

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Documentary Editing: Journal of the Association
for Documentary Editing (1979-2011)

Documentary Editing, Association for

1981

Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing, Volume 3, Number 1, February 1981.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/docedit>

 Part of the [Digital Humanities Commons](#), [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), and the [Technical and Professional Writing Commons](#)

"Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing, Volume 3, Number 1, February 1981." (1981). *Documentary Editing: Journal of the Association for Documentary Editing (1979-2011)*. Paper 153.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/docedit/153>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Documentary Editing, Association for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Documentary Editing: Journal of the Association for Documentary Editing (1979-2011)* by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

ISSN 0196-7134

FEBRUARY 1981

Vol. 3, no. 1

NEWSLETTER

of the

ASSOCIATION FOR
DOCUMENTARY EDITING



ADE Council

John Y. Simon, president, of the Ulysses S. Grant Association, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale IL 62901.

Lester J. Cappon, past-president, of the Newberry Library, 60 West Walton Street, Chicago IL 60610.

Don L. Cook, president-elect, of the Department of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Raymond W. Smock, secretary-treasurer, of the Booker T. Washington Papers, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742.

Nathan Reingold, director of publications, of the Joseph Henry Papers, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560.

The *Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing* is published quarterly by the Association's director of publications. Correspondence on editorial matters and books for review should be addressed to the *Newsletter* editor, Kathleen Waldenfels, Joseph Henry Papers, SI-133, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560. Inquiries about membership in the organization should be addressed to Raymond W. Smock, secretary-treasurer, History Department, University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742.

International Standard Serial Number: 0916-7134

© Association for Documentary Editing, 1981

ADE Publications Committee

GREGG L. LINT

Adams Papers
Massachusetts Historical Society

JON KUKLA

Virginia State Library

JOEL MYERSON

Department of English
University of South Carolina

NATHAN REINGOLD

Joseph Henry Papers
Smithsonian Institution

The Short Happy Thesis of G. Thomas Tanselle

DON L. COOK*

You will be relieved to know that the sheaf of pages I hold in my hand does not constitute the paper I intend to inflict upon you this morning. It is instead a Xerox copy of Tom Tanselle's article "The Editing of Historical Documents" as it appeared in the 1978 volume of *Studies in Bibliography*. I display it in this way for two contrasting reasons. First, it provides the physical evidence of one salient fact of Tom's critical scholarship. That is, when he writes on a topic he writes on *all* of it. There is an encyclopedic quality to his treatment of any subject. Whether you seek information on Greg's Theory of Copy-Text, on the Bibliographical Description of Paper, or on Principles of Editorial Apparatus, you find that reference to an article by Tom Tanselle not only presents his reasoned views of the current state of knowledge, but also makes you master of all the best and much of the worst that has been thought and said on the subject over the years. And any information omitted from the text will surely be referred to in the notes.

I make this point not by way of compliment or complaint but to draw attention to the fact that in the fifty-six pages of the article under discussion, no fewer than fifty-five editorial projects are considered, in almost exactly equal ranks of the elect and the reprobate. In fact, the first forty-one pages of this fifty-six page article are devoted almost exclusively to a survey and *quotation* of the editorial policies announced in these fifty-five editions plus Clarence E. Carter's *Historical Editing*, published as Bulletin #7 of the National Archives, and Samuel Eliot Morison's chapter on "The Editing and Printing of Manuscripts" in *The Harvard Guide to American History*. While editions are grouped so as to focus attention on the similarity of their policies, there is little discussion or advocacy of particular policies.

This observation brings me to the second of my contrasting reasons for displaying the article and to the rationale for my semi-plagiaristic title. The first forty-one pages do not contain a thesis. They contain a catalogue of an-

nounced editorial policies, often in the words of the editors themselves. The Tanselle Thesis—to the extent that it is either a thesis or Tanselle's—is contained in less than ten pages, including the ample footnotes. Thus I think it is, self-evidently, a short thesis. That it is a happy thesis I hope to persuade you with the argument that it is indeed a happy experience to encounter a few simple ideas that will deliver us from error and misconception. The principles of textual editing upon which Tanselle rests his hope of improving our practices are neither numerous nor complex. They are in fact simple and basic in the way that truly radical ideas always are. But I do not think that it has been the radical nature of his ideas that accounts for the prolonged, and sometimes heated, discussion accorded this article among editors.

The most frequent remark I have heard when the article is mentioned is some variation on "Well, we came off pretty well" or "Well, he certainly gave it to the X edition, didn't he?" To an evaluative report, such an initial response is probably inevitable. When the annual evaluation of teaching is published by the student government at Indiana University my first reaction is to check my own ratings and then compare them with the ratings of colleagues who teach similar courses. But there is this difference in the two publications. The students' rating of our teaching is neither a survey of the teachers' own statements of why and how they teach nor is it followed by a carefully reasoned discussion of the principles upon which the teaching proceeds. My point is that the *Consumer Reports* mind-set with which many of us have read this article has tended to focus attention almost exclusively on the first forty-one pages and to exhaust our power to attend or respond before we reach the final ten pages. So today I would like to focus on those final ten pages and, by restating, in blatant, unadorned, unfootnoted simplicity, a few basic ideas I find there, I hope to locate and clarify the "Tanselle Thesis."

Brevity is not the inevitable handmaiden to clarity and in attempting to focus and simplify I may have oversimplified or even misrepresented some of Tom's points. If so, I welcome correction. But I hope that the six propositions that I have drawn from Tom's article will serve to focus attention and to stimulate discussion on some of the more controversial and basic issues he has raised.

The first proposition reads—

In discussing editorial method, the necessary distinction is not between historical editing and literary editing but between "works intended for publication and private papers." "Letters, journals, published works, and manuscripts of unpublished works fall into both fields; all of them are historical documents, and any of them can be 'literary'" (p. 46). "In the case of notebooks, diaries, letters, and the like, whatever state they are in constitutes their finished form,

*Don L. Cook is with the English Department of Indiana University. This paper was presented to the Association's 1980 meeting in Williamsburg to open a session entitled "The Tanselle Thesis," which included two papers and a comment by G. Thomas Tanselle, author of "The Editing of Historical Documents," *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 1-56. Robert Taylor's paper is printed below.

and the question of whether the writer 'intended' something else is irrelevant" (p. 47).

