

LITERARY & HISTORICAL EDITING

Edited and with
introductions by
George L. Vogt and
John Bush Jones

University of Kansas Libraries, 1981

gs of "literary" figures; but I do
es are somehow more appropriate for "li
ve that they are equally applicable to vi

I

ritings not intended for publication
acter from those intended to be publi
ate documents, there are no constrai
at one writes in a diary, private no
es has no obligation to meet any
elligibility. One may write
in a notebook or in a
he fight. He finally makes a final
saves her. With the lovers reunited
quers her. The first act is in Rhodes. The pro
he first act is in Rhodes. The pro
siege to Rhodes. Alphonso, the
n, barbarian infidels must be stop
My sword against proud Solyman I draw
His cursed Prophet and his sensual law,
and fight because
on some
the scene echoing:
Our swords against proud Solyman I draw
s cursed Prophet and his sensual law,
there is the same hostile note
n says that Christians are
ft misled by mists of Wine,
love the Crime of Peace,
It tries of frequent change;
d expensive Vice;
alth by ways as strange
avarice. (II,ii)

the, the model of virtue, is brought
virtue of this woman and immediately
his previous understanding of Chris-
reiled, which shows her respect for
desty. Solyman responds to this
re her husband's fate in a way
about Christians; he responds

nd thy Lord?
w;

express a wish
be postponed for a
see any advantage
Delay on the
longer the
more mischief
we can bear well
making our defense
as in the 20th of Feb
it used — The
grant any blank wa
I borrow your sentiments
the poet

Correspondence of
Letters of Ralph Wal
rd Rollins's The Letters
mas H. Johnson's The Letters
University Press, 1958)
n-Howells Letters (Cambridge
e edition of Washington Irvi
asin Press, 1969-) produced b
ularly detailed discussion of the
s's The Letters of John Addington
1847-69), and Elvan Kintner's The Letters
Barrett, 1845-1846 (Cambridge: Bell
to name only a few excell
it should be cl
e sim

University of Kansas Publications
Library Series, 46

LITERARY & HISTORICAL EDITING

Edited and with
introductions by
George L. Vogt and
John Bush Jones

University of Kansas Libraries, 1981

Printed in Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
By The University of Kansas Printing Service

Contents

Introduction: the Historical Editor's View, by George L. Vogt	1
Introduction: the Literary Editor's View, by John Bush Jones.....	7
JAMES THORPE: Literary and Historical Editing:	
the Values and Limits of Diversity.....	13
GEORGE C. ROGERS, Jr.: The Sacred Text: an Improbable Dream	23
G. THOMAS TANSELLE: Literary Editing.....	35
MARTIN C. BATTESTIN: A Rationale of Literary Annotation:	
the Example of Fielding's Novels.....	57
CHARLES T. CULLEN: Principles of Annotation in Editing	
Historical Documents; or, How to Avoid Breaking the Butterfly	
on the Wheel of Scholarship.....	81

Introduction: The Historical Editor's View

GEORGE L. VOGT

The year is 1965, and we are standing in the editorial offices of the J— B— Papers, a long-term enterprise aimed at gathering, annotating, and publishing the life correspondence of JB, a seminal figure in early American politics if ever there was one.

The main collecting phase is over now. It took four years and \$4,500 in postage for the staff to locate and order copies of JB's papers in repositories and private collections all over the world. The results are apparent and engulfing: an 8-foot wall of chronologically arranged manila envelopes, each containing a single document copy; a file cabinet of microfilm; a chest-high bank of card drawers holding the control slips, the key finding aids for the entire collection. With them, the editors can locate materials by author, recipient, or repository; without them, they would have to rely on memory, intuition, or a long search. Some 60,000 manila envelopes went into The Wall, and about 100,000 control slips were typed in triplicate, separated, and filed in the drawers. Three typists and six graduate assistants came and went before the collecting phase ended.

Now, six years into the project, the editors have just completed the transcripts and annotations for Volume 1. They have approved the university press's third revised book design and scheduled an "urgent" meeting at the request of the press's copy editor—something about cancelled type and Greek superscripts. In six months or so, the press will receive galley proofs set by linotype, and the editors will begin the peculiar, overlapping schedules typical of long-term series: work on future volumes halts as proofs and indexes of the preceding one come back to haunt the staff. With luck and no more changes in the four-person team, Volume 1 will roll off the presses in eighteen months and subsequent volumes at annual intervals.

Keeping the project afloat is a melange of funding from the university, two major foundations, and a federal granting agency. Prospects for continued support appear solid—JB was, after all, a seminal figure in early American politics—but the editors are cautious about what might happen in the sixty-odd years necessary to the full edition. The press director, at least, is optimistic of modest increments in the royalty checks to the project if library subscriptions continue to build and if the volumes sell well in paper-

back. Even more encouraging, the federal granting agency expects a sizable boost in its congressional appropriation next year, so

In 1980, a team of scholars planning a collected edition of the papers of T—P—, a contemporary of JB and a figure every bit as significant, might be surprised to find resistance at almost every turn to their projected comprehensive book series. Notwithstanding TP's enormous impact on everything from the country's infant banking system to the development of indoor plumbing, no private foundation or corporate sponsor has stepped forward, except for a woman bank president who thinks *Mrs.* TP's diary should be published. Federal grants administrators talk in stained glass tones about "fully committed resources" and "budgetary shortfalls," their enthusiasm waning in direct proportion to the waxing number of volumes and years of funding. At the very least, they tell the editors, their agency would like to see substantial cost-sharing in the budget, a convincing argument for 10 or more volumes, and a detailed editorial methods prospectus, which should include sample transcriptions and annotations. And less is more, they imply. Alone among prospective sponsors, the university administration is willing to guarantee substantial direct support in the form of released teaching time; but the university press, faced with a "break even or die" edict from the chancellor's office, flatly refuses to consider anything of this scope without promises of subventions against all losses. Such endowment income as the press earns is already committed to a continuing series of monographs in minority history, explains the press director. Have the editors ever considered, he asks, a comprehensive microfilm project and a smaller book edition? Would they be willing to use sophisticated new word-processing equipment and computer programs to compose and index, say, four selective volumes for the press?

Faced with these responses, one editor revives a long deferred biographical project; and the other begins to see merit in *Mrs.* TP's short and eminently readable diary_____

Are hard times here for historical editing? Not really. It is probably accurate to say that at no other time in our nation's history has so much been done by so many in historical editing. Recent journal reviews yield up dozens of volumes of letters, diaries, and records, some the product of team efforts and grants, others not. No, the point of the tongue-in-cheek comparison is that important changes are taking place in historical editing—in

the types of projects that scholars and sponsors find attractive and in the way the editions are published.

There is still, of course, strong interest in guiding the Founding Fathers' papers into print, but the early and undeniable preponderance of "Great White Fathers" projects is lessening. As scholars' interests have broadened to include women's history, black history, and new kinds of social, scientific, and cultural history, the contours of documentary editing have changed accordingly. In some of these areas, the documentary effort aims at defining the course of movements or the impact of organizations, not individual lives or careers. One of the most complex and interesting of the new projects is a documentary of freedmen and post-Civil War southern society. Drawn primarily from the enormous Freedmen's Bureau collection in the National Archives, the edition will highlight the unplumbed riches of those records and demonstrate what masses of data scholars may expect to find among the originals. Other projects are documenting the ratification of the Constitution, the early development of the U.S. Supreme Court, the rise and impact of black abolitionists, and the course of the woman suffrage movement.

Of particular importance is the historian's growing appreciation for records of the common man: letters of slaves and freedmen, diaries of pioneers and explorers, seamen's journals, representative court records and grand jury presentments. Many of these generic items and the correspondence and records associated with ethnic studies and immigration history are just now emerging from the obscurity of family trunks, overlooked library collections, and courthouse vaults. Editors and publishers are about to place fascinating new materials before the reader.

As the subjects of documentary editions have changed, so have editorial methods and publication techniques. While sharp increases in publication costs account for some changes, editors and publishers would probably agree that comprehensive book series are no longer the only or necessarily the best way of doing justice to many documentary subjects. They certainly are not the fastest.

For many large-scale projects editors are now using microforms to publish entire document collections in advance of a highly selective, annotated book series. This method permits scholars access to historical materials years or even decades sooner than comprehensive book publication would allow. The editor, secure in the knowledge that the significant as well as the apparently insignificant is on record, feels less hesitant to make selection

decisions about book contents. Some editors are publishing only the unprinted documents in special microform supplements to the books; a few are publishing fully annotated editions *only* in microform. More and more editors now agree that few figures or topics deserve comprehensive editorial treatment in bookform—even if patient and unstinting sponsors can be found. At this time, editorial costs alone for one documentary volume average over \$100,000. Manufacturing costs, only part of which is usually recoverable through sales, add another \$25,000.

The complexity of new editorial projects, particularly those dealing with massive, post-Civil War documentation is staggering. As the editor's universe has grown to inhuman proportions, he or she has begun to use inhuman means of manipulating it. Enter the computer in various guises. From the development of fairly simple programs for document control, historical editing is now moving toward very flexible programs for text editing, indexing, and type encoding. At least a dozen editorial projects, including the Department of State's *Foreign Relations* series, now use the relatively "simple" computers in word-processing equipment to capture the complete text on magnetic tape or disks. Computer typesetters read these tapes and disks and almost overnight compose page proofs indistinguishable from those set by hand—except for the absence of newly introduced errors. The savings in shortened production time and lessened proofreading promise to be significant. With the use of more sophisticated computers and programs, editors will be able to decide at the last possible moment which documents will appear in print and which in computer-generated microform supplements.

As contact between literary and historical editors has grown, notably in conferences such as this one and through the new Association for Documentary Editing, historical editors have begun to trade ideas and techniques with their colleagues across campus. An especially interesting aspect of the new dialogue is the matter of literalism in transcriptions. Two of the papers in this book deal with the problems of rendering manuscripts into type. Simply put, the question is how best to reproduce a manuscript fraught with erratic punctuation, indeterminate capitalization, phantom paragraphing, profuse abbreviations, and lined-out trivia. Should editors strive for a literal printed text, or may they make certain concessions to readers, including silent changes (modernized punctuation, spelling, paragraphing, expanded abbreviations, etc.)? The debate, which began well before the Kansas meeting but sharpened there, goes on. Most historical editors probably still balk

at the literary editors' idea of a completely "recoverable" text, with all the back-of-the-book baggage that that implies; but a significant number of young editors, especially, are questioning the silent introduction of twentieth-century punctuation, regularized spelling, and expanded abbreviations into the documents. It was not always so. Perhaps a few remember the hapless transcriber who rendered "Yr. obt. svt." as "Your observant servant."

One final thing might be said about the modern historical editor. The question of status within the historical profession at large and within universities and departments in particular has always been troublesome. Often, career editors have felt undervalued and slighted because, well, they were. Very gradually, the "stigma" of editing and of other non-teaching careers in history seems to be disappearing in the face of unarguable talent, scholarship, dedication, new militance and professionalism, and a tight job market. The recent technological innovations in editing also mean that the editor must necessarily possess knowledge of computers and publishing, a sure grip on the subject at hand and the principles of editing, and a talent for administrative organization and grantsmanship—attributes that make him or her a rare bird on any campus. The effect, a long time in coming, is bound to be a steady appreciation in the historical editor's stock and the opening of an exciting new chapter in documentary editing.

Introduction: The Literary Editor's View

JOHN BUSH JONES

Not much more than fifteen years ago, an idealistic young graduate student of my acquaintance, his eyes and mind opened in a sort of Joycean epiphany, stood aghast in his university's bookstore as he gazed upon the textually corrupt editions of standard works his department's faculty had deliberately chosen to teach from. He silently mourned their benighted state, for lo! *he* had become as one of the converted, worshipping the textual trinity of McKerrow, Greg, and Bowers with a fervor untempered by thoughts of economic necessity or the knowledge that some of those professors had scrawled a lifetime of marginal teaching notes into a copy of the text they prescribed for their students. Uncharitable as our young idealist might have been in failing to weigh convenience and textbook prices against textual accuracy, still, he did know of several superior texts that would have cost students no more than those their professors had selected for them. It saddened him to think that teachers of literature ostensibly cared so little whether what their students read was exactly what the authors wrote. Sometime later, this youthful crusader for textual purity was appalled to learn that the committee on freshman English had picked a particularly botched text of a work for the following year's reading even though the editor of the acknowledged "definitive" edition (available, by the way, in an inexpensive paperback) was himself a member of the department. That editor—one of a more than usually philosophical turn of mind—took the news more good-humoredly than did our young lion, simply telling him, "If the department wants to let the graduate teaching assistants waste half their class time explaining to baffled freshmen why great chunks of the story don't make sense, well, that's *their* problem." For this editor knew, as we all must know by now, that the history of modern literary editing is as much a history of convincing non-editing (not to mention anti-editing) members of the profession of its need and utility, as it has been the history of gradually refining and developing methodologies and, of course, producing more and more responsibly edited texts.

Should those university bookstore shelves be scanned today, however, we would find—pretty much the same situation, say the more cynical among us, and to some extent they would be right. Though far more critical editions of literary texts are available now than, say, prior to 1965, many teachers—

acute, perceptive, even brilliant in their own areas of interest and expertise—still pay scant attention to the quality of texts they have their students use. Moreover, even those who recognize the value of using superior texts in the teaching of literature are often fettered by the hard facts of the publishing trade: though enthusiasm for and competence in critical editing have spread to scholars treating virtually all periods and genres of English and American letters, most products of their labors remain available exclusively in expensive, hardbound volumes. Precious few critically edited texts—even without their elaborate textual apparatus—have drifted down into editions suitably priced for the classroom market. The late Center for Editions of American Authors did improve this situation somewhat for certain nineteenth-century American writing through its policy of having the several affiliated editing projects lease their texts to responsible publishers of books for academic and general consumption. In this fashion, for example, the critically edited text of *The Scarlet Letter* from the Ohio State University Press Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne found its way into the *Norton Anthology of American Literature*. The CEAA's successor within the Modern Language Association, the (also late) Center for Scholarly Editions, continued at least to encourage publishers of scholarly editions to make their superior texts more widely available through leasing or similar arrangements, and the MLA's ongoing Committee on Scholarly Editions continues the good fight to this worthy end.

If efforts to spread the word on the necessity for reliably edited literary works and related documents have not plunged as *deeply* as they might to general students and teachers of literature, they have certainly gone *widely* through the ranks of scholars working in all classes of writing who have an appreciation of both textual accuracy and—through various apparatus—the wherewithal to examine composition and/or publishing history. The time was—and this seems almost antediluvian now—when the principles of scholarly editing were thought to have applicability chiefly limited to early works of the hand-press period, most notably to dramatic texts of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre. Then the CEAA editions and its published *Principles and Procedures* demonstrated that, contrary to popular myth, machine-printed books were not indeed perfect and beyond the need for scrutiny and editing by trained eyes, minds, and hands. As a whole new literature on editing modern texts developed, a literature based on the theories and methodologies originally developed for editing hand-press books

but modified to suit the products of a new technology, small bands of scholars, most of whom learned their editing in terms of traditional "literature," have begun to apply their skills to classes of writing that—while still falling within the broadest definition of the humanities—have not generally been thought of as literary texts. A look at a listing of editorial projects funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities in a recent year (and such a list represents but a fraction of all such projects under way) shows that beyond the usual run of novelists, essayists, poets, and playwrights, critical editions are in progress for the published and unpublished writings of philosophers, composers, judges, scientists, educators, and a pioneering filmmaker—not to mention projects involving the papers of figures most usually thought to come under the province of "historical" as opposed to "literary" editing: America's presidents and prominent statesmen.

Just as so-called literary editors, despite individual differences, have generally shared similar assumptions, priorities, and principles, so too have so-called historical editors developed their sets of common goals and guidelines, until—quite inadvertently, it would seem—two disparate "camps" of editors have apparently emerged, yet camps whose foremost aim is essentially the same: to establish, record, and preserve the written records of a culture. And, as G. Thomas Tanselle observes in his paper in this volume, perhaps because there has been, until lately, so little communication between "historical" and "literary" editors, few scholars in either field have stopped to realize that the fundamental difference in editorial approach has not to do with whether a document is primarily "literary" or "historical" in its nature and substance, but rather whether or not that document was intended for publication.

Communication is precisely what the Conference on Literary and Historical Editing at the University of Kansas in September, 1978, was all about, as is this volume of selected conference papers. As early as April, 1977, the MLA's Committee on Scholarly Editions (CSE) formally recognized in print the communication gap among editors in diverse disciplines and the need to bridge it:

. . . there are issues common to virtually all editing . . . and . . . benefits can result from communication on these matters among persons from widely varying fields. In the past, there has been little exchange of this kind. Both the CEAA and the National Historical

Publications and Records Commission, for instance, have been concerned with American figures, principally of the nineteenth century, and both have performed valuable services; but there has been almost no interchange of ideas between the literary scholars and the historians on matters of mutual concern, even though both groups deal with many of the same classes of documents (letters, journals, printed pieces). The CSE recognizes that editorial procedures must be adapted to the material to be edited. These necessary modifications may differ between an edition of a nineteenth-century American novel and of an American statesman's papers, between a twentieth-century novel and a medieval romance, or a scientist's treatises and a Renaissance play. But the CSE firmly believes that editors of such diverse materials do have a common ground for coming together, and it wishes, through its activities, to promote greater understanding among editors in all fields.

*The Center for Scholarly Editions:
An Introductory Statement* (New York:
Modern Language Association, 1977), p. 2.

One of the CSE's activities during its brief but productive life was just that, to collaborate with the NHPRC as the initiator and co-sponsor of the Kansas conference. The conference brought together forty-two invited participants representing scholarly editions in varied disciplines, university presses and research libraries, the Committee on Scholarly Editions, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The stated objective of the conference was to air the views of editors of diverse training and experience in the hope of dispelling misinformation and misunderstanding, thereby producing clearer visions of the range of scholarly editing, its many specializations and refinements, and *not* to promote any single method of editing as more respectable or desirable than any other. That this goal was achieved may be seen in the summary observation on the two days' activities made by the then chairman of the CSE, Don L. Cook, at the conference's close:

The word conversion, which has been bandied about, I think is not a very happy concept to end on. I didn't come expecting any conversion, I haven't experienced any conversion, and, being a man of notoriously weak principles, if anyone could be converted to anything,

I am probably the person. I doubt there is going to be a conversion, either here or in the future, and I really am not particularly interested in there being a conversion. Yet it seems to me we have accomplished a great deal. John Simon [editor of the Papers of Ulysses S. Grant] spoke of chasms and schisms. I think one thing we have done is to locate some of those, and they turn out not to be as wide or as broad as we thought they were. I think it would be very dangerous if we went away putting wallpaper over them in the hope that they may disappear. I think there *are* differences we have found here, and I think some of the differences we have uncovered are unavoidable given the traditions of the systems we come out of. They aren't matters of personal idiosyncrasies. They are not a kind of meanness or stubbornness, although we tend to be confirmed in the ways we have been trained, and it is not so easy to break out of that. I trust that some of the differences will diminish as we go along, especially differences in terminology. More important, I think, is that we have begun not simply trying to bring people of different disciplines together, but have begun a dialogue to find out what we really believe, and I think that is useful. I think it even more useful perhaps in causing us to look into our own disciplines and find for ourselves what are the essentials and what are simply matters of tradition that we never examined closely enough or assumed were unquestionable. The questioning itself is probably the most valuable thing we have done here. I am hoping this won't be the end of the dialogue, but that it will go on through the work of the Association for Documentary Editing, the CSE, and the sponsorship of the NHPRC and the NEH. It seems to me this has been a rather pioneering venture. And that we have not all been knocked off our mules by a blinding light is not to me a sign of failure in the least. The fact that we perhaps acknowledge there is more than one light might even give us a kind of stereoptic view of reality.

In a sense, this volume of papers is, if not a continuation of the dialogue Professor Cook spoke of, at least a dissemination of the core of the dialogue begun at the Kansas conference. Though the several writers may—indeed, do—express some strong preferences for specific editorial procedures and principles, these should be considered now, as they were when first presented,

not the stuff of a hidebound how-to-do-it manual of scholarly editing, but reasoned, if divergent, statements of editorial method designed to serve as the basis for further questioning and exploration of established practices and the possible refinement and even innovation of new approaches to the various tasks and responsibilities of the editor.

Five of the eight principal conference papers are presented here, those touching most directly on the primary business of scholarly editing: the treatment of texts and the preparation of annotations. Of the remaining three papers, two dealt with the ancillary matters of production methods and publishing procedures, and the third considered the timely yet ephemeral topic of agency funding of editions and the subvention of publication costs. Though these three papers provided valuable information and the stimulus for lively discussion among the conference participants, it was this volume's editors' feeling that the contents as finally selected represent the most permanent contribution of the Kansas conference toward the furtherance of greater understanding and cooperation among editors in diverse fields, whose goals, if not the particulars of their practices, remain singularly similar.

*Literary and Historical Editing:
The Values and Limits of Diversity*

JAMES THORPE

I had the good fortune to begin my teaching career at Princeton University when Julian P. Boyd, the American historian, was the Librarian there, and just beginning his edition of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson. I knew nothing about editing—or less than nothing, if negative values are admissible in the field of human knowledge. (And I think they have to be, in order to account for ignorance of the order I possessed, or that you have doubtless met with among selected students.) I remember his mentioning, after lunch one day, a troublesome textual problem in a letter from Jefferson to John Jay: was it the whole trade of America, or was it the whole trade that was to be taxed? A lot of difference hung on that letter, o or a. I had thought that only literary scholars needed to be fussy about the details of single letters or commas or such small details, that historians could concern themselves with the great issues. I have since had it intimated to me that this is not quite true. I infer that we share a great deal—even if we don't always realize it—and that single fragile letters and great issues run together and concern us all.

The Kansas conference brought together persons with a wide range of interests and accomplishments. Those who spoke included historians who are principal editors of the writings of Ulysses S. Grant, of Andrew Johnson, of Henry Laurens, and of John Marshall. The literary scholars were represented by the principal editors of William Blake, Stephen Crane, Thomas Dekker, Henry Fielding, William Dean Howells, William James, Christopher Marlowe, and Herman Melville.

