

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications -- Department of English

English, Department of

2005

The Publishing History of Augusta Jane Evans's Confederate Novel *Macaria*: Unwriting Some Lost Cause Myths

Melissa J. Homestead

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, mhomestead2@Unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Homestead, Melissa J., "The Publishing History of Augusta Jane Evans's Confederate Novel *Macaria*: Unwriting Some Lost Cause Myths" (2005). *Faculty Publications -- Department of English*. 73.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs/73>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications -- Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

MELISSA J. HOMESTEAD
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

The Publishing History of Augusta Jane Evans's Confederate Novel *Macaria* : Unwriting Some Lost Cause Myths

IN HIS 1884 MEMOIR *FIFTY YEARS AMONG AUTHORS, BOOKS AND Publishers*, New York publisher J. C. Derby, who had published Augusta Jane Evans's second novel, *Beulah*, in 1859, gives an account of the publishing history of Evans's third novel, *Macaria*. Both the facts he recounts and his interpretation of those facts have been taken as largely accurate, appearing repeatedly in scholarly analyses of Evans's life and works.¹ Because this essay argues that Derby's account is a romanticized, factually inaccurate account of wartime events from a post-Reconstruction perspective, I begin by substantially reproducing his account (which also embeds Evans's own 1880s vintage reminiscences, reminiscences Derby apparently solicited while preparing his memoir; however, her letter to him from which he quotes does not survive in manuscript form):

Early in the year 1861 the Civil War came upon us with all the attending troubles, temporarily suspending the publication of books of fiction. Those most in demand outside of school-books were infantry and cavalry tactics and other treatises on War. I heard occasionally through the lines from the gifted young authoress [Evans], who sent me in 1863, by a blockade-runner, *via* Cuba, a copy of her novel entitled 'Macaria,' published by West & Johnson [sic], then, as now, well-known booksellers in Richmond, Virginia. The volume was printed on coarse brown paper, the copyright entered according to the *Confederate States of America*, and dedicated "to the brave soldiers of the Southern Army." The authoress in after years said to me, referring to its first publication: "It is impossible for me to say what I received for 'Macaria,' which was published by West & Johnson, of Richmond, in 1864, and was

¹See, for example: Fidler, *Augusta Evans Wilson* (106-07); Kelley (25); Jones (58-59); Riepma (105-06); Faust, "Introduction" (xxvii-xviii); Gross (37, 51n); Sexton (xxxii, 90n). Other discussions inevitably mention the Northern reprinting and the smuggling of the book through the blockade, even when the financial details are omitted, clearly demonstrating their ultimate indebtedness to Derby's account. See, e.g., Baym (276); Muhlenfeld (182); Bakker (132).

printed by Walker, Evans & Cogswell, of Columbia. When Richmond fell, the publishers owed me a considerable amount in Confederate money, which of course I never received. After the war I applied for a settlement. They stated that the books and accounts had been destroyed, or were so confused that I could get nothing; hence I lost what was due. Those times were so dark and full of sorrow that I can recall none of the financial details, but I presume West & Johnson were too badly crippled to pay in greenbacks what they owed in Confederate money. . . . The book was dedicated to our brave Southern Army, and was a great favorite in camp and hospital; and my *very heart beat in its pages*, coarse and brown though the dear old Confederate paper was. Some portions of it were scribbled in pencil while sitting up with the sick soldiers in the hospital attached to 'Camp Beulah' near Mobile."

On receipt of the copy of "Macaria," I called upon J. B. Lippincott, of Philadelphia, the head at that time, as he is now, of the largest wholesale book establishment in the country, whose house had purchased thousands of copies of "Beulah," and arranged for the publication of "Macaria," in uniform style with the former. It was immediately announced by the publishers as in press, when to the surprise of both of us, one Michael Doolady, who had received a copy of "Macaria" through the lines, had printed and nearly ready for publication five thousand copies of the same work. I called upon Doolady and asked him what copyright he intended to pay the author. He replied "that the author being an arch rebel was not entitled to copyright and would receive none." I immediately advised Mr. Lippincott of the situation. He came on from Philadelphia, and called with me on Doolady, and expostulated with him upon the injustice of publishing the book when *he* had already engaged by contract to do so. It was finally settled by Doolady agreeing to pay a royalty to me in trust for the author on all copies sold, in consideration of which Mr. Lippincott withdrew his proposed edition.

The author of "Macaria," pending these negotiations, was of course in blissful ignorance of what had transpired, as no correspondence had passed between us on the subject. At last the war was over. Mobile was the last of the cities to fall, and still I heard nothing from the young authoress with whom I became acquainted six years previous under the favorable circumstances already narrated.

Late in the Summer of 1865, while sitting in my private office, then in Spruce Street, one of the clerks came to me and said "a lady is waiting to see you at the door." She was closely veiled, and I did not readily recognize her. She said "Mr. Derby, do you not know me?" Knowing well the familiar voice, I said, "Augusta Evans, is that you?"

After explaining that she had just arrived by steamer from Mobile, and expressions of mutual gratification at seeing each other again, I said that Mrs. Derby was very anxious to see her, and she must go at once to our home on Forty-eighth Street. She replied, that she had come on with one of her brothers, who had been very badly wounded and he was then sitting on the steps outside. I told her he would find an excellent nurse in my wife. Then, noticing her attire, I suggested that a new dress and a new bonnet would not be out of place. The styles of ladies' wearing apparel having changed since we last saw each other.

She said, "Mr. Derby, my father has lost everything; the slaves have been freed, and all our property confiscated. I have no money with which to replenish my

wardrobe." I then told her for the first time that she had a considerable amount subject to her order, for copyright received on "Macaria."

And this is the story of "Macaria," and how it came to be published in the *United States of America*.

The generosity of Mr. Lippincott, whose position enabled him to compel a copyright so reluctantly paid, was duly appreciated by the author of "Macaria." She once wrote:

"I have always felt profoundly grateful to Mr. Lippincott, but fate has never indulged me in an opportunity of adequately thanking him for his generous and chivalric action, in behalf of an unknown rebel, who at that period was nursing Confederate soldiers in a hospital established near 'Camp Beulah.'" (Derby 392-95)

To my knowledge, only one scholar has been skeptical of Derby's portrait of Evans as a passive victim totally uninvolved in Northern publication of her novel until after the fact—in *Domestic Novelists of the Old South*, Elizabeth Moss acerbically notes that Evans "made no concessions to Northern sensibilities [in *Macaria*] even though she still sought Northern publication of her novel" (184). Despite her recognition that Evans *sought* Northern publication rather than being victimized by it, she, like all modern critics of the novel, makes an assumption derived, at least in part, from Derby's account—that Evans addressed an exclusively Confederate audience in her novel, and particularly Confederate women.²

Derby's claim that Evans sent him a complete printed copy (including copyright notice) of the Confederate edition of *Macaria* in 1863 has also given rise to a bibliographic ghost, the "lost" 1863 first Confederate edition of *Macaria* (this despite the fact that Evans's own recollection embedded in Derby's specifies an 1864 publication date). Evans biographer William Perry Fidler, for instance, writes,

When *Macaria* was completed, Augusta sent the manuscript to the firm of West and Johnston in Richmond, Virginia, who had the book printed on crude wrapping paper; the boards used in the bindings were covered with wall paper, the only materials available at the time. The printing was done by Walker, Evans, and

²Fidler's analysis of the novel as "propaganda" assumes that the readers requiring propagandizing are Southerners needing a boost in morale ("Augusta Evans Wilson"). All of Faust's work on Evans and *Macaria* analyzes it as a text designed for an audience of Confederate women ("Altars of Sacrifice"; *Mothers of Invention* chap. 7; "Introduction"). See also Holstein. As a corrective to Faust, Gross emphasizes Evans's conservatism and her address to an audience of both male and female readers, but she insists that the novel was intended for and was primarily read by Southerners.

Cogswell of Columbia, South Carolina. This Confederate edition is dated 1863 and is now a rare collector's item (*Augusta Evans Wilson* 106).

In his footnote about this "rare collector's item," Fidler claims, "Mrs. E. S. Sledge of Mobile owned a copy of the Confederate edition in 1940. Mrs. Sledge is the present owner of 'Georgia Cottage'" (235n) (Georgia Cottage was the home Evans bought for her family with the royalties from the sales of *Beulah*). Fidler thus corroborates Derby's account of an 1863 first edition with a hearsay statement from a person who claimed to have possessed such a volume years earlier, but who was, apparently, unable to produce it for Fidler's examination. While later scholars have noted the absence of any copies of an 1863 edition in library collections, they have not challenged the fundamental plausibility of Fidler's claim (Faust "Introduction" xxvii; Sexton 88n).

While there are many lacunae in the historical record of the publishing history of *Macaria* (the records of all of the publishing firms involved do not survive for the Civil War era, for instance), this essay reads the extant evidence contemporary to the novel's original publication, including copyright registration records, notices in the Northern publishing trade press, notices and advertisements in Northern and Southern newspapers and magazines, and Evans's surviving letters. In my reconstruction of the Southern publication history, I decisively lay to rest the myth of the "lost" 1863 Confederate first edition of *Macaria*. This reconstruction does not disprove Evans's later claim that she wrote the novel by candlelight while nursing Confederate soldiers, but it suggests that we should approach with caution Derby's account of the novel's Northern publication as a historical source. Derby's account is typical of late nineteenth-century reminiscences celebrating the cordial and productive relationships between publishers and authors; in light of the post-Reconstruction political and cultural conditions of the 1880s, it is not surprising that both Derby and Evans (by then Augusta Evans Wilson) endorsed this narrative of sectional reconciliation. If we hope to reconstruct Evans's understanding of the nature of her potential audience (or audiences) for her novel while she was in the process of writing it, however, we should not rely on Derby's account precisely because he narrates and interprets the events of 1861-1865 from a vantage point that neither Derby nor Evans could have imagined as these events unfolded. I do not present a sustained analysis of the novel in light of this newly reconstructed publishing history, but making careful

inferences from the incomplete record of Northern publication, I demonstrate that Evans sought both a Northern audience for and Northern royalties from sales of her arch-Confederate novel. Rather than a hapless victim unknowingly rescued by the “chivalry” of Derby and Lippincott, Evans cannily maneuvered and negotiated with Northern and Southern publishers both during and after the war and thus maintained a continuous (and remunerated) presence in the Northern literary market despite her ardent support of the Confederacy’s separation from the North.

