

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln


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

Documentary Editing, Association for

1983

Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing, Volume 5, Number 3, September 1983.

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 5, Number 3, September 1983." (1983). *Documentary Editing: Journal of the Association for Documentary Editing (1979-2011)*. 193.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/docedit/193>

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

SEPTEMBER 1983

Vol. 5, no. 3

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, 455 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, 455 North Park Street, Madison, WI 53706.

On Editing Old French Texts

MARY B. SPEER

As I understand it, a major focus of our discussion this afternoon is to be the problem of writing a manual on editing for an audience that is—to say the least—not in agreement on a single best method of editing texts. By way of approaching the problem of “orthodoxy” in Old French textual criticism, let me describe how Alfred Foulet and I came to write our manual as we did, the readers we had in mind, and the reactions our work evoked. The manual, *On Editing Old French Texts*, was published in 1979 by the Regents Press of Kansas.

Our decision to write a manual grew out of our own dissatisfaction with the poor quality of many of the editions we reviewed or used in research and our realization that the only existing code for preparing Old French editions was both inadequate and outdated. This code, to which most editors referred for more than fifty years, was the list of practical rules for editing old French and old Provençal texts which Mario Roques presented to the Société des Anciens Textes Français in 1925 and published in 1926. Roques’ rules revised the editing instructions compiled for the same society by Paul Meyer in 1908, and Roques adopted the very same headings that Meyer had laid out. Like Meyer, Roques avoided such controversial matters as stemma construction and editorial philosophy; instead he offered *practical* rules governing mainly the external presentation of an already established text: use of diacritics, resolution of scribal abbreviations, numbering of lines and paragraphs in the text, and the content of the accompanying introduction and apparatus. Roques’ rules fill five and one-half journal pages; and, since they did not, of course, cover in that brief space all the possible variations on the problems addressed (such as the use of the diaeresis), numerous editors have since supplemented and modified those rules according to the needs of their texts.

Both Meyer and Roques preferred to divorce rules governing the presentation of edited texts from the thornier theoretical issues of choosing which text to present and deciding how to establish it, no doubt because such rules, if accepted by editors of differing ideological persuasions, would assure a certain superficial uniformity among printed editions prepared by diverse methods. What, then, was the ideological potato that was too hot to handle in the SATF

rules of 1926? This was the contention between two factions often labelled “Lachmannians” and “Bédierists,” or “interventionists” and “conservatives,” a split still much in evidence.

Because of the prestige of German philological science in the nineteenth century and Gaston Paris’ espousal of the Lachmannian method in France, that method dominated the Old French editing scene from about 1866 to 1913. According to the procedures of the common error method known to you all, editors strove to reconstitute both the content and the language of the author’s original composition. The prior existence of one genuine Original (or Archetype) was seldom doubted; the Lachmannian editor confidently expected to reverse the passage of time and reconstruct that original from its unfaithful descendants by methodical deduction. Even in the nineteenth century, though, the critical text thus obtained was not usually considered a historical certainty, but rather a working hypothesis, or even, as we see it today, a subjective approximation of the author’s composition.

In 1913, in the Preface to his second edition of the *Lai de l’Ombre*, Joseph Bédier attacked the supposedly objective and scientific Lachmannian procedures for constructing a stemma and advocated that, instead of creating a new hypothetical text, editors should limit themselves to publishing the best surviving manuscript of a work, intervening only to perform the *toilette du texte* and correct those errors which the scribe himself would have rectified if his supervisor had pointed them out. If this manuscript fell short of being the “authentic” text once set down by its author, it was at least a genuine medieval document and could be used with confidence as an *instrument de travail*.

Within fifteen or twenty years, the best-manuscript edition recommended by Bédier had supplanted the Lachmannian critical text as the standard approach to editing Old French works in France, notably in the influential *Classiques Français du Moyen Age* and *Société des Anciens Textes Français* series directed by Bédier disciples, and it won converts among scholars in many other countries, as well (Italy being a prominent exception). However, as Yakov Malkiel remarked recently, the doctrinaire Bédierists have not succeeded in wiping out the Lachmannian “heresy” they have opposed so vehemently, for important edi-

tions attempting to recover the author's text or to present not just one manuscript but all the major redactions of a significantly variable text have regularly appeared since 1930, most often outside of France proper. And spirited clashes between true Bédierist believers and neo-Lachmannians continue to enliven professional meetings, though the number of well-informed partisans on each side is relatively small in proportion to the total number of specialists in Old French and Old Provençal.

Given, first, the intensity of the conflict between Bédierists and neo-Lachmannians and, second, the disturbingly widespread ignorance of the dimensions, history, and implications of that conflict, Alfred and I chose to remain descriptive and educational when dealing in our manual with most ideologically sensitive questions, and we decided to be prescriptive chiefly in practical concerns. We envisioned in our audience two categories of readers. One would be concerned with the task of editing: novice editors with no idea how to proceed, experienced editors needing a comprehensive reference manual, and reviewers of editions. For these readers we tried to supply clear explanations of procedures and firm practical guidelines, illustrated by precise examples that reveal the complexity of the problems addressed. The second category of readers would include anyone who uses editions of Old French texts (or even translations based on editions). We wanted to alert those readers to the interpretive, critical nature of editing so that they would become aware that the printed book they read and quote from does not, in all likelihood, contain the author's actual composition, but the result of hundreds of editorial decisions. We wanted these non-editing readers of texts to know what decisions the editor has made, how they define and shape the text, and how to use the apparatus that should allow readers to control the editor's work. In short, we hoped to build an informed readership that could appreciate editing as an ongoing critical dialogue with an often recalcitrant text. To accomplish this, we tried to create a context for the more prescriptive sections of the manual by opening with a historical overview of Old French editing methods from the late eighteenth century to the present. This history ends with a description of a wide variety of strategies used in editions published since 1950. In the interest of flexibility and fair-mindedness, we tried to show that the editing method adopted ought to depend on the textual tradition of the work and take into account such factors as the genre of the work, the number and quality of extant manuscripts, and the filiations of those manuscripts. For the *Song of Roland*, for instance, an editor may reasonably favor best-manuscript editions of each redaction, while for the romances of Chrétien de Troyes, we are firmly convinced that an attempt to reconstitute the author's poems must be given priority over the faulty transcription in any surviving copy. Because we tend to see scribes as unfaithful copyists—for a number of reasons—and because we have a fair amount of confidence in the validity of emendation procedures, we are

certainly not Bédierists, then; but neither would we like to be characterized as knee-jerk neo-Lachmannians. Our methodological tastes seem to us fairly eclectic, even if they lean towards favoring the author over the scribe in many of the texts we have examined closely. While we made no effort to conceal this preference for retrieving authorial compositions, where possible, we tried to present the conservative position fairly, and we cited many examples from best-manuscript editions. Our preference probably emerges indirectly from our treating the best-manuscript edition as only one of many possible approaches. We made every effort to acquaint readers with a number of non-Bédierist innovative editing strategies, and we tried to point out the shortcomings of best-manuscript editions since numerous Old French texts are today most commonly read in the best-manuscript editions that are readily available.