They have all, I am sure, faced a wide range of problems in dealing with correspondence, fiction, poetry, essays, marginalia, ephemera, and all the rest. They have doubtless worked with every kind of copy that the mind and hand of man can devise, from the crudest manuscript notes revised in a complex and essentially illegible manner, all the way to the finest and most carefully corrected printed copy. If there are unresolved problems in literary or historical editing, surely someone in this group has had experience with something similar.

We might handle the problem in somewhat different ways, it is true, and we might dispute mightily about who has the best results. Editing is one of the most disputatious disciplines in the entire range of learning. At least this is true if one can judge by the objections, hostility, and contempt expressed in reviews and journal articles. We represent a discipline that finds almost as little to praise with wholeness of heart as does philosophy, the queen of quarrelers. I hope that we don't, however, quite suffer the fate of Wordsworth's Lucy, "A maid whom there were none to praise/ And very few to love."

I come not to quarrel, however, but to open up the question of how we are alike, as editors, in our methods and in our results, and how we differ. I would like to drop some hints about the need for and tradition behind our differences, about what we may possibly be losing along the way.

I would like, at the outset, to outline what I understand to be the practices of several of the best-known modern American editions on a number of basic matters. Or at least how they seem to an outsider. Of course we all know that the practices have to be adapted to the material being edited and to the audience intended. Nevertheless, perhaps we can adjust our thoughts enough to find something useful from a review of these works even though the material differs.

I will begin with two literary editions, the Prose Works of John Milton (published by the Yale University Press) and the Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne (published by the Ohio State University Press). I will first touch on a few key facts about each.

The edition of Milton's prose works was first planned in 1948, under an international board of nine scholars. The number has gradually grown over the years to twelve, additions having been occasioned in part by the death of some of the original editors. The board was in the beginning, and it has continued to be, about as eminent a group of Milton scholars as one could readily think of. For the most part, it has been an active group, with the members participating in the decision making and in the editing. One member, the General Editor, carried the major part of the responsibility, but without dominating the operation. The members of the editorial group gained their eminence as historical scholars, and no one of them is particularly known as a textual scholar.

They planned eight volumes. Volume I came out in 1953 and volume VI in 1973. Two volumes were so bulky that they had to be issued in two

parts. Volume VII was issued in 1974, but it was withdrawn in May 1975 because of the large number of errors discovered in it, and the promised revision has not yet appeared. The editors of the individual volumes have been top Milton scholars, mostly members of the editorial board, none notable for textual work. Where a volume includes several works, each has its own editor, all of them well qualified in the view of the profession, again not textually minded.

The volumes run, on the average, to about 900 pages. Each has an historical introduction giving the background of biography, the times, and the occasion for the works included in the volume. These introductions run to about 200 pages each; like a book, they are divided into chapters, sometimes as many as 25 chapters. The explanatory notes, printed at the bottom of the page, vary a good deal in amount but may take up about 10% of the page. The formal textual introductions, where there are any, are a page or two on individual works; variant readings and other textual notes are ordinarily given in appendixes, ranging in length from little or nothing up to 30 or 40 pages per volume. As examples of bookmaking, the volumes are straightforward, traditional, useful, efficiently dense, manageable, not very attractive.

The edition has been financed in what one would call a traditional way. A couple of foundations have made grants to help cover the printing costs, and the individual editors have occasionally received awards either from their own institutions or by private application to one or another of the usual sources of grants. The edition has depended on free help from the staff of a large number of libraries, particularly in the United States. It is possible that a little of the makeshift quality of the result, and the deliberate pace of the edition—so far, an average of more than four years per volume—may be attributable to the uncertainty of the financing.

With some variation, most everything I have said about this edition could be applied to perhaps the majority of the solid literary editions of the earlier twentieth century, except that the historical introductions are longer and the board of editors is larger and perhaps more eminent than most. The kind of attention given to the text, however, is not uncharacteristic of the body of important literary editions of the immediate past.

I turn now to the Centenary Edition of Hawthorne. The first volume, *The Scarlet Letter*, was published in 1962, and the most recent, volume 13, came out in 1978. All of the volumes published from 1964 on bear the seal

of the Center for Editions of American Authors—all, that is, which were published after the Center came into existence. The edition has had for general editors a group of about three scholars, as eminent as any we have for Hawthorne studies; those scholars have also written the historical introductions for everything except the *Tales*. The edition has had a group of two to four textual editors—including the most renowned textualist in our profession—and they have performed all the textual work, with the exception of part of one volume, which was done by a general editor.

The volumes run, on the average, to about 600 pages, with about 400 pages of it clear text, by Hawthorne, without notes. The historical introductions are relatively brief, about 25 pages; but the textual apparatus is long—each volume has textual introductions of about 35 pages and textual notes of some 75 pages. There are no explanatory notes, except in the volume of the *American Notebooks*, but there they are heavy. In general, however, the textual apparatus is about three times as extensive as the historical material. The textual appendixes very carefully provide full information so that one could, if need be, reconstruct the various texts with the aid of the notes provided. Collation notes are often very fully supplied, including those for later editions that are shown to have no textual authority, and lavish attention is paid to the process of printing—including the instances of loosened type and duplicate settings, even when no textual variants result. There is a table of word division to make clear, in the case of words hyphenated at the end of the line in the Centenary edition, whether or not they were also hyphenated in the copytext, and another table lists end-of-the-line hyphenation in the copytext. One appendix shows, in tabular form, for two of Hawthorne's volumes of children's stories, the names of the compositors and the pages and lines each one set, though these are without discernible textual significance.

As examples of bookmaking, the volumes are clear, clean, simple, with a pleasant amount of white space. Since the text pages are without notes, they can be reproduced photographically for other uses, as in paperbacks for classroom use, since the scholarly apparatus need not be included. And, as with many approved texts of the CEAA and the CSE, this is increasingly the case.

This edition was sponsored and heavily financed by the University with which the general editors were associated at the outset and whose Press has published it. I understand that the University put about a quarter of a

million dollars into the project (not counting staff time) in the early years, and the Press published it at their own risk, without outside subvention, and have not been losers by it. I understand that the General Editors mostly did their work without special financial support, but that the Textual Editors were compensated. For the volumes after the first several, a grant in partial support of editorial expenses—for research assistance and help with the text, particularly—came from the National Endowment for the Humanities, through the administration of the Modern Language Association Center for Editions of American Authors. The first thirteen volumes were issued in sixteen years—1962-1978—and the steady pace of a little more than a year per volume is probably a credit to more than adequate financing. This edition has been a kind of pioneering effort in literary editing, and it has, for a number of different reasons, been especially influential on the current tradition of American literary editing.

I turn now to speak briefly of a couple of historical editions. In remarking on them to a group which includes historians, I think of Winston Churchill's comment as he began to address the French Assembly in French. "Gentlemen," he said, "Anglo-French relations are about to be tested to their foundation—I am about to speak in French."

We academic folk are territorial creatures, and we do not gladly suffer poachers, people coming to speak our language to us. (And of course we know instantly, almost by the tone of voice, whether that person has been bred to our special trade.) I hope that one of the merits of this conference will be taking down some fences and removing some no trespassing signs. When we see how little our fellow workers really understand what we are trying to do, maybe we can run the risk of letting them in on some of our mysteries. I offer myself as the first sacrifice to the goddess of ignorance, and I will seem more appropriate as a burnt offering than I wish I did.

I choose, for two historical editions, the Papers of Thomas Jefferson (published by the Princeton University Press) and the Papers of Alexander Hamilton (published by the Columbia University Press).

The Jefferson Papers have the impressive authorization of an Act of Congress of 1943, by which a special Commission chose the editor and a proposed plan of publication for the approval of the President of the United States. Work got underway in 1944, the first volume was published in 1950, and volume 19 (the last that has come to my hand) in 1974.

The distinguished scholar who was initially appointed has devoted his

full attention to the task since about the time of the first volume. He has had help from a changing staff of one or two associates (who have sometimes been recognized scholars and sometimes skilled editors), and together they have done all the professional work. An advisory committee of twenty or so have held honorific appointments.

The original plan was for 50 volumes, but such plans tend to grow. About a third, perhaps, have come out in the first 28 years. But they are a massive achievement.

The volumes are close to 700 pages in length, with a normal single column for the text but a condensed two-column format for the notes at the end of each item. These notes are relatively brief but they vary in accordance with the material, usually less than a quarter of a page, rarely a couple of pages. Each one includes 1) a physical description of the material, and a list and location of all known versions; 2) an explanatory note on obscure or recondite matters, of which very many are identified; and 3) a textual note. In actual practice, there are very few textual notes, and minor corrections and variant readings are not recorded for ordinary documents; a textual note is usually given only for documents of major importance, and even there with remarkable conciseness. Although the text is intended for scholarly use as a faithful reproduction of Jefferson's writing, it has in fact been modernized in many details: Jefferson began each sentence with a lower-case letter, for example, but his practice has been changed to the modern style.

There are no introductions to the substance of each volume. The introductions take the form of individual editorial notes, but only for important documents such as the Virginia Constitution, which is prefaced by a nine-page editorial note covering all six drafts and the final version.

The work was designed with care, and the books are distinctive in style, with a period flavor, rather on the dense side, particularly the two-column, small notes. The financial responsibility for the entire project has been undertaken by Princeton University, with the aid of substantial grants from the New York Times, from several foundations, and with help from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. Princeton University Press undertook the costs of manufacture and distribution, and many of the volumes have gone into a second or third printing.

For my other example of historical editing, I will mention the Papers of Alexander Hamilton. This is the only edition I know of that has been ably edited by someone who became a dean, a college president, and a professor

yet once more in the course of, and along with, his editorial duties. He has been aided by a changing staff of from one to four assistant or associate editors, who have devoted most of their time to the task. The project was established in 1955 at Columbia University, the first volume was published in 1961, and volume 25 (the most recent one) in 1977, or an average of less than eight months per volume, each of close to 700 pages in length.

This is a brisk edition in more ways than one. It gets right to the point of communicating Hamilton's papers. There are no real introductions to the volumes or to the individual items. There are footnotes at the bottom of the page and at the end of items, locating the item and annotating some difficult matters, but they are spare and concise. The editors conclude their preface with a disarming disclaimer: "Finally, the editors on some occasions were unable to find the desired information, and on other occasions the editors were remiss." (They seem to feel strongly on this topic, as the same comment concludes the preface of each of the 25 volumes.) The notes also give a few—very few—textual variations or mistakes, but the form used (for the *Federalist* papers, for example) probably strikes textual scholars as odd. The editors simply record or calendar (instead of printing out) a good deal of material that they consider routine: various letters and documents by and to Hamilton, the letters he wrote for others, and his letters that deal exclusively with his legal practice. The emphasis is always on Hamilton's papers of importance. I would judge that 90 or 95% of the available space in the edition is devoted to text, and no more than 5 or 10% is given over to front matter, notes, and the index to each volume.

The books are attractive and easy to work with. Typography is used inconspicuously to help the reader. The volumes are not so dense as Jefferson, but not so light and appealing as Hawthorne. The project was undertaken by Columbia University (and its Press), with grants from several corporations and foundations, and help from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

With this little review of four notable editions as a background, I would like to open up—in a very tentative way—two major topics. Those are preparation of texts and preparing annotations. It is a commonplace to say that literary editing at the present time overemphasizes the preparation of the text, while historical editing overemphasizes the annotation of the text. This commonplace may seem to some to be borne out in part, but only in part, by the examples I have talked about. To some, it will not seem so.

It is perhaps worth recalling the nature of the traditions within which we work. The Anglo-American tradition of literary editing includes a rich variety, but the emphasis on the text has generally been strong. Even in the medieval manuscripts which communicate poems, there is a good deal of evidence that the editors—and there were editors then—sometimes consulted more than one version, and that they conflated differing versions in order to produce what they thought the best text. The same practice continued through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the results often perpetuated in printed books which are very difficult to deal with because of the conflation. The earliest major printed English literary edition I know about was William Caxton's remarkable edition of Chaucer in 1478; and Caxton was notably fussy about his texts. When he was told that his Chaucer was printed from an inaccurate copy, he sought out a more accurate text, compared it with his print, and issued a corrected second edition, with a preface which included an apology to the author (who had been dead for 84 years) for hurting and defaming his book by his inadequate text and which concluded with a prayer to God for help in accomplishing the author's ends. The first major English writer to publish a collected edition of his own works was, I believe, Ben Jonson, who caused a folio edition to be issued in 1616. Of course annotation of any kind was virtually unknown in any of the kinds of texts I have been referring to. The attention was always on trying to present the literary material in good texts, and there was a common feeling that the text conferred a kind of immortality on its subject.

The two foreign influences which made the greatest impact on textual literary scholars in the Anglo-American tradition were, I think, practices in editing the New Testament and the Greek and Roman classics. Both of these activities date from the time of antiquity, but they became influential in our tradition mainly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Both focussed attention on ways to perfect the text. From Biblical scholarship we learned about textual analysis, or how to distinguish the relationship of a variety of manuscripts of the same material, particularly from the work on the relations of the four Gospels. From classical scholarship we learned about emendation, or how to correct passages that seem to have become corrupted in the course of manuscript transmission, and about critical editions, or texts based on a collection and comparison of all available texts with their variant readings.

It was with a tradition that included these and other elements that literary scholars in the earlier twentieth century tried to develop textual studies. The material principally examined was English drama of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and a close attention to printing house practices developed at the same time. I believe that some reminders of these traditions and of these more recent developments may be observed in a good deal of our literary editing. It may be that literary editors suffer sometimes from Bibliomania. In the first edition of Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (1728), this term is defined as "an extravagant passion for books, to a degree of madness; or a desire of accumulating them beyond all reason and necessity."

Literary scholars tend to make a distinction between *textual criticism* and *editing*. In a word, *textual criticism* is the term used to cover all of the steps leading to the establishment of the author's text, including the collecting of the variant texts, analyzing the texts, selecting the copy-text, perfecting the copy-text from other sources or by emendation, and giving an accounting of the perfected text. *Editing*, as used by literary scholars, encompasses all of the steps of *textual criticism*, plus a presentation of the perfected text with textual apparatus, with any historical annotations needed, and with any form of requisite introductions.

The traditions in which historical editors work are somewhat different, as I understand them, from those of literary scholars. The work of historical editors derives, in its earlier form, from the desire to collect and preserve documents and records, in the medieval period, charters and property documents, importantly. The great antiquarian movement of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries focussed on the collection and copying of the records of all forms of knowledge of the past, in establishing a new world on the firm foundations of an older age. Piety was surely an element, particularly in the genealogical inquiry. I especially like the comment of a Norfolk man of letters, Thomas Pecke, in 1659: "They are hugely uncivil and notoriously ungrateful who doe not thankfully reward the labour of those who brush the dust from the tombs of their Great-grandfathers."

For our purposes, we can take that brushing of the dust from the tombs of our great-grandfathers to mean the whole process of setting forth and explaining material from the past, or documentary editing. Much of the material, by its nature, was not originally intended for public dissemination: private letters, for example. Such material often requires a kind and degree

of annotation that is different from that for literary works if it is to be understood by the current reader. But first it has to be made available.

I suppose the first American to brush much dust from many of our great-grandfathers' tombs was Jared Sparks. In the twenty years before 1840 he completed, single-handedly, his 12-volume *Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution*, his 3-volume *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, his 12-volume *Life and Writings of George Washington*, his 10-volume *Works of Benjamin Franklin*, and a variety of other publications, all while being a minister of the Gospel, editor of the *North American Review*, and discoverer of many treasure troves of valuable documents, all prior to becoming president of Harvard College.

He brushed the dust off in his own way, it is true, and sometimes brushed away some of the lineaments of our great-grandfathers along with the dust. It was left to workers in the latter nineteenth century to proceed with more scrupulosity in dealing with documents, but they are all our great-grandfathers.

It is easy to see that the tradition of literary editing and the tradition of historical editing have been merging. Literary scholars commonly have to deal with documentary and other material which was *not* intended for public consumption. Historical scholars commonly have to deal with literary and other material that *was* intended for public consumption.

It was a hopeful sign and a fine opportunity for such a group to be assembled at the Kansas conference. We have much to share with one another in working toward an even better level of literary and historical editing.

The Sacred Text: An Improbable Dream

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR.

Both literary and historical editors are engaged in a common purpose. They desire to make available to a large public texts which come as close as possible to what the authors intended to offer as written records of their thoughts. Although two schools of editing have grown up since 1950, editing documents is an ancient and respected tradition. For 2,000 years biblical scholars have been endeavoring to present the books of the Bible as they were originally written. Bruce Metzger in *The Text of the New Testament* explains the divergence and the convergence of that scholarly process. During the Renaissance the discovery of the Greek and Roman classics was the principal order of editing business. During the last thirty years there has been a comparable effort to edit "sacred" texts in the fields of literature and history.

This modern effort has two origins. One stems from a concern to establish the texts of Shakespeare's plays. This has been a continuing intellectual effort from the days of Shakespeare himself. Shakespeare did not write for publication but for players. Thus there was a need to gather together the scripts and prompt sheets, etc., into published form. By the nature of the situation there could be no method. The attempt to bring order out of this chaos reached a new plateau of achievement under the leadership of three English scholars, Alfred W. Pollard, Ronald B. McKerrow, and W. W. Greg. It was Greg in 1949 in his seminal essay "The Rationale of Copy-Text"—expressing views which were endorsed by Fredson Bowers in 1950 in his "Current Theories of Copy-Text"—who launched the modern school of literary editing.

The literary editor is primarily concerned with editing printed texts. He usually works with materials quite different from those with which the historical editor works, for the latter is interested in manuscripts. The nature of the materials marks one of the fundamental differences between the two schools. The first goal of the literary editor is to establish the copy-text, the printed version which comes closest to representing the manuscript that the author sent to the printer. Literary editors now agree that the first printed version has the best claim to be the copy-text. There is no attempt to present a facsimile version to the public for the literary editor desires a *critical* edi-

of annotation that is different from that for literary works if it is to be understood by the current reader. But first it has to be made available.

I suppose the first American to brush much dust from many of our great-grandfathers' tombs was Jared Sparks. In the twenty years before 1840 he completed, single-handedly, his 12-volume *Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution*, his 3-volume *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, his 12-volume *Life and Writings of George Washington*, his 10-volume *Works of Benjamin Franklin*, and a variety of other publications, all while being a minister of the Gospel, editor of the *North American Review*, and discoverer of many treasure troves of valuable documents, all prior to becoming president of Harvard College.

He brushed the dust off in his own way, it is true, and sometimes brushed away some of the lineaments of our great-grandfathers along with the dust. It was left to workers in the latter nineteenth century to proceed with more scrupulosity in dealing with documents, but they are all our great-grandfathers.

It is easy to see that the tradition of literary editing and the tradition of historical editing have been merging. Literary scholars commonly have to deal with documentary and other material which was *not* intended for public consumption. Historical scholars commonly have to deal with literary and other material that *was* intended for public consumption.

It was a hopeful sign and a fine opportunity for such a group to be assembled at the Kansas conference. We have much to share with one another in working toward an even better level of literary and historical editing.

The Sacred Text: An Improbable Dream

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR.

Both literary and historical editors are engaged in a common purpose. They desire to make available to a large public texts which come as close as possible to what the authors intended to offer as written records of their thoughts. Although two schools of editing have grown up since 1950, editing documents is an ancient and respected tradition. For 2,000 years biblical scholars have been endeavoring to present the books of the Bible as they were originally written. Bruce Metzger in *The Text of the New Testament* explains the divergence and the convergence of that scholarly process. During the Renaissance the discovery of the Greek and Roman classics was the principal order of editing business. During the last thirty years there has been a comparable effort to edit "sacred" texts in the fields of literature and history.

This modern effort has two origins. One stems from a concern to establish the texts of Shakespeare's plays. This has been a continuing intellectual effort from the days of Shakespeare himself. Shakespeare did not write for publication but for players. Thus there was a need to gather together the scripts and prompt sheets, etc., into published form. By the nature of the situation there could be no method. The attempt to bring order out of this chaos reached a new plateau of achievement under the leadership of three English scholars, Alfred W. Pollard, Ronald B. McKerrow, and W. W. Greg. It was Greg in 1949 in his seminal essay "The Rationale of Copy-Text"—expressing views which were endorsed by Fredson Bowers in 1950 in his "Current Theories of Copy-Text"—who launched the modern school of literary editing.

The literary editor is primarily concerned with editing printed texts. He usually works with materials quite different from those with which the historical editor works, for the latter is interested in manuscripts. The nature of the materials marks one of the fundamental differences between the two schools. The first goal of the literary editor is to establish the copy-text, the printed version which comes closest to representing the manuscript that the author sent to the printer. Literary editors now agree that the first printed version has the best claim to be the copy-text. There is no attempt to present a facsimile version to the public for the literary editor desires a *critical* edi-

of annotation that is different from that for literary works if it is to be understood by the current reader. But first it has to be made available.

I suppose the first American to brush much dust from many of our great-grandfathers' tombs was Jared Sparks. In the twenty years before 1840 he completed, single-handedly, his 12-volume *Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution*, his 3-volume *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, his 12-volume *Life and Writings of George Washington*, his 10-volume *Works of Benjamin Franklin*, and a variety of other publications, all while being a minister of the Gospel, editor of the *North American Review*, and discoverer of many treasure troves of valuable documents, all prior to becoming president of Harvard College.

He brushed the dust off in his own way, it is true, and sometimes brushed away some of the lineaments of our great-grandfathers along with the dust. It was left to workers in the latter nineteenth century to proceed with more scrupulosity in dealing with documents, but they are all our great-grandfathers.

It is easy to see that the tradition of literary editing and the tradition of historical editing have been merging. Literary scholars commonly have to deal with documentary and other material which was *not* intended for public consumption. Historical scholars commonly have to deal with literary and other material that *was* intended for public consumption.

It was a hopeful sign and a fine opportunity for such a group to be assembled at the Kansas conference. We have much to share with one another in working toward an even better level of literary and historical editing.

The Sacred Text: An Improbable Dream

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR.