Certainly, in the midst of the Civil War, an “arch rebel” such as Evans could not exercise total control over her work in the Northern market. My reading of the story of the Northern publication thus situates Evans and her novel in the midst of a triangulated conflict between Northern publishers driven by messy and conflicting commercial and political interests. Derby represented himself and Lippincott as honorable gentlemen publishers and Doolady as a dishonorable scoundrel, but from the vantage point of 1864, the business practices of all of the Northern publishers involved were potentially politically, ethically, and legally suspect. While I debunk the Lost Cause mythologizing of Derby’s oft-repeated story, I recover an equally interesting and dramatic tale with a more complex, shrewd, and contradictory author-protagonist at its center. This tale has implications for our understanding of Evans and her novel, but, more broadly speaking, the example of Evans opens up new ways of thinking about Southern authorship during the Civil War. As Evans’s experience demonstrates, the boundary between Union and Confederacy during the war could be permeable, at least insofar as the production, circulation, and consumption of literary texts were concerned. Many Northern readers were willing to buy and read Southern-authored works, and Northern publishers were happy to accommodate readers by producing Northern editions of these works. If Evans understood and exploited these conditions, other Southern authors may have done the same.

“[E]vidence of impulse, imparted by the regeneration from a worse than Theban thralldom of our country, to the genius of our people”:

The publication of *Macaria* in the Confederacy

Evans became strongly identified with the Confederacy at the onset of the Civil War, but her career as a published author began six years

before secession. Evans wrote her first novel, *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*, when she was fifteen years old. The novel intertwined romance and anti-Catholic critique with the historical events surrounding the famous battle that eventually led Texas to break ties with Mexico and become an independent republic. Harper & Brothers, a large New York publishing house, published the novel in 1855, when Evans was twenty, but her name did not appear on the title page. Sales were low during the 1850s, and the novel received little critical attention (Fidler, *Augusta Evans Wilson*, 40-45).³ In 1859, Evans approached J. C. Derby, of Derby & Jackson, with the manuscript of *Beulah* (a novel about an orphan's intellectual and spiritual journey from skepticism to Christian faith) after another New York publisher, D. Appleton, declined it. On the recommendation of his wife and other women in his family, Derby published the novel (Derby 389-90). Although *Beulah* was not a best-seller on the scale of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, it sold enough copies to earn Evans considerable royalties, to establish her reputation with readers (she published this novel under her own name), and to ensure that she would find a publisher for her next novel.⁴ The Civil War, of course, intervened.

From early 1861 onward, Confederate periodicals repeatedly proclaimed Southern independence an opportunity for the South to free itself from "a state of colonial vassalage" in manufactures, literary and otherwise ("Yankee Literature"). In writing *Macaria*, Evans was clearly motivated, at least in part, by such Confederate literary nationalism.⁵

³Fidler reconstructs the chronology of the novel's composition and publication, although he seems to rely more on romanticized family legend than on hard proof in claiming that the novel's manuscript was presented as a gift to Evans's father and that publication by Harpers occurred only on the payment of a subsidy by a family member. Evans's contract with Harpers mentions no such subvention and, indeed, appears to be a standard publishing contract on a royalty basis. Sexton reproduces the contract (189).

⁴The last edition of the novel under Derby's imprint appeared in early 1861, with the notation "25th Thousandth." According to Susan Geary's reading of market circumstances in the 1850s, such sales would qualify the novel as a commercial success, if not a best seller ("Domestic Novel"). In the account of the stereotype plate sale discussed below the claim that the novel went through forty editions would appear to be hugely exaggerated, as, alas, are most such figures found in nineteenth-century press accounts.

⁵The story of Confederate literary nationalism and its conjoined twin, the material difficulties of Southern publishing, have been rehashed *ad nauseam* (thus the obsessive attention to the poor quality of paper for the Confederate edition of *Macaria*), but for an

Macaria as a novel both promotes the need for an independent Confederate culture reflecting and promoting the new nation's values and strives to be such a cultural artifact. Even before it became publicly known that Evans was writing a novel to be published in the Confederacy and reflecting Southern values, the Confederate press singled out Evans as a potential producer of literature of a properly Confederate character. In May of 1862, for instance, a Mr. Brooks, writing on "The Intellectual Future of the South" in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, laments the dependencies of Southern culture ("we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact, that we have allowed the North to dictate to us too long, on all points of literature and art" [313]), while also pointing out a few bright spots of achievement before the war, writers who excelled those of the North despite the additional challenges facing Southern authors. He praises Edgar Allan Poe for "depth and originality" in poetry surpassing that of any Northerner, and boasts that "in the walks of light literature, [Northerners] have no female writer who possesses the force of the author of 'Beulah'" (313-14).

In February 1863 (two years after secession), the *Messenger* proclaimed, based on its reading of the catalog of publishers West & Johnston, that the predicted age of a Southern national literature had finally arrived. The editor rails against the South's having been held in "bondage" to the North in the past and sees production of works of art by Confederate citizens as evidence of their new freedom:

The salutary results of our liberation from Yankee bondage are already developing themselves, in the field of Literature, upon a scale surpassing anticipations of the most sanguine. . . . [W]e believe that there are but few publishing houses, either this side the Atlantic or the other, which has announced as at *Press* a longer or more valuable list of books than our go-ahead neighbours—Messrs. WEST & JOHNSTON. ("Editor's Table" 117)

Although most of the books the editor enumerates are actually military manuals, he singles out the announced forthcoming publication of a

excellent recent account, see Fahs (21-41). As I document in more detail elsewhere, Evans traveled to Montgomery, Alabama, in February 1861 to witness the labors of the provisional Confederate Congress and to lobby for an international copyright law in the Confederacy. Her copyright advocacy similarly reflects her Confederate cultural nationalism. I also document her lobbying for a revision to the Confederate copyright act in 1863 designed to help her gain copyright protection for a Confederate edition of *Beulah* (Homestead chap. 5).

novel by “MISS (BEULAH) EVANS, of Mobile” as “evidence of impulse, imparted by the regeneration from a worse than Theban thralldom of our country, to the genius of our people” (118).

West & Johnston publicly released this information only after its contractual arrangements with Evans were firm. On February 22, 1863, Evans wrote to the firm accepting their terms for publication of her still untitled novel, “namely \$1000 cash and ten percent on every copy published.” Evans expresses a “very decided preference for your [publishing] house, above all others in the Confederacy” and pleasure in the successful negotiation of terms, but she also explains why the manuscript is not yet ready for press:

The story is finished, and I am now engaged in revising and copying it for the press. This is necessarily a tedious process, necessitating great particularity, but I shall devote my entire time to it until it is accomplished. I fully appreciate the expediency of bringing it out as early as practicable, and shall therefore work as rapidly as possible. (Sexton 53-54)

In choosing West & Johnston, Evans ignored an obvious choice closer to home, Mobile publisher S. H. Goetzel, who was an equally active publisher during the war, and who was, in fact, on the verge of publishing another female-authored Confederate novel that would be republished in the North during the war, Sally Rochester Ford’s *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men*.⁶ Published first in Mobile in May 1863,⁷ Ford’s novel was set in her home region, the border state of Kentucky. As a notice in the *Mobile Evening News* reported, however, “the author is a refugee from her home in Kentucky, and is now a sojourner in this city” (“Raids and Romance”).

A month after writing to West & Johnston to accept its terms, Evans was still re-copying the earlier parts of her manuscript. She wrote to General P. T. Beauregard asking him to verify the accuracy of her account of the first battle of Manassas (an account derived from an

⁶The most complete accounts of the Civil War activities of West & Johnston, S. H. Goetzel, and Evans & Cogswell from the perspective of a book-publishing history appear in London and in Tebbel (465-66, 474-75). As both Tebbel and London agree, these three publishers were the only book publishers of any size and longevity in the South during the war.

⁷The earliest notice I have run across is dated May 22, 1863 (Rev. of *Raids, Southern Field*). Her first name is spelled both “Sally” and “Sallie” in print.

earlier face-to-face discussion between Evans and Beauregard). She explains that she was in the process of copying the manuscript and did not want to copy the relevant episode until she was certain “that I am entirely accurate in all my statements relative to the Battle” (17 Mar. 1863, Sexton 56). Beauregard’s response does not survive, but Evans’s side of the correspondence makes it clear that in March 1863 she was at least a month away from finishing copying her manuscript.

The remaining traces of the publication history of *Macaria* in the South make it clear that both Evans and her publishers *intended* to see the novel through the press before the end of 1863 but that Evans’s own fastidiousness about her text and the events of the war delayed publication until 1864. By mid-1863, West & Johnston had undertaken one of their most famous wartime publication projects, a serially published, multi-volume translation of Victor Hugo’s *Les Misérables*, a project that would have taxed their typographical resources. The firm subcontracted the printing of *Macaria* to Evans & Cogswell (later Walker, Evans & Cogswell) of Charleston, South Carolina, a decision that likely reflected both the pressures of the Victor Hugo project on their material resources and their ordinary trade practices (West & Johnston subcontracted a significant portion of its book printing to other firms throughout the war). Evans & Cogswell began setting type for *Macaria* by early fall, as Evans’s September 12, 1863, letter to her friend and frequent correspondent Rachel Lyons makes clear. Describing the linked fates of the city of Charleston, General Beauregard, and her novel, she writes, “God grant that Beauregard may hold Charleston successfully. If any human being can, he will. My book is being printed in Charleston, now, though published by West & Johnston. I hope it will soon be ready” (Sexton 76). Notices appearing in the *Record of News, History and Literature*, a short-lived weekly magazine published by West & Johnston, confirm Evans’s understanding that the novel was, indeed, “in press” by September. On September 3, 1863, West & Johnston described the novel as “IN PRESS!” and “the most brilliant and interesting novel ever written in the South. It is dedicated to the gallant army of the Confederate States.”

