

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln


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

Documentary Editing, Association for

1982

Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing, Volume 4, Number 4, December 1982.

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 4, Number 4, December 1982." (1982). *Documentary Editing: Journal of the Association for Documentary Editing (1979-2011)*. 181.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/docedit/181>

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

DECEMBER 1982

Vol. 4, no. 4

NEWSLETTER

of the

ASSOCIATION FOR
DOCUMENTARY EDITING



ADE Council

Charles T. Cullen, president; Thomas Jefferson Papers, Princeton University, Library, Princeton, NJ 08544.

Don L. Cook, past-president; Department of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Raymond W. Smock, president-elect; Booker T. Washington Papers, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20724.

John P. Kaminski, secretary-treasurer; Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution, 5227 Humanities Building, 435 North Park Street, Madison WI 53706.

Joel Myerson, director of publications; Department of English, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.

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: Joel Myerson, Department of English, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. Inquiries about membership in the organization should be addressed to John P. Kaminski, Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution, 5227 Humanities Building, 435 North Park Street, Madison, WI 53706

The Library of America

JOANN BOYDSTON

The spring 1982 publication of the first four volumes of The Library of America (Hawthorne, Melville, Stowe, Whitman) inaugurated a series that is expected to produce and keep permanently in print more than one hundred volumes. Four more volumes (Mark Twain, Howells, and two of Jack London) will have appeared by the time this account is published. These volumes are the initial concrete expression of a movement dating from the late 1940s and early 1950s to collect, preserve, publish, and disseminate widely the best texts of classic American writings.

The large number of reviewers who commented enthusiastically and at some length on the simultaneous appearance of the first Library of America volumes agreed on a number of points; the two that dominated the reviews can be summarized briefly. First, the Library volumes are “a triumph of the bookmaker’s art”: for this, as Jerome Frank said in *Publishers’ Weekly* (7 May 1982, p. 57), credit goes to Bruce Campbell, who “has created a handsome, unpretentious and compact format whose specifications are impressive.” Second, the initiation of this mammoth undertaking marks an event of considerable magnitude in American cultural history. For getting the Library started, credit can be assigned to Daniel Aaron, Jason Epstein, and Cheryl Hurley, key officers of the Library, whose insight and skill shaped the series and brought it to fruition.

The long-term movement that led to the publication of these first volumes of the Library of America was, however, too complex for proper elaboration in the typical review and was therefore treated only briefly by the critics who identified it. This was a movement in two parts, each identifiable by its central emphasis: one segment was concerned primarily with preserving, publishing, and making readily available in a uniform series the best of American writings; the other part was chiefly interested in the kinds of texts to be used in such an edition, the editorial framework in which the writings would be presented, the editorial apparatus, and similar considerations. Reviewers who have discussed the Library have seen these two separate aspects of the Library’s history as somehow symbolized in the 1960s controversy between Edmund Wilson and the Modern Language Association’s Center for Editions of American Authors. This attribution of the movement’s “publication” aspect to Edmund Wilson and of its “editorial” aspect to the MLA/CEAA has resulted in the widespread notion that the Library of America grew solely from Wilson’s dream of “an American *Pléiade*,” that the contents of the Library

volumes would be almost entirely MLA/CEAA texts, and that both parts of the movement began only in the early 1960s.

But no person or group of persons can fairly receive exclusive credit for either part of the impetus that culminated in the Library, nor did the movement start in the 1960s. Several forces interested in the preservation and publication of American letters, often with similar goals but disparate emphases, contributed to the climate that finally made the Library of America possible. For example, as early as 1951, and again in 1954, the National Historical Publications Commission proposed to the President a national program to preserve and publish the papers of America’s leaders—statesmen, *littérateurs*, and philosophers. Completely apart from its support for the Center for Editions of American Authors, the central role of the National Endowment for the Humanities in this part of the movement has been to some extent overlooked. In 1966, Henry Allen Moe said in his inaugural address as Chairman of the Endowment that one of the two channels of public access to the values of the humanities was “through the preparation of comprehensive editions, accurately edited, of works by great American writers of every period of our history, whether these be state papers, works in history, imaginative literature, or philosophy.” The Endowment’s role in the Library continues, of course, in a substantial grant that has made possible its auspicious beginning.

Throughout the 1960s, a primary factor in the movement was also the influence of Edmund Wilson and the host of persons who shared his vision of making our literary heritage available to a wide readership. In fact, Wilson prophetically described almost the exact format of the Library volumes in his 18 August 1962 letter (quoted by Wilson in *New York Review of Books*, 26 September 1968) to Jason Epstein, now Treasurer of the Library. Wilson there proposed an American edition that would “follow the example of the *Éditions de la Pléiade*, which have included so many of the French classics, ancient and modern, in beautifully produced and admirably printed thin paper volumes ranging from 800 to 1,500 pages.” We can note in passing that the Library of America volumes are, as John Gerber remarked in 1969 about American editions in general, “much more readable than the *Pléiade* type of book, which benefits the ophthalmologists more than any one else.” Wilson’s ideas, of course, encompassed much more than a particular format; his goal of preserving the American literary heritage was widely approved, and, in time, his leadership mantle

passed to Jason Epstein, who played a central role in obtaining the Library's initial Ford Foundation funding.

The other part of the movement, characterized by editorial concerns, has an even longer and more complex history dating in some of its features from the early 1940s and Julian P. Boyd's first "Proposed Method of Preparation" in his planning statement for the comprehensive edition of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Boyd's subsequent description of his editorial method in the first volume of the Jefferson edition (1950) was the earliest formal statement of its kind and one that has had considerable influence in the field of documentary editing.

