

## Infrastructural strains on scholarly transnational collaboration in eighteenth-century Europe. The logistics of knowledge in making Thomas Mangey's *Philonis Judaei Opera* 1728–42

Jacob Orrje

**To cite this article:** Jacob Orrje (2023): Infrastructural strains on scholarly transnational collaboration in eighteenth-century Europe. The logistics of knowledge in making Thomas Mangey's *Philonis Judaei Opera* 1728–42, *History of European Ideas*, DOI: [10.1080/01916599.2023.2171460](https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2023.2171460)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2023.2171460>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 27 Jan 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 68



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Infrastructural strains on scholarly transnational collaboration in eighteenth-century Europe. The logistics of knowledge in making Thomas Mangey's *Philonis Judaei Opera* 1728–42

Jacob Orrje

Department of History of Science and Ideas, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

## ABSTRACT



This paper analyses the logistics of knowledge in eighteenth-century Anglo-Swedish scholarly collaborative relationships. More specifically, it analyses the making of Thomas Mangey's *Philonis Judaei Opera* as a long-distance collaborative project between Mangey and the Swedish scholars Jacob Serenius and Erik Benzelius. The early modern Republic of Letters has commonly been characterised as a collaborative communication system upheld by communitarian norms. This description has however been challenged by several recent studies, which have underlined the commercial aspects of early modern scholarly exchange. Building on such studies, this article highlights how negotiations about the logistics of knowledge circulation – of, e.g. shipping and long-distance financing – were an integral part of early modern transnational scholarly relationships. In the correspondence between the three scholars of 1728–42, we find ample practical details of how they struggled with slow and unreliable regional mercantile infrastructures. The strains of these logistical challenges thoroughly shaped the relationships between the three scholars, and would eventually lead to the collapse of their collaboration.

## KEYWORDS

Scholarly collaboration; History of philology; logistics of knowledge; circulation of knowledge; republic of letters; early modern history

During the 1720s, the English language scholar and clergyman Thomas Mangey was busy finishing his *Philonis Judaei Opera*, an edition that would establish him as an authority on the ancient Jewish scholar from first-century Alexandria, known as Philo Judaeus, or Philo Alexandrinus. The basis for his publication was the work of several scholars, who had been dispatched to France and Italy, paid through Mangey's private fortune, and who were tasked with collecting relevant sources and sending them back to England.<sup>1</sup> Little did he know that at the turn of the century, the Swedish scholar and bishop Erik Benzelius had visited the Bodleian library, where he had found the fourth book of the 'Special Laws' of Philo in one of the manuscripts in Selden's collection. Inspired by what he found there, and in turn unaware of Mangey's work, Benzelius was compiling a commentary of his own of Philo's works.<sup>2</sup>

In 1728, Jacob Serenius, the clergyman of the Swedish Lutheran congregation in London, would finally inform the two scholars of their shared interest in Philo. Soon, following a suggestion by Serenius, they decided to merge their efforts into a joint publication, thus hoping to reduce unnecessary competition and to produce a better final edition. Serenius eventually took it upon himself to act

**CONTACT** Jacob Orrje  jacob.orrje@idehist.uu.se  Department of History of Science and Ideas, Uppsala University, Box 629, Uppsala 751 26, Sweden

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

as Benzeliu's local representative in England, guaranteeing his interests in this mutual project. Through his letters to Benzeliu, we can follow the gradual process by which Benzeliu's manuscripts were integrated into Mangey's edition. The letters contain candid discussions of economic and practical concerns, as well as day-to-day social subtleties and intrigues. They highlight a complex patchwork of an eighteenth-century Republic of Letters where scholars collaborated across Europe, while they handled the costs, the logistical complications, and the risk for their scholarly reputation of coordinating their work over such great distances.

Several studies have shown how a certain system of communitarian norms made the transnational relationships that constituted the Republic of Letters possible. These collaborative networks were already in the 1990s described by Anne Goldgar as 'a community of obligation', in which status was based on the exchange of mutual favours rather than on economical transactions.<sup>3</sup> In the same decade, inspired by Jürgen Habermas, several historians of eighteenth-century science argued that, over the course of the 1700s, natural philosophers circulated knowledge in an emerging public sphere of printed books, and meeting places such as coffeehouses and salons.<sup>4</sup> More recently, historians of science have nuanced these claims, by showing how early modern scholarly endeavours were intertwined with commercial ventures.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, book historians have underlined the commercial nature of emerging book markets, and how early modern scholarly work increasingly became intertwined with the world of printers and book sellers.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, a wealth of research has highlighted how scholarly communities became increasingly reliant on mercantile shipping routes and postal networks when transporting instruments, books, and letters, and thus how mercantile and scholarly communities became increasingly intertwined over the eighteenth century.<sup>7</sup> Recently, the theoretical concept of 'logistics of knowledge' has been proposed as way of understanding these material aspects of knowledge making and circulation, which tied the eighteenth-century Republic of Letters to other modes of transnational exchange.<sup>8</sup> By relating intellectual exchanges to emerging European logistical infrastructures – of postal systems, book markets, and systems of long-distance financing – we will thus better comprehend how the Republic of Letters evolved in eighteenth-century Europe.

Building on previous work on the logistics of knowledge, this article aims to understand the interplay between a mercantile world of shipping and long-distance financing on the one hand, and the circulation of scholarly knowledge on the other. Particularly, I analyse how scholars juggled with asymmetries resulting from different private wealth, physical proximity to the site where editorial work was carried out, and reputation among other European scholars. How were mercantile infrastructures used to ameliorate these asymmetries, and how could these infrastructures likewise be a threat to a scholar's authorial claim to a published edition?<sup>9</sup>

### 1. Three scholars across the North Sea

The scholars studied here were in many ways typical of the clerical elite of eighteenth-century protestant Northern Europe. Mangey was born in 1688, the son of a Goldsmith in Leeds. In 1704, he was admitted as a subsizar to St John's college at Cambridge, where he held a fellowship from 1715–18. Subsequently, he made a successful career in the Church of England, holding the vicarages in Guildford and Ealing, Middlesex, as well as the rectory of St Mildred's. Moreover, from 1721, he held a canonicate at Durham Cathedral.<sup>10</sup> When Serenius first presented Mangey in his letters, he underlined his private wealth, gained from these clerical positions, and how his fortune was the basis for his publication project.<sup>11</sup>

Benzeliu and Serenius both grew up in a similar Swedish scholarly environment: they matriculated at Uppsala University at a young age, and grew up in the Latin-speaking community of scholars found there, drawn together from the various parts of the soon-to-be-no-more Swedish empire. At the time of the correspondence studied here, in the late 1720s and early 30s, the relationship of Serenius and Benzeliu was that of a patron and a client, where Benzeliu, the patron, provided new opportunities for his client Serenius, in exchange for loyalty and practical services.<sup>12</sup>

Erik Benzelius was born in Uppsala in 1675, the son of Archbishop of Uppsala Eric Benzelius the elder. Their family was part of the clerical, academic, and political elite in Sweden, and the younger Benzelius would consolidate this position. After graduating from Uppsala in 1697, he received a royal scholarship for a European study tour (1697–1700), during which he befriended European scholars such as Leibniz, Thomasius, and Malebranche. The journey also took him to England, and he made many contacts there. After returning, he held the position as librarian at Uppsala for some time, before following in the footsteps of his father into the clerical estate – first as the Bishop of Gothenburg, later by holding the same office in the city of Linköping, and finally as archbishop himself. Throughout his life, Benzelius maintained a frequent correspondence with several foreign scholarly contacts. Many incoming letters are preserved to this day, collected in 17 folios at Linköping Diocese Library. His frequent and cordial correspondence with important European scholars, maintained throughout the first half of the eighteenth century, hint at Benzelius' solid reputation in the Republic of Letters.<sup>13</sup>