Reactions of reviewers to the theoretical content of *On Editing Old French Texts* have been rather varied. A centrist group seems pleased with our "broad-mindedness." One such reviewer commented: "Foulet and Speer give examples of editions ranging across the spectrum of possible stances, and support adapting the method to the circumstances of the text in question." That's certainly what we meant to do. Another reviewer saw our lack of categorical imperatives or dogmatic recommendations as a possible drawback because our refusal to take an unequivocal position might be confusing to a novice editor confronted with an array of choices. Two other reviewers, however, discerned an excess of dogmatism in our discussions. One, a self-confessed Bédierist who mistrusts the Lachmann method because of its "intrinsic faults," called our book an "essentially Lachmannian handbook" that "mostly concerns texts composed and transmitted in writing." Despite his criticism of what he perceived as a pernicious theoretical bias, this reviewer approved of the practical sections of the book. Yet another reviewer of a kindred spirit, who described his own editorial attitude as one of "extreme conservatism," spoke of our "stronger leanings toward the assumptions of the interventionist editorial school" and even detected, he said, "a certain disdain for the conservative attitude." He nevertheless found our manual preferable to Charles Moorman's complete "rejection of editorial conservatism" in his *Editing the Middle English Manuscript*. On the whole, even the Bédierists seem to have felt that our book would be generally useful and would not unduly prejudice unformed minds.

What effect is the Foulet/Speer manual having on the editing of medieval French texts? I'm honestly not sure yet, and I think it is probably too soon to tell. It is stirring up discussion about editorial methods, both in a few graduate seminars and in some professional meetings; it is also encouraging readers who never did so before to look critically at the variants and rejected readings in the back of the book and to evaluate editorial decisions; and it is beginning to be cited as a reference in some recently published editions.

In a broader sense, *On Editing Old French Texts* seems to be profiting from and contributing to a renewed awareness of the paradoxical importance of change as both the very life of a medieval French work, through oral and written transmissions, and yet the agent of the work's fragmentation and deterioration, through the necessarily and sometimes intentionally unfaithful transmissions known to us. Innovations in the literary theories associated with formalism, structuralism, semiotics, and reception esthetics, together with innovations in editorial praxis, are serving to reshape the ancient quarrel between Bédierists and neo-Lachmannians, and the evolving notion of what role change plays in the ontology of a medieval composition is affecting the types of editions published. Editions offering multiple redactions of a single text provide evidence to support a generative notion of a text and to shift the focus away from the author, where such a primary transmitter can be posited, to the scribe as retransmitter. Such editions seem to strengthen the hand of Bédierists, for they supply a collection of best-manuscript editions. If one's perspective is oriented toward the quest for authentic readings, one may feel that some multiple best-manuscript editions obscure the original poet's contribution and in extreme cases lead critics

to glorify a lazy or error-prone scribe as a perfectly respectable reader/interpreter of a text he may in fact have botched up without intending to change it. The role of oral composition and transmission for epics and lyric poems is still being debated; and as these issues are resolved, editing philosophies may again be modified. But for now, the new emphasis on codicology, textual variations, and change has helped promote a *re-prise de conscience* of the crucial importance of the role of editors as the modern transmitters and first interpreters of the texts they publish.

We are hopeful that these changes in the critical-theoretical ambiance will sustain the renewed interest in and respect for the difficulties and accomplishments of editorial work. And we hope particularly that the better informed readers who seem to be emerging will foster an increase in the number of really excellent editions, of whatever theoretical stripe.¹

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this essay was delivered as a paper in a session on "Manuals of Editing" at the Society for Textual Scholarship conference in New York on 21 April 1983.

The Longfellow Letters

EDWARD L. TUCKER

THE LETTERS OF HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW, edited by Andrew Hilen, Volume V (1866–1874), Volume VI (1875–1882). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982. xiii, 825; ix, 912 pp. \$80.00 the set.

With the publication of these two volumes, Andrew Hilen brings to a conclusion his monumental work consisting of the extant letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807–1882). These last two volumes complete a project that began in 1966 and ended in 1982, one hundred years after the death of the poet.

During this period Longfellow's life was filled with correspondence. Hilen has managed to divide the two volumes equally, with titles for the different sections. For Volume V, the subtitles are: Part Seventeen, Three Score Years, 1866–1867; Part Eighteen, Europe, 1868–1869; Part Nineteen, The Virtuous Man, 1870–1871; Part Twenty, Embers

That Still Burn, 1872–1874. The subtitles of Volume VI are as follows: Part Twenty-One, Among the Breakers, 1875–1876; Part Twenty-Two, the Tumult of Life, 1877–1878; Part Twenty-Three, Lowered Sails, 1879–1880; and Part Twenty-Four, In the Harbor, 1881–1882. The number of letters recovered for Longfellow's last years are so evenly divided that each section, with one exception, contains only two years.

During the period 1866–1882 the Longfellow legend was created: that of the aristocratic white Mr. Longfellow, very kind, unemotional, seldom displaying impatience or anger. These letters, which reinforce the legend, become a means essentially of providing topical information, of encouraging others, or exchanging civilized courtesies.

The courtly, polite Longfellow, feeling it his duty not to destroy himself as a national institution, seldom wrote about his own problems. Instead he discussed his family and the people who visited him; he avoided controversy.

During these years Longfellow traveled to England, received honorary degrees from Cambridge and Oxford, responded to numerous invitations from aristocrats, poets, and novelists. He visited Tennyson and even called on the Queen and the Prince of Wales at Windsor. Back in America on his seventieth birthday he became so much an object of national adulation that he felt his study had become a “garden of flowers.” School children in particular wrote to him of their affection.