Ads continued to run in the *Record* through the end of October, but no ads appeared in either the November or December numbers, and the magazine ceased publication at the end of 1863. So what interrupted the work of typesetting? As Evans’s letter to Lyons implicitly acknowledges,

by September 1863, Charleston had been under siege by Union forces for a month, with Beauregard in command of Confederate forces defending the city. While Evans trusted in Beauregard to hold Charleston, some time before November in the fall of 1863, Evans & Cogswell decided to hedge its bets and move its printing plant inland to Columbia, South Carolina.⁸ Another letter from Evans to Lyons (dated November 21, 1863) makes clear that the further delay caused by Evans & Cogswell's move had made publication by the end of the year unlikely. Evans wrote to Lyons (who lived in Columbia), lamenting,

Long, long ago, I supposed my new book would have been issued, but the removal of Evans & Cogswell from Charleston to Columbia, has necessarily delayed it. Unforseen [sic] difficulties have also arisen, with reference to punctuation, and to the proof-reading. I find that in order to have the MS correctly printed I shall have to revise the proof sheets myself, and it will not be practicable for me to do so, without being in Columbia. . . . Consequently, I write to ask if you will please try to obtain board for me in some private family for three weeks or a month. . . . I can not tell exactly when Evans & Cogswell will be ready to furnish my proof, but I hope, early in December, or it may be, not until January. The delay is very provoking, for the MS has been in the hands of the publishers, ever since the first of June. (Sexton 88)

Evans & Cogswell had at least partial proofs ready for Evans's review by December 14, 1863, when she wrote to General Beauregard from Columbia:

I was called to this city, upon business concerning my new book, which has been in the hands of the publishers, West & Johnston, since last June. Mes'srs [sic] Evans & Cogswell were selected as the printers, and 50 pages had been "worked off," when the bombardment of Charleston, necessitated the removal of the printing presses to Columbia; where the book has remained in statu quo [sic], until this week. A vexed question with reference to punctuation, and my anxiety that the proof sheets should be correctly ready, forced me to come to Columbia for a few days at least. (Sexton 89)

Why would Evans feel compelled to travel to Columbia to correct proofs as the novel was being typeset? By the 1850s, a large Northern publishing firm like Harpers, publisher of Evans's first novel, would have had enough type on hand to typeset the entire text of a novel. The typeset text would have been "locked" into multi-page "formes," and

⁸London dates the move to 1864 based on an article in *The Index* (84), but as the reconstructed chronology of *Macaria* below makes clear, the move definitely occurred in 1863.

page proofs of the entire novel could have been printed for the author's review and correction, the type left "standing" while the author reviewed the proofs and made corrections. However, a smaller firm with a limited number of types available would have only been able to set a portion of a longer book, such as a novel, at a time (and even the largest Civil War-era Southern printers would have had comparatively limited typographical resources). Proofs thus would likely have been printed a "gathering" at a time, the type left standing in the formes only until the proof had been corrected and the requisite number of sheets printed. The formes would have then been disassembled and the type "redistributed" so that they could be used to set the next gathering or used for other printing jobs. Under war-time conditions, both Evans and Evans & Cogswell would probably not have trusted the Confederate postal service to shuttle the proofs back and forth between printer and author quickly and safely, so instead, the author transported herself to the printer to read and correct proof in installments as they issued from the press.⁹

Publication took even longer than Evans predicted in her December 1863 letter to Beauregard. Back in Mobile on March 18, 1864, she wrote to Lyons that her "new book will be ready for sale next week" and that "Mr. Evans . . . is doing all in his power to hurry the work" (Sexton 101). Even that prediction seems to have been overly optimistic: West & Johnston did not offer the book for sale until April. The earliest West & Johnston advertisement for *Macaria* in a Richmond newspaper is from the *Daily Examiner* of April 27, 1864; the ad copy trumpets the appearance of a long-delayed first edition rather than a second edition:

The publishers have at length the great gratification of being able to announce that they have now ready the great literary *chef d'oeuvre* of Miss AUGUSTA J. EVANS of Mobile, the authoress of "Beulah." Miss Evans is justly esteemed as holding the same supremacy of rank in the literature of the Confederacy which Madame de Stael holds in the literature of the French Empire. *Macaria* is a romance of intense intellectual

⁹For typesetting and printing practices and terminology generally, see Gaskell. For Charles Brockden Brown's reading of proof of *Wieland* in the fashion I suggest Evans did, see Katz. Charvat describes the persistence of this printing and proofing in installments in Carey & Lea's publishing of John Pendleton Kennedy's *Swallow Barn* in the 1830s (45-46). Katz and Charvat describe situations decades before the printing of *Macaria* in the South, but the material difficulties faced by Northern printers in the under-developed publishing industry of the 1790s and 1830s and by a Confederate publisher in 1863 were likely equivalent in many respects.

power, as far above the contemporary English novel as *Les Misérables* is above all novels. It is a Southern book, relating the woful [sic] incidents of the time, but without a rival in interest and artistic beauty.¹⁰

The combination of Evans's correspondence and advertisements for the novel in Southern periodicals make it absolutely clear that there was no 1863 Confederate edition of *Macaria*. If Evans had contracted with S. H. Goetzel in her own city, if she had not been so fastidious with copying and proofreading, if West & Johnston had not subcontracted with Evans & Cogswell, or if Evans & Cogswell had not relocated to Columbia, Evans's novel very well might have been published in late 1863, but forces definitively conspired to delay publication until 1864. The bibliographic ghost of an 1863 Confederate first edition of *Macaria* may be laid to rest, no more to walk the pages of scholarship.

As my discussion of Northern publication of the novel below demonstrates, J. C. Derby knew about Evans's novel by late 1863 and had begun making arrangements for its Northern publication, even if his memory of receiving a complete copy with an 1863 imprint date is chimerical. Derby's mistake undoubtedly contributed to biographer Fidler's account of an 1863 first edition. However, before turning to the story of the Northern publication of *Macaria*, I will suggest a further source for the details of Fidler's account that give the recollection both its tangibility and its pathos. Historical accounts of Confederate publishing history inevitably (and even obsessively) focus on the material difficulties faced by Southern publishers during the war; wallpaper covers are mentioned repeatedly in these accounts, making it appear that such covers or bindings for books were quite common. Actually, surviving evidence suggests that wallpaper covers and bindings for books were quite rare. Parrish and Willingham's massive *Confederate Imprints* bibliography (which excludes newspapers and magazines) contains nearly 10,000 items, of which fewer than one quarter of one per

¹⁰H. C. Clarke & Co. and Randall's, bookstores in Mobile, advertised the novel as for sale three days earlier. The earliest Southern reviews began appearing in early May (Demeter). Copyright registration records would provide further confirmation, but no copyright registration record for *Macaria* appears in the radically incomplete surviving copyright registers for the Confederate States. Furthermore, in the surviving copies of *Macaria* in library collections, no copyright registration notice appears. However, this absence likely reflects the absence of original covers and the rebinding of the 1864 Confederate first and second editions of *Macaria* rather than a failure by Evans or West & Johnston to register a copyright.

cent are identified as incorporating wallpaper as a printing or binding material.¹¹ Of those items, fourteen are pamphlets or books with wallpaper covers, wrappers, or bindings, seven of which are books published under S. H. Goetzel's imprint in Mobile during 1863 and 1864. In 1940, Mrs. Sledge of Mobile very well may have owned a copy of a rare Confederate imprint with wallpaper covers dated 1863, but that book was probably by another "Miss Evans," Mary Anne Evans, a/k/a George Eliot.¹² Like other Confederate publishers, Goetzel's list in the category of *belles lettres* featured many reprints of European authors. The printed text on the wallpaper covers of Goetzel's 1863 edition of *Silas Marner* identifies the author as "Miss Evans of London," an appellation that Goetzel probably adopted in order to distinguish her

¹¹Parrish and Willingham include "wallpaper" as an index term, and sixteen items are indexed. However, as is inevitable in an undertaking of this size, the index is imperfect—a close reading of the "belles lettres" section of the bibliography uncovered two additional wallpaper items not indexed, both Goetzel imprints. Most of these are described as featuring "wallpaper covers," which means that the books had paper covers on which the title was printed, much like a modern paper-back book, the text being printed on the blank side of the wallpaper facing outward, and the patterned side on the inside, thus giving the appearance of patterned endpapers. The most detailed discussion of wallpaper covers and bindings (as opposed to newspapers and broadsides printed on wallpaper) is Detlefsen (118-19). Confusingly, however, she claims that *Goetzel* printed a wall-paper cover edition of *Macaria*—a revealing confusion, as my discussion below explains.

¹²I originally assumed that Mrs. Sledge may have misremembered a copy of the 1863 first edition of Sally Rochester Ford's *Raids and Romance* as *Macaria* because both novels were authored by women associated with Mobile (even though Ford was only a refugee) and feature a mix of romantic and martial content. Parrish and Willingham describe the 1863 edition of *Raids* as being "bound in wallpaper," so Mrs. Sledge's confusion seemed understandable and likely. However, in attempting to verify Parrish and Willingham's information, I discovered that *no* library listed in the bibliography had a volume matching this description—either they had an 1863 edition with no sign of a wallpaper binding or covers (either covers/binding were missing entirely, or there was a post-war binding), *or* they held only an 1864 second edition, which clearly *did* appear with printed wallpaper covers. While there *is*, unambiguously, an 1863 first edition of *Raids*, Parrish and Willingham's claim of a wallpaper binding for the 1863 first edition may be as much a bibliographical ghost as the 1863 first edition of *Macaria*.

from "Miss Evans of Mobile," as Southern periodicals often called Augusta Jane Evans.¹³

"However repugnant it may be to loyalty to learn that such a rebel book can find publisher and readers in the North":

The Northern Publication of *Macaria*

My reconstruction of the Southern publication of *Macaria* does not challenge received notions of Evans's Confederate nationalism, a nationalism thoroughly intertwined with her novel as literary text. Through the heroines of her novel, Augusta Evans articulates a vision of the Confederacy and Confederate womanhood as standing entirely apart from the North in all things, including trade and culture. Heroine Irene Huntingdon, for instance, opines that "free trade," with "our ports . . . open to all markets of the world, except Lincolndom," would prompt "the rigid laws of political economy to forge links of amity" with Europe, which, she admits, "has no love for the Confederacy" (366-67).¹⁴ One might expect, then, that Evans would not wish to forge her own links of literary trade with Lincolndom at the height of the Civil War, but my reconstruction of the Northern publication history suggests otherwise and complicates our understanding of Evans's nationalism and our assumptions about her exclusive address to a Confederate audience.

While the material difficulties of Confederate publishing presented Evans with challenges and caused delays, she faced even greater challenges and obstacles as she contemplated Northern publication. The Union considered Confederate loyalists to be "citizens in rebellion" rather than "enemy aliens," but secession and the war still placed Evans, for all practical purposes, in the same position in relation to the Northern market as American authors to the British market and British authors to the American market before the war. In the absence of international copyright statutes or treaties, publishers in the United States could and did, with perfect impunity, republish the works of British authors without their permission and without payment of

¹³See, e.g., an S. H. Goetzel advertisement (in his capacity as a bookseller rather than publisher) that includes both *Macaria* by "Miss Evans of Mobile" and *Silas Marner* by "Miss Evans of London." See also the *Messenger's* identification of Augusta Evans as "Miss (BEULAH) Evans, of Mobile" quoted above.