Compared to Benzelius, Serenius came from a more modest clerical family. He was born at the dawn of the eighteenth century, the son of the clergyman of a small congregation in Färentuna, a village just west of Stockholm. When only nine years old, he matriculated at Uppsala University, where he remained for thirteen years, until he graduated on 12 June 1722.<sup>14</sup> Soon after graduating, in 1723 Serenius became the leader of the newly established Swedish Lutheran congregation in London.<sup>15</sup> Serenius stayed there for almost ten years, until 1732, and tended to the spiritual well-being of actors involved in Anglo-Swedish diplomatic, economic, and maritime contacts.<sup>16</sup> Gradually, he became part of the city's cultural, social, and intellectual circles, and he began acting as an intermediary between English and Swedish scholars.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the Swedish-Lutheran congregation in London was founded by merchants in the Anglo-Swedish iron trade during the 1710s, and as its leader Serenius had ample connections in the mercantile world. As seen from his correspondence with Benzelius, he used these contacts, and especially the Stockholm merchant Jacob Leonard Almacker, to move books, manuscripts, and scholarly travellers around the North Sea region.<sup>18</sup> Serenius was thus also an intermediary in another sense: as someone who resided in-between the transnational communities of scholars and merchants.

## 2. Commencing collaboration on the *Philonis Judaei Opera*

In the first decades of the eighteenth-century, when Mangey and Benzelius worked on their respective commentaries of Philo's work, few other scholars had shown an interest in the ancient scholar. During a long process, culminating in the fifth century, Philo's legacy had been adopted by the early Christian church, and had been made into an important bridge between Greek philosophy and scripture.<sup>19</sup> Through the renaissance, interpreters of Philo had published several new editions, including translations in Latin and various European languages. However, by the seventeenth century, the theological interest in Philo had declined, because of his Platonist character and doubts about his Christian identity. Mangey's *Philonis Judaei Opera* (1742), would not only lead to a renewed interest among Western-European scholars, but would remain the principle textual authority on Philo until modern critical editions were published in Germany between 1896 and 1915.<sup>20</sup>

It was in the summer of 1728 when Serenius first informed Benzelius of Mangey's project. In his first letter, he painted a positive portrait of the English scholar as a candid and easy-going man, who spent his own wealth to print this work in the service of his church.<sup>21</sup> He explained that Mangey had compared manuscripts in Oxford and Cambridge, but that it was in 'a manuscript in the library of a private gentleman' where Mangey had found the most valuable anecdotes about Philo's life and works. Moreover, Serenius related how, while attending a dinner with the archbishop of Canterbury, he had heard of Mangey's ambitious project to send fellows from Cambridge to Paris, Rome, and Florence, where they would compare relevant manuscripts. The project followed a standard philologic process, which consisted of 'collating' (i.e. systematically comparing) different manuscript reproductions of the texts. From these collations, Mangey intended to produce

‘emendations’ (i.e. changes to the texts that aimed to improve them), with the goal of creating a final manuscript that was more faithful to Philo’s original text than any of the compared manuscripts.<sup>22</sup>

It was however not until the spring of 1730 that Benzelius genuinely was drawn into Mangey’s larger project. At this point, Mangey had collated four English, and four French manuscripts, and he had made thousands of emendations. He therefore considered his work finished and intended to publish in the summer of 1730. Nevertheless, he delayed printing until the autumn – partly because he had not yet received the collations of some Vatican and Florentine manuscripts, partly because Benzelius had objected to such a quick publishing schedule. Mangey was evidently interested in Benzelius’ commentaries, and was willing to wait for more information about what possible emendations the Swedish scholar had produced. In his letter to Benzelius, Serenius explained that if Benzelius would send any of his emendations to England, then Mangey would gladly use them in his publication. In return, he would recognise Benzelius publicly, or in any other way the Swedish scholar saw fit.<sup>23</sup>

By the summer of 1730, Serenius suggested that Benzelius and Mangey should merge their emendations. He explained that Mangey would spend a great sum on his publication, and that he thought that it would be unfortunate if this expensive edition lacked Benzelius’ comments, as he believed that the public would not be satisfied with a publication that omitted them.<sup>24</sup> His argument for a mutual project thus sought to appeal both to Benzelius’ scholarly interest in producing the best possible edition, as well as his commercial sense. It is easy to see what compelled Benzelius to agree to this course of action. By sending his manuscripts to England, and by having them incorporated into the larger English project, Benzelius would be able to rely on Mangey’s financial strength, while inserting himself as a major participant in a large and prestigious scholarly project. What prompted Mangey to wait for Benzelius’ commentaries of Philo’s manuscripts is perhaps less evident, as he neither knew the extent of the Swedish emendations, nor their quality. Most likely, it was Benzelius’ scholarly reputation, and his wish to avoid the publication of a competing and possibly superior edition, which compelled Mangey to draw the Swedish scholar into his project.

Serenius thus suggested that Benzelius should send his emendations to England.<sup>25</sup> The plan to combine the two manuscripts was the basis for a new long-distance collaborative project that would prove to be more difficult than any of the involved scholars initially anticipated. Many of the subsequent collaborative problems sprung from the fact that Benzelius was reluctant to hand over his papers. Boiled down to its essentials, his hesitation can be interpreted as a result of an underlying asymmetry, caused by Mangey’s greater control over the final publication. That is, because Mangey would be responsible for the editing process, he would have the ultimate say in how his own emendations should be merged with those of Benzelius. Residing on the other side of the North Sea, Benzelius would have no ways of directly influencing the process. Without the right framework and guarantees, Benzelius would instead need to rely on Mangey’s honour and good intent. Benzelius did not want to place himself in such a subjugated position. Mere promises of an honourable conduct were thus not enough to make the Swedish scholars trust Mangey with Benzelius’ manuscript. Instead, they required a formal collaborative framework, which would guarantee that Benzelius could control the editing process at a distance. More specifically, Serenius and Benzelius asked for a loyal representative to be present, and for a written agreement of how to carry out the comparison, before they would ship the comments to England.

Serenius proposed to Benzelius that they should hire a Swedish ‘corrector’, who would be present in England and who would ensure that Benzelius’ interests were maintained throughout the editing process. This corrector would be ‘a knowledgeable friend’, who would collate Benzelius’ emendations against Mangey’s. Benzelius and Serenius already had someone in mind: the promising student Erik Lang (1702–1743) who had matriculated at Uppsala in 1720. At his disputation *pro exercitio* in 1725, Lang had impressed Benzelius, who had hired him as tutor for his sons. Together with Benzelius’ son Carl Jasper, Lang had continued his studies at Lund University in southern Sweden, and in 1730 he had graduated as first in his class.<sup>26</sup>

By using Lang as a local representative in England, Benzeliuſ aimed to be virtually present during the editing process in Mangey's home. His collations, Serenius argued, would serve as a basis for Mangey's work, and would not only ensure that the English scholar treated Benzeliuſ fairly but would also contribute to an improved final publication.<sup>27</sup> Hence, the representative's instructions needed to be detailed enough to ensure that he acted in Benzeliuſ' interests, yet flexible enough so that he could adapt to changing conditions. He should first collate Mangey's and Benzeliuſ' manuscripts and thus create a document listing their differences. After he had finished his work, Mangey and Benzeliuſ would each appoint two representatives, who would witness and sign the document as well as several copies. Finally, Mangey would sign a written guarantee that he also accepted Lang's collation, and that he would adhere to it when preparing his edition as well as his final publication. After having signed this guarantee, Mangey's honour, Serenius stressed, would depend on him following it.<sup>28</sup>

While this suggested formal collaborative framework addressed some of Benzeliuſ' concerns with the asymmetries in the three scholars' ability to control the editing process, it also introduced new economic problems that needed to be solved. First, it was expensive to send a Swedish representative to England for an extended period. Also, if they were to persuade Lang or any other sufficiently competent and loyal Swedish scholar to travel to England to represent Benzeliuſ, he would need to be compensated. The process of agreeing on what would be an acceptable collation process proved to be long and difficult, and the economic details of the corrector's salary would prove to be the most difficult issue. The ensuing negotiations between Benzeliuſ and Mangey illuminate the need to consider long-distance financing and shipping as an integral part of eighteenth-century intellectual exchange.

