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Experiencing Women’s History as a Documentary Editor

Ann D. Gordon

Historical editions that we recognize as women’s history take the form, primarily, of the papers of individual women. We are Jane Addams, Frances Willard, M. Carey Thomas, Susan B. Anthony, or Jessie Frémont.¹ Such a state of affairs was not the inevitable outcome of the decision to include women’s history in the National Historical Publications and Records Commission’s publications program. If memory serves me well, one of the first completed editions in women’s history supported by the NHPRC was the Papers of the Women’s Trade Union League.² The Trade Union League, based in New York City and Chicago in the early twentieth century, built alliances between working-class, often immigrant, women in factory jobs and upper-class progressive women for the purposes of resisting exploitation, organizing unions, and fighting for safety in the workplace. Two aspects of that early edition are important to the history of editing women’s history: first and obviously, the Commission assigned importance to the activities of women by funding it, and second, it ventured away from publishing the papers of individual leaders into the papers of a group of social activists. These were both markers of a public debate about the Commission’s work during the 1970s. In anticipation of the American Revolution Bicentennial, historian

¹ This is a modest revision of a paper written for a panel on the past and future of historical editing at the annual meeting of the Association for Documentary Editing in 2008. I thank Esther Katz for reading it in my stead. Richard Leffler edited the original and made valuable recommendations. This list of the women whose papers have received editorial treatment is not an exhaustive one. For Addams, see The Jane Addams Papers [microfilm], ed. Mary Lynn McCree Bryan, (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1984), and The Selected Papers of Jane Addams, eds. Mary Lynn McCree Bryan, Barbara Bair, and Maree de Angary (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003–). For Willard, see note 12 below, and for Thomas, see note 6. For Anthony, see The Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony [microfilm], eds. Patricia G. Holland and Ann D. Gordon (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1991), and The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, ed. Ann D. Gordon (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997–). See also The Letters of Jessie Benton Frémont, eds. Pamela Herr and Mary Lee Spence (Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 1993).

² Papers of the Women’s Trade Union League and Its Principal Leaders [microfilm], eds. Edward T. James, Robin Miller Jacoby, and Nancy Schrom Dye (Woodbridge, Conn.: Research Publications, 1981).
Jesse Lemisch had criticized the NHPRC for a narrow focus on “the Papers of Great White Men.” His was not simply a call for new characters to be fit into existing molds; “we need more than the papers of leaders,” he wrote in 1971. Four years later, in the year that I became an editor on Lemisch’s recommendation, he amplified his critique in an article entitled, “The Papers of a Few Great Black Men and a Few Great White Women.” The women’s editions were, he noted, “coming attractions.” Still hopeful that editions might be attuned to social history, he wrote, “History in America is no longer defined so archaically, so simplistically, so exclusively, and so unselfconsciously as the history of ‘notable,’ ‘outstanding’ people.” The Papers of the Women’s Trade Union League seemed to be an approximation of the social history edition that he championed. The League’s papers, however, are a model with few imitators. Right from the start of the Commission’s funding for women’s editions, the more popular model for women’s projects was to publish the papers of a “Few Great White Women,” as Lemisch anticipated.

It would be useful to learn what problem people thought they were solving by adding women’s history to the NHPRC’s program. Even without an oral history of the commissioners, it is possible to identify overlapping definitions of the problem. By one definition, the Commission needed to come to terms with discrimination. At the time of the birth of modern editing in the 1950s, the history of women was invisible: untaught in the academy, unwritten by the professionally trained, absent in textbooks, and undetected in most manuscript collections. Even their most obvious agitation—seventy years of demands for voting rights—was ignored in professional histories. Blindness about women was the contemporary norm.

---


4 Maryland Historian 6 (Spring 1975): 60–66.

5 Ibid., 65.
Fixing discrimination matured into the mantra of “race, class, and gender.” Scholars would apply their craft to new kinds of people. But that was more complicated than it first appeared. In ways Lemisch did not articulate, even the greats among women did not meet the standards of achievement and excellence associated with the white men whose editions were underway. In order to incorporate women, the standards shifted, but the new standards were then reserved for women. Imagine weighing the papers of M. Carey Thomas against those of Woodrow Wilson. Carey Thomas, from her perch at Bryn Mawr College, was a pioneer and national figure in the fields of higher education and training women for leadership. To edit her papers would be a step toward correcting the ignorance about women in history. But why do it? What was her significance in American history? Many of Woodrow Wilson’s papers have a similar focus on education, even on education at Bryn Mawr, but his story went on from there. The man became a president of the United States. The woman did not.

To justify an edition of her papers, the value of an educator’s papers was elevated in order to accommodate the social reality that she had gone about as far as a woman could go. The new standards of significance condescended to women’s disabilities. In the wake of the microfilm edition of the Carey Thomas Papers, we have not seen a rush to edit the papers of male college presidents. That was not the plan.

By another definition of the problem, it was time for funding to be informed by a new historiography. The ideas were the same as those debated among American historians at the time—the contest between social and political history, critiques of how the Cold War had reshaped the American memory, challenges by New Left historians to history written from the top down, and, of course, the voices rising from liberation movements for African Americans and women. The field of women’s history was new. Writing in 1988 about the 1970s, historian Peter Novick described the early interests of its practitioners: he listed “overcoming historical neglect; stressing the contributions of the group; an emphasis on oppression . . . ; a search for foreparents in protest and resistance; finally, a celebration of . . . a separate cultural realm.” And, he added, a refusal to accept “male-centered definitions of importance and excellence.” (I was so much a part of that, that I published an article in 1970 insisting that the history of

---


7 To be fair, The Booker T. Washington Papers, ed. Louis R. Harlan, 14 vols. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972–1989), are an educator’s papers, but that role of his is not the first one to come to mind.

woman suffrage should not be the focus of women’s history.) But in the 1970s the collective voice of woman’s history was not what influenced the decisions about who and what to edit.

The famous list of people deemed meritorious enough to warrant an edition of their papers had a prerequisite: knowledge that there were papers to edit. It is not as obvious as it sounds, and this knowledge, or the lack of it, built a bias in favor of manuscript collections, predominantly organized as collections of famous individuals, and housed in powerful repositories. There was little of modern historiography about it, nor was there much rethinking what editing might be or do.

The money flowed into editions for exceptional women whose achievements were easily recognized. While the Women’s Trade Union League project began its speedy and efficient path to a microfilm edition, I went to work at another early project, the Jane Addams Papers.

Of necessity, the editors of women’s papers developed skills different from their predecessors. Often the searching was more difficult because of the women’s lower profiles and marginal positions. None of us has had the luxury of publishing comprehensive, annotated editions. We learned to make the most of facsimile editions. We invented styles of indexing for comprehensive microfilm editions. Later, we designed highly selective book editions that could be distinguished from documentary histories, point readers into the unwieldy facsimile edition, and meet the needs of readers as well as researchers. We were not alone in this; one of the first places I looked for tips was the Black Abolitionists Papers, a few years ahead of me in the new school of editing.

Editors of women’s papers invented models of editing while navigating the tension between biography and social history that swirled around our birth. The tension arose in part because as historians of women, we brought conflicting values to the editing project. But in many ways, the tension was built into the subject matter. The contradiction that Jesse Lemisch spotted between a publishing program aimed at the greats and a historical profession engaged with social history was not an abstraction for the editors working in African American and women’s history. Our values and interests were shaped by the confusion.

---


10 See Report of the National Historical Publications Commission Advisory Committee on Women’s Papers, c. 1974. The Commission recommended the committee’s list of seventy women whose papers should be published.

For two years, I traveled in search of the Jane Addams Papers. Addams was one of the few American women to avoid the erasure of women’s history during the 1950s and 1960s: college students, myself included, read her *Twenty Years at Hull-House* at a time when a history major was unlikely to hear the name Elizabeth Cady Stanton. The breadth of her influence was staggering: the social sciences, social work, progressive education, international peace work, folklore studies, autobiography, urban reform, juvenile justice, social welfare, and women in politics—all claimed her as a founding mother. Although she wrote many books, considered solely as an author she had little significance. Her ideas had great impact but not because she functioned in the ways of an intellectual. She worked in a social rather than a political environment, and the institutions through which she worked were ones created on the fly, by herself or her friends, to solve specific problems.

Addams’s life left a complex trail for the people tracking down and piecing together her papers. I read smart and funny lesbian love letters at Columbia and the New York Public Library. In Boulder, I was the first historian to read through boxes of office files recently retrieved from Switzerland documenting the work of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, that contained, among many other things, accounts of women’s conditions in Europe at the close of World War I. In Minneapolis at the Social Welfare History Archives, I waded
through countless files created by reformers concerned with old-age pensions and better housing and full of enthusiasm for dreams that would be realized in the New Deal.

I picked out the documents that met our criteria for the papers of Jane Addams. That was my job. But I was ignoring precisely those records that met a standard for a new vision of historical editing. I cherry picked the papers of groups to focus on an individual. Some of those groups were middle-class troublemakers, like the Woman’s Peace Party that resisted World War I. Other groups were made up of trade unionists. From their residence on Halsted Street, Addams and her friends knew as much about the lives of families in an urban, immigrant community as anyone in America. Papers illustrative of what the residents of Hull House learned about their neighborhood are arguably more valuable than the record of a personal life among those residents.

These practices of selection were not unique to the Addams papers. Frances Willard’s accomplishment was her skill as a leader, and the measure of her success lay in the records of her followers. The same could be said of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, with the additional tension created by their politics of confrontation. Stanton’s and Anthony’s contributions to American history needed to be measured not only in their personal lives, but in the response of their followers, and in the reactions of politicians in state and federal governments. In other words, the personal papers of the people in these editions were not always the most revealing of their actions and values in American history.

The women’s editors work hard to resolve the tension. In the Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, for example, there is abundant evidence about participants in the birth control movement. It cannot be systematic: the editors respond to the references that occur in Sanger’s papers. It is not the same as an edition of the papers of each brave person who took the initiative to open a clinic or an edition of the records of those clinics or of the testimony of women who sought help. Nonetheless, the editors provide valuable help in understanding both the circumstances that moved Sanger to action and the experiences that attracted people to her cause. The same could be said for Sanger’s opponents. The reader comes away with at least an introduction to, and probably a more thorough en-


13 Margaret Sanger Papers [microfilm], eds. Esther Katz, Cathy Moran Hajo, and Peter C. Engelman (Frederick, Md.: University Publications of America, 1996, 1997), and The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, eds. Esther Katz, Cathy Moran Hajo, and Peter C. Engelman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003-).
counter with, the fierce conflict over women’s right to control reproduction that occurred in Sanger’s lifetime.

If Peter Novick were to try again to make a quick list of essential elements in women’s history thirty years later, he would, I think, be stumped. Historians of women still profess a conviction that “incorporating the history of women would enrich the study of history,” to quote Alice Kessler-Harris in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and that historians would write better history if they considered all of the nation’s inhabitants. But during the last thirty years, women’s history has become more complex and diverse as historians turned their attention to women of color and to immigrants, for example, and heeded the ways in which women disagreed as well as differed. Even the notion that women shared historical experiences on the basis of their sex is suspect nowadays.

Along the way, women’s history became separated from the liberation movement that shaped its founding. Today’s post-feminist graduate students reject histories that assume a model of oppression and resistance, and they detect that model in places my generation would never see it. Their circumstances tell them that no one needs or wants celebratory histories. The field is pressed on the one hand to mainstream the story—“get over it”—and on the other hand to yield to gender history—“men too are victims.” The defense of women’s history in this new environment is not obvious. But to quote Kessler-Harris again, without women’s history, we risk overlooking “the particular ways in which women . . . engaged their worlds.” This is especially true, she went on, “in areas where the history of women is still being excavated.”

Beyond the university, the history of women bears a closer resemblance to its 1970s form. It is still “cool” in towns and states to celebrate women’s accomplishments. The Stanton and Anthony Papers often benefits from the excitement when librarians and local historians volunteer to solve a problem for us. The history of oppressive disfranchisement and a hard-fought victory still resonates with and inspires the League of Women Voters. Even the right-wing gets into the spirit, reinventing Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton as leaders seeking to criminalize abortions—albeit without a source or document to stand on. Some editors of the papers of women deal regularly with the fact that their subjects’ aims are still aspirational. The English common law is back in vogue: individualism as a model for ridding society of social inequities is on the defensive

---


15 The main source on this phenomenon is Mary Krane Derr, Linda Naranjo-Huebl, and Rachel MacNair, eds., *Prolife Feminism Yesterday & Today* (New York: Sulzburger & Graham Publishing, 1995). Any search on the worldwide web for the names of Stanton or Anthony will turn up many instances of this appropriation to a political cause they knew not of.
in some quarters. State power as a substitute for old-fashioned patriarchy is an idea with a lot of political power. The notion of self-sovereignty is still under siege, especially in reproductive rights. The “field” of women’s history cannot at this moment tell us what to edit.

If I had to choose a new topic for an edition today, I would steer clear of biography. I would avoid heavy reliance on papers already collected and described. I would not worry too much about market research or evidence of an immediate audience for the finished product. I would want to be surprised by my own results; the investment would have an element of risk because I would not know the size or complexity of the “deliverable” when I first applied for a grant. I am not sure I would know all the ways to deliver the product at the start until I had found the papers I hoped to edit. I would think nationally rather than locally, though I will admit to some local or regional ideas that I think would be both fun and valuable. And of course I would consider the transformative powers of the worldwide web as a medium for publication.

As an historian, I have all kinds of odd knowledge about people, places, and papers that could be drawn upon to design an edition. As an editor, I have a few skills. I am quite good at finding historical sources. I am good at drafting a line of demarcation between papers that do and those that do not meet the objectives set for an edition and, equally important, at redraw ing that line as knowledge increases. I know something about making the sources useful in multiple ways. I have the skill to be a transcriber, but like other former residents of the microfilm ghetto, I know how to add value to sources without investing such time in the texts.

So here is one of the editing projects I let my idle brain design. It entails creating a virtual edition of the documents created by a group of northern women about whom no one seems to care—the Woman’s Relief Corps. The Corps was associated with the Grand Army of the Republic, though it apparently decided along the way that its members need not demonstrate a direct connection to military service for the Union. Membership in the Corps seems to have exceeded membership in the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union several times over, despite the claims by historians that the Temperance Union was the largest organized force in the Woman’s Movement. In frontier communities like those in the

---


Dakota Territory, the Corps preceded the Temperance Union. You assembled your Woman’s Relief Corps and later added a local temperance union. One duty of women in the Corps was to be responsible for the states’ homes for soldiers.

At first glance, the Corps might appear to be a classic women’s auxiliary: dinners for the Grand Army of the Republic, beds for ailing veterans. But the group brought itself to my attention because its members stepped onto the stage of women’s politics. Woman’s Day at the South Dakota State Fair, September 1890: a parade of carriages, bands, and lines of marchers escorted nationally known suffragists through the fair grounds to a platform. There, fair-goers listened to speeches in favor of amending the state constitution at the upcoming election to give women the right to vote. The largest group in the parade carried the banners of the Woman’s Relief Corps.19 Early summer 1893, at the annual encampment of the Colorado and Wyoming Department of the Woman’s Relief Corps: the president, Mrs. Gen. Carr, welcomed the women with a speech urging them to help pass Colorado’s constitutional amendment for woman suffrage on the ballot that fall.20 A few months later in Kansas: suffragists rallied in unprecedented numbers to launch their campaign for the amendment that would appear on the ballot in November 1894 and found their numbers swelled by the presence of members of the Woman’s Relief Corps.21

I do not want to suggest that I have identified an underappreciated progressive force in the American heartland. I have no clue what these women wanted to do with the ballot when they got it. But it strikes me that historians should know the answer. Local and state histories of women in the Midwest and Great Plains cannot be told without encountering this large organization. It may be smaller in New England, but the local leaders published their minutes in Lucy Stone’s Woman’s Journal aimed at woman suffragists. I think I could find the papers.

I call it a virtual edition because I am not sure the subject needs even a digital, facsimile edition. I think it needs a spider’s web—a carefully constructed map of where sources on this subject can be found. I make no prior claim to the significance historians should (or should have) paid to the story that I might make visible. But if a million women thought this organization worth their time, a way to become acquainted with each other, useful in training themselves as leaders, and nominally useful to their society, should we not know something about it?

19 For a description, see Papers of Stanton and Anthony [microfilm], reel 28, frames 589–90.
20 See Selected Papers of Stanton and Anthony, 5:523.
21 For an unusual example of tracking the historical connections between the Woman’s Relief Corps and other groups, see June O. Underwood, “Civilizing Kansas: Women’s Organizations, 1880–1920,” Kansas History 7 (Winter-Spring 1985): 291–306.
The “Almanacks” of Mary Moody Emerson: A Scholarly Digital Edition

Noelle A. Baker and Sandra Harbert Petrusinonis

Born in Concord, Massachusetts, on the eve of the American Revolution, Mary Moody Emerson (1774–1863) is most widely known today as the brilliant aunt of American Transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803–1882). She was, however, an exciting figure in her own right: a scholar, a theologian, a proto-feminist, and an author whose writings offer a rare and prolific example of early American women’s intellectual production (see Figure 1). In 1804, when she was thirty, and again in her seventies, Emerson published a handful of periodicals—essays.1 But her most significant literary accomplishment is an unpublished series of manuscript “Almanacks” (c. 1804–1855), a miscellany spanning over one-thousand pages and fifty years, and whose generic form derives from the commonplace book, devotional diary, and epistolary essay. Constructed from loose sheets of letter paper bound with thread, individual Almanacks were circulated among friends and correspondents, as single sheets with letters or as multiple-leaved gifts. These writings reflect Emerson’s immersion in Eastern and Western as well as classical, Enlightenment, and Romantic thought, and they offer perhaps the most complete literary example documenting a single, intellectual woman’s life during the antebellum era. Yet the complete text of these manuscripts has never been readily available.

Unlike many early American women’s manuscripts that have not survived, the Almanacks likely exist today because of their unique history and proximity to Waldo Emerson, who not only inherited the original documents, but who

throughout his life also excerpted Mary Emerson’s letters and Almanacks in his own journals, resulting in three formal and indexed “MME Notebooks” culled from the Almanacks, all of which we have also transcribed. 2 Although Waldo prized this legacy, the Almanacks’ history reads like a near fatality. In 1872, his Concord home caught fire, severely damaging and massively disordering the manuscripts. Eventually, in 1901–1902 the Emerson family hired archival scholar and Concord historian George Tolman to transcribe them, 3 but both Mary Emerson’s originals and his fair-hand copies were eventually relegated to uncatalogued storage at Harvard University’s Houghton Library.

In 1999, at the Thoreau Society’s Annual Gathering in Concord, we heard Emerson scholar Phyllis Cole convey her excitement at locating the Almanacks in the basement of the Houghton in 1980. As she describes it, this pivotal discovery had transformed Cole’s work-in-progress, published in 1998 as *Mary Moody Emerson and the Origins of Transcendentalism*; along with Nancy Craig Simmons’s selected edition of Mary Emerson’s correspondence, Cole establishes Waldo Emerson’s intellectual debt to his aunt and identifies the centrality of the Almanacks in grounding this relationship. 4 Thanks to Cole and Simmons’s ground-breaking work, Emerson is now considered a precursor to the major figures of Transcendentalism, a woman whose literary life and writing bridge the intellectual cultures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Indeed, in Modern Library’s recent anthology *The American Transcendentalists*, excerpts from Mary Emerson’s prose comprise the first entry in the first chapter, “Anticipations.” 5

Because of our experience working on Thoreau’s journal for *The Writings of Henry D. Thoreau*, and our scholarly interests in Transcendentalism and nineteenth-century American women’s writings, editing the Almanacks of Mary Moody Emerson seemed a compelling project. Regrettably, since her death in 1863, the greater status of her famous nephew’s literary reputation and the fragile state of the manuscripts have each contributed to a profound mischaracterization of her life’s work. Time and institutional archival practices have privileged Waldo’s more legible but highly selective and occasionally inaccurate transcriptions of his aunt’s writings as primary source materials, while the complete

---

2 Ralph Waldo Emerson, Journals and Notebooks, 1820–1880 (MS Am 1280H: 147–149), Houghton Library, Harvard University.

3 According to Edward W. Forbes, Tolman transcribed Mary Emerson’s Almanacks in 1901 and 1902 (“Preface,” George Tolman, *Mary Moody Emerson* [Cambridge: Privately printed, 1929], n.p.).


Figure 1: Recently deposited at the Houghton Library, this is the only known extant image of Mary Moody Emerson, taken posthumously, and identified on the reverse of the tintype in an unknown hand: “Mary Moody Emerson the aunt of R. Waldo Emerson—who had such a marked influence on his religious life.” 2008M-92 (6), folder G1, Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Figure 2: bMS Am 1280.235 (385 [folder 35, p. 422]). Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Figure 3: bMS Am 1280.235 (385 [folder 22, p. 378]). Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Figure 4: bMS Am 1280.235 (385 [folder 22, p. 302]). Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Figure 5: bMS Am 1280.235 (385 [folder 9, pp. 499-500]). Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Figure 6: bMS Am 1280.235 (385 [folder 40, p. 471]). Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association deposit, Houghton Library, Harvard University. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission.
Almanacks remain virtually unread. As a result, we were particularly eager to restore Mary Emerson’s authentic voice.

When we began in 2002 our initial objective was a print volume, but we soon recognized that both the length and fragmentary nature of this largely undated and unpaginated manuscript series would necessitate a selected edition. Despite several fine recent publications of women’s private writings, few such extensively damaged manuscript archives of early American women’s intellectual self-cultivation are extant and accessible; thus, no genuinely comparable edition could serve as a model for our organizing framework, editorial decisions, and textual quandaries, many of which derived from the disarray of the manuscripts and the variants between scribal witness transcriptions. Fortunately, we have benefited from the knowledge and advice of fellow editors—Ronald A. Bosco, Helen Deese, Robert N. Hudspeth, Joel Myerson, and Elizabeth Hall Witherell, as well as from Emerson’s biographer, Phyllis Cole, who serves as an advisor to our project and whose wealth of knowledge about Emerson, her family, and her milieu has been invaluable to our initial work.

After considering various possibilities, we have ultimately decided on a digital edition of the complete Almanacks, to be published by the Brown Women Writers Project (WWP) in its highly regarded database of early modern women’s writing, Women Writers Online (WWO). During early discussions of our options, Kenneth Price, Andrew Jewell, and Amy Earhart, leaders of the newly organized Digital Americanists, urged us to explore a partnership with established electronic archives and databases whose archival stability and directors’ technical expertise would help ensure the success and durability of our editorial work. We have discovered repeatedly that the advice of experienced professionals is crucial for textual scholars who lack working knowledge of this new media. Significantly, in such an edition, as opposed to print, we can make available all extant Almanacks, and we can add manuscript leaves indefinitely as they are located over time. Moreover, the fluidity of this searchable hypertext allows us to adhere to rigorous editorial standards even as it provides innovative—even elegant—possibilities for presenting the materiality and complexity of this extraordinary woman’s text.

WWP is one of the longest-running projects in the digital humanities, with an established history of research and publication on text encoding and the representation of complex primary source materials. Emerson’s Almanacks are functioning as a pilot document for its recent commitment to develop procedures and Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) specifications to support collaborative editorial projects. Thus far, with the guidance of WWP Director Julia Flanders, and Senior Programmer Syd Bauman, we have developed an initial set of encoding standards, including practices for representing textual notes, emendations, regu-
larization, annotations, and the manuscripts’ physical description. In all cases, we are following TEI Guidelines but are also determining precisely at what level of detail to apply them, preserving the possibility that a more complex markup may later be added, depending on the specific digital publication goals that evolve for WWP manuscript collections. Each line of text will be uniquely identified, allowing for topical sections throughout the manuscript to be linked and cross-referenced to similar passages. The conceptual power of this encoding approach makes possible a variety of interfaces and editorial presentations while preserving options for how the text is ultimately displayed. Scribal witness transcriptions, normalized abbreviations, emended readings, and textual notes describing damage all can be displayed or suppressed as convenient to the reader (as pop-ups or marginal notes, for instance).

Our foremost objective with this first complete edition of the Almanacks is to reveal the achievement and character of Mary Emerson, whose core reputation as Waldo Emerson’s aunt has over the past century and a half unfortunately overshadowed her participation in a transatlantic culture sustained by and celebrated in the reading and writing practices of many British and American women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As a foundational text in WWO, Emerson’s Almanacks will enrich the works of other women writers; together, they will reach over 250 subscribing institutions and, we envision, be regularly used for research and teaching. As an added benefit, publishing the Almanacks in this database will broaden the audience that they might have enjoyed in a print edition, since scholars interested in early modern British women’s writings will happen on Emerson in the process of keyword searches, especially given the inclusion of many devotional texts similar to hers in WWO.

A digital edition also helps us address two of our greatest challenges: the Almanacks’ lack of chronology or pagination, and their extensive damage—resulting from fire, water, and mildew, often all three on a given leaf. Nearly every page contains missing words; the edges of most leaves are brittle and crumbling, with the first and last words of most lines on a page often irrecoverable (see Figures 2 and 3). Added to this lost text are the complicating facts that Emerson rarely or idiosyncratically dated her entries, and like many a New Englander she

---

6 A trial demonstration of our edition, based on a twelve-page excerpt from the Almanacks, can be accessed at <http://www.personal.psu.edu/shp2/sample_pointer_page.xhtml>.

7 WWO currently holds numerous published works of meditation and prayer, spiritual tracts, and religious histories, including, for example, Hannah Adams’s *The History of the Jews from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the Nineteenth Century* (1812), Jarena Lee’s *The Life and Religious Experience of Jarena Lee* (1836), Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s *Friendship in Death* (1728), and Phillis Wheatley’s *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral* (1773). The complete list of WWO texts can be accessed at <http://www.wwp.brown.edu/texts/textlist.author.html>.
never wasted a scrap of paper, writing on the same leaf at various times (see Figure 4), sometimes but not always in a different direction. Further, because Emerson dispersed portions of the Almanacks with her correspondence, we are still actively recovering individual leaves that have been misfiled as letters at the Houghton Library and other institutions. Although her composition process sheds interesting light on the material culture of Emerson’s manuscripts, it creates tremendous challenges of representation and organization for the editor. Moreover, most Almanacks have been dismembered and are now encapsulated in protective mylar as single leaves, obliging us to reconstruct their original binding and order within the individual fascicles by identifying common water marks and the traces of Emerson’s practice of fascicle making, such as needle marks and thread stains or remnants. In a few instances, sewn booklets do remain for us to examine, as with a relatively undamaged fifty-six page intact example bound in brown thread, which Emerson gave to her intimate friend Elizabeth Hoar in April 1827 (see Figure 5).

As described earlier, two scribal witness transcriptions of the Almanacks are extant: a partial one made in the mid-nineteenth century by Waldo Emerson, which includes roughly one third of the Almanacks, and a nearly complete one produced by George Tolman in 1901–1902. Because both men had access to more complete and legible manuscripts than exist today, we are obligated to report their readings, especially since their transcriptions supply text now missing or damaged. At times, however, both Waldo Emerson and Tolman inaccurately render Mary Emerson’s words, and they occasionally posit different readings for the same passage, variations easily displayed in digital media that will offer rich interpretive material for scholars. Finally, our edition of this complex series of manuscripts will clarify the ways in which the Almanacks were preserved and dispersed, as both an amalgam of private authorial and scribal witness documents and as an influential component of the public talks, sermons, poems, and essays in which Waldo Emerson employed Mary Emerson’s fiery language and unconventional ideas.

An additional and exciting advantage of digital media is that all available transcriptions can be overlaid so that we are not selecting one reading as primary and reporting the others in the back matter. Other potential innovations include a “personography” and subject bibliography, bio-bibliographical information that will, along with our annotations, illustrate the people, texts, and events that populate Mary Emerson’s Almanacks. Similarly, although as previously noted Emerson rarely dated her manuscripts, contextual information will enable us to encode many entries with their correct date, time of day, month, and year in an optional display that provides alternative ways for readers to search and analyze Emerson’s compositional practices, seasonal tributes to nature, and such religious observations as “appointment day.” As with our display of textual variation, these details
will enhance each reader’s experience of the Almanacks. Importantly, as Jerome McGann suggests, such varied and data-rich interfaces are both “integrated and negotiable” for a range of users with their own needs; they “facilitat[e] many ways of passaging and repassaging” complex documents such as the vast Almanacks. Most exciting, perhaps, these personalized viewing options will empower readers, in McGann’s words, “to understand in our own ways,” without sacrificing the integrity of this multifaceted manuscript.

Indeed, one of the most daunting of this project’s tasks is organizing and annotating the incredible range of Emerson’s intellectual inquiry. The Almanacks’ overriding theme is Emerson’s passionate articulation of selfhood, always defined through an interrogating consciousness seeking connection with a Christian divinity but also delighting in vigorous exploration of other spiritual and scriptural texts, from the Bhagavad Gita to Marcus Aurelius Antonius’s Meditations. Enriching this focus is a deep immersion in the cultures of classical Rome and Greece, Asia, Persia, and Western Europe, interests that led Emerson to read and write widely on a range of subjects considered “masculine” by many of her contemporaries: theology, philosophy, literary criticism, science, war, imperialism, and social reform. Our guiding principle is to make this voluminous commentary intelligible to non-specialist readers, a goal that, again, a digital edition usefully enables. From Plato and Aristotle to David Hume, Immanuel Kant, Isaac Newton, Friedrich Schelling; to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Louis Agassiz and William Wilberforce; to Germaine de Staël, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Margaret Fuller, the Almanacks assemble an astounding range of individuals. Almost ad infinitum, we can identify Emerson’s references and simultaneously link readers to online versions of these sources. In addition to these figures and their corresponding theological, philosophical, and historical subjects that form the staple of nearly every Almanack, our annotations will also encompass the mundane details of Emerson’s everyday life—where and with whom she was boarding at a given time, her frequent travels, her caretaking of ill or dying family members. Another level of annotation will provide cross-references to Waldo Emerson’s prose in order to reveal a more complete understanding of Mary’s intellectual exchanges with and personal guidance to Waldo Emerson, as well his brothers Charles and Edward.¹⁰

---

⁸ In sporadic Almanack entries, occurring typically but not always on a Saturday, Emerson dedicates herself to self-examination, prayer, and devotional reading. Her own nomenclature, “appointment day,” refers to the notion of Sabbath as one day in seven that is divinely appointed for rest and spiritual consecration.


¹⁰ For details of Mary’s relationship with her nephews, see Cole; Simmons; and chapter four in Ronald A. Bosco and Joel Myerson, The Emerson Brothers: A Fraternal Biography (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
Surveying the field of nineteenth-century women’s writing in 1994, Judith Fetterley described archival recovery and scholarship as a dialectical partnership, an estimation that Karen Kilcup reiterated in 2000. “Criticism and recovery work are two sides of the same scholarly project,” Kilcup observed, adding that anthologies, editions, and “rediscovered writers” “cannot advance, or be taught, without becoming part of a critical conversation.”¹¹ The historiography of the archive illustrates the significance of this “critical conversation” for early American women; during the past two decades, archival discoveries have enabled scholars such as Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, Jane Tompkins, Cathy Davidson, Sharon Harris, Mary Kelley, Carla Mulford, and Susan Stabile to rewrite the early modern narrative for American women.¹² In the process, they have transformed a formerly narrow field—consisting largely of Anne Bradstreet, Mary Rowlandson, and Sarah Kemble Knight—into our current discipline, in which increasing abundance and diversity of author, genre, method, and style flourish.¹³

Evolving standards regarding “literary quality” and “historical significance,” however, have only slowly fostered the interest in and analysis of manuscripts written by women like Emerson, for whom an intellectual miscellany—rather than imaginative fiction or poetry—constitute her primary genre. As textual scholars, therefore, we remain conscious of the necessity to foster this ongoing dialectical partnership between scholarship and archival recovery. To twenty-first-century readers, the socio-historical contexts of the Almanacks may appear as fragmentary as their physical condition, since Emerson engaged in reading and writing cultures whose ephemeral aesthetics and contributions to the public sphere received broader recognition in the early modern period than they


do today. Yet like more canonical American women writers such as Emily Dickinson and the Peabody sisters, for example, she combined the epistolary form with other genres. And like transatlantic, early modern commonplace-book and letter-book writers such as Milcah Martha Moore and Esther Masham, Emerson considered transcription, arrangement, and interpretation to be creative acts: the means of establishing a personal legacy, commenting on the socio-historical record, and exploring the flexible conventions of manuscript and print production (see Figure 6).

Projects such as the (Emily) Dickinson Electronic Archives have likewise challenged technology to attend not only to canonical verse, but also to the marginalia of American women authors; nonetheless, significant questions remain for editors and scholars of early American women’s manuscripts. How should we evaluate the fragmented writings of less celebrated figures? How do their damaged, coded, or only recently accessible texts shed light on the varied traditions of women’s writing? How might emerging theories of digital archival environments enable us to interpret and represent the physical features of Emerson’s manuscripts, their layered scribal witnesses, mixed genres, and nonlinear structure? The material condition of the Almanacks, complicated further by Emerson’s practice of disseminating individual leaves, lends itself well to these and other questions currently being framed by digital humanists.

13 Sharon Harris, for instance, movingly describes her discovery as a Master’s student in 1983 that the canon of early American women’s writing was limited to Bradstreet’s poetry, Rowlandson’s captivity narrative, and Knight’s travel diary (Harris, “Introduction,” in American Women Writers, 4).

14 Salem, Massachusetts sisters Sophia Amelia (1809-1871), Mary Tyler (1806-1887), and Elizabeth Palmer Peabody (1804-1894) are the focus of several recent studies that establish their centrality to literary, social, and political culture in antebellum New England. Elizabeth, who never married, was a Transcendentalist, an author, a feminist, an abolitionist, and a teacher who opened the first kindergarten in America; Sophia, who married Nathaniel Hawthorne, was a talented artist; and Mary, who married Horace Mann, was a teacher, an author, and an abolitionist. See Megan Marshall, The Peabody Sisters: Three Women Who Ignited American Romanticism (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005); Bruce A. Ronda, ed., The Letters of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: American Renaissance Woman (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984); and, most recently, Patricia Dunlavy Valenti, Sophia Peabody Hawthorne: A Life, Vol. 1, 1809-1847 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2004).

15 Milcah Martha Moore’s Book, 38, 63–64, 66–69; Susan Whyman, “The Correspondence of Esther Masham and John Locke: A Study in Epistolary Silences,” The Huntington Library Quarterly 66.3/4 (2003): 276–78, 290, 297, 300. The Delaware Valley author and coterie writer Milcah Martha Hill Moore (1740-1829) chose the commonplace book as the primary genre for her print publications and manuscript circulation. Her Miscellanies, Moral and Instructive (1787-1829) was reprinted in numerous editions for Quaker schoolchildren in Revolutionary America as well as in London and Dublin. A member of the British Protestant gentry, intellectual Esther Masham (1675-1728) created an interpretive history of herself and her family in 1722 by prefacing, transcribing, arranging, and annotating in a manuscript letterbook selected correspondence from her French and British family members, friends, and a notable family intimate, the British philosopher John Locke. Both figures display the varied ways in which early modern women on either side of the Atlantic experimented with authorship, self-expression, and genre.
Marie-Laure Ryan contends that “a truly digital text, or narrative, is one that cannot be transferred into the print medium without significant loss. It depends on the computer as a sustaining environment, and it uses the screen (or any other display device) as a stage for performance.” Ryan points out the ways in which “new media theorists” have shown that “textuality and narrativity” are transformed when viewed as digital productions, and that “unlike books or paintings, digital texts can be refreshed and rewritten,” and thus remain infinitely renewable. Importantly, our digital edition will preserve the possibility for upgrades and enhancements such that not only recovered Almanack leaves but new annotations as well can be incorporated within the existing edition. Moreover, future editors could use our XML encoded text as the basis for another generation of hypertext, one that provides a more distinctive interface to readers. After the manner of the interactive Web site for Martha Ballard’s diary, for instance, future editors could amplify various cultural contexts of Emerson’s Almanacks—from the legal rights of women as property owners, to the physical experience of and treatment for devastating medical conditions such as erysipelas, from which Emerson suffered throughout her adulthood, to the psycho-social dynamics of boarding-house life. The Almanacks also reveal examples of a single woman’s reality in early America, a life that included weeks and months of tending to sick, dying, and even insane relatives.

Each of these perspectives enlarges our understanding of how Mary Moody Emerson steadfastly pursued a vivid and expansive world of ideas, even as she grappled with the knotty contingencies of everyday life in antebellum America. In a recent scholarly forum on hypertexts, Peter Stallybrass suggests that electronic editions have “changed our relation to the ownership of knowledge.” We trust that engaging with Emerson’s Almanacks via digital media will allow students, scholars, and other interested readers to explore the plenitude of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American life and culture for decades to come.

16 Founded in 1994, the Dickinson Electronic Archives at <http://www.emilydickinson.org/> is “devoted to the study of Emily Dickinson, her writing practices, writings directly influencing her work, and critical and creative writings generated by her work.” In addition to electronic texts of Dickinson’s writings, it provides scholarly information on a variety of topics related to Dickinson, such as her incorporation of graphic marginalia and cartoons in her manuscripts, as well as teaching aids for using these electronic materials.


“Dangerous Thoughts”?
Margaret Sanger’s World Trip Journal, Japan, 1922

On her passport, Margaret Sanger listed herself as a writer, though most everyone knew her as something else: a feminist, reformer, activist, subversive. But in point of fact, she was a busy writer and an efficient one at that. Aside from letters and intermittent entries in a diary and dream journal, nearly everything else Sanger wrote went to feed the birth control movement’s insatiable need for propaganda. Her travel journals were no exception.

Sanger’s travel journals differ from most other early twentieth-century travel writing in that they serve primarily as historical accounts and only secondarily as records of geographical journeys and observations of place and time. Even early in her career, Sanger understood that she was writing the very history she made. She usually wasted no time in turning some of her journal entries into short articles, often well before she returned home from a trip. She also incorporated entries into her speeches and interviews—verbatim at times—and included long passages in later autobiographical writings. These accounts of her groundbreaking tours to organize birth control groups, educate public health officials, and open clinics all over the world became important chapters in her dramatic life story—a story that for much of the twentieth century doubled as the history of the birth control movement.