Both literary and historical editors are engaged in a common purpose. They desire to make available to a large public texts which come as close as possible to what the authors intended to offer as written records of their thoughts. Although two schools of editing have grown up since 1950, editing documents is an ancient and respected tradition. For 2,000 years biblical scholars have been endeavoring to present the books of the Bible as they were originally written. Bruce Metzger in *The Text of the New Testament* explains the divergence and the convergence of that scholarly process. During the Renaissance the discovery of the Greek and Roman classics was the principal order of editing business. During the last thirty years there has been a comparable effort to edit "sacred" texts in the fields of literature and history.

This modern effort has two origins. One stems from a concern to establish the texts of Shakespeare's plays. This has been a continuing intellectual effort from the days of Shakespeare himself. Shakespeare did not write for publication but for players. Thus there was a need to gather together the scripts and prompt sheets, etc., into published form. By the nature of the situation there could be no method. The attempt to bring order out of this chaos reached a new plateau of achievement under the leadership of three English scholars, Alfred W. Pollard, Ronald B. McKerrow, and W. W. Greg. It was Greg in 1949 in his seminal essay "The Rationale of Copy-Text"—expressing views which were endorsed by Fredson Bowers in 1950 in his "Current Theories of Copy-Text"—who launched the modern school of literary editing.

The literary editor is primarily concerned with editing printed texts. He usually works with materials quite different from those with which the historical editor works, for the latter is interested in manuscripts. The nature of the materials marks one of the fundamental differences between the two schools. The first goal of the literary editor is to establish the copy-text, the printed version which comes closest to representing the manuscript that the author sent to the printer. Literary editors now agree that the first printed version has the best claim to be the copy-text. There is no attempt to present a facsimile version to the public for the literary editor desires a *critical* edi-

tion. This means that the editors take liberties with the copy-text in order to obtain what the editors consider a text closer to the authorial intention. If there is a manuscript, the editor can ascertain through analysis what changes were made by the printer. If there are additional printed versions published during the lifetime of the author, these printings can be collated with the copy-text in order to learn if the author himself suggested changes over a period of time. In the process of collation substantives (word changes) receive more attention than accidentals (punctuation changes).

Literary editors generally do not make changes in the copy-text unless comparison or collation indicates that such changes should be made. Yet on occasion they do make alterations based solely upon their own judgment. The editors of Melville's *Typee* did make certain changes which they thought were warranted because of "erroneous readings." They altered "traces" to "leaves" and "nations" to "matrons." Rules were established for such changes. "Such changes are made only when the copy-text reading is unsatisfactory and when the emendation meets three conditions: it must be a word that Melville would have used in the context, insofar as a survey of his literary practice provides relevant evidence; it must improve the sense of the sentence into which it is placed and fit the tone of the larger context; and it must be a word that, in Melville's hand, could easily have been mis-read as the word in the copy-text."

In this scheme of editing there tend to be no silent changes. Thus the apparatus is almost as important as the text. Here again is one of the fundamental differences in the two schools. As Fredson Bowers has stated, "the proof of one's editorial integrity is the recording in a usable form of all data bearing on the editorial problem." "A definitive edition is dependent for its special status as much upon the material in its introductions and apparatus bearing upon the establishment of the text as it is for the presentation of the established text itself. The two parts can scarcely be separated. No reader should be asked to accept anything in the text on trust. In his introductions and apparatus the editor should place all his textual cards on the table-face up."

One of the chief criticisms of this method is that the apparatus often becomes more important than the text or that it gets in the way of reading the text. The most famous example of such criticism is Lewis Mumford's review of the Emerson journals, "Emerson Behind Barbed Wire." In the Hawthorne and Melville editions the apparatus is placed before and after

the text and does not intrude upon a swift reading. Thus literary editions consist of text and apparatus. It has been suggested with reference to the editing of twentieth-century works which are still under copyright that the apparatus for a volume can be printed separately. The reader can then have a do-it-yourself kit to edit his copy of each of the author's works.

The principal goal of the literary editor is to provide the reader and the scholar with a text which comes the closest to authorial intentions. One of the important by-products of this editing scheme is the enormous amount of bibliographical information which is assembled. This is the documentary evidence upon which basis the copy-text is selected and emended. The audience is ultimately the general reader.

But what is the gain for general knowledge? Edmund Wilson asked with reference to the Emerson edition: "Can these scholars of Cornell and Harvard provide us with actual examples of such serious suppressions and distortions?"

Have the editors of nineteenth-century texts come up with any earth-shaking discoveries? Such research has revealed that Hawthorne cut out of the *Blithe dale Romance* a scene in a saloon because his wife objected to it. The editors have restored the scene to the text on the basis that the author had intended to include it. Is there documentary evidence that Hawthorne acted at his wife's request or on his own second thoughts? But even so, is this a great discovery?

Has there been any discovery comparable to that revolving around the publications of the late seventeenth century editor John Toland? Toland published the *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* in three volumes in 1698 and 1699. Recently there has been unearthed a manuscript in Warwick Castle—"A Voyce from the Watch Tower"—which represents the middle portion of the above three-volume work. It is five times as long as the printed version, so liberties were taken with the manuscript by the editor. In fact, there was a complete rewriting. The Whig historians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries wrote of Ludlow as a man who had waged war like a gentleman, not as a sectary. Toland played down the religious enthusiasms of Ludlow. Ludlow himself was partly responsible for this tampering with his manuscript (although his directions seemed to have been misapplied), for he wrote at the end of his manuscript as follows: "If the Lord please to put a period to my pilgrimage before I have brought this narrative to its perfection, it's my desire, that my dear wife, if living, if not, those of my dear

friends, and relations, into whose hands by providence it shall fall, will take care that if it, or any part of it, be thought of use unto others, it may not be made public, before it hath been perused, rectified, and amended by some one, or more judicious friends, who have a fluent style, are of the same principle with me, as to civil, and spiritual government, the liberty of men, and Christians, and well acquainted with the transactions of the late times, to whom I give full power to deface what he, or they conceive to be superfluous, or impertinent, or what they know to be false, to change and alter what they find misplaced in respect of time, or other circumstances, to add what they conceive to be deficient, or may conduce to render it more useful, and agreeable, to that end to clothe it with a more full, and liquid style, and to illustrate what is therein asserted with such reasons, similes, examples, and testimonies, as they shall think fit. Provided that in the main, they make it speak no other than my principle (which I judge is according to the mind of the Lord) in relation to the government of church and state, and Christ's ruling, yea ruling alone by his spirit in the hearts of his people, and carrying on his work in them by his own weapons, which are spiritual, mighty through his blessing for the beating down of the strongholds of sin, and Satan, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." As Toland edited works of John Milton, Algernon Sidney, James Harrington, and Edmund Ludlow around 1700 and as the manuscripts have been lost, one begins to see that Toland may have had a very great influence indeed on the way in which readers perceived these important figures in the eighteenth century. The volumes which Toland edited are prominent among those which Caroline Robbins in *The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman* has told us were most influential on the leaders of the American Revolution. Editing is therefore a serious business.

But what the textual editors of nineteenth and twentieth century authors are concerned with are misinterpretations by compositors. Essentially they are doing the proof-reading job that the authors themselves did not bother to do. No wonder that one of their magazines is entitled *Proof*.

This statement is not meant to be a negative one. This school of editors has produced superb results—the editions of Hawthorne, Melville, Howells, and Crane. What it does do is to ask for a sense of proportion. It looked as though this movement had culminated in the Center for Editions of American Authors (CEAA), which endorsed a set of rules for the profession and placed its stamp on projects approved. This was perhaps forcing

too much into one mold. That the CEAA has now given way to the Center for Scholarly Editions, sponsored by the Modern Language Association, is evidence of a new sense of proportion.

Now let us go back to the same period—1950—and look at the emergence of another modern school of editing. This school goes back to Ebenezer Hazard and has as its primary goal the making available to a wide audience of the documents from which the history of the republic can be written. On February 18, 1791, Thomas Jefferson wrote Ebenezer Hazard to thank him for the loan of two volumes of records. "They are curious monuments of the infancy of our country. I learn with great satisfaction that you are about committing to the press the valuable historical and State papers you have been so long collecting. Time and accident are committing daily havoc on the originals deposited in our public offices. The late war has done the work of centuries in this business. The last cannot be recovered, but let us save what remains; not by vaults and locks which fence them from the public eye and use in consigning them to the waste of time, but by such a multiplication of copies, as shall place them beyond the reach of accident. This being the tendency of your undertaking, be assured there is not one who wishes it more success than, Sir, your most obedient and most humble servant." One of the central goals therefore of the historical editors is the multiplication of copies, the dissemination among the public of documents which might be lost or which are at least inaccessible. The work to preserve the words of the founding fathers is comparable to the work to find out what Shakespeare himself had to say—both extraordinary endeavors. One provides us with an understanding of our republic; the other with an understanding of our language.

In the first half of this century it was the work of J. Franklin Jameson which must be compared with that of Pollard, McKerrow, and Greg. Jameson spawned countless editing projects. Yet it was Julian Boyd in 1950 in the introduction to the first volume of the Jefferson Papers who produced an essay as seminal for historical editors as Greg's was for literary editors. Boyd explained the primary task and the major problem. "The editors construe their primary task as that of placing the whole body of Jefferson's writings in the hands of historians and of the public as expeditiously as can be done in view of the size and complexity of the undertaking and of the need for completeness and for scrupulous accuracy." His chief admission is that "complete exactitude is impossible in transmuting handwriting into

print." This is the point at which the literary editors are most critical of the historical editors.¹ Boyd does admit an esthetic loss. "And, in truth, the original manuscript has always something which print itself must inevitably lose. An erasure, even a blot, a casual irregularity of hand, and all such little imperfections of mechanical execution, bring us close to the writer, and perhaps convey some of those subtle intimations for which language has no shape." Even the greatest of the purists among literary editors would admit that all cannot be carried forward into print. But what does demand serious consideration by historical editors is the lack of sufficient apparatus and the criticism of their expanded rules for editing which were first enunciated by Boyd and then set forth again in 1954 by Samuel Eliot Morison in the *Harvard Guide to American History*.

The influence of Boyd and Morison has certainly been great. Philip Hamer in establishing the editorial guidelines for the *Papers of Henry Laurens* succinctly caught the essence of the new school when he wrote that "the editors will follow a somewhat middle course between the well-nigh impossible task of reproducing an eighteenth-century manuscript in twentieth-century type and, on the other hand, complete modernization and printing of the papers as if they had been prepared today for publication."

The editors of the *Papers of Henry Laurens* have worked primarily from letterbook copies. Of course, if we have an ALS we edit that version of the letter.² If we have difficulty in making out a word, we naturally refer to the letterbook copy, but we do not note variations in the several texts. It would be possible to write a history of the clerks who transcribed the letters. We know their names; we can with some certainty identify their handwriting. But this in our opinion is work that yields few fruits. We do state in our source notes whenever Laurens himself transcribed the copy. The assumption is and it seems warranted that Laurens was a more accurate transcriber of his own letters than were his clerks. There is the possibility of having more than two versions of the same letter inasmuch as Laurens frequently transmitted several copies of each letter, a common practice in the age of sail. The ALS, a copy, and the letterbook copy of Laurens to William Fisher, March 1, 1769, exist, but such a conjunction of surviving copies is rare.

The place-date line is always printed at the beginning of the document in the upper right-hand side even though this information may appear elsewhere in the document. This rule permits standardized treatment of certain portions of the manuscript.

The complimentary close is reproduced as a continuation of the last paragraph with abbreviations and contractions spelled out and commas inserted as appropriate. This rule permits the saving of space on the page and thus reduces the cost of publication.

The guiding rule in transcription is to save the flavor of the eighteenth-century document where clarity would not be sacrificed. The object is an accurate but readable text. In other words eighteenth-century capitalization and spelling have been retained. Capitals are only added, if necessary, at the beginning of a sentence. When superscripts are brought down to the line and expanded, spelling follows Laurens' practice. Abbreviations not in current use are spelled out. Interlineations have been brought down to the line. All of these changes have been made silently by the editors without diacritical marks or other paraphernalia in order to increase the readability of the manuscript.

Punctuation is reproduced as it is found in the document. However, an appropriate punctuation mark is supplied at the end of every sentence and dashes are deleted unless it is obvious that they should be retained as they would be in modern writing. This is done to save space and increase readability. Commas are added only when the editors are sure that the addition will clarify the meaning of a passage. Unusually long paragraphs may be broken into two or more paragraphs.

The name of a vessel is italicized and the name of the master of the vessel which usually follows is set off by commas. As most vessels were named after persons or places—*London, Carolina, Pitt, Hillsborough, Sally, Laurens*, etc.—this practice permits quick comprehension.

The design of the volume was considered in the light of readability. Each letter has a heading, stating to whom it was written or from whom it was received, and a source note. Annotation is placed at the bottom of the page, not at the end of the document.

The central goal is to make available, usually for the first time, a new corpus of materials. The second goal is readability and usability. The index is all important, and it should include the name of every person and a reference to every subject. Literary editions do not have indexes. Why? Presumably concordances would be the appropriate aid, but then as James Meriwether has said, you cannot have a concordance until you have established all the texts of a particular author.

The literary community does not have quite the same goals. Their

materials are already available in at least one form, and these materials have already been widely dispersed before their work begins. Have more people already read Faulkner than will read Faulkner? But the fruits of the historical editors are being perused for the very first time.

There is another basic difference and that arises in the search for documentary evidence. Bibliography is much more the tool of the literary editor than of the historical editor. The latter is looking for manuscripts which are more difficult to find than various printed editions. How well has the historical editor done his searching? This is one aspect upon which the reviewers seldom comment. Some editors do their job of searching better than others, but each has a separate and unique task. Indeed the progress of a project itself acts as a vacuum cleaner sucking in items along the way, sometimes from the most unexpected places. No project has had all information in hand before beginning. This editor did not read every item in the Laurens corpus before beginning; nor has he yet read every scrap of that material.

But the historical editor meets his greatest criticism in the charge that the reader cannot know how faithful he has been to the original text. After the formulation of the rules of transcription, the results must be taken on faith for much is silently done and there is, in contrast to the works of literary editors, a minimum of apparatus. The emphasis is always on readability and on the quickest possible dissemination. Cost is one of the imperatives.

Of what does the apparatus of an historical editing project consist? For each volume there is an introduction which besides providing a glimpse of the contents gives a description of the documents, though admittedly in the most general terms—the number of letterbooks used, whether foreign or domestic, etc. The source note though brief is perhaps the most important component of the apparatus for it lists the category of document, the depository where the original may be found, the address, the number of enclosures, the docket, and a few textual references from time to time such as whether Laurens himself may have copied a portion of the letterbook copy. Footnotes referring to textual matters are occasionally used in the case of noting the inclusion of marginalia or keyed notes, though postscripts recorded later in a letterbook are not so indicated. A list of abbreviations used in annotation, a chronology geared to the particular volume, and an appendix listing the legislative activity, if any, of Laurens are included in each volume.

In a sense it is fair to say that annotation is to the historical editor what apparatus is to the literary editor. The fiercest attack upon the literary editors from scholars within their own fields is over apparatus while in the historical field it is over annotation. In both cases the cry has been: "why give us so much?" Both groups of editors answer: "to throw light upon the texts." But it should be noted that the apparatus of the literary editors throws light inwardly while annotation throws light both inwardly and outwardly. Apparatus tends to confine thinking to the text at hand; annotation tends to release thinking in a thousand new directions. Annotation should lead to further exploration of the myriad subjects embedded in the texts. This is a legitimate role for the footnote. It is quite possible that when a project has been completed in the field of historical editing an entire new body of historical work will arise—work that is not repetitive or imitative but creative in the most original way. Daniel Littlefield has just completed a study entitled "African Immigrants: Aspects of Ethnic Interaction in Colonial South Carolina," a manuscript which is based to a large extent on the letters of Henry Laurens.

There is one problem that faces the historical editors which may not be a problem to their literary counterparts—that is, consistency over the entire series. The historical editing projects tend to endure over a longer period of time which may be another reason why the apparatus has to be reduced to a minimum. Many of the long-range projects will have a succession of editors in chief. Are the rules of transcription adhered to throughout the series? Certainly one is aware that changes in annotation have taken place. The Madison Papers is the best example. Questions of selectivity may also change as those in charge of the project take advantage of the retirement of an editor to reshape the project subtly, usually for the purpose of pushing it forward more rapidly. But to return to questions concerning transcription. The final "ed" of a word can quite often be easily read in two different ways. One editor may tend to want to standardize "'d," another "ed." We have a continual problem with capital "S" and capital "P." The use of the tilde in the eighteenth century to foreshorten a word can be overlooked, particularly if one is working from xerox copies.

Another problem surely faced only by the historical editors arises from the fact that the same document may appear in two separate editions. Boyd publishes all Jefferson-Madison correspondence; so does Rutland. This means that the same document appears in print under two different sets of

rules. If one compares the letter that John Adams wrote to William Tudor of September 29, 1774, as it appears in Lyman Butterfield's *Papers of John Adams* with the same document as it appears in Paul Smith's *Letters of Delegates to Congress*, one will find fifteen variations in the texts. Four variations in capitalization show the difficulties involved in reading such letters as "s," "a," and "o;" five differences in punctuation reflect differences in the basic rules for handling dashes. These nine pertain to accidentals. Five variations fall into a category which proves how difficult it is to edit from photocopies. For an editor handling the documents of one man, it is generally easier to go back to the originals for a final check inasmuch as the bulk of the material is in one place. For the editor of the delegates to Congress it is almost impossible. In the above instance it would appear that Paul Smith was working from a photocopy while Butterfield was working from the original letter. Thus where Butterfield could be certain of end-of-line readings, Smith had to make some conjectures which he enclosed in brackets. The final variation is a matter of style—the placement of five lines of verse on the page. This writer has not had the opportunity to compare the two printed versions with the original, but enough can be gleaned to point up the incompatibilities. It is therefore obvious that there might be as many edited versions of a document as there are editors.

The greatest departure from the original text appears when a document is translated from one language into another. The *Lafayette Papers* has solved this problem by printing all letters and documents in English, but adding the French texts as an appendix to each volume. The purist might say let the reader struggle, but as these series are designed for an English-speaking audience, the editors have certainly made the correct decision.

Although the bulk of most historical editing is based on manuscripts, previously printed materials do form a small corpus in a number of series. Five pamphlets are included in the last three volumes of the *Laurens Papers*. Four emanated from Laurens' pen; the fifth was written by his adversary Egerton Leigh. Following the bibliographic leads in Thomas R. Adams' study of pre-revolutionary pamphlets, all known copies of the Laurens pamphlets were assembled and compared for variants. The examination revealed multiple printings of only one: *Extracts from the Proceedings of the High Court of Vice-admiralty*. That pamphlet was published in February 1769. Two additional printings were discovered. But which came first? The chief variant was a non-recoverable deletion which was inked through

in the copy held by the New York Public Library. In the other copies, the deletion is omitted by a resetting of the line. This suggests that the New York copy is the first printing, but there is no conclusive evidence. Nevertheless, the editors adopted the New York copy as their copy-text and noted all variations from that text in editorial footnotes. Additionally, a second edition of this pamphlet was issued in August 1769. Variations between the first and second editions are also noted in the annotation of the first edition. This eliminated the costly necessity of publishing the second edition. But a similar treatment was not accorded Egerton Leigh's pamphlet. A copy-text was arbitrarily established and other copies were examined only to determine the existence of marginalia.

It should be apparent from this discussion that in the field of historical editing there never could have been an institution comparable to the CEAA. Of course the NHPRC does act as an umbrella. It has brought many projects into being, funded many in part, acted as a clearing house of information, cooperated in searches of auction catalogues, convened conferences for the exchange of ideas. And in this conference the NHPRC has extended its program of meetings in conjunction with the CSE. The editor who is most aware of all developments may be the best editor.

Surely both schools of editors desire to expand knowledge. In this they have the same goals. Perhaps the chief role played by all editors is to be an example to the public of the need to take care with one's work. In an age of declining skills in reading and writing, we can be a weight at the other end of the scales. Though I sometimes feel that just as we obtain the perfect text, we shall find that our audience has lost the ability to read.

NOTES

1. G. Thomas Tanselle in his recent article, "The Editing of Historical Documents," states that Boyd's editorial method "reflects no coherent textual rationale." Tanselle would have liked Boyd to have treated all documents in the literal manner in which he treated the Declaration of Independence so as not to conceal any evidence "that could conceivably be of use." However, he even finds fault with Boyd's literal transcription of the Declaration as the reader cannot reconstruct the stages of revision. For Tanselle readability is of secondary importance. The text, the text, it is always the text! ". . . if one seriously wishes to understand a text, whatever it is, no aspect of it can be slighted."

2. Historical editors also have a "copy-text," although ours is based primarily on the version which is *closest* to the author. Thus a letter written and signed by Laurens—particularly a recipient's copy, with docket or some other indication that it was actually received by the addressee—would take precedence over all other versions of the letter, be they LS, AL, letter-book copy, drafts, contemporary copy, non-contemporary copy, or printed version.

Literary Editing

G. THOMAS TANSALLE

When John Passmore recently reviewed three volumes of the new Harvard edition of William James, he complained about the attention that had been devoted in them to recording variant readings and punctuation. Having spent some time, he said, on the textual study of the Jacobean drama, he was able to see the value of such information for those "devoted to the study of James's rhetoric, or to changes in punctuation and spelling in the earlier years of the century." But "as an edition for philosophers," he maintained, "one cannot but wish that the editorial energies devoted to its preparation had been rather differently distributed." Philosophers, he had stated earlier, "go to James because they are interested in, let us say, truth or meaning or experience and they suppose that James might have something to teach them." As a result, he asserts, "The function of an edition of a philosopher is in this respect quite different from the function of an edition of a novelist."

The idea that scholarly editions of literary works should somehow be different in approach or emphasis from those of philosophical, historical, scientific, or other writings is a curiously widespread one, and Passmore's remarks are characteristic of this point of view. But the form his remarks take also makes clear, to any thoughtful reader, how untenable the position is. He assumes, first, that stylistic and formal matters are distinct from the content of a piece of writing and, second, that students of literature concentrate on the style of literary works, whereas philosophers are concerned with the content of philosophical works. Obviously, however, writings generally referred to as "literature" have truths and insights to convey, and literary scholars examine nuances of style as the means by which ideas are communicated with precision; similarly, one is not in a position to get the most out of a piece of "philosophic" writing without looking closely at its form of expression. As Frederick Burkhardt said in his letter replying to Passmore's review, "It is difficult to understand why the writings of our leading thinkers do not merit the same scrupulous editorial attention given to literary figures, unless it is assumed that a philosopher's thought can somehow be seriously studied in isolation from the style which conveys it and the process by which he developed his final text."² A careful reading of any piece of writing, whatever its content or approach, must—by definition, one would have

thought—involve consideration of the manner of expression, which is indeed an inextricable part of the content.