That proposition addresses the very existence of an Association for Documentary Editing, for unless we embrace with sincerity and intellectual conviction the commonality of our responsibilities as *documentary* editors as opposed to historical or literary editors, there is little hope of our progressing very far beyond the 1978 conference at Lawrence, Kansas, sponsored by the NHPRC and the NEH. At that conference we began to acknowledge our mutual interests and to explore the possibility of mutual understanding, but we left Kansas still speaking of *our* methods and *their* methods. It was the founding, and, even more, the naming of the Association for Documentary Editing that formally acknowledged and encouraged the belief that our division along literary/historical lines was an artificiality and that when we functioned as editors of documents we were all engaged in the same discipline. To the extent that we doubt that fact or hesitate to embrace its scholarly implications, we retard the full and frank exchange of professional views. We must avoid any self-protective parochialism that would cause us to cling to traditions learned through imitation rather than refining our methods and clarifying our principles in rigorous debate with our fellow workers.

But that debate can be useful only when we feel confident that we are all talking about the same undertaking. Too often editors of fiction, poetry, essays and other published works have assumed that scholarly editing begins only when the bibliographic complications of copy-text editing are encountered. But as Tanselle points out, "the question of whether the writer 'intended' something else" becomes irrelevant as soon as one recognizes that the letter, as posted, the journal, as left, warts and all, represents the fullest expression of the author's intention in that document. And we should also note that the authority of that unique document is not increased by its being edited and published. The scrupulosity with which some editors respect the published document is in remarkable and quite illogical contrast to the modernization and correction they visit upon the unpublished document. I believe this is a prime example of our most common failure as documentary editors, that is the failure to think through the *principles*, as opposed to the methodologies of our discipline.

The second principle certainly flows from the first—

Because archaisms, inconsistencies, violations of convention, even careless slips are integral to the *private document* in which they occur, to modernize, to regularize, or even to correct what the modern editor regards as an author's error, is, by definition, to violate what we know of the author's intention. "The position that the text of a *scholarly* edition of any material can ever be modernized is indefensible" (p. 48).

If the position seems extreme, it is nonetheless the log-

ical result of the view that the author's intention with regard to the form and content of a private document resides within, and only within, that document. Did the author habitually rely upon an editor or compositor to regularize his punctuation or correct his spelling? Would he have clarified his meaning and resolved ambiguities before publishing his own letters or journal? These are irrelevant questions, for what we edit is what he left, not what he did elsewhere nor what he might have done in a longer life. If he left the meaning ambiguous, that ambiguity is part of the document and of the author's mental state. If the meaning is so confused that changes in punctuation or wording are required to clarify it, how do we know the meaning, thus clarified, is the author's and not the editor's? Confusion can be pointed out without being editorially resolved.

The convenience of the reader is frequently invoked to justify the modernization and regularization of spelling and punctuation. But who is this modern reader that voraciously consumes volume after volume of letters, diaries, documents, and dispatches, but has never learned to cope with archaic or inconsistent spelling and punctuation? Ought an editor to be tyrannized by so irresponsible an audience? Must we sacrifice the authenticity of the document to the willful incompetence of this putative reader? Or is this putative incompetent a straw man invented in order that we *may* regularize idiosyncratic usage and thereby remove peculiarities that might look like typos in the published volume? The clearest text is not necessarily the most informative, and surely no one would claim that any reader is better served by legible simplifications or handsome suppressions.

Williamsburg is an appropriate setting for the discussion of all aspects of documentary editing, but for none more than for proposition number three—

So far as resources of type permit, an edited private document should recreate for the reader the experience of confronting the original, including the evidences of the process of composition. The author's deletions and corrections are part of the document and best recorded where they occur, within the document. "Simply to leave them out, as is often done (or done on a selective basis), is indefensible, since they are essential characteristics of private documents" (p. 50).

One of the interesting questions in historical restoration is whether one aims at a final product that is exemplary of the builder's, cabinetmaker's, potter's art, a kind of spanking new catalogue model, or whether one should retain as much of the original material as possible, complete with its worm holes, stains, fades, and patches. Is it only the product that interests us, or do we desire to understand the work and materials that went into the product? Tanselle certainly comes out for retaining all evidences of composition in private papers.

Critics of this view regularly complain that corrections and deletions within the text get in the way of the meaning. Such a response seems to me to be based on two misconceptions. First, it ignores the fact that an author's indecision or change of mind *is* part of the meaning in a private document. It is not only Emily Dickinson's indecision about the best noun or verb that is of interest. Surely the change of a word in a military dispatch may be as significant as the proverbial loss of a nail. And where will the author's decision between words be most revealingly recorded? Probably in the context of the sentence rather than in a distant appendix. A second, and very strange, misconception seems to prevail among some reviewers. That is the apparent assumption that corrections and deletions are an option, like power windows, that may be added to the standard model. But unlike the reproduced antiques that have the scratches, worm holes, and wear added in the finishing shop, our flaws and false starts are part of the raw material, and it is not retaining them but removing them that artificially alters and falsifies the original meaning.

The fourth proposition is double-barreled and ought to still rather than inspire controversy—

In editing a holograph document, the process of transcribing is the occasion for the exercise of the editor's best and most fully-informed judgment: "deciphering handwriting and understanding the content are inseparable" (p. 52). But the literal transcription of unique holograph documents does not logically preclude the preparation of eclectic texts of other documents that exist only in multiple, non-holograph copies. If the editor "attempts, so far as his evidence allows, to remove some of the nonauthorial features [from one selected non-holograph copy], he comes that much closer to offering what was present in the author's manuscript" (p. 53).

Tanselle's point here seems to me to throw revealing light on the attitudes we bring to our editing. Implicit in his entire article is the assumption that establishing a text and editing are synonymous terms. But it is my impression that there are editors, of statesmen's papers for instance, who would feel that no matter how reliably the text of a document had been established, the editing remained radically incomplete until its content was fully annotated. This difference of emphasis has led to some interesting discussions on NEH panels. Is a proposal to republish a text with new annotation an editing proposal or only a publishing scheme? Must a new text be established in order for a project to qualify as an edition? Seldom is the question so clear-cut, but the emphasis on annotation has sometimes led to inattention, by reviewers, if not by editors, to the centrality of textual reliability in any edition.

Tanselle's emphasis is on the importance of context for the decipherment of handwriting, an emphasis that some editors might regard as a case of backing into the question.