On 19 January next year, Serenius wrote to his patron that he had finally met Mangey, who had accepted all Benzeliuſ' terms for the process – except that of the salaried corrector. Mangey had explained to Serenius the practical details of his publication: he aimed to start printing by Easter, by which time he would start to deliver 4 sheets to the printer each week. He had already agreed to pay the printer '30 shillings for the work' and this sum included proof-reading, which he would have to pay for no matter if he hired the corrector or had the printer do the work. His objections to a corrector were thus foremost practical and economical: such a salaried worker would, in his opinion, be superfluous and make the edition unnecessarily expensive.<sup>29</sup>

Over the coming months, Serenius and Mangey met several times to find a compromise that ensured Benzeliuſ' control without being too costly. Mangey promised that he would mention Benzeliuſ on the title sheet, and that he would also 'honour and please' him in the preface. Serenius in return explained to Mangey why mere promises were not sufficient, and 'how painful it must be for a man [such as Benzeliuſ], who has spent so much time and effort on a piece of work, to let it out of his hands, without having at least the reassurance that he will receive a just treatment.' Serenius not only explained how the corrector would be a guarantee for such fair dealings, he furthermore suggested that Mangey might find the representative 'rather useful, as he is guaranteed to be a person who is very skilled in that kind of work.' While Mangey agreed, he still maintained that such a process would be too expensive, as he would also need to pay the printer. The two scholars continued to discuss this point of contention during several meetings. Finally, Mangey agreed to let Lang live in his house when he arrived in England. At the same time, Serenius temporarily stopped arguing for Lang's salary, as he thought it best to wait before he pressed this point of contention again.<sup>30</sup>

The corrector's salary was a particularly thorny issue, as it involved a commercial transaction. When Serenius presented Benzeliuſ' position on issues that involved money, he constantly alternated between highlighting and downplaying his patron's concern for the monetary aspects of their collaboration. In a later letter to Benzeliuſ, Serenius jumped between these two positions in rapid order. His letter recounted how, when Mangey had proposed to compensate Benzeliuſ directly with a sum of money, he had first described Benzeliuſ as uninterested in money. Then, in all but a full reversal of his position, he had underlined that he would have requested either 100 ducats or 50 copies of the final publication, had it been his own work. Thus, on the one



hand, he described his patron as someone who ‘refuses all recognition for himself’, and who foremost cared about the quality of the final edition but who still deserved a fair treatment. According to this logic, Benzelius had made it a ‘point of honour’ that the manuscripts should be reviewed by a salaried corrector, and the corrector would moreover ensure that ‘each and everyone’s meaning would be most carefully assessed and maintained’, which would result in a better edition.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, all involved men were experienced scholars who recognised that the publication of a multi-volume edition such as the *Philonis Judaei Opera* was a pricey commercial project, and Benzelius did not want to cover costs of producing a publication that he would not benefit from economically. Serenius was thus required to present Benzelius as selfless while simultaneously representing Benzelius’ economic interests in the affair.

Eventually, Mangey agreed to a salaried corrector and promised to pay Lang 60 guineas when he arrived in England. It is not evident from Serenius’ correspondence why Mangey finally accepted these demands, but an educated guess is again that Benzelius’ reputation as a philologist increased the estimated value of his manuscript among the English scholarly communities. Serenius was pleased that Mangey in his view finally was acting reasonably. Likewise, he praised his patron’s actions. He underlined how he, because of Benzelius’ reasonable stance, had been able to act with more force, as it was easy for him to show that they acted ‘out of honour and not [self-]interest’.<sup>32</sup>

As seen from these negotiations, eighteenth-century long-distance scholarly collaborations raised several logistical issues about coordination and control. While many of these problems had now been resolved, the solutions involved certain expenses, which meant that they in turn introduced new problems. Especially: how would Mangey compensate Benzelius for these expenses, without placing him in a subjugated junior position?

### 3. Authorship and economies of knowledge circulation

While eighteenth-century books were commercial products, and while especially a project such as Mangey’s that involved multiple salaried scholars and printers clearly involved economic relationships, these financial transactions were not completely unproblematic in a scholarly world of reputation, authorship, and reciprocal gifts. For Benzelius, the costs of the framework he himself had suggested in order to assert control over the project, paradoxically also risked undermine his power over the editing process. In particular, he was worried that Lang’s salary might be interpreted as a purchase sum, by which Mangey would acquire the authorship of his manuscripts. The economic details of the collaboration, and the logistical concerns of how to transport Benzelius’ emendations from Sweden to England, thus again became a central point of contention between the three scholars.

By the summer of 1732, these issues were further complicated. Lang had accepted a position as lecturer of Latin at a *gymnasium* in Sweden and had thus after all decided not to travel to England.<sup>33</sup> Upon receiving this unfortunate news, Serenius immediately began considering new ways to deliver the manuscript. Especially, he worried that Benzelius would not receive his promised 60 guineas.<sup>34</sup> The Swedish scholars were eager to have Mangey’s money, and clearly felt that Benzelius had a right to monetary compensation for his manuscript. At the same time, they were concerned with the optics of the transaction and did not want it to appear as if they desired the money that they so clearly wanted. Their wish to attain these conflicted goals set in motion a complicated chain of events that fundamentally damaged the three scholars’ opinion of each other.

As discussed above, the exchanges of the three scholars continuously involved mercantile considerations. Judging from Serenius’ letters, Mangey did not see it as problematic to offer money for Benzelius’ manuscript. Instead, it appears as if he used his relative fortune to solve disputes concerning the particulars of the collation process, as well as to advance his own control over the edition. Likewise, Serenius and Benzelius did not have any fundamental issues with benefitting economically from sharing the manuscript with Mangey. Quite the opposite: Serenius worked

hard to make sure that Benzelius was reimbursed. While he wished Benzelius to be compensated monetarily for their contribution, Serenius however feared that Mangey might use this compensation as an excuse to claim authorship of Benzelius' contributions.<sup>35</sup> It was thus important that it was clear not only to Mangey, but also to the wider scholarly communities in England and in Europe, that the payment was not for the manuscript itself but for other associated costs, related to its production and delivery. When Lang still had been expected to deliver Benzelius' commentaries, the payment was formally supposed to cover Lang's transport of the manuscripts, as well as the costs of him living in England and working on the manuscripts. Now that Lang had declined this task, Serenius needed to arrange a new way of transporting the text across the North Sea, and to come up with a new way of explaining their need for monetary compensation, that protected Benzelius' authorship of the manuscript in a similar way.