And this comfortable man scarcely worried about money; he had wealth from the Appleton estate, the Craigie house, and some well-invested securities. Each of his children at twenty-one was to receive a handsome legacy. He donated a reasonable amount of money to friends, relatives, and worthy causes. His three girls, “grave Alice, and laughing Allegra, and Edith with golden hair”—now growing to womanhood—went to Europe with him, as well as his son Ernest (now newly married) and other family members. All in all, he was a prosperous, ideal family man. And to complete the image, Edith married and brought into the world two grandsons whom he could enjoy—Richard Henry Dana and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana.

Essentially a scholar in his study, Longfellow during this time produced ten separate volumes of poetry. He finished his translation of Dante’s *The Divine Comedy*; he supervised an expanded edition of *The Poets and Poetry of Europe*; he turned out his multi-volume collection of the *Poems of Places*. In 1872 he published *Christus*, which he hoped would be his *magnum opus*. He read widely and when amateurs sent their verses to him for criticism, he did not suggest improvements and sometimes even praised bad poetry, apparently because he could not bring himself to offend the authors.

Longfellow knew other literary figures. His good friend, Charles Dickens, was making a lecture tour of America and was in Boston for a week. The famous speech given by Mark Twain at a dinner honoring John Greenleaf Whittier did not upset him; he assured the young Westerner that he was not insulted, that it was “a pleasant dinner,” and Whittier “enjoyed it very much.” In 1881 when Walt Whitman wrote for an autograph to give to a Canadian friend, Longfellow complied with “great pleasure.” And in January 1882 he received Oscar Wilde, the last of many Englishmen to come to his door, noting in a letter: “However fantastic he may be in public, in private he is a very agreeable and intelligent young man.”

Anthony Trollope, who saw only this conventional image, stated that Longfellow was very pleasant, a “first-class gentleman.” But, underneath the surface, asked Trollope, where and who was the “true” Longfellow?

The letters do go beyond this conventional image and suggest the “true” Longfellow, something more than the kindly, white gentleman.

For one thing, he felt he should be paid well for his literary works; as a result, he drove hard bargains with editors

and publishers. In 1874 he charged a fee of \$3,000 from the publisher of the *New York Ledger* for “The Hanging of the Crane.” And in 1875 he entered a ten-year contract with James R. Osgood & Company that paid him \$4,000 annually, exclusive of his ten percent royalty on new books and his fees from magazines. His average yearly income from his works over the last ten years of his life was \$16,000.

Early in his life, he loved travel, but during his last years, he became a homebody. When he was in Europe in 1868–1869, the memories of the past depressed him and, “heartily tired,” he longed for Craigie House. Though he sometimes went to Boston to lectures or operas and enjoyed an occasional public dinner, he definitely did not want to speak at any celebration. In the summers he went to Nahant (though while there, he longed to return to Cambridge), and annually to Portland to visit his brother and sister. But “Castle Craigie,” run with the help of servants and gardeners, which contained his daughters, their house guests, and his frequent dinner guests, was his place of security.

Fame produced headaches. Visitors, known and unknown, foreign and domestic, came to his home in a merciless procession: photographers, editors, unpublished authors, children, curiosity seekers. He listened patiently to an admirer who had committed the entire *Song of Hiawatha* to memory, and he recorded that on one afternoon in 1877, he had fourteen callers. When he became ill in 1881 and had to remain in his room and bed, he said it was pleasant “having the world shut out.” It was “a great relief,” this “freedom from callers.”

Furthermore, he became a victim to his correspondence, which he considered a penance for his fame. Almost all the letters he received must be answered, not only those from friends but also from people he did not know—the “Entire Stranger”: they wanted topical poems, they sent manuscripts for advice, they praised him. Whenever a letter arrived, he stacked it with others and answered it as soon as possible. The result was that he was anchored to his study for hours at a time. He reported that the incessant letter-writing embittered his existence. On one day in 1873 he recorded: “This morning I counted the unanswered letters on my table. There are fifty-two! Thus is my life riddled to pieces.” During the last six months, Anne Allegra Longfellow acted as amanuensis, and finally Longfellow resorted to a printed form.

The burden of correspondence may have contributed to his poor health. Visitors to Craigie House, who saw him walking the grounds or standing at his study desk, assumed his tranquility of spirit; actually he suffered considerably. There were numerous ills: headaches, insomnia, colds, eye-strain, nervous prostration, difficulty with his hands which, during his last years, made writing very “painful, not to say, impossible,” and especially the “two handmaidens, Influenza and Neuralgia.” He experimented with various treatments that he saw advertised in newspapers or that he made

up: the patent medicines *Vegetine* and *Nux Vomica*; diets emphasizing onions or celery or fish; a medicated belt and breast-plate made of “wash-leather, lined with fine red flannel”; quinine pills; inhalations of ether. But nothing gave much comfort. He finally died of an infection, the result of peritonitis.

Some of his friends didn't help. For example, although Longfellow thought of George Washington Greene, his principal correspondent, as his “oldest friend” and “always a welcome guest,” the man had many unpleasant qualities. Greene, of a jealous nature, felt that the world was conspiring against him. He took advantage of Longfellow's good nature by using him as an intermediary with publishers, as a promoter of schemes to obtain employment, as a procurer of invitations to academic and social events. Longfellow supplied him constantly with encouragement and money, helped subsidize his biography of General Nathanael Greene, bought a house for him, and enlarged it. In 1874 he put Greene on a regular monthly allowance of \$50 and in his will left \$1,000 to each of Greene's children. Greene, not himself a beneficiary, sold his letters from Longfellow to the poet's children for an unspecified amount.

Two family members presented problems. Longfellow's son, Charles, who was very casual in his attitude toward money, seemed determined in dissipating his inheritance on the pleasures of Japan and other countries; because Longfellow himself was rather prudent, this attitude of his adventurous and spendthrift son annoyed him. But the really disturbing member of the household was the poet's nephew, Stephen Longfellow. He relieved his uncle of over \$3,000 over a six-year period. Having spent several years at sea, he persuaded the poet to invest in a mariner's compass, but nothing came of the venture. During succeeding years, Stephen became notorious: he made the headlines in the *Boston Transcript* when he forged Longfellow's name to a check, and, after being arrested, was put under bond of \$3,000; inebriated, he fell down the stairs of a Boston hotel and broke his leg, the result being amputation; when he married a sixteen-year-old girl, even though he had a wife and child elsewhere, the *Boston Globe* described him as the “bigamous Longfellow,” the “wild and wicked nephew of the poet”; he was put for a while in a home for alcoholics. Longfellow wrote about this relative: “How glad I am he is only my nephew. If he were any nearer I could not endure it.” In 1880, Stephen, in what Longfellow called a “wise decision,” sailed to Australia and passed out of the poet's life.