¹⁴ All subsequent quotations are from the 1992 reprint edition of the novel.

royalties to them. While American authors could obtain copyright protection in England under certain, highly limited conditions, American authors were, in most instances, as vulnerable to unauthorized reprinting in England as *vice versa* (Harriet Beecher Stowe received no compensation for the substantial English sales of most of the many British editions of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, for instance).¹⁵

In the North, it did not take long for enterprising publishers to recognize that Confederate authors might be treated as Stowe had been in England or Charles Dickens in America. As the *New-York Tribune* reported in a long article on a book-trade auction of stereotype plates in late 1862, "Miss Evans's Beulah ran through 40 editions in its day, but the plates were bought by a Mr. Scott for \$205, and there is small chance of there being much copyright paid to the authoress hereafter, for the [sic] is a rank Rebel, and a nurse in a Southern Hospital" ("Literary Intelligence"). This report, perfectly understandable to nineteenth-century publishers and even moderately well-informed general readers, requires a brief explanation of the nature and significance of stereotyping to book publishing in the 1850s and 60s. As I described above, printers typeset the text of a book and then locked it in page format into formes. Before stereotyping became common, printers would print as many copies as they thought the market could bear from the type in the formes, and after this printing, in most instances, they redistributed and reused the type for new works. If market demand justified a new edition, the book would be typeset again from scratch. Stereotyping became less expensive and more routine by the 1850s, when stereotype plates were routinely cast from type. The work could be printed from the stereotype plates as needed for years, or even decades, without re-typesetting the book. In between printings, publishers carefully stored the plates in crates, removing them from storage only when their stock was depleted and then printing copies in quantities they felt they could sell within a reasonable period of time. Under normal (prewar) circumstances, a publisher who acquired existing stereotype plates also assumed the original publisher's contractual obligation to pay "copyright" (a term often used in the trade as a synonym for "royalties," as the press account of the sale of the plates of

¹⁵This brief summary of trade practices necessarily oversimplifies. For more detailed discussions, see Barnes (chap. 3 & 7); Exman (52-59); Tebbel (208-09), and Winship, "Transatlantic Book Trade." More generally, see McGill.

Beulah demonstrates) on all copies printed from those plates. However, the *Tribune* predicted (indeed, even encouraged) Northern publishers to ignore such obligations incurred before the war to an author such as Evans who had become a “rank rebel.” It is a small step from ignoring an author-publisher contract signed before the war to ignoring the proprietary rights of a rebel author in a work created after secession.¹⁶

Placed in such a position, Evans did not sit back and let events take their course without her intervention. Instead, she did precisely what American and British authors had done before the war to attempt to gain

¹⁶Winship describes both the process of stereotyping and its implications for trade practices, including copyright (“Printing with Plates,” esp. 25-26). See also his analysis of composition and stereotyping practices for Ticknor & Fields imprints in the 1840s and 1850s (*American Literary Publishing* 103-10). See also Lehmann-Haupt (80-82). Plates could actually be produced by the stereotype or the “electrotype” method, which produced nearly identical results through different methods. In fact, considering Harpers’ reliance on electrotyping over stereotyping by the mid 1850s (Gaskell 206), the plates for *Inez* were probably electrotype, rather than stereotype. However, to avoid confusion and to reflect the usages of the nineteenth-century trade press, I refer to all plates generically as stereotype plates. On the question of a publisher’s obligation to pay royalties to an author if he printed copies from plates purchased privately or at auction, note that such an obligation would only apply if the author contracted for royalties at publication. Such an obligation would not obtain if the author had transferred the right to publish the work to the publisher for a fixed price. E.D.E.N. Southworth, for instance, routinely took such fixed payments from book publishers for the book publication of her serial novels rather than waiting for payment of potentially greater royalties based on sales (Coultrap-McQuin chap. 3). In either arrangement, publishers referred to such payments to authors as “copyright” (Winship, *American Literary Publishing*, 133). Although it is difficult to generalize about the predominance of one practice over the other, evidence suggests that royalty arrangements were the norm in novel publishing in the 1850s. Winship, for instance, finds that the “great majority of Ticknor and Fields publications by American authors were published under a royalty agreement” in the 1840s and 50s (*American Literary Publishing*, 133). Geary explains the economic logic of various forms of payments to authors (fixed payment, royalties, and “half profits,” a system somewhat akin to royalty payments that became increasingly less common by the 1850s) (“Harriet Beecher Stowe”). Most important for my analysis here are the arrangements Evans made with her publishers: her contract with Harpers was a royalty agreement (see below), and her contract with West & Johnston included *both* an advance fixed payment *and* royalties based on sales. Although her contract with Derby does not survive, it seems likely that it would have also been a royalty agreement, and this press account of the sale of the plates of *Beulah* also assumes such an arrangement—the reporter assumes that “copyright” (meaning royalties) *would* be due to Evans under her original contract but that whoever purchased the plates would conveniently ignore the terms of Derby’s original bargain.

some benefit from sales of their books in the opposite country despite the lack of statutory protection—she forwarded an advance copy to a “foreign” publisher on the understanding that he would arrange for publication of an “author’s edition” and would compensate her in some way. As was often the case with these Anglo-American transactions, Evans seems to have forwarded *Macaria* to Derby in installments—the sheets representing each gathering—as Evans & Cogswell typeset and printed them.¹⁷ Compensation to the author for an author’s edition might take the form of either a flat fee for the privilege of receiving an advance copy or voluntary royalty payments per copy sold. In this case, the “foreign” publisher was J. C. Derby in New York. As would have been the case with a British edition of an American author’s work, however, such an “author’s edition” would only be profitable for Evans and her “authorized” publisher as long as other publishers observed “courtesy of the trade,” an extra-legal arrangement whereby the first publisher to announce an edition of a book by a foreign author was considered to have an exclusive right, even in the absence of statutory copyright protection.

Evans, J. C. Derby, and J. B. Lippincott all seem to have understood that they were proceeding according to this model, as Lippincott’s announcement in the Northern trade press in December of 1863 that he would be publishing an un-named “new work by the author of ‘Beulah’” demonstrates (“Announcements” 146). While Lippincott’s announcement to the trade of these arrangements had no legal effect, he was putting the trade on notice and relying on their professional courtesy not to preempt the priority of his claim.¹⁸ That is, with her novel still being typeset in

¹⁷It is likely that Evans also forwarded advance sheets to Saunders & Otley in London for exactly the same purpose. However, I have been unable to travel to England to examine Saunders & Otley’s 1864 London edition of *Macaria* to see whether the book is represented as an “author’s edition,” and there are no copies in U.S. libraries.

¹⁸Of course, it is possible that the events went in the reverse direction—that Derby and Lippincott received word of the book’s imminent publication not through Evans herself but by reading Confederate periodicals that had made their way to New York, and then laid public claim to “rights” in the novel entirely on their own initiative, anticipating correctly that copies of the book would make their way through the blockade. As noted above, the *Messenger*, on the heels of Evans’s acceptance of West & Johnston’s terms, noted that the firm was going to publish a still untitled novel by Evans (and her letter of February 1863 does not yet give the novel a title). The notices in the *Record* beginning in September 1863 specifically name the novel as *Macaria*.

the Confederacy (recall that Evans was still reading proof as it came off the presses in December 1863), she had clearly contacted Derby about Northern publication, and Derby had already arranged with Lippincott to publish it. The timing of Lippincott's 1863 announcement makes it clear that Derby acted without the complete printed text or, it seems, even the title of the novel in hand. Having had considerable lead time and, probably, unbound advance sheets sent by Evans in installments, on May 7, about two weeks after the Richmond publication by West & Johnston, J. B. Lippincott was advertising Evans's novel (now clearly identified by the title *Macaria*) as "in press" (Advertisement for *Macaria*). By May 12, Lippincott had filed for copyright registration of the novel in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania federal court in Philadelphia, a necessary pre-publication step to secure property rights in the novel.¹⁹

However, as a June 1 review of the Northern edition of Sally Rochester Ford's *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men* wryly observed, "there is no reason why the Confederacy, as it is called, should not have its war literature as well as ourselves, and the enterprising publishers of New York are reproducing it for us quite freely" (Rev. of *Raids*). As early as May 19, 1864, John Bradburn was informing the trade of his plan to publish *Macaria* by advertising the book in the *New-York Daily Tribune* as "in press." On June 15, in its "Notes on Books and Booksellers," the *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* reported, "MR. JOHN BRADBURN, of New York, is steadily and effectively adding to his list. He is now putting through the press a new novel entitled 'Macaria,' by Augusta J. Evans, author of 'Beulah,' 'Inez,' &c. He expects that it will be largely successful, and it is stated that orders already received exhaust the first supply" (113). Bradburn and Michael Doolady (the man identified by Derby as the piratical New York publisher) do not appear to have been full business partners but these "enterprising publishers" shared a New York office address and clearly collaborated on Civil War-era publishing ventures, including the first

¹⁹Copyright registrations from the 1860s were recorded in register books kept by the federal district courts. These books now reside in the Rare Books Division of the Library of Congress; microfilm copies are at the U.S. Copyright Office. There is no uniform system of citation (e.g. volume numbers), but readers can easily find records by calling for the books from the relevant district and consulting the indices in each volume.

New York edition of *Macaria*.²⁰ While Bradburn's advertisements in New York newspapers throughout the month of June provide contradictory information about the publication status of the novel, advertisements and copyright registration records suggest that Bradburn's edition appeared around June 25 and no later than June 30, a scant two months after Richmond publication (Michael Doolady's name, contrary to Derby's recollection, does *not* appear as publisher on any Civil War-era edition of *Macaria*, but his name appears in the copyright register as proprietor and in the copyright notice on the verso of the title page of Bradburn's edition).²¹

Macaria was not the only Evans-authored literary property to which Bradburn and Doolady had "helped themselves." They had earlier acquired Harper & Brothers' stereotype plates for Evans's anonymous first novel, *Inez*, which Bradburn began advertising for sale in January 1864 (that is, after West & Johnston first announced their plans to

²⁰Bradburn's edition of *Macaria* and his advertisements from 1864 designate him "successor to Michael Doolady," and Doolady filed for copyright registration of *Macaria* (see below). However, Doolady's name continued to appear as a publisher's imprint during and after 1864, and New York City directories list both men as having a business address of 49 Walker Street in 1864 and 1865, even though they are not listed together as "Doolady and Bradburn," but separately. The exact nature of their business relationship during the relevant years is unclear, but from the surviving evidence, I have to assume that they collaborated in some way during 1864 on the publication of *Macaria* and other books, even if they were not business partners in the full legal sense (for instance, I have located no imprints featuring both of their names together as "Bradburn and Doolady" on the title page). Both publishers have largely flown under the radar in publishing history. They merit only very brief articles in an encyclopedia of nineteenth-century publishers, and the articles do little more than list imprints (Dzwonkoski "M. Doolady," Mills). Mills labels Bradburn a "Southern partisan," a labeling based, in part, on his publication of *Macaria*, but the circumstances of the publication and a closer examination of his list throws such a judgment into doubt.