Serenius never explicitly discussed in his letters how Benzelius' emendations were transported to England. However, in Benzelius' correspondence with his brother Gustaf Benzelstierna (1687–1746) of July and August 1732, we find a thorough discussion of these logistical matters. Benzelius packed the book in a wooden box and asked a clergyman to carry it to Stockholm.<sup>36</sup> He then asked his brother 'to recommend it to some safe merchant,' who could send the box 'to Magister Serenius in London.' Benzelius believed that the merchant 'Mr Almacker would know the best address, as I today through him received a manuscript from Serenius'. Moreover, he urged his brother to act quickly: 'Most likely there will not be a lack of opportunities to send it with some ship to London, and I would also like it sent at the first opportunity, as Doctor Mangey is waiting for it.' Benzelius had written Serenius' address on the wooden box, but he asked his brother to check if it had been smudged, and in that case instead to write the address on a piece of paper and to stick in on the package.<sup>37</sup> On 30 August, Benzelius inquired with his brother 'what shipper who sent it, so that I may write to Magister Serenius and tell him', and in his reply of 7 October Benzelstierna answered that the shipper Johan Schmidt had carried it to England on his boat.<sup>38</sup>

The new transport arrangements, that relied on the merchant Almacker and the shipper Schmidt, offered few opportunities to give Mangey's promised payment a less commercial frame. Consequently, they posed a threat to maintaining Benzelius' authorial rights in relation to Mangey. Anticipating this problem, Serenius presented a new scheme for how they could accept Mangey's money without making it seem like a mercantile transaction. In many ways, this plan – which involved hiding from Mangey how the manuscript was shipped – transgressed the norms of honourable scholarly conduct. Serenius explained the plan to his patron in detail: he could not give the emendations to Mangey himself, 'as that would require me to demand the money, which would lead to an inevitability that I, until now, have tried to avoid, i.e. to give the matter the least appearance of purchase or trade.' Instead, he would attempt to find a suitable scholar who was visiting London, who would pretend to have brought the emendations from Sweden and who would therefore also request the 60 guineas to cover travel expenses.<sup>39</sup> By the fall of 1732, Serenius had found the perfect candidate: a Swedish scholar in England named Berfelt.<sup>40</sup>

On 12 January 1733, Serenius wrote to Benzelius to inform him that the emendations had arrived in London. Though the shipper Schmidt had transported the parcel across the seas, Serenius instead, in accordance with his plan, told Mangey that Berfelt personally had brought the texts from Sweden. In a letter to his patron, Serenius stressed the necessity of this falsehood: even though it would require them to deviate from the truth, this small lie would make their story more believable. Moreover, their scheme would protect them from other potential schemes that Mangey might be plotting against them. He thus believed 'such an innocent construction necessary, as otherwise one would too greatly expose oneself to the many machinations and mischiefs that are all too common nowadays.'<sup>41</sup> Though he wrote that he expected Mangey to act honourably, Serenius iterated that the English scholar might claim ownership over Benzelius' manuscript if he could argue that he had 'bought Philo and its annotations with a great sum of money, and that he hence had the right to do with it as he pleased.'<sup>42</sup> By pretending that Berfelt had delivered the manuscript, Mangey's money would instead 'not be accepted as a purchase-sum, but would cover the voyage for the



person delivering the book.<sup>43</sup> By controlling the narrative of how the manuscript had been transported, Serenius hoped that Benzelius could accept Mangey's economic compensation while still maintaining authorship of it. His manoeuvring thus again underlines how the ways scholars relied on underlying logistical infrastructures could have clear repercussions for the power dynamics of transnational scholarly relationships.

Soon after Berfelt handed over the manuscript to Mangey, the collation began. By May, Berfelt would soon return to Sweden. For Serenius' money scheme to work, they would thus have to expedite the payment. Mangey, however, asked for deferment until he received a reply from Benzelius. He believed that Benzelius might want to adjust the sum they had agreed on when he realised that Mangey's emendations were much more extensive than his own. As it linked the monetary exchange to matters of scholarly quality, this suggestion again made Serenius fear that Mangey perceived the exchange as a purchase of the authorial rights, and that he consequently potentially might claim ownership over Benzelius' contributions. Serenius immediately went to Mangey's house and 'explained with sharp sincerity how much [Mangey] deceived himself if he believed that he had bought the *Philo* [manuscript] like in a market for money'.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, he asked Mangey

with what honour he could propose to value another man's work so low as 60 guineas, which according to his own words and valediction were promised as travelling-money for the messenger but never as a purchase sum for the whole work.<sup>45</sup>

According to Serenius' account of their meeting, this criticism made Mangey very meek and he 'soon caved, promising me more than one time that he had not meant it as I had understood it'. Once again Mangey used his wealth as a way to try to resolve the conflict. He offered Serenius 12 guineas there and then, and promised that he would pay the remainder using a bill of exchange. Though it is hard to imagine that this was actually the case, in his letter to Benzelius, Serenius ensured his patron that he and Mangey parted as friends after the meeting.<sup>46</sup>

An indication that their relationship was frostier than Serenius admitted, was the fact that Mangey still was reluctant to pay the 60 guineas. Serenius described how 'when the designated time arrived, and my accepted bill was presented, he did not pay it'.<sup>47</sup> Instead, Mangey had sent Serenius an invitation to 'come dine the next day'. Moreover, he asked him to bring 'an extract of the honourable Bishop's orders for the payment'.<sup>48</sup> Serenius once again saw several risks with this request. Especially, he did not want Benzelius to be associated with any request for money, as that once again would give the exchange an air of commerce in a way that might compromise Benzelius' authorial claims to the manuscript. Thus, he underlined to Benzelius 'how much it affected me to be cheated one more time'. Distancing himself from the exchange, he instead sent Berfelt to Mangey with orders to repay the 12 guineas.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, Serenius sent a letter with Berfelt, in which he explained to Mangey how his 'patron has never given me any orders to ask for money'.<sup>50</sup> Finally, he also translated an extract of a previous letter from Benzelius into English and asked Berfelt to forward it to Mangey. The emphasis with which Benzelius and Serenius distanced themselves from monetary interest in this extract, despite their intricate money scheme, makes it worth repeat in full:

If You find that D:r Mangey accepts of my work with as little alacrity & chearfulness [*sic*] as His Long silence makes me suspect, I desire You not to insist upon one farthing of His money that He agreed to pay to the bringer, but to receive the Book back again & defray all expenses for my own account. For I am so far from all mercenary views [*sic*], that if He will but soon oblige the publick with a neat edition of *Philo*, so that I may have the pleasure to see it before I die, I shall value that more than all the treasure of England.<sup>51</sup>

Serenius had instructed Berfelt that he should not stay for dinner at Mangey's, but only deliver the letter and then leave. When he returned, Berfelt described to Serenius how 'Mangey had been rather spineless when he read [Serenius'] letter and even more so from the translated extract'.<sup>52</sup> Mangey had protested, refused to take back the money, and had insisted that Berfelt would stay for dinner (a refusal, Mangey had stated, would have been 'the worst affront anyone had ever put upon him'). The English scholar had moreover blamed Serenius for the whole incident, and had described him as 'too hasty and hot-tempered etcetera'.<sup>53</sup> This was of course Serenius' third-hand account

of Berfelt's description of Mangey's words. That Serenius related them in the letter to his patron should perhaps rather be seen as a way to present Mangey as an unreliable backtalker. Nevertheless, they also show the complicated expectations of scholarly authorship and monetary exchange that the three collaborating scholars needed to navigate.