That so-called "literary" works should not be accorded different editorial treatment from other kinds of writing is evident when one considers that no distinct boundary lines exist separating one type of writing from another. Many efforts have been made to define "literature"; and while some of them provide illuminating insights into the nature of the literary experience or of communication in general, they have not resulted in any established or accepted method for distinguishing "literary" works from other types of communication. Even if the literary or imaginative or creative aspects of communication could be effectively segregated from the more directly factual or expository, one would still have no practical basis for classifying whole works, since they would so frequently be found to contain both kinds of communication. Novels can contain factually accurate expository passages, and philosophical or historical treatises can utilize passages of metaphorical statement. The nature of each work as an entity may be equally mixed: "histories," for instance, are often read as literary works, whereas works that superficially appear to be novels may actually be historical accounts. Stanley Edgar Hyman's book *The Tangled Ban* (1962) effectively illustrates how the works of Darwin, Marx, Frazer, and Freud can be taken as imaginative writing. Any approach to editing that attempts to justify differing treatment for "literature" and for other works is thus built on an insecure foundation, for the simple reason that "literature" is not a fixed body of material and what constitutes "literature" is a matter of judgment.³

But there is an even more important, and basic, reason. Whether a work is "creative" or "nonfictional," it is made up of an arrangement of words and punctuation marks; it is a piece of verbal communication, whatever else it may be. And while one may argue that literary communication is different from other communication, the fact is that both utilize words and language; one must therefore know precisely what arrangement of words and marks is involved before one has any basis for deciding that a particular text is "literary." A writer may claim to be writing a novel or a history, but that claim does not determine what the finished product turns out to be; one can venture an opinion on what the work is only after examining it. Serious readers will wish to know that the texts in front of them are reliable ones, and they will wish to have available for each work a textual record indicating its textual history and listing the variant readings that have been

present in significant texts of it. The task of the scholarly editor is to prepare such editions, placing before readers the evidence necessary for an intelligent approach to each work. To believe that philosophers can expect to extract the "truth" from a philosophic work without being concerned with its means of expression and without wishing to know at particular points what textual variants there may be is to believe that philosophers are careless readers. Of course, some of them are, just as some literary scholars are: there are irresponsible people in every field. But surely all serious students, regardless of their fields, are concerned to have at their disposal as much information as possible about the contents of the documents that preserve their heritage. They cannot hope to understand what those documents say without examining their style and form. The inseparability of form and content in historical writing has been well put by Savoie Lottinville, who recognizes that "the search for historical reality is only half the game, the search for historical meaning, captured in writing style, is the other half."⁴ The same point could be extended to any other kind of writing: attention to the details of expression is not unique to the study of literature but is in fact a prerequisite for understanding any verbal communication.

The useful distinction to be made is not between literary editing and other kinds of editing but instead between the kinds of documents that editors—regardless of their fields—have to deal with. Two broad classes of documents, calling for different editorial treatment, do exist: documents preserving writings of the kind normally intended for publication and those preserving writings of the kind not normally intended for publication. Historians more often find themselves editing the latter kind of writing, and as a result they have not had as much experience editing the former as have literary scholars; and literary scholars, in turn, have had somewhat less occasion for editing private documents. This situation no doubt accounts for some of the lack of understanding that has existed between editors of NHPRC editions and those of CEAA and CSE editions.⁵ But historians do at times have to edit the texts of published books, and literary scholars frequently are called upon to edit diaries, notebooks, and letters, and their methods in these cases are often different from those of their colleagues in the other field. There is no reason, however, why a diary should be edited one way if its author was a statesman and another way if its author was a novelist, or why the text of a published work should be approached differently according to whether it was written by a "historical" or a "literary"

figure. The promotion of better understanding among editors in different fields is greatly to be desired, but progress in assessing common problems can be made only if the problems are indeed seen to be common: little is to be gained by comparing an NHPRC volume of letters with a CEAA volume of a novel. In making a few comments on "literary editing," therefore, I wish to look first at writings not intended for publication and then at those intended for publication—for these categories extend beyond the bounds of "literature." In other words, I am dealing with "literary editing" only in the sense that the rationale and approaches set forth below are those that seem to me to represent the best practices on the part of recent editors of the writings of "literary" figures; but I do not wish to imply that those approaches are somehow more appropriate for "literary" writings, since in fact I believe that they are equally applicable to virtually all writing.

I

Writings not intended for publication are fundamentally different in character from those intended to be published, by virtue of the fact that, as private documents, there are no constraints placed on their idiosyncrasy. What one writes in a diary, private notebook, or journal for one's own purposes has no obligation to meet any public conventions of decorum or even of intelligibility. One may write a diary in a private shorthand, like Pepys; or when in a notebook one inserts an alternative wording for a phrase there is no necessity to make a final choice between the two versions. Even letters, though they are intended to be read by someone else (usually an audience of one), are not normally written for the public at large, and they can be just as eccentric in manner of presentation as other private papers. False starts, excised words, slips of the pen, peculiar abbreviations, and unusual punctuation are among the characteristic features of all kinds of private documents. These elements constitute part of the evidence that such documents preserve and can often be important clues to the writer's psychology and personality. They are, in other words, integral parts of the content of the documents, whether or not they were consciously intended by the persons who wrote them. The writers' intention is not an issue here, because what one is interested in is the historical evidence that the documents present as they stand. Whatever form a letter was in when it was sent or whatever form a journal was in when its author died is by definition the "intended" form of such documents (that is, with all canceled or alternative

readings as integral parts of the text); they were constructed to serve a private function, which is inevitably subverted by any attempt to alter the precise form present in the documents.⁶ However rough these documents may seem, they cannot be regarded as rough drafts: they are finished products, not preliminary stages of uncompleted works, and the roughness is simply one of the usual characteristics of this kind of writing.⁷

Many editors would be in essential agreement with this view, but they would not necessarily draw from it the same inferences about the nature of the published text that should result. Some would argue that, for purposes of serious study, there is no substitute for the original documents and that therefore little useful purpose is served, and much effort wasted, by many of the attempts to be meticulous in transferring to print the characteristics of manuscripts. A more effective argument, however, would stress the advantages of having conveniently accessible a text that has had the benefit of a specialist's attention and would point out how frequently a carefully prepared text can in fact serve scholars more effectively than the original documents. It is true, of course, that such features of an original as the paper and the inks, the formation of the letters, the positions of the words and lines in relation to each other and to the piece of paper, the method of crossing out words, and so on furnish evidence about the writer's habits and state of mind, and any form of publication of a document entails a loss of evidence to some degree. But the effects of the compromise can often be mitigated by editorial commentary, discussing the aspects of the document not recoverable in the published version, and certainly the editor's transcription of the text of the document, providing readers with an expert assessment of what each mark on the paper signifies, can be a great boon to further scholarly work.

If there is no doubt about the desirability of publishing the texts of significant documents,⁸ the editorial question becomes the determination, in each case, of what degree of compromise—of alteration of the original—can be considered appropriate. Some form of photographic reproduction naturally entails the least sacrifice of detail, and when accompanied by a transcription it offers an ideal means for making a document widely available. The expense of publishing documents in this fashion,⁹ however, prevents it from becoming the method employed routinely for all sorts of documents. Type facsimiles are also too expensive for general use: *Shelley and His Circle*¹⁰ is a great example of the detailed representation in print of hand-

written documents, with caret-ed insertions, for instance, placed above the line in smaller type, but the method employed in it is obviously not feasible economically in most situations. And a practical problem not solved by photographic or type facsimiles is the difficulty of quoting from the texts they present; each quoter must in effect become an editor, determining how the quoted passage is to be rendered in ordinary typography. For practical purposes, then, discussion of the editorial treatment of writings not intended for publication comes down to a consideration of what alterations need to be made in the *text* of a document before it is published in printed form. One can take for granted that such physical features of the document as the paper, the ink(s), the margins, the spacing of the lines, and so on will be sacrificed and will have to be covered by the editor's description. What remains to be transferred to print is the actual writing, and the question is how faithful the transcription ought to be to the *textual* (as opposed to the spatial or physical) features of the original. Should unconventional practices, such as the use of dashes for periods and lower-case letters for sentence openings, be normalized? Should canceled words or false starts be reproduced? Should interlinear insertions be labeled as such? In discussing these questions, many editors—though by no means all—have adduced "the reader's convenience" and argued on that basis that some normalization is appropriate. Their position involves two curious assumptions: first, that the reader's convenience sometimes takes precedence over textual accuracy; second, that certain aspects of punctuation and spelling are not significant parts of the original and can therefore be altered without affecting a reader's understanding of the text. These two interrelated points deserve to be examined, because any rationale for editing materials not intended for publication will rest on the stand taken in regard to them.

When the reader's convenience is spoken of, one assumes that it is the welfare of the "general" reader, not the specialist or scholarly reader, that is being considered (although many editions of documents would seem not to have much of a potential audience other than scholars)—for surely no serious scholar would feel "inconvenienced" by having to adjust to idiosyncratic punctuation and spelling, if those were characteristics of the text of the document. But just how much is the general or nonspecialist reader really put off by such features of a text? The answer would appear to be that they are not bothered nearly so much as many editors seem to think. In fact, when editors argue that various alterations must be made if certain sentences

are to be readily comprehensible to the reader, they often succeed only in showing their over-zealousness and condescension. To tell readers that the text has been smoothed out by placing periods at the ends of sentences and capital letters at the beginnings (this situation is a very common one) is bound to be an insult to their intelligence and is certain to make them wonder why the editor has gone to such unnecessary trouble. When the punctuation at a particular point in a manuscript produces a true ambiguity, the matter can always be discussed in a note; but to eliminate such problems by repunctuation is to alter the nature of the text, and in most instances of unconventional punctuation there is no real lack of clarity anyway. Readers will generally have little more difficulty with such texts than with some letters from their friends—indeed, they expect raggedness as a characteristic of texts not intended for publication. Serious readers—whether scholars or not—do not consult texts because they are easy to read and will not abandon them merely because they offer some difficulties; but such readers have cause for complaint when they are presented with texts containing editorial alterations made for the ostensible purpose of helping them to follow those texts. To place the reader's ease of reading above fidelity to the original text is doubly misguided: in the first place, the assistance rendered the reader is generally superfluous; in the second, the reader's convenience is surely better served by the availability of a text as close to the original as possible.

A more serious issue than the reader's convenience is the role which idiosyncratic punctuation and spelling, canceled words, apparently superseded but uncanceled readings, and the like play in the text of a document. Even if the retention of such features caused readers some difficulty (which in general it does not), there would be strong reason for retaining them. After all, the point of editing a document not intended for publication is to make more widely available the evidence it contains, and every mark on it is a part of that evidence, including canceled words, slips of the pen, and dashes for periods. A few editors have regarded close attention to these details as pedantic and have felt that the exact reproduction of the spelling and punctuation of a documentary text stresses quaintness over content. But anyone who can dismiss as "pedantic" a concern with the totality of textual evidence available or who cannot see more than quaintness in the characteristics of a given period or writer is surely taking a superficial view of what it means to read and study a document from the past. Responsible scholars and serious readers will not wish to be deprived of any of the evidence that can be

transmitted through the medium of print, for they will understand that the punctuation and spelling, the errors and cancellations, and so on, are part of the texture, and thus ultimately of the meaning, of the text of a document. Sentences joined with dashes or punctuated sparsely produce a different effect from those regularly ending in full stops or those that are heavily punctuated, and knowing what word a writer put down before altering it to another word can often give one a fuller understanding of what is being said; all such details help one to assess a writer's frame of mind and method of working. Normalizing, or smoothing out, a text does not necessarily have the same aims as modernizing, but in practice it becomes a form of modernizing, for it moves one some distance away from the surviving text and forces the text to yield to an alien regularity. Modernizing the spelling and punctuation of a text not intended for publication is clearly inappropriate because it conceals some of the evidence that constitutes the reason for looking at the document in the first place; one can hardly improve on Clarence E. Carter's statement—made in particular reference to historical documents—that modernization "tends to obscure rather than to clarify."¹¹ Any attempt at normalizing can be objected to on the same grounds. The best course to follow, therefore, in bringing into print the text of a document not intended for publication is to do as little to that text as possible.

Although one can naturally find many editions of the letters and journals of literary figures that do not follow this advice, it is also true that there is a strong tradition among literary editors of preserving all the textual features of these documents with scrupulous care. Gordon N. Ray, in his edition of *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945-46), recognized that not to reproduce the peculiarities of the manuscripts would be "to falsify the tone and blur the meaning" (I, lxxiii). R. W. Chapman, in *The Letters of Samuel Johnson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), similarly followed the manuscripts "as closely as typography admits," preserving Johnson's "inadvertences" because they "furnish some indication of his state of health or his state of mind" and "show the sort of error to which he was prone" (I, viii). Leslie A. Marchand, in the first volume of his edition of Byron's letters and journals (*In my hot youth*) (London: Murray, 1973), pointed out that one cannot be sure, from the punctuation of the originals, whether Byron "recognized the sentence as a unit of expression" and that an attempt to normalize his punctuation "may often arbitrarily impose a meaning or an emphasis

not intended by the writer"; Marchand concluded that "there is less danger of distortion if the reader may see exactly how he punctuated and then determine whether a phrase between commas or dashes belongs to one sentence or another" (p. 28). Other effective statements and demonstrations of the intelligence of this policy can be found in Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley's *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), Ralph L. Rusk's *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), Hyder Edward Rollins's *The Letters of John Keats* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), Thomas H. Johnson's *The Letters of Emily Dickinson* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1958), Henry Nash Smith and William M. Gibson's *Mark Twain-Howells Letters* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960), the edition of Washington Irving's *Journals and Notebooks* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969-) produced by Henry A. Pochmann *et al.* (and containing a particularly detailed discussion of the matter), Herbert M. Schueller and Robert L. Peters's *The Letters of John Addington Symonds* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967-69), and Elvan Kintner's *The Letters of Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Barrett, 1845-1846* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969)—to name only a few excellent editions of the past forty years or so.

It should be clear that the editor's task, viewed in this light, does not become simply a mechanical one. The fact that editors pledge themselves to report all textual details of the documents does not mean that no judgment is involved. Some manuscripts are of course clearer, and offer fewer difficulties, than others, but it is a rare case in which the editor's judgment is not called upon to determine exactly what the author wrote at particular points. The editor, as an expert in the handwriting of a given author and period, is in a better position than most other people to read that handwriting accurately, and one of the great contributions of an editor's transcription is the authority it represents in the deciphering of the hand. But the fact remains that subjective decisions are required, and no two qualified editors would be likely to come up with precisely the same transcription of a manuscript—at least, if it contains any difficult spots at all. For this reason, one can scarcely be too meticulous in describing the evidence and discussing any debatable readings. Even though an editor is undertaking no emendations—no alterations to correct or normalize the text of the document—there

are still textual decisions to be reported: printing as "these" a word that could possibly be "those," for example, or deciding that what looks like "brng" is actually a careless rendering of "bring" and not an abbreviated form or a misspelling. One edition that deals thoroughly with this kind of problem is Merrell R. Davis and William H. Gilman's *The Letters of Herman Melville* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960); a perusal of the textual notes to this edition illustrates how editors must often differentiate between careless handwriting (where a word may be regarded as spelled correctly, though some of its letters are indistinctly formed) and actual misspellings or nonce abbreviations (which would not be corrected or expanded in a printed *literatim* text). Transcribing the text of a document thus requires editorial expertise and judgment—directed toward the determination of what is actually in the text, not what one may believe ought to be in it.

There is also another way in which editorial judgment enters into preparing an edition of a text not intended for publication: one must decide which details can be incorporated within the text itself and which are to be relegated to textual notes. This decision involves more than a question of form, for whenever a characteristic of the text (such as a canceled word or the fact that a particular word was inserted above the line) is reported in a note rather than in the body of the edited text, the resulting text is a step farther from the original than would otherwise be the case. Some editors, however, may feel that this additional compromise is justified in certain situations. The incorporation into the text of cancellations and information about insertions requires a number of symbols, and in the case of complicated manuscripts an editor may decide that the symbols become inefficiently cumbersome and that the information can be more conveniently conveyed through a set of appended notes or tables. Although practical considerations may sometimes dictate this procedure, one must recognize that it in effect involves editorial emendation, for certain elements integral to the original text are deleted or altered; having them available in the notes is of course essential but not quite the same thing as being able to see directly the role they play in the texture of the original. Several admirable editions, whose editors thoroughly understand the necessity of preserving the texture of writings not intended for publication, manage effectively to combine the idea of retaining most of the irregularities of the documents with that of emending a few particularly troublesome ones. For instance, both *The*

Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson (ed. William H. Gilman *et al.*, Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960-) and Mark Twain's *Notebooks & Journals* (ed. Frederick Anderson *et al.*; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975-) offer careful texts containing cancellations, insertions, and so on, but each also contains at the end a list of certain editorial alterations not labeled in the text. The point to be emphasized about these editions is not that they incorporate some emendations which might not be universally agreed upon but that they put on record any editorial changes made, recognizing the crucial importance of informing the reader of all textual details of the original.

Varying circumstances may naturally lead to varying treatments: material by prominent writers likely to be widely read and quoted, for example, may sometimes call for somewhat different handling from documents of a more limited appeal. But such adjustments are concessions to practical exigencies and do not affect the theoretical position; their result may be that the textual evidence is reported in a different fashion but should not be that any of it is concealed through silent emendations. The most satisfactory editing of documents not intended for publication has been founded on the principle that all the irregularities and roughnesses of the texts of such documents are inextricable parts of what those texts communicate; editors following this principle have therefore aimed to reproduce in print as many of these features of texts as possible, and when they have decided that certain alterations should be made they have provided a complete record of the changes and the original readings. One is interested in these texts as their authors left them, not as they might conceivably have been revised if their authors had had further opportunity; and no detail of these texts is so small that it can safely be regarded as an inconsequential, and thus expendable, part of the preserved evidence.¹²

II

What this reasoning asserts about the importance of the formal features of texts not intended for publication is equally applicable to texts intended for publication; but in the latter case there is an additional factor—the author's intention—to be taken into account. Authors writing for the public have preferences and intentions regarding the words and punctuation that are to appear in their texts in print, but there can normally be no guarantee that any one of the surviving printed or manuscript texts contains all these

desired features and thus corresponds exactly to its author's intentions. Editors who wish to establish the most authoritative form of a text, the form that represents the author's desires as fully as surviving evidence permits, must therefore take an eclectic approach and incorporate into their text evidence derived from various sources. They cannot have as their goal the faithful reproduction of any single document, for no one document can be confidently relied upon to reflect the author's intentions in every respect; in occasional instances, of course, it may happen that an editor judges no emendation to be called for in a particular text, but the resulting edited text is still the product of critical evaluation and not of a policy requiring the blanket acceptance of all the details of a given text. An edition of this kind is generally called a "critical edition" because its text is prepared through a process relying on the editor's judgment and critical insight: the editor, after an assessment of all relevant evidence, may decide that certain readings from one text should be combined with those from another text or may believe that certain readings are corrupt in all texts and require editorial substitution. This type of editing is what is frequently thought of as "literary editing," because fiction, drama, and poetry have been accorded this treatment more often perhaps than any other genres of writing. But clearly all kinds of writing intended for public distribution—histories, scientific treatises, expository and analytical essays of all sorts—are equally amenable to this approach. It is true, nevertheless, that editors of "literary" works have had the most experience in thinking about and putting into practice the concept of critical editing.

One of the first points they would make about the nature of their work is that the emendation of a text does not involve any lack of respect for historical evidence. Indeed, scholarly critical editors will always insist on including some form of editorial apparatus to make clear exactly what changes they have made in a particular basic text and what other variants exist in other relevant texts. They wish to place before the reader, in other words, the evidence that underlies their textual decisions. Their emendations, when responsibly made, are not merely officious tamperings but attempts to produce a text nearer its author's wishes than any preserved document happens to be; though these editors are specialists, their decisions still involve subjective judgments that are legitimately open to debate, and they recognize that readers need to have available the original readings of the emended text, as well as any other readings that constituted part of the fund of information

on which the editorial decisions were based. There is no question, then, in critical editing, of any concealment or distortion of historical evidence: by consulting the notes a reader can always reconstruct the textual features of the relevant documents.

One might ask why the reader should be put to this bother and what is gained by incorporating the editor's emendations into the text rather than printing them in notes. The answer involves both theoretical and practical considerations. On the theoretical side, one must recognize that a work intended for publication should somewhere be given an appearance in print that as fully as possible realizes its author's wishes. To offer suggested emendations only in notes would be to present the materials for a finished text but not the finished text itself; and there is a great difference between being able to read and respond to a coherent text and having to construct that text as one goes along. Just as works not intended for publication should be printed so as to show the roughness characteristic of the original, works intended for publication should be printed so as to reflect their authors' intentions. The fact that these intentions can rarely be known with complete certainty and that some of the editors' decisions are thus open to question does not invalidate the attempt: one is willing to accept some degree of uncertainty in return for the benefits of texts incorporating specialists' judgments regarding the authors' intentions. From a practical point of view, there is the question of what text will be used in future reprintings and editions. Many works intended for publication (and not only those in belles lettres) have become classics that circulate more or less widely among the general public, and it is unrealistic to think that the editions in which they appear will normally contain lists of variant readings or that the persons who prepare those editions will generally give careful attention to such lists in scholarly editions. Scholarly critical editors will therefore be contributing to the widespread dissemination of texts in the forms intended by their authors if they publish those texts in such a way as to encourage reprinting. The simpler it is for a reprint publisher to lease and reproduce by photo-offset a reliably edited text the more often such reproduction will occur. It is true that publishing a critical text without its accompanying textual apparatus conceals some textual evidence, but that evidence is available in print in the original scholarly edition—and surely it is better for a text to receive wide distribution in a form representing its author's intentions,

insofar as scholarship can determine them, than in a form known to contain errors or superseded readings.