But it has the advantage of focusing our attention on the means of securing a reliable text, including the use of multiple copies to construct an eclectic text of a lost holograph. In this paragraph Tanselle comes closer than anywhere else in the article to raising the question of where the text resides: is it a particular document, or is it an abstraction imperfectly embodied in each of several documents? So long as we deal with unique holographs of private papers, that question may be comfortably ignored. But it is one of those ideas that a documentary editor needs to have thought through before he runs out of holographs.

Proposition five comes up because of Peter Shaw's article in the *American Scholar*—

An editor's respect for historical fact is evidenced less in his choice between a literal transcription and an eclectic text than in his scrupulous reporting of his textual data. It is desirable that a reader be "able to reconstruct the original copy-texts and [be] in possession of much of the textual evidence which the editor had at his disposal" (p. 54).

But the point has wider implications because it emphasizes two traditions in documentary editing. One is a genteel tradition in which an editor's reputation as a scholar is the warranty for the reliability of the texts he publishes. Massive erudition in the annotation has sometimes had the effect of de-emphasizing textual expertise, and the indifference of many reviewers to textual editing has reinforced this tendency. At the other pole is the tradition that looks upon the text offered by an editor as a subjective product, the result of a series of decisions and choices which, with no hard feelings, are open to review and perhaps reversal on the basis of the data that accompanies the text. Within this tradition the term "definitive text" is considered a logical contradiction: the best one hopes for is a definitive apparatus, that is an error-free record of the variant forms. Obviously the second tradition is more prevalent in the editing of published works and therefore of literary figures.

The invidious comparisons Peter Shaw's article contained took note of no such fine distinctions. But an understanding of these traditions and of their roots within the historical and the literary disciplines is important to the ADE. The way we address editorial theory and indeed the way we address one another, is colored by these two traditions. We are in more than one way the practitioners of our professions and while we are met on the common ground of documentary editing, almost all of us carry passports from other points of origin.

And that is why the simple declaration that Tom Tanselle makes in the final paragraph of his article is so freighted with importance—

"Editing is of course more than a matter of technique" (p. 56).

As all of us have learned who have taught courses in editing, students learn the techniques, the methodologies,

rather quickly. But two things essential to editing come slowly. The first is a sufficient understanding of the context from which the documents derive, the life and times, and modes of speaking and thinking. And the second is a bone-deep grasp of the *principles* behind editorial methodologies. Not the techniques for searching, filing, and

proofing, but an understanding of the essential differences between published works and private papers, of the assumptions an editor makes when he chooses to modernize, and why every attempt to perfect a text must also be viewed as an opportunity for a new corruption.

Editorial Practices— An Historian's View

ROBERT J. TAYLOR*

All those engaged in the editing of literary and historical documents are deeply in debt to Dr. Tanselle for his thorough analysis of the editorial standards that have been set for the dozens of projects now going forward. Somewhat to the embarrassment of the profession, he has seized upon individual statements of editorial practice that have internal inconsistencies and that are in conflict with the editor's actual practice. And although his article, now before us for discussion, is aimed primarily at the shortcomings of historical editors, he has not let the literary fraternity escape unscathed, some of whom, he finds, are guilty of the same sins as the historians. Nor is Dr. Tanselle all negative in his assessments. He gives generous praise to historians for annotation that provides the needed context for edited documents. Some of us are thankful that he is not at all disturbed about the length of notes and that he firmly eschews the charge of triviality that has been leveled by some historians. "If a note illuminates, who is to say that it is trivial or time-wasting?" he seems to ask. He finds that the scholars of literature need to do more than they have done to provide the settings for the works they edit.

In the course of his critical examination of editorial practices, Dr. Tanselle sets forth standards that he would have all editors adhere to. Rejecting as far as editing goes any distinction between literary and historical documents or between the productions of literary men and statesmen, he insists that the paramount concern must be the integrity of the document itself. And here he does make a distinction—that between printed and manuscript documents never intended for print or between public and private papers.

Writings intended for publication introduce a complicating element: the printer's or publisher's contribution. In editing a printed document, the scholarly editor is urged to make corrections and emendations that will re-

store the intention of the author. The result will be a critical text, preferably in clear form. That is to say, the editor, using available manuscript sources and carefully collating all obtainable and significant printed versions, may produce a version not precisely like any extant document, whether in print or not, but one that in the editor's best judgment adheres strictly to the author's intent. Such a text will be clear of the impedimenta of the editorial craft—the brackets, braces, carets, different type faces and sizes—but the reader will be able to reconstruct each of the significant variant texts by consulting a list of all changes made that is given in the back of the book. Thus the reader enjoys an eminently readable text, but he does not remain uninstructed on what the editor has been up to.

Private papers, such as letters and journals, never intended by their authors for publication, Dr. Tanselle wants treated in a different way. First, he rejects any silent changes in the text, particularly any effort at modernization. He takes historians to task, for example, for regularizing punctuation or paragraphing; for silently correcting slips of the pen, such as inadvertent repetition of word or phrase; or even for dropping the dash that in the eighteenth century commonly follows a period. Silently tinkering with the text alters the spirit and mood of the original; it injects an editor's judgment or taste between reader and author. What Dr. Tanselle desires is a literal text that with suitable editorial devices includes every cross-out, interlineation, comma, capital letter, and misspelling. To give notice of deletions in a note would leave the reader "to reconstruct the text of the document, which is after all of primary interest" (p. 50). By keeping the deleted matter in the text, the editor allows the reader to have the same experience as "reading the original" (p. 51). So far as the text goes, the only editorial judgments allowed silently to intrude are those which determine what a carelessly written word actually is despite malformation of a letter or two and whether the author made his changes at first writing or at a later time.

Dr. Tanselle likes clear lines drawn and firm distinctions

*Robert J. Taylor is editor in chief of the Adams Papers at the Massachusetts Historical Society.

made. He is partial to no-nonsense terms. If an editor presents private documents "as anything more polished or finished than they were left by the writer, he is *falsifying* their nature." Failure to record every deletion is indefensible. Deletions are "*essential* characteristics of private documents" (pp. 47, 50; all italics supplied). Why then, have historical editors behaved so badly? They have pleaded that they wanted to make their documents more readable. Ironically, those of their colleagues who are partial to writing monographs seem less and less concerned with readability—except when they choose to consult printed and edited documents. Dr. Tanselle has no patience with the readability defense. The only way the reader can recapture the author's spirit and mood is to tackle angle brackets, braces, unexpanded abbreviations, and intrusive commas.