Sanger’s longest and, I would argue, most significant piece of travel writing was her 1922 World Trip Journal, which chronicles her six-month tour to discuss birth control in Japan, Korea, China, Hong Kong and Ceylon, with stops in Yemen and Egypt, vacation time on the European continent, and a major conference in London. Coming just a few months after she formed the American Birth Control League in New York, the world tour raised Sanger’s international

1 Many thanks to my colleagues on the Sanger Project, Esther Katz and Cathy Moran Hajo, for their support and assistance with some of the research for this article, which is a revision of a paper I delivered at the annual meeting of the Association for Documentary Editing in 2008.
profile and gave her increased prominence at home, solidifying her leadership of
the American movement.

My focus in what follows is on the first leg of that trip, Sanger’s voyage to
and lecture tour of Japan. Sanger’s 1922 World Trip Journal is probably the piece
of travel writing she recycled the most; parts of it were featured in the Birth Con-
trol Review, the movement’s chief publication, shared with large lecture audiences
when she returned to the States, and she used it as the basis for several chapters
in her two autobiographies. It also exhibits Sanger’s remarkable perseverance and
unparalleled ability to attract publicity. And it tells a great story.

The Japan portion of Sanger’s World Trip journal runs about sixty pages,
and we are including a number of entries in The Selected Papers of Margaret
Sanger, Volume 4: Round the World for Birth Control, 1920–1959, the final volume
of the edition, which is currently in the research phase. Editing these journals and
her international correspondence has proven to be our most challenging work to
date as we must overcome a number of obstacles related to information access
and language. For instance, changes in how Asian names have been transliterated,
paired with Sanger’s idiosyncratic rendering of personal and organizational names
(she wrote them as they sounded to her, but not necessarily as they may sound to
us) has made our task of identification extremely difficult and time-consuming.

Sanger’s tour originated with an invitation from a Japanese publisher to
deliver between five and ten public lectures in Japan on birth control and popula-
tion issues as part of an international lecture series that had previously featured
Albert Einstein, H. G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell. Sanger then lined up other
meetings in China and elsewhere, though some of her itinerary was not pinned
down until she was en route.

Booked to depart from San Francisco in late February 1922, Sanger had
every reason to believe her journey would be clear sailing. Her bags were packed;
her thirteen-year-old son Grant had been whisked away from school to join her
on the adventure; and sixty-one-year-old J. Noah Slee, the wealthy founder and
president of the Three-in-One Oil Company, and Sanger’s new suitor, was ready
to join her, his fat wallet in hand (though few knew of his connection to Sanger,
and he planned to be inconspicuous). Friends and supporters had thrown bon voyage parties for Sanger, and the press seemed keen to cover the trip, thus keep-
ing the issue of birth control in the headlines. ²

Then, just four days before she was scheduled to sail on a Japanese pas-
enger ship, Japan’s Home Minister directed the Japanese Consul-General in San
Francisco to deny Sanger an entry visa.

Why did the Japanese government decide to keep Sanger from entering
Japan? Though some surmised that it was related to sparring between the U.S.

and Japan over immigration policy, in all likelihood Sanger was the first victim of a proposed new law. While she had been making her way to San Francisco, Japan’s Home and Justice Ministries were drafting a “Law to Control Radical Social Movements,” better known as the “Dangerous Thoughts Bill,” an effort to control the spread of socialism, anarchism, and Bolshevism in Japan. The law was intended to give officials more power in silencing propaganda and keeping out foreigners they believed might disrupt the moral order. Birth control was not included in this bill, introduced into the House of Peers on February 21, the same day Sanger was to sail. But the bill’s vague language and broad scope allowed the authorities to crack down on any ideas they found repugnant or inflammatory. There were no laws that specifically outlawed birth control in Japan, but birth control clearly threatened a long-standing policy that encouraged Japan’s population growth and military and political expansion.³

When Sanger asked the polite and apologetic Japanese Consul-General in San Francisco whether Japan objected to her or to her cause, he told her it was both. After all, she still was considered a dangerous radical in the U.S. with ties to anarchists and socialist groups and a long police record. This was not the first time that her reputation had preceded her. News of the ban was picked up by U.S. and Japanese wire services and made headlines in both countries, testing a fragile U.S.-Japanese diplomatic relationship.⁴

Some in the press applauded Japan’s protective inclination and frowned upon Sanger’s missionary zeal. The Los Angeles Times called Sanger’s proposed speaking tour “a rather gross piece of impertinence,” and asked how she could force herself on Japan to advocate birth control when it remained illegal in the U.S. “For the sake of international amity,” the Times editorial implored, “for the sake of the reputation of the United States, for the sake of your own good manners stay at home, Margaret.”⁵

But Sanger had no intention of staying home. She said she was confident that the Japanese refusal was “due to a misunderstanding of her message,” and that she would be able to change minds once she met with officials on board the ship where she would have ample opportunity to press her case. More than a hundred Japanese who had traveled with the Japanese delegation to the just-concluded Washington Naval Conference—diplomats, professors, doctors, and


⁵ Los Angeles Times, February 22, 1922.
military men—were returning to Tokyo on the Taiyo Maru passenger ship. Sanger’s immediate challenge was to secure a ticket without a visa. Since the ship sailed on to Chinese ports after Japan, Sanger was able to get a Chinese visa and a ticket to Shanghai as long as she agreed in writing not to leave the ship when docked in a Japanese port.6

“I always chose to go forward,” Sanger later wrote, “and there was always a chance that a way might open.” Once on board the Taiyo Maru, Sanger set out to insure that she could not only disembark in Japan, but also keep her scheduled speaking engagements. She released a statement from the ship saying that she had no specific plans to discuss methods of birth control, but would confine her remarks to “the necessity of birth control for social improvement.” Two days out at sea, a group of Japanese passengers requested that she address them on the birth control movement. Afterwards, she had a discussion with Admiral Baron Kato, the head of the Naval Conference delegation and a rising political leader in Japan who became prime minister just three months later. She also charmed the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs. These men and others on board did not fully embrace Sanger’s rationale for birth control, but they clearly wanted to know more. In fact, some of them sought information from Sanger on specific contraceptive methods. Sanger wrote in her journal that “a delegation of several Japanese came to my cabin to be informed. They want to know the best advice.” After meeting with Sanger, both the Admiral and the Vice Minister cabled officials in Tokyo asking that Sanger be allowed to land and lecture without constraints.7

Yet even as the ship pulled into the Yokohama port, Sanger had not yet received any official word that she would be permitted to disembark. “From the various invitations I am receiving to speak before representative groups,” she wrote at sea, “it would seem I must be going to land.” Conflicting telegrams told her she might be allowed to speak but not in public; that she might be permitted to speak in public but not on birth control; and that she would only be able to speak to private groups. There were press reports stating that the Home Office in Tokyo continued to weigh its “misgivings as to the perils of birth control” and would assign police investigators to follow Sanger. The director of police for the Home Office said that he was determined to keep Sanger from touching land. She also was told that thousands awaited her arrival. She wrote, “I await with interest the results of all this publicity—There has been tremendous interest all through Japan & if I address all the people who are asking me I shall be worked

---

thin.” She appeared, however, to relish the opportunity: “I have had a good lazy trip rested fully and am now ready to ‘eat ‘em alive.’”

Her ship anchored in the harbor in Yokohama on March 10 and was surrounded by police launches, health department boats, mail tenders, and boats carrying reporters. Japanese officials and the press marched onto the ship. The police, who in private jokingly referred to Sanger as “Mrs. Sangai,” a term that means “destructive of production,” handed her detailed questionnaires to be filled out, while government agents asked who paid her expenses and inquired about her contacts in Japan. Sanger wrote in her journal:

After much minute questioning it was told me that it would be necessary for me to apply to the American Consul to use his influence for me to land or enter Japan. Also I was to sign a statement that I would not give a public lecture on Birth Control during my stay here.

In two minutes after the door was closed upon the government officials, I was besieged with reporters. At least twenty-five crowded into my cabin to ask me questions, to sign cards or to take a photograph. . . . Had to go on deck to be photographed at least by a dozen photographers. Then more interviews . . . .

Every reporter expressed his regrets that the government was acting this way & said the people of Japan want me to come here and desire to hear about birth control. . . .

Mrs. Kohashi the woman reporter or Editor of Womans Magazine [Shufu no tomo (The Housewife’s Friend)] came & also a delegation of six women representing New Womans Movement in Japan.

These adorably perfect doll women came in costume, bowing so stately & courteously from the waist to the floor almost, took ones thoughts away from the difficulties of officials & the trials of the day and brought first the perfume of a fairy land with gnomes & delightful wise old ladies to the realization that these little new women in Japan are the instruments to carry out the real dreams of an emancipated womanhood in Japan.

---

8 Sanger to Anne Kennedy, March 8, 1922 (M SM S2:125); Japan Times & Mail, March 7, 1922; Japan Weekly Chronicle, March 2, 1922; Sanger, World Trip Journal, March 9, 1922 (M SM S70:29–30); Sanger, Autobiography, 319.


Apparently, final permission for Sanger to land had been given only the night before, after a series of negotiations between prefectural authorities in Yokohama and the Home Minister, the Foreign Office, the House of Peers, and the Police Bureau in Tokyo. After five hours spent on the ship in quarantine, Sanger descended the gangway and set foot on what one Japanese newspaper called “the Land of the Rising Sun and the Closed Mouth.” Customs promptly confiscated forty copies of Sanger’s birth control guide, *Family Limitation*, before she and her son Grant were hurried off to the Tokyo home of Baroness Shidzue Ishimoto, Sanger’s good friend and a leading feminist and birth-control advocate in Japan. J. Noah Slee slipped away to a hotel.\(^\text{11}\)

Sanger wrote in her journal that it was:

> Raining torrents, no special impression yet, except parasols, jinrichas [jin rickshaws] and women with babies on backs, also wooden shoes making queer noise especially at Stations where crowds of people come out of trains, while waiting at station for automobile reporters snapped & flashed light photographs.

Then home to Barons house where fires in fireplaces cheered us after a long fatiguing day. More flash lights for out of town papers, and Grant & I went to bed in large airy bright room, fire burning nicely. Maid prepared hot, oh so hot, bath in which one sits & soaks & gets warm, one washes & scrubs before getting into tub. Anyone else wishing bath gets into the same tub of water. It seems complicated so far, but familiarity eases & simplifies every problem.\(^\text{12}\)

During the next month Sanger gave many interviews and a dozen public lectures, overcoming the ban on speaking to public groups by addressing crowds that the police had been told were specially “invited” by various private organizations. As she had promised, Sanger did not discuss contraceptive methods except in private meetings. The police kept an eye on her public appearances but did not interfere. Birth control became the topic of the day as newspapers reported daily on Sanger’s activities and magazines ran profiles and articles about her ideas.

Sanger recorded every event and meeting in her journal, writing at night and while traveling from city to city. She was also writing letters home and preparing speeches. It left her little time to reflect on her personal life. There are only a few passages on her son, Grant, and barely a mention of J. Noah Slee, who was trying to seal the deal on marriage to Sanger (they were married in London at the end of the trip). A public figure always under scrutiny, especially by her

---

\(^{11}\) *Japan Times & Mail*, March 9 and 11, 1922; *Japan Advertiser*, March 11, 1922; Sanger, *World Trip Journal*, March 10, 1922 (MSM S70:36).

March 9, 1922

This is indeed a mysterious voyage. Very Japanese. They don’t seem quite sure who I am. They know more about me than I do. They know all the cables I receive before I get them. They think I can do in Japan what I do not know. It is very mysterious.

Yesterday I received three cables: one from Marie, telling me, “Anticipate your remaining weeks.” Another from Nagoya, saying, “Welcome, to the land of phthisism.” Another from New York, “Welcome, to the land of phthisism.”

Today Nagoya sends a cable saying, “Welcome, to the land of phthisism.”

First page of Sanger’s March 9th journal entry written as she neared the port in Yokohama. (Courtesy of the Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College)
opposition, Sanger was the model of discretion and seldom discussed her love life, either in journals or letters.

In recording each day’s activities, the juxtaposition of places and events is at times startling. Sanger wrote one minute about the preferred contraceptive technique of an activist doctor who treated prostitutes, and the next about her formal dinner at the Peers Club, the social outlet for Japanese aristocracy and government leaders, where it was highly unusual for a woman to be invited, let alone to be the focus of the evening. She wrote:

At noon we went to Dr [Koji’s] hospital, where he holds a place for patients—charges 1 yen—70 cents a day for bed, all food, medicine and care included—Nurses squat on floor at bedside.

About twenty of the nurses dressed in white and seven doctors came to welcome me. Then followed us from room to room. . . .

Dr Koji told of the methods of B.C. he found successful—plain soft Japanese paper folded & inserted against cervix—then as this absorbs the sperm it is removed and a clean piece wet in antiseptic solution and wiped the vagina dry and clean. 1000 cases no failures.

And then this follows immediately in the same entry:

At four thirty we were due at the “Peers Club” where Count [Kawamura] invited me to speak before a select group. We spoke very frankly—talked of methods & the art of love—It was very inspiring to hear their questions & to hear their perfect English. Baroness Ishimoto sat throughout the discussion very bravely. We went from the Peers Club to have dinner with an Industrial group of twenty five select men. This was very very Japanese. I had to remove my shoes at the door and put on house slippers to shuffle on to the dining room. There we had to remove those also and enter the dining room in stockings. . . .

The dinner with chop sticks was excellent—hot sake wine was also good. I’m sorry now we gave away the bottle on the boat to the waiter. It is so charming & artistic the way dinner is served. The plain walls & floors—only a screen decorated. I improved with the chopsticks & finished dinner with little trouble. Then began the questions on birth control. These men all had wives, but none of them ever out. It’s like Spain and other man countries. Intelligent questions of every sort & shade. All agreed birth control a good thing & said they were in accord with my work & not in agreement with the government attitude at all. Though many of these men were government officials. . . .
No women’s club here—no power to vote for women. Another day, after giving a speech on the morality of birth control to a group of over 100 professional men, Sanger toured Yoshiwara, the Tokyo prostitution district. She related these events in her journal as follows:

I spoke on Morality of B.C. & gave an outline of the movement in other countries.

Its morality that seems to trouble these people. They fear B.C. will lower morals of young people, but when I visited [Y]oshiwara after the reception... . . . I wonder just what is meant by that fear.

The unlicensed quarters are avenues of small two story houses—small alcoves where behind a window sits the girl with only a slit for her eyes to be seen. There are thousands of these girls in this quarter. The streets were full of men walking up & down occasionally talking to one of the girls. Some men going into the houses while others were coming out.

It gave one the horrors—The price of the girl was above the door—per hour—per night.

After walking a half hour in this district we crossed the bridge to the Licensed quarter & there one sees a new world. The houses are like large hotels, lanterns or electric lights sending out a soft warm glow. The wide streets are inviting and clean—The houses are built so large & spaciously, they all have courts with flowers or small gardens. There is an entrance like a driveway through which the men walk to view the various photographs of the inmates ready for use. In some frames there were no pictures but writing which said ‘just arrived not time for picture.’ This would usually be the girl most in favor & I was told a new girl has nine or ten visitors an evening to the other girls two or three. All of these photographs look young, none of them look like girls over twenty-two or three—

Certainly this quarter is the most attractive part of Tokyo. Is it any wonder the girls prefer to live there than in the factory visited this morning or at home where there is squalor, & poverty & suppression.

There were less men wandering in the streets in this quarter than in the unlicensed, it was after eleven oclock, so perhaps they were inside. It was very depressing, but it makes one think deeply.

I felt helpless in my work against that swarming crowd of men. They do not want these conditions made different. The women of these quarters seem to have no children.\textsuperscript{14}

These passages from Sanger’s journal cover only a few days of nearly a month spent in Japan in one of the most historic visits ever made by a Westerner to that country. Baroness Ishimoto, the great Japanese pioneer for women’s rights, claimed that those few weeks in March and early April of 1922 transformed Sanger’s name into a household word in Japan for many years after. A public relations triumph, Sanger’s tour also inspired a Japanese birth control movement to coalesce in her wake. Ishimoto later wrote, “Not since Commodore Perry had forced Japan to open its doors to foreign commerce, in 1852, had an American created such a sensation”; she added, “if the government had deliberately tried to focus interest on birth control, it could not have done a better job.”\textsuperscript{15}

Apart from a few letters and many newspaper stories, Sanger’s journal provides the most complete and insightful account of her lecture tour in Japan and is among the best sources on the founding of the Japanese birth control movement. This journal has also been used over the years by scholars looking at Western conceptions of Japan and Asia in the immediate post-World War I period. Relatively few Americans in Japan traveled as extensively as Sanger, nor are there very many surviving impressions of this time from Western women about aspects of Japanese culture related to women, child-bearing, and sexuality.

Though it carries an agenda to educate people in the U.S. and abroad about the birth control movement and the need for postwar population policy, this journal is also written with an open-eyed sense of wonder and acceptance of another culture. Sanger was neither highly educated nor parochial, and she seldom fell into the trappings of either informed preconception or outright prejudice. She was rarely judgmental and made an effort to get to know individuals. Sanger is speaking to an audience in these entries, but she remains honest in her impressions.

Looking critically at her writing here, it is hurried and sketchy, and her descriptive language is redundant and frequently not up to the task of translating the exotic. But at the same time her writing is energetic, of the moment, and comfortably colloquial. Even though her journal writing may not double as good journalism or succeed as dispassionate literary narration, it is rare to find other travel journals in the early twentieth-century that take a reader so far off Baedeker’s beaten path or open doors to scenes and situations unseen by other Westerner travelers.

\textsuperscript{14} Sanger, World Trip Journal, March 18, 1922 (MSM S70:60–65).

Models of Digital Documentation:

*The 19th-Century Concord Digital Archive*

Amy E. Earhart

I wish I could write that I recognized the possibilities of digital scholarship immediately and, with my enlightenment, proceeded to create a project that captured the potential of such scholarship. Instead, the journey to my current digital work has been halting and slow, with many moments of confusion along the way. My mantra, during my early work, was taken from John Unsworth: “If an electronic scholarly project can’t fail and doesn’t produce new ignorance, then it isn’t worth a damn.” Ultimately, digital scholarship is in its infancy and digital practitioners are largely self-trained. Missteps and failures necessarily come with experimentation. And, the primary objective of digital work, in my opinion, should be experimentation. The work of digital scholarship is not only about production of the final product, but production of the theoretical and methodological approaches to the digital that we have only just begun to explore. The value of such work is not to be underestimated. Jerome McGann has famously predicted that in “the next fifty years the entirety of our inherited archive of cultural works will have to be reedited within a network of digital storage, access, and dissemination.” As our cultural heritage is being digitized at an increasingly rapid rate we are experiencing greater access to materials, but we are also confronted with new problems of use. Scholars will want digital materials to meet our particularized needs. For example, Geoffrey Nunberg has recently described the many problems connected to search capability that stifle scholarly work within Google Books. For the average user, Nunberg notes, Google-based searching is useful, but for the type of work that scholars imagine, “The metadata simply aren’t up to it.”

---


Nunberg suggests, scholars must step up and participate in the debate about digital materials if we want to engage with our cultural resources.

As with many digital archives, *The 19th-Century Digital Concord Archive (CDA)* started as a website utilizing simple technology and has evolved to a more technologically advanced scholarly site. The *CDA* joins an interdisciplinary team from the Department of English, Texas A&M University; the Digital Humanities Initiative, the College of Liberal Arts, Texas A&M University; the Map and GIS Collections and Services, Texas A&M University Libraries; and the Concord Free Public Library, Concord, Massachusetts, in the development of infrastructures that allow the entities to share metadata easily, develop innovative, visually-based search functions, and make visible and accessible the cultural record of Concord, Massachusetts, in an interactive, free-access digital archive.

This project leverages resources and skills across the team to develop a model of interaction between academic, museum-and-library, and community partners, developing multiple ways of displaying information about the town of Concord that will encourage innovative scholarly research. Materials slated for inclusion in the archive include literary texts, historical documents, maps, photographs, census materials, educational minutes, broadsides, physical artifacts, and town records. Concord figures centrally in critical discussions of nineteenth-century literature, philosophy, abolition, women’s literature and history, architecture, and government. Scholarly production reflects the importance of this location. Currently, WorldCat lists over 500 books published since 2000 that include Concord in their description. When the search is expanded to include figures that lived or worked in Concord, the numbers grow exponentially. Concord is also an interesting test case for this work as it is a location that helped to define the critical framework of American literature and history. The depth of this small town’s historical record proves important to the study of literature, history, government, architecture, philosophy, digital humanities and other fields. By digitizing a broad range of materials we will provide scholars with additional materials to rethink the way in which we conceptualize these fields. Concord is an interesting choice for a digital archive as it bridges the divide between canonical, well-studied figures and unknown figures that flesh out the historical and literary record.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Louisa May Alcott, Henry David Thoreau, and Bronson Alcott resided in Concord and interacted with those groups less frequently represented by digital archives: free African-Americans, Irish immigrants, the poor, and the criminal class. In addition to the tremendous scholarly interest in Concord, Concord attracts broad general interest as an historical tourism center. The booming tourism trade attracts tens of thousands of visitors a year, many of whom explore Concord virtually before their visit. Given the interest in nineteenth-century Concord, the Concord archive should experience tremendous use and generate a substantive impact.
When I first began to sketch out what the CDA might become, I was a lecturer. While the position provided a low wage and high teaching load with little chance of advancement, it also allowed the freedom to experiment with a project that might have no measurable value in a tenure decision, yet interested me immensely and had, I thought, real scholarly value. During the ensuing years I effectively retrained myself to work with digital scholarship, something that would have been nearly impossible to do under the pressures of the tenure track. I found little infrastructure to support digital work on my campus, so I went to the experts. I attended a TEI/XML workshop at Brown University given by Julia Flanders and Syd Bauman and the first NINES (networked infrastructure for nineteenth-century electronic scholarship) summer workshop, where I learned much from Jerome McGann, Bethany Nowviskie, Laura Mandell, and a small but dedicated group of scholars working on digital archives. I contacted Ken Price, co-founder of the Whitman Archive and a former professor of mine, to ask for advice. I was lucky that these pioneers were generous to a scholar interested in the field and were available for help and support. My story is not unique. Digital projects are often created by scholars outside the traditional academic power structure who believe strongly in the importance of such work or, at the other extreme, leaders in the field who have used their endowed chairs and full professorships to help alter attitudes toward digital work. If you decide to take on a digital project, people and organizations are there to help. Structures are changing. Universities are putting support for digital work into place, new organizations, such as NINES, are emerging, and digital humanities centers are being created to support the digital work that you imagine. But, a scholar interested in digital work needs to be realistic about how current digital work is valued by the academy.

Some changes to tenure and promotion criteria are occurring, but many departments are slow to respond. While groups like the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship have called for development of “a system of evaluation for collaborative work that is appropriate to research in the humanities and that resolves questions of credit in our discipline as in others,” the same task force found that “60% of departments in Carnegie doctorate institutions say referred articles in digital format either ‘don’t count’ for tenure in their departments and institutions or that they have no experience evaluating them.” Imagine, then, these departments’ response to non-referred online digital scholarship. I say this not to discourage work within this field, but to caution you to be realistic and plan accordingly.

---

4 TEI/XML markup of texts is the de facto international standard for encoding texts in the humanities.

I was trained at Texas A&M University during the height of the New Historicism movement. My dissertation project mapped shifting constructions of race in nineteenth-century Boston, what I designated the “Architecture of Inequality,” through historical texts, literature, physical structures, and landscape. However, the print monograph was not particularly conducive to the type of exploration that I imagined. It was difficult to represent shifting constructions of race, architecture, and literature through a static form of scholarship, which limited the representational possibilities of this fascinating set of documents. As I began to experiment with digital environments I thought that the computer might aid such scholarship as I had imagined. Concord was a smaller environment than Boston in which I could experiment with mapping the texts that I was interested in exploring. And, for a person trained to gather historical texts to set in play with literary texts, the modeled digital archive allowed me not only to position these materials in a print analysis, but to do so in a visual manner. Unlike a digital edition, my archive would not include multiple versions of a text. Instead, it would bring the literary text into direct dialogue with the historical text, the image, the map, the census documents, crime statistics, and more. I began to shape an infrastructure to represent my theoretical take on the Concord landscape, choosing to work with digital maps and GIS data. My choice of infrastructure was a choice made to represent the theoretical underpinnings of my literary scholarship, but the challenge was to bringing the technology into a working relationship with literary theory. As my example demonstrates, those who choose to work with a digital project must give careful thought to matching the archive structure—the selection and arrangement of materials, metadata, and interface—to the theoretical goals of the scholar. An infrastructure that is matched to a scholarly edition project is probably not the right infrastructure for a project that seeks to represent shifts of iconography over time. Ultimately, the archive structure needs to allow the scholar to complete the type of work imagined possible.

The CDA interface is designed to address my concern that, while many scholars who work with Concord discuss the importance of location, physical structures and landscape, there remains a limitation in the way that textual materials might be explored through traditional print scholarship. Unfortunately, digital archives have historically replicated much of the print book structure, from presentation of text to user interface. One of the goals of the CDA is to reimagine the book-based interface (index, table of contents) in a digital environment. Too often the digital archive is merely a digital repository of a broad number of texts, rather than a carefully constructed set of interpretive data. Given the importance of the location, geography and landscape of Concord, a visual means of addressing the humanities information allows for interesting possibilities and should provide new ways of researching the related areas. Our team has developed initial, simple maps that represent the town site, and we are currently developing ad-
vanced map interfaces that visualize the town over time. Using Google Earth, historical and contemporary maps as well as digitized town reports, census, and literary materials, we are hoping to develop a map and connected timeline that allows users to manipulate time and place as well as sift the materials to locate textual data.

Another important issue that the Concord Digital Archive seeks to explore through its interface structure is the way that transnationalism plays out within the particular literary and historical moments of the town. Current work on the CDA suggests that the African and Irish Diasporas reveal themselves in town materials and that interactions between these groups impact the literary production of Concord writers and vice versa. Rather than focusing on the few authors that lived in Concord for most of their lives, the CDA materials invite the scholar to see those who immigrate, who traverse national boundaries, and who look outward, out of Concord, Massachusetts and the United States to a broader world. The mapping segment of the project is currently being built to show patterns of movement in Concord by Irish- and African-Americans and the response of Anglo-Concordians to both groups by digitizing place of residence, nationality, race, and socioeconomic factors over time. In other words, while the Concord project does indeed look to one particular element of literary history that has been interpreted as “American,” the materials found within the archive challenge this simplistic reading.

While digital archives offer the scholar a chance to produce groundbreaking research, there remain structural difficulties in the creation of such scholarship. Digital work is often immeasurably slow to produce, so glacial, in fact, that those working within the field often speak of their never-ending projects. If you wish to publish a book, there is a long history of process in place. In addition, a print project has boundaries that are fairly rigid. Presses limit page numbers, contracts limit time to finished product, print publication is finished and a bound book produced. Not so with the digital. Changing technology, the unbounded length of a project, changes in copyright law, and more can create issues with completion. A spring 2009 DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly volume addresses the difficulty of demarcating production boundaries within digital projects from a variety of perspectives. Matthew Kirschenbaum asks in his introduction, “What is the measure of ‘completeness’ in a medium where the prevailing wisdom is to celebrate the incomplete, the open-ended, and the extensible?” Or, as Susan Brown et al. state of their project, “the Orlando Project, a large-scale and long-standing digital humanities undertaking, reveals an arbitrariness, even a fictive-

---

ness or contradicitoriness, to the notion of completion of the project as a whole or even of its major online product."
7 Those interested in the creation of digital work should spend time considering how they might structure their projects in response to the inevitable open-endedness of the digital, whether modeling stages or projects within a larger project, housing their digital work within the more traditional structure of a digital press, such as the University of Virginia's Rotunda Press, or declaring a project ever expanding and rejecting the closure of a traditional scholarly project.

The struggle to define a project within the fluid environs of the digital can be rewarding. I have a far greater understanding of how I define digital humanities and, through the interactive laboratory of the Concord Digital Archive, have learned invaluable lessons about production and use of digital materials. As Jerome McGann has repeatedly argued, you must build the archive to learn what you need to know: "Translating paper-based texts into electronic forms entirely alters one’s view of the original materials." 8 I have learned that basic notions about what I am creating are actually highly contested. I initially titled my project an archive, believing that it would be a digital repository of materials that functioned much like a physical archive. Out of all the initial decisions I made for the CDA, I thought titling the set of materials “archive” would be one of the easiest. When I began the project, the archive form was the norm for digital literary scholarship production, suggesting that Jacques Derrida might have been on to something in his analysis of archive fever. However, recent work on the archive, from digitally engaged analysis, such as work in DHQ by Margaret Ezell and Ken Price, to more generic analysis, by scholars including Antoinette Burton, Archive Stories, and Carolyn Steedman, Dust: The Archive and Cultural History, challenges us to rethink a simple conception of the digital archive. 9 In my own work several crucial factors have exploded the concept of archive, yet I continue to use the original title of the project as the best descriptive term to date. An archive is a repository, yet my archive actually does not reposit most of the materials it represents, even in the form of a surrogate. Instead, the archive acts as a search-and-

---

display space for materials located on disparate servers. In some ways, then, the
archive is a display catalog, rather than a rare-books room. And, how does one
understand the physical archive that underpins the CDA, the Concord Free Pub-
lic Library’s Special Collections? The Concord Free Public Library has an exten-
sive physical archive collection from which it chooses selected items for
digitization. Out of that set the CDA chooses materials of which to provide
metadata and to connect to our search function. Does this make the CDA a col-
lection? A presentation? Archive as a term is far more contested within the mal-
leable digital environment.

Digital scholarship is tough and challenging, but the most rewarding
scholarly work I have undertaken. However, you must go into the project with
your eyes wide open. What infrastructure is available at your institution? Could
you develop links to other digital humanities projects or resources, such as
NINES or the TEI consortium? Can you standardize your materials to best take
advantage of work that is already completed in digital humanities? There is a
growing body of best practices for scholars interested in creating digital materials
and groups to support the work. Generally, those working in the field are helpful
and generous, supporting scholars in this new and exciting work. I encourage you
to think about contributing to the field, and I invite you to visit and explore The
The Boydston Essay Prize 2009

The Boydston Essay Prize was established in 1995 by Jo Ann Boydston to honor the best essay or review published anywhere during the previous two years, the primary focus of which is the editing of a volume of works or documents. The following essay by Ronald Broude is the winner of the 2009 Boydston Essay Prize. It appeared originally in Textual Cultures, 3 (2008), the publication of the Society for Textual Scholarship, and is reprinted by permission of Indiana University Press. The members of the Prize committee were William C. diGiacomantonio, associate editor of the First Federal Congress Project; Peter Engelman, associate editor of the Margaret Sanger Papers; Leslie Rowland, co-editor and project director of the Freedmen and Southern Society Project; and Carol DeBoer-Langworthy, editor of the Neith Boyce Project, chair.
The Gilbert & Sullivan Critical Edition and the Full Scores that Never Were*1

Ronald Broude

Abstract: The critical edition of the “Savoy Operas” of W. S. Gilbert and Arthur Sullivan provides a useful example of the ways in which scholarly editions of performing works can alter important elements of the sources on which they are based. The accepted form for the presentation of a critical edition of an opera is the “full score,” but for no Savoy Opera did a real full score ever exist—nor was one ever intended. The sources closest to full scores were the copying masters that Sullivan prepared for use by copyists extracting parts for performers, but these are skeletons into which Sullivan often did not enter revisions. In preparing critical texts of Savoy Operas, editors have been obliged to take different elements of the text from different sources: the instrumental parts from Sullivan’s holographs (with ambiguities clarified by surviving early band parts); the vocal lines and underlaid words from printed vocal scores; and the dialogue and stage directions from printed libretti. Thus are created full scores that not only “never were” but that were never intended.

Scholarly editions can often be artificial texts, prepared for purposes that may be quite different from those for which the texts they present were originally created. In no case is this more so than with performing genres, and in no per-

* The author wishes to thank Marc Shepherd, who, after the publication of this paper in Textual Cultures, kindly brought to his attention several points requiring clarification; Mr. Shepherd’s suggestions have been incorporated into the present state of this paper.

1 The critical edition here referred to is Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas (New York: Broude Brothers Limited, 1994—). Since the expiration in 1961 of the international copyright that protected the Savoy Operas, several editions have been undertaken. Almost immediately after copyright expired, the firm of Edwin F. Kalms (then of New York, now of Boca Raton) began to produce editions of the most popular Savoy operas, eventually publishing scores and performing material for nine works; Kalms’ full scores were evidently scored up from D’Oyly Carte band parts, with instrumental readings adjusted to agree with pre-existing vocal scores. Dover Publications (Mineola and New York) has produced full scores of The Mikado (1999), The Pirates of Penzance (2001) and HMS Pinafore (2002), all in editions by Carl Simpson and E. H. Jones. Oxford University Press (Oxford and New York) began but abandoned a critical edition after the publication of one volume—Ruddigore, edited by David Russell Hulme—in 2000.
forming genre is this more the case than with opera. The purposes for which a scholarly edition of an opera is undertaken necessarily include analysis, research and teaching, but the purpose for which the original sources were prepared often looked no farther than performance. The adjustments that must be made in order to produce a text suitable for use by music theorists, theater historians and teachers often alter—sometimes subtly and sometimes grossly—important elements of the original sources, conferring a sense of permanence on texts that were originally at best provisional.

The format in which opera is customarily presented in scholarly editions is the full score, a form in which each vocal part and each instrumental part is represented in detail, with every pitch and every indication of tempo, dynamics, and articulation unambiguously specified. But for much of the history of opera, publication in full score was the exception rather than the rule. In some periods, opera composers composed in short score, and even when composers prepared full scores, their full-score holographs did not necessarily represent what was actually performed. In the world of nineteenth-century light opera, where a constant demand for new works led to a stream of pieces hastily composed, inadequately rehearsed and, in some instances, regarded by their creators with embarrassment, composers often thought of their works as too slight or too ephemeral to merit the trouble of preparing full scores.

Editorial practice has traditionally assumed that an edition should seek to present the text of some specific document, whether a document that actually exists, a document that once existed but is now lost, or the ideal document that would have existed had the creator of the work represented transferred his conception to paper with perfect accuracy and without mechanical error. More conservative editors, referring to an edition that offers the “ideal” text that such a hypothetical document would transmit, often speak disparagingly of such an edition as presenting “a text that never was.” An editor preparing a musicological edition of a light opera for which the composer had never set about to prepare a real full score is in the even more unenviable position of preparing “a text that was never intended.”

The light operas created by W. S. Gilbert and Arthur Sullivan between 1871 and 1896 provide an informative example of the difficulties faced by scholarly editors preparing editions of operatic works for which full scores were never intended. In all, Gilbert and Sullivan collaborated on some fourteen light operas, and musical sources enabling us to reconstruct complete texts are available for all

2 A short score is a score in which only the vocal lines and bass are given.

3 For a survey of the various sorts of sources, unpublished and published, by which nineteenth-century Italian opera was created and preserved, see Philip Gossett, Divas and Scholars (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), passim, but esp. 3–106.
but their first collaboration, *Thespis*, for which only bits and pieces are extant. These works enjoyed immense popularity in their own time, and still hold the stage today. So much an institution have they become and so devoted a following do they command that the Gilbert and Sullivan community has a lexicon of its own. The works are solemnly referred to as “operas,” the parts from which the pit orchestra plays are called “band parts,” and the corpus is spoken of as “The Savoy Operas,” even though six of them were premiered before the Savoy Theatre opened and one was never performed there at all.

The Savoy Operas are unusual in that they belong to one of the longest lasting closed performing traditions in the history of musical theatre. All but the first two Savoy operas were composed for a troupe assembled by Gilbert, Sullivan, and the impresario who brought them together, Richard D’Oyly Carte. The D’Oyly Carte organization controlled the rights to these works until the expiration of their international copyright in 1961, almost three quarters of a century after the premiere of the last collaboration, *The Grand Duke*, in 1896. Almost from the first—when a quarrel between the Triumvirate (Gilbert, Sullivan and Carte) and their financial backers led to there being two rival *Pinafore’s* running simultaneously in London—the D’Oyly Carte organization identified itself as the only company performing the versions of the operas authorized by composer and librettist. And, indeed, down to its last unhappy days, the D’Oyly Carte Company could boast that its singers and musicians belonged to a tradition in which roles had been passed from generation to generation in an unbroken line going back to the singers and musicians directed by Gilbert and Sullivan themselves. However, as the work of editors preparing editions has revealed, even in such a carefully controlled environment, and with every incentive to do so, the D’Oyly Carte establishment found it impossible to maintain the stability of either the textual or the performing tradition.

What an editor undertaking a critical edition of a Savoy Opera might like to produce is an edition based on a fair copy holograph full score prepared by Sul-

---

4 Parts of the score of *Thespis* were recycled; the fascicle containing “Climbing Over Rocky Mountain” was incorporated in the holograph of *The Pirates of Penzance*, where it became No. 5. There have been several attempts to reconstruct the score of Gilbert and Sullivan’s first collaboration, most proceeding from the assumption that the music of *Thespis* is to be found in some of Sullivan’s other works—usually with new lyrics.

5 The Savoy Theatre opened on October 10, 1881, and the Gilbert and Sullivan collaborations written prior to that year—*Thespis*, *Trial By Jury*, *The Sorcerer*, *H M S Pinafore*, *The Pirates of Penzance*, and *Patience*—opened in other theatres. *Patience* was moved to the Savoy in the middle of its opening run, and the other early operas, with the exception of *Thespis*, were revived at the Savoy over the years.

6 Even after the expiration of copyright, the D’Oyly Carte Company continued to perform and record the operas, and the D’Oyly Carte Opera Trust maintained a library of band parts that served both its own company and other groups, both professional and amateur, interested in performing any work in the repertoire.
livan. Alas, nothing of the kind exists for any Savoy Opera. It is one of the well-known ironies of Sullivan’s career that the composer and many of his admirers regarded his collaborations with Gilbert as musical slumming, and Sullivan’s casual attitude towards the scores of his Savoy Operas may be seen to reflect his sense that while these were works that may have been financially rewarding, they were not the creations for which he would want to be remembered. An editor, then, is left to declare as his aim the construction of the text of a full score such as Sullivan might have produced had he been inclined to do so, to which one must add Gilbert’s dialogue and stage directions.

Traditional editorial practice has favored basing an edition on a single source, emending that source where there is a mechanical mistake—e.g., a spelling error—or when the editor believes that the source transmits a reading that the creator did not intend. Such a procedure is out of the question for the Savoy Operas, since for none of these works was there ever a single source that provides all of the data necessary to construct a full score. To construct a full score of an opera, one needs information about the sequence of musical numbers and connective verbal matter, the content of the vocal lines and the underlaid lyrics, the content of the instrumental lines, and the content of the dialogue, scenery and stage directions. No single source of a Savoy Opera provides all this information.