None of this is meant to suggest that there is not also a place for editions of unemended texts of individual documents. Many manuscripts or drafts of works intended for publication are complex enough or of enough significance for literary history that it is appropriate to have exact transcriptions of them available in published form. Such editions, one must clearly recognize, are no different from editions of writings not intended for publication: in both cases the interest is in the features present in a particular document. The fact that a document contains a draft of a work intended for publication does not mean that one cannot treat it as an end in itself; in this sense it is a private document, not intended for publication in precisely its present form,¹³ and students of the author have a legitimate interest in the evidence displayed in the document. The central point, however, is that in the case of writings intended for publication the matter does not end here, as it must for private writings. There is nothing further to do to writings not intended for publication; but any work intended for a public audience demands an additional operation, which attempts to evaluate the documentary text or texts: first assessing how closely each of them conforms to what the author intended the audience to see, and then producing, if required, an eclectic and emended text that does conform more closely with those intentions. Only in this way can justice be done to a work as a finished intellectual production; justice can be done to a document as a repository of physical evidence by reproducing that evidence faithfully, but if the work embodied in the document is one intended for publication, the act of transcription does not fulfill the scholarly obligations toward the text of the *work* (as opposed to that of the *document*). This point is well illustrated by the treatment accorded Melville's *Billy Budd* manuscript by Harrison Hayford and Merton M. Sealts, Jr. (in their 1962 University of Chicago Press edition). At the time of his death, Melville had not put this manuscript in final shape; indeed, it is a very difficult manuscript, full of cancellations and revisions, but it is the only source of the text of this work. Because of its importance as a document in American literary history, Hayford and Sealts present it in a "genetic" transcription, indicating with the help of symbols the textual features of the manuscript and the stages of revision involved. If the text of this document had been made up of journal or diary entries, they could have stopped at that point; but because it consists of a work of fiction,

a work of a kind normally intended for publication, they go on and produce a "reading text," a text free of editorial symbols and composed of Melville's final readings, along with any further emendations that they judge to be necessary to rectify authorial slips. The reading text is thus concerned with a work of American literature, the genetic text with a document of American literary history. Providing authoritative reading texts is the ultimate editorial goal in connection with works intended for publication; and because the information supplied by genetic transcriptions can (with greater or lesser efficiency, depending on the complexity of the situation) be appended, in the form of textual apparatus, to reading texts, those transcriptions are not likely to be separately published except in the case of the most important documents. Subordinating this information to a finished reading text is not meant to belittle its importance—for it is clearly important—but simply reflects the fact that transcription is not the final stage of the scholarly editorial process for certain kinds of writing.

Just how one can tell when a piece of writing was intended for publication—or how one settles any other question of authorial intention—is naturally a difficult matter. Generally one can operate on the principle that works of the kind normally intended for publication—novels, poems, essays, and so on—should be treated as intended for publication, whether or not their authors actually published them. But there are borderline cases: deciding, for instance, whether the manuscript of an unpublished novel is finished enough to serve as the basis for a critical edition or whether it is so rough and fragmentary that it must be regarded as a private paper. Similarly, with writings not normally intended for publication, like letters and diaries, there will be instances in which external and internal evidence convinces the editor that the writers of these documents were indeed writing for the public and that the texts should be edited accordingly.¹⁴ Another problem of intention that requires the exercise of editorial judgment is defining what intention to focus on in preparing a critical text. Certainly one cannot accept at face value statements that writers may make about their own intentions: such statements may be at odds with what is evident in the writings themselves, and, even when the discrepancy is not so obvious, the mixture of motivations that may underlie those statements makes them an untrustworthy guide. Although all available evidence, including authors' statements, should be taken into account, editors must ultimately rely on the characteristics of each piece of writing in determining what its author intended to say; the editor

is concerned not with what writers intend in advance to do, or think afterward that they have done, but with their intention in the act of writing, their intention to have one particular word follow another. The only primary evidence for that intention, therefore, is the writing itself: the editor, armed with knowledge of the author's habits, contemporary customs, and other historical information, decides whether or not to emend at a given point (that is, decides what the author intended at that point) by an informed assessment of the context of the disputed reading.¹⁵

Authors' intentions change over time, however; and although the apparatus of a critical text can record the readings that reflect such changes, the critical text itself can only represent the author's intention as it stood at one particular time. Determining which stage of intention is to take precedence over the others and be incorporated into the main text is another difficult question of judgment that the critical editor faces. When an author publishes successive revised editions of a work, it often happens that whatever authorial revisions are present in the last edition supersede the corresponding readings of the earlier editions—they are indications, that is, of the author's final intention. But in some cases an author's revisions result from external pressure—a publisher's demands, for instance—and do not therefore point to a new authorial intention. Furthermore, revisions are sometimes so radical that they alter the nature or conception of a work and in effect produce a new work; in such cases it is probable that the earlier version and the later one are best treated as two separate works, each worthy of a critical edition. Classic examples of this sort of revision are Henry James's rewriting of his earlier novels for his New York Edition of 1907-09 and Walt Whitman's changes in each new edition of *Leaves of Grass*. Although these authors believed that their last revisions superseded earlier versions, critics need not feel that the earlier versions (or "works") are superseded aesthetically and may indeed find them superior; at any rate those versions represented their authors' "final" intentions at the time of publication and may still be worthy of study as literary works, not simply as literary documents. Deciding whether a particular set of revisions can be regarded as producing a new work or whether it merely refines and adjusts the original conception is a crucial question for the critical editor, since the eclectic process of critical editing works well in the latter case but not in the former except as applied to the two distinct versions separately. Some editors have suggested—as a way of dealing with works that appeared in several revised editions—the

exact reproduction of the text of one of them (generally either the first or the last), with an appended apparatus setting forth the variant readings of the remaining texts. This approach is of course perfectly acceptable as an efficient way of producing a historical record. But one should have no illusions that such a text could render a critical text unnecessary: the main text would have been selected largely on the basis of its convenience for keying the variant readings to, not because it is a text (particularly when unemended) that deserves to be broadly circulated as representing the author's intentions. It would have been treated, in other words, as a document and not as a work.¹⁶ A critical edition, on the other hand, could equally well display in apparatus the historical record of variants and simultaneously offer a reading text that would embody the results of an informed scholar's decisions regarding what the author intended at a particular time.

The choice of copy-text—that text judged to have presumptive authority, the one to be followed at points where no emendations are made—is therefore the central decision for the critical editor to make. If all choices among variant readings could be rationally arrived at and if all errors in the extant texts could be detected by analysis, there would be no need for the concept of copy-text. But inevitably there will be points at which the editor has insufficient evidence for making reasoned textual decisions and must fall back on the readings of a text judged to have presumptive authority. The text chosen as copy-text thus has a considerable bearing on the characteristics of the critical text as finally edited, for a conservative editorial policy will dictate that the copy-text be followed at all points except those where a convincing case can be made for emendation. Of the various approaches to the selection of copy-text that are conceivable, the rationale that has had the greatest influence in the last quarter-century—indeed, has shaped the modern editing of literary works—is the one formulated in 1950 by W. W. Greg.¹⁷ His suggested rationale has been the subject of extensive, and sometimes heated, discussion,¹⁸ but those objecting to it have generally failed to grasp its essential nature and have taken it to be a much *mora* prescriptive and arbitrary method than it actually is. Greg recognized that editors normally have a firmer basis for reasoning about the intended words of a text (what he called its "substantives") than about the intended punctuation and spelling (or other formal features—what he called its "accidentals"); and he observed that texts usually become more and more corrupt as they descend through successive editions—particularly in punctuation and spelling, which

have often been regarded by printers and publishers as within their prerogative to alter. As a result, he argued that textual authority may often be divided, the most authoritative accidentals tending to be in the author's fair-copy manuscript or in the first edition (the edition closest to the manuscript) and the most authoritative substantives often tending to be in the last edition supervised by the author. His distinction between substantives and accidentals, however, was meant only as a practical guide, based on the characteristic practices of writers and printers, not as a philosophical observation about the nature of literary communication; and nothing in his position was intended to restrict the freedom of editors to employ their informed judgment. Whenever editors have convincing reason to believe, for instance, that certain alterations in punctuation are authorial—or, indeed, to believe that the punctuation of a particular late edition was more likely to have resulted from the accurate reproduction of authorial revisions than from the introduction of errors or alterations by the compositors¹⁹—they are of course free to follow where their evidence leads them; but when they have no other basis for deciding, Greg would argue that his rationale offers them a way of increasing the likelihood that they will choose authorial readings rather than nonauthorial ones.²⁰ His approach, emerging from his work on Elizabethan drama, has shown its flexibility by being usefully employed in the editing of a wide variety of materials from different centuries, ranging from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century drama (Dekker, Dryden) to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fiction (Fielding, Stephen Crane) and nineteenth- and twentieth-century nonfiction (Thoreau, John Dewey), including cases where extant manuscripts can serve as copy-text (e.g., Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*) and those where they cannot (e.g., Howells's *Their Wedding Journey*), and instances where serialization (as in Howells) or transatlantic editions (as in Melville) complicate the chronology of variant readings.²¹

One essential element of any editing where printed texts are involved is illustrated in all these editions: the necessity of understanding the processes of printing and book production in the period concerned and of examining multiple copies of each relevant edition. It is surprising how often scholars who are otherwise experienced in the critical examination of evidence will naively accept what they find on a printed page as "the text" of a work or at least of that edition of the work, without focusing on the fact that other copies of the edition may be different. Presumably most scholars are aware,

from the great attention which the editing of Shakespeare and other Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists has received, that textual variants are likely to exist among copies of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions. But what is not always recognized is that the advent of machine printing and stereotyping did not eliminate the possibility of variation among copies and that variations in fact do often exist in editions down to the present time. Elizabethan proofreading practices, which resulted in sheets representing varying combinations of uncorrected and corrected type-formes, were not the practices of later periods; but the making and the correcting of error exist in all human activity and have from time to time in all periods necessitated textual alterations during press runs, after press runs but before publication, after the distribution of some but not all copies, and between press runs from the same typesetting. Knowledge of printing and publishing conditions in a given period enables one to see the range of variations possible, and an informed analysis of the physical evidence present in the printed book—which has come to be called "analytical bibliography"—must underlie any attempt to establish a text for which printed materials are authoritative documents. Just as in working with manuscripts one cannot finally be content with photocopies but must see the physical evidence directly, so with printed pieces one must examine the evidence at first hand; because a printed item, however, is not normally unique, but is a part of an edition of a certain number of copies, the evidence consists of the totality of that edition. Although it is not feasible in many instances to examine every copy of an edition, a responsible editor must examine a large enough number of copies of every printing of an edition to have some confidence that all the evidence bearing on the text has been uncovered; just what percentage is sufficient will of course vary with the situation, but the day is long past when a scholarly editor can use a single copy of a book, even a nineteenth- or twentieth-century book.²² Recognition of the great contribution that analytical bibliography can make to solving textual problems has been one of the principal factors that have altered the character of scholarly editing in this century.

The point of view I have been outlining here is, in its essentials, simple to state. It begins with the premise that the serious study of a text depends on access to the documentary evidence (whether the documents are manuscripts or printed) and that the process of editing therefore should not be one that conceals such evidence. It moves on to recognize that for writings

not intended for publication the surviving documents are the end products, which should be reproduced with as much fidelity as possible; for writings intended for publication, on the other hand, it recognizes that none of the surviving documents may be a faithful representation of the intended end product and that an eclectic text, based on an editor's informed judgment, is called for in an attempt to establish such a representation. Although any given text of a work intended for publication can usefully be reproduced as a document for study, the editorial process for such a work cannot be regarded as completed until there exists a text incorporating a specialist scholar's view as to what readings the author wished to be present. For scholarly purposes, this kind of edited text must naturally be documented, but the apparatus should intrude as little as possible into the text itself, in order not to detract from the effect of the text as a finished work (and incidentally to encourage the broad dissemination of the text by photoreproduction). An eclectic or critical approach—when it involves editorial judgment directed toward establishing what the author wished, not merely what the editor prefers, and when it entails the recording of the evidence (variant readings, emendations) for assessing that judgment—at once shows respect for the historical record and for the work as a completed intellectual production. Decisions about such matters as the choice of copy-text or whether regularizing spelling and punctuation amounts to modernizing are extremely important, but varying answers to these questions can be defended under differing circumstances; what is crucial is that they be discussed within a framework of the kind suggested here. Not all editors of literary materials, I must recognize, would support this framework—and neither would all editors from other fields necessarily oppose it. Indeed, there is more divergence of opinion about editing within the literary field and within the historical field than there is between certain literary editors and certain editors of the works of statesmen and philosophers: the lines of debate do not coincide with disciplinary boundaries. As editors from various fields come increasingly to recognize this fact, there will be greater progress in what is ultimately a common enterprise.

NOTES

1. "A Philosopher of the Particulars," *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 June 1977, pp. 746-47.

2. *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 August 1977, p. 962. Further criticism of Passmore's review appears in Fredson Bowers, "Editing a Philosopher: The Works of William James,"

Analytical & Bnumerative Bibliography, 4 (1980), 3-36 (esp. pp. 7-10, which include a quotation from the present paper).

3. For some additional discussion of this point, and references to other discussions, see G. T. Tanselle, "The Problem of Final Authorial Intention," *Studies in Bibliography*, 29 (1976), esp. pp. 176-77 and footnote 19; and Tanselle, "External Fact as an Editorial Problem," *Studies in Bibliography*, 32 (1979), 1-47.

4. *The Rhetoric of History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976), p. 51.

5. Some of the literature that has grown up around the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Center for Editions of American Authors, and the Center for Scholarly Editions is referred to in *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), footnotes to pp. 4-7, and in the survey of textual scholarship in *The Center for Scholarly Editions: An Introductory Statement* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1977), pp. 4-15 (also printed in *PMLA*, 92 [1977], 583-97; see pp. 586-97).

6. These remarks obviously apply only to original documents. When originals do not survive and the texts are preserved only in scribal copies or in printed forms, the editor faces the same kinds of problems of textual transmission that are encountered by editors of published works, and the approach described in Part II below would therefore be appropriate.

7. Of course, there can be rough drafts of letters, or earlier versions of journal entries that are later written out by their authors in fair copies and altered in the process, and other similar documents, but each of these qualifies as a document of interest in its own right; and any slips, cancellations, and so on in the texts of any of these documents—even in the apparently "final" versions—are integral elements of those texts.

8. Deciding what documents are significant is not a problem unique to editors: all scholars must decide what they wish to spend their time on, and general agreement on the significance of given documents is unlikely.

9. Not merely the expense of the photography but that entailed by the bulkiness of the resulting production.

10. Edited by Kenneth Neill Cameron and, later, by Donald H. Reiman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961-).

11. *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 22 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1956), ix.

12. The point of view expressed here about editing materials not intended for publication is set forth more fully, and with more illustrations and references, in "The Editing of Historical Documents," *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), 1-56.

13. Even an authorial fair-copy manuscript is a pre-publication (or private) document, and it cannot be assumed to represent its author's intention in every respect (it may well contain unintended slips, for example).

14. The fact that a writer would probably have wished to make alterations in letters or diaries before they were published does not, of course, mean that the editor should try to guess what those alterations would have been: the documents remain private ones, and the editor, in bringing them into print, is not changing their nature. But when writers publish, or prepare for publication, some of their own letters or diaries, they are thereby converting these materials into writings intended for publication.

15. This review of intention and its relation to editing is expressed in more detail in "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," *Studies in Bibliography*, 29 (1976), 167-211.

16. Sometimes one encounters an illogical mixture of aims, when an editor objects to any eclectic procedure as an unjustified mixing of discrete historical documents and yet is willing to make editorial alterations in individual texts (apparently not recognizing that the incorporation of one's own corrections produces an eclectic text and that reference to other texts might call attention to further "corrections" no different in kind from those already contemplated by the editor).

17. "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 (1950-51), 19-36; reprinted in Greg's *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 374-91.

18. This discussion has been surveyed in G. T. Tanselle, "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature," *Studies in Bibliography*, 28 (1975), 167-229 and "Recent Editorial Discussion and the Central Questions of Editing," *Studies in Bibliography*, 34 (1981), 23-65.

19. This possibility is among those considered by Fredson Bowers in his important recent

analysis of Greg's position, "Greg's 'Rationale of Copy-Text' Revisited," *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), 90-161.

20. It is true that in preferring early to late readings they may be eliminating some authorial alterations but at least are not importing into the text what are likely to be a larger number of nonauthorial ones; and the readings taken from the early edition can be plausibly argued to have a better chance of representing an author's practice (even if not, in every instance, that author's final preference).

21. See the edition of Dekker edited by Fredson Bowers (Cambridge University Press, 1953-61); Dryden, ed. Bowers (University of Chicago Press, 1967); Fielding, ed. W. B. Coley, Bowers, Martin C. Battestin, *et al.* (Wesleyan University Press, 1967-); Crane, ed. Bowers (University Press of Virginia, 1969-76); Thoreau, ed. William L. Howarth *et al.* (Princeton University Press, 1971-); Dewey, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Southern Illinois University Press, 1967-); Hawthorne, text ed. Bowers (Ohio State University Press, 1962-); Howells, ed. Edwin H. Cady, Don L. Cook, Ronald Gottesman, David J. Nordloh, *et al.* (Indiana University Press, 1968-); and Melville, ed. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. T. Tanselle (Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1968-). More detailed identification of these and other editions that utilize Greg can be found in *The Center for Scholarly Editions* (see note 5 above), esp. pp. 5-6 (or *PMLA*, 92 [1977], 587-88).

22. The bibliographical literature is full of examples of the dangers of failing to examine enough copies; one recently reported by Jeanne A. Roberts, in *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), 203-8, involves a reading in *The Tempest*: most copies of the First Folio appear to have "wise" (with long "s") at IV.i.124, but further checking shows that a few copies do contain the evidence for seeing that the word is really "wife" (the "f" became damaged in the process of printing so that it looked like a long "s").

A Rationale of Literary Annotation: The Example of Fielding's Novels

MARTIN C. BATTESTIN

In 1751 Thomas Edwards, who in *The Canons of Criticism* (1748) had mischievously exploded Warburton's pompous edition of Shakespeare (1747), was urged by his friend Philip Yorke to exert himself more constructively in the future—to turn editor himself, in fact, and rescue Spenser's works from their current state of dilapidation. As canny as he was unlovable, Edwards declined the invitation with thanks, and with a degree of prudence which, if the members of this conference cannot pretend to, we will certainly appreciate:

I regret as much as you do [he replied] that our Classic Authors have fallen into such unhallowed hands as they have of late been profaned by, but who am I that I can prevent the sacrilege? . . . Why, say you, publish a good Edition of [Spenser] yourself. Very well Sir—but to publish a good Edition of an Old Author is not, as we find by melancholy experience, as easy a matter as to poach eggs, nor is it to be done without a great deal of care and application, and some time too . . . }

That last poignant sentence has the ring of a maxim that ought to be inscribed as a motto over the portals of the Center for Scholarly Editions—the editor's analogue to "Abandon hope, all you who enter here." But I expect we will agree that the business of editing, if a more exacting enterprise than poaching eggs, is no less wholesome, good authors being in their way no less nourishing.

Indeed, since they are likely to delight and instruct us the more according to how precisely we can ascertain what they wrote and what they meant, it is not too much to claim that an editor performs the fundamental act of criticism. As the work of Greg and Bowers has shown, editing in its primary aspect—that of establishing the text—has the advantage over other kinds of criticism in that its principles may be more surely formulated.

•Professor Battestin's paper also appears in *Studies in Bibliography*, 34 (1981), III, and is printed here by permission of the author and the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia.

There is, for instance, a certain compelling logic about the proposition that, in the absence of an author's manuscript, we can best approximate the linguistic texture of his work—the essential form in which he clothed his thought—by choosing as our copy-text the first edition, the version of the work that derives immediately from the manuscript. I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere²—by showing that the full sense of certain passages in Fielding's novels ultimately resides in his use of capitals, italics, type-sizes, etc.—that accuracy in this matter of rendering even the accidentals of a text is not at all the merely precious or pedantic consideration it is sometimes thought to be. Criticism as she is generally known is a disappointing mistress who has a way of changing her favorites: Richards gives place to Wittgenstein, Wittgenstein to Levi-Strauss, Levi-Strauss to Shklovsky, Shklovsky to Poulet, Poulet to Derrida, and Derrida, with any luck, will soon give way to Common Sense. The boulevards of Paris, as George Watson has noticed, are littered with ex-structuralists. But there is the permanency of sweet reason in Greg's rationale of copy-text.