Well, I am not a clear-lines, firm-distinctions sort of fellow myself. I prefer to leave rather more latitude to editorial judgment than Dr. Tanselle would. Take the matter of deletions. I am convinced that a sensible and sensitive editor can determine whether in the given context a deletion is significant or not. The determination, of course, will be more obvious in some cases than others. If there were many deletions (I cannot give a quantitative definition of "many"), I might want to include them all because they might, given the context, suggest an indecisive or agitated state of mind. But three or four inconsequential ones in a document, along with incomprehensible punctuation and superfluous dashes, could well annoy a modern reader. They would not be "too difficult," as Dr. Tanselle insists, but reader annoyance itself could block the reader from sensing a writer's mood. I believe that there is a difference between essential and non-essential, although I cannot draw a precise line. In the interest of precision, Dr. Tanselle would say that it is essential to record every deletion.

It seems to me that insisting that silent changes of any sort will destroy the mood conveyed by a document puts the burden of proof on those who insist. If, as many editors have said, a dash after a period can safely be eliminated as meaningless, it is incumbent upon those who agree with Dr. Tanselle to demonstrate what exact mood or spirit is sacrificed by the silent deletion of such dashes. By way of aside, it would not surprise me if someone were able to show that the dash after a period was copied from newspaper printers, who used it to justify lines. I believe that no one, among historians at least, has publicly observed that newspaper printers were much closer to modern practice in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation than educated statesmen of the eighteenth century. It may be that printers set a kind of standard that the educated gradually copied.

The important point is that newspaper readers until late in the eighteenth century felt no compulsion *to follow* a standard; the notion of an authority for orthography and

punctuation did not emerge until then. Dr. Johnson's dictionary, which did not appear until 1755, took a long time to become an arbiter, especially in America. Without agreed-upon norms, abnormalities by our standards today were not such then and probably did not reflect mood or spirit. Not until Noah Webster's spellers began to appear, the first in 1782, did children begin to be trained to spell and pronounce according to a single standard as a way of promoting nationalism and even equality. Ironing out differences in orthography and pronunciation, it was thought, would help to level distinctions. But the effort was largely a nineteenth-century phenomenon (Robert L. Church and Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States*, N.Y., 1976, pp. 16-20).

John Adams and other gentlemen of his generation never looked upon correct spelling and capitalization as worthy of notice. Occasionally I receive a letter from a family member who makes a lazy stab at spelling a difficult word and puts "sp?" in parentheses after it—the mark of a guilty conscience. Our generation thinks that spelling is important, or knows that it ought to think so, at least. Living in Philadelphia in the early days of the Continental Congress, Adams fumbled repeatedly with the spelling of "Pennsylvania." Had he cared about it, he could have obtained the form accepted locally from the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, which he read regularly. I have read many a letter to and from Adamses that apologized for a poor performance. A large sheet was used to write only a few lines; the letter was written in haste; it was prolix; it was scribbled and had words crossed out and interlined. Never did anyone apologize for his punctuation, spelling, abbreviations, capital letters, or the use of the ampersand. There simply was no established and recognized authority on these matters, nor did statesmen feel the need for one. Everyone was on his own. My wincing the first few times I encountered John Adams' spelling of "college" with a "d" only revealed an unhistorical attitude. So did my perception of quaintness in the unexpanded abbreviations, superscript letters, and ampersands of the *Susquehanna Company Papers*, on which I served my apprenticeship as an historical editor. Proofreading volumes of such literally rendered text soon made it seem ordinary enough. No special flavor lingered. Probably we have all been surprised when a young undergraduate remarks upon the funny "s's" of the eighteenth century that look like "f's." Scholars immersed in manuscripts and books of the period have long since forgotten to notice such a peculiarity.

Critics of the silent supplying of minimal punctuation where it is required need to do more than assert that a mood has been destroyed. At the Adams Papers we have encountered whole pages without periods or capital letters to mark divisions of sentences. Only slow and careful reading enabled us to figure out where a sentence should begin and end. We then provided a few periods without any sense of guilt, notifying the reader in a general way that we

had done so. In some instances the placement of a period can alter meaning, for it may shift a modifying phrase or clause from one sentence to another. Clearly in these instances, the editor must tell the reader exactly where he has supplied terminal punctuation. Our rule of thumb has been that if one is reading along and has to back up to ascertain meaning, the editor should supply help with due notice to the reader. A different sort of example is a series of names in which missing commas make it difficult to keep first names linked with last ones. In this case we insert minimal punctuation without notice. What mood is conveyed by such missing commas? Haste? Boredom? Or no mood at all, but perhaps a poor nib on the quill? Who is to say? Several commas in a row with brackets around them may only distract the reader from the mood that the whole page or document was meant to evoke.

I would not convey the impression that we at the Adams Papers are cavalier in our approach to the integrity of the text. We concede that retention of spelling and punctuation may say something about an Adams and those who were frequent correspondents of his. There are misspellings and misspellings, for example. Some may suggest a level of education or slipshod habits. Although there was no standard for punctuation, some correspondents show a pretty consistent standard of their own, and it seems simpler to copy their practice than constantly to "correct" it. But what retention of spelling and pointing says does not warrant slavish copying if that will get in the way of the meaning of the words and the spirit of the document. Thus the Adams Papers retain misspellings, peculiarities of punctuation, and the like. We do not supply periods if commas, semi-colons, or colons do duty in grouping words meaningfully. We ignore all that is taught in freshman composition about the horrors of the comma splice and separation of subject and verb with a comma (a favorite practice of John Adams); but where sentence meaning is at stake, we prefer an exercise of editorial judgment to exact copying with intrusive brackets and other devices.

For us, meaning inheres mostly in the sense of the words, with archaic and obsolete ones getting footnote explanations. If there is meaning in odd colons and superfluous dashes, we believe that it is not retrievable. An assertion that part of the meaning lies in these is an assertion and nothing more when there is little apparent relation between pauses, stress, and rhythm and the marks used or not used. A student of punctuation may find meaning in pointing practice, but that is another story altogether. Although we try to serve a variety of needs among our readers, we cannot serve them all and keep in sight our main objective, the illumination of history. Even genealogists must accept whatever part of a loaf we offer and not beg for answers to their every question.