While Serenius' hard stance further damaged the relationships between the three scholars, it also paid off monetarily as Mangey finally yielded and paid the requested 60 guineas. Once again, Serenius was 'rather pleased to have finished this affair'.<sup>54</sup> Perhaps anticipating his patron's concerns about his confrontational method of intermediation, Serenius made excuses for his hard tactics. He admitted that he would have acted less aggressively if he had not represented Benzelius but only had acted on his own. As Benzelius' representative however, he could 'not stand to suffer one breath of the fancy that they needed [Mangey's] money'.<sup>55</sup>

The exchanges discussed here again show the complexities that the three scholars faced when merging the two manuscripts. In making their joint edition, Serenius, Benzelius, and Mangey juggled various mercantile infrastructures, of book printers, merchants, and shippers. While these infrastructures made scholarly collaboration possible, they also introduced new complications. As they functioned through economic exchanges, commercial considerations thus necessarily also were a part of the relationships of the three scholars. Because of the great difference in private wealth, and the economic inequalities between eighteenth-century Britain and Sweden, these economic considerations introduced specific power dynamics, where Mangey could use his wealth to take control over the collation process and to attain authorial recognition of the edition. At the same time, Mangey's financial muscles made the Swedish scholars distrust his intentions. Hence, while they manoeuvred to benefit from Mangey's wealth, they also devised tactics to offset his position. Serenius, the intermediary, wished his patron both to benefit economically from the collaboration and to receive authorial recognition for his contributions. Primarily, this strategy revolved around shaming the English scholar for his attempts to solve their conflicts through monetary means, while at the same time presenting Benzelius as a reputable scholar uninterested in financial compensation.

#### 4. Collaboration or competition?

As the publication process of the *Philonis Judaei Opera* carried on, increasing distrust and suspicion transformed the relationships between the involved scholars. From the beginning, Mangey, Benzelius, and Serenius seem to have balanced between two parallel relational logics. On the one hand, they were scholarly collaborators, who embraced disinterestedness and who wished to produce a mutual scholarly publication of high repute. They were however also competitors, tactically trying to benefit from the work of their rival while trying to beat him to market. Each of these logics was based both in the realities of early modern scholarly work and collaboration, and in shared communitarian and mercantile norms that permeated eighteenth-century scholarly communities. We should thus not view the one as reflecting an ideal and the other as the reality of the Republic of Letters. However, as trust between the scholars deteriorated, the collaborative logic seems increasingly to have yielded to a more competitive relationship. In the end, this competitive relational mode resulted in a break between the three scholars, which also had consequences on the pages of the final publication of the *Philo*.

The two competing relational logics, and the uncertainties that they created, are for example evident in the correspondence between Serenius and Benzelius of the summer of 1731. After a previous letter from Serenius to Benzelius had been delayed in the post, Serenius insisted that Benzelius should write directly to Mangey as soon as he heard from him. Otherwise, Serenius thought, Mangey might suspect that they had not acted sincerely, or 'which I least of all want him to believe, that we are not satisfied with the money he is offering and that we want more from him'.<sup>56</sup> Serenius feared that Mangey suspected that they deliberately sought to delay the English edition of the *Philo*, so that the Swedish scholars could publish an competing edition in Amsterdam.<sup>57</sup> Both

for his own sake, as well as Benzelius', Serenius wanted to avoid such distrust, at least while he was living in England. Foremost, he was worried about what Mangey might do to his reputation. While he pointed out that partaking in the English publication had many potential benefits, he considered it to be especially important for him to appease Mangey while he lived in England. There, in the middle of English scholarly communities, he was more dependent on his reputation in a local community of acquaintances: 'as Dr Mangey is known in all places where I have acquaintances among the erudite and noble, and I prefer not to have a bad friendship with him.'<sup>58</sup>

Serenius did however not remain in England permanently. By the summer of 1733, he left London for Hamburg, where he would oversee the publication of an English-Swedish dictionary.<sup>59</sup> While he lived there, he continued to act as an intermediary between Benzelius and Mangey. As the distance increased to English scholarly communities, he sided more clearly with Benzelius and championed an even more confrontational approach towards Mangey. This change can be seen already in one of Serenius' first letters to Benzelius from Hamburg of 15 August 1733. Serenius informed his patron that the last parts of Benzelius' emendations had not yet arrived in London, but also that he had sent orders to London that it should not be forwarded to Mangey until Benzelius had given explicit orders. Moreover, Serenius discussed the *Dissertatio De Vita Philonis*, a biographical dissertation on Philonis that Benzelius had written, which he argued could be used as leverage in negotiations with Mangey. He suggested that they should postpone giving Mangey the dissertation, if the English scholar 'did not act honourably with the footnotes, or if he continued to argue about them like he has done'. In that case, Benzelius should attempt to publish a competing edition in Amsterdam, which Serenius believed would be greatly appreciated by the booksellers there.<sup>60</sup> While tensions clearly were rising, Serenius increasingly entertained the idea of using the transnational book trade as a way to introduce a competing edition of *Philo*.

During the coming years, Mangey's publication continued to progress slowly. Serenius and Benzelius sent a trickle of material, but also consciously withheld manuscripts as a means of maintaining control of the publication process. In 1735, when Serenius returned to Sweden to take up a position as clergyman, internal politics of the Swedish church came to be the dominating topic in the letters, and some time passed without any mentions of Mangey's edition. Discussions about *Philonis Judaei Opera* did not reappear in their letters until 1736. At that time, Mangey had started to send proof-sheets to Serenius through the new Swedish clergyman in London Tobias Biörk, sheets which Serenius in turn forwarded to Benzelius. Biörk had met with Mangey together with the astronomer Anders Celsius, who was currently visiting England. Mangey had asked them to intercede in the matter and to convince Benzelius to give him the biographical dissertation.<sup>61</sup>

By the end of 1737, it however seems as if all pretense of collaboration finally had vanished. Serenius was explicitly confrontational, stating that 'Mangey is an ungodly man, who exhausts all patience.' Serenius even suggested submitting a letter to the *Journal des Scavans*, where he would describe Mangey's bad character.<sup>62</sup> While there is nothing in the *Journal* around that year that suggests that he followed through with his threat, there are clear indications that Serenius and Benzelius were venting their dissent with other European scholars. In February 1738, Serenius reported to Benzelius of another letter from Biörk. This time, Biörk warned that Mangey was furious with the Swedish scholars, as he had 'observed in yr newspapers from Holland such a reflection as if I was printing nothing but the Bishop's writings.'<sup>63</sup> Serenius did nothing to ameliorate the situation, or to salvage the collaboration. Instead, he wrote to his patron that he believed 'that Mangey had thrown away his mask' and that he 'had always considered him a false man, whom I have never known when to believe.' He even claimed that Mangey had a bad reputation among scholars in general: 'among all scholars in London, it was evident that if any good results would ever come from his *Philo*, it would be Benzelius' work and not his.'<sup>64</sup>

Still, besides complaining there was not much that the two Swedish scholars could do at this point. Mangey would soon publish his edition, and they had little leverage to influence its contents. While all prospects on collaborating on a mutual edition evidently had disappeared, in reality Benzelius and Serenius had no means of making a competing edition. Mangey had control over

Benzelius' papers that had been shipped to England, which amounted to the majority of his emendations. And even if they had had the papers, they lacked the financial resources and a structure that could compete with Mangey's transnational project. Serenius could therefore only suggest that they should wait for Mangey's edition and see what happened.<sup>65</sup>

In 1742, Mangey finally published the first volume of his *Philonis Judaei Opera*, and his edition would eventually establish him as an authority on the ancient thinker Philo of Alexandria.<sup>66</sup> After reading the published volume, the English philologist Edward Lye wrote a letter to Benzelius of 23 July 1742 informing him that, judging from 'the quotation printed in the specimen', Mangey was 'much obliged' to Benzelius.<sup>67</sup> The first volume contained a wealth of quotes of the Swedish scholar's work. However, in the subsequent volumes, we find no more references to him, indicating that Mangey perhaps consciously excluded him as their relationship deteriorated.<sup>68</sup>

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper, I have examined how eighteenth-century transnational scholarly relationships relied on mercantile infrastructures, primarily of financing and shipping, necessary for the circulation of scholarly knowledge. Moreover, I have underlined how the commercial considerations that permeated these infrastructures was an integral part of transnational scholarly relationships. Thus, Serenius' letters not only provide a detailed example of how the mercantile world was a vital infrastructure for the exchange of scholarly knowledge, but they also show how this infrastructure actualised several delicate issues that eighteenth-century scholars continuously needed to handle.