Editors, however, have no comparable set of principles to guide them in that other, and I believe no less important operation, the annotation of the text. As far as I am aware, the most valuable attempt to supply such a guide is Arthur Friedman's essay, "Principles of Historical Annotation in Critical Editions of Modern Texts," published some thirty-five years ago.³ Much briefer statements of principle sometimes occur incidentally in the prefaces to scholarly editions—as, for example, in Professor Friedman's Introduction to his edition of Goldsmith⁴—but because these statements rationalize the approach to annotation which a particular editor has found congenial, their general usefulness is limited. Most reviews of scholarly editions include, moreover, incidental criticism of the explanatory notes, but such criticism, being desultory as well as widely scattered through a hundred journals, is neither systematic nor very convenient; and, being founded on the personal preferences and prejudices of individual reviewers, it is rather too subjective and impressionistic. Every editor, it appears, is confident he knows what a proper note should do, but few readers are satisfied with the results. As James Thorpe observes,⁵ the editors of the Yale edition of Milton's Prose Works are at one extreme, supplying an especially copious commentary; at the other is Herbert Davis's edition of Swift's Prose Works, which eschews explanatory annotation altogether. The spectrum runs from nothing to too much, and in between these extremes one finds every degree

of amplitude or dearth. Indeed, the enterprise itself of explanatory annotation is often regarded as a necessary evil (and not always even as a *necessary* one), provoking in scholars feelings ranging from gratitude for the light a good note can shed on the obscure places of a text to dismay at the vanity and pedantry of editors who are thought to use such opportunities to primp and strut in public. To Charles Moorman, for example, "a comprehensive, carefully-prepared set of explanatory notes is, aside from the establishment of a hitherto unprocurable text, the greatest gift an editor can bestow upon a reader"; to Samuel Schoenbaum, writing of the editing of Shakespeare, the editor who goes beyond the glossing of words and phrases is not only professionally irresponsible but morally reprehensible, since he is "having a free ride at the expense of a captive audience that has paid its money for the plays."⁶

The state of the art, it appears, looks disconcertingly like anarchy; and it is time that those of us who are engaged in the exacting and, as our readers will assure us, expensive business of preparing "definitive" editions of major authors should follow Professor Friedman's lead in asking ourselves what, if anything, can be done to introduce a measure at least of order into the confusion—to mark out a terrain ample and firm enough to accommodate and support such a wide variety of edifices. The attempt is not likely to be entirely satisfactory, for, as I hope to make clear, much of the confusion, contradiction, and inconsistency that has characterized literary annotation from the time of Bentley and Warburton to the present is an inevitable function of the nature of the enterprise itself. This being so, I mean by the indefinite article in my title—which might otherwise seem to imply that I am here trying to do for the literary annotator what Greg has done for the textual editor—to emphasize that this will be a wholly tentative essay in which, on balance, I will be more concerned with defining the relative aspects of the problem than with proposing absolute solutions. Though I am persuaded that there is essentially one sound rationale for the treatment of copy-texts, I am no less convinced that there can be no single rationale of literary annotation that will prove universally practicable and appropriate. For, though they are colleagues in the community of textual criticism, the provinces of editor and annotator are different in kind. The editor is concerned with establishing the ideal form of the text, its physical reality on the printed page. The choices confronting him as he selects and arranges the linguistic signs which constitute the literary work as the author intended

it will be essentially the same choices whether he is editing Shakespeare or Milton, Fielding or Hume. The element of uniformity in this operation makes it susceptible, therefore, of a kind of rational control and discipline that it is not too much to describe as scientific; and, like a scientist, the editor as he performs his task will be as objective and as unobtrusive as possible. The task of the annotator, on the other hand, is to mediate between the text which the editor has thus established and the reader who wishes to recover its meanings wherever they are obscure. Being concerned therefore with the mental, as it were, rather than the physical reality of the work, he will function not as scientist, but as historian and critic. He is necessarily obtrusive in this role, and he cannot be objective: every choice he makes as to when or when not to supply a note is subjectively determined, governed entirely by the quality of his own understanding of the author's intention and by his estimation of the reader's need to be enlightened. The element of uniformity which validates Greg's rationale of copy-text and which simplifies the task of the editor is lacking here, and without it, though we may suggest certain principles and guidelines for the annotator, these cannot amount to a theoretical system that will be applicable in all cases.

Let me briefly illustrate what I take to be the three chief variables affecting the annotation of any given literary work: (1) the character of the audience which the annotator supposes he is addressing; (2) the nature of the text he is annotating; and (3) the peculiar interests, competencies, and assumptions of the annotator himself.

The first of these variables is surely the most obvious. Before we can proceed very far in annotating a text we must have formed some notion of the interests and capacities of those who are likely to use the edition. Will they be professional scholars in the field or undergraduates in survey courses? Though in most cases the answer to this basic question will be immediately apparent and will determine our general orientation as we set about the task of annotation, yet its implications are today rather less clear than they would have been even a generation or two ago. I suppose it can be safely assumed that undergraduates are likely to be ignorant of most matters relating to the literary, social, and intellectual history of whatever period, to say nothing of the classics and the scriptures which not very long ago were the staples of every schoolboy's education. But can we as confidently assume that our colleagues will need much less enlightenment? We, too, are increasingly the products of an educational system that has abandoned the study of Latin

and Greek and the Bible for subjects more "relevant" and secular; as a consequence most of us are ill at ease within the most important frames of reference shared by the community of literate men from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. In these times of narrowing disciplines and increasing specialization, furthermore, few of us are equally knowledgeable about all aspects even of the historical periods in which we spend our professional lives. The literary critic who knows *Gulliver's Travels* intimately may well need to be informed in some detail of the political circumstances referred to in *The Conduct of the Allies*, and it is more than likely that he has never read a sermon by Swift or anyone else. He will probably be unable to translate for himself a passage from the *Aeneid*, or to identify the work or to recall the context when it has been translated for him. Freud may have acquainted him with the myths of Narcissus and Electra, but will he be just as familiar with those of Hylas and Pasiphae? With respect to many areas of knowledge, the distance between a bright philosophy major, say, who finds himself taking a course in Renaissance literature and the Professor of history who wishes to read Spenser's *Faerie Queene* is probably shorter than we might suppose: for different reasons they may be grateful to know that in *Una*, Spenser allegorizes both the platonic ideal of the One and the character and destiny of the Church of England.

Though the annotator's conception of his audience will thus have a less radical effect on the process of selecting passages to gloss than might at first seem to be the case, yet it is certainly not irrelevant to this process. We may reasonably assume that the general knowledge of scholars is superior to that of undergraduates and that their command of the language is more comprehensive and more sophisticated. For this reason it has seemed to me supererogatory for the Twickenham editor of *The Rape of the Lock* to supply definitions of such terms as "Virago," "Termagant," and "Spark," which, one trusts, few scholars will need to be instructed in, and to gloss such other terms as "Treat," "Denizens," and "Resign'd," which, though applied by Pope in a somewhat unusual sense, may be easily found in the *OED*. Notes such as these in a definitive edition serve only to clutter the page and to betray the editor's pedantry, not to say his condescension toward his readers. Paradoxically, however, though scholars are generally better informed than college students, notes designed to enlighten the former will normally be fuller than those addressed to the latter. For scholars, who may be teaching the work in question or writing about it, and who are by and

large a curious and skeptical lot, will not be content with a gloss that is superficial or perfunctory; they expect to be informed of the historical context that explains the author's use of a term or concept and whether his usage is conventional or novel, and before accepting an editor's assertions on trust they wish to be apprized of the evidence. Not only the decision itself to annotate or not to annotate will be affected, therefore, by our conception of an audience, but also our notion of the scope and thoroughness of any given note.

Secondly, the annotator's task will vary, and quite appreciably, according to the nature of the work in question—that is, according to whether its allusive and topical texture is complicated and dense or comparatively simple and straightforward. A poem like *The Dunciad*, for example, poses in this respect an editorial problem that is virtually insoluble. The conscientious editor who attempts an exhaustive commentary on this richly allusive work must either fail miserably or, by succeeding, earn for himself a niche in the poem (which I like to imagine Pope revising from time to time from his vantage point in the Elysian Fields). Such an editor would be obliged not only to retain Pope's and Warburton's own copious notes (which often require commentary in their own right), but also to supplement these by sharpening the identification of the hordes of obscure scribblers imprisoned in Pope's couplets; what is more, he would have the further formidable task of locating the sources of Pope's frequent plagiarisms and paraphrases, of explaining his innumerable puns, and spotting his countless allusions to various literary, religious, and political matters. By attempting this questionable feat the notes to the Twickenham edition virtually crowd the poetry off the page, yet, even so, admirable as Professor Sutherland's commentary is, they ignore scores of allusions and at best merely hint at the range and complexity of the ambiguities in which Pope veils his "deep intent." It is generally true—as, say, Roger Lonsdale's edition of Gray, Collins, and Goldsmith will attest⁷—that the poetry of a literate age which values the pleasures of imitation will have an allusive texture of uncommon density posing for the annotator a far more exacting problem than its fiction will do. One may hope, at least, to provide all the needful commentary for *Moll Flanders* or *Emma*, but to annotate Pope's poetry is to accept from the start the necessity of compromise. I am not, of course, proposing as an axiom that all novels present simpler challenges for the annotator than all poems: Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* and Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, to say nothing of

Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and Fielding's *Tom Jones*, are plain examples to the contrary; and I can think of no poem of any period that affords a problem for the annotator as hopelessly demanding as that posed by *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. The point is that what we may reasonably expect an annotator to undertake to elucidate in any given work will vary according to a number of factors, such as the obscurity of the contexts to which it relates—literary, intellectual, political, biographical, etc.—and the density of its allusive texture.

A third variable preventing uniformity in the practice of annotation is the apparent (and, regrettably, perhaps inevitable) cause of that disconcerting subjectivity which is and has ever been the distinguishing characteristic of editorial practice and editorial reviewing. No two editors will annotate a text in the same way because each, according to his interests, competencies, and assumptions—according, indeed, to his temperament and sensibilities—will respond to the text in different ways: what to one may be obscure will be clear to another; what to one seems an allusion is to another the author's own turn of phrase; what to one seems significant about a passage may seem to another irrelevant. Such differences will obtain even among editors of comparable abilities and industry, and even if they should happen to agree on the audience they are addressing and on the nature of the annotation a specific text demands. According to his peculiar interests and competencies, an editor will *see* some things as happening in a text and be oblivious to others: he may be alert to every political, literary, and theatrical innuendo in *The Dunciad*, say, but be largely unaware of Pope's complex system of religious and philosophical allusion. In this respect the factor of subjectivity in annotation, though its distorting effects may be minimized by further study and research as the editor attempts to familiarize himself with the sources of his author's knowledge and thought, can never be eliminated and, consequently, the commentary even of a Mack or a Wasserman will be imperfect and incomplete.

Literary annotation being, then, the attempt of a particular editor to mediate between a particular text and a particular kind of reader, it follows that this process is a relative thing which in certain essential respects will vary from edition to edition. For this reason, as I have said, annotation more nearly resembles an art than a science; it cannot be completely regularized or reduced to a single set of invariable principles. Yet it need not be practised in quite the anarchic way it has been. Like any other art, this one

has a purpose as well as certain strategies and techniques for achieving that purpose. We ought at least to be able to agree on what we are trying to do as annotators and on how we can best go about doing it. In the remainder of this essay, by drawing on Professor Friedman's early article and on my own experience editing Fielding's novels, I will try to bring us a little closer to a consensus on these basic questions, particularly as they apply to scholarly editions of eighteenth-century literary prose. Narrow as this focus may be with respect to the historical frame of reference and the nature of the text, the results of the inquiry should not be irrelevant to the problems of other editors concerned with other kinds of texts in other periods.

Though in some important respects it needs to be refined and qualified, Professor Friedman's statement of the purpose of annotation and of the two principal kinds of notes is useful. To paraphrase him, we may say that the editor in annotating a work intends to make the meaning of the text more intelligible to the reader, on the one hand by recovering for him certain information about specific persons, places, and events once known to the author's contemporaries but now obscure, and on the other hand by placing the author's ideas and expressions in the context of his own writings and those of his contemporaries. Professor Friedman calls these two kinds of notes "notes of recovery" and "explanatory notes," observing, however, that in actual practice the distinction between them often blurs. "Notes of recovery" are needed in *Tom Jones*, for example, when Fielding refers to acquaintances such as Richard Willoughby the lawyer (p. 458)⁸ and Thomas King the coachman (p. 549); to places such as Prior Park (pp. 612-13) and Bridges Street (p. 375); and to events such as the wreck of the *Victory* (p. 593) and the riotous first night of Edward Moore's play, *The Foundling* (p. 729). Another sort of "note of recovery," implied though not specified in Professor Friedman's definition, provides information often crucial to the subtler play of meanings in a given passage: namely, the note identifying a literary allusion—such as Fielding's arch reference, interrupting his ostentatiously eloquent introduction of his heroine, to "the rude Answer which Lord *Rochester* once gave to a Man, who had seen many Things" (pp. 155-56); or his having Sophy reveal her distress at a scene in Southerne's *Fatal Marriage* which closely resembles her own unhappy situation (p. 796). And of course "notes of recovery" will also be required whenever it is likely that an author's language will be obscure to most readers, as when Fielding's surgeon wishes to subject Jones to "a Revulsion" (p. 411), or when Jones

supposes that Partridge must be good "at capping Verses" (p. 414). Most editors will readily recognize the need to supply such information as this. Even so, as I will show presently, there is considerable disagreement about the fullness of treatment appropriate to certain kinds of "notes of recovery" whose function at first glance would seem to be quite straightforward.

Much more problematical are the decisions relating to what Professor Friedman calls "explanatory notes." It is not always easy to distinguish in a text those ideas and expressions which require commentary from those which don't, and here, especially, an editor's judgment and powers of discrimination are tested. In editing *Tom Jones*, for example, I glossed rather fully Fielding's use of such concepts as "Good-nature" (p. 39) and "Prudence" (p. 36), because I am personally convinced that a modern reader cannot adequately appreciate Fielding's characterization and moral purpose in that novel unless he is apprized of the personal and historical contexts which deepen our sense of the significance of these ideas to Fielding and his first readers, and which enable us to estimate the degree of originality apparent in Fielding's treatment of them. Another editor, unconvinced of the importance of the ideas, would leave them unexplained, or treat them in a cursory way. The question of *scope*—of how full our commentary should be and of what kinds of information it should contain—must be faced in any sort of annotation; but the vaguer, more subjective question of *relevance* is particularly vexing as the editor tries to determine whether or not a note of the "explanatory" kind is needed. With respect to frequency and fullness, the character of the notes in any edition will be determined by how the editor answers these two questions. Indeed, the all too apparent anarchy of modern annotative practice—the aspect of contemporary scholarly editing in which, with reference to the commentary, individual editions range themselves (as we have remarked) along a broad spectrum defined by the antithetical practice of the Yale Milton and Herbert Davis's Swift—is chiefly to be accounted for in this way.

Must this confusion continue? Is the business of annotation really such a relative and subjective enterprise that any editor's notions of scope and relevancy are as valid as any other's? I think not. The trouble has been that, though most editors can agree that the purpose of annotation is "to make the meaning of the text intelligible to the reader," individually they have construed that definition in very different ways. In practice we have been unable to agree on what *constitutes* "the meaning of the text" or on

the *procedure* required to make that meaning "intelligible to the reader." This disagreement is curious since, as linguists from Richards to the present have demonstrated, the meaning of a text—and particularly of a literary text—is not limited to the strict denotative or referential signification of its language, but includes as well the connotative values of that language, the full range of associations which the words had for the author and his first readers. Though it is true that we can never hope wholly to recover the meanings of a text in this sense, it is also true that an editor who has given some years of his life to studying his author and the historical context in which he wrote is most likely to be aware of them, and that, whenever in his judgment the text may be obscure, he has a responsibility to share his knowledge and understanding with the reader by providing whatever information may be necessary to make the author's meaning intelligible.

In this view, even a "note of recovery"—the neater and more straightforward of the two kinds Professor Friedman has defined—will often require fuller treatment than we might suppose. It will of course serve the basic function of identifying person, place, event, or literary allusion; but it must frequently do more than this. In *Tom Jones*, for example, Fielding several times compliments Ralph Allen, referring to his friend's benevolence (p. 4), to his being both esteemed and condescended to by Pope (pp. 6, 404), to his having built hospitals (p. 38), to his intelligence, wealth, business activities, as well as his taste, hospitality, and personal integrity (pp. 403-04), to his estate (pp. 612-13). Clearly, no note which in a sentence records his dates and characterizes him as a philanthropist and patron of letters will adequately identify Allen for the reader of the novel; the editor must also illuminate the specific aspects of Allen's life and character which comprise the substance of Fielding's various compliments, for that is Allen's meaning in the text. Similarly, when Fielding mentions "the well-wooded Forest of Hampshire" and troubles to add a rare footnote of his own implying that it has been stripped of its trees (p. 259 and n.), the editor will oblige the reader by identifying the place as the New Forest; but he will oblige him more by explaining the particular historical circumstance to which Fielding refers, and still more by supplying the biographical information which in all probability accounts for the occurrence and prominence of the allusion in the novel: namely, that the Duke of Bedford, Fielding's patron and Warden of the New Forest, had appointed him its High Steward in 1748.⁹ What the reader wishes to know, in other words, is the author's *use* of an

allusion, why he chose to make the reference and how it works in the text.

To supply the reader with the information he requires in order to know the text this intimately is the function of any note, but the problem of recovery is often especially complex in annotating works of fiction and poetry, in which literary allusions are generally a principal device of the author for complicating, deepening, and extending the denotative sense of a passage. A proper note on such an allusion will not only identify the author and the work quoted, but will briefly point out those features of the context and circumstances of the passage quoted that serve to clarify whatever analogy or irony may be latent in the allusion. Consider, for example, the following allusion occurring in Fielding's celebrated discussion of conservation of character, an aspect of the principle of Probability he is recommending to fellow novelists:

It is admirably remarked by a most excellent Writer, That Zeal can no more hurry a Man to act in direct Opposition to itself, than a rapid Stream can carry a Boat against its own Current. I will venture to say, that for a Man to act in direct Contradiction to the Dictates of his Nature, is, if not impossible, as improbable and as miraculous as any Thing which can well be conceived. Should the best Parts of the Story of *Marcus Antoninus* be ascribed to *Nero*, or should the worst Incidents of *Nero's* Life be imputed to *Antoninus*, what would be more shocking to Belief than either Instance

(pp. 405-06)

The editor annotating the allusion in the opening sentence of this passage will of course state that Fielding is here recalling a remark of George Lyttelton's in his *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul* (1747); and, since Fielding is paraphrasing rather than giving Lyttelton's exact words, he should probably quote the passage so as to enable the reader to judge for himself how Fielding alters the original. Having done this much, the editor yet has not helped the reader to grasp how the allusion *u/or*s; in itself the passage Fielding paraphrases is a simple generalization about human nature. In context, however, the aphorism summarizes Lyttelton's crucial argument to prove that St. Paul's sudden conversion, from being the persecutor of Christians to being an apostle of Christ, was a true and genuine miracle, not to be explained by natural causes alone. By clarifying this context, the editor will enable the reader to respond to the spe-

cifically religious resonances of the word "miraculous" in Fielding's second sentence and of the phrase "shocking to Belief" in his third; and he will enable him to see that, implicit in the allusion, is a specific example of Fielding's point: though the authors of divine history may concern themselves with the Marvellous, the province of the novelist is the Probable. In his own life St. Paul was a greater contradiction than what Fielding next imagines would occur if an historian confused the characters of Nero and Marcus Aurelius. The allusion, moreover, works in a more personal way as well, serving as another of Fielding's compliments to Lyttelton, his friend and patron, to whom he dedicated *Tom Jones* and who stood with Ralph Allen as a model for Squire Allworthy. Since this biographical context will have been described in an earlier note, the editor may by a cross-reference direct the reader to this information. But, while enhancing the sense we already have of Lyttelton's goodness as a man (he is, we are reminded, the pious author of Christian apologetics), the present allusion contributes a new dimension to Fielding's praise of his friend, who is now complimented specifically for his excellence as a writer. By adducing similar compliments from Fielding's other works, the editor may also wish to assure us of Fielding's sincerity in admiring this less obvious virtue in his friend. And finally, in another cross-reference, he may wish to direct us to a later instance in the novel in which Fielding again alludes to the work quoted here.¹⁰

In short, the meaning of an allusion such as this—the full range of its associations and resonances—is complex. To render that meaning intelligible to the reader, the editor must recover for him the several elements which constitute it in all its complexity. Those elements will certainly include the identity of the author and work alluded to, but they will also include a knowledge of context, of historical and biographical circumstances, and of the occurrence of the same allusion or of similar ones elsewhere in the author's writings; for only when the reader is apprized of these latter kinds of information will he understand what the allusion meant to the author, why he chose to introduce it at the particular place in the text where it occurs, and how it works there. Unless in such exceptional cases as I discussed earlier—cases, such as *The Dunciad*, where the extreme density of a work's allusive texture obliges us to compromise with this ideal—the literary editor who undertakes to annotate a text in a scholarly edition must accept his responsibility to recover all these elements for the reader.

This responsibility, let me hasten to add, should not be construed as a

license to display everything he knows about the topic; a note should not be, as George Sherburn once remarked, a sort of wastebasket into which the editor may conveniently dump the accumulated debris of his filing cabinet. This self-indulgent practice—the impulse "to tell all that they have learned rather than what readers need to know"—is what James Thorpe rightly deploras as the "occupational disease of editors."¹¹ The ideal note is that which supplies *essential* information only and in the briefest compass possible. It does not of course follow that such a note will be short: since meaning can be complex, to supply the reader with even the essential elements that will enable him to recover it in all its complexity will frequently require a certain amplitude (in the Wesleyan Edition the note to the passage analyzed above takes up fourteen lines of print). But it will be as brief as the editor can make it, its brevity being measured by how well he has distilled the essential matter from the mass of potentially relevant information at his disposal. Far from encouraging self-indulgence, the making of a proper note requires of the editor a discipline and restraint that can be painful, for it demands of him the nicest discrimination in selecting his material and the most rigorous polishing of his own exposition.

Nor should a note, ideally, offer the editor an opportunity for self-indulgence in another sense. Though he is responsible for supplying essential information, he should strive to avoid imposing on the reader his own interpretation of a passage. His aim is to make the act of criticism possible, not to perform it. The editor's lack of restraint in this regard is what Professor Schoenbaum deploras as "having a free ride at the expense of a captive audience . . ." Regrettably, however, by making available the elements out of which the reader may construct his own interpretation of the text, the editor to some extent will unavoidably control his reader's understanding of the text. For to identify the pieces of a puzzle and to arrange them in order, as rational discourse requires, is not only to define the nature of the puzzle but to suggest how the pieces should be assembled. One distinguished reviewer of the Wesleyan *Tom Jones* lamented this consequence of the rationale of literary annotation I am here proposing and which I have tried to apply in my own practice. The reviewer, Professor Middendorf, observed that, though the aim of the Wesleyan editors is not to interpret their texts, yet "in giving necessary background information and explaining 18th-century—and Fielding's—political and religious preoccupations in their introductions and notes, [the] editors open up their texts in ways that suggest

and even occasionally establish judgments and evaluations." He continues in this "gloomy" vein by asking:

Once quotations are traced and names, places, events identified, how does one decide what deserves a note, what doesn't? Obviously the editor's interests and previous knowledge come into play, and though these may be, as here, of the most responsible and wide-ranging sort, may they not also, especially in an imposing edition like this, forestall fresh responses and invite an end to debate?¹²

This is not, certainly, a captious criticism of the difficulty—indeed, I would agree with Professor Middendorf in calling it the "impossibility"—of perfectly reconciling the editor's responsibility to supply essential information with his wish to be as objective and unobtrusive as possible in doing so. As I have observed, the process of annotation is the process by which an individual scholar with certain personal interests and certain personal kinds of competencies mediates between a particular text and a particular kind of reader. That he should be entirely objective and self-effacing in performing this function is a happiness unobtainable by the very nature of the art. Try as he may not to do so, the editor cannot help governing, to some degree, the reader's response to the text.