The result of the publication of all the available letters is to present a more fully developed man than seen previously: in addition to the conventional legendary figure, there is also a view of a human being with anxieties and sufferings.

Hilen's editorial principles are of special interest to the textual scholar, for he is handling a massive amount of material. This edition contains all the available letters of Longfellow, published and unpublished. Hilen ends up with

4,992 dated letters. A section entitled “Undated Letters and Fragments,” which arranges the manuscripts alphabetically by recipient or by the month in which they were written, brings the total to 5,055. The dated letters are arranged in chronological order, numbered consecutively, and placed under the full name of the recipient. When the exact date is not known, Hilen has provided a date within brackets, justifying it when necessary in a footnote. When only the year of a letter is known, the letter is put at the end of the year; when the month and year are known, it is placed at the end of the month.

The matter of copy text is not so crucial in this edition as it might be in editions of the works because a letter written and sent is seldom revised in future years. Whenever available, the manuscript text becomes the copy text. When the original letter is unrecovered, Hilen has depended—in order of priority—on photographic reproductions, printed versions, and typed or handwritten copies. When depending on a printed version, he has reproduced the text exactly as he has found it except for obvious typographical errors or errors in transcription, which he was silently corrected.

In the overall plan, Hilen has adhered strictly to a basic principle: absolute fidelity to the substantives. In the matter of accidentals, he has retained as closely as possible Longfellow's orthography, punctuation, paragraphing, grammar, and syntax. Longfellow wrote in a legible hand, and for the most part the actual readings of texts present few problems in interpretation. In some instances, though, Hilen has felt it necessary to emend the accidentals in the interests of clarity and readability. The following are some of his editorial rules:

1. Spelling has been retained as found in the manuscripts, although a few words that appear to be the result of mere slips of the pen (such as *vioelent* for *violent*) have been silently corrected. He has preserved such spellings as *recieved* and *schollars* when he has established the fact that Longfellow consistently spelled the words in that way.

2. Punctuation has not been changed, except in a few instances. For example, all sentences have been made to end with a period, which eliminates the terminal dash. In some cases he has supplied punctuation where it is clear that Longfellow inadvertently omitted it; he has closed his quotations and parenthetical remarks, ended his sentences, and provided question marks when necessary. Occasionally he has silently added punctuation, or deleted it, in order to clarify meaning, provided the correction, addition, or deletion in punctuation does not alter what Longfellow intended.

3. Capitalization is preserved as in the manuscripts, although for the sake of uniformity Hilen has started all sentences with a capital letter.

4. Grammar and syntax remain the same as in the manuscripts with a few exceptions, such as the occasional and inadvertent repetition of words and phrases (*the the*); and he has sometimes added a word or phrase to clarify meaning,

but always within square brackets.

5. Editorial insertions have been held to a minimum. On occasion he has used square brackets to enclose an explanatory word or phrase omitted by Longfellow or to expand initials or names.

Interested readers may wish to refer to Hilen's "Editorial Principles" for all six volumes, clearly stated in Volume I, pp. 12–15. In the matter of annotation, at the end of each letter is a series of necessary notes. These include identifications of names mentioned, textual clarifications, explanatory remarks, and translations of lengthy passages in foreign languages. Information concerning the location of a manuscript is given at the end of each letter, or if the manuscript is unrecovered, the source of the text. The great majority of the letters are the property of the Longfellow Trust, now on permanent deposit in the Houghton Library of Harvard University. Also included at the end of each letter are, if available, the address of the recipient, legible postmarks, annotations on the address leaf. If the letter has been previously printed in its complete form, this information is also included.

An Appendix contains Longfellow's Last Will and Testament. At the end of Volume VI is a section entitled "Additions and Corrections," containing a number of substantive and accidental errors in Volumes I–IV that have come to

light. Each volume has at the end an Index of Recipients, and at the end of Volume VI is the section that many Longfellow scholars have been waiting for: a Comprehensive Index containing personal names and titles mentioned in the letters.

The editor had planned a supplementary volume or article containing some letters that, as might have been expected, have surfaced since the beginning of the project. But he personally will not complete this addition.

Andrew Hilen, who devoted most of his scholarly life to Longfellow, who wrote *Longfellow and Scandinavia* and edited *The Diary of Clara Crowninshield*, died on 12 May 1982, one hundred years and less than two months after the poet. This edition of the letters, a model of impeccable scholarship, good taste, and sufficient humility in the presence of the poet, thus becomes a monument to our foremost Longfellow scholar.

Hilen, with the completion of this undertaking, almost demands a re-evaluation of the poet. What next? The Journals *must* be edited in their entirety by someone of Hilen's painstaking caliber. The Longfellow manuscripts of the literary works must be re-examined and some, certainly, must appear in modern editions. Hilen has pointed the way; other scholars must follow.

Computer-Assisted Document Control For Editorial Projects

PAUL MACHLIS

Effective organizing and indexing of historical and literary texts are essential to the work of documentary editing. Card files, typed lists, and computer printouts help us count and classify documents and provide access to materials by date, subject, owner, and other features. In doing so, they offer editors some control over the tens of thousands of documents that form each of the editions. Maintaining tools of document control is not our central work, but it is prerequisite to the publication of accurate and thoroughly annotated texts.

The following remarks concern the use of computers at four projects to produce instruments of document control that are more helpful, efficient, and flexible than their card-file alternatives. I will introduce some basic concepts of

computer-assisted control, describe each system, and offer general comment on their differences and similarities.

As editors, we are familiar with, if not actively using, word-processing capabilities of computers. The application of computing to document control utilizes different facilities, known as data processing, with which we may store and sort information about an item chosen for classification (such as a manuscript letter). That stored information is called a "record" and consists of numerous fields, or elements, of data. Many similarly structured records form a data file, which can itself be processed as a unit. Part or all of the data file can be sorted and printed in various ways. In this discussion the outcome of a document control system will be called a catalog.¹

Before creating a computer-assisted catalog, a project should (1) define its goals in document control; (2) review and, if necessary, alter procedures of document acquisition, organization, and record-keeping so that the aims of document control and editing are best served; (3) determine the computer hardware (equipment) and software (programs or instructions) that are most appropriate to the task; and (4) define the records, fields, and lists to be used in the catalog. Four groups of procedures and guidelines should also be considered in producing the catalog: (1) input of records and initial proofreading; (2) sorting and selection of records from various lists; (3) output (paper, microform, or online); and (4) incorporation of revisions and additions.