The case discussed here thus corroborates the point, made recently in both history of science and book history, that eighteenth-century making and publishing of scholarly knowledge was permeated by commercial considerations. However, the case also shifts the focus of that research in two important ways. First, by focusing on theology and philology, instead of on various forms of natural philosophy, we see how commercial matters did not merely become urgent when shipping heavy and expensive objects such as instruments and naturalia, or when knowledge making was closely connected to commercial or state-related fields of knowledge. When carried out in a transnational context, even basic scholarly activities, such as the sharing of manuscripts, tied eighteenth-century scholars to mercantile shipping and long-distance financing. Second, the case discussed here has only indirectly discussed relationships between scholars and eighteenth-century European book markets. Instead, we see how the collaborating scholars among themselves pre-emptively considered ways of making their book cheaper and more competitive: Would too many footnotes make it expensive? Would a hired corrector cost too much? Would a mutual edition be more appreciated by the readers? In the case studied here, the commercial logic of the emerging European book markets were thus not something that merely formed the relationships between scholars and book sellers, but rather something that the scholars had in mind already at an early stage of manuscript production.

From Serenius' correspondence, it is exceedingly evident how in a large scholarly project, such as Mangey's publication of *Philonis Judaei Opera*, correspondents needed to discuss and solve a range of logistical issues of shipping and financing. At the same time, the slow and unreliable postal services over the North Sea, often consisting of improvised merchant messengers, exacerbated these issues and made it difficult for the scholars to overcome their differences. To a degree, having Serenius as a local go-between, and eventually even a salaried representative in Mangey's home, solved some of these issues. At the same time, as we have seen, the interests of these intermediaries did not always align with those of Benzelius, and thus they also introduced new complexities and problems into the collaborative project.

All involved needed to deal with these logistical issues not only because it was necessary from a practical point of view, but also, and perhaps even more importantly, because these issues were inherently intertwined with the relationships between the three collaborating scholars, as well as their reputations in a wider Republic of Letters. Certain ways of shipping manuscripts, and of

financing the shipments, risked undermine a scholar's authorial claim to a text. The ways Mangey, Benzelius, and Serenius choose to transport manuscripts (and how they paid carriers), how they financed the help of junior scholars, and the economical transactions between the three thus affected their claims to authorship both of manuscripts and of the final edition. Consequently, the strains of these underlying logistical infrastructures also risked damaging their reputation in the wider community of scholars that constituted the Republic of Letters. In the end, the complexities of juggling with the logistics of knowledge was the basis for their relationships' eventual collapse.

## Notes

1. Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 217; David T. Runia, 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers', in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 210–30; The full title of Mangey's edition was: *Ta Heuriskomena hapanta. Philonis Judaei Opera Quae Reperiri potuerunt Omnia: Textum cum MSS. contulit, quamplurima etiam e Codd. Vaticano, Mediceo, et Bodleiano, Scriptoribus item vetustis, necon Catenis Graecis ineditis, adjecit, Interpretationemque emendavit, universa Notis et Observationibus illustravit* (London: G. Bowyer, 1742).
2. John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship: 3, The Eighteenth Century in Germany, and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1921), 347.
3. Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680–1750* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1995), 13. For similar perspectives, see also Lorraine Daston, 'The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment', *Science in Context* 4, no. 2 (1991): 367–386; Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1994).
4. Jan Golinski, *Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992); Larry R. Stewart, *Rise of Public Science: Rhetoric, Technology and Natural Philosophy in Newtonian Britain, 1660–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992).
5. Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen, *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Dániel Margócsy, *Commercial Visions: Science, Trade, and Visual Culture in the Dutch Golden Age* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2014); Sarah Easterby-Smith, eds., *Cultivating Commerce: Cultures of Botany in Britain and France, 1760–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017).
6. Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book. Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1998), 1–57, 187–265; Adrian Johns, *Piracy: The Intellectual Property Wars from Gutenberg to Gates* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2009), 41–56; Robert Darnton, *Pirating and Publishing: The Book Trade in the Age of Enlightenment* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2021), 13–44.
7. See e.g., Simon Schaffer, 'Newton on the Beach: The Information Order of Principia Mathematica', *History of Science* 47, no. 3 (September 2009): 243–76; Peter Burke, 'The Republic of Letters as a Communication System', *Media History* 18, no. 3–4 (August 2012): 395–407; Jay Caplan, *Postal Culture in Europe, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2016).
8. Vincent Denis and Pierre-Yves Lacour, 'La logistique des savoirs: Surabondance d'informations et technologies de papier au XVIII:e siècle', *Genèses*, no. 102 (2016): 107–22; Isabelle Laboulais, 'Territorialisation and Logistics of Knowledge and Learning: The Case of Mineral Resource Surveys in France in the Eighteenth Century', in *Transnational Cultures of Expertise: Circulating State-Related Knowledge in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, eds. Lothar Schilling and Jakob Vogel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019); Jacob Orrje, 'The Logistics of the Republic of Letters: Mercantile Undercurrents of Early Modern Scholarly Knowledge Circulation', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 53, no. 3 (September 2020): 351–69.
9. A similar point about circulation of knowledge, and interrelated scholarly and mercantile circulation of knowledge is made in Kapil Raj, 'Networks of Knowledge, or Spaces of Circulation? The Birth of British Cartography in Colonial South Asia in the Late Eighteenth Century', *Global Intellectual History* 2, no. 1 (2017): 52.
10. William Hutchinson, *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine, of Durham*, vol. 2 (Newcastle: Hodgson & Robinsons, 1785), 173; J. H. Lupton, 'Mangey, Thomas (1688–1755)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (London: Macmillan, 1893).
11. Letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 21 June 1728, file Br 10/11/38/, Linköping Diocese Library (LDL).
12. For a discussion of the patron-client relationships permeated the scholarly networks of eighteenth-century Sweden, see Patrik Winton, *Frihetstidens politiska praktik: Nätverk och offentlighet 1746–1766* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2006).
13. Benzelius' correspondence with foreign scholars have been translated and published in Alvar Erikson, ed., *Letters to Erik Benzelius the Younger from Learned Foreigners* (Göteborg: Vetenskaps- och vitterhets-