But the gloom this dilemma inspires need not be quite so oppressive as it seems to Professor Middendorf. As a reader myself of scholarly editions, far from resenting I have been grateful for the opportunity a good set of notes provides to share the editor's insights into the text and his knowledge of its contexts and circumstances—to share, that is, his informed personal response to the text based on a consideration of its meanings more prolonged and intensive than my own could be. Though it is true, furthermore, that the interpretations suggested in the notes to a definitive edition carry the stamp of authority, need we really be quite so apprehensive that the readers of such an edition, who are for the most part teachers and scholars and critics, cannot be trusted to judge for themselves the validity and usefulness of these interpretations? A scholarly edition is addressed to the most sophisticated audience imaginable; its readers may be supposed, I think, to accept or reject what is offered them according to their sense of its accuracy and cogency. Anxious as he understandably is to keep to a minimum editorial interference in the reading process, Middendorf, I suspect, would prefer Friedman's spare and extremely conservative manner of annotating Gold-

smith to Donald Bond's more liberal practice in his edition of *The Spectator*, and surely Friedman's modesty and self-restraint as an editor are admirable. But knowing how brilliantly, after so many years of study, he *might* have illuminated his author for us, many have thought these virtues achieved at too great a sacrifice.

Though I have so far illustrated the purpose and nature of literary annotation chiefly by reference to "notes of recovery," these same principles apply equally to notes of the "explanatory" kind, which must also supply the reader with essential information only and in the briefest compass possible. Here, however, as I have remarked, the task of the editor defines itself less neatly: it is generally speaking simple enough to recognize those allusions to persons, places, events, or literary works that need clarifying; it is not so simple to decide which of an author's ideas or expressions need to be rendered more intelligible by placing them in context. Such decisions will of course be easier to make the better an editor knows his author and the historical and intellectual milieu that influenced his thought, for he will then be better able to tell when the author is using concepts that carried a special significance for him and his first readers of which a modern audience may be unaware. Ideas such as "Prudence" (p. 36) or "Good-nature" (p. 39), the dramatic unities (p. 209) or the chain of being (p. 481), the double standard in sexual matters (p. 755) or the reputation of the Dutch for cowardice (p. 513) had meanings for Fielding and his contemporaries which in the course of time either have been lost entirely, or have been modified to the point where some explanation is required to restore them to their original contexts. Notes such as these are particularly difficult to write, however, since the topics in question—often implying the basic assumptions and representative ideas of an entire culture—invite a copiousness of treatment that the editor must try to resist. Essays, indeed monographs, have been written on such subjects; but the editor, whose medium might be thought the sonnet form of scholarship, must distill an adequate sense of them as efficiently as possible. Here especially his powers of discrimination and his sense of proportion will be tested.

Having discussed the general principles governing the purpose of literary annotation, let us consider more practical matters of procedure—a subject on which Professor Friedman's pioneering article is particularly judicious and helpful. With some slight qualification Friedman's insistence that illustrative evidence used in annotation must not be "drawn from writings later

than the one being edited"¹³ should be regarded as axiomatic. The editor in a note is trying to reconstruct for the reader those *original* elements which informed the *author's* intention, who, as he wrote the passage in question, cannot have been acquainted with the fruits of modern scholarship or, for that matter, with any sources of information published later than the period in which he composed the work. Friedman's formulation of this primary axiom of annotation is, however, rather too strict. The meanings a given allusion or idea has for an author do not cease to exist at the moment his work is published; they may continue to live in his thoughts and therefore may find expression in his later works in ways that can illuminate the passage we are annotating. This same persistence of meaning, moreover, is just as obviously a feature of the historical context in which the work was written. In attempting to recreate meanings for his reader the editor should actually confine himself to considering the *useful life* of the idea in question. All things being equal, he will prefer to adduce illustrative evidence from earlier sources (not *much* earlier, of course: since, as the very purpose of annotation suggests, meanings change over the course of time, we will generally wish to annotate an author by reference to writings and ideas more or less contemporary with him). Lacking such earlier sources—or, for that matter, lacking earlier sources which will illuminate a passage as effectively as some later source—the editor may reasonably look ahead to find his evidence. The closer such evidence is to the time of composition of the passage, the more persuasive it will be; and in any event we must not range beyond the immediate historical and personal contexts which define the life of the idea. Some latitude in this matter is admissible. In annotating the passage in *The Champion* (12 February 1739/40) in which Fielding commends Samuel Boyse's poem, *Deity*, for example, the editor of that journal will certainly wish to cite the almost identical compliment in *Tom Jones* (VII. i), published nine years later. Or in glossing Fielding's attitude toward duelling implicit in Jones's reluctance to fight Northerton (pp. 383-84), we will not fail to mention the much fuller and more explicit condemnation of this practice in *Amelia* (1751) and *The Covent-Garden Journal* (14 January 1752). Indeed, the best sources I could find to illustrate the specific nature of Fielding's comments on The Bull's Head Inn at Meriden (p. 574) or on "Beau" Nash's reputation as self-appointed guardian of the young ladies at Bath (p. 585) were books published, respectively, in 1757 and 1761, several years after the novelist's death.

Friedman's second axiom concerns the focussing of a note: "the editor," he asserts, "should annotate only what his author has to say about a subject, not the whole subject and everything connected with it."¹⁴ As a general principle this, of course, is perfectly sound, since the purpose of any note, as we have been insisting all along, is not to indulge the editor in displaying the full range of his erudition, but to clarify the author's specific meaning and intention. When annotating Fielding's representation of conditions in Newgate Prison in *Amelia* (I. iii), for example, we should focus on those particular features of the subject which illuminate the corresponding circumstances of the narrative; we should not rehearse the entire history of the prison or stray into a sociological survey of English penal reform. In actual practice, however, this axiom also requires a certain latitude of interpretation that Friedman, if we consider the conservative character of his notes to the Goldsmith edition, seems not to have intended. For, as I earlier remarked, what an author has to say about a subject can often be adequately understood only if the reader is apprized of the historical contexts and circumstances affecting it. Implicit in what Fielding in *Tom Jones* has to say—often in rather elliptical and oblique ways—about such subjects as "Prudence" (p. 36 and passim), the aesthetic principle of contrast (p. 212), or the polity of the gypsies (p. 666) are a whole range of complex historical associations which, once we are aware of them, significantly deepen our sense of the author's quality of thought, of how conventional or original he may be in his treatment of a subject.

Friedman's next two caveats are, one hopes, too patently just to require further comment. The editor, he insists, must be precise in distinguishing from among several possible contexts the particular frame of reference implied in his author's treatment of an idea; and he must be scrupulous enough not to mislead the reader by setting up "false parallels" between the passage he is annotating and those adduced to illustrate it.¹⁵ Errors of discrimination this fundamental are obviously irresponsible; indeed, they are in a sense unethical, since the editor who commits them is abusing the reader's trust.

From Friedman's analysis two further axioms may be drawn respecting the kinds of cogency to be achieved in explanatory annotations. I have some slight reservations about the general usefulness of the first of these, which seems to confuse the advantage of identifying the specific source of an idea or expression with what seems to me the greater and rather different virtue of illuminating the author's thought; the second principle, however, con-

stitutes a cardinal rule for effective annotation. Friedman thus offers the following definition:

We may, I think, set it down as a principle that the most convincing explanatory notes are those in which unmistakable plagiarism from earlier writings is shown, for in such cases we have the unique elements out of which the author has constructed parts of his text. If this is true, it follows that other notes (at least notes that are intended to show similarity, not difference—that is, that reveal the author following a tradition of thought or expression, not departing from it) will be convincing and enlightening to the extent that the parallels pointed out approach plagiarism.¹⁶

No doubt the most "convincing" note is one which demonstrates an author's verbatim borrowing from a particular source, since in this instance the reader can have no suspicion that the correspondence proposed is the product of mere coincidence or of the editor's fancy. And there is always a heady thrill in catching a writer in the act of pilfering. Few authors, however, are such irrepressible plagiarists as Goldsmith, on whose example Friedman chiefly bases his analysis. For the most part, an editor cannot expect to find a *specific* source for his author's ideas; indeed, to set about the task of annotation assuming that the only proper and successful note is one that demonstrates a plagiarism—as Friedman, following this axiom, seems to have done in editing Goldsmith—is to achieve cogency at the expense of other, no less useful kinds of illumination. Rather, the editor must be alert to more general correspondencies, to echoes from various works that approximate the phrasing of the text. He must have a good memory, certainly, so that he "hears" the text as he conducts his research; but he must also rely on his judgment to distinguish the viable context of his author's thought. The note that supplies this context, though it may be somewhat less "convincing," will often be more "enlightening" than one which merely records a plagiarism; for it will inform the reader not only of what the author read, but of how he read—how he was influenced, whether positively or negatively, by the vital currents of thought of his time.

For this reason Friedman's next axiom, which addresses itself to the usefulness of this latter kind of note and to the most effective method of proceeding in such annotation, is especially valuable. Friedman here rightly insists that when attempting to reconstruct the viable contexts of an author's

thought, the editor will be more convincing when the parallels he adduces are drawn from sources more or less contemporary with the work being annotated. Correspondences between an author's ideas and those expressed in works published, say, a hundred years earlier are likely to seem merely fortuitous, whereas the same correspondences occurring in several works published within a few years of each other probably derive from a common current of thought. Thus, in Friedman's model, Louis Landa shed much light on Swift's "Sermon upon the Martyrdom of K. Charles I" by demonstrating numerous parallels between Swift's topics and rhetorical strategies and those of many other thirtieth-of-January sermons. The point, of course, will not be that the author actually read all or indeed any of these contemporary documents, but that, in Friedman's words, the work "is in many ways explained by being thus related to its historical background."¹⁷ More than the identification of outright plagiarisms—which is seldom possible—the definition of such relationships between text and context is one of the most valuable services an editor can perform. I would, however, again insist on a somewhat more liberal construction of the principle than Friedman's statement allows. What constitutes the contemporaneity of a parallel passage—and therefore its potential validity as an element in the editor's commentary on the text—is defined only in part by the proximity of its actual *date of publication* to the period of the text's composition. Fundamentally, of course, the contemporaneity of such a passage is determined by its *currency* during the period of composition. In this sense *Hamlet* and *Paradise Lost*, say, are no less contemporary with *Tom Jones* than Moore's *The Foundling* or Boyse's *Deity*, and, as Fielding himself makes clear, the sermons of the seventeenth-century divines Isaac Barrow and John Tillotson influenced his thought to an even greater degree than the works of Bishop Hoadly.

At the risk of belaboring a point I have already insisted on, I wish to conclude this review of Friedman's useful article by heartily endorsing a principle which, though applied in his final remarks to the making of "notes of recovery" only, should in fact be applied to the procedure of annotation in general: "namely, that as far as possible [an editor's notes] should be derived from contemporary sources rather than from modern reference books."¹⁸ The editor who takes this advice stands a far better chance of being able to illustrate the precise nuances of meaning a particular topic had for the author and his first readers. If it were not so apparent that many

editors are unaware of the most obvious of these contemporary sources—namely, the journalism of the period—it would seem impertinent to add that the first step toward recovering information of this kind should be the conscientious perusal of at least those newspapers and magazines published during the period of the work's composition. By studying not only the "leaders," but also the news items and advertisements contained in such documents, the editor will come as close as possible to recreating in his own mind the daily circumstances in which his author wrote and to which he sometimes alludes in his writings. By analyzing the advertisements and monthly catalogues of works published during this period, moreover, and by tracking down and examining as many of these works as possible, the editor will often discover in even the fugitive literature of the time patterns of thought and allusion that illuminate his text in unexpected ways. From such hints couched in contemporary news items and advertisements, for example, I was able to deduce the personal circumstances underlying the episode of the puppet show in *Tom Jones* (XII. v-vi), and to identify Fielding's cryptic allusion in *Amelia* (I. ii) to "the celebrated Writer of three Letters" as a reference to Bolingbroke.

Let me conclude by proposing, in summary form, the following definitions of the purpose and nature of literary annotation, together with some recommendations concerning basic procedures for the annotator. I have in mind specifically, of course, as I trust will be clear by now, the typical case of a scholarly edition of an eighteenth-century literary text of unexceptional allusive density; but perhaps other editors in other fields will find at least some of these principles helpful in their own tasks.

The purpose of literary annotation, whether of "explanatory notes" or "notes of recovery," is to recover for the reader, as briefly and objectively as possible, all essential information (and *only* essential information) necessary to render the author's meaning wholly intelligible, the "author's meaning" being understood as not only the primary denotative significance of a passage but also, when appropriate, its full range of implicit associations, whether biographical, historical, or literary. To achieve this purpose an effective note will serve one or more of four functions: (1) it may define obscure terms or provide translations of words and passages in a foreign language; (2) it may identify persons, places, events, and literary allusions, supplying the reader when appropriate with such additional contextual information as he needs to appreciate how the reference "works" in the text;

(3) it may illuminate the author's ideas or expressions either by citing specific sources for them or by adducing parallel passages from contemporary writings; and (4) it will record, whenever they seem significant, parallel or contradictory passages from the author's other works, as well as indicating such passages by cross-references as they occur elsewhere in the text itself. Since the aim of annotation is to reconstruct what a passage meant to the author and his first readers, all such information should be drawn as far as possible from contemporary sources rather than from modern reference books.

Assuming of course that he already has a sound general knowledge of his subject—that he is well acquainted with his author's life, works, and times and has carefully read the text in question—I recommend that the scholarly editor who undertakes to annotate a literary work according to these principles proceed as follows:

(1) He should first establish the text by collation of all editions published during the author's lifetime, observing as he does such unusual typographical features in the first edition especially as may signal the occurrence of a topical reference or literary allusion and noticing as well those substantive revisions which may require explanation. On the importance of such textual analysis to the annotator, see my article, "Fielding's Novels and the Wesleyan Edition: Some Principles and Problems" (cited in note 2).

(2) On the basis of external and internal evidence he should define the period of composition of the work, for by so doing he will define the chronological scope of his most intensive research in contemporary sources.

(3) Having defined the period of composition, he should inform himself in depth of the circumstances in which the author wrote—of his activities, residences, and acquaintances, and of the historical and intellectual events that may have mattered to him. As the surest means to this end, he will of course read through the author's correspondence and other personal papers when they are available. And he should conscientiously examine the newspapers and magazines issued during this period, thus familiarizing himself with its daily history and current topics of interest, and enabling him to identify books, poems, and pamphlets which his author may have read.

(4) He should also extend these investigations into the period immediately following the publication of the work in order to acquaint himself with its early reception as reflected in reviews, letters, etc. In this way not only will he be able to judge the initial general response to the work, but he

will also often recover some of the specific meanings the work had for the author's contemporaries.

(5) With the text in all its detail firmly in mind, he should reread the author's other writings, keeping alert for parallel or contradictory passages. Since this review of the canon will often result in the identification of obscure references in the text which the author has treated elsewhere more explicitly, it should be undertaken at an early stage of the editor's research, though not before he has performed the basic task of establishing the text.

(6) He should then conduct his remaining research by consulting contemporary sources whenever possible, so as to acquaint himself with the specific meanings and connotations an allusion or an idea may have had for the author and his first readers.

(7) Finally, since the identification of some references will generally elude even the most conscientious research, he may wish as a last resort to appeal for help to the community of scholars by publishing a list of queries in appropriate places. (Almost, it may seem, as a vindication of Fielding's belief in a providential universe, three such queries which I published in the *TLS* were answered by three letters, two from German classicists and one from a Canadian scholar, each addressing himself to and identifying a separate allusion!)

The editor who observes these procedures conscientiously will have done what he can to fulfill his responsibility as a mediator between the text and his reader. The thought and spirit of an era being evanescent things and scholars being mortal, he will not of course succeed in illuminating all the dark corners of the work. Too often after the effort to track down an allusion he will find himself having to confess his uncertainty, introducing notes that can claim to be nothing more than guesswork with those, to him, most pitiable of adverbs, "probably" and "possibly"; or declaring his utter helplessness in that still more humiliating phrase—"Not identified." Annotating a topical and complex work from another time can be as arduous a task as writing a proper scholarly book of one's own, and there are no convenient dodges available to an editor, who cannot control his subject as he pleases but must answer, as it were, every question on the examination. In this business the demands and frustrations will sometimes be enough to tempt him to apply to his author what Harry Thunder declares of Rover in the play: "I don't know a pleasanter fellow, except when he gets to his abomi-

nable habit of quotation."¹⁹ Even so, the editor has his compensation; for if his author is worth knowing, few will have come to know him better.

University of Virginia

NOTES

1. Edwards to Yorke from Turrick, 5 April 1751. *Hardwicke Papers: General Correspondence of Philip, 2nd Lord Hardwicke* (B.L. Add. Mss. 35606, ff. 16'-17').

2. See "Fielding's Novels and the Wesleyan Edition: Some Principles and Problems,"* in *Editing Eighteenth Century Novels*, ed. G. E. Bentley, Jr. (Toronto, 1975), pp. 9-30.

3. See *English Institute Annual, 1941* (New York, 1942), pp. 115-28. Alice Walker's article, "Principles of Annotation: Some Suggestions for Editors of Shakespeare," *Studies in Bibliography*, 9 (1957), 95-105, is concerned exclusively with the annotation of vocabulary.

4. *Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith* (Oxford, 1966), I. xx-xxi.

5. Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino, Calif., 1972), p. 201.

6. Moorman, *Editing the Middle English Manuscript* (Jackson, Miss., 1975), p. 94; Schoenbaum, "Editing English Dramatic Texts," in *Editing Sixteenth Century Texts*, ed. R. J. Schoeck (Toronto, 1966), p. 20.

7. See *The Poems of Thomas Gray, William Collins, Oliver Goldsmith* (London, 1969).

8. References to *Tom Jones* are to the Wesleyan Edition, eds. Battestin and Bowers (Oxford and Middletown, Conn., 1975).

9. On this latter point, unknown to me when I annotated the passage, see M. C. and R. R. Battestin, "Fielding, Bedford, and the Westminster Election of 1749," *ECS*, 11 (Winter 1977/78), esp. pp. 146-47.

10. As an illustration of how these several kinds of information may be imparted in a note of this complexity, the Wesleyan Edition, p. 405, n. 2, reads as follows:

George Lyttelton (see above, p. 3, n. 1) in *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul* (May 1747): "The power of imagination in enthusiastical minds is no doubt very strong, but always acts in conformity to the opinions imprinted upon it at the time of its working, and can no more act against them, than a rapid river can carry a boat against the current of its own stream" (*Works*, ed. G. E. Ayscough [1774], p. 316). In context this is Lyttelton's crucial argument to prove that St. Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus was a true miracle and, consequently, that Christianity itself is a divine revelation: since, Lyttelton maintains, Paul set out on his journey not only disbelieving the Christian faith but intending to persecute its followers, his sudden transformation from infidel to believer cannot be explained by reference to natural causes. For another compliment to Lyttelton as 'a Master of Style, as of every other Excellence', see Fielding's Preface to his sister's *Familiar Letters between the Principal Characters in David Simple* (1747). Later in *Tom Jones* (XVIII. iv) Lyttelton's *Observations* is part of the background of Square's conversion (see below, p. 952, n.2).

11. Thorpe, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

12. *Johnsonian News Letter*, 35 (March 1975), p. 2.

13. *English Institute Annual, 1941*, p. 119.

14. *Loc. cit.*

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 120-21.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 121-22.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 123.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 125.

19. John O'Keeffe's *Wild Oats* (1798), I. ii.

Principles of Annotation in Editing Historical Documents; or, How to Avoid Breaking the Butterfly on the Wheel of Scholarship

CHARLES T. CULLEN

Twenty years ago a distinguished and dedicated editor said the most obvious result of the editor's work was his annotation.¹ Many recent reviews of edited volumes support this assertion and suggest, moreover, that annotation has become the most controversial result of the editor's task. As editors have slowly begun to review each other's work it has become apparent that even they do not agree on a set of principles of annotation. Beginning editors are left to their own devices in large part, especially when it comes to note writing. Uncertainty over annotation of edited documents started when professional historians began to take over the task of editing from the amateurs who dominated the field during its first fifty years. The amateurs had no problem with annotation; they simply did not do it, and this approach had a profound effect on the professional historians once they began editing. The result was primary attention to accuracy and completeness and an acceptance of the editor as an "adjunct" to those who wrote history. Worthington C. Ford referred to his colleagues as the ginners who prepared the materials for historians to use in weaving the fabric of history. The first professional historians who became editors—J. Franklin Jameson, Edmund C. Burnett, Clarence E. Carter, and others—considered it their mission to publish documents in order to make source materials more widely available to the profession.²

Since 1950 we have entered into a new stage of development in historical editing that most refer to as "modern editing." It was initiated by Julian Boyd's publication of the first volume of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, and is distinguished from previous edited works by its high scholarship in the treatment of documents, but most importantly by its introduction of scholarship in annotation. Although Boyd's methods have not always been imitated, each editor of a new documentary project since 1950 has been influenced by his innovations and has adopted at least some of his practices. Overall, this new method has had strong defenders and sometimes vehement critics, especially as it has encouraged historical interpretation in annotation.