With the exception of Thespis, for which only the libretto survives complete (it was published in 1871 and reprinted subsequently in collections of Gilbert’s plays), each of Gilbert and Sullivan’s operas reaches us in four sorts of sources. First, there are Sullivan’s holographs. These provide, in skeletal form, the vocal and instrumental lines, but they contain neither dialogue nor stage directions. Moreover, they were not consistently updated during rehearsals. Second, there are the vocal scores published under Sullivan’s direction. But these vocal scores do not provide the instrumental lines; British vocal scores provide neither dialogue nor stage directions, though some of the American ones do. Third, there are the few surviving “band parts” from first productions, but (aside from the occasional cue) these have no vocal lines, much less dialogue and stage directions. Finally, there are the printed libretti: these contain all of the verbal matter—the dialogue, lyrics and stage directions—but they contain no music. The four plates of Figure 1 reproduce the opening of Trial by Jury, No. 10, as it appears in the critical edition, 1(a); the holograph, 1(b); the vocal score, 1(c); and an early band part, 1(d).

Facing such a complex of sources, the editor of any single opera is best advised to invoke the principle of “divided authority,” a concept that came into vogue in Anglo-American text-critical circles with W. W. Greg’s influential...


(d) *Trial by Jury*, No. 10, early flute part, reproduced from a copy in a private collection.
paper “The Rationale of Copy-Text.” If once we accept the basic premise of divided authority—that where a work survives in two or more sources, one source may furnish the best readings for some element(s) of the editorially established text but not for others—then preparing a text of an opera for which no source provides all the needed data becomes a matter of identifying for each element of the opera the kind of source most likely to provide the best readings for that element and then using that source as the base text for that element. The readings of this “base source” are reproduced except for those readings for which the editor believes that the base source does not reflect accurately the state of the opera that the editor wishes his edition to represent. Each reading in which the text that the editor has established does not agree with the base source for that element is reported as an emendation; any reading in any one of the other polled sources that does not agree with the text established by the editor is reported as a variant. In the present context, “best” has been taken in the sense of representing more closely and completely what composer and librettist finally decided they wanted performed. In managing base sources, the editor must be careful to select sources—or layers within sources—that reflect the same state of the opera: one does not want inadvertently to mix, say, the scenery and stage directions of a first run with the vocal lines of a revival for which there was new scenery requiring re-assignment of the vocal parts.

For most of the Savoy Operas, the state of the work that seems most desirable to represent is what we would call the “settled” state during the first production. Given Gilbert and Sullivan’s method of working, it was only quite late in rehearsals that all the numbers and all the dialogue were in a sufficiently advanced state to enable a run-through that would give an overall sense of the entire work. During the course of rehearsals—in fact, right up to opening night—numbers might be added, repositioned, or cut (normally in the interest of improving pacing), and the associated dialogue would be adjusted accordingly. The final test was performance before a real audience, and this took place on

---

7 Studies in Bibliography, 3 (1950–51), pp. 19–36. Greg’s essay was, of course, concerned with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English play texts forming ancestral series, but his theories have been tried in other textual circumstances, albeit with mixed results.

8 Serious problems can occur when different states are mixed. In H M S Pinafore, for example, changes in the scenery between the first production (1878) and the first revival (1887) created uncertainty in early sources about where—onstage or off—Dick Dead-eye is when he sings—if he sings at all—in No. 12, mm 56ff.

9 Some exceptions to this rule: Percy M. Young decided that his edition of H M S Pinafore (New York: Broude Brothers Limited, 2003) should reflect the settled state of the first revival: he acknowledged that in 1878 Pinafore may have “defined the essential Gilbert and Sullivan opera,” but he reasoned that the 1878 version “was not then marked by the confident balance and pacing that would distinguish the subsequent operas” (Introduction, Part B, p. 24). Young therefore chose to print the text in its 1887 form, although his apparatus enables users to reconstruct the text of the 1878 version.
opening night. After judging audience reactions, critics’ reviews, and their own responses, librettist and composer might make additional adjustments, and the opera would have reached a “settled” state. A text representing this state is what the editor should want to establish.

The only sources providing the complete dramatic text—the dialogue and the sequence of numbers as finally fixed early in the first run—are the British printed libretti. Therefore, it is these printed libretti that should determine the sequence of numbers and the dialogue of the edition of any Savoy Opera. (However, as we shall see, the printed libretti are not necessarily the best sources for the underlaid lyrics.) The sequence of numbers is usually confirmed by the vocal scores.

Prima facie, the most important category of sources for the Savoy Operas would seem to be the composer’s holograph scores: there is one for each of the thirteen collaborations for which music survives. These holographs have two important shortcomings: they are not true full scores, and they were not kept current during rehearsals.

The holographs are laid out on printed staff paper, prepared as if for full score, but they are not fair copy full scores in which every note, every dynamic, and every indication of articulation is carefully specified for every line. Rather, they are executed in a musical shorthand that makes liberal use of abbreviations and of verbal instructions that are often ambiguous and sometimes opaque. Some of the abbreviations are conventional and therefore familiar: e.g., “./.” may indicate that the content of this measure replicates that of the preceding measure. The verbal instructions are of two kinds: vertical and horizontal. Vertical instructions are usually of the *colla parte* type, indicating that one part is to be derived from another. Thus, the line for the flute may be written out, and the line for the first violin may contain just one note, to establish register, and the instruction “col flauto,” i.e., the first violin plays, in the register specified, the same notes as the flute. The horizontal instructions involve reproducing in one place a passage that is to be found written out—or partially written out—in another place: say, taking a passage from an ensemble and copying it into a finale. The actual instruction may appear at the destination location: “No. 11, A-H,” meaning, “Copy here

---

10 There are American printed libretti—mostly pirated but some of them authorized—but even the authorized libretti did not keep up with changes.

11 Sullivan’s holograph of *Utopia Limited* has dropped out of sight, but it has not been unusual for collectors to acquire and secretly to hold Sullivan manuscripts; the *Trial By Jury* holograph was secretly held by such a collector, who offered it for sale in 1975, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of *Trial*’s first production. Fortunately, microfilms of the *Utopia* holograph are in several archives.
the passage in Number 11 consisting of the measures that I have marked there A–H.” 12

At one time, it was thought that Sullivan’s scores partook of this form because Sullivan was lazy or because he usually wrote under pressure and rarely had time enough to fill in every detail. In short, the assumption was that the holographs were incipient fair copies—and that, had Sullivan had the time or inclination, he would have expanded the abbreviations and produced neat and complete full scores. 13 In fact, this assumption has proved to be unfounded. As those familiar with sources for music-dramatic works will recognize, Sullivan’s Savoy Opera holographs belong to the tradition of copying masters, skeleton scores intended solely for the use of the copyists who would extract the parts distributed to the singers and pit orchestra. There is no generally accepted term for such scores: skeleton scores, quasi-scores, shorthand scores, working scores, rehearsal scores, copying masters—all are terms that fail to catch some essential quality of these documents that were intended to serve only at a particular stage of production and not necessarily afterwards.

Once we recognize the status of the holographs as copying masters, we can understand why the holographs present some of the problems that they do. They were prepared for copyists familiar with Sullivan’s personal conventions, and any abbreviation that a copyist misconstrued could be caught during rehearsals. Refinements of tempo, dynamics, articulation and nuance could also be effected during rehearsals. And so the holographs are often silent about matters that would be dealt with when rehearsals began. Thus, the vertical instructions of the holographs usually leave us in doubt about such details as articulation and dynamics: if only one part is written out, are the articulation and dynamics of the model line to be applied to all lines? 14 The answers to these questions can come only from the band parts—if such survive—actually marked by the pit musicians during rehearsals in accordance with Sullivan’s ad hoc instructions. Similarly, the horizontal instructions almost invariably leave us uncertain about whether the tempi and dynamics of model passages should be reproduced in derived passages, or whether derived passages require tempi and dynamics suitable for their new contexts. There is, of course, every reason to expect that the tempi and dynamics

---

12 So many are the passages that must be expanded from abbreviations and so great the potential for misinterpretation that the critical apparatus for each opera contains a table of passages that have been so expanded.

13 Steven Ledbetter, in his edition of Trial By Jury (New York: Broude Brothers Limited, 1994), proceeded from this premise; see his discussion of sources, pp. 156–58.

14 Roger Harris has suggested, in a personal communication, that perhaps Sullivan intended that some sort of formula be applied, e.g., that dynamics for the lower brass be a level softer than those for the upper brass.
of a phrase lifted from an aria and incorporated into an overture or finale would be different in the two iterations. Again, we must be edified by the band parts.

But the holographs have another important deficiency: when changes were made during rehearsals, Sullivan did not always enter them in the holographs. Thus the holographs, as we have them, do not always represent the latest state of each number. In the holograph of *H M S Pinafore*, for example, No. 9, the First Lord's Song, “When I was a lad,” still has Sir Joseph beginning his career in a cotton-broking firm, even though in this number’s final form the ruler of the Queen’s Navy started out as “an office boy in an attorney’s firm.”15 The forms of these numbers as Sullivan finally fixed them are to be found in the vocal scores. Somewhere between the holographs and the vocal scores there were undoubtedly sources—perhaps leaves of manuscript paper, perhaps marked up engraver’s proofs, perhaps menus from Simpson’s—on which Sullivan first recorded what the vocal scores tell us he eventually wanted. But whatever these sources may have been, they are now lost: no surviving source in Sullivan’s hand has been identified as being intermediate between holograph and vocal score. In the end, the holographs are the best sources in matters of orchestration, but they need a great deal of assistance from other sources.

There are other scores connected with the D’Oyly Carte tradition that sometimes assist in reading Sullivan’s holographs. There are house copies of the holographs made by D’Oyly Carte copyists. These are on the whole simply dutiful transcriptions of Sullivan’s holographs, and, although they do not usually expand Sullivan’s abbreviations, they do occasionally show us how a professional copyist familiar with Sullivan’s notational idiosyncrasies understood a reading that is ambiguous in a holograph. There are also scores of *H M S Pinafore* and *The Mikado* published in Germany.16 It is clear that these scores were produced with D’Oyly Carte’s co-operation—probably with a view to obtaining German copyrights—for each is derived from the respective holograph, access to which could have come only through D’Oyly Carte. Neither score has any independent authority, but both are helpful in showing how Sullivan’s contemporaries might have construed his notation.

The vocal scores are the sources most likely to incorporate the musical details, for the elements they transmit, upon which Sullivan and Gilbert finally set-

---

15 The superseded first verse reads: “When I [was a lad I] served [a term] | [As] office [boy to a] cotton-broking firm. | [I] cleaned [the windows with a] flannel & a mop, | [And I] took down the [shutters & I] swept [the shop].” The material in brackets is not present in the holograph and is supplied from other sources.

16 *H M S Pinafore*, with a German text, was published as *Amor am Bord* (Braunschweig: Henry Litolf’s Verlag [1883]), and *The Mikado* was published with its English text—although not the final one (Leipzig: Bosworth, c. 1889).
tled. These scores—containing all vocal lines, both solo and choral, and all lyrics (i.e., words to be sung) together with piano reductions of the orchestral parts—were prepared for sale, to be used by amateur groups giving public performances and by private individuals for use at home. The vocal scores were usually being prepared for printing while rehearsals were still in progress, in order to have them available for sale shortly after opening night. For operas beginning with Patience, stereos were made and sent to the United States so that American and English editions might be published simultaneously, thereby discouraging the American pirates who had been printing the most popular songs from the operas ever since the spectacular success of H M S Pinafore.17

For such a market, it was important that the vocal scores reflect the settled states of the operas, and, it would seem, some effort was made to see that they did so. Changes were entered on the stereos so that a page of a vocal score might go through two—or even three—states. For example, some of the pages of H M S Pinafore were altered and type was set for some new pages when the first revival took place in 1887: these alterations were made to correct mistakes, to reflect changes, and to incorporate the overture, which had not been included—quite possibly because it had not yet been written—when the first issue of the vocal score had appeared in 1878. Unfortunately, however, the alterations were not made with uniform care, and many readings in need of correction were overlooked.

Because the stereos from which plates would be made in America were dispatched several weeks before opening night, the American vocal scores give us “avant-première” states of the operas they transmit. The vocal scores, therefore, provide valuable insight into the process by which operas were refined as opening night approached, and they sometimes include numbers that were suppressed before the London premières.18 In most cases, the English vocal scores probably represent—with allowance for the inevitable error and oversight—what composer and librettist considered the settled state of each work, and they should therefore be the base text for the vocal lines and the underlaid lyrics. However, since the piano parts are reductions of the instrumental ensemble, they provide only limited information about the orchestral lines—say, clarification of a harmony. Moreover, some of the information that they provide, such as dynamics, cannot be assumed to be applicable to performance by a pit orchestra.

17 The protection of American copyright was available only to citizens of the United States, and it was not until Princess Ida (1884) that Gilbert, Sullivan, and Carte hit upon the strategy of retaining an American—George Lowell Tracy of Boston—to prepare the piano reduction for the vocal scores, thereby providing the basis for a claim to American copyright protection.
18 For example, the American vocal score of Iolanthe contains the inflammatory song “Fold Your Flapping Wings,” which was cut after opening night, and which never appeared in an English vocal score.
Early band-parts, it was once hoped, would provide valuable information about the details of Sullivan’s orchestration. Modern D’Oyly Carte band parts—still available from the most recent successor to the D’Oyly Carte Opera Trust—cannot be considered textually reliable, thanks to the D’Oyly Carte practice of transcribing new copies neither from archive exemplars of band parts nor from authorized master copies but rather from any at-hand copy of the required part. This practice was bound to introduce and/or perpetuate bad readings, sometimes because the copyist reproduced his exemplar inaccurately and sometimes because he reproduced accurately unauthoritative readings introduced earlier in the train of transmission. D’Oyly Carte long denied any knowledge of early band parts, and it was only in 1999, when two determined Gilbert & Sullivan researchers, Helga Perry and Bruce Miller, unearthed a trove of early band parts, some dating back to original productions, that an assessment of what information early band parts might provide was possible. However, the band parts raised as many questions as they answered. Collation revealed that, notwithstanding Sullivan’s reputation as a stickler for detail, the D’Oyly Carte performing tradition was more flexible than we might have supposed. When two copies of the same part (say two violoncello parts for the same opera) were compared, they were found to differ in numerous readings, ranging from articulation and dynamics through pitch and value to the presence or absence of entire passages. In retrospect, the existence of such discrepancies should not have been surprising: a set of parts might have been used by several companies. In D’Oyly Carte’s heyday there were, in addition to the principal company performing in London, several touring companies. Conductors of these companies were often obliged to make adjustments for the unique circumstances of particular performances. For an editor, therefore, the utility of these parts is limited to resolving ambiguities and filling in gaps in

19 Among the early parts, Miller and Perry were able to identify the original No. 6, “Reflect, My Child,” of H.M.S. Pinafore, suppressed before opening night and thought to be lost forever. The discovery was announced in a paper read at the New York meeting of The Society for Textual Scholarship, April 15, 1999, “‘Reflect, My Child’: Reflections on the Suppressed No. 6 in H.M.S. Pinafore.” This paper, in an expanded form, is published as the introduction to “Reflect, My Child,” Former No. 6, Reconstruction by Bruce I. Miller and Helga J. Perry, Gilbert and Sullivan: The Operas, 3A (New York & Williamstown: Broude Brothers Limited, 1999).

20 The comings and goings of the D’Oyly Carte touring companies are traced in detail by Cyril Rollins and R. John Witts, The Gilbert and Sullivan Operas: A Record of Productions 1875–1961 (London: Michael Joseph, [1962]). It is clear from the tables of Rollins and Witt that the operas were performed on tour well after they had finished their London runs, so that band parts were frequently if not continually in use. D’Oyly Carte touring companies did not necessarily include instrumentalists; instrumentalists were often recruited in each city the company visited. When the necessary musicians were not all available—when, for example, only one clarinetist could be found instead of the two for which the work was scored—adjustments would be made, and these adjustments might be reflected in the parts. Similarly, adjustments would be made to accommodate musicians of modest capabilities, to meet the requirements of singers, or to conform to the characteristics of the hall.
the holograph, aiding in such questions as: Are both horns playing at this point or is only Horn 1? Are the celli here really still pizzicato (as the absence of “arco” in the holograph implies) or are they indeed arco (as the musical sense suggests)?

The holograph scores, vocal scores and band parts constitute the musical sources, and they represent a textual tradition independent of what we may think of as the “dramatic” tradition—the dialogue, descriptions of scenery, and stage directions—of which the printed libretti form the most important component.

In keeping with a tradition going back to the birth of opera at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the libretti of the Savoy Operas were published separately; copies were sold at the theatre door to patrons so that they could follow along during performances, and copies were available in shops, to be purchased by Savoyards who might want to enjoy Gilbert’s wit at home. It has long been known that the type for most of the printed libretti was set up from copy supplied by Gilbert shortly before and/or during rehearsal, and that this type was kept standing until after opening night, so that the libretti could incorporate the changes made as the opera evolved towards its settled state.  

However, for earlier operas—at least through *Pirates*—there might be several editions, and so several settings of type, some incorporating authorized changes but each introducing its own complement of errors. Just how closely these libretti tracked authorial changes could be determined only when copies of the libretti were collated against each other and against other sources. Some idea of the extent to which all of the sources—both the printed libretti and the vocal scores—fail to reflect the verbal material actually being performed in productions directed by Gilbert and Sullivan themselves can be seen by examining early prompt copies. There is at the British Library a set of prompt copies prepared upon Gilbert’s instructions in 1890, and this set presum-

---


22 In the twentieth century, after the advent of offset lithography, new material was typeset, proofs pulled, and the proofs were pasted over superseded material to provide the camera copy for a new printing; the newly added word or words can be readily distinguished because they are lighter and sharper than the surrounding material.
ably represents the authorized states of the respective texts as of that year. These prompt copies consist of copies of printed libretti interleaved with blank pages, on which blocking diagrams and similar material have been entered by hand. On both the blank and printed pages handwritten entries have been made to bring the printed text into conformance with what was being performed. In these prompt copies the substantial number of printed readings cancelled and replaced by manuscript entries indicates how far the vocal scores and printed libretti often were from the words actually sung and spoken under Gilbert's direction. In the critical edition, the prompt copies have usually been accepted as the basis for verbal matter—except for lyrics. Where the prompt copies provide readings that supersede those in the printed libretti—that is, where a printed reading is cancelled and replaced by a handwritten entry—the manuscript entry is usually to be preferred, on the assumption that no change would have been made if it had not been required. However, after consulting other reliable sources, editors have reason to believe that there are readings in prompt copies that should have been changed but were not. Thus, the fact that no change was made in a prompt copy cannot be regarded as unassailable evidence that the prompt copy reflects what was being performed circa 1890.

It is important to understand that for the Savoy Operas—as for many other operatic texts—the musical sources (all descended from Sullivan's holographs) and the dramatic sources (all descended from the compositor's copy that Gilbert delivered to the printer) represent independent textual traditions, and that there are numerous discrepancies between the two. These discrepancies are the result of the way in which the Savoy Operas were created. Once a plot was agreed upon, Gilbert would prepare the words for individual numbers and deliver them to Sullivan a number—or sometimes a few numbers—at a time. Sullivan would set what Gilbert had delivered, and the two would later confer to identify and revise passages that seemed unsatisfactory to one or both. Differences between the words Gilbert delivered and the words sung in the finished musical number resulted sometimes from Sullivan's either deliberately or inadvertently setting a word or phrase other than the one Gilbert had provided or from a considered revision involving both parties. Since Gilbert himself directed productions—and was known for his insistence that singers and actors adhere scrupulously to his text—he must surely have been aware when singers were singing words other than those he had given to Sullivan. In some cases, discrepancies between the musical sources and the printed libretti may have resulted

23 These prompt copies, known collectively as “The Gilbert Prompt Copies” (London, British Library, MSS Add 49310–49313), were prepared, probably by Charles Harris, during the Great Carpet Controversy, when Gilbert thought it likely that he would permanently sever connections with D'Oyly Carte.
from Gilbert’s failing to pass along to the printer changes in which he had acqui-
essed; in others, he may have preferred to retain in the printed libretti the words
he had originally written, even though he had agreed that they might be altered
in performance. When there is a discrepancy between what Gilbert supplied and
what Sullivan set—as evidenced by the vocal scores and prompt copies—it seems
clear that the reading of the musical tradition—what Sullivan actually set—
should be preferred.

Not until after World War I was any effort made to bring the musical and
the dramatic traditions into agreement with each other. And when such an effort
was made, it was directed not at restoring the original texts but rather at provid-
ning libretti reflecting what was being performed at the time—including unau-
thoritative material that had found its way into the performing tradition.

For most of this essay we have addressed two textual traditions—the musi-
cal and the dramatic. But at the point that performance began taking place—from
the first reading at the first rehearsal—a third tradition was developing: the per-
formance tradition. This third tradition was atextual and would involve performa-
tive components present neither in the musical nor in the dramatic texts. It might
include a brief musical fragment (in The Mikado the phrase, played by the piccolo,
from the air that the condemned criminal is described as having whistled), a bit of
gagging (the “No money, no grovel” passage in The Mikado), or an interpretation
as important as the tragic reading of the final stage direction in Yeomen, “Point falls
insensible.” This tradition would take on a life of its own; it would be passed on
from performer to performer, usually without benefit of text, becoming part of the
opera that audiences would expect and that actors would feel obliged to deliver—
even though it might have no basis in any authoritative text.

The result of all this juggling of sources is for each opera a constructed
text representing what might have been performed on any given evening during
its first run or, in some cases, during its first revival. But such a text is quite a dif-
ferent thing from a critical edition of a novel or a poem, which proposes to offer
the text of a document that an original audience might have read. The critically
edited full score of Patience or Iolanthe does not represent the text from which ei-
ther Arthur Sullivan or Francis Cellier (his assistant and successor at the podium)
would have conducted the opera. D’Oyly Carte conductors have almost always
conducted from vocal scores, since Sullivan’s holographs were safely locked away
to prevent piracy. Consequently, a conductor never knew with certainty whether
the notes played by the pit musicians corresponded to what Sullivan had written.
Rather, the critical edition introduces a reassuring if artificial mechanism of con-
trol, since all components of the text—vocal score, band parts and libretto—de-
rive from a single source, the editorially established full score. Thus, all
components of the text are co-ordinated in a way that rarely occurred in the real
world of the theatre, where ill-matched performing materials, such as band parts
representing one line of descent and vocal scores representing another, often required conductors at rehearsals to devise ad hoc solutions to the problems that such discrepant texts presented. The critical editions therefore authorize musicians and audiences who care about such things to believe that what they are playing and hearing is relatively close to what Sullivan wrote, as certified by knowledgeable editors. The critically edited musical score, moreover, serves as a reference text against which variants can be logged in the apparatus, so that users can reconstruct the states through which various portions of the text have passed. It also gives them historical and textual information that allows them, if they wish, to incorporate traditional but unauthoritative material in their productions or to restore material that composer and librettist suppressed. However, the process of preparing these editions reminds us that these are works that have survived quite successfully without benefit of a unifying master text that specifies in detail the content of each component part. We are therefore also reminded that with a performing work the purpose of sources is often not to serve as repositories of a work’s identity, as a means of preserving it for posterity, but simply as a mechanism for getting it performed.
Review Essay


John P. Kaminski

The introduction to *My Dearest Friend* begins, “Abigail and John Adams’s correspondence, spanning the years 1762 to 1801, covers the most important forty years in American history.” It is hard to refute that statement. Written by a couple who were arguably the nation’s most powerful political husband-and-wife team, this correspondence paints a portrait of a lifelong romance upon a canvas of revolution, independence, and nation building. Ten years into their marriage, John expressed how important their partnership was to him: “In all the Joys and sorrows, Prosperity and Adversity of my Life” she would “take a Part with me in the struggle.”1 A month before their wedding, he predicted that she “shall polish and refine my sentiments of Life and Manners, banish all the unsocial and ill-natured Particles in my Composition, and form me to that happy Temper, that can reconcile, a quick Discernment with a perfect Candour.”2 She was what he needed: “Ballast, without which [he would] totter with every Breeze.”3 No other correspondence between a husband and a wife shows better the great sacrifices that both endured for their country.

*My Dearest Friend* is the third published compilation of the letters of Abigail and John Adams. Charles Francis Adams edited the first compilation of his grandparents’ correspondence in 1876, the nation’s centennial. A century later, in 1975, the staff of the Adams Family Papers (Lyman H. Butterfield, Marc Friedlaender, and Mary-Jo Kline) edited a second collection of letters, entitled *The Book of Abigail and John*. The first compilation contains 284 letters written between 1774 and 1783; the second, 207 letters written between 1762 and 1784. The second compilation also includes diary entries and third-party letters that assist in transitions.

1 To Abigail Adams, York, Maine, 1 July 1774. (*MDF*, 32–33)
2 To Abigail Smith, 30 September 1764. (*MDF*, 24)
3 John Adams: Draft of a letter to an unidentified correspondent. (MHS)
My Dearest Friend contains 289 letters “selected from the entire corpus” of the Adams letters from 1762 to 1801 and “is meant to show both the consistency of their relationship and the evolution of the family through the entire founding era.” A three-page epilogue on the death of Abigail consists of a short headnote and two letters exchanged between John and John Quincy Adams. All but three of the letters in My Dearest Friend are in the Adams Family manuscript collection given by the Adams family to the Massachusetts Historical Society (MHS) in 1956. The letters were all microfilmed on 608 reels by the MHS in the 1950s and sold to research libraries throughout the world. The Abigail and John letters appear on the MHS Web site (www.masshist.org) at “The Adams Family Papers: An Electronic Archive.” (See below.) Abigail and John’s letters also appear among the volumes of The Adams Family Correspondence published by The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Nine volumes have been published to date, covering the years through 1793. All of the published Adams volumes appear on the MHS Web site and are also digitally available on Rotunda, University of Virginia Press.

The editors of My Dearest Friend tell the readers that this volume is “to be read and enjoyed, not necessarily studied.” Readers are told to go to the published volumes for full annotation. Annotation for My Dearest Friend can be found in four places: (1) short introductions to chronological chapters, (2) very short headnotes to individual documents, (3) editorial insertions in square brackets within the transcriptions, and (4) brief identifications within index entries. An additional light sprinkling of footnotes to references that are unclear or unknown to most readers would have been helpful in making the letters more understandable and enjoyable.

Transcription policies reflect the times in which the compilations were published. The 1876 edition corrected errors in spelling (primarily in Abigail’s letters) and omitted matters the editor considered to be trivial, mundane, or inappropriate, or that he deemed too personal. These omissions were not repeated in the subsequent compilations. The 1975 compilation followed the transcription policy set by Julian P. Boyd in the Papers of Thomas Jefferson and adopted by Lyman Butterfield in the Adams Papers volumes, in which the text is modernized. Editors Hogan and Taylor in My Dearest Friend chose to present a literal transcription of the text with only minor alterations in punctuation when needed for clarity. This literal transcription does not make it more difficult to understand the letters. The transcriptions in My Dearest Friend are very accurate.

The twenty-page index is straightforward and well done. Birth-death dates and brief identifications often are placed in parentheses after index entries. An informative six-page chronology precedes the index.

Like its 1975 predecessor, My Dearest Friend contains a beautiful collection of illustrations; in this volume they are gathered together in twenty pages in
the middle of the book. Mostly in vivid full color, the illustrations include portraiture of the young and old John and Abigail Adams, portraits of their children and son-in-law, engravings or paintings of seven of their residences, cartoons, a map, and facsimiles of manuscript letters written by the Adamses. The stunning dustjacket reproduces the young portraits and the retirement residence on the front, along with a facsimile of a letter by Abigail on the back.

The correspondence between Abigail and John Adams is unique among the Founders. When George Washington died, his wife destroyed all of the correspondence between them in her possession. Only three letters now remain extant. When Martha Jefferson died in 1782, Thomas Jefferson destroyed their correspondence. James Monroe did the same when his wife Eliza died in 1830. Even if any of these three sets of marital correspondence survived, they would not have the same significance as the correspondence between Abigail and John. Few women participated in the politics of the day. John jokingly wrote to Abigail that he was guilty of a grievous sin—he had introduced “a Woman!” to politics. As the years went by and Abigail’s maternal duties subsided, her interest and involvement in politics increased until she became her husband’s chief adviser and confidante.

Although she never attended school, Abigail Adams had a remarkable education. Her letters are brilliant. They capture the events and the way life was lived over a period of fifty momentous years. They reveal a woman of truly incredible strength, of insight, and of wisdom. In 1794, while he was serving as vice president and presiding over the U.S. Senate, John told Abigail that her letters gave him “more entertainment than all the speeches I hear. There is more good Thoughts, fine strokes and Mother Wit in them than I hear in the whole Week. An Ounce of Mother Wit is worth a Pound of Clergy.” He was happy that at least one of their children (John Quincy Adams) had “an Abundance of not only Mother Wit, but his Mother’s Wit.”

The letters almost always consist of a single sheet of paper folded once in half to form four pages, with on rare occasions another single sheet of paper inserted, making a six-page letter. The completed letter was then folded and tucked in such a way that the fourth page became a sort of cover or “envelope,” upon which was written the recipient’s name and address. The folded letter was then sealed with a spot of wax. (This wax seal is shown on the back of the dustjacket.)

Abigail nearly always filled the first three pages of her letters to overflowing. “My pen will always run greater lengths than I am aware of when I address those who are particularly dear to me and to whom I can write with unreserve.”

---

4 To Abigail Adams, Passy, 13 February 1779. (MDF, 225)
5 John Adams to Abigail Adams, Philadelphia, 4 February 1794. (MDF, 355)
6 To John Quincy Adams, London, 26 June 1785. (AFC, 6: 194)
Short letters disappointed her because they “always give one pain as well as pleasure since a few lines only from such a distance looks as if the Friend we wrote to possesssd but a small share of our attention and regard.” On several occasions she complained to John that his letters were not “half long enough.” She most enjoyed letters that he wrote on Sundays, because he seemed to have “a greater command” of his time on that day.

John’s letters were usually shorter. He justified his brevity because of his busy schedule. “How I find Time to write half the Letters I do, I know not, for my whole Time seems engrossed with Business.”

Abigail Adams’s literary legacy would have surprised her. She was embarrassed by her lack of a formal education and was aware of her shortcomings in spelling, grammar, and handwriting, which she referred to as “incorrect and unpolished.” On at least five occasions she asked her husband to destroy her letters, once suggesting that he light his cigars with them. He responded that her letters made his “Heart throb, more than a Cannonade,” and that he “must forget” her first before destroying her letters. To a friend, she confided that she would “make a bond fire” of her letters rather than “they should some hundred years hence be thought of consequence enough to publish.”

Abigail valued letters highly, even if they contained “nothing but an account of the Health” of those we love. As a young woman she wrote her fiancé how much she appreciated his letters: “I do not estimate everything according to the price the world set upon it, but according to the value of it is of to me, thus that which was cheapest to you I look upon as highly valuable.” A decade later, she delighted in informing her husband, then serving in Congress in Philadelphia, how their four little children “run upon the Sight of a Letter [from their father]—like chicks for a crum, when the Hen clucks.” She confided to him that when she received his letters her heart was “as light as a feather” and her spirits danced. Letters from him were “Like cold water to a thirsty Soul”; like “a feast to

---

7 To John Adams, 13 December 1778. (AFC, 3: 136)
8 To John Adams, Braintree, 20 September 1776. (MDF, 155)
9 To John Adams, Braintree, 16 July 1775. (AFC, 1: 247)
10 To Abigail Adams, Philadelphia, 3 December 1775. (MDF, 91)
11 To Mercy Otis Warren, Boston, 5 December 1773. (AFC, 5: 88)
12 To Abigail Adams, Philadelphia, 28 April 1776. (MHS)
13 To Harriet Welsh, Quincy, 9 March 1815. (MHS)
14 To Charles Adams and John Quincy Adams, 22 July 1780. (AFC, 3: 381)
15 To John Adams, Weymouth, 12 April 1764. (MDF, 13)
16 To John Adams, Braintree, 25 June 1775. (MDF, 68)
me.” When she received letters, Abigail felt an urgency to respond. “My Heart overflows, and longs to give utterance to my pen.” Whenever she heard of a safe conveyance, especially a ship readying to cross the Atlantic, she seized the opportunity to write.

To a great extent, the nature and number of Abigail’s letters were dictated by circumstances. When at home raising four children, she wrote primarily to her husband, who, as an up-and-coming provincial attorney, rode the judicial circuit throughout Massachusetts and Maine for almost half the year. During these early years, Abigail seldom wrote to her family because they were nearby and often visited each other. Her correspondence with John increased when he served in Congress in Philadelphia. When her husband and ten-year-old son sailed for Europe in 1778, she wrote to them whenever a nearby American ship prepared to put to sea, despite the constant dangers from the British navy. On several occasions a packet of her letters was thrown overboard so as not to allow the letters to fall into the enemy’s possession. When, after the war, Abigail joined her husband in Europe, their correspondence stopped. When they returned to America in 1788 and John left Braintree the following year to become vice president and then president in 1797, their correspondence blossomed again whenever she stayed home, as she often did. When Abigail joined John in New York City, Philadelphia, or Washington, D.C., their correspondence with each other naturally ceased while her correspondence with family and friends burgeoned. Whether at home in Braintree (or Quincy), abroad, or in the nation’s capital, she always awakened early and spent “almost every morning in writing” letters. When John lost his bid for a second term as president, the Adamses retired to Quincy. No longer separated, they never wrote another letter to each other.

While at home Abigail wrote about the health of family and friends. Often her letters mentioned the death of family, friends, and acquaintances—“the Infant Bud, the blooming Youth, and the Mature in Life have fallen around me.” After a deadly dysentery epidemic, Abigail wrote of how her mother nursed her through the illness only to succumb to the disease herself. John consoled Abigail, saying “The best Thing We can do, the greatest Respect We can show to the Memory of our departed Friend, is to copy into Our own Lives those Virtues which in her Life time rendered her the object of our Esteem, Love and Admiration.” He then went well beyond simple condolences. Although he vener-

17 To John Adams, Braintree, 27 May 1776; to John Quincy Adams, Quincy, 27 February 1814. (AFc, 1: 416 & MHS)
18 To John Adams, Braintree, c. 15 July 1778. (AFc, 3: 61)
19 To Mary Cranch, Philadelphia, 19 June 1798. (MHS)
20 To Louisa Catherine Adams, Quincy, 30 September 1815. (MHS)
ated his mother-in-law, he hoped Abigail would forgive him when he said that "her Talents, and Virtues [were] too much confined to private, social and domestic Life. My Opinion of the Duties of Religion and Morality, comprehends a very extensive Connection with society at large, and the great Interest of the public. Does not natural Morality, and much more Christian Benevolence, make it our indispensable Duty to lay ourselves out, to serve our fellow Creatures to the Utmost of our Power, in promoting and supporting those great Political systems, and general Regulations upon which the Happiness of Multitudes depends." Abigail and John had to elevate their concern from the personal level to "the great Principles of Virtue and Freedom of political Regulations" in order to "secure whole Nations and Generations from Misery, Want and Contempt." 21

She wrote of domestic matters—the farm, servants, field hands, the weather, and financial concerns—and politics at the state, national, and international levels. When John served in Congress, she advocated independence, criticized the delay in calling for it, and urged the adoption of laws to protect women from their abusive husbands. He responded that America was "a great, unwieldy Body," which he compared to a convoy in which the "fleetest Sailors, must wait for the dullest and slowest" and like a "Coach and six—the swiftest Horses, must be slackened and the slowest quickened, that all may keep an even Pace." 22 When John served abroad, she admonished him to guard his health and to come home as soon as possible. When John served as vice president and president, she advised him on all matters, repeatedly advocating the passage of alien and sedition laws that would restrict the subversive activities of Americans and immigrants (mainly Frenchmen, who, according to Abigail, all became Jeffersonians) who threatened the stability of the government. (Unfortunately the editors of My Dearest Friend did not include any of the letters in which Abigail advocated alien and sedition laws or the prosecution under them.) After admonishing her correspondents, Abigail regularly reinforced her admonitions with a quotation from the Bible (heavily citing Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Matthew) or from such literary favorites as Alexander Pope (especially his Essay on Man) and Shakespeare. She acknowledged "Common Sense’s" (Thomas Paine’s) reference to the "use of quotations [only by] those who are destitute of Ideas of their own," but felt comfortable reinforcing her own often pithy admonitions with appropriate reinforcing quotations.

It was through her voluminous correspondence that Abigail sustained herself when so often separated from her family and friends. During their first

21 To Abigail Adams, Philadelphia, 29 October 1775. (MDF, 87–88)
22 To Abigail Adams, Philadelphia, 17 June 1775. (MDF, 60)
23 To John Adams, 2 April 1777. (APC, 2: 193)
twenty years of marriage, Abigail and John were separated more than half of the time. Household matters, the education of the children, and family business affairs fell to her. Early in the Revolution, she wrote John that “I know not How I should support an absence already tedious, and many times attended with melancholy reflections, if it was not for so frequently hearing from you. That is a consolation to me, tho a cold comfort in a winter’s Night.”24 To her husband she confessed that “I have scarcely ever taken my pen to write but the tears have flowed faster than the Ink.”25 She told John that “I love to amuse myself with my pen, and pour out some of the tender sentiments of a Heart over flowing with affection.”26 Although she knew that “Many things may be said, which it is improper to commit to paper,”27 yet she also found that her pen was “always freer than my tongue.” She told John that “I have wrote many things to you that I suppose I never could have talk’d.”28 Sometimes she approached eroticism, which embarrassed her more prudish husband, who advised her to be more cautious. She would have none of it. She could relieve “the anxiety of my Heart” only by “a frequent intercourse by Letters unrestrained by the apprehension of their becoming food for our Enemies. The affection I feel for my Friend is of the tenderest kind, matured by years, sanctified by choice and approved by Heaven. Angels can witness to its purity, what care I then for the Ridicule of Britains should this testimony of it fall into their Hands, nor can I endure that so much caution and circumspection on your part should deprive me of the only consolor of your absence.”29

After John left a second time for diplomatic service abroad, Abigail wrote, “My candle and my pen are all my companions. I send my thoughts across the broad Atlantick in search of my associate and rejoice that thought and immagination are not confined like my person to the small spot on which I exist.”30 It was the correspondence she received from loved ones that sustained her throughout a life filled with illness and “the pangs of seperation from near and dear Friends.”31 It was from her frequent, regular correspondence that her husband remained close though separated by miles and time.