Each project faces a unique set of factors in these eight areas of choice. The size and organization of the document collection, the types of documents to be edited, the urgency of need for document control, the plan of the edition, and the availability of administrative and financial support must all be considered. The choices to be made are interrelated and will require constant reevaluation during the design process. The variety of factors and options will be evident in the following descriptions of four document catalogs.

The Joseph Henry Papers (Smithsonian Institution) is preparing a comprehensive microfilm edition and a selected fifteen-volume letterpress edition of documents (mainly letters) by, to, and about the nineteenth-century physicist and first Secretary of the Smithsonian. Since 1966, the project has maintained a document control system on the Institution's mainframe (large, multi-user) computer, currently a Honeywell Series 60 level 66/20, using specially designed programs in the COBOL language as well as adaptations of the Smithsonian's "SELGEM" archival control programs. Information about approximately 55,000 of an estimated eighty to one-hundred thousand documents has been entered from worksheets prepared by project assistants; the remaining records are being added at a rate of about 3,000 per year. During a typical two- to three-minute examination of a document, the assistant records up to twenty-two fields

of information in up to fifty-five characters.

The fields chosen by the project are: the unique control number assigned to each document; a batch number, indicating the location of the project's microfilm or Xerox copy of the document; the number of pages in the document; document date, author, and addressee; the source (depository) holding the original document; up to two personal names mentioned in the document; up to five significant subjects treated in it; and a preliminary indication of whether the document will be included in the letterpress edition. Comment fields allow catalogers to indicate whether the author name, recipient name, month, day, or year have been editorially supplied, and whether the document has an enclosure, is not a letter, or spans several dates. Four lists are printed, on lettersize paper, with a Xerox 1200 system: a chronological list (subsorted by author), an alphabetical list by personal name (with writers, addressees, and mentioned persons interfiled and subsorted by date), a list by subject code (subsorted by date), and a list by control number. The current catalog is stored in looseleaf binders; an auxiliary binder guides users in the understanding of name, subject, and depository codes. A full paper printing of the catalog, including new records and data corrections, is produced every twelve to eighteen months. The data file has been used to produce specialized lists as needed, such as statistical tables and calendars for volumes of the letterpress edition, and will serve as the basis for the index to the microfilm edition.

An essential feature of the catalog is the use of codes for personal names, depositories, and subjects. Although initially name codes were acronyms (JHE for Joseph Henry), most are arbitrarily assigned. As there are only a few hundred depositories listed, depository codes roughly reflect institutional names. Subject indexing is governed by a thesaurus of 133 three-digit codes, arranged in nine groups (for instance, in the area of "Electricity and Magnetism" are codes for "Batteries," "Induction," "Magnets," "Wire," and other topics).²

PROGRAM: JHPPRT		JOSEPH HENRY PAPERS										DATE 05/25/82		PAGE 27								
NAME INDEX	CONTROL NUMBER	BATCH X M NO.	NUMBER PAGES	SYMBOL A/R	ENCL OR NON-CORR	SPAN S	M/D/Y ADDED	DATE MO DAY	YR	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	SOURCE	NAMES TREATED		SUBJECTS					STATUS SELEC. TRANS.		
													A	B	A	B	C	D	E			
ADB	05977	M 070	01				03 16	39	ADB	JHE	SIA		866	645							002	
ADB	06766	M 071	01				03 16	39	ADB	JHE	SIA											
ADB	05978	M 070	08			S	03 19	39	JHE	ADB	SIA	TRB	866	270							002	
ADB	05979	M 070	02				03 20	39	JHE	ADB	SIA		560	284	145						002	
ADB	16682	M 122	02				03 20	39	JHE	ADB	SIA	JZM	GIC	627	145	235						
ADB	05980	M 070	01				03 23	39	ADB	JHE	SIA		284	654							002	
ADB	36201	X 066	03	R			04 16	39	ADB	ESA	PRO	JHE	CW1	407	170	449	645	866			002	
ADB	05981	M 070	02				04 19	39	ADB	JHE	SIA	JWQ		284	170						002	
ADB	17867	M 129	04				04 21	39	ADB	CRT	SIA	GIC	BID	049	284	170						
ADB	07513	M 072	01				04 25	39	JHE	HAH	SIA	ADB	SAL	654								
ADB	08274	M 098	01				04	39	JHE		SIA	ADB		170							000	
ADB	05982	M 070	03	A			05 04	39	ADB	HLL	SIA	JES	GIC	866	800	170	284	645				
ADB	05983	M 070	04				05 20	39	JHE	ADB	SIA	MFA		049	013	284					002	
ADB	05984	M 070	03				05 28	39	ADB	JHE	SIA			284	049	270					002	
ADB	00288	X 002	01				06 10	39	ADB	CCO	APS	ZOF		284	160							

Illustration 1

The Joseph Henry Papers Catalog, Name List, page 27, lists documents by, to, or mentioning Alexander D. Bache (ADB) in chronological order.

The Thomas A. Edison Papers (Rutgers University, New Brunswick, and Edison National Historic Site, West Orange, New Jersey) is preparing a selected six-part microfilm edition and a selected fifteen- to twenty-volume letterpress edition of correspondence, laboratory notebooks, patents, and litigation records. In 1980 the project implemented a document control system, closely modelled after that of the Joseph Henry Papers, with the use of an in-house Xerox 860 word processor, the Rutgers DEC 20 mainframe computer, and specially designed programs in the FORTRAN and SITBOL languages. Records include up to nineteen fields and fifty-two characters. They have been entered for about 9,000 documents selected for the first part of the microfilm edition from approximately three and one-half million pages of material in the entire archive. Project editors and student assistants prepare coded worksheets, at a rate roughly estimated at five to seven minutes per document, for later keypunching.

rections will be incorporated periodically in revised printings. Auxiliary lists of codes for names, subjects, and document types assist users of the catalog. The data file will serve as the foundation of the index to the microfilm edition.