Mention of meaning raises another consideration. I have called Dr. Tanselle an admirer of distinctions, but I should have mentioned an exception. He asserts that historical

and literary documents are intrinsically the same, that no difference in approach to the text of a statesman's letter and a poet's is warranted, even though the one is a man of affairs and the other an artist. Granted that good poets may write dull letters and indifferent politicians, lively ones, still a statesman's letters are read for what they may reveal about his views, his motives, the opinions of others, the course of events—in short, what they reveal about history and the subject's role in it. If his style of writing says something about his character, so much the better. A distinguished poet's letters may be read for biographical information and any manner of other things, too; but we look especially for clues to his aesthetics, his approach to life, the experiences that may underlie and shape the meaning of his poems. If in his letters his word-choice is undistinguished and his sentences clumsy (hard to believe of a poet), we feel a sense of loss from disappointed expectations. No one feels the need to study the poems of mediocre poets or to run through their letters, unless they made better friends than they did poems. But the letters of even the dullest politicians who had a part, however humble, in important events can be perused with profit for the light they may throw upon a moment or a decade. In a roundabout way I am saying that the aesthetic interest is central in the study of literary documents of all kinds. For historical documents, that interest is a bonus; their contribution to the understanding of history is of overriding concern. To insist upon literal rendition in all private papers is to throw things out of balance.

The absolute fidelity to punctuation, deletions, and interlineations that Dr. Tanselle supports can best be defended for legal documents: legislative resolutions, statutes, declarations, constitutions, treaties, and the like. Since lawyer-like minds sweat over them with thought for their future use in the courts or in the court of world opinion, editorial judgment of what is significant and what is not about alterations in the language needs to give place to the judgments that courts and world opinion will ultimately make. Letters dashed off to friends or thoughts confided to a diary are hardly in the same class. I would not have such distinctions laid down in rules, however, for no set of editorial practices spelled out in an introduction can provide for every contingency. An attempt to do so would mean spending more time laboring over distinctions than can be justified. Proclaiming a thoroughly consistent and inflexible rule that every text shall be preserved as it is in the original insofar as type permits has a seductive simplicity, but I rather like the complexities of a freer reign for editorial judgment.

I have been talking all along about the eighteenth century, which I know best. In the next century, regularization of spelling and punctuation had come to be regarded as important in and outside the schools. If an author chose to ignore that trend, with or without feeling guilty, then the editor will be making a different sort of judgment in

preparing his text. Misspellings and whimsical punctuation will have some meaning. Even in the eighteenth century, whimsy had its place. One thinks of the evocative dashes in *Tristram Shandy*, which I once had the temerity to puzzle over in a master's essay on Laurence Sterne's prose style. But the Adamases and their friends seem to have ignored the delightful possibilities of punctuation.

Here perhaps we have the inherent difficulty in trying to set up standards equally applicable to editors of literary and historical documents. For students of literature and bibliographers the text is the thing, even though Dr. Tanselle urges literary editors to put more effort into "explanatory annotation." A good part of the historical editor's work is finding and arranging the documents of his edition. His most important task is placing each in its historical context by explaining references, supplying background, showing development of ideas, and making comparisons. In performing these tasks he functions as an historian. The literary editor is a textual critic primarily; less often is he a literary critic in the broad sense. His work does not require in-depth analysis of non-textual matters, for the document has its own integrity; it can be taken on its own terms. Few historical documents, besides those in the categories just mentioned, are so important that textual purity in Dr. Tanselle's sense is of prime concern.

Dr. Tanselle does not say anything about readers except that they ought not to be dismayed by the difficulties of a literally rendered text. It will still be readable. What is required, however, is a definition of readability. If all one means by the term is that editorial insertions in a printed text of private papers will not prevent a reader from grasping the sense of a passage, one must concede that such devices do not render a sentence or a paragraph incomprehensible. But there is more to readability than that. A multiplicity of devices can be distracting. Within a paragraph a whole succession of angle brackets around deletions can leave a reader to puzzle out just how the final version is to go and cause him to lose the mood of the whole piece, particularly if he finds the editorial apparatus annoying. Those who follow the rules of the Center for Scholarly Editions seem to recognize this danger in that clear text is preferred for printed works or public documents, but Dr. Tanselle insists that private papers should carry all the editorial apparatus right in the text. Aside from the intrusiveness of apparatus, the expense of typesetting a text full of brackets and other devices would greatly increase production costs that are already burdensome.

Although the letters of novelists may remain essentially private, the letters of statesmen are the stuff of history; and historians deeply believe, however much their performance may belie the ideal, that all citizens need to understand history. Historians want edited documents of all kinds, not just public ones, to be accessible to scholar and non-scholar alike. They are encouraged when they learn that private

papers are being increasingly used in the classroom and when physicians and businessmen confess that they are reading diaries and letters of historical figures. Readability, then, if a wide audience is to be secured, is not a frivolous but a legitimate goal. To obtain it, an editor need not automatically follow precise rules laid down with iron consistency. In fact, I welcome the variety of editorial practices being followed on the assumption that each qualified editor best understands the requirements for accessibility for the materials that he is dealing with. Chided for his modernization of the documents on ratification of the United States Constitution and the first federal elections, Merrill Jensen perhaps knew best. No central figure dominates the documents which he edited; important ideas from a great variety of sources are the thing, not individual spelling and punctuation. Once again, Dr. Tanselle imports from the editing of literary documents the principle of the sanctity of the text with its every wart preserved, a principle not necessary for many, perhaps most, of the documents that an historical editor works with.

For a moment I would like to return to the reproduction of printed documents or, rather, public ones, as Dr. Tanselle calls them. He is quite right in stressing that historical editors should examine whatever printed versions are extant, just as one would compare drafts and letterbook copies with finished products and recipients' copies. But, again, I would leave the editor to distinguish between significant and inconsequential differences and to note only the former—unless the editor decided that the sheer number of differences was significant in itself. I am, however, troubled by the production of a public work that has no real counterpart in any document because the editor has divined through manuscripts and other means the intention of the author. Although I have made a case of sorts for allowing latitude to the editor's judgment, I would not go so far as to sanction what almost looks like collaboration, a point raised by several CSE critics. Preferably, the editor should choose from among the possibilities the version of an historical document which is closest to finished form, that is, closest to the author's desire at a given time, and then where the author's intention has not been carried out, suggest at those various points with appropriate documentation what that intention was. In this way at least a text is presented that has a real existence, that has author approval or author and publisher approval, if you will, at some stage. For an editor to create a text suitable for a perfect world in which the author's intention reigned is to create one that never was, one that has no *historical* validity, whatever its *critical* soundness. Historical editors must deal first with what was; a flawed document may have considerable historical significance. What should have been can appear in the notes. A clear text can too easily be lifted out and passed off as the definitive version, despite its designation by the CSE, or some comparable body for historians, as "An," not "The," "Approved Text."