- samhället, 1980); Eva Nilsson Nylander and Alvar Erikson, eds., *Erik Benzelius' Letters to His Learned Friends* (Göteborg: Vetenskaps- och vitterhets-samhället, 1983). Although he lived in London, Serenius' letters are however not included in these edited volumes. In the following, I thus refer to the original letters at the Linköping Diocese Library.
14. Lena Rogström, *Jacob Serenius lexikografiska insats* (Göteborg: Institutionen för svenska språket, 1998), 36; *Dictionary of Swedish National Biography*, s.v. 'Jacob Serenius', <https://sok.riksarkivet.se/sbl/artikel/5864> (accessed 9 May 2022).
  15. Lars Hagberg, *Jacob Serenius' kyrkliga insats. Kyrkopolitik, kristendomsförsvar, undervisningsfrågor* (Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1952), 13–14.
  16. Sven Evander and Lennart Sjöström, *Svenska kyrkan i London 1710–2000: en historia i ord och bilder* (London: Svenska kyrkan, 2001); Gustaf Wilhelm Carlson, *Anteckningar rörande Svenska Kyrkan i London* (Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt, 1852).
  17. See, e.g., Jacob Serenius to Sr Hans Sloane, 8 December 1730, Sloane MS 4051, British Library. In this letter, Serenius mentions having forwarded another letter from the Swedish mechanic Mårten Triewald, asking Sloane for a recommendation for membership in the Royal Society. Travelogues written by Swedish visitors to London give a glance of Serenius' everyday life in the city: Jacob Arfwedson, 'Jacob Arfwedsons resejournal 1726–28', Arfwedson's Archive, vol. 14, Uppsala University Library, pp. 1104–6; Carl Reinhold Berch, 'C. R. Berchs självbiografi', in vol. 3 of *Äldre svenska biografier*, ed. Henrik Schück, Uppsala universitets årskrift, (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1916), 122–123. On the role of intermediaries in the circulation of knowledge, see Kapil Raj, 'Go-Betweens, Travelers, and Cultural Translators', in *A Companion to the History of Science*, ed. Bernard Lightman (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2016), 39–57.
  18. On Almacker, see Peter Ericsson and Patrik Winton, 'Politics of Credit: The Market for Government Debt in Sweden, 1715–60' (Economic History Society Annual Conference, Keele University, 2018), 14–5.
  19. Runia, 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers', 210–230.
  20. Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 217.
  21. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 21 June 1728, file Br 10/11/38/, LDL.
  22. 'et manuscript uti en privat Gentlemans Biliothek här i England', *ibid.* For a discussion of the emergence of early modern philological practices of manuscript editing, see Anthony Grafton, 'Humanist Philologies: Texts, Antiquities, and Their Scholarly Transformations in the Early Modern West', in Sheldon Pollock et al. (eds.), *World Philology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press), 154–177.
  23. Letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 28 April 1730, file Br 10/11/117, LDL.
  24. Letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 21 July 1730, file Br 10/11/139, LDL.
  25. *Ibid.*
  26. K. A. Hagström, *Strengnäs Stifts Herdaminne*, vol. 4 (Strengnäs: Svenska kyrkan, 1901), 201–202.
  27. 'en wän som förstår saker wäl', letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 21 July 1730, file Br 10/11/139, LDL.
  28. Details of the collation process can be found in a later letter: Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 2 July 1731, file Br 10/12/102/, LDL.
  29. '30 skill. för arbete', letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 19 January 1731, file Br 33/784, LDL.
  30. 'huru ömt det måtte wara för en Man som så mycken tid och möda användt på et stycke arbete, at släppa det ur händerne, utan at hafwa åtminstone den Securite at honom skedde justice derwid', 'ganska nyttig, efter han försäkras wara en person af mycken habilité för sådant wärk', letter from Jacob Serenius to Erik Benzelius, 19 March 1731, file Br 33/785, LDL.
  31. 'refuserar all recognition til sig sielf', 'point d'honneur', 'hwars och Ens mening blir nogast assequerad och behållen', Serenius to Benzelius, 2 July 1731.
  32. 'p'honneur och icke p'intresse', *ibid.*
  33. Hagström, vol. 4 of *Strengnäs Stifts Herdaminne*, 201.
  34. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 18 August 1732, file Br 10/13/51/, LDL.
  35. A similar point was made already in a nineteenth-century analysis of the correspondence: Hans Forsell, 'Minne af Erkebiskopen doktor Erik Benzelius den yngre', *Svenska akademien handlingar* 58 (1883): 375.
  36. Letter from Gustaf Benzeltierna to Erik Benzelius, 28 July 1732, file Br 11a/52, LDL
  37. 'recommendera then til någon säker köpman', 'til Mag:r Serenius i London', 'Hr Almacker skulle kunna gifwa bästa adressen, ty genom honom Hahr jag i dag fått från br:te Mag:r Serenius ett MS', 'Thet lærer ej felas tilfalle at senda thet med något skepp til London skulle och gärna se at thet skedde med aldra-första, efter Docor Mangey wentar therpå', letter from Erik Benzelius to Gustaf Benzeltierna, 11 July 1732, file Br 11/34, LDL.
  38. 'hwilken skeppare thet han sendt, at jag må skrifwa til Magr Serenius, och berättat', letter from Benzelius to Benzeltierna, 30 August 1732, file Br 11/35, LDL; Gustaf Benzeltierna to Erik Benzelius, 'Letter from Benzeltierna 1732-10-07', 7 October 1732, file Br 11a/54, LDL.
  39. Serenius to Benzelius, 18 August 1732, file Br 10/13/51/, LDL.



40. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 5 September 1732, file Br 10/13/54/, LDL. Serenius' letters do not mention Berfelt's first name.
41. 'et sådant oskyldigt bidrag aldeles oumgångligt efter man eliest skulle gifwa sig alt för blott för de många konster och illbragd hwar med tiderna nu äro för kränktä', letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 12 January 1733, file Br 10/13/76/, LDL.
42. 'kiöpt Philo och dess annotata med en så stor summa pengar och egde giöra dermed som honom behagade', *ibid.*
43. 'hans pengar emottages icke såsom en kiöpskilling, utan som en respenning för den som boken framförer', *ibid.*
44. 'med skarpa alfware förestälte hoo huru mycket han bedrogo sig om han tänkte at han hade kiöpt *Philo* så som i en marknad för pgr', letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 1 May 1733, file Br 10/13/101/, LDL.
45. 'med hwad heder han kunde bjude til at sätte et så ringa värde på annans arbete som 60 guinneer, hwilka efter hans egit ord och afsked wore utfästa såsom en rese penning för övfwer bringaren men aldrig så som en kiöpe skilling för värket', Serenius to Benzelius, *ibid.*
46. 'gaf strax hwiga försäkrandes mig mer än en gång at han det ej mente så som iag det uptagit', *ibid.* On the use of bills of exchange as a means of financing long-distance trade, see Veronica Aoki Santarosa, 'Financing long-distance trade: the joint liability rule and bills of exchange in eighteenth-century France', *Journal of Economic History* 75, no. 3 (2015): 691.
47. 'när den aftalte tiden kom och min trätte efter accord blef presenterad, betalte han den icke', *ibid.*
48. 'komma dagen derpå til måltid', 'extract af H H Biskopens bref och ordres om betalningen', *ibid.*
49. 'huru mycket det gick mig til sinnes at blifwa ännu en gång fixerad', *ibid.*
50. 'min principal aldrig gifwit mig några ordres at fordra pgr', *ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*
52. 'Mangey har warit ganska flat när han läsit mit bref och ännu mera öfwer Transleterade Extractet', *ibid.*
53. 'den största afront han nånsin kunde giöra honom', 'för hastig och kort om hufwudet, med mera', *ibid.*
54. 'rätt glad at med denna affairen så wida kommit til ändskap', *ibid.*
55. 'icke anstå at tåla en halfdragen enda af någon sådan inbillning som man behöfde hans pgr', *ibid.*
56. 'det som iag alraminst wille ha honom at tänka, det man icke är nögd med hans gjorde tilbud af penningar, utan at man wille hafwa mer af honom', letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 27 August 1731, file Br 10/12/128/, LDL.
57. *Ibid.*
58. 'efter Doc:tr Mangey är bekant på alla ställen hwar iag har bekantskaper hos Erudita och de förnäma, och iag icke gierna har en kace wänkap med honom.', *ibid.*
59. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 27 July 1733, file Br 10/13/112/, LDL.
60. 'icke bär sig redel. åt med noterne, eller han fortfor at qwackla dermed som han giort', letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 15 August 1733, file Br 10/13/118/, LDL.
61. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 8 April 1736, file Br 10/14/167, LDL; letter from Serenius to Benzelius, May 1736, file Br 10/14/169, LDL.
62. 'Mangey är en ogudaktig man som så uttröttat alt tolamod', letter from Serenius to Benzelius 14 December 1737, file Br 10/15/86, LDL.
63. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 11 February 1738, file Br 10/15/103, LDL. Serenius quoted Mangey's original comment in English, and this quote is thus not translated.
64. 'at Mangey kastet af sig masquen', 'har alltid hållit hoo för en falsk karl, som iag aldrig wetat när iag kunnat tro.', 'hos alla lärde i London gick det för Contant at om något godt engång kommo uti hans Philo, wore det Benzelianens och icke hans.' *Ibid.*
65. Letter from Serenius to Benzelius, 11 March 1738, file Br 10/15/105, LDL.
66. Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 217; Runia, 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers'; The full title of Mangey's edition was: *Philonis Judaei Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*.
67. Margaret Clunies Ross and Amanda J. Collins, eds., *The Correspondence of Edward Lye* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004), 151.
68. For example, one can compare Philo and Mangey, *Philonis Judaei Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, volume 1 and volume 2. A search through the first volume, using Google books, finds 33 mentions of Benzelius. A similar search of the second volume generates no hits.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This work was supported by Swedish Research Council [grant number 2017-02271].