²¹On June 5 and 12, 1864, Bradburn advertised *Macaria* as "just published," but this advertisement was likely premature. Doolady filed for copyright registration in the Southern District of New York on June 21, 1864, and on the same day, Bradburn advertised that the novel "will be published this week." Advertisements appeared on June 25, 1864, describing *Macaria* as "published this day." On June 30, 1864, Lippincott deposited a copy of *Macaria* in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (Doolady did not complete his registration with a deposit until July 7). Neither I nor any other scholar has ever located a Philadelphia Lippincott edition of the novel, so this deposit suggests that Lippincott had obtained a copy of Bradburn's edition of the novel by June 30. Finally, the *American Literary Gazette* listed Bradburn's edition of *Macaria* on July 1 ("List"), and all reviews of the novel in New York papers appear no earlier than July.

publish Evans's third novel, but before their much-delayed publication of it). Bradburn and Doolady undoubtedly relished buying the stereotype plates from Harpers, probably at very low cost, at a time when they could safely ignore Harpers' promise to pay Evans royalties on sales (her contract with Harpers, dated November 1, 1854, specified a royalty of "ten per cent, on their trade-list price for each copy sold by them over and above one thousand" [Sexton 189]). Although *Inez* originally appeared without Evans's name on the title page, Bradburn and Doolady added a by-line, "Miss Evans, author of 'Beulah,'" thus exploiting Evans's greater success with *Beulah* to wring some additional commercial value out of the seemingly valueless plates of her anonymous first novel. Bradburn's early advertisements were also vague and ambiguous enough to allow purchasers to assume that the book was new and that it featured Civil War content.²² (One can imagine Evans's dismay in February 1864 when she read the following item the *Mobile Advertiser & Register* reprinted from the *Chicago Times*: "A new novel, by Augusta J. Evans, authoress of 'Beulah,' entitled 'Inez; a Tale of the Alamo,' is announced by John Bradburn, of New York. The last heard of Miss Evans she was nursing rebel soldiers in Mobile" ["New Novel"]). Already positioned in the market as Evans's Northern publisher, their decision to abrogate Evans's new novel to themselves is hardly surprising. By June of 1864, Bradburn and Doolady had thus appropriated two-thirds of Evans's existing *oeuvre*, turning her and her works into items on their Civil War list and under their control in the Northern market. They even went so far as to register U.S. copyrights in their names as proprietors of *Macaria* and *Inez*, thereby claiming legitimacy and exclusivity for their appropriation.²³

²²See, for instance, a January 13, 1864 *Tribune* advertisement that ambiguously sandwiches the line "A Splendid New Story of the War" between an announcement of the imminent publication of *Inez* and an announcement of the imminent publication of *The Rival Volunteers, or, The Black Plume Rifles* by Mary A. Howe. The ambiguity of these advertisements is demonstrated by the report quoted above. By February 13, 1864, Bradburn's ads in the *Tribune* clearly indicated that *Inez* was an old book: "Another book by the popular author of 'Beulah' . . . This charming work was published anonymously a few years since, but is now republished uniform with the author's other work."

²³See note 21 on the *Macaria* copyright registrations. John Bradburn's 1864 edition of *Inez* features a copyright notice claiming an 1864 Southern District of New York registration in his own name as proprietor.

So just what interests, personal and political, did this “rank rebel” author and these multiple Northern men in the publishing business serve in their efforts to give Northern readers access to *Macaria*? Augusta Evans was certainly looking out for her own financial interests when she made arrangements with Derby to publish her novel in the North, but in ensuring that a Northern audience had access to her novel, she also worked in tandem with efforts by the Confederate government to manipulate Northern politics. Throughout the war, the Confederacy covertly supported Northern political elements (the so-called “Peace Democrats” and “Copperheads”) who wanted to see the war end immediately without a Northern military victory (or a concomitant Southern surrender). Evans’s novel potentially bolstered such Northern sentiments. At times in *Macaria*, Evans attacks the North in the strongest terms, but she also celebrates the Confederate nation and its values and portrays all elements of that nation, rich and poor, black and white, men and women, as united in support of the war effort.²⁴ For Northerners who longed for an end to the bloodshed, such a portrait of the Confederate cause reinforced the message of those who claimed that the war was unjust and should cease immediately. A reviewer in a New York Copperhead newspaper, the *Day-Book Caucasian*, understood the import of the novel for Northern readers in precisely this way:

It asserts the dignity and earnestness of purpose characteristic of that people, and suggests them in the light of men and women who are worthy of the condition of the rights of freedom, and are determined to have them. This idea conflicts with current notions in many parts of the North, while it would seem that the southerners are regarded as an ignorant and low minded class of ruffians. (“*Macaria*: A Novel”)

The covert efforts of the Confederate government to support the peace movement in the North had the ultimate goal of Lincoln’s ouster from the Presidency in the fall 1864 election by the election of a Democratic president. A Democratic president would, they believed, immediately call an armistice and begin negotiations with the Confederacy. After the

²⁴For instance, Planter-class Irene’s efforts receive the most attention, but Mrs. Baker, a poor white woman living on Factory Row, declares, “I am a poor woman, Miss Irene, but no soul loves the Confederacy better than I do, or will work harder for it” (312). Loyal William, a slave who serves as the family cook, willingly follows his master, Mr. Huntingdon, into battle, and, in the words of his dying master on the battlefield, “[H]e followed me so closely that he was shot through the head. . . . Poor fellow! he was faithful to the last” (336).

stunning Union victory at Gettysburg in July, such efforts failed; however, Evans's novel hit the bookstores in New York at a moment when Peace Democrats were a powerful force on the verge of success and Lincoln and his Republican Party in danger of being toppled. Thus the unintentional delay of Southern publication gave Evans's novel potentially greater influence and currency in the North.²⁵

Why, however, would two sets of Northern publishers compete for the right to republish Evans's novelistic attack on the Union on Union ground? Bradburn's and Doolady's lists from this time reveal them to be political opportunists, at least in their professional roles as publishers. Playing both sides of the aisle, their heavily war-related lists included everything from Copperhead pamphlets attacking Lincoln and defending slavery to pro-Union abolitionist tracts. A few examples of Civil War related materials published by each man during the war years demonstrate their political flexibility. Bradburn published Sir Arthur James Lyon Fremantle, *Three Months in the Southern States: April-June, 1863* (1864) (a sympathetic account by an Englishman who observed the Confederate army, reprinted from the original British edition); John H. Van Evrie, *Subgenation: The Theory of the Normal Relation of the Races: An Answer to "Miscegenation"* (1864) (a Copperhead defense of slavery and black subservience as grounded in nature); and Thomas Shepard Goodwin, *The Natural History of Secession; or, Despotism and Democracy at Necessary, Eternal, Exterminating War* (1864) (a Northern minister's critique of Southern slavery as fundamentally incompatible with American democracy). Doolady published *Interior Causes of the War; The Nation Demonised, and its President a Spirit-Rapper* (1863) (a satirical attack on the Lincoln administration); Richard Grant White, *Revelations: A Companion to the "New Gospel of Peace." According to Abraham* (1863) (a satirical attack on the Copperheads and Peace Democrats); and Oliver B. Bunce, *Reconstruction* (1862) (advocating an end to the war and reconstruction with autonomy for and continuance of slavery in the South). From the commercial perspective of these politically opportunistic publishers, the delay in publication of *Macaria* in the Confederacy heightened the potential for the Northern reprinting of *Macaria* to become a "sensation" at a crucial juncture in Union politics.

²⁵For the political climate and events of 1864 as described in this paragraph, see McPherson (chaps. 23, 25, 26).

As described above, the legal status of Evans's copyright in the North was ambiguous; Bradburn and Doolady, acting opportunistically, used this ambiguity to personal advantage. Her legal status as a "citizen in rebellion" made Evans's property, including intangible property, subject to confiscation and sale to finance the war effort (as Evans later reported to Derby, her family's assets in Mobile were "confiscated" by Union forces). Private citizens who instigated confiscation suits were, however, only entitled to a percentage of the value of the property confiscated; the lion's share went to the government.²⁶ In essence, Bradburn and Doolady confiscated Evans's literary property extra-legally for their own benefit rather than for the war effort.

While J. C. Derby, writing well after the war, presented himself as gentlemanly and chivalrous, his own actions with respect to Evans's novel were legally suspect on other grounds and demonstrate his own political and commercial opportunism. In his memoirs and as part of his narrative of the publication of *Macaria*, Derby claims that he was forced out of the publishing business in 1861 because the market required only school books and military manuals rather than the novels that were his stock and trade; he also claims that he did not return to publishing until well after the war.²⁷ However, Derby either misremembered or misrepresented his activities. As reported in the trade press and documented by extensive advertising, in early 1864, Derby re-entered the publishing business in partnership with his former partner N. C.

²⁶For the standard historical account of the U.S. law and its effects, with a specific focus on legal proceedings in New York, see Shapiro. The Union passed two separate confiscation statutes, one in August 1861, and the other in July 1862. As Shapiro notes, the first act specifically provided for the filing of suits by civilian "informers" while the second act did not, but courts routinely accepted suits filed by informers under the provisions of *both* acts, allowing for a "financially profitable" niche for informers (43). While the first act provided only for confiscation of property used in support of insurrection, under the second act, "title to property owned by Confederates was vested in the government of the United States upon even tacit support of insurrection by a Southern owner" (46). Under the 1862 standard, Evans's property was clearly subject to confiscation and the fact that it was intangible property represented no obstacle to confiscation; most of the suits filed in New York sought the confiscation of another sort of intangible property—financial instruments such as stocks, bonds, and notes.

²⁷The scarce scholarly literature on Derby has tended to rely unquestioningly on his memoir (Sutton, Becker). According to Stern, "in the '60's, Derby and his former partner, Norman C. Miller, were again united for a time in the publication of books" (14). However, she provides no details.