In emphasizing the absolute need to compare all available versions of a piece of writing whether intended by its author for print or not, Dr. Tanselle resorts to a footnote (No. 36) to condemn the historian's use of photocopies as authentic sources for comparison. He reminds us all that such copies can be misleading, but he goes too far in his insistence that comparison only with originals will do, thus setting a standard for perfection that historical editors cannot live up to. Unlike most editorial enterprises, the Adams Papers has access to the originals, as distinct from photocopies and film, of the several hundred thousand documents carefully preserved through six generations (now on 608 reels of microfilm deposited in 90 libraries, here and abroad). But the "accessions" acquired in photo-facsimile form from 233 widely scattered archives and collections, many of them in foreign countries, are of equal importance to the editorial function. These were gathered over many years, and a few still come in. The expense in time and money that would be required to return to depositories to check typed transcripts against originals would be prohibitive and unjustifiable. The size of travel budgets and the resulting delays in publication would give the NHPRC apoplexy. The editor does need to be on his guard in using photocopies, and when his suspicions are aroused to seek out the originals. Our office has occasional requests from scholars using the Adams Papers microfilms that require us to look up the originals to settle a point. But examination of every original is unthinkable; depositories trying to save wear and tear on manuscripts by

making film or Xeroxes available would not even permit such zeal to override their rules.

Obviously I have made no effort to enter a defense for every editorial project or set of editorial practices found wanting by Dr. Tanselle. Some are not defensible, and none of them is without blemish. His contribution has been to make us think harder about what we are doing and about what our colleagues are doing, examining more carefully the models whose guidance we have accepted. Yet, although we are met together as members of a single organization engaged in what sounds like the same scholarly activity, I contend that the materials we labor over and the aims we pursue justify different practices. Neither historian nor literary scholar need be contemptuous of the other; rather, we can and ought to learn from each other, giving regard to both the approach to a documentary text and the circumstances that provide its setting. Beyond this, and perhaps as a matter of temperament, I am uneasy with inflexible rules and favor more readily than Dr. Tanselle the exercise of editorial discretion within the limits of a text as given. Readers are entitled to know the principles which an editor sets for himself, but editors can design those rules with reference to the materials they work with, choosing modernization or partial regularization as befits their purposes. An historical editor's real sin is saying carefully and explicitly what he is going to do and then not sticking to it. And here Dr. Tanselle has indeed struck home.

Study on Documentary Editing

A major study on documentary editing will be presented to the NHPRC in early 1981. Professor Henry Graff of Columbia University and Dr. Simone Reagor of Radcliffe are conducting the study with the assistance of a nine-member advisory committee of historians, librarians, and publishers. The committee consists of Janet James, Professor of History at Boston College; Robert Wedgeworth, Executive Director of the American Library Association; Garry Wills, columnist and historian; Eugene Sheehy, Chief Reference Librarian, Columbia University; Morris Phillipson, Director, University of Chicago Press; Richard Etulain, Editor, *New Mexico Historical Review*; Stanley Idzerda, Editor-in-chief, Papers of the Marquis de Lafayette; Mary Beth Norton, Professor of History, Cornell University; and Jill Conway, President, Smith College.

Commissioned by the NHPRC and funded by the Mellon Foundation, the study is a product of the Commission's concern that the major documentary editions are

taking too long and costing too much. The study will examine "the extent and use of the major documentary editions; current practices of annotation and selection, especially as they affect the cost and duration of projects; the promise of new technological advances; types of editions needed and desired by the scholarly community as well as the general public; funding dilemmas of most long-term projects and possible solutions; and responsibilities of sponsoring institutions in forwarding the work of the projects" (*Annotation*, November 1980, p. 1).

An article by Karen J. Winkler in the 19 January 1981 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* describes the problems, largely financial, faced by the large-scale editing projects and quotes the authors of the study, project editors, and NHPRC staff on their particular concerns and proposed solutions.



Alexander De Conde compliments editor Richard B. Morris for skirting "the pitfalls in large-scale historical editing" in "Cantankerous Diplomat of Independence," a review of *John Jay: The Winning of the Peace* (volume 2 of 4) in *Reviews in American History* 8 (December 1980): 483-486.

ADE COMMITTEES

ADE Council

Lester J. Cappon
Don L. Cook
Nathan Reingold
John Y. Simon
Raymond W. Smock

Bylaws

Warren M. Billings, chair
George C. Rogers
Raymond W. Smock

Education

Carl E. Prince, chair
John P. Kaminski
Richard N. Sheldon

Federal Policy

Charlene N. Bickford, chair
Ira Berlin
Sharon Lew
Henry K. Tom

Job Register Feasibility

David W. Hirst

Julian P. Boyd Award

Robert A. Rutland, chair
Louis R. Harlan
Donald Jackson

Nominating

G. Thomas Tanselle, chair
Linda Grant DePauw
LeRoy Graf
Michael Richman
Kenneth Sanderson

Bylaws Warren Billings reports that the committee is working on a proposed set of bylaws which will be presented to the membership in the May *Newsletter* for a vote by mail. Approved bylaws are a necessary step towards incorporation and tax-exempt status.

Federal Policy A committee on federal policy has been appointed to follow the progress of federal legislation which will have an effect on the field of documentary editing; to inform members when support for such legislation is needed; and to arrange for ADE testimony before the responsible subcommittees. Charlene Bickford (First Federal Congress Project) will chair the committee, which is made up of Sharon Lew (Olmsted Papers), Henry Tom (Johns Hopkins University Press), and Ira Berlin (Freedom History Project). The committee seeks the widest possible participation by ADE members and would welcome suggestions on issues that should be addressed, which members of Congress might be approached for support etc. Establishment of a broader base of support for documentary editing will be a goal of the committee, and to this

Program

Don L. Cook, chair
Roger Bruns
Charles Cullen
James B. Meriwether
John P. Kaminski (local arrangements)

Publications

Nathan Reingold, director
Jon Kukla
Gregg L. Lint
Joel Myerson

Editing Manual

Richard K. Showman, chair
John Porter Bloom
Lester J. Cappon
David R. Chesnutt
Don L. Cook
Thomas E. Jeffrey
John P. Kaminski
Glenn W. LaFantasie
Arthur S. Link
David J. Nordloh
Barbara B. Oberg
John Y. Simon
Paul H. Smith
G. Thomas Tanselle

executive subcommittee

David J. Nordloh, chair
David R. Chesnutt
Paul H. Smith

author

Mary-Jo Kline

end regular communications with other interested organizations (i.e., the MLA, SAA, DAR, AAUP, the Society for History in the Federal Government) will be maintained. Your comments may be sent to Charlene Bickford, First Federal Congress Project, George Washington University, Washington DC 20052.