---

24 To John Adams, Braintree, 17 April 1777. (MDF, 168)
25 To John Adams, Braintree, 21 October 1778. (MDF, 211)
26 To John Adams, Sunday Evening, 27 December 1778. (MDF, 222)
27 To John Quincy Adams, Quincy, April 1808. (MHS)
28 To John Adams, Braintree, 22 October 1775. (MDF, 86)
29 To John Adams, Braintree, 12–13 November 1778. (MDF, 215–16)
30 To John Adams, June–July 1779. (MHS)
31 To Louisa Catherine Adams, Quincy, 22 September 1810. (MHS)
The correspondence between Abigail and John Adams appears on the MHS Web site. A total of 1198 letters are available—430 from Abigail and 768 from John. The letters are arranged chronologically into six groups: the courtship and early marriage, 1762–74 (56 letters), the Continental Congress, 1774–77 (339 letters), John Adams’s first diplomatic mission to France, 1778–79 (59 letters), the second diplomatic mission to Europe, 1779–89 (199 letters), the vice presidency, 1789–97 (346 letters), and the presidency, 1797–1801 (199 letters).

For best results, users need to access the Web site with a standards-compliant browser that supports Cascading Style Sheets (see below). Microsoft Explorer 5 or higher or Netscape Navigator 6 or higher is recommended. Arranged by year, transcriptions appear on the left side of the screen opposite a small image of the manuscript on the right side. By right-clicking on the manuscript, a new window appears with a full-page image of the manuscript. An additional click further expands the image, allowing the viewer more closely to examine individual words and letters that might be difficult to decipher. The user can then toggle between the manuscript image and the transcription. A search mode allows the user to locate passages from the entire collection by bringing up excerpts of all the letters that contain the searched-for string of words. Once found, the user can click to the full document, enter another search, return to the browser listing all of the years of correspondence, or return to the home page.

The Web site makes use of Cascading Style Sheets with color-coded features throughout. Names of persons and places with additional information are placed in bold. Crossed-out text appears in cancelled type within square brackets. Unreadable crossed-out text is indicated by the word “illegible” in cancelled type within square brackets. Additions and interlineations made by the author are placed in gray superscript. Editorial insertions added to clarify, correct, or complete passages in the manuscripts are placed within square brackets. Explanatory notes appear in italic red type within square brackets. Links to other documents appear in bold green type within square brackets. A help icon (a question mark within a shaded circle) located in the upper right-hand corner of the transcriptions can be used to show the colors and formatting used in the display of the transcriptions. Most print-outs of a single letter are four pages long. The transcriptions and the images of the manuscripts are to be used for study purposes only. Permission from the MHS must be obtained in advance to reproduce or publish the transcriptions and/or the images of the manuscripts.

The MHS electronic archive of the Adams family papers is not intended to be a documentary edition. Letters from before 23 December 1786 were proofread and the same texts appear in the project’s first six volumes of the Adams Family Correspondence. For letters between Abigail and John written after 23 December 1786, the texts were derived from the unverified transcripts from the Adams Papers project’s files and must be used with care. However, the accompa-
nying manuscript image on the Web site can be used to check the reliability of
the transcription. The Web site complements the many published volumes of the
*Adams Family Correspondence*, which should be consulted for the full apparatus of
Prepared by scholars who are well-seasoned documentary editors, the aim of *My
Dearest Friend* is to allow a diverse audience easy access to the correspondence of
a couple deeply in love with each other and with their country—a country that
demanded incredible sacrifices from them both. *My Dearest Friend* is a testament
to the legendary partnership of Abigail and John Adams.
Editing Sophia Peabody’s Cuba Journal:
Travel, Recovery, and Interpretation

Jana L. Argersinger and Cheryl J. Fish

Some collaborations are born out of chance encounters. For us, it happened at a recent conference of the Society for the Study of American Women Writers. Having briefly met before on the common ground of studies in nineteenth-century American literature, we said “Hello” and discovered in the space of a five-minute conversation that both of us had our eyes on the early nineteenth-century journal-account of a young New Englander’s rest cure in Cuba. The traveler who authored the journal was Sophia Amelia Peabody (1809–1871), an accomplished visual artist, writer, member of a family that was vitally involved in the intellectual and cultural life of antebellum New England, and later Nathaniel Hawthorne’s collaborator and wife. Creating an edition of her crumbling unpublished manuscript from the 1830s had begun to take shape in our respective research plans, but after discussing our individual intentions, we eventually agreed to embark on the project together. We come to Peabody’s text with complementary angles of interest: Cheryl J. Fish, in women’s travel texts of nineteenth-century America and the intersections among travel, race, and disability studies; Jana Argersinger, in “relational aesthetics,” theories of antebellum female authorship, and scholarly editing.

The Traveler, the Text

Peabody's journal, a traveling text in more than one sense, does not sit still in an armchair by the fire. It is a text that, like its young author, goes places, traversing miles and national boundaries in the form of letter installments; circulating among familial and social circles; crossing generic lines between journal record and epistolary exchange; shuttling between language and picture as modes of expression; wandering from English into Spanish now and again; pushing at authorial models that fix the text in one central consciousness under one proprietary hand. And its peripatetic tendencies bear both on the intellectual and social contexts that interest us and on the forms an edition might take.

Here is the trajectory of Peabody's journey—and the journey of her text. In
December 1833, the twenty-four-year-old Sophia, along with older sister Mary, sailed south to Cuba from Salem, Massachusetts, headed for a rest cure her family hoped would ease a harrowing procession of headaches and other ills that had, since childhood, often confined her to bed. She was part of a package deal: Mary engaged to work as governess and tutor for the elite Morrell family, their Cuban hosts, and part of her compensation would cover Sophia’s room and board. During an eighteen-month stay, Peabody penned—and sketched—what would grow to be a more than 800-page journal, detailing her experiences at and en route to La Recompensa, the Morrell’s slave-holding plantation at San Marcos, west-southwest of Havana. She renders, in vivid sensory detail, the novelty of a sea voyage; the constant “Babel” of that city; and, then, at La Recompensa and nearby estates: dawn rides on horseback down avenues fragrant with orange, coffee, and lime hedge; excursions into the tropical landscape that inspire sketches of plant life—convolvulus, palm, night-blooming cereus—in fine naturalistic detail and stretches of language that call out for comparison to later writings of the recognized New England Transcendentalists; agile conversation in Spanish, French, and English in the multilingual household of her hosts; the visceral responses of her body to a new environment; waltzes danced (shockingly for her mother) with a dashing young member of the local Spanish aristocracy, while, she says, the “sables . . . look[ed] on delightedly”; the “strange evolutions” (again, her words) of those African bodies in their own New Year festivities of dancing and drumming; a brick kiln worked by slaves, whom she figures as “dark nude forms . . . like spirits of evil.”

All this Peabody wrote in extended letter form and sent home at intervals to her mother, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody (Sr.), who would ultimately bind the whole into the three volumes now housed in the Berg Collection of English and American Literature at the New York Public Library. Although “Letters from Cuba” appears on the title page of each volume, the family came to call the text Sophia’s Cuba Journal.

The other Elizabeth in the family, Sophia’s eldest sister (named after their mother), passed the freshly arrived letters to family, friends, and acquaintances,
and she read passages aloud at social gatherings—without Sophia’s consent and to her heated consternation. Nathaniel Hawthorne would eventually borrow the manuscript and make use of it in some of his tales, reportedly dubbing Sophia the “Queen of Journalizers.” The text was not published in the conventional sense during the nineteenth century (Sophia would resist her masterful elder sister’s later attempts to do so), and although it did move through patterns of circulation in keeping with scribal traditions, Sophia’s reluctance to let it circulate even in manuscript form beyond her immediate family complicates such an understanding. The one contemporary iteration of the journal is an annotated scholarly transcription by Claire Badaracco, who submitted the first volume as her Ph.D. dissertation in the 1970s and completed all three volumes in typescript by 1985. Until quite recently scholarship on the journal has been limited.

Peabody in Contexts

Those attributes of Peabody’s Cuba Journal that attract us, both individually and jointly, are guiding our plans to set it in contextual and interpretive frames. First, let us situate the journal in the context of Atlantic travel literature. In Black and White Women’s Travel Narratives: Antebellum Explorations, Fish examines travel and its relation to benevolent labor for two women of the African diaspora, Nancy Prince and Mary Seacole, both of whom found through mobility and writing a way in which to enter the public sphere. They inscribed in the hybrid genre of the travel narrative their significant interventions in institutional policy and practices related to abolition, education, medicine, economy, and women’s roles—uses of the genre that differ from Peabody’s in telling ways.

Bronson Alcott on the experimental Temple School and brought kindergarten to the U.S.) and promoting artistic talents like Nathaniel Hawthorne and her own sister Sophia. The bookstore and publishing house she established in Boston served as a gathering place for Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, and others. And her own Transcendentalist bearings found expression in her contributions to The Dial as both publisher and writer.


Prince, a free-born African-American from the Boston area, traveled to Russia with her husband, a guard for the Tsar, and ran her own clothing-making business in St. Petersburg; later, as a widow, she moved on to post-emancipation Jamaica and found “a field of usefulness” spread out before her.\(^8\) There, she attempted to observe the freed slaves and convey in her writing, transnationally, their industriousness, love of freedom, and desire for opportunity to American readers, both white and black, who knew her from Garrisonian abolitionist circles. Seacole, a Jamaican-born traveling doctress and businesswoman, used her healing and entrepreneurial skills to intervene at the colonial crossroads of Panama when it was the popular stopover for gold-rush prospectors. After running a hotel there for a time, she decamped for the Crimean War, where she was rejected as a Nightingale nurse but remained convinced of her pluck and usefulness, especially in the theatre of war.

The third traveler in Fish’s study, Margaret Fuller, had more in common with Sophia Peabody: they were both white women from prominent but struggling New England families that counted on income from their enterprising and ambitious daughters; both, moreover, suffered debilitating headaches. By the time Fuller took her first extended journey away from New England in the summer of 1843, to what was then the West (Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois), she had already conceived of herself as a public intellectual who contributed to Transcendentalist circles as a conversationalist, editor, and writer. Although we now recognize that the Peabody sisters—especially the eldest, Elizabeth—moved in overlapping circles with Fuller, Sophia’s case is rather different. As the youngest of the family’s three daughters, who lived under the watchful eyes of sister Elizabeth and their mother, she found herself dispatched to Cuba and under pressure to compose letters for home that would keep her mother entertained and also “advised of whereabouts and whatabouts,” as Mrs. Peabody feared Sophia’s “high state of excitement and her tendency to enjoy things.”\(^9\) As a number of scholars, including Megan Marshall and Patricia Valenti, have argued, the precedent of the seduction of both Mrs. Peabody’s mother and a younger sister by Revolutionary-era jurist and playwright Royall Tyler influenced the concern for female propriety and protection that seemed especially intense with Sophia due to her chronic headaches. Those headaches “allowed her family to legitimate restraining her, but

---

\(^7\) Cheryl J. Fish, *Black and White Women’s Travel Narratives: Antebellum Explorations* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2004).

\(^8\) Nancy Prince, *A Narrative of the Life and Travels of Mrs. Nancy Prince, Written by Herself* (Boston: Published by the author, 1850); quoted in Fish, p. 3.

not withstanding their efforts,” Valenti asserts, “Sophia remains a young woman who experiences every aspect of her life intensely.”

Disability studies, another promising theoretical frame for the Cuba Journal, emphasizes the culturally fabricated narrative of the body similar to what we understand as fictions of race and gender. The disability/ability system produces subjects by differentiating and marking bodies, as does the mobile traveler’s gaze by distinguishing self from other. How does the disability system function in the Cuba Journal for the persona of Sophia in various contexts, locations, and temporal frames? According to Rosemarie Garland-Thomas, disability nuances feminist readings by examining the power relations between givers and receivers of care. How, then, does Sophia negotiate her positionality and subjectivity as the invalid, the one who is cared for and excused temporarily from work in an exotic location? What incidents of flirtation and boundary crossing does Sophia leave out or fictionalize, transform or undercut? What role does Mary, in part the caregiver, another dynamic of the able/disabled dichotomy, perform in the text? And what is the relation between figuring disability and figuring racial otherness in Cuba?

More questions arise: How and what did Sophia Peabody see? How did she figure herself in relation to landscapes, persons, society? What kinds of performance did she embody in her letters, and how did she represent herself? Black women travelers of the antebellum era emphasized their own racial and social differences in the places through which they passed, sometimes drawing attention to their bodies, and sometimes disembodying themselves in relation to the empowered “public” voices they created, in order to question institutional practices and authorize their ability to “trespass” where most women did not venture. Prince and Seacole pointed to racial inequities and hypocrisy, even as they sometimes took the position of the superior Westerner over more “heathen” populations in the Caribbean, in Central America, or at the Crimean War front. Margaret Fuller mourned the loss of the American frontier and Native American dignity, even as she felt it inevitable. Peabody, on the other hand, expressly did “not allow [her]self to dwell upon slavery for two reasons”: “One is, it would certainly counteract the benificent [sic] influences, which I have left home and country to court, and another is, that my faith in GOD makes me sure that he makes up to every being the measure of happiness which he loses thro’ the instrumentality of others.”

The context of colonialism in Cuba and the debates about slavery in-

---


habit this text as present absences. Peabody does not position herself as willfully entering any public discussions as a writer of traditional travelogues about Cuba; Rodrigo Lazo calls her stance “antirepresentational” in relation to the more typical travel writer’s gaze, and Fish would add that her vision is also not in the consciously corrective or counterhegemonic mode, in contrast to the visions of such black women travelers as Prince and Seacole.

Moving forward, then, our plan is to use theory from performance studies and disability studies to contextualize in greater depth Sophia’s negotiation of place, space, and subjectivity within her letters. Fish will apply her concept of “mobile subjectivity,” defined as shifting positionality contingent upon geographic, geopolitical, institutional and/or familial policies and practices to create various versions of the self and the writer’s voice. We see different Sophias in the Cuba Journal letters home—the recovering or languishing invalid, the (Transcendentalist) nature lover, the early-rising horsewoman and her guide, the lady of leisure in the upper-class plantation society life, and—as Argersinger, in particular, will address—the self-conscious writer with decided opinions about the disposition of her narrative.

Migrating “Author(s)”

One of this text’s tendencies to restlessness, we propose, is in the multiple, dialogic model of authorship it manifests: given that it is both a semi-private journal and a semi-public collection of letters (ultimately quite public thanks to sister Elizabeth and to some extent mother Elizabeth), the center of writing migrates, pushed and pulled between Sophia’s fierce possessiveness and a more relational, often competitive, form of authorship and circulation. These two—authorship and circulation—are closely bound together in the case of the Cuba Journal, because the text was composed, and sent out, episodically over a period of many months, affording time for reactions from home to reach the writer and make their effects, to greater and lesser degree, felt in further installments; in this respect, the journal represents a pattern not unlike serial publication in periodicals.

The pattern of authorship begins, of course, with Sophia Peabody, putative “owner” of the journal. Then comes Mary, the sister who shares Sophia’s sojourn and competes for ownership of the Cuban narrative by way of her incur-

---


14 Fish, p. 7.

sions into the journal itself, and whose own letters have come down to us as part of the text in an “appendix.” Elizabeth Sr. added to the three volumes she bound together. In a letter dated October 31st, 1834 (see Figure 1), a paragraph of Sophia’s gives way to six lines of text emphatically cancelled out in dark, spiralled ink. After which Sophia reasserts herself:

That was some of Mary’s impudence which I did not choose to have in my journal & so I have made that <homely[?]> blot which I was very sorry to do. It has been very cool indeed today.17

Suggestively, Sophia’s sentence just before the cancellation makes reference to La Recompensa’s slaves; perhaps Mary, whose reformist ire kindled at the sight of plantation slavery, made a critical comment that Sophia did not like.

A little later, Mary inserts an aside to their mother reporting that, at the moment, Sophia is deeply and healthfully asleep. She concludes:

I hope this will not be called ‘impudence’—it is too bad that my little facetious sayings should be lost upon you — but she cannot scratch out my tongue, and when I get home I mean to say every thing I choose.18

Sophia waves this away as “a harmless parenthesis to [her] story” and lets it stand. The upper hand is hers, at least for the moment.

The next participant in the imbricated network of authorship, circulation, and editorial intervention was Elizabeth Sr., the mother, addressee and primary audience of the epistolary journal—one of the very few (familial) intimates whom Sophia apparently intended to see her letters. But Elizabeth, on the other side of the correspondence, took up multiple roles that sought both to shape the narrative of Sophia’s Cuban experience (Sophia’s assurance, “No, dear mother, we do not forget the Sabbath,” gives evidence of motherly admonishments)19 and to foster its transmission beyond the close communion of mother and daughter. Elizabeth Sr. was the text’s compiler, copyist, and perhaps first editor, producing for her bound volumes copies of a number of Sophia’s original letters now apparently lost (see Figure 2 for an example); while no evidence of silent emendation has come to light, we might test the mother’s copies against the body of related correspondence that surrounds and interacts with Sophia’s journal.

16 Mary’s letters are cross-referenced, in an unidentified hand, with Sophia’s dated accounts.
18 Peabody, “Letters from Cuba” (MS), 3: 11.
19 Peabody, “Letters from Cuba” (MS).
Figure 1: A leaf from Sophia Peabody's Cuba Journal manuscript (vol. 3, pg. 10, dated October 31, 1834), showing an incursion by sister Mary that Sophia blacked out. By permission of the Berg Collection, New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations.

Figure 2: A leaf from the bound Cuba Journal manuscript (vol. 2, pg. 35), apparently copied by Elizabeth Peabody Sr. from Sophia's original letter. By permission of the Berg Collection, New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations.
Another figure enters the pattern, this one particularly dominant: Eliza-
beth, the older sister who sometimes censured Sophia’s reported behavior and
other times urged her on to further literary efforts for the delectation of the keen
audience Elizabeth herself created by performing and circulating the letters. In
1834, the elder sister tried to engineer publication in the *American Monthly*, but
the author would not countenance it. “Betty,” said Sophia, “is too bad. . . . I feel
as if the nation were feeling my pulse. . . . If I were stuck up bodily upon a pole &
carried about the streets I could not feel more exposed.”

Another figure enters the pattern, this one particularly dominant: Eliza-
beth, the older sister who sometimes censured Sophia’s reported behavior and
other times urged her on to further literary efforts for the delectation of the keen
audience Elizabeth herself created by performing and circulating the letters. In
1834, the elder sister tried to engineer publication in the *American Monthly*, but
the author would not countenance it. “Betty,” said Sophia, “is too bad. . . . I feel
as if the nation were feeling my pulse. . . . If I were stuck up bodily upon a pole &
carried about the streets I could not feel more exposed.”

**State of the Manuscript and Possible Editions**

At 170 years remove, the author’s purported distaste for the exposure of
publication no longer at issue (at least in any simple or direct way), the time is
ripe for an edition—not least because the manuscript is feeling its years. On two
of the journal volumes, the binding does remain largely intact, but the third is un-
bound and its loose leaves, protected in Mylar sleeves, are vulnerable to shuffling.
While the manuscript seems virtually complete, it is becoming increasingly frag-
ile as scholars handle its pages in the surge of interest Sophia Peabody has begun
to inspire. Fortunately, a much-needed and timely conservation effort is now un-
derway: Patricia Dunlavy Valenti (Peabody’s current biographer) has restored
proper page order in volume 3 and prepared the manuscript, along with a user’s
guide, for a full digitized holograph that the New York Public Library plans to
mount online in the near future. This resource will make the way substantially
smoother for our project, among its other benefits to scholars.

In our role as editors and interpreters, we are mulling over how best to
represent in print and/or online the multiple crosscurrents that run through and
around this text. An edition that did justice to that fraught and fertile web of re-
lation would make available, as much as possible, the correspondence and other
writing that went on around it, in response to it, and that contoured the journal
itself as words of reaction reached Sophia. One route, an ambitious one, would
lead toward a digital presentation something like the Emily Dickinson online
archive, laying out a hypertextual constellation of interconnected letters and
other materials: a “relational” edition. Links to facsimile pages would be needed

---

20 Sophia Peabody to her mother, December 8, 1834, 3: 90, Berg Collection of English and American
Peabody Hawthorne*, p. 82.


22 Other materials that might be included: According to Valenti, the University of Virginia holds an
important letter identified as part of the Cuba Journal, though Peabody wrote it to Nathaniel
Hawthorne in late 1838, describing, at his request, her last stretch of days in Cuba (e-mail to Jana
to capture the interplay of picture and text, and of marginal notes and text proper in English and Spanish. Mary’s posthumously published novel *Juanita* (1887), based on her earlier Cuban experiences, might be linked in order to allow comparisons between her reactions to plantation slavery and Sophia’s.\(^{23}\) And bringing the text together with other travel literature of the period and other representations of disability would help users to explore the journal’s literary and social environs. Supporting our efforts in these directions, we and the *Cuba Journal* have been accepted as participants in a digital editing venture planned by Brown University’s Women Writers Project.

These are a few of the promising paths and tributaries that beckon. Our collaborative editorial journey is still in its early stages, but we look forward to getting Sophia Peabody’s traveling text up and running again.

---

\(^{23}\) See Mary Tyler Peabody Mann, *Juanita: A Romance of Real Life in Cuba Fifty Years Ago* (Boston: D. Lothrop Co., 1887). According to Lazo, both Peabody sisters were reluctant to enter publicly into the Cuba and slavery debates (p. 183).
A New Approach to Thoreau’s “Indian Books”

Jessie Bray

Indians were prismatic figures for Henry D. Thoreau which took on variously positive and negative aspects throughout his career. At least publicly, Thoreau never seemed completely settled on how to treat Indian history and culture effectively, although it is clear he applied himself assiduously to the task. Embodying the collision of science, culture, nature and aesthetics in the nineteenth century, Indian lives synthesized these factors into an ethnohistorical performance of increasing importance to Thoreau as his career developed. That such a performance would interest him should not come as surprise. As Lawrence Buell argued in *Literary Transcendentalism*, Transcendentalists strove to embody their moral convictions in aesthetic performances (speaking, acting, and art) that could be synthesized with the revealed theism of nature;\(^1\) in the years since Buell first advanced this argument, Laura Dassow Walls, William Rossi, and Robert D. Richardson, Jr., have each contended that natural science formed the keystone of this relationship, meaning that science, if miscarried, aborted the development of an enlightened spiritual milieu.\(^2\) Thus, for instance, when Thoreau speaks in “Natural History of Massachusetts” of a “more perfect Indian wisdom,” he acknowledges how Indian cultures achieved a successful, if not entirely advanced, demonstration of the Transcendental ethos before their exposure to the “civil” world of white men.\(^3\)

---

Thoreau’s unpublished Indian Books depict a similar consideration of these cultural vectors that cuts across the chronology of his career, which places them at the forefront of his most serious and ambitious research. In order to track Thoreau’s evolution as a writer and thinker, a re-evaluation of this text is necessary. In the 147 years since his death, comparatively little work has been done to bring the value of this remarkable text to light. Yet the advantages of our present digital age provide perhaps the most useful, but heretofore inaccessible, solution to the problem of discussing the Indian Books. In spite of the disorganized and unfinished nature of the manuscript, a new and innovative approach—comparable to the “database” concept employed by Ed Folsom and Kenneth M. Price for their *Walt Whitman Archive*—would enable navigation of this vast, labyrinthine text without restricting its generative and multifarious potential.

Materially, the Indian Books is comprised of eleven volumes currently housed at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York City. They amount to roughly two linear feet of manuscript material containing documentary research interspersed with sporadic observations by Thoreau. Despite the arbitrary boundary imposed by filling one of these literal notebooks, there is no internal or external evidence to suggest that Thoreau intended the Indian Books as free-standing volumes. However, the varying size of these notebooks—the first are smaller in terms of page size, while the later books graduate to larger pages—raises the possibility that Thoreau began the Indian Books as a portable endeavor for field work which he eventually confined to his desk. The progressive improvement of his documentation practices in each new volume supports this possibility; although, unlike his field notes or journals that he carried with him, it is unclear

---

5 For Thoreau’s surviving eleven (out of an original twelve) Indian Books, see MA 596-MA 606, inclusive, at the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. Confusion over the total number of original Books and Thoreau’s numbering of them on their spines has prevailed since they were turned over to Harrison Otis Blake for safekeeping after Sophia Thoreau, Henry Thoreau’s sister, died in 1876. According to William Howarth in *The Literary Manuscripts of Henry David Thoreau* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1974), the Indian Books “suffer[ed] from considerable mishandling while Blake retained them”; Blake is also the person who incorrectly renumbered the Books from Thoreau’s original number system (xxii). A third numbering system was applied to the Indian Books when Blake gave them to E. H. Russell in 1898, and this system appears on George Hellman’s record of his purchase of them in 1904. Although Howarth later formalized this last numbering system, in *Thoreau and the American Indians* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), Robert Sayre proves from Thoreau’s *Journal* (25 June 1853) and two excerpts from Indian Book 9 that Thoreau numbered the Books 1 through 12, and he argues that the first of the remaining Books is actually number 2 (217–20). As Sayre notes, the word “notebook” implies eventual publication, which is not true of the Indian Books. He also addresses another error common among Thoreau scholars: calling the manuscript the “Indian Notebooks” as opposed to the “Indian books” (218). Sayre is also the first to observe that on those occasions when Thoreau referred to these texts in his *Journal*, he called them his “Indian books.”
what reason he would have had to make his notes on Indians more portable since he reserved his principal observations on Indians for his Maine Woods trilogy.

Along with his written notes, Thoreau’s Indian Books reproduce drawings of Indian implements and maps of tribal territories; additionally, they include newspaper clippings pertaining to Indians and occasional loose paper notes inserted between pages. Thought to have been begun in 1847 while he was working on A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers, the Indian Books continued as silent script behind Thoreau’s other projects. Cutting across temporal and chronological epochs, the Indian Books were informed by Thoreau’s research into other subjects, and they informed those writings he would eventually publish. The Indian Books also grew exponentially after the publication of Walden in 1854, coinciding with Thoreau’s increased interest in natural science. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, Arthur Christy and a team of graduate students transcribed the manuscript of the Indian Books in a project that made it available to later scholars; however, this transcription has never been published and is itself difficult to access. Without a widely available version of the Books, their scope and Thoreau’s

---

6 There have been disputes over the existence and identity of the first Indian Book as well as the chronology the text followed; as yet, the matter remains far from settled. For example, in Thoreau and the American Indians, Sayre makes a case for their beginning contemporaneously with the last draft of A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers or the first draft of Walden in the late 1840s (110); however, in “‘Tracking the moccasin print’: A descriptive index to Henry David Thoreau’s Indian notebooks and a study of the relationship of the Indian notebooks to mythmaking in ‘Walden’” (University of Oklahoma: Ph.D. dissertation, 1994, pp.106–107), Susanna Dvorak Rose argues that the missing first Indian Book was begun sometime between 1841 and 1844 and Indian Book 2 as early as 1845.

7 In the past, some scholars have regarded Thoreau’s post-Walden studies as a declension from serious literary engagement. However, as Walls demonstrates in Seeing New Worlds, his interest in natural science illustrates a desire “to read a history of man and nature together, as and in one single, interconnected act” (4). Symptomatic of this desire is Thoreau’s 1853 membership application for the Association for the Advancement of Science, where he claims “The Manners & Customs of the Indians of the Algonquin Group previous to contact with the civilized man” as his field of expertise. See The Correspondence of Henry D. Thoreau, ed. Walter Harding and Carl Bode (New York: Washington Square, 1958), p. 310. As a subject and discipline, natural science stood for Thoreau at the cusp of human and natural civics.

8 Arthur Christy, “Notes on Thoreau” Transcript. MS Coll Christy, Columbia University Library; a copy is also available in the Sayre Collection at the University of Iowa Library (“Thoreau Indian Books,” Special Collections Department, MsC 795). Limited selections from the Indian Books are available in Sayre, Thoreau and the American Indians, and Richard Fleck, The Indians of Thoreau (Albuquerque: Hummingbird Press, 1974). A second transcription effort has been undertaken by cultural anthropologist Paul Maher, Jr., whose Books 1 (Sayre, Indian Book 2) and 2 (Sayre, Indian Book 3) are available online through Lulu Electronic Publishing at https://www.lulu.com. On the whole, Maher does an accurate job of transcribing Thoreau’s handwriting and provides sources for non-cited material; however, in his transcription he silently omits at least one page from Indian Book 2 as well as a list of possible sources that Thoreau himself crossed out in the original manuscript. While the resulting clear text is accessible to and informative for the casual reader, the omissions are problematic for those scholars attempting to trace Thoreau’s writing and research processes.
propensity to cite contradictory accounts drawn from natural history or ethnographic writings and other sources in them encourages a tendency among researchers to “cherry pick” only those passages that support a specific reading. Yet, it is the contradictory nature of the material Thoreau cited in them that permits a balanced survey of the ethnographic terrain that existed in his lifetime.

Rumors that the Indian Books were intended for publication circulated as early as 1855, when F. B. Sanborn reported in a letter to Theodore Parker that he had seen “Thoreau’s Indian Books” and thought them “significant”; subsequently, when Sanborn wrote his biography of Thoreau, which appeared in 1882, he propagated the publication theory. A fragmentary draft essay in Indian Book 7 seems to support Sanborn’s theory; in addition, a topical prospectus tucked in the back of Indian Book 2 in which Thoreau compares his objectives to the fifth volume of Henry Rowe Schoolcraft’s *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1851–57) suggests that there was a time when he considered publishing an essay based on his extensive research. Yet, Sanborn’s evidence is hardly conclusive when considering that Thoreau’s close friend Ellery Channing notes how “little” he spoke on the subject of his Indian collections. Perhaps the issue that most succinctly problematizes the publication argument is the material in the Books themselves. Aside from a few notable exceptions, the text lacks the kind of narrative frame and critical connective tissue necessary to become a published book. Furthermore, in spite of the aforementioned prospectus, the Indian Books disclose no substantive evidence that Thoreau actually utilized an outline of any kind in developing them, which may well indicate that he viewed them exclusively as a private text.

That Thoreau most likely developed the Indian Books for himself is their primary difficulty for today’s researchers; they lack almost all the clues that scholars have come to rely on when determining an author’s intention for a work. In fact, as with the apocryphal story of Thoreau’s favorite dish at dinner being “the one nearest,” one might say that his guiding organizational principle in the Indian Books was their convenience to him as a source material for other projects. Additionally, comparing his list of potential reading material to those books he actually annotated in the Indian Books, there is a sense that Thoreau read much

---


more material on Indians than he had the time or ability to record. However, the lack of organization in and the incompleteness of Thoreau’s project are not insurmountable obstacles for the interested researcher; indeed, it is this aspect of their current state that presents rare intellectual opportunities for us. As the editors of Walter Benjamin’s *Arcades* attest, the unfinished nature of a manuscript does not make the ecology of the text or the author’s motives inscrutable; instead, they note that “proliferating individual passages” “communicate amongst themselves, often in a rather subterranean manner.” Like Thoreau, Benjamin did not structure his working text for publication, but he did group the several thousand pages of the *Arcades* into clusters or “convolutes” according to a host of topics. The word *konvolut* in German literally means a “bundle” or “sheaf”—a textual image full of organic suggestion, as with a bundle of flowers, or a sheaf of wheat, or, as in Whitman’s case, “leaves of grass.” As a noun in English, “convolute” suggests a similar organic etymology with an evolutionary bent. It is an object that spirals into deeper development as it grows, but its evolution is always in reference to its nascent construction. Thus, as the tightly folded petals of a rose bud form a convolute in their contrivance, the bud acts as a convolute when it blossoms. Viewing text as a convolute of progressive intelligence, there is a sense that

12 For example, Thoreau mentions in *Indian Book 7* that he has a copy of George Copway, *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation* (1850); one need only leaf through the pages of Thoreau’s copy of Copway’s text to observe that it is peppered with his marginalia, including his list on the back flyleaf of pages he wished to quote from. See Robert Sattemeyer, *Thoreau’s Reading: A Study in Intellectual History with a Bibliographical Catalogue* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 138.

13 Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Howard Eiland; trans. Kevin McLaughlin (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), p. x. The idea of Thoreau’s Indian Books as intellectual ecosystems is a useful one, if only because it means each “organism” functionally interacts with other “organisms” in order to achieve balance. Yet, remove a passage from its web of associations and its usefulness can be extinguished, causing the other components to suffer as well. Thus, a passage from the Indian Books removed from its context can be interpreted in precisely the opposite fashion from its original intention.  

14 Wai Chee Dimock, “A Theory of Resonance,” *PMLA*, 112 (1997): 1060–71. The most obvious objection to this argument is that, as Thoreau prefigures Benjamin, there is not reason to apply the work of the latter to the former. However, as Dimock notes “historicism” as it is now practiced rests largely on semantic anachronism: the meaning of a text is assumed to be the property of the historical period in which it originated; coexistive with that period it remains untouched” (1061). Against this, she argues

This synchronic model hardly acknowledges the hermeneutical horizon of a text might extend beyond the moment of composition. Nor does it recognize that the passage of time, deadening some words and quickening others, can give a past text a semantic life that is an effect of the present. (1061)  

Thus, to view Thoreau with a twenty-first century perspective is not a miscarriage of literary criticism and, in fact, reproduces Thoreau’s own openness to the futurity of evolution of nature and of intelligence.
a body of written language is something not necessarily static but organic, expanding and evolving through the life of the author and even after.

Although Thoreau never used the word “convolute” to describe his own note taking, on 2 February 1859, following an essay on Indians in his Journal, he suggests a method of textual organization that prefigures Benjamin’s use of the term:

Most of his [the writer’s] sentences may at first lie dead in his essay, but when these are arranged, some life and color will be reflected on them from mature and successful lines; they will appear to pulsate with fresh life . . . and make them worthy of their neighborhood. . . . Most that is first written on any subject is a mere groping after it, mere rubble-stone foundation. It is only when many observations on different periods have been brought together that he begins to grasp his subject and can make one pertinent and just observation.¹⁵

Thus for Thoreau, like Benjamin, there is faith in the ability of a text to be arranged through an organic interplay between mind and matter, bearing fruit, in this case, in the broad scope of the text as a documentary fact collection. That both men repeatedly contradict themselves throughout the span of their respective projects signifies their trust that the only evil is ignorance and “fact” will always “flower into truth.”

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s concept of the rhizome demonstrates the proliferation and growth potential of these intellectual convolutes, an image translated into a useful literary form through Ed Folsom’s concept of “database.”¹⁶ As a genre that exceeds its boundaries by design and represents the world as “an endless and unstructured collection of images, texts, and other data records,” a navigable electronic database shares the often inscrutable associative capacities of the mind in how shared resonances between intellectual subjects act as conduits (i.e. “hyperlinks”), shuttling thoughts seamlessly between related elements.¹⁷ It can be argued that such theoretical subtlety as what a database provides was beyond the scope of a nineteenth-century author; however, arguing for


¹⁶ For the fullest exposition of their theory, see Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987).

¹⁷ Ed Folsom’s project, The Walt Whitman Archive, is fertile ground for such a project, for, as he notes, Whitman’s work is “rhizomorphous” in its original conception and made more appreciably so through its conversion to an electronic database; see Ed Folsom, “Database as Genre: The Epic Transformation of Archives,” PMLA 122 (2007), p. 1573. Here, Folsom further argues that, because Whitman embraced “incessant revision,” digitizing the archives has enabled a fuller fruition of the project in as much as it does not require “single book objects.”
the complexity of Thoreau’s unpublished writings is not unprecedented. Sharon Cameron also observes that what appears as randomness in Thoreau’s *Journal* “not only seems a product of journal discourse; it also seems cultivated.”

By this reckoning, resisting an outline for the Indian Books as expansive and ever-growing fact books, makes it entirely possible that Thoreau made a deliberate attempt to let the meaning of the text create itself in unlimited and unanticipated ways.

Significant to understanding this interconnectivity is “the refrain,” another facet of Deleuze and Guattari’s hypothesis of “rhizomatics.” Organization functions as a bias and insists information be arranged in a particular fashion to be understood. Patterns result from this organization and can create archetypal resonances (symbols, etc.) that disable unanticipated intersections between intellectual vectors because the mind ceases to look for connections outside those patterns. Thus, too much organization curtails ingenuity. By contrast, Deleuze and Guattari argue that knowledge can proliferate in a series of refrains that appear at chance collisions between ideas and concepts but also refuse the overcoding that would reify it into patterns. Mark Bonta and John Protevi describe this evasion with the example of a bird establishing home territory by flying in a circuit, sounding its song at key perimeter points.

Such territorialization is not concrete because a bird can, with sufficient provocation or threat, re-establish a different set of perimeter points, even moving to a new site. Converted to intellectual territorialization, such fluid deterritorialization and reterritorialization that is in no way predictable or paradigmatic overturns static paradigms of the Western tradition.

Recognizing Thoreau’s Indian Books as an exercise in rhizomatics makes his published works the reification of concurrent and overlapping refrains that emerge in his vast research database. Because they are not published, however, his Indian Books are a manifestation of his esoteric inner dialogue—a dialogue revealed only by the contextualization of the Indian Books within the rest of his literary corpus. While it is possible that, in the same fashion that Thoreau dictated publishable works from his sickbed, he could have composed an essay on the Indian before his death, his silence acts as resistance to arbitrary historical boundaries that could brutalize a still-living people. Because, generally, recording a history was not perceived as an interpretive exercise, any oversight or prejudice on

---


20 For further discussion of how Deleuze and Guattari’s approach may be applied to the Indian Books, see my essay, “‘A so-called savage tribe’: Reading Thoreau’s Indian Books,” forthcoming in *Thoreauvian Modernities*, ed. François Specq (University of Georgia Press).
the part of the historian could be transmitted as fact. Of this, Thoreau observes, “It frequently happens that the historian, though he professes more humanity than the trapper, mountain man, or gold-digger, who shoots one as a wild beast, really exhibits and practices a similar inhumanity to him, wielding a pen instead of a rifle.”21 Yet, on the other hand, the absence of a true end and the lack of a concrete position does not negate the value of the text. As Michael Wood has argued, some manuscripts are by nature “unfinished, unfinishable text” that “can’t end,” for “what happens in it has already happened and is still going on” and thus makes the end of the text the death of the point.22

If we participate in this view, then the Indian Books remain as vibrant with life and potential as when Thoreau kept them. They represent an uncharted terrain of ethnographic thought that deeply influenced his published writings, while also suggesting their own latent germination as a still-growing compendium stilled only by their author’s death. Through the creation of an accessible archive and the extensive use of databases scholars can remain true to Thoreau’s intellectual vision by making this essential and overlooked text available for serious research.