As early as 1947-48, the Modern Language Association had formed a "Committee on Definitive Editions," dedicated not only to collecting and making available American literary works but also to establishing principles for editing those works. The Committee was the forerunner of the MLA Center for Editions of American Authors, formed in 1963, which was in turn succeeded by the Committee on Scholarly Editions. As its name implies, the CSE broadened the purview and goals of the CEAA to include all scholarly editions and to set up guidelines and principles that apply to a wide variety of texts. The overall growth of modern editorial theory during the last forty years, as a discipline with a body of scholarly research and products, has been thoroughly discussed by G. Thomas Tanselle in several articles—notably "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 167-229, and "The Editing of Historical Documents," *ibid.* 31 (1978): 1-56; the literature is described in similar detail in "The Center on Scholarly Editions: An Introductory Statement," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 92 (1977): 568-97. These studies make clear that assigning credit to any one person or group for the "editorial" part of the movement now expressed in the Library of America is as difficult as isolating a single impetus for the collecting-publishing part. Within the past five years, communication among editors of various orientations from different fields has been accelerated by the efforts of the CSE and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and parti-

cularly by the growth of the supra-disciplinary organizations, the Society for Textual Studies and the Association for Documentary Editing. The communication and common understandings fostered by these groups are in large measure responsible for the eclectic scholarly editorial policies used by the Library of America.

To put those editorial policies in perspective, it is important to clarify what the Library of America is not. First, it is not a "literary" edition, even though it was first organized by The Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., which was incorporated with initial support from the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The word "literary" in the original corporation's title refers to the full range of American letters rather than to an artificial distinction between works produced by "literary" or "historical" editors. Second, the Library is not an editing project; it is a publishing project. As a publishing project, it is beyond doubt an undertaking of monumental and historic proportions, a project whose innovative practices and experiences in all phases of production will increasingly be discussed at length by students of publishing. Even though it is not an "editorial" project, however, the Library's editorial aspect is of special interest to editors because it represents in many ways some forty years' cumulative study of and experience in editing in this country.

"Editing" is a word so variously used, even by editors, that all parts of the Library of America's editorial approach are included here: selection of authors and works; editorial framework and arrangement of editorial matter; choices of texts; changes in texts, and proofreading.

Comprehensive analysis of the Library's selection philosophy and procedures appears in R. W. B. Lewis's "The Literary Americans," *New Republic*, 19 May 1982, pp. 26-31 (see esp. pp. 28-30). Some details not discussed by Lewis are these: a large, active, and broadly qualified Selection Committee, chaired by Richard Poirier, vice-president of the Library of America, is dedicated to presenting works that represent the full spectrum of American thought. Working within a carefully wrought structure, this committee meets with Library of America officers and staff members. After the committee has tentatively decided to include an author, it entertains proposals about which of that author's works should be in the Library and in what order those works should appear in Library volumes. A period of consultation usually ensues, with the final decision reached only after a number of qualified persons have advised the committee about the author's basic, classic writings. Although references to volume "editors" have appeared in various places, no person is officially designated as the editor of any volume. In the front-matter of each book appears a standard single-page notice, "[John Doe] wrote the notes and chronology and selected the texts [read 'works'] for this volume."

ADE 1983

Ray Smock, program chairman for the 1983 convention of the ADE in Baltimore on 6-8 October, would like to hear from members who have suggestions for papers or entire sessions. Please forward your comments to him at 6824 Nashville Road, Lanham, MD 20706, or call 301-552-3907.

The editorial matter for the Library was designed to be spare, consisting only of “a table of contents, headnotes (where appropriate for individual letters or journal entries), notes, a chronology of the author’s life, and a textual note. The notes, chronology, and textual note will appear at the end of the volume.” Each of these sections was further described in the same 1980 internal Library statement just quoted:

NOTES are to be few and of substantive nature, referring either to words, phrases, or concepts in the work that genuinely require clarification or to textual problems or cruxes significant enough to merit the attention of the general reader. The annotation should be kept to a minimum.

CHRONOLOGY. A concise chronology (between 3 and 7 pages) should record the central facts of the author’s life and career. The author’s major works should be cited to provide the reader with a basic bibliography.

Historical events of the times should not be cited except when they directly affected the author’s life or work, e.g., Stephen Crane and the Spanish-American War. If an historical event merits inclusion, it should be cited in the context of the author’s life and work.

While the chronology should not be extensive, it should give the reader some sense of the major forces in the author’s life and work. Since there will be no critical essay, the chronology should record more than mere demographic information and should be complete and interesting in and of itself.

TEXTUAL NOTE. A brief essay (between 3 and 7 pages) will appear following the chronology, setting forth the rationale for deciding which *texts* of the selected works are the most appropriate for the volume. . . . This statement should contain a brief textual history of the works. It is to be limited to textual or editorial matters and is not to include biographical discussion or critical interpretation. The textual note should include a record of any typographical errors that have been corrected in the texts.

Early announcements and notices, necessarily compressed by considerations of space and of wide audience appeal, describe Library texts as “uncorrupted” and “the most authoritative.” Key phrases in current statements about the Library refer to efforts to select “an authoritative edition of each work,” and in each case the “text that [in scholarly advisers’ opinions] comes closest to the author’s intention.” A number of reviewers have implied that MLA-CEAA/CSE texts would be used when officially

“approved” texts were not available. This element of the Library of America editorial approach is particularly important to editors of varied backgrounds, inasmuch as the Library uses only texts that have been previously edited in some way. All materials included have been published before, which clearly means that a person or combination of persons—whether publisher, document-transcriber, compiler, proofreader, textual critic, or compositor—has applied editorial judgment to the texts before their selection for use in the Library.