Miller as Derby & Miller, and they commenced publishing a list made up entirely of war-related, pro-Republican pamphlets and books. Prominent on their list were Lincoln's collected "State Papers," which reviewers recognized as campaign propaganda for Lincoln in the upcoming presidential election.²⁸ Considering that books began appearing under their joint imprint in February 1864, Derby and Miller must have been planning their joint enterprise by late 1863, when Derby set the wheels in motion for Northern publication of a certain Confederate novel. (Despite her disavowal of trade with "Lincolndom" through Irene, Augusta Evans clearly knew Derby's political sympathies; writing on February 2, 1861 to Rachel Lyons, she remarks, "You ask of Mr Derby in your last. I hear from him frequently—had a letter yesterday. . . . Mr. Derby is of course a Union Man; and thinks Secession is a grave sin. He is much distressed because I am so very warm a Secessionist, and believes southern rights might have been obtained in the Union; which we at the South know to be impossible" [Sexton 31]).

In his memoirs, Derby claims that he asked Lippincott to publish *Macaria* in the North because he himself was no longer a publisher and because Lippincott, in his capacity as a book wholesaler, had dealt largely in copies of Derby's edition of *Beulah*.²⁹ However, it seems

²⁸The earliest advertisement I have located appeared on February 6, 1864. See also "Notes on Books and Booksellers" (February 15, 1864: 268). Among books that appeared under their imprint in 1864 are William D. Jones, *The Mirror of Democracy. Being a History of the Democratic Party from its Organization in 1825, to its Last Great Achievement, the Slaveholders' Rebellion* (also issued in 1863 under N. C. Miller's solo imprint); Julian K. Larke, *General Grant and His Campaigns*; and Henry J. Raymond, *The History of the Administration of President Lincoln* (also called "Lincoln's State Papers"). They were also New York agents for Horace Greeley's *History of the American Conflict*. The *American Literary Gazette* notes of the State Papers, "The work has, in fact, been prepared at the request of the friends of the Administration as a sort of political text-book in the approaching Presidential Campaign" (Rev. of *History*). The *Gazette* labels *The Mirror of Democracy* a "very violent diatribe against 'The Democratic Party'" which "may serve to furnish pabulum to the partisans on one side, but [which] . . . will not affect the opinions of those on the other side" ("Book Notices").

²⁹In the nineteenth century and in modern scholarship, Lippincott has been widely recognized as the biggest wholesaler of books in the United States, and even the world (Freeman 5-16). Furthermore, his geographical position in Philadelphia gave him ideal access to North, West, and South, and his business suffered greatly early in the War when he was cut off from Southern markets (Tebbel 376). Unfortunately, all of Lippincott's nineteenth-century records, except for a few scrapbooks, burned when their building burned in 1899 (Freeman vii-viii, 29-30; J. B. Lippincott Company, *Author* 8-9).

equally or more plausible that he wanted to avoid accusations of Confederate sympathies that might have interfered with his Republican party alliances inside and outside of the publishing business. Derby held two political appointments under Lincoln's Republican administration, as Librarian of the Department of State in 1861 and Despatch Agent for the City of New York in 1865.³⁰ J. B. Lippincott was also a Union man and a Republican: he was a founder of the Philadelphia Union League. However, as a large, general publisher rather than a narrow specialist as Derby was during this phase of his career, Lippincott was probably subject to less political risk for publishing a single Confederate novel. Whatever their political and commercial motivations, both men subverted the spirit, if not the letter, of the Union's confiscation laws by holding royalties in trust for Evans. By so doing, they helped Evans to profit from Northern business dealings and evade confiscation of those profits to support the Union war effort.

Considering some of the reactions to the publication of *Macaria* in the Northern press, Derby and Lippincott may have been grateful that Doolady and Bradburn pre-empted their plans. Well after the war and after the failure of radical Reconstruction, Derby boasted of their honorable protection of the interests of a rebel lady, but during the war, their original plan to publish *Macaria* went unremarked, while reviewers wrote scathingly of Evans and "her" Northern publishers. The *New York Post*, a strongly pro-Union and Republican paper, describes the book and the controversy caused by its sale:

Miss Evans, the author of "Beulah," is a Southerner, and has embraced with an enthusiasm amounting to malignity, the ultra political views of her section of the country. Thus imbued, she has written a novel called "Macaria"—published in this city by John Bradburn—in which she gives full scope to her political vagaries. The work originally appeared in Richmond, and is so rampantly disloyal in the tone and utterance, that the booksellers of a western town returned to the publisher here all the copies they had received from him. ("New Novels")

Damning the book with faint praise, the *Post* concludes its review,

³⁰For Derby's political appointments, see Sutton (23). Sutton also claims that Derby "spent most of the war years in Washington," a claim that Derby's publishing activities in New York in 1864 would seem to belie; it is thus unclear whether Derby held a (Republican) federal appointment in 1864 while he was publishing Republican propaganda in New York.

As a literary production, "Macaria" is at least equal to Miss Evans's previous works, and however repugnant it may be to loyalty to learn that such a rebel book can find publisher and readers in the North, yet it must be said this is the most carefully written novel—we might say, too, the most pretentious one—that the war has suggested to the novelists of either side.

While the *Post* found the novel "pretentious" and thus easily resistible, another strongly pro-Union paper, the New York *Sunday Dispatch*, found the novel to be alarming because seductively compelling. Describing the novel from the "powerful pen of the author of Beulah" as "peculiar, forcible, eloquent . . . riveting and enchaining the interest from the outset," the reviewer describes the appeal of Evans's uncommon, highly individual characters, who "haunt you replete with magnetism." Readers, "eyes blinded" and "following [their] heart[s]" awake abruptly from this seductive dream at chapter 27 of the novel, when they are "plunged head and ears into the whirl and tumult of Secession." The reviewer is repelled by Evans's support for the "monstrous birth" of secession,

whose nourishment has cost us so vastly much of life and peace. . . . Strip aside the mask of entertaining fiction with which the intent before us is veiled, and you behold the cunning appeal for aid and sympathy for an ill, a horror that has in its wake the ultimate death of the country's prosperity. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." ("New Publications")

Before and after this critical backlash, Bradburn advertised the book in New York papers across the political spectrum, from Republican (the *Post*, Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*, and the *Dispatch*), to "War Democrat" (the *World*), to "Copperhead" (the *New York Day-Book* *Caucasian*). Rather than back off from his promotion of the novel after critics characterized it as seductively traitorous and as promoting the doctrines responsible for division and ruin of the nation, Bradburn responded by *advertising* the controversy. Bradburn's early ads say nothing about the content of the novel, instead puffing Evans's established reputation and using the common tactic of advertising sales already achieved as a means to promote further sales.³¹ His ads breathlessly claim, "The publisher deems the bare announcement of a new book by the author of 'Beulah,' sufficient to insure the largest

³¹For the development of this promotional strategy in the 1850s, see Geary ("Domestic Novel").

advance orders of any novel of the season. . . . The first edition of Five Thousand is fast passing through the press. . . . Orders already received exhaust our first supply . . ." (Advertisement, *Evening Post*). In July, however, Bradburn began quoting *negative* reviews in his ads and otherwise drawing attention to the novel's war content and Confederate loyalties. Ads feature the *Post's* "repugnance" at the mere fact of the book's publication in the North and its reports that Western booksellers returned copies of the novel as badges of honor, and proclaimed *Macaria* a "Great Southern Novel" rather than simply a "new novel by the author of 'Beulah'." Bradburn also solicited and published a defense of Evans's novel from Mary Howe, a Northern woman whose Civil War novel, *The Rival Volunteers, or The Black-Plumed Rifles*, he had just published. In her political defense of Evans and "her publisher," Howe implicitly contrasts *Macaria's* reception with the U.S. and foreign reception of Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*:

As to its political bearing, although I have no secession sympathies, and should bitterly mourn the day ushering in the final dismemberment of our once happy and prosperous land, I yet think the free press of a free people in a most anomalous condition, when Abolitionism, (in my humble opinion, rank treason toward both the spirit and letter of the Constitution,) is tricked out—the public applauding the echo—in the most gorgeous dyes of romance, throughout our most popular fictitious literature while a word, even in a novel, against the fanatical demagoguism that has brought our country to the verge of ruin, is visited with threat and rebuke upon publisher and author. (Advertisements, *New York Times*, *Daily Tribune*, and *Day-Book Caucasian*, July 1864).

From Mary Howe's perspective, Bradburn deserved praise for vigorously exercising the freedom of the press worthy of a free people, and Evans, though misguided in her secessionist sympathies, presented far less of a threat to the national union than did Stowe.

Augusta Jane Evans re-occupies the North: *Macaria* in the post-war period

Within a year of Mary Howe's defense of Evans as an author and Bradburn as a publisher, the Civil War was over. The Union was re-membered, if not fully politically reconstructed or happy and prosperous; and Augusta Evans, "blissfully unaware" of the Northern tussle over her novel (at least so J. C. Derby thought), showed up on Derby's doorstep in New York and was given access to substantial

royalties held in trust for her. When Derby tells Evans to buy a new dress, she presents herself as entirely without resources because of the war, the family's property confiscated by Union forces and its slaves emancipated (Derby 394-95). Derby thus ascribes agency exclusively to himself and Lippincott, while the female author remains a passive object.

Modern scholars have not challenged (and Evans herself did not challenge) Derby's account, but as is often the case with Evans, the ladylike pose of submission and deference to masculine authority masks a calculated strategy to achieve her own ends. One might pause to reflect here on her motivations for visiting Derby's office—was she in New York solely to find medical care for her brother and was coincidentally making a social call on her old friend, as he seemed to think, or had she arrived at Derby's place of business with the specific intention of collecting royalties from the man to whom she had entrusted the publication of her novel in the North? She may have been "blissfully unaware" of the particularities of the imbroglio involving Derby, Lippincott, Bradburn, and Doolady, but she was *not* blissfully unaware of the practices of the publishing trade. Sensibly, rather than waiting in the devastated city of Mobile for publishers to write her, she went to them. Her appearance on Derby's doorstep thus implies that rather than being a passive victim of circumstances, Evans was executing the first step in her comprehensive campaign for claiming profits from a Northern readership and reoccupying the Northern market.

