvertently omitted from the Notes on Contributors in #44 Michael Fischer, who reviewed Northrop Frye's criticism in its Blakean relations. The note should have read: Michael Fischer teaches critical theory at the University of New Mexico. He is writing a book on the defense of poetry in modern criticism, excerpts from which are appearing in *Centennial Review* and *Southern Humanities Review*.

HIGHER PRICES

Subscription prices for *Blake* have been raised considerably, as you will have no doubt noticed. The following explanation and apology was mailed with this year's bills:

Dear Subscriber

With your annual bill for another year's subscription to *Blake*, we would like to offer an apology for contributing to the increases in your cost of living.

You will notice that the price of a subscription has increased to \$10 for individuals, \$12 for institutions. We *hope* you have also noticed that the number of pages in an average issue of *Blake* has increased proportionately during the past year. Our issues have been running about 80 pages. When we were the *Blake Newsletter* issues averaged 24-44 pages. We hope you have also noticed that *Blake* gets a *lot* of text on a single page, much more than the average 6 x 9 scholarly journal that prints 1 column per page. And finally, we don't think you could have missed the illustrations, which are very

expensive to print, but which we think make *Blake* especially useful to you as a scholar.

We would also like to assure you that we take every economy to keep the cost of our issues as low as possible. *All* the layout and pasteup of our journal is done by unpaid volunteer editorial assistants, for example. That is extremely unusual for a scholarly journal, if not unique. If that work were turned over to professionals, the cost of *Blake* would soar.

And, despite the economies, despite the increase in your subscription price, the cost of *Blake* is still heavily subsidized by the University of New Mexico. The subsidy has, in fact, just been increased.

Finally, we hope that you will take a moment to consider that the fat issues of *Blake* are costing you only about \$2.50 each--even at the \$10 per year price.

Thank you in advance for your patience. Yours truly, The Editors.

FOUR ZOAS FOR FALL

The fall issue, #46, will feature a number of essays on Blake's *Four Zoas*, including a series on the editorial problem of the "two" Nights Seven, a pair of articles on the text of Night I, and interpretive articles on the influence of the Cabbala, on "atmospheres", and on the spectrous embrace in Night VII. In addition to the material on *The Four Zoas*, there will be several reviews and the annual checklist of Blake scholarship.

DISCUSSION

(with intellectual spears & long winged arrows of thought)

We received the following letter from Erica Doctorow and Donald Wolf and solicited the reply from Ruth E. Fine that follows it in turn:

To the Editors:

1 June 1978

This may seem like a tardy reply to Ruth Fine's review (*Blake* 42, fall 1977) of the Blake exhibition at Adelphi University, but the review itself appeared six months after the exhibition closed, and it raises some interesting questions.

To begin with, Miss Fine writes that it is a "disservice to late 18th-early 19th century England" to suggest that Blake confronted neglect and indifference. Isn't it an even greater disservice to Blake to imply that he may actually have received the recognition he deserved?

Miss Fine's review also does a disservice to the catalog, a reading of which can hardly justify her remark that it is "more spirited than informative," especially if one keeps in mind that it was intended