The philosophical orientation of the Library of America was explicit from the start; a 1979 proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities mentions not only CEAA/CSE texts, but quotes from the CSE “Introductory Statement” to emphasize that “one of the [Library’s] aims is to foster the widespread dissemination of reliable texts in cheap editions appropriate for classroom use and available to the general reading public. . . . *The texts would be the most reliable that scholarship can provide*” (italics added).

Selecting the most reliable texts that scholarship can provide is a more complicated undertaking than previous references suggest and one that is, obviously, far from automatic. Just as the Selection Committee not only chooses authors to be represented in the series but also consults extensively with scholars about which of that author’s works in fact form the “core of American literature,” so also the three-person Textual Standards Committee meets with the Library of America staff to study and discuss at length the textual research done on each author’s work and to decide on the basis of all the evidence which texts will be used.

Specifically, the policies that govern the choice of texts for Library of America volumes continue to be those that G. Thomas Tanselle proposed to Library President Daniel Aaron in a letter of 7 May 1979. The key statement in that document is that the Library should select for each part of every volume “the text that is most defensible from a scholarly point of view as a text deserving of republication and wide dissemination.” As Tanselle explained further, the policy has certain ramifications: “Thus if a reliable scholarly edition has already been published—whether it is a CEAA/CSE edition or an edition prepared independently of those MLA committees—the text of that edition would normally be the one selected.” Attention is called to the word “normally,” which is applied even to the previously published editions “prepared independently of those MLA committees.” The implication is clear: CEAA/CSE editions are not automatically chosen; in fact, even scholarly editions prepared independently of those committees are not automatically chosen. Moreover, if a critical edition does not exist or is not available for use in the Library, the choice of texts poses a new problem, one not necessarily easier to solve but simply different. In such cases, the texts will often be “the first edition of a

work or of some other edition that constitutes a significant document in literary history.”

The cornerstone of the Library of America textual policy is that all choices of texts must be “defensible from a scholarly point of view.” The Textual Standards Committee bases its decisions on extremely thorough and sophisticated bibliographical research by the Library of America staff similar to the evidence collected by any editor as the first step in preparing a scholarly edition. As Don L. Cook wrote in a 1980 letter to Cheryl Hurley,

The choice of text should be based on a full knowledge of all the forms, and the choice among those forms should be based on the explicit acknowledgement of differences and of the basis for the preference. The basis of choice may differ from author to author, even essay to essay, but whether the basis is historical primacy, matured authorial judgment, artistic polish, or documentary significance, that basis should be clear to the compiler, to the textual standards committee, and to the user of the volume.

Ordinarily, when that kind of evidence has been assembled and studied, the choice of “the most defensible” text is not difficult. Without discussing specific selections—which are always identified in the published volumes—it can be noted that CEAA/CSE critical editions are not always used, even when available; first editions are not always used, even in the absence of critical editions; occasionally, volumes include a mixture of variously edited texts, each selected for a specific reason, and always identified in the published volumes.

Once texts have been chosen, however, further “editorial” work diverges from that used in developing critical editions, as Tanselle proposed in 1979:

Whether a reliable scholarly edition or a first (or other significant early) edition is chosen, any unquestionable errors that the editor discovers in the text can be corrected, so long as all such alterations are recorded in a list with the text. No readings other than those that are demonstrable errors should be altered, so that readers can be assured that they are receiving accurate reproductions of particular previous texts, chosen according to a well-considered rationale and altered only with respect to typographical (or other undeniable) errors, all of which are recorded in a list in the volume.

This policy is expressed in short paragraphs that appear in the “Note on the Text(s)” in each Library of America volume, following a statement about which texts are used. First:

The standards for American English continue to fluctuate and in some ways were conspicuously different in earlier periods from what they are now. In nineteenth-century writings, for example, a word might be spelled in more than one way, even in the same work, and such variations might be carried into print. Commas were sometimes used expressively to suggest the movements of voice, and capitals were sometimes meant to give significance to a word beyond those it might have in its uncapitalized form. Since modernization would remove such effects, this volume has preserved the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and wording of the editions reprinted here.

That paragraph is followed by another standard statement with minor appropriate variations:

The present edition is concerned only with representing the texts of these [identified] editions; it does not attempt to reproduce the features of their typographic design—such as the display capitalization of chapter openings.

Changes made in the specified texts for the Library of America volume are noted at this point, followed by the brief running list of typographic errors that have been corrected. Despite the careful proofreading of earlier editions, even of widely accepted critical texts, the in-house control of printer’s copy preparation has made possible the discovery and correction of errors in all Library texts published.

As both the CEAA and the CSE have long maintained, procedures for thorough and careful supervision of proofreading are integral to any complete set of “editorial” standards. In this respect the Library of America has a distinct advantage over most other publishing, and in some cases editorial, projects. Locating and correcting previous errors, whether in critical texts, first editions, or “other significant early forms” of texts has been facilitated by the Library’s proofreading procedures. Hanna M. Bercovitch, Senior Editor, supervises a cadre of freelance proofreaders in the New York City area who have qualified for their positions by passing a rigorous test. An in-house statement to the Textual Standards Committee in the summer of 1982 summarized the steps in the proofreading procedures of the Library:

The proofreading procedure for our books involves three complete readings by freelance proofreaders, plus readings of the corrections until perfect. Two readings take place simultaneously at Pass I (galley stage); corrections are collated on to the master proof by our most trusted proofreader and reviewed by Bercovitch before being returned to the compositor.