The large number of documents has called for the processing of certain classes of documents (financial papers, inventories, brochures, and others) in groups rather than as individual items, with the identification of date, author, and recipient adjusted to apply to a collection of items. However, some documents call for more analysis than the record structure allows. When additional access for "names mentioned" or subjects is desired, a second record is created for the document. The wide variety of documents (unlike the preponderance of letters in the Henry catalog) and the desire of the editors to record all types of documents in one catalog have required guidelines for determining the authors and recipients of such items as drawings, lab notes,

Thomas A. Edison Papers													18-Mar-83		
Specific Name Code Report - JG2													Page 1		
Gr	Local	Ty	Date	Au1	Au2	Rp1	Rp2	Nr1	Nr2	Sj1	Sj2	Sj3	Status	Re1	Frme
XX	XXXXXXXX	XX	XX/XX/XX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXXXXX	XXX	XXXX X
D	7501F	01	75/09/10	JG2	TAE					280					
D	7511A	01	75/01/00	TAE	JG2			TTE		215	245		6	2	
D	7511D	01	75/07/26	TAE	JG2	742		ABC	W02	613	215	230	7		
D	7511N	72	75/00/00	TAE				TTE	JG2	210			4		

Illustration 2
The Thomas A. Edison Papers Catalog, Name Code Report for documents by, to, or mentioning Jay Gould (JG2).

The catalog's fields include: a call number specifying the location of the original document at the Historic Site; a two-character code to show whether the document is a letter, lab note, patent item, legal document, financial paper, or other type of material; the document date; up to two authors of the document; up to two recipients; up to two personal names mentioned; up to three subjects treated; an indication that a name or date is conjectural; and reel and frame numbers for the microfilm edition. As with the Henry project, three-letter codes are arbitrarily assigned for authors, recipients, and names mentioned, and three-digit codes are assigned for subjects within ten categories (for instance, under "Phonograph and Motion Picture" are categories for "Cylinder Phonograph," "Disk Phonograph," and "Kinetoscope," among others). The principal form of output is lists of records that match specific combinations of fields requested by project editors (for instance, all documents with a specified author and subject). Three other comprehensive lists are also currently produced: a list by file location; a frequencies list, in which names are printed with a count of their appearance in the data file; and the indexes to the volumes of the microfilm edition. New records and cor-

mortgages, stock and bond certificates, and diplomas. Because the microfilm edition and catalog currently record only those documents held at the Edison Historic Site, no depository information is given.³

The Papers of Jefferson Davis (Rice University) is preparing a selected letterpress edition of works and papers, including letters to Davis. An in-house Micom microprocessor, utilizing packaged database management software and data storage on eight-inch floppy disks, was acquired in 1980 to facilitate control over the approximately 100,000 documents of the edition. Records for some 24,000 documents related to the two volumes currently in preparation have been entered by project editors in up to eleven fields and up to 150 characters.

The fields of the Davis catalog are: date; author/recipient; type of document (report, request, memo, endorsement, etc.); one name mentioned; one subject heading; document type (ALS, LS, etc.); depository name and call number; project file location (film or folder number); an indication that the document will either be published in full or merely be listed in the series calendar; and discursive notes. Only one field is needed for both authors and recipients, because

55.12.11	f	Depierris, V.B.	query	Garland, N?	address	ALS	DNA, M567, r514	ED196	
55.12.11	f	Depierris, V.B.	query	Molinard, Albert J.S.	address	ALS	DNA, M567, r514	ED196	
55.12.11	f	Lee, John P.	submits*	Scott, Winfield	ct martial rec, 1811	LS	DNA, M221, r176	K301	ack 12.11
55.12.11	f	McClelland, R.	query	Henley, Thomas J.	clerk	LS	DNA, RG092, LsRecd	JQ413	
55.12.11	f	Totten, J.G.		* Barnard, John G.			DNA, RG094, USMA Recs	GL577	
55.12.11	f	Totten, J.G.	report	* Hulse, Isaac, Dr.	Pt Barrancas	LS	DNA, RG077, Land Papers	JH202	
55.12.11	f	Totten, J.G.		* Walker, William H.T.	USMA assignt		DNA, RG094, USMA Recs	GL577	
55.12.11	f	Zollicoffer, Felix K.	recom	Jackson, Alexander	USMA Bd Vis	ALS	DNA, RG094, USMA Recs	GM523	
55.12.11			refers		Liberty Depot stores	LbC	DNA, M444, r003, v5	Q244	to QMG
55.12.11	f	Tabor, James M.	query	*	leave, USMA	ALS	DLC, Davis	PP# 132	
55.12.12	to	Blanchard, Albert G.	ack		services, Kan; L, 12.3	PC	DNA, M221, r176	K107	
55.12.12	to	Kelly, John	reply	Wallace, Patrick	address	LbC	DNA, M006, r037	AL186	
55.12.12	to	McClelland, R.	reply	Henley, Thomas J.	clerk	PC	DNA, RG092, LsRecd	JQ414	
55.12.12	to	Vail, George	decision	Fleming, George	discharge denied	LbC	DNA, M006, r037	AL186	
55.12.12	f	Abert, J.J.	opinion*	Lester & Redington	Oswego contract		DNA, M506, r071	IL1250	JD upholds Abert decision
55.12.12	f	Atkinson, Robert J.	report *	Clark, Michael M.	mil contrib fund	LS	DNA, M221, r176	K066	
55.12.12	f	Atkinson, Robert J.	report *	Scott, Winfield	mil contrib fund	LS	DNA, M221, r176	K066	
55.12.12	f	Burnet, William E.	applic		comm; renews	ALS	DNA, RG107, Applics	KF272	
55.12.12	f	Cannon, William R.	discusse*	Brown, A.G.	pol, Miss	ALS	KyLxT	KS477	P
55.12.12	f	Cannon, William R.		* Davis, Jefferson	pol, senate	ALS	KyLxT	KS477	P
55.12.12	f	Guthrie, James	request	*	Hockaway Beach	LS	DNA, RG077, Land Papers	JH303	
55.12.12	f	Lawson, Thomas	query	*	Va Med & Surg Jour	LbC	DNA, Rg112, Ls to Sec	J1071	JD E

Illustration 3

The Papers of Jefferson Davis Catalog, sample page from a Date List, with sorting by columns two, three, and five.