Job Register Feasibility John Simon has asked David W. Hirst (Papers of Woodrow Wilson) to study the feasibility of a job register for ADE members. They would like to hear from anyone with ideas on the subject.

Publications At the invitation of the Director of Publications, Kathleen Waldenfels will be editing the *Newsletter* in 1981. The *Newsletter* will continue to appear quarterly in February, May, September, and December. Contributions and suggestions are welcome.

The Publications Committee is interested in developing ideas for additional ADE publications. Members are encouraged to send their thoughts on possible publications to the committee members: Nathan Reingold, Director of Publications, Jon Kukla, Gregg Lint, and Joel Myerson.

Proposed Editing Manual: Background

In his presidential address at the ADE meeting in Princeton in November 1979, Arthur Link suggested that the profession's most obvious need was for "an authoritative manual on documentary editing." As a first step, Lester Cappon, the incoming president, suggested the formation of a committee whose first objective would be to determine the practicability of ADE producing a manual, and whose next objective (assuming the first was decided in the affirmative) would be to prepare a set of preliminary guidelines to be discussed at the annual meeting in Williamsburg in October 1980. Richard Showman (Nathanael Greene Papers) agreed to chair the committee and with Lester Cappon chose fourteen members (see the current list elsewhere in this issue).

Prior to a committee meeting in Williamsburg almost a year later, the committee communicated by mail and phone. To begin discussions, Dr. Showman drew up and circulated a thirty-five-page outline of the kind of manual his project would have found useful at its inception. Realizing that "only the collective wisdom and experience of a number of editors could produce a useful manual," Dr. Showman hoped that his outline would elicit a variety of comments that would become the basis for a tentative set of guidelines to be discussed and further developed at a committee meeting in Williamsburg.

In the meantime, the NHPRC made \$1000 in private funds available to the committee to cover expenses. George Farr of the National Endowment for the Humanities, who was consulted on the possibility of NEH financing, recommended that the committee choose an author of the manual well before the annual meeting who could help with preparing a proposal to NEH. Since the ADE meeting would not occur until after NEH's normal deadline for applications, he approved a December deadline for ADE's proposal. During the summer three university presses—South Carolina, North Carolina, and Johns Hopkins—expressed strong interest in publishing the book.

In September Mary-Jo Kline, whose Aaron Burr Papers are to be completed in February 1981, was chosen by the committee as author of the prospective manual. She was invited to attend the committee meetings in Williamsburg, which occurred October 29 and 30 prior to the full ADE meeting. All members except Arthur Link, John Simon, and Thomas Tanselle attended. Secretary-Treasurer Ray Smock was invited to attend as a participant, while George Farr of the NEH and Roger Bruns and Mary Giunta of the NHPRC attended as observers.

Mary-Jo Kline had drawn up a tentative outline of a manual based on the committee's earlier comments as well as on her own editorial experience, and this document be-

came the basis of the committee's discussions on the nature and scope of the manual. The committee agreed unanimously with Mary-Jo that the manual would in no way be prescriptive. It would be rather descriptive of the broad experience of documentary editors, especially those in the United States, both literary and historical. Since the word "manual" has implications of authoritative how-to handbooks, most members thought a better designation desirable. Ray Smock suggested a title such as "Documentary Editing: Principles and Practices." Whether this is the eventual title of the book or not, it expresses the committee's recognition of the great variety of editorial projects and the committee's desire to stay away from any suggestion of laying down hard and fast rules or methodologies. The committee felt strongly that examples of documentary editing would be an important part of any such work.

At Williamsburg it was decided that there should be a small subcommittee that Mary-Jo Kline could consult and which would periodically review the progress of the work or help in solving unforeseen problems. The full committee would have an opportunity to approve the final manuscript before it goes to press, while the officers of ADE, including Nathan Reingold of the Publications Committee, and the subcommittee would be authorized to choose a publisher and to make suitable financial arrangements.

—KW

In November John Simon appointed a review subcommittee within the full committee to increase efficiency in the gathering of information and to improve communication with the author. Facing a December deadline for the NEH proposal, Mary-Jo Kline sent a draft to the subcommittee for revisions and suggestions and submitted the proposal to NEH. A decision is expected in late May.

The proposal asks for funds to cover salary support for the author; travel by her to a limited number of significant research sites for the collection of information; stationery, postage, telephone, and the typing of the final manuscript; and a meeting of the subcommittee to review the entire manuscript before submission to the whole committee and then to the ADE Council. More importantly, the proposal emphasizes ADE's interest in description rather than proscription, and the constant participation in and supervision of the work by the organization.

Mary-Jo Kline's introductory summary to the proposal speaks for itself on these points:

ADE proposes to prepare a guide to the principles and practices of documentary editing that have evolved in the United States in the last forty years. The traditions of both "historical" and "literary" editorial projects will be surveyed . . . It will be organized to serve the needs not only of editors but also of faculty and students in formal courses on documentary editing and of scholars and other readers who

form the audience for such editions.

ADE has created a review panel drawn from its membership's many fields of interest to ensure that the guide will draw on the expertise of a full range of documentary specialists.

The application outlines the procedures adopted by ADE to expedite the process of collaboration by which Dr. Kline will prepare the guide with the assistance of ADE and its members and to ensure that the ADE and its Executive Council will exercise full review over the manuscript.

The body of the proposal elaborates on all of these elements, describing the processes of research, writing, and review, and identifying the committee members. It only generally summarizes the contents of the guide itself, since that fuller, more specific detail will be generated by the research NEH is being asked to support. A list of chapter titles provided in the final section of the proposal constitutes an outline of the issues which the committee meeting at Williamsburg approved as the basis for the guide:

1. Collection of Materials
2. "Control" Procedures
3. Form of Publication
4. Selection of Materials for Editorial Attention
5. Transcription and Collation
6. Determination of the "established" or "copy" text for annotation
7. Annotation
8. Preparation of the Edition for Publication

The outline may not comprehend all the topics and concerns of individual editors and projects, but it is the general process, and not the outline, which NEH is being asked to support. At the appropriate time, ADE members will be called on to fill in and expand on that outline from their experience. We hope that time will arrive.