This stage takes about a month, depending on the length of the book. Freelancers then do a third reading at Pass II using the corrected master proof against the copy-edited manuscript. This also takes about a month. From that point, corrections and blues are checked and rechecked during about a month's time. In sum, the complete proofreading process from receipt of Pass I through approval of the blues takes about three months. When all blues are approved, film is made by the compositor and sent directly to the printer.

Moreover, because Library volumes are now and will continue to be reprinted frequently, new printings provide opportunities for speedy correction of the always

possible but never acceptable *new* error. If such errors are found, their correction is noted in reprintings, each of which is carefully identified by printing number and date.

All aspects of the editorial and textual policies of the Library of America thus represent a distillation of what scholarly editors have been learning and developing in this country since the end of World War II. Since the Library also is a coalescence of the sometimes divided movement to collect, preserve, and disseminate the best of American letters, it is finding wide acceptance in the scholarly community. All of us who classify ourselves as editors should find it especially rewarding that an effort of this kind, representing the highest scholarly standards, is at the same time clearly achieving its chief goal of appealing to the widest possible reading public.

Letter to the Editor

Two items in the September 1982 *Newsletter* deal with matters I should like to comment on: Philip F. Gura's review of the Thoreau *Journal*, Vol. I, in which he compares the editorial methods of that edition with those of the Emerson *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks (JMN)*; and Fredson Bowers' letter to the Editor, commenting on differences between the systems used to record manuscript alterations (or to present a genetic text) in the Emerson *JMN* and in Professor Bowers' editions of William James and others.

Professor Gura (p. 7) "compares the sheer economy and readability of the [Thoreau] volume to the ponderous and distracting editorial apparatus that overwhelms the . . . edition of Emerson's [*JMN*]," and remarks that in this matter, "Thoreau's friend Waldo has not fared well at the hands of his twentieth-century admirers." On the contrary, I would maintain that Emerson has fared just as well as Thoreau, if not better. The question can be stated as which method is preferable in editing a journal: clear-text or genetic? And my answer is that it depends on what kind of journal one is editing. Emerson used his journals as, among other things, a "savings bank" from which to draw phrases, aphorisms, quotations, stray thoughts, paragraphs, or longer passages for later use in a lecture, essay, or book. Sometimes he set them down just as they first occurred to him, but often revised and refined them in the process of writing them. In some cases he later transferred them to another journal volume, revising them more or less as he did so. Then when composing a lecture or essay, he brought together passages from various parts of the journals, rewrote and rearranged them, and wrote new passages to connect, amplify, or illustrate them. Further revision took place when he transformed a lecture into an essay or a chapter in a book.

Thus there were several stages of revision, only one of which normally occurred in the journals; but that stage is important and interesting as showing the first glimmerings and early development of many of the ideas more clearly stated in the lectures and published works. For this reason a genetic text, recording in one continuous version all the journal material — false starts, finger-wipings, corrections, rephrasings, and more substantial deletions, insertions, and rearrangements — seems to me the best way to reveal what Emerson was thinking and how he got it down on paper. That is what the editors of *JMN* have done. (Whether they chose the most efficient technique for doing it is a matter I shall come to later.)

While Thoreau used his journal for some of the same purposes as Emerson, he also made it — especially in the earlier volumes — a work-book in which he prepared successive drafts of long passages, sometimes whole chapters, of what later became parts of books like *A Week* and *Walden*. Typically he wrote such a passage first in ink, making only a few minor corrections as he went, and then later came back and revised it (usually in pencil) by extensive deletions and interlineations on the same page. He might write one or more further drafts in subsequent journal sections or volumes, or on separate sheets of paper, before arriving at the version to be submitted as printer's copy. The editors of Thoreau's *Journal* have therefore decided to print a clear-text edition that presents only the earliest draft (as corrected during original composition) of what he wrote, and to include in an appendix selected later alterations of passages that did *not* appear later in a published work. Intermediate drafts of essay or book passages that were composed by interlineation on journal pages are not printed in this edition, presumably because it would have been too confusing

(or prohibitively expensive) to include them, either in a genetic text or in appendices to a clear-text edition. It is hoped that they will be published eventually in some form — perhaps a parallel-text edition — for the benefit of Thoreau scholars.

Whether or not a genetic text is feasible or desirable for publication of certain manuscript materials, it is at least necessary to have a method for recording manuscript alterations; and such a method can also be used in genetic-text editions. There are two basic systems now in general use in editions that I am familiar with: the one employed in *JMN* (and in the Lemay-Zall edition of Franklin's *Autobiography*, as explained in Joel Myerson's review of that volume in the May 1982 *Newsletter*), and the one developed by Fredson Bowers (also explained in Myerson's review, and clarified by Professor Bowers in his September letter mentioned above). I consider both systems good. Joel Myerson suggested to me (in conversation) that the Bowers method may be more efficient for use with documents that are extensively revised or that contain multiple layers of revision; but I am not convinced that this is so. In those volumes of Emerson's *Collected Works* (of which I am textual editor) for which there are extant manuscripts — e.g., *Representative Men* and parts of *Conduct of Life* — we will print a clear-text, but will show all manuscript alterations (except corrections of minor slips and errors) in appendices, using the *JMN* method. We do so partly because this system is more familiar to most Emersonians, having been used not only in *JMN* but also in the textual notes to the *Early Lectures*, and prospectively in the *Later Lectures* as well — both of which, like the *Collected Works*, are clear-text editions. We also use it because we find it just as simple, clear, and easy to follow as Professor Bowers' system, and perhaps more economical of space.