An Assessment of Recent Developments in Historical Editing

Jennifer E. Steenshorne

The American historical editing profession has a rich and varied history of publishing projects ranging from the collected papers of great men and women to diaries of relatively obscure individuals. However, one senses that as the profession enters the twenty-first century, as new technologies appear, and as boundaries between disciplines are blurred, the profession is at a loss as to where to place itself. This article is based on a survey of current projects, both in the United States and internationally, from a variety of disciplines, and in both traditional print and new media. My aim is to broaden our definition of historical editing and to encourage a dialogue among different kinds of projects. The current ongoing evolution of documentary editing spurred by the Internet raises a question: Is this a crisis or an opportunity?

sent Text: Jefferson’s Anas”). The panel participants were able to transcend the seemingly different goals and natures of these projects and to talk to each other meaningfully about editing.

Despite reports of its demise, the letterpress edition still exists. A quick WorldCat search, using the key words “correspondence” or letters,” reveals more than two hundred titles published in the last year (2008–2009) that could be classified as editions.

The traditional, comprehensive, long-term projects (like the papers of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, et al.) are still productive, though some have finished or are nearing completion. The newer projects (such as the Papers of John Jay) tend to be selected editions, focusing on the most important (or what the editors feel are the most important) documents and topics. This is the result of several factors: funding or the lack thereof, pressure to make certain kinds of documents available sooner rather than later, publishing costs, and the potential market. Publishers find it easier to market a single volume, especially if it can be used in the all-important textbook market. Other types of editions have emerged, including diaries and selected letters aimed at a more general reading public as well as an academic audience, and editions aimed at students. Of course, selected editions reveal the hand of the editor in a way that a comprehensive edition does not.

When we think of historical editions, we tend to think of the papers of Great Men or Great Women: political figures, activists, religious leaders, scientists, artists, inventors, and writers. We also think of the institutional records of governments and courts. While this subject matter may be seen as traditional, these editions are now no longer limited to correspondence, diaries, and draft essays. The increasing number of editions coming from the field of the history of science includes notebooks, lab notes, sketches, and other non-traditional textual materials in their editions. These materials provide a whole new set of challenges for the editor.

Diaries and letters of the less well known are also proliferating. Of particular interest to general readers are those of participants in wars, particularly the Civil War, westward expansion, and the wars of the twentieth century. I call this the “Ken Burns” effect.

The push for document-based curricula in primary, secondary, and college-level education has been another source of innovative editions. For example, the use of documents is a mandatory part of the New York State curriculum, and document-based questions are part of the Regents exams (beginning in the Fifth
Grade) in social studies and history. Textbook publishers have been quick to respond to this. Even traditional textbooks are now including documents in support of the narrative text. Bedford/St. Martin’s has made a specialty of this kind of textbook, publishing short histories with supporting documents, as well readers that cover broader topics. These collections vary greatly in quality, as anyone who has taught with them can attest. Many “documents” are mere excerpts aimed at students with a limited attention span. Even complete documents are often presented with no explanation as to what the document is, how it was transcribed, or its source.

Fewer comprehensive editions, then, are being produced. Selected editions have become the norm. Diaries and letters of “regular” people have increased in number and are marketed to a broader audience. Documentary editions have begun to serve another growth market, document-based pedagogy, and vary greatly in quality. Editions in the history of science include new kinds of documents innovatively presented.

Obviously, the biggest change in the profession is the enormous demand for digital projects and their proliferation, which has been the subject of ongoing debate. Digitization, of course, is now a fact of life. Increasingly, letterpress editions are being digitized, either as complete editions or mini-editions. This includes the digitization of older editions, some from the nineteenth century. “Completed” projects have gained a new life in digital form. “Born digital” projects are increasing. Formats range from single volumes of diaries or letters, to digital projects that include transcriptions, annotations, document images, visual materials, and curriculum guides. People involved in projects include full-time editors, faculty members, graduate students, archivists, local historians, and interested amateurs, as well as an increasing group of technical staff.

This is due to a number of factors. Funding agencies encourage projects with a digital component. For example, the text of the NEH Scholarly Editions and Translations grant application states, “While grants may be used to support works in print, the NEH encourages applications that provide for online access.” It is less expensive to “publish” a digital edition. These factors have affected what types of projects have emerged and who is mounting them (including people who do not identify themselves as “editors”).

Recently, the profession has come under scrutiny from groups such as the Pew Charitable Trust, the National Archives, and, of course, Congress. The details of this controversy are familiar. In brief, there is a concern that the scrupulous editorial method used by the Founding Fathers projects (for that is the group of papers targeted) has slowed publication and thereby prevented the American

2 http://www.neh.gov/grants/guidelines/editions.html#final
Public from gaining access to their patrimony. In response to this “crisis,” the National Archives and Records Administration published a report, “The Founders Online: Open Access to the Papers of America’s Founding Era. A Report to Congress,” which recommends publishing raw documents on the Web (using one central provider to do markup, etc.) and the standardization of texts across projects, with corrections and annotations done later. The authors of the report recognize that document images alone will not suffice, that the public needs transcriptions, but they believe less processed transcriptions are adequate for most of the public’s needs. Most editors and many other scholars disagree. The debate reveals the fissure between funding agencies, foundations, and some popular historians who want immediate online access to documents and scholars who believe that the editorial process is a necessary guide to the full understanding of these documents. It also reveals a desire or even a hunger for certain kinds of documents, which explains in part much of what is now being put up on the Web.

Another related development is the rise of the electronic archive. Many new projects are hybrids of editions (in the traditional sense) and archives, combining transcriptions (with various levels of editing) and images of documents. These hybrids can enable projects to mount more documents and to concentrate more resources and time on selected documents, indices, and search engines. These projects also raise the question of whether it is better to make a bad transcription available to the public quickly or to mount a beautiful digital image of the document, with full metadata and searchable abstracts. (Of course, many manuscripts are so difficult to read that they are not usable by the general public or even by many scholars, who are unwilling to devote the time needed to transcribe them.) There are also issues of standards, both in coding and editing, especially as the archival profession has begun to formulate its own standards that may be at odds with those of the editorial profession.

Many projects now include curriculum guides or teacher resource materials. Other collections of documents (with and without guides) are coming out of archives (the Library of Congress, the National Archives, great historical societies in Massachusetts and Wisconsin, etc.) and universities. Often this is done in conjunction with educators and scholarly editors, but more often without thought, care, or provenance. Even the Avalon Project at Yale Law School mounts materials that come from mysterious and un-vetted sources. Of course, pretty much anyone can put up a set of documents purporting to be accurate, but users may not have the skills to evaluate this material.

Projects such as Making of America (based at Cornell and the University of Michigan) and, most importantly, Google Books, that digitize older books

containing invaluable documents have created another problem. Some of these editions were published as early as the nineteenth century. While these can be great resources, the texts are provided without context. For example, William Jay’s biography of his father John Jay (1833) and Henry Johnston’s *Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay* (1893) are now available on Google Books. Both works silently expunged much material from documents, corrected grammar, and, generally speaking, tidied up the texts. Yet scholars continue to use these editions, presumably at least somewhat aware that the transcriptions are defective. But once these editions are online, the general public uses them more readily, without any idea that these changes have been made in the transcriptions.

Print editions no longer necessarily terminate when the final volume is published. Older editions can be digitized, and new material can be added to them. For example, the *Robert Boyle Project*, under the direction of Michael Hunter, is an ongoing project that combines the print edition with archival materials, images, and transcripts. Rotunda, based at the University of Virginia Press, brings together the existing and future volumes of the papers of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton, Jay, and Jackson, and the Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution, among others in the American Founding Era collection, in a form that will eventually be cross-searchable. One of the results of the new digital age of editing is an increase in the number of people involved in editing projects who may not self-identify as editors, but rather see these projects as an extension of their other scholarly or archival work. The positive aspect of this trend is that more scholars are engaging in documentary editing. The downside is that people may be leaping into projects without much thought or skill in editing. The digital age has also increased the need for technical support staff on projects. Organizations such as the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) and Documents Compass (based at the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities) have been formed to set standards, provide expertise, and act as facilitators for projects. These organizations are well known within the editing community, but it is not clear if non-editors are aware of their services.

Clearly, the definition of historical editing has vastly expanded, along with the number and types of projects, and the number of people involved in those projects. Is this a crisis or an opportunity? The editorial profession should see this as an opportunity, must be proactive, reach out, offer our expertise, and seek out the expertise of others, as we embrace this evolution in the field.

---

4 http://www.bbk.ac.uk/boyle/
How many of you remember when the World Wide Web was new? I remember being thrilled by the things I could do, the information that I could find quickly, and the ability to spread the word about our work. I also remember being unsure how the Web would change the practice of editing. Lately, the design advances and the use of Web technology often described in shorthand as Web 2.0 have made me feel that way again. I am excited about the possibilities, but uncertain about some of the underlying premises of Web 2.0 and what it might mean to the practice of scholarly editing. I am not sure that we have agreed upon the best model for digital editions in the Web 1.0 world, but editors and other scholars are already being pressed to move ahead to the next generation of tools if they want to create fundable and cutting-edge work. How will documentary editing fit into a Web 2.0 world? Will we be able to adapt our practices to the changing technology? Before we go too far along, we need to take the time to stop and think broadly about how we want to interact with the Web, with our documents, and with the public.

---

1 I would like to thank Esther Katz for her comments on an early draft of this speech, and for arguing with me about some of these ideas; it helped me enormously to sharpen this version. I would also like to thank Amanda French, the Digital Curriculum Specialist at NYU’s Archives and Public History Program, whose knowledge of and enthusiasm for these new technologies first started me thinking, and whose comments also helped enrich my speech. Lastly, thanks to my brother Mike Moran, author of several Web marketing books, including *Do It Wrong Quickly: How the Web Changes the Old Marketing Rules* (New York: IBM Press, 2008), who found a surprising number of parallels between the situation facing documentary editors and those faced by businesses in adapting to new forms of technology.
You will hear more questions than answers here—questions that I hope get you thinking because we need to answer them, not only for ourselves and our projects, but for our profession.

What is Web 2.0?

Before we can figure out how it will impact editing, we need to grasp what Web 2.0 means. The term was coined in 2004 as a marketing pitch for a conference about the Web. Tim O’Reilly used it to sell the idea that new Web-based tools had caused a major shift in the way that people used the internet. Initially used to discuss the shift from desktop-based applications to Web-based ones, it has come to mean much more. One easy way of thinking about the difference between the old and the new is that Web 1.0 was about the consumption of both information and products, while Web 2.0 is about participation, the creation of communities, conversations, and information. Web 2.0 has come to stand for broader ideas about democratizing the Web and increasing user participation in Web sites. We all know of some of its more popular applications—Twitter, Facebook, Flickr, YouTube, and Wikipedia, of the ubiquity of blogs and wikis, all lumped under the term social networking. For many, Web 2.0 tools are “game-changers,” that challenge the way we organize, produce, and access information. They have decentralized and democratized access to media: one no longer needs a publisher, a news bureau, or a record deal to get one’s ideas, viewpoints, and creativity out to a large and growing audience. Through the Web we can interact directly with people across the block or across the world, and form vibrant communities around common interests that would have been impossible just ten years ago. But it has its critics, among them Andrew Keen, who blames these tools for a cult of digital narcissism that places undue value on the amateurish opinions that he calls “an endless digital forest of mediocrity.” But we need to remember that some of this criticism hides a fear or reluctance to engage with a technology that many find difficult.

As I read about Web 2.0 and its possibilities, I have mixed reactions, ranging from skepticism to amazement. When it works, it harnesses the power of an engaged public to build in-depth knowledge at an incredible rate. When it does not work, it makes me feel as if I am eavesdropping on conversations in a high school bathroom, as masses of poorly spelled, self-absorbed ruminations threaten to overwhelm whatever good might be out there. How can we benefit from the best of the Web 2.0 technologies while avoiding the worst? Should doc-

---


3 Andrew Keen, The Cult of the Amateur: how blogs, MySpace, YouTube, and the rest of today’s user-generated media are destroying our economy, our culture, and our values (New York: Doubleday, 2008), p. 3.
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umentary editing be influenced by these new tools and ways of organizing information? What happens to us if we do not get on board? I think that if we do not experiment with the underlying challenges of Web 2.0 tools, we may be left on the sidelines.

About 1.6 billion people use the Web. That is what is at stake for editions and for historical and literary documents themselves. With access to numbers that stagger the mind, any of our editions ought to be able to attract a far larger and more varied audience than we can reach with our print editions. If we fail to engage with this throng, will our work end up in a print “ghetto,” as each increasingly Web-savvy generation relies more and more heavily on online content?

Longevity vs. Accessibility

The Web 2.0 world is constructed on our computer displays as we open our personalized pages in browsers. The content of my Facebook page is very different from yours; it changes every day based upon the “friends” that I select, the interests that I acknowledge, and what those friends post on their pages. Facebook, a Web 2.0 technology, does not provide content; instead it provides a platform for its users to interact. Like other Web 2.0 tools, it is ephemeral. It may be popular for a few years but then be eclipsed by something newer, better, or just a bit cooler. So the idea of using a tool like this for our editions makes me uncomfortable. Editors come from a long tradition of preparing resources that will last for generations. We cannot conceive of publishing our documents using anything as short-lived as a blog or as ephemeral as a wiki, because there is no guarantee that these tools will be around in five years, never mind fifty. When we turned to digital publications, we sought to create the digital equivalent of the same lasting quality as our print editions.

From the start, with the formation of the Model Editions Partnership in 1995, editors have been advised to take the route that best preserves our digital editions, even though that road might be hard to travel. At the start it required expensive software to encode and display SGML files, and even with the conversion to XML it demands a familiarity with text encoding that comes naturally to very few editors. The results have been mixed, especially for history-based editions, as the complexity of the work slowed the creation of digital editions. Ten years ago, I thought that by this time there would be far more digital editions than there are. They are hard to secure funding for, difficult to produce, and oftentimes difficult for users to access. But many are well done and are as certain to migrate to the next generation of digital texts as any texts produced today. Most

succeed in the effort to capture the detailed attention to texts that we value and promote.

I would not argue that we should not use XML and the Text Encoding Initiative’s descriptive schema for our editions, but I question whether this the only way that we can create digital editions. A case worth looking at is the online diary of seventeenth-century civil servant, Samuel Pepys.\(^5\) Using blogging software, the site is at heart a daily dose of Pepys’ life. Instead of publishing the entire diary, as a traditional edition might do, the Pepys site gives us one entry at a time, as if Pepys was blogging about his life. It started on January 1, 2003, with the entry for January 1, 1660. Pepys’ diary entry for October 16, 1666 was posted on October 16, 2009. Pepys kept his diary until 1669, which means that the site will be posting new entries until 2012. But that is not all the site provides. There are popup annotations of important people, some illustrated with portraits. There are identifications of buildings and organizations mentioned in the diary, all gathered into a searchable encyclopedia. There are also what they call “in-depth articles,” contributed by readers on more complex topics, such as the Great Fire of London. A sidebar provides additional information, providing the weather in central England, and links to Parliamentary journal entries, to letters, and to other primary sources that were created on that day. Samuel Pepys is also the first seventeenth-century tweeter. The editor summarizes each diary entry in the ubiquitous 140 characters and posts them on Twitter. You can follow Pepys on Twitter, receive e-mailed updates as his blogs are posted, or subscribe to an RSS feed to receive daily updates. The site fosters discussion groups, populated by experts and novices, where conversations about Pepys and his times flourish. Users make comments about the diary entries, showing a clear engagement with the texts and the historical period.

Simply put, the site is fun to visit. It offers a richly annotated text, and gives us a daily dose of a life very different from our own. It is easy to use and very accessible to the non-expert. The day-by-day release creates a dramatic tension difficult to reproduce in print when one can just skip ahead to the next page to see what happens. As Pepys recounts the Great Fire of London, his efforts to protect his property, tales of loss and bravery, and rumors of a French plot behind it all, the event becomes quite real and personal, doing what documentary editions do best.\(^6\)

The Pepys editor, Phil Gylford, is a Web site designer and developer. He is not a member of our Association and has no training as a scholarly editor.

---

\(^5\) The site can be found at http://www.pepysdiary.com/. The Twitter site is: http://twitter.com/SamuelPepys.

\(^6\) See the entry for Wednesday, 5 Sept. 1666 (http://www.pepysdiary.com/archive/1666/09/05/)
What he has done, and done well, is to take a resource well known to scholars, and re-purpose it, drawing attention to it in a way that has attracted a large following, far larger I imagine, than would have attended yet another published edition of the diary. But where did he get the text? Well, we find that Gylford used a published edition, in this case, the 1893 version edited by Henry B. Wheatley. Wheatley’s edition was in the public domain, and Gylford did not even need to transcribe the edition himself—someone had already done so and posted the text on Project Gutenberg. I am sure that some of you would ask, “Why did Gylford not use the scholarly edition of the diary edited by Robert Latham and William Matthews?” We will return to that later.

Gylford linked a number of annotations to the entries. Those published in the Wheatley edition take the form of popups that you can access by mousing over the text. That is not necessarily Web 2.0. But Gylford also enabled comments on the entries, both to give himself a space to add notes or corrections, and to let his readers comment as well. Called annotations on the site, they include speculation, reactions to the story and scenes described, and research added by readers of varying expertise levels.

So, what can we learn from the Pepys Diary that we could adapt to our editions? It starts with the text. Gylford would not have been able to create his site were it not for the heavy lifting already done by Wheatley. Obviously he chose the Wheatley edition over the more complete Latham and Mathews edition because he did not have to secure copyright or permissions from its editors and publishers. The digitized text was also freely available because it was mounted on Project Gutenberg. Gylford acknowledges that the Latham and Matthews edition is more complete, suggesting that readers wanting more should consult it. Gylford’s site is not the only one on the Web using the same text; what sets his apart is his creativity in matching the software tool, the blog in this case, to the source material that made the diary come alive. He was not concerned about making his blog last forever. The Pepys diary has been edited and published many times, and his goal was to make it available. One would think that Latham and Matthews had the same goal, and it is disheartening when we find that the acknowledged best version of the text languishes in footnotes and in

---

7 For the Project Gutenberg text, see http://digital.library.upenn.edu/webbin/gutbook/lookup?num=4200.
a select set of libraries, while an older text, less ably created and lacking in completeness, gets far more use. I do not know if there are any plans to digitize the Latham and Matthews edition, which is still in print, but it would seem that the best solution for all might have been a collaboration between Gylford and the scholarly editing team. While editors are undoubtedly the experts when it comes to creating print editions, we are not always the ones best suited for presenting them on the Web.

There seems to be a growing split in the digital humanities, with one branch preferring the creation of highly complicated digital texts, usually using XML to record the intricate details of the text’s creation and meaning. These texts are usually designed for scholars and advanced students to stand as digital versions of our print editions. The other branch is less interested in preparing such complex documents and more interested in producing digital texts more quickly and encouraging more people to use them. The Center for History and New Media at George Mason University offers an example of this kind of work. They create tools like the Omeka content management system to help organize and publish primary sources as Web-based archives and exhibits without becoming bogged down in detailed XML encoding. Which way should editions go? Both branches have their good points, and while scholarly editors generally favor the first, I think we should try our hand at both, even if that means that some of the digital products we create may be ephemeral. The creation of the digital transcription of an historical document, whether as a Word document, a blog post, an HTML page, an XML encoded text, or a simple ascii file, is the work we are best qualified to do. Making that base text as good as it can be by proofreading it and researching is the work that takes the most skill and time. Once we have that, there is no reason to have to settle on only one form of digital publication. Yes, there might be issues with migrating editions published as a blog or a wiki, but if the content is valuable enough, people will find a way to do it.

The Power of 1.6 Billion People

One point six billion people actively use the World Wide Web around the world, with more logging on each year. As editors, our goal has always been to preserve and disseminate important historical and literary documents, using the most appropriate tools available. For most of our lives, that tool was the book, and in some cases microform. It simply is no longer the case in 2009. We count ourselves fortunate to sell 1,000 copies of one of our volumes, but over 20 million people have seen just one 1987 video clip of pop star Rick Astley singing “Never Gonna Give You Up” on YouTube. If you have not been “Rickrolled,” you do not know nearly enough twelve year olds! If you have seen it, it probably means that you were tricked into clicking a link that you thought was one thing, but was in-
stead a cheesy MTV video.\textsuperscript{10} Something is wrong here. I am not advocating trying to trick people to view our editions, but do we not need at least to try to get a tiny portion of this audience? They are out there—and they clearly have nothing better to do!

Most of our volumes are bought by research libraries, where serious scholars consult them. We do not know how often they are used and have only anecdotal feedback on how they are used. Did we get reviewed, and if so, was it favorable? What libraries purchased the volume? Do scholars use our books in their footnotes? Who contacts the project’s Web site? While this kind of feedback can help us tweak our editions, it rarely causes us to revise our editorial principles or fine-tune selection policies. It is feedback that is slow in coming, and because of the long lead time for publishing volumes, it is equally slow for changes to appear in print. Unless a second edition is published, we cannot even correct the errors found in our volumes. Don’t get me wrong, I like a hardcover book as well as the next editor. My pride in holding our first volume, never mind the sudden interest and excitement of friends and family, was so much greater than when a carton of microfilm was shipped to our offices. We have emotional attachments to books; we respect them more than articles, Web sites, or sheaves of microfiche. But if we acknowledge that our main purpose is to bring our documents to the greater public, the book can no longer be our pre-eminent form of publication. It is not the means by which we can reach a billion people.

We are in the midst of a transition over the control of media and publication and we do not yet know how things will play out. But can we wait around until things are hashed out, until publishers, especially the university presses that publish our editions, figure out how they want to deal with the Web? Are there other options to traditional scholarly publication? How will editors deal with the push for open access, the Web 2.0 imperative to make all materials free and accessible on the Web? As Robert Darnton wrote this past February, “To digitize collections and sell the product in ways that fail to guarantee wide access would . . . turn the Internet into an instrument for privatizing knowledge that belongs in the public sphere.”\textsuperscript{11} Yet, what about our publishers? What about royalties for the work that we produce? An esteemed colleague characterized these calls for free access as coming from a “kumbaya generation,” who generally work from secure posts at well-endowed institutions. They rarely address the costs of producing and maintaining these works. Should we give away our editions in order to

\textsuperscript{10} Thanks to Esther Katz for introducing me to this Internet phenomenon known as rickrolling. For those who have not seen the clip (and want to): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yu_moia-oVI.

encourage greater use? Some would argue that we can and should, and I tend to favor that camp. But others argue, equally cogently, that it is not possible to break even doing this.\footnote{For the experiences of the American Historical Association, see Robert Townsend, “Mission, Media, and Risk: The American Historical Association Online,” \textit{AHA Perspectives}, Dec. 2008 (http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2008/0812/0812aha2.cfm).}

It is a dilemma. We want high-quality editions, which require effort and attention, but we also want to reach the broadest audience. That audience is fickle, lazy, and cheap. Materials that are not free or are not digitized are often not used. Materials of lesser quality that are out of copyright are often preferred over higher-quality sources that are not free and easy to use. The online encyclopedia Wikipedia offers a good example of this principle. In its initial form, known as Nupedia, the idea was to create a monitored wiki-based encyclopedia, where scholars and experts would manage various subjects, selecting topics, writing articles, and vetting them before they were posted. Have you ever heard of Nupedia? It didn’t work. Participation was sluggish, and the few pages that were created were not so much better than what was already available. But the creators of Nupedia took a risk with a new version, called Wikipedia, that allowed anyone to post or edit an article, with no gatekeepers or scholarly supervision. They rely on Wikipedia’s users themselves to check, improve, and police the work. Who would have thought this would work? Sometimes trying something—even if you do not know what will happen—can result in unexpected and even runaway success. There is a cadre of people who dedicate huge amounts of time to crafting Wikipedia with no payment or even a byline; people who have become intensely protective of the site and are willing to work hard to keep it going. A far larger group of people—myself included—have contributed a single article, or made a few corrections here and there.\footnote{See Chapter 5 in Clay Shirky’s \textit{Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations} (New York: Penguin Press, 2008), pp. 109–42, for an insightful description of Wikipedia’s operations and organizing.}

What makes this kind of participation so powerful is the number of people who access Wikipedia’s pages. When you have so many millions visiting, you only need a tiny percentage to participate in order to secure an army of editors who have built a three-million-page up-to-date encyclopedia in less than nine years. Wikipedia is among the top ten Web sites in terms of use, friendly and inviting to its contributors, and a successful example of Web 2.0 technology changing how we gather and report information.

But there is a flip side. People use Wikipedia because it is free and because it is easy, even if they admit that it might contain errors, some honest, others more malicious. Web 2.0 culture has embraced the idea that accessibility is king.

that it is more important than accuracy. Listen to Paul Graham, a programmer and essayist:

Experts have given Wikipedia middling reviews, but they miss the critical point: it’s good enough. And it’s free, which means people actually read it. On the Web, articles you have to pay for might as well not exist. Even if you were willing to pay to read them yourself, you can’t link to them. They’re not part of the conversation. 15

The phrase “good enough,” I am sure stiffens your back. It tightens my jaw. Good enough is not what editors do. We will craft new editions of previously edited works, like the Wheatley edition of Pepys, specifically because it was not “good enough.” Whether it has inaccurate transcriptions, incomplete or subjective selection policies, or poor annotation, editors demand quality, not only for the scholars that are their main audiences, but for everyone who reads an historical document. Little errors matter and can build into misinterpretations and greater error. We stand as authorities on our subjects and take very seriously the work that we do. But authority is one thing that the Web 2.0 challenges when it states that “good enough” is good enough. 16 We cannot let this notion go unchallenged, but it will take some doing to prove to this generation of Internet users that just because it appears on the Internet seventeen hundred times, does not mean it is correct or, more seriously, that it is not malicious and vicious. This is the risk of keeping quality sources behind subscription-based portals.

If we could build a Web 2.0 edition, with a different relationship to our readers, what might it look like? What could we do with the participation of a hundred thousand people? A traditional Web 1.0 edition might measure every time a page was opened and perhaps include an e-mail address where the reader might send feedback. We could run Google Analytics to get a sense of what pages were opened most and where geographically our users came from. Even those small advances provide us more than we know about the uses of our paper publications. But how would we deal with the “holy grail” of Web 2.0, user-created content? That is something that we have shied away from. Part of this is due to our reluctance to yield our role as experts. Do we want to turn our readers into collaborators? How would we do it? We do not know how it would work, or if it would work, but for a minute let us try not to scoff at the idea that by involving our readers we might actually change the way that we edit documents. I am sure it will be

16 For a sleepless night, read Shirky’s Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations, in which he describes the anti-expert quality of Web 2.0 as “about what happens when people are given the tools to do things together, without needing traditional organizational structures.” See his blog as well: http://www.herecomeseverybody.org/.
challenging, I will bet it will be nerve-wracking at times. Could it be that we fear learning how much, or how little our readers think about our editions?

I do not for a moment believe that there is someone in the vast digital wasteland who can read the letters of Thomas Jefferson better than Barbara Oberg and Jeff Looney’s teams; nor do I think that there are armies of armchair historians who can interpret Thomas Edison’s scrawled diagrams better than the Edison Papers staff. I certainly do not believe that document selection or interpretation of Margaret Sanger’s writings on eugenics should be left to activists engaged in the highly charged abortion debate. We have worked hard to gain the expertise and insights needed to edit our documents, trained as scholarly editors, and our immersion into the lives and times of our subjects takes time and talent. But that does not mean that we cannot find roles for our users that could enhance our documents and editions.

The roles that our readers could take would vary from project to project and might include data gathering. We might start by making available some of our research files. If I mounted a version of the chronology database that we use to track Margaret Sanger’s life and allowed people to edit and contribute to it, what do you think would happen? I could envision a hot mess of Sanger haters foaming at the mouth in all the commenting areas, as they do on a number of anti-abortion blogs. But say that we manage, somehow, to keep most of the crazies out and enforce some rudimentary decorum. People are interested in Sanger and her role in the reproductive rights movement and they are also interested in local history. If we could tap into that, perhaps focusing on students of history, women’s history, or public policy, we could encourage readers to scour their local archives and libraries for additional documentation of Sanger’s travels around the country and the world. We would not ask them to build it from scratch—we would provide the dates, as best we have them, and what we know already. For example, based on our chronology database, I know that Sanger was in Illinois at least 53 days between 1916 and 1957. Could we persuade people to survey newspapers, check for photographs and ephemera in local archives, or even identify some of the places where Sanger stayed and spoke and plot them on Google maps? I do not know if they would come, but the interest and enthusiasm that we find among students, interns, and archivists when we tell them about Sanger’s involvement in their own city suggests that some might. It could also expand beyond Sanger. If readers were interested in posting events and timelines of local birth-control activism, the site could become a powerful resource bringing together materials in ways that could help us better understand the birth control movement.

Another way to use social networking is to have users rank or tag the contents of the Web site, and to use the information created to build better searches and to learn about the users. A digital edition might enable a ranking system for
documents, much as we might do for Netflix movies or products that we purchased at Amazon.com. As more people provided rankings, software could use them to produce more useful search results. A five-star document would come to the top of the list, while a one star document would remain at the bottom. Users could add subject terms to documents, especially those that have been digitized in image format only, where text searching is not an option. Not only would this kind of social tagging help to search the edition, but it would help editors to understand our audiences better. We could learn about what people are looking for when they use our editions, which documents appeal most to them. I have always wondered whether users prefer to see the image of a document or a transcription, and wondered about whether advanced scholars actually do look at the image when conducting research. Are documents with difficult handwriting less likely to be used than those that are read more easily? How often do people consult the transcription guidelines when using an edition? Do they tend to prefer “sound-bite” documents that contain a short, strongly worded quote over longer more reasoned treatments of a subject? In which subjects are they most interested? Which document in our edition is most popular? By seeking feedback from our readers, we could learn far more about how they see the documents and annotations, in ways that are not possible with books. We could fine tune this data by gathering demographic information about our users as well. Armed with this knowledge, I am certain that we would learn important things. With such knowledge we might change the way we plan and create editions.

What, you might ask, makes people volunteer their time to contribute to such experimental sites? I believe it is the same thing that drives us: the appeal of our subjects, of working with these rich historical sources, and the feeling that one is contributing to something bigger. We study fascinating people who did interesting and important work, and the lure of participating in some way, whether as an intern, volunteer, or user on a Web site, will attract people if we invite them in. The students and interns who work on our projects get as much as they give, in terms of seeing the past in a different light. This immersion in the past personalizes history and historical actors in a way that other treatments, even biography, do not approach. You can tell from the kinds of questions our students ask that they are connecting to the subject in a different manner than they would by reading a textbook or watching a documentary.

17 For an interesting take on seeking user collaboration in museum settings, see Nina Simon’s Museum 2.0 blog entry, “Self Expression is Overrated: Better Constraints Make Better Participatory Experiences,” Mar. 16, 2009. (http://museumtwo.blogspot.com/2009/03/self-expression-is-over-rated-better.html). Simon argues that only a small percentage of museum goers are interested in reacting to exhibits by writing open-ended comments; far more participate when the collaboration is clearly defined and explained.
Getting Dirty

One thing that the Internet teaches is that trying something new, even if it fails, is in most cases better than waiting for the perfect opportunity to come along. Every time we try something, we learn—whether we succeed or fail—and in many ways the risk of trying something new on the Web is smaller than it is using traditional publishing media. Yes, we will trip up sometimes, and yes, we might get dirty. But if we do not take chances and try out new and interesting ways of publishing documents, we will not be able to re-invent the edition for a new generation. In general, editors, myself included, have been too cautious about digitization. We are so concerned about selecting the perfect system for publishing our documents online, capturing all of their complexity, enabling other editions to be searched along with ours, and employing the best standards and chances of longevity, that we are almost afraid to act. Our funders are caught in the same trap. Both the Model Editions Partnership and the University of Virginia Press’s Rotunda digital imprint have been designed with the best of these goals, but while we have been trying to solve the questions asked of digital publishing in the 1990s and early 2000s, new questions have come up. In many senses those systems replicate the experience of using our editions in print format, with some nice searching added in. But they do not address the challenges of Web 2.0 technologies. They do not invite our users in or make their experiences with the documents a part of our edition. Taking care is important, but sometimes we move too slowly and miss out on the opportunities that new and changing media offer.

Is this something that we want to do? We will not know if we do not try it. Looking at Pepys again, I would say that there is much to admire there. If it had failed, if no one had read it, no one had commented on it or forwarded the link to their friends and colleagues, how much would Phil Gylford have lost? Some time, but that is about it. I am not suggesting that we abandon the work that we have traditionally published as print volumes, but I am suggesting that we can do more things with that work and with the research files that we all have in our offices. We publish only a tiny part of the knowledge and expertise that we gather in our work and it is time to take some chances, to try new things, and to risk some investment of time, against the chance that we can make a connection with the biggest audience that any of us will address. Because we do not have to get it right every time, but if we wait and wait to create the perfect digital edition that can meet every standard out there, we may find ourselves passed by.

We may fail, but even in that we will have learned more about how people use documents online. If even one crazy idea succeeds, it could change the playing field for scholarly editions.
Review


Anthony M. Joseph

Lincoln’s long career as a lawyer has been as much the subject of winsome anecdote as comprehensive scholarly study—an unhappy balance caused in part by the lack of readily accessible documents bearing on his practice. That problem, however, was remedied in stunning fashion with the publication in 2000 of the massive digital edition of Lincoln’s legal papers, *The Law Practice of Abraham Lincoln* (LPAL). The LPAL produced more than 96,000 searchable documents spanning over 5,000 cases and nearly 500 nonlitigation activities through the course of Lincoln’s legal career. The present selective letterpress edition in four volumes continues the same tradition of legal and editorial expertise found in the digital edition. Together the two editions should help bring about a great leap forward in Lincoln legal scholarship. With its extensive scholarly apparatus, the letterpress edition in particular provides a unique window onto Lincoln’s daily work as a lawyer.

Here, of course, the material is necessarily whittled down. This edition presents forty-nine cases chosen from the digital edition on the basis of “many attributes, including chronology, geography, jurisdiction, subject matter, legal action, the quality of the documentation, the number of Lincoln documents, Lincoln’s role, judgment, and, to a lesser extent, the notoriety of the case at the time and since in Lincoln scholarship” (1: xix). A larger number of cases are given brief treatment over the course of three additional chapters, one covering Lincoln’s practice in the Sangamon County Circuit Court during its Spring 1842 term and two covering Lincoln on circuit in 1842 and 1852. In addition to the cases, the editors have included chapters on Lincoln’s views of lawyering, his legal work outside the courtroom, and his work as a court official. Three appendices explain the structure of the Illinois court system, its pleading and practice, and legal descriptions of land. A biographical directory, a glossary of legal terms, and an effective index round out the fourth and final volume. The legal glossary and the appendix on pleading and practice provide an extensive technical introduction to antebellum law. Properly used, these sections will make the documents vastly more intelligible to readers and researchers alike. Researchers just beginning their forays into American antebellum legal history, whether as Lincoln scholars, Illi-
nois historians, political historians, or legal historians, will find this technical apparatus of enormous value.

Despite the culling of case materials, this edition is remarkable for its breadth. The cases illustrate a great variety of areas of law, including debt, bankruptcy, inheritance, divorce, murder, breach of contract, patents, personal injury, taxation, and slander. Lincoln’s work in different venues is also represented, including the Illinois county circuit courts, the Illinois Supreme Court, and federal circuit and district courts held in Springfield. This edition also impresses with its unflagging effort to provide biographical, social, and legal background to the cases. Through commentary, copious annotation, the biographical directory, and the legal glossary, the editors have provided readers and researchers with an abundance of material to contextualize Lincoln’s role and the legal issues involved.

The degree of biographical detail concerning the litigants as well as the lawyers, judges, and court officers is remarkable. We learn that Samuel Rogers remarried after securing his divorce (1: 48). We discover that Jane Davidson died just a few months after Lincoln helped the father of her illegitimate child avoid paying her child support (1: 398). Illustrations sprinkle the case narratives. Sarah Allsop Tennery gazes at us in an 1884 portrait, years after she won her slander case against John Sturgeon for calling Sarah and her sister whores and adulterers (2: 160, 168). We see the drawing of the “atmospheric churn” at issue in the case of Lewis v. Moffett (1848–50) (2: 45) and a diagram of Jonathan Haines’s new harvesting machine from the patent infringement case of Rugg v. Haines (3: 250).

William Duff Armstrong, accused of murder, and his mother, Hannah Armstrong, who asked Lincoln to defend her son, make their disturbing appearances (4: 3, 10, 11). Illustrations of documents in Lincoln’s own hand are strangely absent. Nonetheless, no reader or researcher will leave these volumes feeling they have encountered materials lacking in sufficient scholarly adornment.

Legal Documents and Cases does include some editorial decisions that merit scrutiny.

The placement of the more substantive biographies at the end of volume four sometimes puts the information at a considerable distance from where the person is actually mentioned. For example, we first encounter William Florville, “Billy the Barber,” on page six in the first volume, and an intriguing photograph of Florville appears on the following page; however, we must turn to volume four, page 349, to read that Florville was a Haitian émigré who became Lincoln’s barber in Springfield. On the other hand, the directory does allow the editors to supply very full accounts of the personages once and for all, without the limitations of space imposed by footnotes. On balance, one sees more gain than loss in this arrangement, which is of course found in many other documentary editions.

The editors have also published letters in full even where they only partially bear on the case at hand. In the chapter on James Bell & Company For the
Use of Speed v. Hall (1842–43), for example, one of Lincoln’s letters to Joshua Speed, running more than two pages long, addresses a number of additional cases as well as political and personal matters (1: 256–58). One wonders whether it might have been more appropriate to publish only the portion related to the Bell case. That raises the question, of course, of where the remainder of the letter could be placed, as the edition does not provide a chapter for Lincoln’s general legal correspondence.