A few months after her New York visit, in the fall of 1865, she wrote to her friend J. L. M. Curry (formerly Confederate congressman representing Alabama), reporting to him on her visit to New York. Once again, she presents herself as stripped of all property (specifically, Confederate bonds and slaves) as a result of the war and declares authorship a financial necessity. In the wake of Southern defeat, Evans describes to Curry her intention to write a history of the Confederate government (a plan she later surrendered because former vice president of the Confederacy Alexander Stephens announced his intentions to do so), as well as a novel (the incipient *St. Elmo*):

[A]s I lost my property (negroes and Confederate bonds) during that revolution [the Civil War], I must attend to the "question of bread and butter," and I am trying to write out a novel, the plan of which has been vaguely straying through my mind for some time. My history, I intend to make the great end of all my labors in the realm of letters, and while I gather the requisite materials, I must continue to draw a support from my inkstand. (October 7, 1865, Sexton 107)

She goes on to describe the difficulties of finding time to write when she is “doing her own work” because of the “advent of the Yankees, and consequent hegira of our negroes.” Without human property to labor on her behalf, she herself must labor over a hot stove in the heat of a Mobile summer.

Both of Evans’s self-representations in 1865, one preserved in Derby’s memoir and the other more directly in her letter to Curry, are strategically incomplete, allowing two men, one a Northern Republican, the other a conservative Confederate, to mobilize the figure of the Southern lady to ends appropriate to their contrasting ideologies. Derby can “save” her, the helpless, defeated woman, from the ill effects of the war and bring her back into the Union. Strategically, she *omits* from her letter to Curry her visit to Derby and his payment to her of substantial royalties on the sale of *Macaria* in the North. Instead, she tells Curry she went with her brother to consult a “German physician of celebrity” and refused to speak with “prominent Republican leaders [who] wished to see me,” accepting visits only from men “who had proved their detestation of the war party and policy” (108). Unless, casuistically, Evans excluded Derby from the category of “Republican leaders” because he was not “prominent” or excluded her visit with Derby because *she* went to call on *him*, rather than *vice versa*, it is difficult not to read this statement as a lie designed to preserve her reputation as a Confederate loyalist and to elicit Curry’s sympathy for her sacrifices on behalf of the Lost Cause.

While presenting herself to both Curry and Derby as fiercely loyal to the recently Lost Cause, she went about the business of protecting her authorial interests in the newly reunited nation. Her visit to J. C. Derby (and her decision to send *Macaria* North to him in the first place) ensured that she benefited handsomely from Northern sales of *Macaria* during the war, but her visit to Derby was not, it seems, her only visit to a New York publisher. Another 1880s statement by Evans quoted later by Derby in his memoir of Evans’s career sheds more light on her activities during that 1865 New York trip. In typical fashion, she presents these facts in praise of her chivalrous publisher rather than as a tribute to her own acumen and business sense:

With reference to my present Publisher, G. W. Carleton, I should like the world to know how noble and generous he has always been to me. When purchasing the stereotype plates of my earlier books, he told me that he was obliged to pay so much

for the plates of 'Macaria' that he could only allow me a moderate percentage on the future sales. We agreed upon the terms and signed the contract, which specified a certain percentage on 'Macaria.' Subsequently, after 'St. Elmo' and 'Vashti' [her fifth novel] had been published, I one day received a letter from Mr. Carleton, saying that the sales of the volumes justified him in increasing the percentage on 'Macaria.' From that period until now, in making his annual settlement of copyright, he has paid me a larger percentage on 'Macaria' than my original contract specified, and this increase was his own voluntary generous impulse, for I had never solicited any change of terms. Verily, a Prince of Publishers! (Derby 397)³²

So how did G. W. Carleton become Evans's postwar publisher, the man fortunate enough to publish one of the nineteenth century's great best sellers, *St. Elmo*? It seems likely that during the same trip during which Evans visited Derby, she approached Carleton not at random but because he, as much as Bradburn, had become "her" publisher in the North during the war.³³ Recall the mysterious "Mr. Scott" who bought the plates for *Beulah* at a publisher's trade sale in 1862, a trade sale that featured the entire stock of plates owned by the then defunct firm of Derby & Jackson. By 1863, those plates had made their way from the hands of Mr. Scott to Carleton, who began featuring *Beulah* in his catalog as "a novel of great power and interest" (Carleton *New Books*). Carleton did not have the strong Republican party ties of J. C. Derby, but in partnership as Rudd & Carleton, he had published the Wigwam Edition of the *Life, Speeches and Public Services of Abraham Lincoln*, Lincoln's popular campaign biography for his first run for President in 1860 (Tebbel 346), and during the war, he published many war-related titles, leaning heavily to the Republican side, occasionally publishing

³²Evans most likely understood that her letter to Derby about the events of the 1860s was a public document, and she self-consciously shaped her recollections to present her own actions in what she considered the most flattering light in the 1880s.

³³Fidler claims that "G. W. Carleton . . . had acquired Derby's control in the firm during the sixties" and implies that this business transfer led to Evans's publishing *St. Elmo* with Carleton (*Augusta Evans Wilson*, 127). He offers no evidence for this proposition, but he most likely drew this inference from Carleton's possession of Derby's plates for *Beulah*. However, those plates were sold at auction rather than transferred privately, and there is no other evidence supporting the notion that Carleton assumed Derby's publishing business (Derby does not describe such a transaction in his memoirs, for example—memoirs that Carleton published, and in the context of which such a representation would have seemed flattering to both men).

titles from opposing points of view.³⁴ By 1864, perhaps anxious to avoid Evans's Confederate sympathies, Carleton's advertisements describe *Beulah* as "a very powerful *American* novel" (emphasis added) (Carleton "Advertisement").

Perhaps Evans found a copy of *Beulah* in a New York bookstore under Carleton's imprint, perhaps she saw an advertisement for it in a Northern newspaper or magazine, or perhaps Derby alerted her to Carleton's edition. Through whatever means Evans became aware of Carleton's edition of her second novel, it seems likely that, armed with this information, she approached him with threefold purpose: to seek payment of royalties on his sales of copies of *Beulah* printed from Derby's plates, to propose that he publish her next novel, and to suggest that he acquire the plates for *Macaria* and *Inez* from Bradburn and Doolady. Carleton acted the part of the honorable gentleman—and took advantage of the connection that his possession of the plates of *Beulah* gave him to the popular author. Carleton, like Derby before the war, had developed a profitable specialty in women's novels. He also published Mary Jane Holmes and Miriam Coles Harris in 1865, and would soon add "Marion Harland" (pseudonym of Mary Virginia Terhune—another former Derby & Jackson author) to his list. Evans proved to be a logical and highly profitable addition to his stable of women novelists.

Bradburn and Doolady, however, were not cut out for the role of gentlemen publishers. With the war over, would they continue to pay royalties on sales of *Macaria*, either through Derby or directly to Evans? With the prospect of a new Evans novel on the horizon, would they squeeze as much money as they possibly could out of Carleton in return for the plates? And what about *Inez*, the profits from which they had apparently been enjoying royalty free without Derby and Lippincott's standing in for Evans? As Evans attested in the 1880s, Carleton ransomed the plates for *Macaria* from Bradburn and Doolady at a high price. By

³⁴His partnership with Rudd ended in 1861 (Tebbel 346). For Carleton's career, see also Stern. The publication of *St. Elmo* always figures prominently in accounts of Carleton's career, but no mention is made of his acquisition of *Beulah*. Neither Tebbel nor Stern says much about Carleton's Civil War activities. His publications ranged politically from Epes Sargent's novel *Peculiar* (1864) (abolitionist/Republican), to Dennis A. Mahony's memoir *Prisoner of State* (1863) (about his imprisonment in Washington, DC, in 1862 for his opposition to Lincoln's government and its interpretation of the Constitution) and a reprint of West & Johnston's Confederate edition of Raphael Semmes's *The Cruise of the Alabama and the Sumter* (1864).

acquiring those plates, Carleton was able to offer *Beulah*, *Macaria*, and *St. Elmo* together on his list for the 1866/67 holiday season and throughout the rest of the century. Bringing *Inez* out under the Carleton imprint took a little longer, as Bradburn and Doolady continued to control use of the Harpers plates and to issue editions through 1870, thus exploiting the exponentially increased value of Evans's name and reputation in the wake of *St. Elmo*'s phenomenal success. The first G. W. Carleton edition of *Inez* finally appeared in 1871, printed from the original 1855 Harpers plates, with the plates and the book remaining under the control of Carleton and his successors until the copyright expired in 1897. G. W. Carleton and his successor, G. W. Dillingham, continued to publish Evans's copyrighted works, both old and new, through the early twentieth century (Dillingham published her last novel, *Devota*, in 1907).³⁵ Through astute maneuvering in the post-war period, Evans thus ensured that all of her books eventually came under the stewardship of one publisher, who kept them in print and paid her royalties regularly for the remainder of the century. While one might expect to find Evans's career as devastated by the war as was her erstwhile nation, the exact opposite was true. Despite temporary dislocation and discontinuity, Evans effectively reconsolidated her position in the Northern market and, it seems likely, lost little or no money on the sales of her novels.

³⁵After printing the 1864 edition of *Inez* from the Harpers plates, Bradburn printed another edition dated 1865. In 1868, the plates found their way back briefly to their original home, when "W.I. Pooley, Harper & Brothers Bldg." issued an undated edition. Libraries routinely miscatalog this as an 1864 edition because of Bradburn's 1864 copyright notice. However, the description on title page and covers of Evans as "the author of *St. Elmo*" indicate that the edition had to have been issued in 1866 or later. Furthermore, Pooley's edition was advertised in Mobile newspapers in January 1868 (W. I. Pooley, Advertisement). The plates were most likely only leased to Pooley, because in 1870, *Inez* was issued under Michael Doolady's imprint. In her introduction to her edition of *Macaria*, Faust traces the post-war editions of *Macaria*, including a revised 1896 edition issued by Dillingham. Noting the use of the author's maiden name on the title page, Faust speculates that "the author's maiden name indicates a lack of participation in the project by Evans herself, who by 1896 went by Wilson" (xxviii n). That surmise, however, is contradicted by the copyright registration notice on the verso of the title page in her married name—she clearly remained actively involved in promoting the continued circulation of *Macaria* decades after the war.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Research for portions of this essay was supported by a Mellon Post-Dissertation Fellowship at the American Antiquarian Society and a Faculty Enrichment Grant from the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Oklahoma. Thanks to the anonymous reader for the *Mississippi Quarterly* for comments on this essay (especially in regards to matters bibliographic), as well as to Leon Jackson and Naomi Z. Sofer for comments on the longer piece from which this essay derives.