Contrary to Professor Gura's characterization of the *JMN* format as "ponderous and distracting," or Lewis Mumford's as "barbed wire," it is based almost entirely on the use of two symbols: the < angle brackets > for deletions and the ↑ arrows ↓ for insertions, since practically all authorial alterations are one or the other. (Transpositions and other changes in word-order can generally be shown in the same way, but may occasionally have to be explained in a textual note.) Insertions within deletions, deletions within insertions, and other such variations are expressed by the same symbols. To reconstruct the original version, in most cases one merely reads through the text in order, ignoring everything printed between ↑ arrows ↓; to arrive at the final version, one does the same thing but ignores everything printed between < two angle brackets >. This is easy to do after a little practice, and it is almost equally simple to pick out and analyze successive layers of revision. A minor variation in the placement of the second angle bracket (which, incidentally, was not done correctly by the printer of

Professor Myerson's *Newsletter* review) shows whether a correction was made directly *over* (i.e., in the same space as) the deleted material, or was made later on the same line or elsewhere on the page. As Professor Bowers points out (p. 9), it isn't really necessary to know whether the correction was made by finger-wiping or by writing over an undeleted word; the important question is whether it seems to have been made *currente calamo* or at some later time. The *JMN* system helps to answer that question. Nor does one need to know whether an insertion was made with or without a caret, between the lines or in the margin, or the like. A few supplementary notes will explain anything significant that is not made immediately clear by the brackets and arrows.

In short, I suggest that editors of revised manuscript materials consider both the Bowers system and the *JMN* system for recording alterations, and choose whichever one better suits their needs.

DOUGLAS EMORY WILSON
Anniston, Alabama

NHPRC Fellowships

The fellowship program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, which has sponsored from three to seven fellowships per year since 1967, has not been funded beyond 1982. Private sources have supported it in the past, and the Commission is actively seeking funds to continue the program. The Commission is tentatively offering up to three fellowships in historical editing for 1983-84 and will begin accepting applications immediately. If the necessary funds become available, successful candidates will receive a stipend, tentatively set at \$16,000, and spend 12 months in training at a documentary editing project. Participating projects are the *Documentary Relations of the Southwest* (Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona), *The Papers of William Penn* (Historical Society of Pennsylvania), and *The Papers of Andrew Jackson* (University of Tennessee). Applicants should hold a Ph.D. or have completed all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation. A reading knowledge of Spanish is required for the Southwest fellowship. Further information and application forms are available from the NHPRC, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408. Application deadline is April 15, 1983.

Federal Policy Committee Reports

Any report on the activities of the ADE's committee on federal policy is actually a report on the work of the Coalition to Save Our Documentary Heritage and the results of that work. Members of the federal policy committee and many other ADE members have provided leadership and support for the Coalition's efforts. In turn, the Coalition has brought together historians, archivists, librarians, manuscript curators, university presses, genealogists and others with an interest in the survival of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and in the health and welfare of the National Archives and Records Service (NARS). A working advocacy group that is respected and listened to on Capitol Hill has been created, and positive results have been achieved.

ADE members can be proud of the part that our relatively small organization has played in this accomplishment. Three ADE members (Charlene Bickford, Michael Richman and Connie Schulz) serve on the eight member steering committee of the Coalition, which was created last February after the formal expansion of the Coalition's goals to include issues relating to NARS. In addition ADE members have not only proved themselves to be eloquent and persistent advocates for NARS and the NHPRC, but also have demonstrated considerable political savvy in the process.

And, this fall we have reason to celebrate the positive results of this effort, which I will enumerate briefly:

1. The NHPRC grants program is still alive. Due to the supplemental FY82 appropriation of \$1.5 million received in September and the earmark of \$3 million in the FY83 appropriation, it looks like the Commission will be able to make \$4.5 in grants this year. Projects which managed to limp through the lean FY82 will be able to live above the subsistence level in FY83.

2. The Commission itself still exists. The OMB had claimed in FY82 that although the NHPRC would not be making grants, it would continue to play an important advisory role. But, in the draft "Miscellaneous Government Instrumentalities Termination Act of 1982," the OMB abandoned all pretense and proposed the elimination of all legislation relating to the Commission from the federal statutes. The Coalition called upon the Commission's Congressional supporters, and the NHPRC was removed from this act before it was sent to the Hill.

3. The overall NARS budget in FY83 is much improved from FY82. Due to the fact that Congress was made aware of the Archives' desperate FY82 funding situation, NARS received a supplemental appropriation of \$4.281 million in September "to remain until expended." This enabled them to finish out FY82 without furloughing employees

and provides some cushion for FY83. It now looks like the FY83 funding level will be \$87.6 million, of which \$3 million is for NHPRC grants. Although this amount is still below the FY81 level of \$88.9 million, it will allow some recovery from the devastating FY82 figure of \$75.1 and some rehiring of full time employees (NARS has experienced more than a 22% loss of full time staff since the beginning of FY81 due to budget restraints).

4. Real progress has been made toward freedom from the General Services Administration (GSA) for the National Archives and Records Service. During the 97th Congress, independence legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senators Eagleton and Mathias and in the House by Representatives Brooks and English. Thus, the legislation already has the support of critically important legislators on the authorizing committees. We fully expect that independence bills will be reintroduced early in the 98th Congress.

What began as an emergency response to the proposed elimination of the NHPRC grants program in February of 1981 has developed into an advocacy movement with staying power and a growing influence on Capitol Hill. But this momentum can only be maintained by continued participation by all of the constituency. Next Spring the battle to insure funding for the grants program will be resumed; the case for increased NARS funding will need to be made; and a new push for NARS independence will be required. We know that we can count on ADE members to continue to be activists in this advocacy effort.