Of greater impact on the organization of Legal Documents and Cases is the editors’ decision to intersperse a running commentary for each case among its documents. This method contrasts with the practice of other editions of legal papers, such as the collections for Lord Mansfield, John Adams, Daniel Webster, and the early Supreme Court of the United States, which generally discuss the background to each case in a single, consolidated introduction preceding all the documents. The running commentary does have the advantage of drawing the reader’s eye to the surrounding documents. But the commentary also has the tendency to diminish the impact of valuable scholarly findings, such as the number of each type of case Lincoln tried—information that appears at different points in the commentaries and must be fished out at some inconvenience. The commentaries also tend to repeat information that the reader has just encountered in the documents themselves. In Rogers v. Rogers, for example, the judgment indicates that the jury found that Samuel Rogers’ wife Polly “has not been guilty of adultery as charged” (1: 47). The editors add in the summary on the very next page that Rogers and his counsel “did not convince the jury that Polly Rogers was guilty of the charge of adultery” (1: 48). Although such repetition sometimes helps the reader understand the gist of difficult documents, it also sometimes makes the commentary appear perfunctory in striking contrast to the other editorial interventions in the edition. The editors’ decision to place their commentary in a larger font than the documents themselves compounds the problem.

Such criticisms, however, do not substantially detract from the overall impression this edition makes. The legal documents are well chosen and illuminating in surprising ways. They reveal, first, how varied the work of the antebellum lawyer was. Lincoln served as a guardian ad litem for minors, as a public prosecutor, and, in more than three-hundred cases, as a temporary judge (4: 274–75, 280). He was called upon to serve on at least five writ-of-inquiry juries, which were used to assess damages in cases of default judgments (4: 272–73). In the numerous cases for which he was an attorney, Lincoln propelled litigation forward. He not only filed pleadings on behalf of his clients, but also drafted jury instructions which he hoped the judge would incorporate into the instructions ultimately delivered to jurors (2: 158–59, 169–70, 238, 274–75). This was not an uncommon maneuver for antebellum lawyers, as the glossary helpfully notes (4: 398). In one case, the famous murder trial of William Armstrong, the judge cer-
tainly used Lincoln’s proposed instructions, as they were endorsed “given” (4: 14–15). In a breach-of-contract case, by contrast, the judge explicitly refused Lincoln’s proposed jury instruction, and after the jury returned a verdict against his client, Lincoln protested the refusal in a succession of filings (3: 241–43, 244). Lincoln also drafted in his own hand a number of decrees and judgments in cases where the decision from the bench was favorable to his client (1: 130; 2: 85–87, 279–80, 289–90, 300, 348–49; 3: 59–60, 63, 187–88; 4: 134). The editors are undoubtedly correct in concluding that these decrees and judgments formally became the decisions of the courts. Thus when Lincoln, acting as a temporary judge, wrote the judgment in Peabody v. Roney (1852), he was only doing, textually speaking, what he had done as a lawyer in many other cases (4: 286).

Even the pleadings themselves prove to be more than mere legal boiler-plate dutifully but reluctantly printed. The seduction case of Grable v. Margrave (1840–42) demonstrates how the pleadings can help fully illuminate the legal significance of a case. William J. Grable impregnated Melissa Jane Margrave, the unmarried daughter of Thomas Margrave, in 1839. Rather than sue Grable explicitly for the seduction of his daughter, Thomas Margrave followed the path that common-law pleading offered in such cases. In his declaration, the first pleading made by the plaintiff in a common-law case, Margrave became not an aggrieved father seeking to vindicate his daughter’s honor but instead a “master” harmed by the expenses and loss of service associated with the pregnancy of his “servant” (1: 241). Indeed, the word “seduction” is not even mentioned in the declaration. Yet Margrave won $300 in damages, less than the amount he sought but more than his stated financial loss. Hearing the case on appeal in the Illinois Supreme Court, Judge Samuel H. Treat acknowledged that “the loss of service is still the legal foundation of the right to recover” but noted that the common law now permitted the father to recover damages “beyond the mere loss of service” (1: 247). Treat’s opinion was already published in the Illinois state reports, but by publishing here both the declaration and the opinion the editors are able to expose the gap between the common law’s forms of pleading and its actual rules of decision.

Lincoln himself, of course, emerges from these pages through the case documents he filed as well as in the letters that passed between him and his clients, which are amply represented here. In his recent work, An Honest Calling: The Law Practice of Abraham Lincoln (2006), Mark E. Steiner, a former associate editor of the LPAL, describes Lincoln as a lawyer who was willing to represent any side in a case and who trusted the legal system to produce a morally acceptable outcome. These volumes, selective though they are, do convey this impression of Lincoln the lawyer.

The case of Todd v. Ware (1843–44) is instructive. This was the only case in which Lincoln represented his father-in-law, John Todd (1: 301). Lincoln initi-
ated the case for breach of contract in 1843, about one year after marrying Mary Todd and shortly after meeting her father for the first time (1: 305). In 1841 Todd had purchased 243 acres of land from Nathaniel A. Ware, agreeing to make three annual payments for the property in “current Bankable Paper receivable in Deposite at the State Bank of Ills. in Springfield.” In early 1842, however, the State Bank of Illinois failed. Todd subsequently made two payments in the bank’s paper, which Ware accepted, but when in May 1843 he tendered the balance in the same currency, Ware refused to accept it. By that time the bank’s money had depreciated to less than half its face value. Todd, however, insisted that the agreement permitted payment in depreciated currency and sued Ware for breach of contract.

In the proceedings that followed, Lincoln went to great lengths on his father-in-law’s behalf. When his bill of complaint was successfully challenged for being “argumentative” and otherwise insufficient, he promptly filed an amendment. He sought unsuccessfully to obtain the notes of debt originally given to Ware. He deposed three of his own witnesses and cross-examined two of the defendant’s. He filed exceptions to some of the questions the defense had asked of witnesses as well as the witnesses’ answers (1: 332–33). He wrote a lengthy brief, one of the few published in this edition (1: 328–32). Ultimately, however, Lincoln’s efforts were to no avail. Judge Samuel H. Treat, in an opinion published here for the first time, determined that the bank’s notes were not truly “bankable” at the time Todd tendered payment and that the notes circulated at a forty-to-fifty percent discount in comparison to those of other institutions. Equity demanded that Todd make payment in better money than that.

Ultimately, this case does much more than show a lawyer serving his client or a son-in-law helping out his father-in-law. Lincoln sought to permit a debtor to pay in depreciated money, an action which Federalists had considered patently unjust in the era of the Founding and which continued to vex and dismay Americans in Lincoln’s time. Lincoln’s posture in the case is explicable on the premise that Lincoln placed virtually complete trust in the moral efficacy of the legal system and believed that his trust fulfilled his moral responsibility.

Or was Lincoln willing to do for John Todd what he was unwilling to do for others? The Bennett cases suggest otherwise. Richard Bennett, father of a large family, impregnated Jane Davidson, a woman not his wife. She sought child support from him. With Lincoln’s help, however, Bennett took advantage of an Illinois statutory provision that released a father from his financial obligation to an illegitimate child if he sought custody of the child and the mother refused to grant it. In the Illinois Supreme Court, Justice Norman Purple was “reluctantly compelled to admit” that a father who had the “inhumanity” to demand custody of his illegitimate child “in its helpless and dependent infancy” was indeed released from further financial obligation should the mother refuse. The state legis-
lature revised the law before Purple’s opinion was issued, but of course the new provision, which required the father to pay support until the child was three, could not be applied to Bennett. In short, Lincoln had helped loosen Bennett from any underlying ethical obligation both to mother and child. When Davidson died a few months after the decision, the editors poignantly note, “the county paid for her casket and burial” (1: 398).

Nor was Lincoln inclined to be discriminating in cases with clear political implications. When the Illinois Central Railroad sought to enjoin two Illinois counties from taxing its land, Lincoln made himself available as counsel for the counties. When the counties declined, Lincoln offered his services to the railroad, which quickly retained him (2: 384). Ultimately, Lincoln won the case for the railroad and claimed $5,000 for his efforts, the largest legal fee he ever collected (2: 410). When Stephen Douglas later accused Lincoln of representing the railroad to the detriment of the people of Illinois, Lincoln simply explained that the railroad’s charter required the company to pay taxes to the state, not the counties, and that the people’s interest was served thereby. He also noted that he had offered his services to the other side and had been declined (2: 413–14). What more need be said? Any notion that he was “on very cozy terms with the Railroad Company, I do not comprehend,” Lincoln offered (1: 414).

Lincoln’s trust in the legal system, however legitimate, may have masked a lack of zeal for the specific content of the law, whether he saw ethical implications in that content or not. Over time his cases became more important and his reputation grew, but Lincoln was never beyond being caught flatfooted on legal questions that arose. In the murder case People v. Harrison, Judge Edward Y. Rice claimed the right to determine the admissibility of dying declarations; Lincoln remarked to his own discredit that he had “never heard of such law” (4: 174–75). In 1860, an indictment drafted by Lincoln was quashed because of a critical omission. Ward Hill Lamon, the public prosecutor for whom Lincoln had written the indictment, asked Lincoln for any legal authorities that might be adduced to revive the indictment. “I will take it as a great favor,” Lamon remarked, as “I have more pride in having my Indictments sustained, than in anything else in the practice of law” (4: 278). Lincoln replied vaguely that “Our Statute … relaxes the high degree of technical certainty formerly required.” If the indictment remained quashed, Lincoln quipped, “it will only prove that my forte is as a Statesman, rather than as a Prosecutor” (4: 279).

Lincoln’s errors, indeed, did not seem to faze him. To be sure, he was careful to protect his reputation. When his plea in the case of Dungey v. Spencer was successfully challenged by a demurrer, Lincoln exclaimed to the opposing attorneys, “Now, by Jing, I will beat you boys!” As one opposing attorney later reminisced, Lincoln wanted to redeem himself for having been “demurred out of court” (3: 145). Yet the correspondence published in this edition shows a Lincoln
who was remarkably candid—even breezily so—in admitting to doubts, omissions, and errors. The legal view expressed by a federal marshal in one case “did not occur to me,” Lincoln acknowledges to one client (3:221). He tells another that he “took fright” when he became aware that the statute of limitations might have expired on the client’s suit (3:202). Lincoln states plainly that he “forgot” to pay the taxes on several lots owned by William Florville, “though under promise” to do so (4:258).

Lincoln scholars will mine this edition for new insights into Lincoln’s legal temperament, his legal philosophy, and the impact his practice had on his political outlook. Studies of Lincoln the lawyer have emerged since the LPAL were published, including Steiner’s as well as Brian Dirck’s *Lincoln the Lawyer* (2000), but undoubtedly these will not be the last. *Legal Documents and Cases*, with its four substantial volumes of material transcribed and contextualized, will encourage scholars to look at Lincoln’s law practice afresh. Previous assessments, some stretching back to the reminiscences of the late nineteenth century, will be influential but not determinative. Was it trust in the legal system that encouraged Lincoln to rely on America’s political system to resolve the sectional dispute? Was it his regard for legal outcomes that inclined him to expect Southerners to accept the political outcome of the election of 1860? It is gratifying to know that this edition puts us on a road to answering such questions more effectively and reliably than ever before.
Review


James M. Perry

The Irish Diaspora and the influx of Irish immigrants to North America have received much attention in recent decades. The multitudes of Irish-Catholics arriving in the middle nineteenth century in the aftermath of Ireland’s Potato Famine have received the majority of this scholarly attention. In Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan, Kerby A. Miller, Arnold Schrier, Bruce D. Boling, and David N. Doyle tackle an often overlooked aspect of the Irish migration to North America, the largely Protestant immigrants arriving before the American Revolution and in its immediate aftermath. Using letters, and occasionally other sources such as personal memoirs and diaries, the authors seek to illuminate the immigrant experience of the “approximately four hundred thousand emigrants from Ireland who settled in North America between the late 1600s and the end of the Napoleonic War in 1815” (p. 4).

The authors (a more appropriate term than “editors,” given the amount of analysis presented) parade a fascinating collection of first-person accounts in front of the reader. Informative and scholarly essays accompany each document. The first-person accounts and essays collectively highlight the push-and-pull factors of emigration, the search for personal and ethnic identity, and the impact of Irish immigrants during the years of the American colonial period and the fledgling United States. The results justify the book’s imposing length. Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan is a stunning accomplishment and will long be an influential work in multiple fields. It is also a testament to the quality of work produced when top scholars collaborate. Miller, author of the landmark Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America (1985), assumes responsibility for historical interpretation. The rest of the lineup is equally impressive, as Miller’s co-contributors, Schrier, Boling, and Doyle, are experts in the fields of Irish emigration, manuscript interpretation, philology, and Irish America. Each contributor provides something unique to the finished product.

The seven sections (containing a total of sixty-eight chapters) of Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan each highlight a different aspect of the immigrant experience. The first two sections engage the causes and processes of Irish emigration. The next four sections are separated according to the occupations Irish
immigrants held in the New World, with chapters relating to farmers and planters; craftsmen, laborers and servants; merchants, shopkeepers and peddlers; and clergymen and schoolmasters. The final section chronicles Irish immigrants and their maneuverings through the tumultuous era of revolution against Great Britain. Within each section, the chapters center on the personal narratives of either a single individual or a collection of related individuals. The method of organization will undoubtedly benefit future scholars who use this work; as examples, those interested in transatlantic travel or eighteenth-century labor can easily find the sections that appeal to their own interests.

This collection of documents is the product of years of research in numerous depositories. The documents come from university libraries, state and local historical societies, archives in the United States and abroad, and private collections. In selecting the appropriate texts for inclusion, the compilers sought documents that they deemed both “historically representative and inherently interesting” (p. vii). In this endeavor their work is a success. The selected documents shed light on multiple facets of history and are ripe with personal details indicating a cornucopia of immigrants’ hopes, fears, and ambitions. As personal stories, the documents humanize the immigrants in a way that monographs on immigration often do not. Documents are presented unabridged, with the exception of some lengthy memoirs which have been edited for manageable presentation. Most of the selections make for an easy read, except for those selections written with a heavy emphasis on regional dialects. The latter documents require special attention to the purposefully and thoughtfully employed footnotes. The authors rightly suggest in the preface that “understanding how and why immigrants express themselves in certain ways is crucial to appreciating what they wrote and the cultures that shaped their perceptions and interpretations of experience” (p. viii).

The letters, memoirs, and diaries in this volume represent a broad and encompassing segment of immigrant experiences. The selections embrace immigrants from the whole of Ireland, not just Ulster, and are representative of a broad range of experiences, of wealthy merchants, indentured servants, struggling farmers, and clergy searching for congregations. This diversity is apparent in the examples of Robert Witherspoon and Robert Pillson. Witherspoon’s memoirs recall his family’s attempts to carve out a farm amidst hostile Indians, swamps, and the unsettled wilderness of South Carolina (pp. 135–43). A very different experience is that of Robert Pillson, a merchant who settled in the more “civilized” confines of New York and wrote home to Irish business associates peddling butter, flaxseed, and cloth (pp. 323–28). While the authors admit in the preface that “low literacy rates that prevailed among poor immigrants and among Irish Catholics and women, generally, determined that members of those groups remain underrepresented” (p. viii), they made efforts to find examples of these...
groups to include in their final work. These include the Catholic Margaret Carey
Murphy Burke, whose letter to her brother Matthew Carey (among the more
prominent Irish immigrants of his era) details the problems of a widow operating
a tavern frequented predominantly by male drinkers and gamblers (pp. 353–55).

Historical essays introduce and conclude each chapter to accompany the
voices of the immigrants. These essays provide clarity, and in some cases closure,
to the lives in which we are allowed voyeuristic entry. Although the essays vary in
scope and length, they serve to place the letters into larger cultural, economic, re-
ligious, and historical contexts, further enriching the value of the documents. The
essays are superb both in content and in the writing style that makes the reading
accessible to a large audience.

In the Introduction, the authors address the notion of “Irish identity” as it
relates to these trailblazers of Irish America. The authors contend that during the
period from the mid-1700s until the early 1800s, “close affinities between Irish
and American economic and political developments” and migration to America
resulted in “modern ‘Irish’ (and ‘Scotch-Irish’) ethnic and political identities on
both sides of the Atlantic Ocean” (p. 8). In the final section of the book this
theme becomes central to discussions of Irish immigrant roles in the political
arena of revolutionary America. The delayed gratification of this discussion does
not diminish its effectiveness, but readers searching for the core of this argument
may wonder why it does not appear until the latter pages. When the matter is fi-
ally advanced, readers learn that the concept of an “Irish” or “Scotch-Irish”
identity proved remarkably fluid, changing connotations as the political winds
changed on both sides of the ocean. The early nature of this transatlantic search
for identity appears largely framed by anti-English sentiment. Irish Presbyterians,
constituting the bulk of the immigrants in the period studied, regularly struggled
for acceptance and equality in Ireland despite sharing Protestant beliefs with the
Anglican establishment. Some Irish Presbyterians fomented rebellion in Ireland
through the Society of United Irishmen, mirroring the actions of their relatives
who participated in the American Revolution. The anti-English sentiment car-
ried over to other non-Anglican denominations in varying degrees. One example
is the case of John Morton, a Quaker originally from County Down. Morton
maintained conflicted loyalties during the American Revolution, apparently fail-
ing to support either side completely. Yet when British regulations interfered with
Morton’s business interests, the authors note a “transplanted resentment against
British restrictions on Irish trade” as a factor in Morton’s “youthful enthusiasm
for ‘the good Cause of Liberty’ ” (p. 527). In the aftermath of the American Rev-
olution, political and religious tribalism precluded a unified identity for the Irish
at home and abroad, regardless of their affinity for Great Britain. “Irish” and
“Scotch-Irish” as terms accumulated new connotations that served to divide
rather than unite Irish and Irish-American populations.
Reliance on friendship and kinship networks from Ireland marked the immigrant experience, both in deciding to leave Ireland and in orienting immigrants to their new homes. James Wansbrough of County Westmeath, having watched his neighbors and relatives emigrate, wrote to his sister in New Jersey in 1728 begging for information on the New World in order to decide if he should join them. Wansbrough implored his sister to “write unto me and give me good Encoragment” (p. 22). John Smilie, writing in 1762 from Pennsylvania to family in County Down, warned his relatives contemplating the Atlantic voyage to avoid contracting with a nefarious seaman named “Captain Taylor” (pp. 91–93). Upon arrival, immigrants sought help from their Irish connections to aid in starting their new lives. Charles Lewis Reilly of New York wrote in 1749 to a man he did not personally know seeking employment based on the friendship of their parents in County Meath (pp. 465–68). Others who arrived without connections in place could seek the help of networks and organizations such as the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland. One such person, Thomas McMahon, wrote the Hibernian Society for assistance upon hearing of the “goodness & readiness” of the organization to serve fellow “Country men” (p. 289).

In addition to the documents presented and the historical analysis in the body of the book, *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan* contains useful aids that add clarity and context to the volume. Front matter includes maps of Ireland, the early colonies and the United States, and the Caribbean. The maps are clear and straightforward—each map includes an easily understood key for references to the documents. There are also three appendices, two of which are worth noting here. Boling’s appendix on editorial conventions and language offers transparency to the emendations made in the documents. The majority of these emendations are unavoidable owing to the condition of the manuscripts, where the occasional hole or fold renders a word unreadable. Boling explains the language, spelling, and syntax of the era. Miller’s appendix, co-written with Kennedy, is an impressive commentary on the religious demographics of the Irish locations mentioned in the immigrants’ writings.

Liberal footnotes accompany each document. Sometimes these annotations are longer than the actual document. It would be easy to criticize the notes as excessive if they were not of such value in understanding each document. The annotations include, but are not limited to, definitions of archaic words and phrases, locations of towns and villages that no longer appear on modern maps, and brief biographical descriptions of otherwise obscure persons mentioned in each letter. The annotations provide insight into the cultural background of each immigrant in a way that a casual reading of the letters alone cannot. In the case of *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan*, fewer annotations would have resulted in an inferior volume.
Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan is prodigious in content and achievement, enhancing and altering our understanding of Irish-American immigration, notions of ethnic identity, and colonial and revolutionary America. This fine work of history will be useful for linguists, genealogists, anthropologists, historians in a variety of subfields, and many other disciplines. The fresh perspective offered here on the lesser known, less studied period of Irish immigration should inspire more complete treatment of the topic in subsequent studies of the Irish in America.
Review


Julie R. Newell

This volume brings to an end a forty-year project that is both a tremendous contribution to the content and practice of the history of American science and a monument to the talents, commitment, and perseverance of its editors. The list of sponsoring institutions provides some indication of the perceived value of this project across a range of academic disciplines: the Smithsonian Institution, the American Philosophical Society, and the National Academy of Sciences.

Twelve volumes in all including the index, the series traces the life of Joseph Henry (1797–1878) from his education and early academic employment in Albany, New York, through his years on the faculty at Princeton, and then to his efforts, as the first Secretary of the Smithsonian, to shape the nature and future of that institution when many did not share his vision. Henry struggled throughout his career to continue to conduct scientific research and to influence the nature and practice of science in the United States. In both his own research and his ideals for American scientific practice and institutions, Henry sought to build a scientific reputation that would be recognized and respected far beyond the boundaries of the United States.

When Nathan Reingold was appointed editor of the Henry Papers Project in 1966, he was one of a small group within the discipline of the history of science interested primarily in American science and scientists. In an essay in the British Journal of the History of Science in 1987, Reingold made the philosophy behind his editorial approach explicit:

The Papers of Joseph Henry is designed to be a critical, documentary epic of the origins of the professional scientific community in this country. Although centered around a key figure, our volumes are definitely not a memorial to him. My intentions influence both the selection of documents and their treatment.¹

In an earlier article in *The Public Historian*, Reingold had detailed his editorial process. He also argued quite strongly that all editing requires interpretation, and that such interpretation is an act of professional historical writing.2 While Reingold’s approach to documentary editing, and his insistence that his work should be considered professional historical writing, were controversial among both academic editors and academic historians, the results of his approach make these volumes valuable on three levels.

Across the first eleven volumes of this series, one can trace three stories. The first is the story of Joseph Henry’s life. The documents relevant to the life of perhaps the most important scientific figure of nineteenth-century American science could have been presented with far less editorial content, but it would have been far less rich and accessible. The second is the story of the development of American science in the nineteenth century—its practice, its supporting institutions, and its place in the broader culture and politics of the nation. The third is the development of the discipline of the history of American science itself. These second and third stories are contained not only in the documents but in the volume introductions and in the explanatory and interpretive notes that accompany the documents. This content is extremely valuable and makes a strong case for Reingold’s approach and for the status of the editors’ work as professional historical scholarship.

The series, originally conceived as fifteen volumes in three series, ultimately appeared in twelve volumes over 36 years.3 There were many changes over the four decades between Reingold’s initial appointment and the appearance of volume 12. Among these were changes in personnel, changes in disciplinary knowledge and practice, and very dramatic changes in technology. For instance, from the very beginning, the project was expected to exist in two forms: a very selective and extensively annotated published version; and an extensive (even exhaustive) microfilm collection of Joseph Henry’s papers gathered from institutions around the world.4 By the time editor Marc Rothenberg wrote the “Introduction” to the eleventh volume, the projected microfilm edition (long since abandoned to rapid technological change) had morphed into a database of over 135,000 items including documents, transcriptions, newspaper articles, essays, and various other supporting materials.5 The first six volumes followed the original editorial practices

---

3 Full publication information and a brief summary of each volume are available on The Joseph Henry Papers Project Web site at http://siarchives.si.edu/history/jhp/papers01.htm (accessed 13 April 2009).
4 Reingold gave the figures as 250 institutions in 14 countries (Reingold 1980, p. 90). The final figure was 300 institutions in 17 countries. http://siarchives.si.edu/history/jhp/proj01.htm (accessed 13 April 2009).
5 Rothenberg, p. lv. The database is available at the Smithsonian Institution archives; see http://siarchives.si.edu/history/jhp/resour01.htm (accessed 13 April 2009).
set out by Reingold, but editorial policy and practice shifted with volume 7 and
the start of the third series to reflect the thirty years of change in the discipline
since the beginning of the project. Another major transition came with volume 9,
when publication shifted from the Smithsonian Institution Press to Science History
Publications. One change that might seem trivial but indicates the tremen-
dous change in context between the first and eleventh volumes: volume 1 had a
publisher’s listed price of $15, volume 11 of $110.

The editorial practices used in producing volume 11 are spelled out in the
“Notes on Style” (pp. lix–lxii). This volume, like all the others, is arranged
chronologically, rather than thematically or by type of document. Thus the vari-
ous aspects of Henry’s life—his personal life, his scientific life, his institutional
life—are integrated rather than compartmentalized. The period covered in vol-
ume 11 falls entirely after the disastrous Smithsonian fire of January 1865. The
85,000 pages of correspondence lost in that fire would have been a treasure trove
for volumes 7 through 10. On the other hand, the wealth of resources available
for the post-fire period had to be winnowed ruthlessly. The volume ultimately
contains, according to the editor, “only 0.3 percent of the nearly one-hundred
thousand documents datable to the years 1866–1878 written by, to, or about
Henry that we have located.” In selecting documents for publication, preference
was given to those “that throw the most light on Henry’s private life and his pro-
fessional career,” and highest priority is given to materials authored by Henry
himself.

Many of the documents presented here (as in previous volumes) are fol-
lowed by editorial notes that may be as long as, or many times longer than, the
document itself. While some of these notes refer back to notes in previous vol-
umes, creating a rich cross-indexing of tremendous value to anyone with access to
all the volumes, the notes of volume 11 are also fully functional without recourse
to the earlier volumes. For any scholar not thoroughly versed in the practice,
practitioners, and context of nineteenth-century American science, the editorial
notes are critical to understanding the documents and provide rich references to
the secondary literature in the field. Even those who are specialists will find a
wealth of information and insight in the editorial notes. Anyone who approaches
the volumes primarily as a reader will find that the editorial notes carry most of
the very interesting “story” of the volume, while the documents provide a ground-
ing in reality and at the same time give a flavor of the times and of Henry him-
self. This volume, like its predecessors, is very enjoyable purely as historical
reading, beyond its value to the researcher.

Henry’s vision of the Smithsonian Institution as a sponsor of scientific re-

\footnote{Rothenberg, p. lix.}
search, with minimal demands on its resources for upkeep of buildings or other functions, is very clear. This volume chronicles Henry's efforts to improve the funding of the Institution (successful), remove the library and art collections from Institution responsibility and expense (also successful), and remove the expense and labor involved in responsibility for the National Museum from the charge of the Institution (unsuccessful, but never abandoned).

In addition, Henry served critical leadership roles with both the Light-House Board and the National Academy of Sciences during these years. He struggled to continue his own original research, and, as a man whose opinion on scientific matters was often sought, advocated the support of original scientific (“basic”) research in any available setting. Henry continued in all these roles until his death at 80 in May 1878.

Joseph Henry was at the heart of critical institutions that controlled resources both tangible and intangible which were critical to the promotion and support of scientific activity in the United States. These volumes provide unique access to the primary documents and to the contextual analysis that tell the story of the rise of science to a place of political influence and cultural importance in a nation that (now) thinks of itself as a scientific world power.
Review


Kenneth P. Minkema

With the long-anticipated appearance of the first volume of *The Joseph Smith Papers*, a landmark project in American religious history and in Mormon Studies commences. Containing the scribal and printed remains of the founder and organizer of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The Joseph Smith Papers*, when completed, will amount to some thirty-two volumes—a phenomenal undertaking in an age when the magisterial, multivolume printed edition is an endangered species. Under the general editorship of distinguished historians Dean C. Jessee, Ronald K. Esplin, and Richard Lyman Bushman, the edition is arranged in six series: Journals, Documents, Revelations and Translations (which will include the printer’s manuscript of *The Book of Mormon*), History, Legal and Business, and Administrative. Documents included in this collection are those created by Joseph Smith or by staff whose work the Prophet directed, as well as papers received, collected, and generated by his office.

The *Journals* series begins this ambitious project in American religious history with the unaltered and unabridged transcripts of each of Smith’s known journals. A general introduction contextualizes the five journals presented here, highlighting the diverse roles these journals played—recording movements, visits, decisions, letters, disciplinary cases, revelations, and personal details—and the features that distinguish each journal from the others. Especially interesting is the role of Smith’s scribes, such as Oliver Cowdery, Frederick Williams, and Parley Pratt, who took dictation from Smith, kept entries in his name, or committed their own memoranda relating to Smith and church activities to the record books. The journals are sporadic, with many lacunae, reflecting the unsettled nature of the movement at this time, subject to animosity, lawsuits, forced relocations, and violence. Through it all, what emerges from these documents is not only the historical consciousness that Mormons possessed, but also the importance of the impulse for community—“gathering,” as Smith and his followers called it. This impulse, formative for church, community, family, and self, was at once the strength of the movement but also its bane, because of the fear that gathered Mormons engendered among others.

The first journal, from 1832, is the book that contains the most entries by Smith himself; with the exception of only a few contributions in Smith’s hand, subsequent journals were kept by scribes. The second journal (1835–36) is by far
the largest of the five, preserving a wide range of activities though focused around the construction and dedication of the House of the Lord in Kirtland, to which Smith lent an incredible amount of energy. The third journal (March–September 1838) bridges the move from Ohio to Missouri, where Smith established a new church headquarters. The next journal, covering the two succeeding months of 1838, a time of increasing legal threats against Smith and the church, was kept by scribe James Mulholland, probably to keep track of Smith’s whereabouts. Finally there is the 1839 “Minute Book,” covering the period from Smith’s escape from a Missouri jail and arrival in Illinois, up to the point when he and other representatives were preparing to depart for Washington, D.C., to meet with political leaders, including President Van Buren, for a redress of their grievances.

There has been no lack of voluminous histories of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, produced by its church historians and others; indeed, the Mormons have been more conscious of their own history, arguably, than nearly any other religious movement. None of the earlier narratives and documentary collections, however, had access to the range of manuscripts, ephemera, and other sources that the staff of the Joseph Smith Papers enjoys, and none employs the modern standards that will surely make this the authoritative edition. Readers need not raise a skeptical eyebrow when they see this edition is produced by LDS members and printed by an LDS press. While this project is meant in part to be a resource for its own constituency, there is an impartiality and professionalism here in the tone, subjects, and sources that bode well for this series and edition as a reliable resource for all. What some readers may quibble with is the short shrift that some important questions have been given, such as Joseph Smith’s association with a band of treasure-seekers (p. xix)—though the argument can be made that this phase of Smith’s life predates this collection—or the dissension within the leadership that led to the 1838 excommunication of several significant leaders (pp. xl, 231).

The texts are presented as “verbatim transcripts,” preserving original wording, spelling (which varies greatly, reflecting the different levels of education among Smith and his scribes), punctuation, capitalization, insertions, deletions, and later interpolations. (It is the intention of the Smith Papers to make digital scans of the original documents available on the project’s website, josephsmithpapers.org.) Original line lengths are not preserved. Handwriting changes are noted along with other textual features. Entries and words in Smith’s own handwriting are printed in boldface.

Annotation is copious. Though the editors do not pretend to present a “unified narrative,” besides editorial headnotes to each source, additional headnotes do fill in gaps between and within journals. Footnotes utilize a broad variety of primary and secondary literature. References to contemporary sources range over newspapers, territorial, county, and state records, genealogical records,
correspondence, diaries, and iterations of journal entries in Mormon scriptures. The notes also incorporate an impressive array of multidisciplinary monographs, articles, theses, and dissertations on American history and from the rapidly growing body of titles in Mormon Studies.

The primary sources provided in this volume, and to be included in subsequent ones, are supplemented by an array of reference aids. These include, placed at appropriate locations through the text, timelines, maps, images of individuals, locations, and sample manuscript pages. A series of appendices, entitled “Reference Materials,” presents chronologies, a geographical directory, more maps, a pedigree chart, a biographical directory (identifying individuals named in the texts), ecclesiastical organizational charts, a glossary of terms, and other aids.

While this is not a born-digital project, the Smith Papers staff intends to mount digital, searchable versions of the transcripts on its site in the near future. Ideally, the archive will be mounted on an XML-based, open-access platform that will allow for cross-searching with other digital archives, whether already online or in process. This interoperability will greatly enhance scholars’ abilities to frame questions of both greater breadth and detail, and acquire almost instantaneous results.

Some readers will be disappointed about the lack of an index in this premier volume. However, the intention of the editors is to include a cumulative index in the third and final volume of the Journals. In the meantime, a printable, searchable index for volume 1 is available at the project’s website.
Recent Editions

Compiled by Margaret A. Hogan

This annual bibliography of documentary editions recently published in the fields of American and British history, literature, and culture is generally restricted to scholarly first editions of English-language works. In addition to the bibliographical references, Internet addresses are provided for the editorial project or the publisher.

ADAMS FAMILY. Adams Family Correspondence, Volume 9: January 1790 to December 1793. Edited by Margaret A. Hogan, C. James Taylor, Karen N. Barzilay, Hobson Woodward, Mary T. Claffey, Robert F. Karachuk, Sara B. Sikes, and Gregg L. Lint. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2009. 624 pp. $100. ISBN: 9780674032750. This volume covers the early years of the American republic under the new constitution, as the nation struggled to create a functioning government amid increasingly bitter factionalism. As usual, the Adams family found themselves in the midst of it all. John, as vice president, faithfully chaired Senate sessions even as he was prevented from participating in any meaningful fashion. Abigail joined him when her health permitted, but even from afar, provided important advice and keen observations on American politics and society. All three sons continued to build their legal careers, while daughter Nabby expanded her family and dealt with the financial schemes of her ambitious husband, William Stephens Smith.

http://www.adamspapers.org

ALCOHOL. George Saintsbury, Notes on a Cellar-Book. Edited by Thomas Pinney. University of California Press. 2008. 304 pp. $29.95. ISBN: 9780520253520. Since its original publication in 1920, George Saintsbury’s Notes on a Cellar-Book has remained one of the greatest tributes to drink and drinking in the literature of wine. This new edition reproduces the original with full annotation to explain the many cultural references and also includes additional articles on wine by Saintsbury.

http://www.ucpress.edu

AMERICAN SOUTH. See HAILE, C. M.

AMERICAN WEST. See BOURKE, JOHN GREGORY; EMBREE FAMILY;
HALL, JAMES; ROYCE, SARAH

ANTHONY, SUSAN B. See WOMEN’S HISTORY.

BACON, EDWARD W. Double Duty in the Civil War: The Letters of Sailor and Soldier Edward W. Bacon. Edited by George S. Burkhardt. Southern Illinois University Press. 2009. 272 pp. $27.95. ISBN: 9780809329106. Edward Bacon, an eighteen-year-old Yale student, left Connecticut in 1861 to fight for the United States. Serving in both the Union army and navy, he had a sweeping view of the Civil War. This work compiles both his letters home to friends and family and portions of his diary, documenting a range of activities from riverine warfare on the Mississippi to infantry drills in South Carolina. It also provides a rare account of the service of a white officer with black troops, revealing much of his beliefs regarding race, slavery, and the Union cause.

http://www.siu.edu/~siupress

BECKETT, SAMUEL. The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume 1: 1929–1940. Edited by Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge University Press. 2009. 882 pp. $50. ISBN: 9780521867931. The letters written by Beckett between 1929 and 1940 provide a vivid and personal view of Western Europe in the 1930s and mark the gradual emergence of Beckett’s unique voice and sensibility. This edition, a planned four volumes, offers for the first time a comprehensive range of letters—selected from over 15,000 extant—of one of the greatest literary figures of the twentieth century.

http://www.graduateschool.emory.edu/beckettletters/

BOURKE, JOHN GREGORY. The Diaries of John Gregory Bourke, Volume 4: 3 July 1880 to 22 May 1881. Edited by Charles M. Robinson III. University of North Texas Press. 2009. 592 pp. $55. ISBN: 9781574412635. This fourth volume of the Bourke diaries chronicles the political and managerial affairs in General George Crook’s Department of the Platte. Major issues include the continuing controversy surrounding the forced relocation of the Ponca Indians and Bourke’s ethnological work under official sanction from the U.S. army and the Bureau of Ethnology.

http://www.tamu.edu/upress

ests. A comprehensive edition of the surviving Mercers’ accounts from 1347 to 1464, this set opens a unique window onto the day-to-day workings of one of England’s most powerful institutions at the height of its influence.

CATHER, WILLA. *Sapphira and the Slave Girl*. History essay and explanatory notes by Ann Romines; textual essay and editing by Charles W. Mignon, Kari A. Ronning, and Frederick M. Link. University of Nebraska Press. 2009. 688 pp. $80. ISBN: 9780803214354. Cather’s final novel, *Sapphira and the Slave Girl* is set in 1856 Virginia and draws on Cather’s own family and local history to examine a slave-owning family in the last years of slavery. More early drafts, including manuscripts, are available for this work than for any other Cather novel, so the editors are able to provide new insights into Cather’s composition process.

CATHER, WILLA. *Youth and the Bright Medusa*. Historical essay and explanatory notes by Mark J. Madigan; textual essay and editing by Frederick M. Link, Charles W. Mignon, Judith Boss, and Kari A. Ronning. University of Nebraska Press. 2009. 646 pp. $80. ISBN: 9780803217546. In 1920, Cather collected eight of the stories she had written over the past twenty years into *Youth and the Bright Medusa*. These stories chronicle the difficult pursuit of the “bright medusa” of art in a hostile, materialistic world.

CHASE FAMILY. “Spur Up Your Pegasus”: *Family Letters of Salmon, Kate, and Nettie Chase, 1844–1873*. Edited by James P. McClure, Peg A. Llampier, and Erika M. Kreger. The Kent State University Press. 2009. 508 pp. $70. ISBN: 9780873389884. This volume includes all the known surviving letters to American statesman Salmon P. Chase from his daughters Kate (b. 1840) and her half-sister Nettie (b. 1847), and selected letters from the many that he wrote to them. Also included are a few letters to and from the girls’ mothers, who both died of tuberculosis; Kate’s and Nettie’s husbands; and two of their boarding-school headmistresses. The correspondence documents aspects of family relationships, childhood, social life, education, religion, and health in nineteenth-century America.