DAVID J. NORDLOH
Indiana University

Word Processing

The NHPRC will sponsor a conference on the use of word processors and computers in documentary editing to be held at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia on 4-5 May 1981. NHPRC-sponsored publication projects which are at an early enough stage to benefit from the recent technology will be invited to send a staff member to the conference. Other participants will include projects which have used word processing, publishers of NHPRC-sponsored editions, and representatives from computer firms. The conference is funded by a grant from the Mellon Foundation.

TEXT

The Society for Textual Scholarship will hold its first conference at the City University of New York on 10-11 April 1981. Entitled "Current Problems in Textual Scholarship: An Interdisciplinary Conference," the program will consist of papers "concerned with any aspect of the enumeration, description, transcription, editing or annotating of texts in any discipline."

Sponsored by Brooklyn College, Herbert H. Lehman College, Queensborough Community College, and the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, the Society will hold a two-day conference every year and publish *TEXT*, a volume of transactions edited by D.C. Greetham and W. Speed Hill. Further information is available from the *TEXT* Correspondence Secretary, Room H-428, Queensborough Community College, Springfield Boulevard, Bayside NY 11364.

NEH Editing Program

The Program for Editions of the National Endowment for the Humanities accepts applications for funding of scholarly editorial projects (book or microform) in all fields of the humanities. Proposals may be presented against the program's 1 October 1981 deadline for funding beginning as early as 1 July 1982. Applications are evaluated by specialists in the field, a panel of scholarly editors, the National Council on the Humanities, and the Endowment's Chairman. Final decisions on applications are made in late May.

It is recommended that persons interested in applying contact the program at least eight to ten weeks before the 1 October deadline to determine whether their projects are eligible for competition and to request the program's specific guidelines.

Program for Editions
Division of Research Programs, MS 350
National Endowment for the Humanities
806 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
(202) 724-1672



In a joint review of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, volume 21, and *The Papers of Robert Morris*, volumes 3 and 4, Colin Bonwick congratulates the editors for "their policy of publishing their successive volumes as rapidly as is consonant with sound scholarly practice." According to the reviewer, "the two sets of editors have understood that they perform essentially a service to other historians." *Journal of American Studies* 14 (August 1980): 316-318.

Editors and Their Work

LINDA J. PIKE, assistant editor of *Lafayette in the Age of the American Revolution*, won the 1980 Philip M. Hamer Award of the Society of American Archivists. The award is made annually to an outstanding junior historical editor. NHPRC Fellowships in Historical Editing for 1980-1981 were awarded to MICHAEL CRAWFORD (The Adams Papers), CONSTANCE B. SCHULZ (Documentary History of the First Federal Congress), and JASON H. SILVERMAN (Fredrick Douglass Papers).

Three documentary editions were chosen for the 1980 Book and Journal Show of the Association of American University Presses. Selected by jurors for excellence in design and production were Frank C. Mevers, ed., *The Papers of Josiah Bartlett* (University Press of New England); Bernard Peach, ed., with J.E. Larson, *Richard Price and the Ethical Foundations of the American Revolution* (Duke University Press); William G. McLoughlin, ed., *The Diary of Isaac Backus*, 3 vols. (Brown University Press). The latter was typeset by the press on an IBM Composer.

The Peale Papers marked the publication of a comprehensive microfiche edition of *The Collected Papers of Charles Willson Peale and His Family* at a reception in the National Portrait Gallery on 2 December 1980. Prepared by LILLIAN B. MILLER and her staff, the edition contains over 5,500 items, including color fiches of sketches and water-colors. A guide accompanying the 449 microfiches contains a detailed subject index and essays providing historical background, biographical information, and a history of the Peale Papers. The complete microfiche collection and guidebook are available from the publisher, Kraus Microform, Route 100, Millwood NY 10546.

Dr. Miller presented sets of the edition to Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., Executive Officer of the American Philosophical

Annual Meeting

The third annual meeting of the ADE will be held 8-10 October 1981 at the Lowell House in Madison, Wisconsin. John Kaminski is in charge of local arrangements for the meeting. Don Cook is chairman of the program committee.

While the Association thanked our local arrangements chairman at Williamsburg, Chuck Hobson, for the splendid job he did in conducting the annual meeting, we neglected to mention the persons who operated the registration table with such efficiency and good humor. We extend our gratitude to Trudi Heyer, secretary of the John Marshall Papers project, and to Deborah Speas, MaryAnn Frances Williamson, and Alec Anderson, editing interns at the Institute for Early American History and Culture.

Society, which once housed the Peale family and is now the major depository of Peale Papers, and Joseph Duffey, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, which provided a grant for preparation of the edition.

A selected printed edition will be published by Yale University Press. The first volume of eight is scheduled to appear in late 1981 or early 1982.

The Papers of Joseph Henry at the Smithsonian Institution may have a vacancy for an assistant editor starting 1 May 1981. Candidates should have a specialization in either the history of the physical sciences, especially in the nineteenth century, or in the history of science and technology in the United States. A Ph.D. or equivalent in the above areas is desirable. Experience with archives and manuscripts is desirable but not mandatory. This is a Federal position and will be filled at the GS-11, GS-12, or GS-13 levels (\$22,486-\$32,048), depending on the selected candidate's attainments and experience. Candidates should send their credentials (examples of work are encouraged) and a Form 171 to Nathan Reingold, Editor of the Henry Papers, SI-133, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560. The Smithsonian Institution is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

The Papers of Thomas A. Edison is seeking an editorial assistant for 10-12 weeks during the summer of 1981 who will work with the senior professional staff in the preparation of materials for the microfilm and book editions of the Edison Papers. Applicants should have a background and an interest in the history of science, technology, and business in the era of Edison. EOE/AA. The application deadline is 15 March 1981. Contact the Thomas A. Edison Papers, One Richardson Street, Rutgers University, New Brunswick NJ 08903.

If you have an opening for a position, please send a notice to Kathleen Waldenfels (*Newsletter* Editor), Joseph Henry Papers, SI-133, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560.

Recent Publications

Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Volume 8, edited by William James Morgan (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980), 1184 pp. Those wishing to purchase this volume should send their request with a check for \$24.00 to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Be sure to include the government stock number, as follows: 008-046-00080-8.

Space permitting, we will announce recent documentary publications if notices are received at least two weeks prior to the month of issue. For the May issue send copy to the *Newsletter* editor by April 15.

~~NEWSLETTER~~ of the

Association for Documentary Editing



ISSN 0196-7134