Charlene Bickford, co-chair

Other committee members:

Ira Berlin

Henry Tom

Wayne Cutler

Editing Institute Set

The twelfth annual Institute for Historical Editing is scheduled for July 17-29, 1983, in Madison, Wisconsin. Jointly sponsored by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin, the institute will provide detailed theoretical and practical instruction in documentary editing. Applicants should hold a master's degree in history or American civilization. A limited number of study grants are available. For information and application forms, write to NHPRC, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408. Application deadline: March 15, 1983.

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru: An Introduction

LAKSHMAN DEWANI

The publication of the *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru* was undertaken by the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund in New Delhi in 1968. The object was to help build a corpus of Nehru's writings and speeches on a variety of subjects which span over a period of fifty years of active political life of one of this century's foremost public leaders and statesmen. It was a stupendous task to collect his writings from various sources, ranging from government archives to private individuals. The task was, however, made less difficult by the availability of a large number of Nehru's letters and other writings in his own collection. This collection, now preserved in the Nehru Memorial Library in New Delhi, is a vast storehouse of information on Nehru's ideas as well as on the history of the past fifty years or so of India's struggle for independence.

The trustees of the Fund desired this project to be a non-governmental venture. They therefore decided to finance it from donations collected by the Fund from all over India, including some received from abroad to perpetuate Nehru's memory. The Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund has been engaging itself in several other activities to promote Nehru's ideas, including the awarding of Nehru Fellowships every year to two or three outstanding scholars, scientists, or artists within the country to help them to further pursue their creative work. The Fund also invites, every year, on the occasion of Jawaharlal Nehru's birthday, on November 14, a scholar of repute to deliver a Nehru Memorial Lecture. Among several distinguished scholars from abroad who have delivered Nehru Memorial Lectures have been two well known American scholars, Noam Chomsky and Margaret Mead. Also, to promote an interest in science among the youth, the Fund holds an annual exhibition in New Delhi of the best scientific works of young school students drawn from all over India on the basis of competition organized at the district and the provincial levels.

The *Selected Works* began with a team of four persons to collect, sift, and arrange the material, and duly edit and annotate it for publication. This team of three sub-editors with one editor was headed by one honorary general editor. The general editor of the series is Professor S. Gopal, a well-known historian in India. The editor who worked on the project for a period of about one year decided to leave before the material for publishing the first volume had been made ready. He had, however, as a result of his queer thinking, got the post of a sub-editor redesignated as a research officer. He perhaps suffered

from a not uncommon notion that he alone would be able to carry on his shoulders the entire burden of editing and publication. The first three volumes, however, were printed in 1972 chiefly as a result of the fine team work put in by the three sub-editors redesignated as research officers with the overall supervision and guidance of the general editor. By the time the first volume had almost been printed, a new editor joined the project, but he left by the time the fourth volume was in production. Yet another editor who followed him also left within a year of joining the project. They left because none of them showed the ability to cope with the onerous demands of editing a series which was unique in the country, as till now no other historical series of a comparable nature has been published with as much regard for the maintenance of historical accuracy and printing excellence. The team of young men and women who are responsible for having contributed largely to the publication of the fourteen volumes in a series published so far can take pride in producing a work of such great value and historical importance. This team at present is comprised of ten research assistants and two research officers, headed by one associate editor and the general editor. The associate editor, who joined the team in late 1973, works more in a managerial capacity, as the entire burden of producing the volumes devolves on the team of researchers.

The volumes published so far cover the period from the early childhood days of Nehru to the time when the World War II ended in the middle of 1945, leading to the release from detention in jail of the leaders of India's nationalist movement. The fifteenth volume, now in production, covers the entire period of negotiations between the various Indian political parties and the alien government which was then seriously preparing itself to terminate its rule over India.

Some of the salient features of the *Selected Works* are:

- (1) Each volume contains material for a number of years which is divided into seven or eight broad subjects, with each subject heading being further sub-divided into small sections according to subject;
- (2) a volume covers a period of two to three years on an average and the number of pages in each volume does exceed more than seven hundred pages;
- (3) each item included in a volume is richly annotated to render understanding of the time and the events better;

- (4) the letters received by Nehru or replies received to his communications are put in a summarized form in footnotes whenever they are available;
- (5) the names of all the persons appearing in the text are identified and wherever possible short biographical notes are written on them;
- (6) the correspondence or speeches made in Hindi or on certain occasions, verses written in Urdu and citations made in French or Sanskrit, are reproduced in original form in the text with their translations in English given in the form of footnotes. For instance, in volume thirteen, which covers the period of Nehru's detention in jail for a period of three and a half years during World War II, he learned Urdu from his senior Muslim colleague and jailmate, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. From the same jail, he wrote, in his letters to his daughter, several Urdu couplets, which reveal Nehru's sense of helplessness and his sad feelings. These efforts of his to learn Urdu and his writing couplets in Urdu to his daughter have been extensively reproduced in the volume;
- (7) so far, nothing has been omitted from the volumes if it merited inclusion, in spite of its containing some uncomplimentary references to political associates or opponents;
- (8) each volume carries a glossary of Indian terms appearing in the text, and has eight to ten illustrations which have a close bearing on the subject matter discussed in the volume; and
- (9) in addition to an index listing all names of places, institutions, and individuals, the index entry on Jawaharlal Nehru gives in a summary form the major events or his views on important matters in an alphabetical order.