CIVIL WAR. See BACON, EDWARD W.; DULANY, IDA POWELL; GRIERSON, BENJAMIN H.; MCNEILL, SALLIE; PAINE, HALBERT ELEAZER; PARKER, ROBERT W.; RICHARDS, SAMUEL PEARCE; RUMLEY, JAMES; UNDERWOOD, JOSIE; WALKER, C. IRVINE
In *Ned Myers*, Cooper sought to contribute to the contemporary interest in realistic accounts of maritime life by writing the life of a typical common seaman, Ned Myers. Cooper had sailed with Myers in the first decade of the nineteenth century; the old salt had contacted the famous author in the 1840s, and Cooper based his account on conversations with Myers.

http://www.wjfc.org/

**COTTON, JOHN, JR.** *The Correspondence of John Cotton Jr.* Edited by Sheila McIntyre and Len Travers. Colonial Society of Massachusetts. 2009. 640 pp. $49.50. ISBN: 9780979466229. The second son of one of New England’s most famous clergymen, John Cotton Jr. (1633–1699) became a pastor by the age of twenty-two but lost the ministry due to a sexual scandal. After rehabilitating his reputation as a missionary to the Indians, he returned to the ministry at Plymouth, a position he held for thirty years before again losing it in another scandal. His letters, written to be widely circulated, document some of the most important and dramatic events of the late seventeenth century, including King Philip’s War and the eventual overthrow of the hated Dominion of New England.

http://www.colonialsociety.org


http://oupress.com

**DARWIN, CHARLES.** *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin, Volume 17: 1869.* Edited by Frederick Burkhardt. Cambridge University Press. 2009. 818 pp. $140. ISBN: 9780521190305. Throughout 1869, Darwin continued to collect data for his two books: *The Descent of Man* and *Expression of the Emotions*. He corresponded with explorers, diplomats, and missionaries all over the world, asking for assistance with his continuing investigations into human evolution. He inquired of them, for example, how emotions such as surprise, anger, and shame are expressed in different cultures.

http://www.cambridge.org
DAVIS, JEFFERSON. *The Papers of Jefferson Davis, Volume 12: June 1865 to December 1870*. Edited by Lynda Lasswell Crist, Suzanne Scott Gibbs, Brady L. Hutchison, and Elizabeth Henson Smith; introduction by William J. Cooper Jr. Louisiana State University Press. 2008. 696 pp. $105. ISBN: 9780807133415. Volume 12 of *The Papers of Jefferson Davis* follows the former president of the Confederacy as he and his family fight to find their place in the world after the Civil War. A federal prisoner, incarcerated while the government decided whether, where, and by whom he should be tried for treason, Davis was initially allowed to correspond only with his wife and counsel. Released from prison after two years, he was not free from legal proceedings until 1869. After wandering in Canada and Europe, he finally settled in Memphis as president of a life insurance company.

http://jeffersondavis.rice.edu/

DREISER, THEODORE. *Letters to Women: New Letters, Volume 2*. Edited by Thomas P. Riggio. University of Illinois Press. 2009. 384 pp. $60. ISBN: 9780252033766. This second volume of Dreiser’s correspondence gathers previously unpublished letters he wrote to women between 1893 and 1945. Many show personal feelings that he revealed nowhere else. He also used them to discuss his writings, to point out where he thought he had succeeded or failed, and to seek out approval or criticism. They provide an intimate view of a master writer.

http://www.press.uillinois.edu


http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/
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Confederacy. Her journal documents not only her day-to-day experiences in the Civil War but also how her community coped with extreme conditions. The account reveals the southern culture of the time, demonstrating the importance of community, the unwavering faith in God and the righteousness of the Confeder ate cause, and the demonization of Union soldiers.

EAKINS, THOMAS. The Paris Letters of Thomas Eakins. Edited by William Innes Homer. Princeton University Press. 2009. 392 pp. $35. ISBN: 9780691138084. The first complete compilation of Thomas Eakins’ letters from Paris, written between 1866 and 1870, this work offers considerable new information on Eakins, providing a much richer picture of his artistic development and casting fresh light on his debated psychosexual makeup. The correspondence covers Eakins’ frank comments about human relationships, male companionship, marriage, and women, and also offers his vivid, sometimes comic impressions of Paris. The book is illustrated with the small drawings Eakins included in his correspondence, as well as additional photographs and paintings.


EINSTEIN, ALBERT. The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein, Volume 11: Cumulative Index, Bibliography, List of Correspondence, Chronology, and Errata to Volumes 1–10. Compiled by A. J. Kox, Tilman Sauer, Diana Kormos Buchwald, Rudy Hirschmann, Osk Moses, Benjamin Aronin, and Jennifer Stolper. Princeton University Press. 2009. 664 pp. $125. ISBN: 9780691141879. This volume provides a cumulative index to the first ten volumes of Einstein’s collected papers, the first complete bibliography of his scientific and nonscientific writings until 1921, and a succinct biographical time line. It also contains two complete lists of Einstein’s correspondence up through 1920, arranged both chronologically and alphabetically. Collectively, the volume serves as an important research tool for delving into Einstein’s written legacy; his interactions with colleagues, family, and friends; and his scientific, political, educational, and social activities.
EINSTEIN, ALBERT. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein, Volume 12: The Berlin Years: Correspondence, January–December 1921*. Edited by Diana Kormos Buchwald, Ze’ev Rosenkranz, Tilman Sauer, József Illy, and Virginia Iris Holmes. Princeton University Press. 2009. 696 pp. $125. ISBN: 9780691141909. Einstein’s visible public persona is amply documented in his correspondence, honors and prizes, lectures and travels, and articles all covered in this volume. He remained primarily preoccupied with scientific issues, particularly the emerging field of quantum theory, and continued his own original research, but he also found time to travel to the United States for the first time, to fundraise for Zionism, to weigh in on German reparations, and to assist Russian physicists in rebuilding Russian science.

http://www.einstein.caltech.edu/


http://www.einstein.caltech.edu/

EMBREE FAMILY. *Tandem Lives: The Frontier Texas Diaries of Henrietta Baker Embree and Tennessee Keys Embree, 1856–1884*. Edited by Amy L. Wink. University of Tennessee Press. 2009. 448 pp. $56. ISBN: 9781572335042. Publishing for the first time the diaries of the two wives of Dr. John W. Embree, this volume offers a complex and intimate perspective on women’s cultural experiences in mid-nineteenth-century Texas. These diaries reveal the social and personal challenges women faced in a region beset first by the Civil War and then by Reconstruction, illuminating how these women coped with such issues as domestic violence, childrearing, faith, frailty, and morality.

http://utpress.org

essays, “Works and Days,” “Clubs,” “Courage,” “Success,” and “Farming.” This edition is based on Emerson’s holograph manuscripts and published sources. The text incorporates corrections and revisions he recorded in both sources, and thus restores for the reader the text he actually wrote. Although he is still visibly the insistent optimist of his early and middle career, here Emerson assumes a more pragmatic attitude than formerly toward the life of the mind and the imagination. *Society and Solitude* captures the penultimate expression of Emersonian Transcendentalism and Romanticism.

http://www.bup.harvard.edu

ENNIS, SEAMUS. *Going to the Well for Water: The Seamus Ennis Field Diary 1942–1946*. Edited by Rionach Uí Ogáin. Cork University Press. 2009. 544 pp. €49. ISBN: 9781859184370. This is a translation of the diaries of Seamus Ennis, full-time collector of music and song with the Irish Folklore Commission, describing his day-to-day work, the people he met, the material he gathered, and his constant communication with the head office in Dublin. It also paints a vivid picture of daily life in Ireland during World War II and the social life of the period.

http://www.corkuniversitypress.com

FARRAND, BEATRIX. *The Collected Writings of Beatrix Farrand: American Landscape Gardener, 1872–1959*. Edited by Carmen Pearson. University Press of New England. 2009. 240 pp. $55. ISBN: 9781584657934. Beatrix Jones Farrand was among the first professional American women landscape gardeners and one of the founding members of the American Society of Landscape Architects. She believed in using native plant materials to connect the natural and designed landscape. This volume includes most of her written work, including a gardening diary and an array of essays, culled from her papers archived at the University of California-Berkeley and Harvard University’s Arnold Arboretum.

http://www.upne.com

FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN. *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 39: 21 January to 15 May 1783*. Edited by Ellen R. Cohn, Jonathan R. Dull, Karen Duval, Kate M. Ohno, Michael Sletcher, Philipp Ziesche, Alicia K. Anderson, Elizabeth Morris, and Claude A. Lopez. Yale University Press. 2008. 752 pp. $95. ISBN: 9780300134483. In the four months following the 20 January 1783 armistice that ended the Revolutionary War, Franklin was remarkably energetic as he helped oversee the transition to peace and waged a multifaceted campaign to publicize the ideals of the new nation. Though political turmoil in Britain delayed negotiations for the definitive peace treaty, Franklin successfully negotiated a commercial treaty with Sweden.

http://yalepress.yale.edu
FRANKLIN, LADY JANE. *As Affecting the Fate of My Absent Husband: Selected Letters of Lady Franklin Concerning the Search for the Lost Franklin Expedition, 1848–1860*. Edited by Erika Behrisc Elce. McGill–Queen’s University Press. 2009. 240 pp. $39.95. ISBN: 9780773534797. The letters of Lady Jane Franklin provide a personal dimension to and show the domestic side of the tragedy of the lost Franklin expedition (1845–1848). Lady Franklin played a crucial role in the search for her husband, corresponding with British prime ministers, members of Parliament, lords of the admiralty, and even the president of the United States. The letters also demonstrate the significance of the loss of the expedition to the British public and the nation’s sense of itself as an imperial power.

http://mqup.mcgill.ca

GILMAN, CHARLOTTE PERKINS. *The Selected Letters of Charlotte Perkins Gilman*. Edited by Denise D. Knight and Jennifer S. Tuttle. University of Alabama Press. 2009. 400 pp. $60. ISBN: 9780817316488. Charlotte Perkins Gilman has reemerged as a major American literary figure, evidenced by the republication of many of her stories and novels, as well as by an explosion of scholarship about her. This collection of letters—the last significant portion of Gilman’s private papers to remain unpublished—fills a crucial gap in the scholarship, providing countless insights into her character through her own words.

http://www.uapress.ua.edu


http://www.history.umd.edu/gompers

nificant and turbulent regions of the Third World, embellished by his thoughts about the changing nature of American economic and foreign policies and Grady’s own role as a representative of that system. Grady, who served as an American diplomat in India, Italy, Greece, and Iran, offers new perspectives on and an important critique of U.S. foreign policy in the first half of the twentieth century.

http://press.umsystem.edu

GRIERSON, BENJAMIN H. *A Just and Righteous Cause: Benjamin H. Grierson’s Civil War Memoir*. Edited by Bruce J. Dinges and Shirley A. Leckie. Southern Illinois University Press. 2008. 528 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9780809328598. General Benjamin Grierson is best known as the Union general who helped facilitate the capture of Vicksburg. His memoir, however, offers a more complete picture of the man, beginning with his childhood and youth, then covering the early years of his marriage and his business activities prior to his becoming a cavalry officer. It touches on his antislavery views, Republican Party principles, and the military strategy and tactics he taught himself. It also provides intimate accounts of his relationships with various prominent politicians and Union leaders including Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, and Ulysses S. Grant.

http://www.siu.edu/~siupress

HAILE, C. M. *C. M. Haile’s “Pardon Jones” Letters: Old Southwest Humor from Antebellum Louisiana*. Edited by Ed Piacentino. Louisiana State University Press. 2009. 264 pp. $37.50. ISBN: 9780807134375. From 1840 to 1848, journalist C. M. Haile published a series of mock letters to the editor in the *New Orleans Picayune* under the pseudonym “Pardon Jones.” Their rural dialect, outlandish characters, and farcical situations made the letters extremely popular, and they became a regular feature in the newspaper. Ed Piacentino has collected all sixty-seven epistles here, highlighting this trove of Old Southwest humor.

http://www.lsu.edu/lsupress

HALL, JAMES. *“The Indian Hater” and Other Stories, by James Hall*. Edited by Edward Watts. Kent State University Press. 2009. 212 pp. $19.95. ISBN: 9781606350164. James Hall (1793–1867), a prolific short-story writer, was a lawyer and judge in 1820s Illinois and later a businessman in Cincinnati. His tales of the American West were extremely popular at the time, despite their depictions of complex cultural collisions on the frontier. The volume includes two versions of “The Indian Hater,” Hall’s most famous story, including one that ends with an interracial marriage, a controversial theme at the time.

http://upress.kent.edu
HARROLD, EDMUND. *The Diary of Edmund Harrold, Wigmaker of Manchester 1712–15.* Edited by Craig Horner. Ashgate Press. 2008. 216 pp. $99.95. ISBN: 9780754661726. This volume presents a fully referenced, modern edition of the diary of the Manchester barber Edmund Harrold. It offers insights into his life and thoughts, laying open his struggles with alcohol, his attitudes toward marital sex, his reactions to the deaths of his three wives and five children, and his religious meditations upon these and other subjects. The diary also relates the ups and downs of his business and the day-to-day realities of life as a provincial barber.

http://www.ashgate.com


http://www.syracuseuniversitypress.syr.edu

HARTRANFT, JOHN FREDERICK. *The Lincoln Assassination Conspirators: Their Confinement and Execution, as Recorded in the Letterbook of John Frederick Hartranft.* Edited by Edward Steers Jr. and Harold Holzer. Louisiana State University Press. 2009. 200 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9780807133965. Two weeks after Lincoln’s assassination, John Frederick Hartranft was appointed commander of the military prison at the Washington Arsenal, where the eight alleged conspirators in the assassination were incarcerated. Hartranft kept a meticulously detailed account of his experiences overseeing the prison in the form of a letterbook, published here for the first time. He dutifully recorded all aspects of the prisoners’ routines, and his records shed light on many of the legal and moral issues raised in the aftermath of the assassination, including the use of military rather than civil justice and the treatment of the accused.

http://www.lsu.edu/lsupress

HEILMAN, ROBERT B. *Robert B. Heilman: His Life in Letters.* Edited by Edward Alexander, Richard Dunn, and Paul Jaussen. University of Washington Press. 2009. 808 pp. $60. ISBN: 9780295988665. This collection contains over 600 letters to and from the literary critic Robert Berthold Heilman with an array of important twentieth-century figures including Saul Bellow, Bernard Malamud, and William Carlos Williams. They provide a sense of Heilman’s character and achievements in the context of American letters, as well as an inside history of
the changes that took place over sixty years in American universities, literary criticism, and the politics of literature.

http://www.washington.edu/uwpRESS

JAMES, HENRY. *The Complete Letters of Henry James, Volume 1: 1872–1876*. Edited by Pierre A. Walker and Greg W. Zacharias. University of Nebraska Press. 2009. 486 pp. $125. ISBN: 9780803222250. Comprising more than 10,000 letters reflecting on a remarkable range of topics—from James’s own life and literary projects to broader questions about art, literature, and criticism—*The Complete Letters of Henry James* is an important resource for students of James and of American and English literature, culture, and criticism. This is the third volume in the edition and the first of three volumes presenting James’s letters from 1872 to 1876. It contains eighty letters, forty-four of which are published for the first time, dating from 20 May 1872 to 8 July 1873.

http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu

JEFFERS, ROBINSON. *The Collected Letters of Robinson Jeffers, with Selected Letters of Una Jeffers, Volume 1: 1890–1930*. Edited by James Karman. Stanford University Press. 2009. 1,016 pp. $95. ISBN: 9780804762519. This is the first volume of a planned three-volume, fully annotated edition that collects all of noted California poet Robinson Jeffers’ letters and the most important of Una Jeffers’ letters. Comprising material written between 1890 and 1930, and a substantial introduction of Jeffers’ life and work, this volume imparts a completely new understanding of Jeffers’ formative years. Readers will witness the evolution of Robinson and Una’s relationship, their move to Carmel, the building of Tor House and Hawk Tower, Jeffers’ maturation as a poet, the couple’s widening circle of friends, and their first trip together to the British Isles.

http://www.sup.org

JEFFERSON, THOMAS. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Volume 35: 1 August to 30 November 1801*. Edited by Barbara B. Oberg. Princeton University Press. 2009. 878 pp. $99.50. ISBN: 9780691137735. For the first two months covered by this volume, Jefferson was residing at Monticello, avoiding the sickly season in the nation’s capital and enjoying visits from both daughters and their families. In Washington, the construction of buildings for the nation’s capital was moving forward, along with the interior decoration of the President’s House. As the city took shape, so too did the operating principles of Jefferson’s administration, including “the mode & degrees of communication” for conducting business. In mid-November, he entered a period of intense activity in the preparation of his first annual message to Congress.

http://press.princeton.edu
JEFFERSON, THOMAS. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series, Volume 5: 1 May 1812 to 10 March 1813*. Edited by J. Jefferson Looney. Princeton University Press. 790 pp. $99.50 ISBN: 9780691137711. The 592 documents in this volume describe complex legal disputes that took up much of Jefferson’s attention. The War of 1812 began, and Jefferson counseled reconciliation within his own country while suggesting that if Britain bombarded New York, America should recruit discontented British incendiaries to burn London. He received anonymous letters urging him to convert to Christianity, reacted to a colorful assortment of authors and inventors, including a fraudulent perpetual-motion discoverer, and settled a wager for one correspondent who asked if he had ever met the British king.

http://press.princeton.edu

JOHNSON, SAMUEL. *Sir John Hawkins, The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Edited by O. M. Brack Jr. University of Georgia Press. 2009. 528 pp. $59.95. ISBN: 9780820329956. This is the first and only scholarly edition of Sir John Hawkins’ *Life of Samuel Johnson*, a work that has not been widely available in complete form for more than 200 years. Published in 1787, some four years before James Boswell’s biography of Johnson, Hawkins’ *Life* complements, clarifies, and often corrects numerous aspects of Boswell’s *Life*. Brack annotates the text and also provides a history of the composition, publication, and reception of Hawkins’ work.

http://www.ugapress.org

KELLEY, FLORENCE. *The Selected Letters of Florence Kelley, 1869–1931*. Edited by Kathryn Kish Sklar and Beverly Wilson Palmer. University of Illinois Press. 2009. 640 pp. $75. ISBN: 9780252034046. This volume of nearly 300 letters, rendered in Kelley’s vivid, often combative prose, covers her years as the head of the National Consumers’ League; her campaigns that led to the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, the eight-hour workday and minimum wage, and federal health care legislation for women and children; her crusade against child labor; and her work as a founding member of the NAACP. The letters also provide a view into the personal life of a reformer who balanced her career with her responsibilities as a single mother of three children.

http://www.press.uillinois.edu

KNIPTASH, VERNON E. *On the Western Front with the Rainbow Division: A World War I Diary*. Edited by E. Bruce Geelhoed. University of Oklahoma Press. 2009. 256 pp. $29.95. ISBN: 9780806140322. Vernon E. Kniptash, an Indiana national guardsman who served as a radio operator in the Rainbow Division during World War I, describes in his diary the experiences of an ordinary soldier thrust into the most violent conflict the world had seen to date. His writings
move from his initial enthusiasm at enlistment to the horrors of combat and the
drugery of daily routine. Because he remained in Europe following the
armistice, his diary also covers the occupation period.

http://oupress.com

LINCOLN, ABRAHAM. The Lincoln Assassination: The Evidence. Edited by
pp. $125. ISBN: 9780252033681. Thousands of documents were collected in
1865 for the trial of the conspirators in the Lincoln assassination. Together, these
letters, depositions, eyewitness accounts, and investigative reports, among other
items, provide considerable insight into the historical, cultural, and judicial con-
text of the investigation. Most, however, were not used in the trial and have never
been readily accessible. Bringing together annotated and indexed transcriptions
of these materials gives researchers significant new access to information on the
events surrounding the assassination and a new perspective on the social and po-
litical history of the Civil War era.

http://www.press.uiillinois.edu

LINCOLN, ABRAHAM. Lincoln on Race and Slavery. Edited by Henry Louis
$24.95. ISBN: 9780691142340. The first complete collection of Lincoln’s im-
portant writings on race and slavery, this book allows readers to explore the con-
trictions contained in his views on these topics. While Lincoln issued the
Emancipation Proclamation, authorized the use of black troops during the Civil
War, and supported a constitutional amendment outlawing slavery, he also had
grave doubts about the intellectual capacity of blacks and favored permanent
racial segregation and voluntary colonization of former slaves in Africa. This
works charts the evolution of Lincoln’s racial attitudes and demonstrates the
complexities of his beliefs.

http://press.princeton.edu

LINCOLN, ABRAHAM. See also HARTRANFT, JOHN FREDERICK.

MCDONALD, JAMES G. Refugees and Rescue: The Diaries and Papers of James G.
McDonald, 1935–1945. Edited by Richard Breitman, Barbara McDonald Stew-
ISBN: 9780253353078. This volume, the second of three, documents James G.
McDonald’s attempts to rescue European Jews from the impending Holocaust.
McDonald, who resigned as League of Nations High Commissioner for
Refugees in 1935, became chairman of President Franklin Roosevelt’s advisory
committee on refugees in 1938. From that position, he worked to save as many
people as possible, though his efforts were hampered by pervasive anti-Semitism, fears about security, and changing presidential wartime priorities.

MCNEILL, SALLIE. *The Uncompromising Diary of Sallie McNeill, 1858–1867.* Edited by Ginny McNeill Raska and Mary Lynne Gasaway Hill. Texas A&M University Press. 2009. 216 pp. $32.50. ISBN 9781603440875. In this annotated diary, Sallie McNeill chronicles thoughts, observations, and details of her daily life during the Civil War and Reconstruction. McNeill’s story—common to the place and era and yet still intensely personal—lets readers glimpse the numbing expectations of a woman’s proper behavior, the intellectual questions posed by the education of the day, and the lifestyle of the planter class in Texas.

MELVILLE, HERMAN. *The Writings of Herman Melville, Volume 11: Published Poems: Battle-Pieces, John Marr, Timoleon.* Edited by Robert C. Ryan, Harrison Hayford, Alma MacDougall Reising, and G. Thomas Tanselle. Northwestern University Press. 2009. 1,040 pp. $99.95. ISBN: 9780810126053. The second to last volume in the *Writings of Herman Melville* series, *Published Poems* focuses on Melville the poet. Although Melville did not publish his first book of poetry until 1866, he had long been steeped in poetry and this work brings together for the first time all of the pieces published in his lifetime.


MORMONS. *See WOODRUFF FAMILY*

This volume sheds light on the role of the medical and scientific communities in Canada in the twentieth century through the correspondence of two of the country’s most distinguished microbiologists, Everitt G. D. Murray (1890–1964), and his son, Robert G. Murray. Their letters also cover a period of important political and social changes, with World War II and the Cold War affecting both their professional careers and personal lives.

http://www.champlainssociety.ca

NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY. See BOURKE, JOHN GREGORY; CRAFT, FRANCIS M.; POSEY, ALEXANDER; THOMPSON, DAVID

PAINE, HALBERT ELEAZER. *A Wisconsin Yankee in Confederate Bayou Country: The Civil War Reminiscences of a Union General.* Edited by Samuel C. Hyde Jr. Louisiana State University Press. 2009. 200 pp. $32.50. ISBN: 9780807134184. Forty years after the end of the Civil War, Gen. Halbert Eleazer Paine, who commanded the Fourth Wisconsin Regiment of Volunteers, wrote his recollections of his wartime activities, including his involvement in the Vicksburg campaign, the capture of New Orleans, the Battle of Baton Rouge, and the siege of Port Hudson. The reminiscences reveal some of Paine’s internal conflicts—his sympathy for southern families but his tolerance of excessive looting by Union soldiers and other forms of retribution.

http://www.lsu.edu/lsupress

PARKER, ROBERT W. *Lee’s Last Casualty: The Life and Letters of Sgt. Robert W. Parker, Second Virginia Cavalry.* Edited by Catherine M. Wright. University of Tennessee Press. 2008. 240 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9781572336308. The letters assembled in this rich collection were written by Robert W. Parker, an enlisted Confederate cavalryman who is thought to have been the last man killed in action in the Army of Northern Virginia during the Civil War. A Confederate “Everyman,” his letters describe life as an enlisted soldier in most of the major Virginia campaigns. They also reveal how local communities worked together to support the war effort, providing food, clothing, and moral support.

http://utpress.org

PLOTKIN, ABRAHAM. *An American in Hitler’s Berlin: Abraham Plotkin’s Diary, 1932–33.* Edited by Catherine Collomp and Bruno Groppo. University of Illinois Press. 2009. 248 pp. $60. ISBN: 9780252033612. This is the first published edition of the diary of Abraham Plotkin, an American labor leader of immigrant Jewish origins who lived in Berlin between November 1932 and June 1933. He provides a firsthand account of the final months of the Weimar Republic and the
early rise of Nazi power in Germany, with a focus on the German working class, the labor movement, and the plight of German Jews.

http://www.press.uiillinois.edu

POLK, JAMES K. *Correspondence of James K. Polk, Volume 11: 1846*. Edited by Wayne Cutler, James L. Rogers II, Benjamin H. Severance, Cynthia J. Rogers, Trevor A. Smith, and William K. Bolt. University of Tennessee Press, 2009. 568 pp. $55. ISBN: 9781572336476. The eleventh volume of the Polk correspondence covers the year 1846 and focuses on the president’s four major goals for his administration: resolution of the Oregon boundary dispute with Great Britain, acquisition of Upper California, creation of an independent treasury system, and reduction of tariff duties on nonluxury imports. A fifth major objective, resumption of diplomatic relations with Mexico, ended with Mariano Paredes’ military coup and his regime’s determination to reverse the United States’s annexation of Texas. The outbreak of the Mexican-American War and subsequent mobilization of the volunteers add consequential threads of historical interest to the letters to and from the nation’s eleventh president.

http://utpress.org

POSEY, ALEXANDER. *Lost Creeks: Collected Journals*. Edited by Matthew Wynn Sivils. University of Nebraska Press. 2009. 200 pp. $45. ISBN: 9780803216280. *Lost Creeks* collects for the first time all the journals and shorter autobiographical works of noted Muscogee (Creek) writer, humorist, and political activist Alexander Posey (1873–1908). In his brief life, Posey became an influential political spokesperson, man of letters, and advocate for better conditions in Indian Territory.

http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu

RANDALL, DUDLEY. *Roses and Revolutions: The Selected Writings of Dudley Randall*. Edited by Melba Joyce Boyd. Wayne State University Press. 2009. 256 pp. $27.95. ISBN: 9780814334454. Dudley Randall was one of the foremost voices in African American literature during the twentieth century, best known for his poetry and work as the editor and publisher of Broadside Press in Detroit. *Roses and Revolutions* brings together his most popular poems with his lesser-known short stories and several essays, many of which were, until now, out of print.

http://www.wsupress.wayne.edu

Bookseller Samuel Pearce Richards (1824–1910) kept a diary for sixty-seven years, and this volume excerpts material from October 1860, just before Lincoln’s election, to August 1865, when the Richards family returned after a year’s exile in New York City following Sherman’s occupation of Atlanta. The diary recounts Richards’ conflicted attitudes toward the war and the Confederacy, the social life of the city, race relations, religion, and the challenges of families divided politically and geographically by the war.

http://www.ugapress.org

ROYCE, SARAH. Across the Plains: Sarah Royce’s Western Narrative. Edited by Jennifer Dawes Adkison. University of Arizona Press. 2009. 128 pp. $19.95. ISBN: 9780816527267. On 30 April 1849, Sarah Royce and her husband Josiah left their home in Iowa and headed for California in a covered wagon. Along the way, she kept a diary that, thirty years later, served as the basis for a memoir she entitled Across the Plains. This volume is a new transcription of the original handwritten document and provides the full text, including portions omitted from previous editions. It also gives new context to a memoir that was deliberately constructed to portray faith and fortitude as the foundations of California history.

http://www.uapress.arizona.edu

RUMLEY, JAMES. The Southern Mind under Union Rule: The Diary of James Rumley, Beaufort, North Carolina, 1862–1865. Edited by Judkin Browning. University Press of Florida. 2009. 216 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9780813034072. James Rumley, a clerk of the Superior Court of Carteret County, North Carolina, was nearly fifty years old when a Union fleet took control of the region in 1862. In response to laws enacted by the occupying force, Rumley took the Oath of Allegiance and publicly cooperated with the Union forces. Privately, however, he poured all his horror, disgust, and outrage into his diary. There he explained how his pledge of allegiance was not morally binding and expressed his worries over former slaves emancipated and empowered. The diary provides a rare window into the mind of a Confederate sympathizer under the rule of what he considered an alien and unlawful power.

http://www.upf.com

SANTAYANA, GEORGE. The Essential Santayana. Edited by Martin A. Coleman. Indiana University Press. 2009. 696 pp. $75. ISBN: 9780253353481. Although born in Spain, George Santayana became a uniquely American philosopher, critic, poet, and novelist, as well as one of the founders of American pragmatism. This collection presents a selection of Santayana’s most important and influential literary and philosophical works.

http://iupress.indiana.edu
SCORESBY, WILLIAM. *The Arctic Whaling Journals of William Scoresby the Younger (1789–1857), Volume 2: The Voyages of 1815 and 1816*. Edited by Ian Jackson. Ashgate Press. 2009. 346 pp. $99.95. ISBN: 9780904180923. This second volume of Scoresby’s journals contains the unpublished accounts of his three voyages in the Esk between 1814 and 1816. They combine scientific records and social and religious comment as well as detailed descriptions of navigation and whaling, and exemplify the dangers and dramas inherent in sailing to the edge of the Arctic ice. This book additionally contains another view of the 1814 voyage, the journal of Charles Steward, a young supernumerary.

[Sitiki](http://www.ashgate.com)

SITIKI. *The Odyssey of an African Slave*. Edited by Patricia C. Griffin. University Press of Florida. 2009. 192 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9780813033914. Recently discovered as a handwritten document in the Buckingham Smith Collection at the New-York Historical Society, this remarkable first-person narrative traces the life of Sitiki, also known as Jack Smith, an African taken into slavery at age five. He was sold to Capt. Josiah Smith of Georgia. Captured by the British during the War of 1812, he was returned to the Smiths and ultimately freed by the Civil War. Afterward, he became the first black Methodist minister in St. Augustine, Florida, where he established his own church.

[Slave Narratives](http://www.upf.com)

SLAVE NARRATIVES. *See Sitiki; Wheeler, Peter*

SMITH, JOSEPH. *The Joseph Smith Papers, Journals, Volume 1: 1832–1839*. Edited by Dean C. Jessee, Mark Ashurst-McGee, and Richard L. Jensen. The Church Historian’s Press. 2008. 572 pp. $49.95. ISBN: 9781570088490. Joseph Smith, founder and first prophet of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the Mormon Church), left an extensive body of letters, revelations, and other written records. *The Joseph Smith Papers* will eventually publish all of his writings in thirty volumes organized into six series. Volume 1 of the *Journals* series follows Smith’s life as the fledgling church built a temple in Ohio and faced opposition in Missouri. It ends as the Saints settled along the Illinois shore of the Mississippi River in Commerce, a swampy, malaria-ridden area that they renamed Nauvoo.

[JosephSmithPapers.org](http://josephsmithpapers.org)

revelations formed the basis for the Book of Commandments, the Mormon Church’s first canonical compilation, published in 1833. This oversized volume presents full-color photographic facsimiles and corresponding typographic facsimiles that are color-coded to distinguish the handwriting of Smith and his scribes. The conservative transcripts capture all contemporaneous revisions and later redactions.

http://josephsmithpapers.org

SNOW, ELIZA R. *Eliza R. Snow: The Complete Poetry*. Edited by Jill Mulvay Derr and Karen Lynn Davidson. University of Utah Press. 2009. 1,376 pp. $44.95. ISBN: 9780842527378. Between 1825, when Eliza Snow published her first poem pseudonymously at the age of twenty-one, and her death in 1887, Snow wrote over 500 poems, covering such topics as the fight for Greek independence, the plight of American Indians, and the deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. After joining the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, her poetry increasingly reflected the Mormon experience. Each poem in this edition is presented with contextual information.

http://www.uofupress.com

STANTON, ELIZABETH CADY. *See WOMEN’S HISTORY*.

STYRON, WILLIAM. *Letters to My Father*. Edited by James L. W. West III. Louisiana State University Press. 2009. 256 pp. $28. ISBN: 9780807134009. From 1943 to 1953, Styron—who would later become the Pulitzer Prize-winning author of many books, including *The Confessions of Nat Turner* and *Sophie’s Choice*—wrote over 100 letters to his father, William C. Styron Sr., detailing his adventures, his works in progress, and his ruminations on the craft of writing. This correspondence has been collected for the first time, showing the early, intimate thoughts of a young man en route to becoming a literary icon.

http://www.lsu.edu/lsupress

SWALLOW, BETTY. *Dear Helen: Wartime Letters from a Londoner to Her American Pen Pal*. Edited by Russell M. Jones and John H. Swanson. University of Missouri Press. 2009. 264 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9780826218506. In 1937, Betty Swallow, a young London secretary, began a correspondence with a fellow movie buff in Kansas City, Helen Bradley. Swallow’s letters, dating from 1937 to 1950, initially focused on their shared love of film but soon shifted as Swallow became caught up in world events. This volume gives a new vision of World War II from the perspective of the average London citizen, documenting the challenges of life during the Blitz, wartime shortages, British attitudes toward American
isolationism, and the social changes in English society in the aftermath of the war.


THOREAU, HENRY DAVID. *The Writings of Henry D. Thoreau*, *Excursions*. Edited by Joseph J. Moldenhauer. Princeton University Press. 2007. 650 pp. $65.00. ISBN: 9780691065405. *Excursions* presents texts of nine essays, including some of Thoreau’s most engaging and popular works, newly edited and based on the most authoritative versions of each. These essays represent Thoreau in many stages of his writing career, ranging from 1842—when he accepted Emerson’s commission to review four volumes of botanical and zoological catalogues in an essay that was published in *The Dial* as “Natural History of Massachusetts”—to 1862, when he prepared “Wild Apples,” a lecture he had delivered in the Concord Lyceum’s 1859–1860 season, for publication in the *Atlantic Monthly* after his death.

THOREAU, HENRY DAVID. *The Writings of Henry D. Thoreau, Journal 7: 1853–1854*. Edited by Nancy Craig Simmons and Ron Thomas. Princeton University Press. 2009. 531 pp. $65.00. ISBN: 9780691065403. *Journal 7* is edited from the 454-page manuscript that Thoreau kept from 19 August 1853 through 12 February 1854. During the six months covered here, Thoreau continued to add to his store of observations about local animals, plants, and weather. Most of the journal is dedicated to describing natural phenomena, creating a detailed portrait of Concord and the surrounding areas. In addition, Thoreau integrates these observations with ethical reflections about living in harmony with nature, following the model of the Roman agricultural writers. *Journal 7* includes a number of passages found in *Walden* as well as Thoreau’s account of a September 1853 trip to the Maine woods that appeared in 1858 as “Chesuncook.”

http://www.ubcpress.ca

TRANSLATED WORKS. *Ballads of the Lords of New Spain: The Codex Romances de los Señores de la Nueva Espana*. Transcribed and translated by John Bierhorst. University of Texas Press. 2009. 253 pp. $65. ISBN: 9780292718524. Compiled in 1582, *Ballads of the Lords of New Spain* is one of the two principal sources of Nahuatl song, as well as a poetical window into the mindset of the Aztec people some sixty years after the conquest of Mexico. This volume contains exact transcriptions of the thirty-six Nahuatl song texts, accompanied by authoritative English translations and thorough annotations to help readers understand the imagery and allusions in the texts.

http://www.utexas.edu/utpress

TRANSLATED WORKS. See also ENNIS, SEAMUS; MORAVIANS

TRAVEL NARRATIVES. See ROYCE, SARAH; SCORESBY, WILLIAM; THOMPSON, DAVID

TWAIN, MARK. *Mainly the Truth: Interviews with Mark Twain*. Edited by Gary Scharnhorst. University of Alabama Press. 2009. 344 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9780817355395. This volume is a collection of some of the most colorful and interesting interviews Mark Twain gave to newspapers and reporters throughout his life. Touching on a wide array of themes—civil service reform, lecture styles, government corruption, racism, suffrage, international copyright, and many more—they are both oral performances in their own right and a new basis for evaluating contemporary responses to Twain’s writings.

http://www.uapress.ua.edu

cally prominent family in Bowling Green, Kentucky, left a unique account of the early years of the Civil War from the perspective of a Kentucky woman sympathetic to the Union. Her family owned slaves and opposed Lincoln but still ardently supported the Union. Underwood describes her fears of secession and war and the anguish of having friends and family on opposing sides of the conflict. She also recounts the normal activities of a young woman including parties, travel, local gossip, and the search for a beau.

http://www.kentuckypress.com

VOEGELIN, ERIC. *The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin, Volume 29: Selected Correspondence, 1924–1949*. Translated by William Petropulos; edited by Jürgen Gebhardt. University of Missouri Press. 2009. 784 pp. $74.95. ISBN: 9780826218421. Eric Voegelin’s letters—an important supplement to the Collected Works—give insight into the development of his thought, document his struggle with himself, and reveal his ongoing reflections on human affairs. Due to the large number of extant letters, the editors have only included those written by Voegelin (omitting those he received); despite this choice, the volume helps to elucidate his intellectual journey from his earliest academic years to his emergence as one of the most significant philosophers of the twentieth century.

http://press.umsystem.edu

WALKER, C. IRVINE. *Great Things Are Expected of Us: The Letters of Colonel C. Irvine Walker, 10th South Carolina Infantry, C.S.A.* Edited by William Lee White and Charles Denny Runion. University of Tennessee Press. 2009. 216 pp. $35.95. ISBN: 9781572336636. This correspondence between Col. C. Irvine Walker and his fiancée, as Walker fought for the Confederacy in the Civil War’s Western Theater between May 1862 and April 1865, offers candid, revealing insights by a man whose devotion to the Southern cause was matched only by his desire to maintain the status befitting his high station in society. This edition also contains Walker’s postwar corrections and emendations to his letters, providing yet another layer to his analysis of the military campaigns in which he participated.

http://utpress.org

WARREN, MERCY OTIS. *Mercy Otis Warren: Selected Letters.* Edited by Jeffrey H. Richards and Sharon M. Harris. University of Georgia Press. 2009. 368 pp. $44.95. ISBN: 9780820326801. This volume collects over 100 letters—many previously unpublished—written by Mercy Otis Warren, a major literary figure of the Revolutionary era and one of the most important American women writers of the eighteenth century. Correspondents include Martha and George Washington, Abigail and John Adams, and Catharine Macaulay. Warren’s letters provide new insights into eighteenth-century American culture, including social customs,
women’s concerns, political and economic conditions, medical issues, and attitudes on child rearing.

http://www.ugapress.org

WASHINGTON, GEORGE. The Papers of George Washington, Presidential Series, Volume 14: September–December 1793. Edited by David R. Hoth. University of Virginia Press. 2008. 784 pp. $85. ISBN: 9780813927596. During the last four months of 1793, Washington and his administration remained chiefly involved with maintaining the neutrality of the United States in the wake of increasing activity by French privateers and growing frustration with French minister Edmond Genet. Other topics of interest include frontier defense and concerns about British retention of northwestern forts; problems associated with the arrival of refugees from Saint Domingue; and the ubiquitous applications for appointments to federal office. But more than anything, this period was dominated by a virulent yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia. Washington himself left for Mount Vernon in September but he still had to address the question of whether Congress could safely meet in Philadelphia in December.

http://www.upress.virginia.edu

WHEELE R, PETER. Chains and Freedom; or, The Life and Adventures of Peter Wheeler, A Colored Man Yet Living. A Slave in Chains, A Sailor on the Deep, and A Sinner at the Cross. Edited by Graham Russell Gao Hodges. University of Alabama Press. 2009. 208 pp. $21.50. ISBN: 9780817355432. Peter Wheeler’s 1839 slave narrative tells the story of a northern-born freeman illegally sold into slavery in New York State, reminding readers that slavery was not purely a southern phenomenon. He also describes his life working on canals and seagoing vessels, as well as on farms and in households. This is the book’s first publication in over 150 years.

http://www.uapress.ua.edu

WOMEN’S HISTORY. The Birth of Mankind: Otherwise Named, The Woman’s Book. Edited by Elaine Hobby. Ashgate Press. 350 pp. $114.95. ISBN: 9780754638186. Between 1540 and 1654, The Byrth of Mankynde was a huge commercial success, offering information on fertility, pregnancy, and infant care, and influencing other literary works on sex and reproduction. Until now, it was unavailable except for a microfilm of the 1654 edition. This volume provides an annotated version of the 1560 edition with modernized spelling and informative notes to assist the nonspecialist.

http://www.ashgate.com
WOMEN’S HISTORY. The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, Volume 5: Their Place Inside the Body-Politic, 1887–1895. Edited by Ann D. Gordon, Lesley L. Doig, Patricia L. Hampson, Kathleen Manning, and Shannon Dee Williams. Rutgers University Press. 2009. 736 pp. $70. ISBN: 9780813523217. This, the edition’s penultimate volume, opens just after the U.S. Senate voted against a constitutional amendment for woman suffrage. It closes with Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s grand, eightieth birthday party at the Metropolitan Opera House. Susan B. Anthony, just five years younger, shared the stage with her. Despite their age, these pioneers maintained positions of leadership in an international reform movement increasingly dominated by younger people.

http://rutgerspress.rutgers.edu
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In Memoriam

W. W. Abbot (1922–2009)

Making Something of Life

Philander D. Chase

George Washington, Bill Abbot wrote in his 1989 essay “An Uncommon Awareness of Self,” “saw life as something a person must make something of.” Several years of patiently editing Washington’s pre-Revolutionary papers had left Bill “with the impression of a man driven to master every aspect of his life and to make the most of what life offered.” Anyone who had the privilege of working with Bill Abbot, particularly during his long and distinguished documentary editing career spanning the last third of his life, is left with a similar impression of Bill himself.