Works Cited

- "Announcements." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* December 15, 1863: 145-46.
- Bakker, Jan. "Overlooked Progenitors: Independent Women and Southern Renaissance in Augusta Jane Evans Wilson's *Macaria: or, Altars of Sacrifice*." *Southern Quarterly* 25.2 (1987): 131-42.
- Barnes, James J. *Authors, Publishers, and Politicians: The Quest for an Anglo-American Copyright Agreement, 1815-1854*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.
- Baym, Nina. *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and About Women in America, 1820-1870*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.
- Becker, Robert S. "J. C. Derby and Company." Dzwonkoski, *American* 116-17.
- "Book Notices . . . Politics and Questions of the Day." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* March 15, 1864: 341.
- Brooks, Mr. "The Intellectual Future of the South." *Southern Literary Messenger* May 1862: 313-14.
- Carleton. "Advertisement—New Books." *New-York Daily Tribune* April 9, 1864: 8.
- . *New Books and New Editions Recently Issued by Carleton, Publisher*. New York: Carleton, 1863.
- Charvat, William. *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1968.
- Coultrap-McQuin, Susan. *Doing Literary Business: American Women Writers in the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1990.
- Demeter. Rev. of *Macaria*. *Mobile Evening Telegraph* May 2, 1864: 1-2.

- Derby, J. C. *Fifty Years among Authors, Books and Publishers*. New York: G. W. Carleton & Co., 1884.
- Derby & Miller. Advertisement. *New York Times* February 6, 1864: 6.
- Detlefsen, Ellen Gay. "Printing in the Confederacy, 1861-1865: A Southern Industry in Wartime." Diss. Columbia U, 1975.
- Dzwonkoski, David, ed. *American Literary Publishing Houses, 1638-1899, Part 1: A-M*. Dictionary of Literary Biography 49. Detroit, MI: Gale, 1986.
- . "M. Doolady." Dzwonkoski, *American* 137.
- "Editor's Table." *Southern Literary Messenger*. February 1863: 117-18.
- Evans, Augusta J[ane]. *Beulah. A Novel*. New York: Derby & Jackson, 1859.
- . *Beulah. A Novel*. New York: Derby & Jackson, 1861.
- [Evans, August Jane]. *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1855.
- Evans, Augusta J[ane]. *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*. New York: John Bradburn, 1864.
- . *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*. New York: John Bradburn, 1865.
- . *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*. New York: W.I. Pooley, n.d. [1867].
- . *Inez: A Tale of the Alamo*. New York: John Bradburn, 1870.
- [Evans, Augusta Jane]. *Macaria; or, Altars of Sacrifice*. Richmond: West & Johnston, 1864.
- Evans, August J[ane]. *Macaria*. New York: John Bradburn, 1864.
- . *Macaria. A Novel*. New York: G. W. Dillingham, 1896.
- Evans, Augusta Jane. *Macaria; or Altars of Sacrifice*. Ed. Drew Gilpin Faust. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1992.
- Evans, [Mary Anne]. *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe*. Mobile, AL: S. H. Goetzl, 1863.
- Exman, Eugene. *The Brothers Harper*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Fahs, Alice. *The Imagined Civil War: Popular Literature of the North & South, 1861-1865*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2001.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Introduction: *Macaria*, a War Story for Confederate Women." Evans, *Macaria* (1992), xiii-xxix.
- . "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War." *Journal of American History* 76 (1990): 1200-28.
- . *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1996.

- Fidler, William Perry. *Augusta Evans Wilson, 1835-1909: A Biography*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1951.
- . "Augusta Evans Wilson as Confederate Propagandist." *Alabama Review* (1949): 32-44.
- Ford, Sally Rochester. *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men*. Mobile, AL: S. H. Goetzl, 1863.
- . *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men*. New York: Charles B. Richardson, 1864.
- Freeman, J. Stuart, Jr. *Toward a Third Century of Excellence: An Informal History of the J. B. Lippincott Company on the Occasion of Its Two-Hundredth Anniversary*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1992.
- Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. New York: Oxford UP, 1972.
- Geary, Susan. "The Domestic Novel as a Commercial Commodity: Making a Best Seller in the 1850s." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 70 (1976): 365-93.
- . "Harriet Beecher Stowe, John P. Jewett, and Author-Publisher Relations in 1853." *Studies in the American Renaissance* (1977): 345-67.
- Gross, Jennifer Lynn. "'Lonely Lives are Not Necessarily Joyless': Augusta Jane Evans's *Macaria* and the Creation of a Place for Single Womanhood in the Postwar South." *American Nineteenth Century History* 2.1 (2001): 33-52.
- H.C. Clarke & Co. Advertisement. *Mobile Advertiser & Register* April 24, 1864: [2].
- Holstein, Suzy Clarkson. "'Offering up Her Life': Confederate Women on the Altars of Sacrifice." *Southern Studies* 2.2 (1991): 113-30.
- Homestead, Melissa J. *American Women Authors and Literary Property, 1822-1869*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- J. B. Lippincott & Co., Publishers. Advertisement for *Macaria*. *New-York Daily Tribune* May 7, 1864: 2.
- J. B. Lippincott Company. *The Author and His Audience, with a Chronology of J. B. Lippincott Company*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1967.
- John Bradburn. Advertisement. *New-York Daily Tribune* January 13, 1864: 6.
- . Advertisement. *New-York Daily Tribune* February 13, 1864: 8.

- . Advertisement. *New-York Daily Tribune* May 19, 1864: 2.
- . Advertisement. *New York Dispatch* (Sunday ed.) June 5, 1864: 8.
- . Advertisement. *New York Dispatch* (Sunday ed.) June 12, 1864: 8.
- . Advertisement. *New-York Daily Tribune* June 21, 1864: 2.
- . Advertisement. *Evening Post* (New York) June 25, 1864: 2.
- . Advertisement. *World* (New York) June 25, 1864: [5].
- . Advertisement. *New York Times* July 23, 1864: 5.
- . Advertisement. *New York Daily Tribune* July 27 and 30, 1864: 2.
- . Advertisement. *New York Day-Book Caucasian* (weekly ed.) July 30, 1864: 5.
- Jones, Anne Goodwyn. *Tomorrow is Another Day: The Woman Writer in the South, 1859-1936*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1981.
- Katz, Joseph. "Analytical Bibliography and Literary History: The Writing and Printing of *Wieland*." *Proof: The Yearbook of American Bibliographical and Textual Studies* 1 (1971): 8-25.
- Kelley, Mary. *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1984.
- Lehmann-Haupt, Hellmut, Rollo G. Silver, and Lawrence Wroth. *The Book in America: A History of the Making and Selling of Books in the United States*, 2nd ed. New York: Bowker, 1951.
- "List of Books Recently Published in the United States." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* July 1, 1864: 157-60.
- "Literary Intelligence . . . The Book-Trade Sale—the Great Auction of Stereotype Plates." *American Publishers' Circular and Literary Gazette* November 1, 1862: 115 (rept. from *New York Tribune*).
- "Literary Notices." *Southern Literary Messenger* 36.5 (May 1864): 317.
- London, Lawrence. "Confederate Literature and Its Publishers." *Studies in Southern History*. Ed. J. Carlyle Sitterson. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1957. 82-96.
- "Macaria: A Novel." *New York Day-Book Caucasian* (weekly ed.) July 20, 1864: 5.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Ballentine, 1989.
- McGill, Meredith M. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.
- Mills, Theodora. "John Bradburn." Dzwonkoski, *American* 63.
- Moss, Elizabeth. *Domestic Novelists in the Old South: Defenders of Southern Culture*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1992.

- Muhlenfeld, Elisabeth. "The Civil War and Authorship." *The History of Southern Literature*. Ed. Louis D. Rubin, Jr., et al. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1985. 178-87.
- "New Novel." *Mobile Weekly Advertiser & Register*. Feb. 27, 1864. In the Augusta Jane Evans clippings file, Museum of Mobile, Alabama.
- "New Novels: Confederate, English, and Federal." *Evening Post* (New York) July 25, 1864: 1.
- "New Publications." *New York Dispatch* (Sunday ed.) July 17, 1864: 3.
- "Notes on Books and Booksellers." *American Literary Gazette and Publisher's Circular* February 15, 1864: 268-72.
- "Notes on Books and Booksellers." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* June 15, 1864: 112-14.
- Parrish, Michael T., and Robert M. Willingham, Jr. *Confederate Imprints: A Bibliography of Southern Publications from Secession to Surrender*. Austin, TX, and Katonah, NY: Jenkins and Gary A. Foster, 1987.
- "Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men." *Mobile Evening News* June 25, 1863: 1.
- Randall's. Advertisement. *Mobile Daily Advertiser and Register* April 26, 1864: [2].
- Rev. of *History of President Lincoln, Including His Speeches, Letters, Addresses, Proclamations, and Messages*. *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular* June 15, 1864: 120.
- Rev. of *Macaria*. *Southern Literary Messenger* May 1864: 317.
- Rev. of *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men*. *American Literary Gazette and Publisher's Circular* June 1, 1864: 87.
- Rev. of *Raids and Romance of Morgan and His Men*. *Southern Field and Fireside* May 23, 1863: 143.
- Riepma, Anne Sophie. *Fire & Fiction: Augusta Jane Evans in Context*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.
- S. H. Goetzel. Advertisement. *Advertiser and Register* (Mobile, AL) May 22, 1864: [2]
- Sexton, Rebecca Grant, ed. *A Southern Woman of Letters: The Correspondence of Augusta Jane Evans Wilson*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2002.
- Shapiro, Henry D. *Confiscation of Confederate Property in the North*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1962.

- Stern, Madeleine B. *Books and Book People in 19th-Century America*. New York: Bowker, 1978.
- Sutton, Walter. "The Derby Brothers: 19th Century Bookmen." *University of Rochester Library Bulletin* 3.2 (1948): 21-29.
- Tebbel, John. *A History of Book Publishing in the United States. Vol. 1: The Creation of an Industry, 1630-1865*. New York: Bowker, 1972.
- West & Johnston. Advertisement for *Macaria*. *Daily Examiner* (Richmond, VA). April 27, 1864: n.p.
- West & Johnston. Advertisement for *Macaria*. *Record of News, History and Literature* September 3, 1863: 112.
- W. I. Pooley. Advertisement for *Inez*. Clipping from unidentified Mobile, AL, newspaper, dated January 19, 1868 in pencil. Augusta Jane Evans file, Historic Mobile Preservation Society.
- Winship, Michael. *American Literary Publishing in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: The Business of Ticknor and Fields*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- . "Printing with Plates in the Nineteenth Century United States." *Printing History* 5.2 (1983): 15-26.
- . "The Transatlantic Book Trade and Anglo-American Literary Culture in the Nineteenth Century." *Reciprocal Influences: Literary Production, Distribution, and Consumption in America*. Ed. Steven Fink and Susan S. Williams. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1999. 98-108.
- "Yankee Literature." *Southern Illustrated News* September 13, 1862: 5.