It is expected that the pre-independence series will be completed by the end of 1983 and will comprise seven-teen volumes. The post-independence series, which will mainly include Nehru's correspondence as India's first prime minister for a period of seventeen years, will be started in 1984, and it will be about fifteen volumes. Each volume's preparation for the press requires, on an average, one to one-and-one-half year's time to check, collate, and annotate. The press takes about nine months to print seven hundred pages of the text and index. Normally, after reading galley proofs, the research team of two or three persons which is responsible for making the volume ready for the press also has to read the first and the second proofs of the pages. The printing is done on linotype machines and as a consequence, any changes or corrections, and sometimes addition and subtraction of some information, is strongly resented by the printers. We have, however, found from our experience that certain changes or additions made even at the second proof stage are inevitable. This becomes absolutely

unavoidable in the event of the research team's inability to get the necessary biographical data or some other information from the printed sources. In such cases, information has to be obtained from other sources, and this is mostly done by correspondence. It has, therefore, been our sad experience that the sponsors of the project do not show adequate appreciation of the efforts involved in such a time-consuming work, and show impatience with the rate of progress of the work. For last two years or so, the sponsors, turning their faces away from facts, have been firmly insistent that the publication of the post-independence series must be completed by the end of 1986.

I may mention that I have come to The United States to collect material relating to Jawaharlal Nehru and Indo-U.S. relations during the time of his prime ministership of India from various presidential libraries, such as the Truman Library in Missouri, the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, the Johnson Library in Austin, and the Kennedy Library in Boston. In Princeton, I have been collecting material from the papers of John Foster Dulles, Adlai Stevenson, and Louis Fischer which are preserved in the Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library. My visit to this country has been made possible by a fellowship granted to me by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, Washington, D.C. The material collected by me will be used in the *Selected Works* series.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING
Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting
Columbia, South Carolina
October 8, 1982

The annual business meeting was called to order by Charles T. Cullen at 11:05 A.M. Eighty-six members were present. The minutes of last year's meeting were approved. The secretary-treasurer presented the financial report for the fiscal year July 1, 1981 to June 30, 1982.

Ray Smock announced the results of the election of officers for 1982-83. Elected were: Raymond W. Smock, President-Elect, Joel Myerson, Director of Publications, John Kaminski, Secretary-Treasurer, and a Nominating Committee composed of Roger Bruns, Mary-Jo Kline, Robert Leitz, James Perry, and Elizabeth Witherell (Chair).

The secretary-treasurer reported that membership was up substantially. One year ago membership stood at 242; this year it is 312. Mary Giunta's work as chairman of the membership committee is responsible for most of the increase.

Paul Smith reported on Mary-Jo Kline's "guide" and gave an account of the committee's work. A draft of the

book should be completed about Thanksgiving and copies should be ready for distribution to the committee by January 1983.

John Kaminski, reporting for the Education Committee, noted that the NHPRC editing institute at Madison should be able to continue for at least two more years. The NHPRC fellowship program has not been able to raise funds for its continuance.

Charlene Bickford reported on the work of the Federal Policy Committee and was pleased to be able to say that overall things looked better this year than they did last year when NHPRC was threatened with extinction. For the fiscal 1983 budget all signs now indicate that \$3 million will be the level of appropriation.

Elizabeth Hughes reported for the Committee on Meetings that Baltimore has been selected for the 1983 meeting. The hotel headquarters will be the Baltimore Hilton at Harbor Place. The meeting will be held Oct. 6-8, 1983.

David Hirst reported that the placement service was not utilized by very many members; six applicants and ten openings were brought to his attention, and he was not being kept informed about job hunting progress from those who did use the service.

John Simon reported for the Julian Boyd Award Committee and introduced a letter written to the anonymous donor of the award fund concerning a more concrete agreement regarding the fund. Simon read the letter and moved that it be adopted. The motion was seconded and the following was approved:

1. The money donated will be used to establish the Julian P. Boyd Award. Funds will be deposited in an interest-bearing insured account. The award will be in the amount of \$500 until such time as a prudent calculation of the anticipated interest warrants an increase in the amount of the award.
2. The award will be given for a distinguished contribution to American history and culture through documentary editing. The award committee will consist of experienced documentary editors.
3. The award will be given every three years beginning in 1980.
4. Other persons will be invited to contribute funds for the award. As soon as possible, money for the award will come from interest.
5. In the event that ADE ceases to exist, or is unwilling to administer the award, the award fund will be transferred to Princeton University, which will administer the award under the terms and conditions specified above.

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 P.M.

ASSOCIATION FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING
Statement of Revenue Collected,
Expenses Paid and
Change in Net Worth
Fiscal Year July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982

REVENUE COLLECTED	
Dues	\$3,837.50
Boyd Prize Fund	510.00
Interest received	61.41
Miscellaneous contributions (including OAH breakfast)	360.42
Annual meeting receipts	<u>1,264.00</u>
Total Revenue Collected	<u><u>\$6,033.33</u></u>
EXPENSES PAID	
Newsletter	\$1,830.16
Printing	8.93
Postage	648.44
Manuals and publications	100.00
Photocopying	61.91
Secretarial Services	100.00
Office supplies	190.26
Legal and accounting	275.00
Convention	1,846.33
Coalition to Save our Documentary Heritage	75.00
Boyd Prize expenditure	500.00
Special meeting expense (OAH breakfast)	<u>123.50</u>
Total Expenses Paid	<u><u>5,759.53</u></u>
Excess of Revenue Collected Over Expenses Paid	273.80
Net Worth, Beginning of Year	<u>3,600.73</u>
Net Worth, End of Year	<u><u>\$3,874.53</u></u>

Raymond W. Smock
Secretary-Treasurer
October 5, 1982

Next Issue

In the next issue we are pleased to offer two papers on Jonathan Edwards, first read at the October meeting: "Realities of the Sermon: Some Considerations for Editors" by Wilson H. Kinnach, and "Jonathan Edwards' *A History of the Work of Redemption*" by John F. Wilson.