Having graduated from the University of Georgia in 1943 and having served during the latter part of World War II as a young naval officer in the Pacific Ocean and the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas, Bill returned to his beloved hometown of Louisville, Georgia, at the end of the war and began teaching a variety of subjects and coaching basketball at the small local high school. As satisfying as he found that experience, Bill realized that he needed and wanted more from life. In 1947 at the age of twenty-five, Bill enrolled at Duke University, and soon he was studying with and assisting one of the leading early American historians of the day, Charles Sydnor, who was then writing Gentlemen Freeholders. “Six years in graduate school set me free,” Bill said in “How It Happened,” the sketch of his career that he wrote in 1995 for the William and Mary Quarterly. “I learned that the point was for me, not others, to judge the value of what I did.”

Over a period of three decades—the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s—Bill constructed for himself a reputation as a superb college teacher and an academic good citizen par excellence. He taught at the College of William and Mary for several years and briefly at Northwestern and Rice universities. He edited the Journal of Southern History for a time and then the William and Mary Quarterly. In 1966 he became the James Madison Professor of History at the University of Virginia. Remarkably enough, however, Bill felt compelled to make something even more of life. His projected history of South Carolina, Bill admitted in “How It Happened,” was languishing. He had dutifully served twice as history depart-
ment chair, but academic administration held no charms for him. The prospect of turning out graduate students for a weak job market drove him back to his first love, undergraduate teaching. Nor was he enticed by the retirement alternatives of “building houses for the poor” or “playing golf with the retired rich.” Then Bill found exactly what he was seeking, or rather, it found him. When Don Jackson, the first editor of the Papers of George Washington, decided to retire at the end of 1976, the position was offered to Bill. Encouraged by his wife Eleanor, Bill promptly accepted, and at the age of fifty-five, he became a documentary editor.

Bill's involvement with the Washington Papers project actually began a decade earlier in 1967 when he chaired a committee to study the need and feasibility of establishing such a project at the University of Virginia. Bill wrote the committee’s report supporting that course of action, and he and Merrill Peterson served as the search committee that chose Don Jackson to be the first editor. By the time that Bill succeeded Don in 1977, Don and Associate Editor Dorothy Twohig had gathered photocopies of over 100,000 Washington documents and had started editing Washington’s diaries in six volumes. While the staff under Dorothy's direction completed the editing and publication of the diaries, Bill began planning how to deal with the extensive correspondence that constitutes the heart of the Washington Papers. The most vexing problem facing the editors, he soon saw, was the collection’s massiveness which threatened to bog the project down in a Vietnam-like quagmire from which it might never emerge. Bill remembered that NHPRC director Oliver Wendell Holmes once had suggested that such a fate might be averted by breaking the Washington Papers up into three separate projects corresponding to the three parts into which Washington’s life naturally fell: the Virginia planter before 1775, the Revolutionary War general, and the first President. Finding that the editors’ expertise and interests broke down in similar fashion, Bill decided that Washington’s correspondence should be edited not in separate projects, but in separate chronological series to be edited simultaneously under the umbrella of a single unified project. “I had become convinced,” Bill wrote in an unpublished paper that he delivered at a Monticello symposium in 2005, “that each of us should be doing what he or she was best qualified to do, and that we would all be better editors for taking public responsibility and receiving proper credit for what each of us did.” Equally important, users of the edition would benefit by not having to wait for the editors to work their way through thousands of complex Revolutionary War letters, orders, council proceedings, enclosures, and enclosures to enclosures before gaining access to modern edited versions of Washington’s post-war papers.

The editing of the first correspondence series—the Colonial Series covering Washington’s early life—began in 1979 with all of the editors working on the first two volumes of that series in order to master together the project’s basic editorial procedures. The Revolutionary War and Presidential series were begun in
the early 1980s, and in the 1990s series were added for the Confederation years, 1784–1788, and Washington’s retirement years, 1797–1799. Working closely with Assistant Editor Beverly Runge and other staff members, Bill edited the Colonial, Confederation, and Retirement series, a total of twenty volumes in his twenty-one years of active editing, including six years as a volunteer editor after he officially retired as editor in chief in 1992. In the process, Bill said in his 1999 University of Virginia lecture on “The Young George Washington and His Papers,” “my colleagues and I have become better acquainted with [Washington] the private man than almost anyone else. Not that I can recall most of the details of his youth or middle years any more than I can remember those of my own. Nor do I claim to understand him better than others do. I just know him when I see him. I can recognize him from afar as I would a relative or an old friend. When someone gets him right, I know it. I know it, too, when anyone gets him wrong. That is my reward for the years with the documents.”

Bill never attempted to write a comprehensive scholarly study of Washington’s life and character. Like Washington, who declined to write an autobiography or memoir, Bill was content to let Washington’s papers speak for themselves. “The job of the textual editor,” Bill said in his “Young George Washington” lecture, “is to take things apart, not put them together. He [or she] never lets the big picture get in the way of the little detail. Forget the forest; watch the trees.” Bill not only watched the trees; he closely examined the bark, the leaves, and the roots. Of the many somethings that Bill Abbot made of life during his long academic career, the something that he made of the Washington Papers was his greatest achievement.

Sources
Matthew J. Bruccoli (1931–2008)

Matt Bruccoli joined the English department at the University of South Carolina in 1969, and retired in 2005 as the Emily Brown Jefferies Distinguished Professor of English. As his obituary in the New York Times noted, he “continued to cut a dash on campus, instantly recognizable by his vintage red Mercedes convertible, Brooks Brothers suits, Groucho mustache and bristling crew cut that dated to his Yale days. His untamed Bronx accent also set him apart.” As a scholar, Matt published widely on James Gould Cozzens, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Vladimir Nabokov, and John O’Hara. Matt knew more about F. Scott Fitzgerald and his works than anyone then alive. He was also my colleague for thirty-seven years.

Matt Bruccoli defined scholarship (as opposed to mere criticism) broadly, including book collecting and publishing history. He was exasperated by most librarians, describing them as ignorant of books and enemies to scholars. As an English teacher and professor he frightened faculty with his productivity and made students uneasy with his honesty. Students, unused to seeing faculty actually working in their offices, approached him with trepidation, then discovered that he would drop everything to work with them. He believed books were important, often bringing first editions and manuscripts into the classroom. Above all, he held that he was called to teaching, whether in classrooms, through distant education, lecturing around the world before scholarly and civilian audiences, or publishing articles and books.

Matt lived his life according to simple and straightforward principles. Among them:

Publication is the essential act of scholarship. And, when Matt was really holding forth, its corollary: “Everything else is playing with yourself.” Placed against the backdrop of the mantra “publish and perish” so beloved by many in the profession, his agenda provided a welcome relief. He had little patience for the “gentleman scholar,” people (of both sexes) who claim that it is the “quality of mind” that is truly important. What good is knowledge, Matt asked, unless you shared it with as wide and large an audience as possible?

Meet your deadline! Matt was in the steadily shrinking minority in the profession who believe that deadlines are sacred. He had little patience for professors who expected him to put up with delays and excuses that they themselves would never tolerate from their own students. (A corollary to this was “The deadline was yesterday,” usually delivered when he made the assignment.)

Make it useful for civilians. Matt firmly believed that if the reader could
not understand and use what you published, then your work was in vain. He had no patience for academics who wrote for each other.

We are put here to do God's work. Matt had a strong sense of social responsibility and, because he had been granted a skill, his job in this life was to use that skill for the benefit of others.

Two other aspects of Matt's career deserve special mention. He was a book collector of the first magnitude (indeed, he considered it a contact sport), and the Matthew J. and Arlyn Brucoli Collection of F. Scott Fitzgerald is now housed at the USC library. He was instrumental in establishing the Thomas Cooper Society, a group that serves as friends of the library, and—through the Cooper Society—in organizing an annual book-collecting award for students. He was also enormously generous to graduate students. According to one legendary story, Matt walked into class one day and announced that he was changing the syllabus because he had just bought the galleys to *The Great Gatsby*, and he thought the class might like to study the relation between them and the published text. He later wowed an undergraduate Honors College class by giving them as a group project the task of creating a hypertext version of *Gatsby*, even though he himself was a computer illiterate.

If it is true, as Emerson writes in "Self-Reliance," that "all history resolves itself very easily into the biography of a few stout and earnest persons," then we were privileged to witness the Brucoli era.

**Note**

J. A. Leo Lemay (1935–2008), A Remembrance

Kevin J. Hayes

My first semester in graduate school at the University of Delaware I took J. A. Leo Lemay’s Edgar Allan Poe seminar. Writing a seminar paper on the subject of Poe’s use of frontier imagery in his short fiction, I happened to read Prof. Lemay’s essay “The Frontiersman from Lout to Hero” (Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society 88 [1978]: 187-223). In terms of its breadth of knowledge and depth of insight, I found this essay astonishing. As an undergraduate I had read much about the American frontier, a special interest of mine, but Prof. Lemay’s essay was the single best treatment on the subject I had ever read. I started reading more of his work and realized that the frontiersman essay was typical of Prof. Lemay’s approach: to pick a topic; put it within its historical, literary, and cultural contexts; and treat it exhaustively. In the coming semesters I would take several more classes from Prof. Lemay; his writings would form a sizeable part of my personal library.

Later that first semester, my officemate and fellow graduate student Tom Haslam returned to our office in the dome of Memorial Hall with a Cheshire grin on his face and a copy of Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography under his arm. To be specific, Tom had a copy of the genetic text of Franklin’s autobiography that Prof. Lemay had edited with Paul Zall. Tom explained that the bookstore in the student union was having a huge clearance sale. It was selling off its slow-moving inventory—mainly the books that clogged the “Faculty Authors” section. In fact, the store was selling these clearance books like raw hamburger: ninety-nine cents a pound. I asked Tom if there were any more copies of the Franklin edition left. As soon as he said yes, I dropped what I was doing, bolted downstairs, and headed across campus to the student union, where I snagged the very last copy of the Lemay / Zall genetic text.

Though I added this edition to my personal library, I did not read it as readily as I had read the frontiersman essay. The Lemay / Zall genetic text is chockful of information about Franklin’s composition of the autobiography, but it is quite intimidating, with its up arrows and down arrows, angle brackets, braces, and square brackets. When I eventually worked my way through the text, I was impressed with its editors’ ingenuity and hard work. The genetic text of Franklin’s autobiography is a model of textual editing, a useful reference tool that can open up new ways of seeing Franklin and his world. When I wrote a seminar paper on Franklin’s use of religion in the autobiography for Prof. Lemay a few years later, I made use of the genetic text, arguing that many of Franklin’s religious thoughts
were really afterthoughts inserted in revision to add a veneer of Christianity to an otherwise secular work. Prof. Lemay liked the paper well enough to invite me to contribute to a collection of new essays on Franklin’s autobiography.

That collection fell through when the publisher abruptly canceled the series, but Prof. Lemay or Leo, as he let me call him once I completed my dissertation, continued to keep an eye on my career. Attending the MLA conference a few years after graduate school, I spent one afternoon strolling through the book exhibit with a friend of mine, who had attended graduate school in one of those prestigious universities located in that narrow “V” formed by the Atlantic coast and the Hudson River. As we turned from one aisle to the next, we suddenly ran into Leo. I introduced him to my friend. After we chatted briefly, he walked us over to one particular booth and introduced me to a friend of his, who was a commissioning editor for a major university press. Not only did Leo introduce me to him, he also sang my praises and encouraged this editor to consider my work for publication.

Before the always-energetic Leo ricocheted off in another direction, he and I agreed to meet for drinks that evening. For the nonce, my friend and I continued to view the publishers’ exhibits. When Leo was out of earshot, she said, “Wow! My teacher has never done anything like that for me.” This personal introduction was just one of many things Leo did for me over the course of my career. My experience is not unique. Similarly, he kept an eye on the careers of many of his former students. Correct that last phrase. There is no such thing as being a “former Leo Lemay student”: once a Leo student, always a Leo student.

Leo was the one who encouraged me to join the Association for Documentary Editing. Having established himself as a challenging new voice in the world of documentary editing with the genetic text of Franklin’s autobiography, Leo became active in the ADE, one of many professional societies of which he was an active member. At the annual meetings sponsored by these societies, Leo always enjoyed cocktail parties, hotel-room get-togethers, and various other assorted social receptions. No doubt many ADE members have fond memories of late nights at the ADE conference that ended up in Leo’s hotel room hunched around a bottle of Wild Turkey.

Leo’s efforts to encourage social interaction among professional colleagues had a greater purpose beyond conviviality. He saw the social gathering as a way of furthering scholarship. He brought together like-minded scholars as a way to get them talking, thinking, and writing. Many people came away from his parties with new contacts in the literary world and new research ideas to mull over for weeks and years. Leo’s writings and his personal interactions combined to make him a major force in the field of American literary scholarship. Speaking for myself, I can say that he had a profound impact on my thinking and left an indelible mark on my memory. I miss him.
Association for Documentary Editing  
Business Meeting, 15 October 2009  
Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library  
Springfield, Illinois

President Cathy Moran Hajo called the meeting to order at 3:52 p.m.  
Motion to approve the minutes of the 2008 Business Meeting passed unanimously.

Local Arrangements Committee – Cathy Hajo thanked the Local Arrangements Committee members, John Lupton (chair), Daniel Stowell, RowenaMcClinton, and Martin Tuohy. Hajo then introduced John Lupton, who thanked the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library for the use of their space and webcasting equipment and staff. Hajo then thanked Ken Price and the Program Committee for their work. Price announced the travel award recipients – Elizabeth Lorang, Wesley Raabe, and James Hanna. Hajo then asked all first time attendees at the meeting to stand and be recognized.

President’s Report – Cathy Hajo reported that much progress was made in advancing the Long Range Plan, most notably effective communication. Hajo then mentioned the proposal for implementing the ADE’s educational mission, which includes taking responsibility for the annual NHPRC Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents (Camp Edit). Hajo welcomed all those interested in volunteering for the committee to investigate this idea to email Ken Price. Hajo then reported that additional committee help is needed and urged members to sign up. Increased membership being a goal this coming year, Hajo asked all those interested in joining the membership committee to contact Price. Hajo also thanked Martha King for her dedicated service on the Council.

Secretary’s Report – Jennifer Stertzer reviewed the changes implemented this past year, including electronic delivery of all secretarial communications (membership dues payment and conference registration notices and reminders), the online payment of membership dues / contributions option, and new online “Member Gateway.” Stertzer explained the gateway is accessible only by logging in with a username and password provided to members on their membership dues receipt. Currently, the gateway contains the member directory, ADE Strategic and Action Plan, lists of Officers and Committees, the ADE Constitution, E-Newsletter Archive, Liaison information, and Officer/Committee Manuals. Stertzer reminded members that ADE memberships expire at the end of every calendar year and renewal notices are
sent out end of January / beginning of February. At present there are 282 members. This is down slightly from last year’s total of 289.

The results of this year’s election are as follows: Susan H. Perdue will serve as President-elect; John T. Fierst will serve as Treasurer; Jennifer Stertzer will continue as Secretary; Sharon Ritenour Stevens will continue as Director of Publications; and Denton L. Watson will serve as Councilor-at-large. Our Nominating Committee members are: John A. Lupton, chair; Theodore Crackel; Ann Gordon; Margaret Hogan; and Joel Myerson.

Stertzer then reported on the creation and work of the liaison committee and encouraged members to become involved in this effort.

Treasurer’s Report – John Lupton reported that despite the bad economy, the ADE’s finances did quite well. The organization had a net gain of $3,731.00 which Lupton attributes to the ten percent increase in membership income and the substantial increase in contributions because of Beth Luey’s generous matching membership contribution. Lupton also reported that the conference in Tucson did very well with a profit of just over $3,000.00. After five years of serving as treasurer, Lupton reminded members he was stepping down. Lupton thanked the finance committee members, particularly Bill Ferraro and Gary Moulton, who served on the finance committee the entire time. Lupton also thanked the secretaries he worked with over the years. Lupton then presented the members with a revised, proposed budget for 2009-2010, with a total expenditure of $30,850.00. Motion to adopt the 2009-2010 budget as revised passed unanimously.

Publications Committee Report – Sharon Stevens reported that at the annual meeting in Tucson, the Council had charged the committee with two tasks: 1) create a mission statement for and define goals of Documentary Editing, and 2) locate an editor. Stevens stated that Council approved the mission statement in December 2008 and that Ron Bosco and Rich Leffler had agreed to co-edit the next two issues of Documentary Editing. Stevens reported that Volume 31 will be mailed out in December 2009. Stevens also made a call for an editor/s for the 2011 issue. Stevens then reported that the Publications Committee was looking into putting back issues online and noted that the 2011 editor should have an interest in a print-to-electronic transition.

E-newsletter – Martha King reported that the inaugural year for the e-newsletter was a success and thanked Jennifer Steenshorne, editor, for her work. King also extended a thank you from Steenshorne to regular contributors Charlene Bickford, William Ferraro, and Barbara Bair, as well as to Cathy Moran Hajo, Mary-Jo Kline, and Alexis Luckey for their assistance. King then reported that at present, the main goal is to ensure timeliness and announced
that the e-newsletter team would be experimenting with WordPress. King also encouraged members to submit feedback and offers of help to Steenshorne.

Meetings Committee Report – Mary Hackett reported that we have signed a contract for the Hilton Garden Inn in Philadelphia for Friday to Sunday, 15–17 October 2010. A local arrangements committee is still needed and Hackett encouraged all those interested to contact her. The 2011 meeting is still planned for Salt Lake City, Utah, while the site for the 2012 meeting remains open. Hackett then reported that the Philadelphia contract was arranged by Helms-Briscoe, a company that arranges meetings and contracts nationally and internationally. If the Philadelphia meeting is successful, Hackett recommends we continue using this service.

Federal Policy Committee Report – Charlene Bickford reported that the Humanities Advocacy Day was a huge success and thanked all members who participated. The ADE had the highest level of participation of any organization, with sixteen ADE members in attendance. Bickford urged the need for even greater representation and involvement from ADE members and expressed the hope that those from other states would be able to participate at next year’s HAD on 8 and 9 March 2010.

Bickford briefly reported on the events of last year, noting the impact of the 2008 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing and appropriations committee directive relating to the digitizing of the Founding Father’s papers. Bickford explained that although the change in Presidential Administrations brought recommendations for increased support of both the NEH and NHPRC, there was also an attempt to direct how the NHPRC funding would be allocated and limit funding for editions. While the final resolutions remain undecided, Bickford reported that our efforts will continue in taking a stand against these types of earmarks. Cathy Hajo then reminded members to fill out the funding survey so that the ADE can focus its advocacy efforts accordingly.

New Business – Cathy Hajo called for any new business. Connie Schulz inquired whether it would be possible to implement a reduced conference registration fee for graduate students and it was agreed this would be discussed at the next Council meeting. There being no additional new business, the Motion to adjourn was passed unanimously at 4:37 pm.

Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by Jennifer E. Stertzer, Secretary.
Lyman H. Butterfield Award for 2009 Presented to Gregg L. Lint

Mary-Jo Kline

It has become a tradition for the person presenting the Butterfield Award to create a bit of suspense in the presentation speech, mentioning first the more general aspects of the recipient’s career, then introducing details that enable all members of the audience but one to realize: “Well, I’m not going to get it this year!”

I will follow that tradition tonight, but even my first remarks will make it clear that the youngsters in the room—those of you under the age of 60 or so—should abandon hope and relax while I sing the praises of one of your elders. This year’s Butterfield Award recognizes not only recent contributions to documentary editing, but contributions that have continued for more than thirty years.

One colleague has called our honoree “an unsung hero among today’s documentary editors who has long played a very behind-the-scenes role in promoting our profession.” After tonight, the “unsung” descriptor will no longer apply. All the members of the Butterfield Committee were struck not only by the high praise our “hero” received from those supporting his receipt of the award, but by the consistency with which his colleagues and friends identified the areas in which he has shone.

First, of course, there is the quality of the scholarship displayed in the volumes he has edited. But the testimonials we read also revealed the vital role he has played within the walls of his project, as a mentor to junior editors within his office and as a vital aide to the project’s directors; he has been equally helpful to fledgling editors of other projects who have sought his help. He has been a model for the rest of us by participating in outreach programs for educators at all levels, by participating in scholarly conferences that publicize the work of editors to a broader audience, by loyal service on the ADE’s Nominating Committee, and,
noblest of all, by service on conference local arrangements committees—a task I have avoided like the plague.

Now I will begin leaking details that will enable you to confirm your suspicions, for by now many of you will have guessed that this year’s recipient of the Lyman H. Butterfield Award is Gregg L. Lint.

The project where he has spent his entire career as an editor is, of course, the Adams Papers, whose staff he joined in the fall of 1975. He recently completed work on the fifteenth volume of *The Papers of John Adams*, the series with which he has been most closely identified. He has been the “lead editor” responsible for volumes in that series since 1983, and the 2010 volume will be the ninth in which his position on the title page recognizes his role. In addition, he has contributed to several other volumes in other Adams Papers series. Said one colleague: “His knowledge of John Adams’s public life is unrivaled, and he has used that expertise to produce well-edited books that have furthered substantially our understanding of U.S. diplomacy in the revolutionary era.” Another regrets the fact that “nowadays not many students of the late colonial, revolutionary, and early national periods think of themselves as diplomatic historians.” But our Butterfield laureate does, and his work shows him to be “a scholar of diplomatic history of insight and skill.”

Next we come to the role he plays in the working lives of his colleagues, something little known outside the Adams Papers offices. Every junior editor on the Adams Papers roster sings his praises. One portrays Gregg as “a kind and considerate colleague who has taken much time and interest in the newer and younger editors”; another as “an important mentor to newer staff members [who] patiently guided me through the process of learning to edit a volume from start to finish, and is doing the same now with other junior editors. Even as he has risen to the rank of senior editor, he has not forgotten the challenges of starting out in this field, and his quiet encouragement has helped many staff members move forward”; and yet another as a “treasured colleague in the field of history and documentary editing” and a “wonderful mentor—both knowledgeable and patient—to all the new editors.”

One junior co-worker wrote that “Gregg has spent his career immersed in John Adams and the early republic and has a wealth of knowledge at his fingertips [which] he loves to share . . . with young editors, and his bright enthusiasm for both the subject matter and the process of documentary editing is infectious. Gregg’s institutional knowledge of the Adams Papers project is invaluable, and he is happy and ready to share what he knows from the Butterfield days as well as the latest policy decisions.” “Gregg’s contribution to documentary editing,” the committee was told, “goes beyond the many years invested and the many volumes published. . . . Between his work and his reading, Gregg has accumulated a vast
fund of wisdom and knowledge. He has mastered the Adamses and their papers as well as the historical context and the editorial process. Much to the relief of his more junior colleagues, he freely shares his wealth. Gregg’s nurturing of the rising cohort of editors has been critical to the recent revitalization of the Adams Papers and has laid a foundation for the continued success of the project.”

Ted Crackel, now director of the Papers of George Washington, speaks of Gregg’s service as a mentor to editors outside the walls of the Massachusetts Historical Society on Boylston Street. The two met in the mid-1990s, when Ted was struggling to get the Papers of the War Department project into operation. “As anyone who has ever launched a new project will attest,” he recalls, “someone who evidences a true interest in your work is almost as rare as an unsolicited donor. Gregg’s interest was, moreover, deeper than a simple inquiry. He was truly interested in both the subject and how I was addressing the problems posed by such a ‘pile of ashes.’ He asked good questions and had good advice and his obvious interest was just the kind of encouragement I needed. Year after year, as the War Department project developed, he continued to encourage me, to make helpful suggestions, to arrange useful contacts, and to provide sometimes much needed reassurance.”

Perhaps the most telling tributes come from two men who have served as Gregg Lint’s boss during the years in which the Adams Papers office underwent seismic changes in staffing and direction: Conrad Wright, who was interim editor-in-chief of the project for the year before a new permanent director came on board in 2001, and James Taylor, who became editor-in-chief that year. Conrad recalled that when he assumed temporary command “at a time of turmoil for the project—and at a time when Federal funders were expressing grave doubts about its ability to bring out volumes—it was Gregg who saved the day. As interim editor I made a decision that required him to take the lead. Breaking with our past practice of publishing two volumes at once, I decided that to demonstrate the project’s productivity we would focus on the single volume closest to being ready—The Papers of John Adams, volume 11, for which Gregg was the primary editor. He rose to the challenge, produced a fine volume, and resolved the immediate worries of the Federal funders. Both the project and documentary editing more generally owe him a debt of thanks for coming through when he did.” Jim Taylor found Gregg just as invaluable as a permanent colleague: “I too regularly rely on him for advice concerning almost every aspect of the project. The renewed energy and success of the project in recent years would not have been possible without his unwavering commitment to it.”

Beyond his work in producing documentary editions, Gregg has provided a model for outreach to the world of users, and, more important, to potential users of specific texts and notes. One of the newer Adams editors sums it up this way: “For Gregg the goal of documentary editing is not only to get the docu-
ments out but to bring people in. It is not enough to make more primary sources more accessible; it is necessary to demonstrate their value to the advancement of historical understanding and to encourage others to take a look. . . .” To this end, he has “presented his findings at academic conferences and in teacher seminars, inspiring interest in the Adams Papers in particular while garnering respect for editors and their work in general.”

An admirer from another project says, “He has frequently served as an emissary of documentary editing to those outside our profession. . . . He is, in fact, elegant when speaking of the understanding that documentary editors bring to the historical record and the richness they add to the story of events that have marked our nation’s history.”

More specifically, and recently, he can always be counted on to lend a hand and his eloquent voice to programs at the MHS for classroom teachers. Just last July, Gregg and two other members of the Adams Papers staff made six presentations to college instructors attending two NEH-sponsored programs. On a more scholarly level are the papers he has given at conferences, such as the one in the fall of 2008 that celebrated the 225th anniversary of the signing of the 1783 Treaty of Paris concluding the peace between Britain and the United States. And only this summer he presented a paper on Adams’s diplomacy at the week-long meeting on *John Adams & Thomas Jefferson: Libraries, Leadership, Legacy*, co-sponsored by the MHS and the Robert Smith International Center for Jefferson Studies. Gregg also stands as a model for veteran editors faced with technological change. At the Adams Papers, says one colleague, “Gregg’s longevity with the project has given him an important role in long-term planning. Most recently, he has helped us to shape our plans for digital editions. Although he remembers a time when word processors were cutting edge, Gregg has not shied away from embracing new technology and making the most of it in service to editing.” And I particularly enjoy the comment of one of his youngest and most technologically gifted colleagues: “Gregg has also impressed me with the openness and ease with which he has embraced the latest technical advancements in publishing and his cheerful willingness to learn new software—he is an old dog that *can* learn new tricks—with great aplomb and humor.”

All of which reminds us of how Gregg has become someone who can be described as “a hero of the documentary editing community. We need more like him and we badly need to recognize such persons for the really important roles they play, behind the scenes, in our profession.”

I will conclude by admitting that I take special pleasure in honoring Gregg tonight, for I was a member of the team that interviewed him for his job at the Adams Papers in 1975. It is always nice to have my own good judgment validated in such a public and deserving way.
Life Service Award Presented to Rich Leffler

John P. Kaminski

I have known Rich Leffler for more than forty years. We both came to the University of Wisconsin in 1967 as graduate students in the Department of History. He came from New York and I from Chicago. Rich started to work informally with the Ratification project in 1969–70, when he went to Raleigh, North Carolina, to do research on his dissertation. He searched libraries for the Ratification project, the First Federal Elections project, and the First Federal Congress project. Officially, Rich started to work full time on the project in 1973, first as a researcher, then as assistant editor, associate editor, senior associate editor, and finally as co-editor. He contributed importantly to the publication of twenty-one Ratification volumes. He just retired in July.

Rich has served the ADE long and hard. He has served a couple of stints as director of publications and is now co-editing with Ron Bosco Documentary Editing, the Association’s journal. He has been on the nominating committee, and served as chair. He was on the meetings committee, and served as chair of that committee. He was president of ADE in 1994–95.

He also served the profession as a long-time faculty member, frequent resident advisor, and commencement speaker at the annual Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents. He has applied his skills as an editor and his knowledge of the history of the process of ratifying the Constitution more broadly. He has been a reviewer for the NHPRC and the NEH. He has edited, along with me, two different volumes for general use on Ratification, one derived from weekly newspaper articles published during the Bicentennial of the Constitution. He has written articles for various journals. He has been a consultant to the Chicago Historical Society, and he was recently the co-curator for the New-York
Historical Society for an exhibit on the ratification of the Constitution by New York.

But it was at a session of the ADE Convention about twenty years ago that Rich’s presence in the ADE was trumpeted. I was serving on a panel with James Hutson, director of the manuscripts division of the Library of Congress and, at the time, a commissioner on the NHPRC. Hutson was critical of the job being done by documentary editors. He thought that merely getting the texts online was sufficient. He unfavorably compared John Catanzariti, the new editor of the Thomas Jefferson papers, with Julian Boyd, saying that John was no Julian Boyd. When we got to the question-and-answer period, Rich told Hutson that he should be ashamed of himself. He told Hutson “You sir, are no J. Franklin Jameson.” Ever since that moment, Rich has served as the conscience of the ADE.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to have the privilege of conferring upon Richard Leffler the ADE’s Life Service Award.
Contributors

Jana L. Argersinger is a long-time editor of Poe Studies and of ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance. Most of her published articles and conference presentations focus on Peabody, Elizabeth Stoddard, and Susan Warner. She co-edited Hawthorne and Melville: Writing a Relationship (2008); Poe Writing/Writing Poe (forthcoming in 2010); and a feature on journal editing for the MLA’s journal Profession (2009). She is also a past president of the Council of Editors of Learned Journals.

Noelle Baker is an independent scholar and an Editorial Associate for the Princeton edition of Henry D. Thoreau’s Writings. Her publications and research focus on Transcendentalism and women’s writing. Currently, she is working on two projects: a scholarly digital edition of Mary Moody Emerson’s Almanacks, co-edited with Sandy Petrulionis and in collaboration with the Brown Women Writers Project, and a study of manuscript culture within Transcendentalist families.

Jessie Bray is a Ph.D. candidate in English at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, where she received her M.A. in 2005; she specializes in nineteenth-century American literature and the formation of national identity through exploration and cultural contact. The author of “‘Not a pure idealist’: Ralph Waldo Emerson, Edward Emerson and the Civil War” (Research in American Literary Study, 2008), she is currently finishing her dissertation, “A more perfect Indian Wisdom: Literary Performance and Imperialism in Antebellum America,” which she intends to cultivate into a book-length study of Transcendentalism and the Indian question.

Ronald Broude is president of the music publisher Broude Brothers Limited and Trustee of the non-profit Broude Trust for the Publication of Musicological Editions. He has published papers on textual theory and practice in journals ranging from Historical Performance and Early Music America to Text and Textual Cultures. He serves on the Executive Committee of the Society for Textual Scholarship, and was executive director of that organization from 2004 to 2005.

Philander D. Chase was an editor of the Papers of George Washington at the University of Virginia for thirty-five years before his retirement in 2008. He served as treasurer of the Association for Documentary Editing from 1994 to 1997 and remains active in the association’s affairs as a councilor-at-large.
Amy Earhart is an Assistant Professor of English at Texas A&M University. Her work has appeared in *Reinventing the Peabody Sisters* (Iowa University Press, 2006), *ATQ: American Transcendental Quarterly,* and *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly.* Forthcoming work will appear in *The Thoreau Society Bulletin* and the *Oxford Handbook to Transcendentalism.* She has co-edited the forthcoming University of Michigan Press collection of essays, *The American Literature Scholar in the Digital Age.* Earhart is at work on a monograph titled *Traces of the Old, Uses of the New: The Emergence of the Digital Humanities.*

Peter C. Engelman is associate editor of the Margaret Sanger Papers at New York University, a writer, and an archivist. He is a graduate of the NYU program in Archival Management and Historical Editing and holds an MA in history. He has written widely on Margaret Sanger and the birth control movement, including an introduction to a reprint of Sanger’s 1922 *Pivot of Civilization* (Humanity Books, 2003). Currently, he is writing a history of the American birth control movement for Praeger Publishers.

Cheryl J. Fish has published two books on African American travel writing and on the importance of women’s mobility: *Black and White Women’s Travel Narratives: Antebellum Explorations* (University Press of Florida, 2004), and *A Stranger in the Village: Two Centuries of African-American Travel Writing* (co-edited with Farah Griffin, Beacon Press, 1999). The author of a number of essays on critical environmental studies, she is Professor of English at Borough of Manhattan Community College and Visiting Professor of Women’s Studies at the Graduate School, City University of New York.

Ann D. Gordon is editor of the *Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* and research professor in the Department of History, Rutgers University, New Brunswick. She is a former president of the Association for Documentary Editing and a recipient of its Distinguished Service Award in 2000 and its Lyman H. Butterfield Award in 1996. She was associate editor of the Jane Addams Papers, 1975 to 1977; assistant editor of the Papers of Woodrow Wilson, 1977 to 1979; and co-editor with Patricia G. Holland of the microfilm edition *Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* (Scholarly Resources, 1991).
Cathy Moran Hajo is the Associate Editor and Assistant Director of the Margaret Sanger Papers Project at New York University. She received her Ph.D. in History from New York University and is the author of the forthcoming book, *Birth Control on Main Street: Organizing Clinics in the United States, 1916–1939* (University of Illinois Press, 2010). She was the president of the Association for Documentary Editing from 2008 to 2009.

Kevin J. Hayes, Professor of English at the University of Central Oklahoma, is the author of several books including *The Road to Monticello: The Life and Mind of Thomas Jefferson* (Oxford University Press, 2008), *The Mind of a Patriot: Patrick Henry and the World of Ideas* (University of Virginia Press, 2008), and *Edgar Allan Poe* (Reaktion Books, 2009), a short critical biography. He is currently preparing an annotated edition of Poe’s works for Harvard University Press. To readers of *Documentary Editing*, he may be best known for starting the “Recent Editions” column, which he wrote for six years and for which he received the ADE’s Distinguished Service Award.

Margaret A. Hogan is the managing editor of the Adams Papers and the series editor for *Adams Family Correspondence*. With C. James Taylor, she recently published *My Dearest Friend: Letters of Abigail and John Adams* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007). Prior to joining the staff of the Adams Papers in 2003, she was an assistant editor with the Documentary History of the Ratification project and a project editor in the Trade Reference Department of Oxford University Press.

Anthony M. Joseph is Associate Professor of History at Houston Baptist University. He is currently editing the legal papers of James Iredell, one of the first justices of the United States Supreme Court.

John P. Kaminski is the director of the Center for the Study of the American Constitution in the History Department at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He is director and co-editor of *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*. In addition to the twenty-one ratification volumes, he has published twenty other volumes, the last of which are *The Founders on the Founders: Word Portraits from the American Revolutionary Era* (University of Virginia Press, 2008) and *The Quotable Abigail Adams* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009).
Mary-Jo Kline headed the Papers of Aaron Burr at the New-York Historical Society. She is the author of the standard text in this field, *A Guide to Documentary Editing* (Johns Hopkins University Press). She is currently a resident scholar in the history department of the University of Virginia. She is a past president of the ADE and the recipient of the 2008 Butterfield Award.

Kenneth P. Minkema is the Executive Editor of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* and of the Jonathan Edwards Center & Online Archive and Assistant Adjunct Professor of American Religious History at Yale Divinity School. He offers seminars in early American and early modern religious history, as well as reading courses in all periods of American religious history.

Joel Myerson is Carolina Distinguished Professor of American Literature Emeritus, at the University of South Carolina. Among his many works, he co-edited *The Professions of Authorship: Essays in Honor of Matthew J. Bruccoli* (University of South Carolina Press, 1996). He has also co-edited the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Transcendentalism* (2010).
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