Davis is always assumed to be either the writer or addressee; "to" or "f" in the preceding field indicates whether the document was to or from the person named. Editorial doubt about a name or date is indicated with a question mark; such doubtful names and dates follow those without question marks, in the various sortings. Codes are employed for depositories (NUC symbols) and types of document (ALS, etc.). Additional records are frequently created for documents when access is desired through more than one subject or name mentioned and to different versions of one document (draft, signed letter, letterbook copy). Although the project could generate full listings of the data file according to such elements as date and author, online access has so far made such lists unnecessary. Lists are produced, on the in-house daisywheel printer, in response to specific research or editorial needs. Because the computer system allows printing of documents while two users are inputting or editing data, frequent requests for printouts are not inconvenient. New records and corrections are incorporated into the data file periodically. The data base serves as an outline for the letterpress calendar and could serve similarly for a microfilm edition.⁴

The Mark Twain Project (The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley) is preparing a letterpress edition of the complete works and papers of Samuel L. Clemens. The project implemented a control system in 1981 on a campus PDP 11/70 computer (UNIX operating system), utilizing programs specially written in the BASIC language. Information about approximately 10,000 letters by Mark Twain has been entered in records of up to twenty fields and 350 characters (with an average record length of 100 characters). A student assistant examines the project's manuscript, photocopy, or typescript texts and directly enters data through an online terminal at an average rate of one record per minute. The catalog records letters by Clemens' wife and daughters, letters by secretaries writing on behalf of Clemens, and letters known to have been written but for which no text has been located (ghost letters). Separate catalogs are in preparation for some 12,000 letters to or about Clemens, and some 5,000 writings by him.

The fields of the catalog are: a unique record number; up to two writers; up to two addressees; a date modifier (circa, before, after, postmarked, etc.); up to three dates; up to two places of writing; up to two sources of the text (to catalog composite and radiating texts accurately); and discursive notes. Lists are printed with records arranged by date, writer, addressee, place of writing, record number, day, and text source. Multiple source lists—one subsorted by date, one by addressee—allow ready collation with differing cataloging practices at different depositories. The day list groups letters by day of month (all 2 May letters together) to facilitate identification of letters listed in auction or depository catalogs without indication of year. All lists have secondary and tertiary sorting keys for records with identical primary sorting keys. Records are duplicated for particular lists: a letter addressed to two persons appears once under each name in the addressee list. Reference guides to abbreviations and source codes accompany each list. The first edition of the catalog was printed on a Xerox 6770 laser printer and bound in eight volumes. A supplement is updated monthly and will be merged with the main data file for periodic reprinting. Records are corrected with the UNIX text editor.

The catalog utilizes two- or three-letter abbreviations for writers. For the place of writing a hierarchical listing was adopted that provides sortings by state or country, then by city. Standard U.S. postal abbreviations for states were supplemented by similarly constructed codes for countries ("SH" and ship name are given for letters written at sea). The source of the most authoritative text is represented in two manners: the first, used for private and public collections, consists of a two-letter state or country code, the collection name (often in short form), and an indication whether the text source is a manuscript, transcript, or photocopy; the second, used for printed sources, consists of the publication name and pertinent bibliographic information. Uncertainty about names, dates, and places is mentioned in the notes, and unknown parts of a date are represented by asterisks. Although final printouts are relatively free of codes, the speed and accuracy of input are increased by the

OLC	to Howland, Robert M. 00677	1871.11.20	CT.Hartford	CA.MTP.ms
SLC and OLC	to Howland, Robert M. and Howland, Louise A. 04656	ca. 1877.09.03	NY.Elmira	CA.MTP.ms.
SLC	to Howland, Robert M. 07428 notes: year uncertain.	1879.10.27	CT.Hartford	CA.Daley.ms
SLC	to Howland, Robert M. 02810	1879.12.14	CT.Hartford	CA.MTP.ms
SLC	to Howland, Robert M. 04128	1879.12.29	CT.Hartford	CA.MTP.ms.
SLC	to Howland, Robert M. 02325 notes: date uncertain.	1879.12.29	CT.Hartford	CA.MTP.ms

Illustration 4

The Mark Twain Project Catalog, Addressee List, page 272, lists documents alphabetically by addressee name, with subsorting by date and writer.

liberal use of codes that are later converted to full listings by "global" substitution commands.⁵

Undoubtedly, computer-generated catalogs exist at other editorial projects. As they are publicly described, the variety of approaches to document control will become more apparent. Other applications of data processing, both inside and outside of the editorial sphere, will display techniques pertinent to our concerns.⁶ Even the preceding brief descriptions of only four catalogs illustrate that somewhat different solutions to similar problems will be appropriate for different projects.

The Henry, Edison, and Davis projects supplement access by writers, dates, and other features with access to the content of documents, through preliminary subject and "names mentioned" indexing. In each case, subject indexing has been of great assistance in the preparation of selected editions, in that it "aids the editors in choosing documents for letterpress publication while making the significant information in the unselected documents readily available for use in annotation."⁷ The Twain project chose a more modest goal of access by prominent features of documents because of an urgent need for improved cataloging. By rejecting time-consuming input of desirable but less essential information, the project completed an initial version of its catalog very quickly and relatively inexpensively.

The Twain project chose to record its three major collections in three catalogs with different record designs. The user may be inconvenienced by having to consult three reference tools but at the same time may benefit from cataloging more pertinent to the particular classes of documents: certainly the inclusion of letters with such documents as manuscripts of novels, autobiographical sketches, and poems would have required a complex and possibly cumbersome record design. The division of the edition into series (letters, sketches, etc.) also argued for separate catalogs. The other projects, each of which edits documents for strictly chronological (not series) publication, chose to cata-

log together a variety of documents (although most can be convincingly likened to letters).

Each project has chosen only those characteristics of documents that are most important to its goals. The Henry project chose not to record detailed depository call numbers, specification of document type (ALS, LS, etc.), or the identification of unclear names. The Twain project rejected as fields the type of paper, watermark, letterhead, ink color, subjects, occurrences in print, depository call numbers, and key phrases. Only the Henry project records the number of pages, only the Twain project records ghost letters and place of writing, and only the Davis project records detailed depository information and different versions of a text. The decision to exclude information from the record format may be very difficult to make. Yet the inclusion of all information that might prove useful would raise the cost and time of cataloging of any collection to unmanageable levels.

The projects use different computer hardware and software. The Davis project enjoys the convenience and independence of the in-house microcomputer but would like to have the increased storage capacity of hard disks. The Edison project utilizes the convenience and low cost of its microprocessor for record input but takes advantage of the superior processing and storage capabilities of the mainframe for other functions. The Twain and Henry projects rely exclusively on mainframe computers.

Each catalog has required careful planning of document analysis and input. Editors who know their materials well have designed catalogs that can accommodate peculiarities of their collections and a variety of unusual features. Patience and persistence in tackling the initial decisions of catalog design have saved them from inconsistencies and inadequacies in their data files, problems that could be repaired only by largescale, expensive revision of programs and data. The active involvement of all editors of the projects, including those unfamiliar with cataloging and computers, has improved both the quality and the ease of acceptance of the catalogs. Consistent cataloging has been

achieved by strictly limiting and formalizing data elements according to in-house thesauri and manuals of procedure.