## Bibliography

- Arfwedson, Jacob. 'Jacob Arfwedsons resejournal 1726–1728', 1726. Anders, Abraham and Jacob Arfwedson's archive, vol. 14. Uppsala University Library.
- Berch, Carl Reinhold. 'C. R. Berchs själfbiografi'. In *Äldre svenska biografier. 3/4*, edited by Henrik Schück, 107–34. Uppsala universitetens årsskrift, 1916. Uppsala: Uppsala university, 1916.
- Burke, Peter. 'The Republic of Letters as a Communication System'. *Media History* 18, no. 3–4 (1 August 2012): 395–407. doi:10.1080/13688804.2012.721956
- Caplan, Jay. *Postal Culture in Europe, 1500–1800*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2016.
- Carhart, Michael C. 'Practices of Intellectual Labor in the Republic of Letters: Leibniz and Edward Bernard on Language and European Origins'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 80, no. 3 (1 January 2019): 365–86. doi:10.1353/jhi.2019.0023
- Carlson, Gustaf Wilhelm. *Anteckningar rörande Svenska Kyrkan i London*. Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt, 1852.
- Clunies Ross, Margaret, and Amanda J. Collins, eds. *The Correspondence of Edward Lye*. Publications of the Dictionary of Old English, 6. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004.
- Darnton, Robert. *Pirating and Publishing: The Book Trade in the Age of Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2021.
- Daston, Lorraine. 'Nationalism and Scientific Neutrality under Napoleon'. In *Solomon's House Revisited: The Organization and Institutionalization of Science*, edited by Tore Frängsmyr, 95–115. Nobel Symposium. Canton, MA: Science History Publications, 1990.
- Daston, Lorraine. 'The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment'. *Science in Context* 4, no. 02 (1991): 367–86. doi:10.1017/S0269889700001010
- Denis, Vincent and Pierre-Yves Lacour. 'La logistique des savoirs: Surabondance d'informations et technologies de papier au XVIII:e siècle'. *Genèses*, no 102 (2016): 107–22. doi:10.3917/gen.102.0107
- Easterby-Smith, Sarah. *Cultivating Commerce: Cultures of Botany in Britain and France, 1760–1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Ericsson, Peter, and Patrik Winton. 'Politics of Credit: The Market for Government Debt in Sweden, 1715–60'. Economic History Society Annual Conference, Keele University, 2018.
- Erikson, Alvar, ed. *Letters to Erik Benzelius the Younger from Learned Foreigners*. Göteborg: Vetenskaps- och vitterhets-samhället, 1980.
- Evander, Sven, and Lennart Sjöström. *Svenska kyrkan i London 1710–2000: en historia i ord och bilder*. London: Svenska kyrkan, 2001.
- Forsell, Hans. 'Minne af Erkebiskopen doktor Erik Benzelius den yngre'. *Svenska akademien handlingar* 58 (1883): 113–476.
- Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680–1750*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1995.
- Golinski, Jan. *Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760–1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.
- Goodman, Dana. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1994.
- Grafton, Anthony. 'Humanist Philologies: Texts, Antiquities, and Their Scholarly Transformations in the Early Modern West' in Sheldon Pollock et al (eds.), *World Philology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 154–177, 2015.
- Hadas-Label, Mireille. *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Hagberg, Lars. *Jacob Serenius' kyrkliga insats. Kyrkopolitik, kristendomsförsvar, undervisningsfrågor*. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1952.
- Hagström, K. A. *Strengnäs Stifts Herdaminne*. Vol. 4. Strengnäs, Svenska kyrkan, 1901.
- Hutchinson, William. *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine, of Durham*. Vol. 2. Newcastle: Hodgson & Robinsons, 1785.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book. Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Johns, Adrian. *Piracy: The Intellectual Property Wars from Gutenberg to Gates*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Laboulais, Isabelle. 'Territorialisation and Logistics of Knowledge and Learning: The Case of Mineral Resource Surveys in France in the Eighteenth Century', in Lothar Schilling and Jakob Vogel (eds.), *Transnational Cultures of Expertise: Circulating State-Related Knowledge in the 18th and 19th Centuries*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019.
- Lupton, J. H. 'Mangey, Thomas (1688–1755)'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 36:32. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- Margócsy, Dániel. *Commercial Visions: Science, Trade, and Visual Culture in the Dutch Golden Age*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2014.
- Nilsson Nylander, Eva, and Alvar Erikson, eds. *Erik Benzelius' Letters to His Learned Friends*. Göteborg: Vetenskaps- och vitterhets-samhället, 1983.

- Orrje, Jacob. 'The Logistics of the Republic of Letters: Mercantile Undercurrents of Early Modern Scholarly Knowledge Circulation'. *The British Journal for the History of Science* 53, no. 3 (September 2020): 351–69. doi:10.1017/S0007087420000242
- Philo, and Thomas Mangey. *Ta Heuriskomena hapanta. Philonis Judaei Opera Quae Reperiri potuerunt Omnia: Textum cum MSS. contulit, quamplurima etiam e Codd. Vaticano, Mediceo, et Bodleiano, Scriptoribus item vetustis, necon Catenis Graecis ineditis, adjecit, Interpretationemque emendavit, universa Notis et Observationibus illustravit.* London: G. Bowyer, 1742.
- Raj, Kapil. 'Go-Betweens, Travelers, and Cultural Translators'. In *A Companion to the History of Science*, edited by Bernard Lightman, 39–57. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- Raj, Kapil. 'Networks of Knowledge, or Spaces of Circulation? The Birth of British Cartography in Colonial South Asia in the Late Eighteenth Century'. *Global Intellectual History* 2, no. 1 (2017): 49–66.
- Rogström, Lena. *Jacob Serenius lexikografiska insats.* Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning. Göteborg: Institutionen för svenska språket, 1998.
- Runia, David T. 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, edited by Adam Kamesar, 210–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Sandys, John Edwin. *A History of Classical Scholarship: 3, The Eighteenth Century in Germany, and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1921.
- Schaffer, Simon. 'Newton on the Beach: The Information Order of Principia Mathematica'. *History of Science* 47, no. 3 (September 2009): 243–76. doi:10.1177/007327530904700301
- Smith, Pamela H., and Paula Findlen (eds.). *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe.* New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Stewart, Larry R. *Rise of Public Science: Rhetoric, Technology and Natural Philosophy in Newtonian Britain, 1660–1750.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.
- Winton, Patrik. *Frihetstidens politiska praktik: Nätverk och offentlighet 1746–1766.* Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2006.