Society for Textual Scholarship To Meet in New York

The second international interdisciplinary conference of the Society for Textual Scholarship will be held in New York City on 21-24 April 1983 at the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. Speakers will include Robert S. Becker on the annotation of correspondence, Elizabeth A. R. Brown on the editorial use of the computer, Howard M. Brown on the manuscripts of the Mass, Mary Ann Caws on textual analysis, Mervin R. Dilts on the *Scholia Demosthenica*, A. S. G. Edwards on the production of erotic manuscripts in France in the nineteenth century, Thomas G. Faulkner on internal consistency of accidentals in the copy-text for *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, T. H. Howard-Hill on the *Index to British Literary Bibliography*, Mary-Jo Kline and Charles Moorman on manuals of editing, John McClelland on the rhetorical and textological foundations of meaning, E. L. Meyers on the relation of text and image, Arthur D. Mosher on scribal characteristics, Robert L. Oakman on the Spenser concordance, Elliott Rubenstein and Charles Affron on establishing the text of a film, John T. Shawcross on early Milton bibliography, its nature and implications, and Robert K. Turner, Jr., on the Shakespeare Variorum. There will also be special panels for featuring papers by, for example, John Barnard, Charles T. Cullen, David Erdman, Maria Green, Joel Myerson, Hershel Parker, Peter Shillingsburg, and Marvin Spevack. This year's presidential address will be given by Paul Oskar Kristeller. For further information on the conference and the STS journal, *Text*, write David C. Greetham, Ph.D. Program in English, CUNY Graduate Center, 33 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036.

ADE Mailing List

The ADE has received requests to use its mailing list by such diverse groups as phototypesetters and scholarly organizations. The rental of the list would provide additional income for the association. We realize, however, that some people already receive enough mail and would not wish their names included on any list which we might rent. If you would object to having your name included on the rental list, would you please drop a note to that effect to John Kaminski.

NARS/Smithsonian Study Begun

A special task force has been appointed by the Archivist of the United States, Dr. Robert M. Warner, to undertake a comparative study of the organization and operation of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Archives and Records Service (NARS). The eight-member study team will include three officials from NAR's parent agency, the General Services Administration (GSA), as well as five members of the National Archives staff.

The study has been launched at the request of the Administrator of General Services, Gerald P. Carmen. Carmen stated at a recent meeting of the National Archives Advisory Council that ". . . an objective and comparative study would be useful for further discussions of NARS' organization and operations. . . ." Carmen further stated that although he does not now support separation for NARS he indicated the study would lead to further dialogue and possible adjustments of his current position.

Position Available at the Papers of Andrew Jackson

The Papers of Andrew Jackson anticipates an opening for an assistant editor to join the staff as soon as possible. The appointment will be for one year, with renewal contingent on the availability of funds. Requirements: Ph.D. in American history, with speciality in the Middle Period; training or experience in documentary editing highly desirable; ability to type and to carry on detailed research. Salary range \$18,000 to \$20,000, depending on qualifications and experience. Send credentials to Harold D. Moser, Editor, The Papers of Andrew Jackson, The University of Tennessee, Box D, The Hermitage, Hermitage, Tennessee 37076. The University of Tennessee is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

ADE Members

Patron Members

Linda Grant Depauw Ralph G. Newman

Sustaining Members

Frederick Aandahl	Arthur Link
Ross Beales, Jr.	Charles McLaughlin
Charlene Bickford	Edward Moore
Roger Bruns	Harold Moser
Edward Carter II	Beverly Palmer
David Chesnutt	Michael Richman
Don Cook	Gaspere Saladino
Charles Cullen	Richard Sheldon
Gordon DenBoer	Richard Showman
John Doskey	Harriet Simon
Handy F. Fant	John Simon
Mary Giunta	Raymond Smock
Genevieve Gormley	Robert Taylor
LeRoy Graf	Helen Veit
Anne Henry	George Vogt
Thomas Jeffrey	Kathleen Waldenfels
John Kaminski	David Wilson
Richard Leffler	

Job Placement

The ADE is offering job placement assistance on an experimental basis. If you know of positions in which ADE members might be interested, please contact:

David W. Hirst
The Papers of Woodrow Wilson
Firestone Library
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey, 08544
Telephone (609) 452-3212

Members who wish to use this service should send 10 copies of a resumé (not to exceed 3 pages) and include a covering letter with additional information for the placement officer.

ADE Memberships

The Association for Documentary Editing was founded in 1978 to "encourage excellence in documentary editing by providing means of cooperation and exchange of information among those concerned with documentary editing and by promoting broader understanding of the principles and values underlying the practice of documentary editing." Membership is open to any person

interested in documentary editing upon payment of one year's dues.

To join the ADE or to begin an institutional subscription to the *Newsletter*, please circle the appropriate category and send the form with payment to John P. Kaminski, Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, 455 N. Park Street, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

Affiliation _____

Amount enclosed _____

Regular \$15
Sustaining \$25
Patron \$50

Student \$7.50
Retired \$7.50
Institutional subscription
to *Newsletter* \$15

NEWSLETTER of the
Association for Documentary Editing
c/o Joel Myerson
Department of English

ISSN: 0196-7134