Different input procedures have been used: readers at the Twain project enter data directly during document analysis while the other projects employ readers to complete worksheets for later keystroking. The "global" search-and-replace function of computers facilitates the input of highly abbreviated information, for uncoded catalogs like those for Twain and Davis, that can be easily transformed into correct form.

The projects face common problems concerning output. While all editors wish to consult data bases that are complete and accurate, they must also consider the cost and effort of continual correction and reprinting of lists. The Henry project is considering less costly microfilm output, but has found some form of "hard copy" useful for many project functions, such as producing photocopy of selected catalog information. It is also considering less frequent printings, issuance of selected lists, and online access. The Twain project is experimenting with compressed lineprinter output of selected lists. The Davis and Edison projects enjoy online access, the opportunity to revise and reprint records continually, and relatively inexpensive printing on in-house printers. Each project must devise methods of alerting users to errors in the current printings; unlike the penciled marking (and possibly refile) of two or three index cards, correction of computer-assisted catalogs will require correction of each error in each printed listing as well as of the stored record itself.

Differences exist in specific record and field features. Twain documents span two centuries and thus cannot conveniently be recorded with two-digit years in date fields, as can the documents of the other three projects. The Davis catalog assumes the major figure (Davis) to be either the writer or the addressee; the others enter the name of their major figure for each appropriate record and also record documents neither to nor from their major figures. The Davis project includes question marks within conjectural information (with sorting order affected), the Henry and Edison projects express doubt with codes in fields assigned to that purpose, and the Twain project mentions doubt in its discursive notes. The projects differ in the number of fields allotted to various types of information, such as authors, addressees, and dates, and differ in the extent to which extra records must be created for documents requiring more than the allotted number. The Twain and Davis catalogs, containing variable length records and few codes, require little use of ancillary reference lists but more storage space, paper, and computing time than the coded files of the Edison and Henry catalogs. Coded files require constant reference to "code guides" for input, proofreading, and consultation of the catalog. These differences are relatively unrestricting for output because of the powerful search-and-replace capabilities of computer systems: any project may choose to change codes to full forms, full names to codes,

or alter the format of printouts, with an ease unimaginable with manual control systems.

Analysis of the four systems reviewed here suggests several precepts for successful computer-assisted cataloging: (1) a comprehensive knowledge of the document collection and editorial plan (more than of computer operations) is essential to produce a catalog that is most suitable to a project; (2) the adoption of limited goals and the acceptance of restrictions in time and money will produce useful reference tools in reasonable time; (3) a willingness to give ample time to initial design and document review will prevent major deficiencies and inconsistencies from arising during implementation; (4) documentation in the form of manuals and thesauri is necessary to maintain consistency and accuracy in cataloging.

Just as the publication of accurate and well-annotated texts is a desirable basis for accurate historical and literary scholarship, the preparation of tools of document control is necessary for responsible textual editing. Computers can help us produce catalogs that contribute significantly to the quality of our editorial work.

NOTES

1. For an excellent discussion of the application of data processing to archival control, see H. Thomas Hickerson, *Archives & Manuscripts: An Introduction to Automated Access* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1981). Additional publications in the field are listed in *Automation, Machine-Readable Records, and Archival Administration: An Annotated Bibliography*, ed. Richard M. Kester (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1980).
2. Information about the Henry catalog has been contributed by Kathleen W. Dorman, Assistant Editor, Joseph Henry Papers, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560.
3. Information about the Edison catalog has been contributed by Thomas E. Jeffrey, Associate Editor, Thomas A. Edison Papers, Edison National Historic Site, Main Street and Lakeside Avenue, West Orange, NJ 07052.
4. Information about the Davis catalog has been contributed by Lynda L. Crist, Editor, Papers of Jefferson Davis, Rice University, P. O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77251.
5. Additional information about the Mark Twain catalog can be obtained from Paul Machlis, Associate Editor, Mark Twain Project, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.
6. For information on the use of data processing for related purposes, see Bruce Wheaton, "A Computer Database System To Store and Display Archival Data on Correspondence of Historical Significance" (*American Archivist*, 45 [Fall 1982]: 455-466); Charles W. Polzer, "The Documentary Relations of the Southwest" (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, 58 [1978]: 460-465); *Users' Guide to Cindex . . . A Computer Indexing Program* (Papers of Henry Laurens, University of South Carolina, 1981); and Hickerson, *op cit*.
7. James M. Hobbins and Kathleen Waldenfels, *Computer Applications for Historical Editing Projects: The Henry Papers Index of Documents* (unpublished, 1980).

Members

There are three levels of personal membership in the ADE: Regular (\$15), Sustaining (\$25), and Patron (\$50). The ADE wishes to thank those individuals listed below who have paid their 1983 dues at the Patron or Sustaining member rate.

Patron Members

Ralph G. Newman S. D. Tulles

Sustaining Members

Frederick Aandahl	Robert Leitz
Ross W. Beales, Jr.	Kirsten Lewis
Charlene N. Bickford	Arthur S. Link
Warren M. Billings	Mary Lynn McCree
Larry I. Bland	John R. McKivigan
Kenneth R. Bowling	Edward C. Moore
Frank G. Burke	Harold Moser
Edward C. Carter II	Joel Myerson
Center for Western Studies	Barbara B. Oberg

David R. Chesnutt	Beverly W. Palmer
Don L. Cook	Linda J. Pike
Robert Rhoades Crout	Charles W. Polzer, S.J.
Charles T. Cullen	Nathan Reingold
George M. Curtis III	Michael Richman
Gordon R. DenBoer	Kenneth M. Sanderson
Linda Grant DePauw	Constance B. Schulz
Kathleen Dorman	Robert Seager II
John S. Doskey	Richard N. Sheldon
Ronald M. Gephart	Terry L. Shoptaugh
Mary A. Giunta	Richard K. Showman
LeRoy P. Graf	Harriet F. Simon
Louis R. Harlan	John Y. Simon
David W. Hirst	Raymond W. Smock
Charles F. Hobson	Robert J. Taylor
Ronald Hoffman	Anne Stone Vandegrift
Edward T. James	Helen E. Veit
Thomas E. Jeffrey	David L. Wilson
John P. Kaminski	Douglas E. Wilson
Richard Leffler	

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 _____ Regular \$15 Student \$7.50

Affiliation _____ Sustaining \$25 Retired \$7.50

Amount enclosed _____ Patron \$50 Institutional subscription
to *Newsletter* \$15

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

ISSN: 0196-7134