When many historians remained critical of the new method after the National Historical Publications Commission initiated its large program of sponsorship, Lester Cappon delivered an important defense of the practice of interpretive annotation. Arguing that it offered a "rationale for historical editing," Cappon decried what he termed a "misconception of historical method" that held that historical editors merely accumulated facts in footnotes that might later be critically evaluated and turned into "history" by others. The editor is expected to obtain satisfaction from an affair with the documents themselves while the historical writer uses them to draw conclusions which are then shared in articles or books. Cappon suggested that editors cannot escape the process of historical interpretation as they reflect upon the documents during the early stages of editing. Such prolonged reflection enables the editor to "offer an interpretation as worthy of respect as that of the historical writer within the framework of his particular subject." Cappon concluded that "the editor whose comprehension of the sources fails to identify any significant meaning in or beyond them has his counterpart in the historian whose narrative never transcends the facts."³ Stanley Idzerda, in a talk on the status of editors, put it another way: " 'No documents, no history, . . . No erudition, no history.' Surely there must be the documents, the raw material however defined, but without an erudition adequate to the documents, the work of history may be ill-conceived or poisoned at the source. Neither piety, eloquence, charm, nor even patriotism will ever be a substitute for straightforward, thorough, workmanlike competence with all the historical insight and the tools and apparatus which can put the document in its setting, illuminate it in ways which raw empiricism never can, and elicit from the document some of the meaning and potential it has for the historian and finally for the person who peruses the historian's work seeking knowledge and understanding."⁴

Yet, almost thirty years after Boyd introduced the practice, criticism remains and is sometimes stated most strongly by editors. At a recent conference of editors, a discussion of annotation produced more voices in opposition to what might be termed "interpretive notes" than voices heard in support of the practice. Such a position has a long history and is supported by the widely consulted pamphlet on historical editing written by Clarence E. Carter in 1952. Carter stated quite succinctly and simply, "the editor must eschew any and all forms of interpretation; he cannot deal with his documents in a subjective manner. There is no exception to this rule."⁵

When volume fifteen of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* appeared, a former assistant editor of that project wrote in a review, "I do not think it is the editor's business to tell us what the documents say," using as partial justification for that statement his contention that his interpretation of a particular letter was exactly opposite from the editor's.⁶ More recently the most persistent critic from within the craft, Robert A. Rutland, said "an editor's responsibility . . . is to permit a scholar to do his own work. The thrill of discovery is one of the great attractions to scholarship, and the editor who throws out a broad net to gather all the information and deliver it, neatly bundled, will make only a small catch in a vast ocean of fact and interpretation. He will also run the risk of misleading scholars because of his prejudices and personal leanings."

Many historians continue to insist that the editor should "edit" and not turn his task into an opportunity to "cast a broad net" or to "farm" the subject of his publication. On the one hand, James Hutson argued in his review of the Franklin papers that an editor's attempt to introduce his documents created an impression that an "official" interpretation was being offered and that such practices suggested a kind of preemption by the scholarly editor of topics closely related to his subject. On the other hand, some historians, recognizing the closeness of the specialist to his subject, have expressed a belief in the supremacy of a scholarly editor's interpretation. Controversy has been the inevitable result of this dichotomy, but the present debate over annotation of historical documents is centered more precisely upon the scope of editorial notes than upon the question of interpretation within those notes. This is as it should be.

The different approaches scholarly editors and historical writers employ in their work must be remembered when one considers the question of intellectual scope in annotation of historical documents. A mutually beneficial coexistence between the editing branch and the rest of the historical profession will be the natural result of editors paying stricter attention to the limitations of their subject and historians recognizing the non-restrictive implications of competent annotation. Editors should concentrate their efforts on establishing a set of principles that would produce quality scholarship free of excess while recognizing the innovation and improvement in post-1950 historical editing. Rutland's comment in 1976 neglects, inadvertently perhaps, the point that historical editors must themselves be scholars and that occasionally, without casting broad nets, they will make discoveries as a

result of their editing that might not be made by the historical writer using traditional fishing tackle. His words could well be turned to say the editor's responsibility is to work as a scholar, and, when experiencing the thrill of discovery, to offer his findings to other scholars even at the risk (universally shared by historians) of misleading them because of prejudice or personal proclivity. By campaigning for what he terms "the light touch" in annotation Rutland overlooks the relative degree of compatibility that exists between both ends of the spectrum and obscures his own primary but perhaps unrecognized concern with scope rather than interpretation.

What is the proper scope for scholarly annotation? First, last, and always, the subject of the volume or series must be considered. Some collections of papers need little or no annotation whatsoever. *Children of Pride* is such a publication and its sales figures of more than 20,000 copies attest to its widespread use. In general, collections of papers revolving around a single topic require less annotation than one in which a prominent individual's papers are being published. As always, it is the subject that controls. The eagerly awaited publication of papers dealing with newly freed blacks, being edited by Ira Berlin, offers an example. These papers will tell readers a great deal with little or no annotation. Questions of provenance, variant texts, and in many instances completeness will not be as important as if the subject were an individual and the papers pertained to many varied topics. Here the subject is a topic and all the papers will themselves illuminate the subject whether the editors annotate or not. The identification of a former master or a soldier passing through a neighborhood will reveal little about the subject of newly freed slaves. Similarly the discovery that most letters written from Mississippi were postmarked in Natchez rather than Jackson as previously believed will have little relevance to the subject of the collection and ought not receive lengthy treatment in an essay. However, the editors, as historians, fully intend to write about their discoveries and interpretations of the experience of freedom from slavery as revealed in these papers, and indeed, as scholars they are obliged to do this. It would be inappropriate for them to edit several volumes of these documents and then walk away from this responsibility owed to the historical—and editing—profession. Furthermore, there is no good reason why these findings should not be discussed by the editors in one or more of their volumes; the interpretation of the edited documents ought properly to be with them rather than in a separate publi-

cation that may not be accessible to the general reader untrained in historical bibliography.

The scope of a collection of papers dealing with an individual is quite different. Here the subject is the person and the documents are not always closely related in character or content. The editor must determine what requires annotation, using several fundamental principles as his guide. He must gauge his audience using the best intelligent speculation at his command. If the audience is defined too broadly and attempts are made to satisfy virtually every reader, the volumes will become pure reference works and will probably contain too little of interest to any single reader. Furthermore, readers will miss the opportunity of discovering that good, even great, history can be found in other forms than the single monograph on which we have too long relied. Perhaps the audience aimed for should be approximately the same as if the editors were writing a general life and times biography. Other scholars would be rewarded with information while general readers would not be lost in technical discussions or interpretations of minutiae. This requires discipline on the part of the editor, who, if he digresses too far beyond his primary subject, will cause confusion in his readers' minds as to what the subject actually is. For example, the subject of Marshall during the Federalist period remains John Marshall and not Thomas Jefferson or the government. Annotation of papers emanating from his pen or coming to his attention ought not wander from the subject of Marshall's effect on people or events or vice versa. A long essay, for example, on the development of commerce in the 1780s would be out of place in the absence of Marshall documents indicating an involvement in the question. It might be out of place anyway unless it were needed to understand his involvement as discussed in his papers.⁸ If this principle is adhered to it is unlikely that the editors of Marshall's papers would preempt any additional scholarly work on topics their subject encounters; holding their focus on Marshall at all times might lead to discussions of significant discoveries about their subject but it would still allow other scholars to do their own additional related work. If the focus is kept on the subject, the work of other scholars will be enhanced by the contributions of the historical editor in his annotation.

By the very nature of the craft, editors make discoveries by asking questions of the documents being prepared for publication that are not frequently asked by other historians. If editors employ high standards of scholarship in questioning their documents, they will inevitably experience the "thrill of

discovery." Indeed, the adoption of a casual attitude toward annotation inevitably results in a casual questioning of the documents and the scholar becomes once again at best a mere scribe. Dedication and strict adherence to high standards of scholarly editing result in texts that should never need reworking, texts that are adorned with helpful annotation that does not intrude or obscure, and occasionally with historical interpretation that leads rather than stops scholars in their constant search for truth. As Julian Boyd wrote in defense of this practice almost fifteen years ago, "the editorial scholar who has assumed the responsibility for defining the central body of documentation belonging to a great man's recorded words and actions, for relating this to the larger body of the records of his age, for confronting every page of every variant text of each particle of this mass, for accounting for enclosures, memoranda, and every other ascertainable document that passed under his subject's eye and impinged upon his consciousness, and for presenting the result in systematic order with disciplined comment—such a scholar has assumed obligations of collation, comparison, and investigation that the biographer and the historian in their necessarily selective tasks are not normally called upon to meet in the same manner or in the same degree."⁹

Boyd's critics, as well as critics of other editors, have asserted that this kind of editing changes the function of the practitioner from an editor to an author. But what if we were to substitute "historian" for "author"? Is the editor an historian, and if he is, does he cease functioning as one when he prepares important documents for publication? Does he mask his discoveries or attempt to separate them from the documents by publication in a separate work such as a journal or monograph? Annotation is only the natural by-product of the editing experience and Boyd and Cappon have properly insisted upon including it within the boundaries of their work as editors. If editors are guided by adherence to the principle that the subject of their publication controls their boundaries when they are writing their interpretations they should not stray far afield and lose sight of the main task undertaken—the editing of documents.

The editor frequently employs the rules of internal evidence to establish the author or recipient of a letter, or sometimes most significantly, to establish the correct date it was written. Each of these tasks is more easily done in the context of the entire corpus of a subject's papers. While working on volume two of the Marshall papers, we encountered many letters and other

documents relating to the lands claimed by Denny Martin Fairfax in Northern Virginia. It is generally known that Marshall had purchased some of that land after a compromise with the state legislature in 1796. It is also known that litigation over the title to the land was reopened after the turn of the century and that the landmark decision in *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee* settled the issue finally in Marshall's favor. Nevertheless, several of the documents did not fit comfortably into the picture. Before deciding that pieces of the puzzle were lost and that the currently accepted interpretation simply should be left to prevail, we studied the documents in our collection, asking not only what they told us about the event but also what each meant to its recipient. People were identified if possible, references to other documents or sources of other documents and information were explored. Motivation in writing each document was questioned. Realizing that this effort might result in nothing new was no deterrent, nor can it be for the editor. The responsible editor must ask these questions routinely, as should any good historian.

One particular document had not been dated by Marshall and it had been lying in the Virginia State Library with a circa date penciled on it by a clerk. The date seemed plausible—ca. 1793—and we had inserted it at that point in our collection. However, it contained a sentence that when fully researched by trained historians resulted in the basis for an entirely new interpretation of Marshall's role as an attorney, as one of the principals in the purchase of Fairfax's land, and as an interested party in *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*. After exploring the ramifications of statements made in the letter, it became apparent also that the 11th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution had been ratified in Virginia. The opinion Marshall held of provisions of that amendment revealed an interpretation that has never been explored by constitutional historians before. The re-dating of the letter in question (to ca. 1795) therefore was significant beyond our expectations. Simply printing the letter under what we had decided was its correct date with no annotation informing readers of the significance of the change would have been foolish. It would have been worse than historical narrative that does not transcend the facts. It would have left readers unaware of the significance of the change in relation to the other documents on this topic within the corpus of Marshall's papers.

Occasionally a single document in a collection will require substantial annotation. In the same volume as the Fairfax material was a lengthy docu-

merit called "Notes of Evidence" in *Commonwealth v. Randolph*, copied by John Randolph of Roanoke from the original. This has existed as the only source of information on that famous murder "trial" in the 1790s that involved one of Virginia's most prominent families and reveals details of social life in this period seldom seen in other kinds of documents. Biographers of John Randolph of Roanoke, brother of the accused, and Patrick Henry, attorney for the accused, have relied upon Marshall's "notes" as evidence of what occurred in the courtroom when Richard Randolph was brought before the bar. Readers of popular history, who must not be ignored by historical editors, had seen a novel on the affair, again relying upon Marshall's notes for several chapters. An article in *American Heritage* purported to give the best scholarly, and up-to-date account. It too placed primary reliance upon this document. In sum, the editors felt some obligation to print the document and to explain as well as possible what it was about.

When the editors attempted to establish the authenticity of what had been considered by scholars and amateur historians for 200 years an account of the proceedings of Richard Randolph's "trial," they called upon their expertise as scholars of Virginia legal history and recognized that the document could not be what it had always been considered—Richard Randolph, as a white citizen, could not be tried in the county court for a felony. Therefore, this document could not be an account of a trial since none had taken place (the case ended in the county court). In attempting to say what it was, the editors were obliged to inform their readers of this fact and to suggest alternative interpretations in order to make the document understandable in the context of the papers of John Marshall. That is, if this document was not Marshall's account of what went on in court, then what was it and how was he involved? A seven page note focused on the meaning of the document and, incidentally, offered a reinterpretation of the case that was appropriate, but the subject—John Marshall—always controlled the annotation.

This same principle applies to the task of writing explanatory or identifying footnotes and we should recognize after all that most of our annotation results from this responsibility. Much of the criticism made by historians is centered on excessive or too sparse annotation in what we might consider routine notes. Leonard Levy's legendary review of several volumes of the Madison papers impressed several errant editors but it failed to suggest any principles or standards for this kind of annotation that could guide editors

toward a sensible practice.¹⁰ Editors constantly struggle with the question of what to explain or identify and they have been left to decide on their own in the best tradition of the academic cloister. Wilmarth Lewis discussed his experience with this problem as he introduced a series of Horace Walpole's correspondence. Advocating a principle of moderation in this kind of note writing, he offered Walpole's own words from a letter in his current volume as illustration: "since neither Aristotle nor Bossu have laid down rules for letters, and consequently have left them to their native wildness, I shall persist in saying whatever comes uppermost, and the less I am understood by anybody but the person I write to, so much the better. St. Paul is my model for letter-writing, who being a man of fashion and very unaffected, never studies for what he shall say, but in one paragraph takes care of Timothy's soul, and in the next of his own cloak." Lewis wrote a footnote to that last sentence after consulting a biblical scholar and learning that Paul had probably written the part about his cloak but not about Timothy's soul. After struggling with his principles as an editor, he deleted the note from the printer's proofs.¹¹ Advocating a different principle of annotation in a review of *The Papers of James K. Polk*, Aida DiPace Donald lamented the "inadequate annotation" she found there. "There are literally dozens of events in the Polk correspondence that need explication and cross reference," she wrote. "Throughout the early years we need some annotation to guide us through the thickets of Tennessee politics; family affairs are too tangled because of scanty notes; and on national politics and sometimes international affairs we could use some aid."¹²

The editor is under no obligation to explain every subject or identify every person mentioned in a document he is printing. He is, however, obliged to consider doing so and he should be guided by the importance of the person or thing in general and to his subject in particular. The more important and well-known the subject or individual the less he or it needs annotation. This is not to say that he or it should have no annotation. A famous person may be briefly identified by dates or a special association to the subject of the publication may be noted. To identify such persons as presidents or such things as Jay's Treaty or the French Revolution is pedantry and deserves the ridicule it invites. But the editor should be aware that people or events well-known in the region or area closest to his subject may not be so well-known nationally. A note might be employed in the Marshall papers, for example, to explain what the James River canal was. Even

though it is generally well-known to students of that period who have studied Virginia history, it may not be familiar to students of New England or the Southwest. And it may not be known to general readers outside Virginia.

It is difficult to propose definite guidelines for unfamiliar individuals and subjects. By their very nature of being unknown they are perhaps more important to the historical editor in terms of the amount of work they might require in annotation. There is, of course, a category of people who are not necessarily well-known but who are identified in such works as the *Dictionary of American Biography*, *Biographical Directory of Congress*, and *Who's Who*. People included in these are often identified in annotation simply for the convenience of the reader. Footnotes for these people require very little time and sometimes save the reader the inconvenience of going to a library to look up particulars on his own. Within this category, again, the editor must keep his focus on the subject of his publication. The relationship of people and things to the subject is what is important in most instances.

The problem of identifying people mentioned in incoming correspondence is perplexing. Some editors have argued that they should spend whatever time it takes trying to identify these people. This position flirts with pedantry. Attempts to identify a long (or short, for that matter) list of names attached to a letter or contained with the letter simply because they are there is not the proper duty of the historical editor. Such names generally have little relationship to the subject and notes identifying a dozen or more individuals in one document take the focus away from the subject and when compounded cause confusion. Occasionally a single unknown person will be mentioned in incoming correspondence and because of the editor's familiarity with his subject he may know the name has potential significance. In a letter from Rawleigh Colston to John Marshall, for example, Colston relates the story of the loss of his house when a slave set it afire. The mention of a neighbor's name may seem insignificant and indeed may prove to be so. But the editor's knowledge that Colston is Marshall's brother-in-law suggests that the neighbor may be known to Marshall and may appear again in later correspondence. Attempts to identify him may uncover facts important to the subject, but the editor's good judgment should direct him in determining the reasonable amount of time he will spend ferreting out information on the person. For example, the editor may know from his reading of the entire collection that the unknown person's name

appears again later in additional incoming and perhaps even outgoing correspondence. His initial significance may be unknown to the editor but his appearance has raised a question an historian must not ignore. By focusing on the subject, John Marshall, the unknown person in this example has taken on potential importance.

If editors can accept the general principle that annotation should focus on the subject of the publication several caveats should be offered to help avoid pitfalls. In all things the editor must be guided by moderation. This rule applies to all forms of annotation and if followed should result in concise, lean, clear notes that will not detract from the reader's primary interest which is the document itself. Notes full of extraneous detail, even though terribly important in general, do not belong in documentary editions. Citations to secondary sources should be used to refer interested readers to more detailed information than the editor, in his wisdom, has elected to include in his footnote, but it is worth remembering that leading monographs and articles are often replaced with different and sometimes better works. Again, moderation should be the guiding rule. The occasion may arise when the editor might refer readers to a thorough account of some background event that is fundamentally important to his subject and the note or essay he is writing but which has been covered adequately elsewhere. References to primary sources are more useful to those who may be interested in sources, in any event. Word that information on a specific topic may be found in the Wolcott Papers or the St. George Tucker Papers is more beneficial to the scholar who, presumably, already knows the leading secondary literature or at least how to find it on his own. This is an area where the editor should "permit the scholar to do his own work" by offering no more than leads to information.

Annotation should not be used for displays of erudition in essays that bear questionable connection to the documents they pretend to introduce or explain. Arthur Link, in a popular talk on this subject, uses the hypothetical example of a brief mention in a Jefferson Davis letter about a trip on a riverboat down the Mississippi River. "This is no occasion for a long essay on riverboat travel on the Mississippi, and don't worry about finding the name of the mule," he advises. Also, polemical essays are out of place in historical editing. It is not the editor's function to condemn or defend anything, but to let the documents reveal their substance to the reader without taking the focus off the subject. Many of the editor's discoveries go beyond

the range of their subject of documentary publication. The experience of working on the Fairfax case, discussed above, is a case in point. It became apparent that the full story of this topic would be of the utmost importance to Virginia history during this period and might even lead to a spectacular discovery. The story was of monographic proportion, however, and involved what appeared to be collusion, perhaps even conspiracy, between the executive and judiciary as the state tried to win its case against Fairfax. Some of the issues in the affair were revived after Marshall became chief justice by a leading figure on the state Court of Appeals and the full story might well provide a significant new interpretation of Virginia politics at the turn of the century. But this was beyond the scope of John Marshall and his attempt to clear the title to the Fairfax lands. Editorial projects should not become establishments that then create unique publication farms. Adoption of that posture tends to encourage editors to spend more and more time in annotation which they may develop with a degree of leisure and assurance of publication that historians normally do not have. (All historians should have the former but it would be undesirable for all to have the latter.) When lack of moderation has resulted in excessive annotation it has tended to evoke resentment and even hostility within the profession that can only exacerbate misunderstandings about historical editing. No plethora of fine editing will convince those historians who have become predisposed against it solely because of past abuses, nor will students profit from the instruction this segment of the profession could provide. Some editors, assured of publication, may well continue to preempt additional research on broad topics that they choose to write on, justifying their excesses with lipservice to the responsibilities of historical editing. If, however, editors adopt principles that advocate moderation and balance in annotation, always limiting the focus to the subject of publication, they will be less likely to err in the direction of excess and will be better able to share their insights and discoveries with other scholars who, in turn, would then be in a better position to use the findings of scholarly editors to write monographs and articles on broader, less limited topics. Editors would then be truly nourishing the roots of history rather than harvesting seemingly mature crops.

Editors must not confuse problems of annotation with problems of funding. In attempting to adopt principles of annotation we must recognize that good editing, like good history, takes time and time costs money. The pressures of tenure and the current employment situation in the historical pro-

fession have produced too many hastily written, even hastily conceived, books and articles. To apply haste to the task of editing documents prevents adherence to high standards and wastes the money spent on the effort by creating the necessity of a better edition later on. Too many of the early twentieth century editions are flawed primarily because of decisions based on economics. Would it be better now to publish ten volumes of a figure's papers in a fashion that would eliminate the need for re-editing them ever again than to publish quickly twenty-five volumes that are not reliable because of errors born of haste? If we believe in agreed upon principles of editing, we should adhere to those principles and publish as much as the funds will allow. Later editors can begin where we leave off if we must close down for lack of funds. While problems of funding may be considered in the adoption of principles of annotation they should not govern adherence to those principles once a project is begun.

Many of the problems of and misunderstandings over historical editing would be removed or greatly lessened by the adoption of formal training in editing within graduate, and possibly undergraduate, curricula. Traditional historical method courses concentrate on historiography, and exercises with internal and external evidence, for example, are directed at writing history rather than toward developing critical abilities. Papers written in these courses normally are traditional research papers, sometimes filling in as a chapter in one's thesis or dissertation. It is perhaps not possible to train students, or editors for that matter, in the area of annotation, but anyone calling himself an historian should have some knowledge of what an editor does and what principles should guide him as an editor. An historical methods seminar that required completion of a group of edited documents and mixed discussion and reading of the history of editing with traditional historiography and methodology would produce better historians and better editors.

Stanley Idzerda suggested that historians have a distorted and improper view of editing because most of us consider edited documents as strictly a professional tool. "We do not seem to see the need for public understanding of the raw materials of our heritage, and maybe we assume that the public cannot or should not delve into the sources," he stated.¹³ Annotation properly conceived and properly executed helps solve this problem, but it requires better training and more widespread acceptance of certain basic principles of annotation in order to benefit scholar and layman at the same time. As an example, scholars interested in aspects of the history of Richmond have

found the annotation to John Marshall's account book helpful, while interested laymen have purportedly enjoyed reading about the variety of activity in that city during its early history as experienced by a prominent citizen whose subsequent career had previously eclipsed his involvement in this early activity. General readers have explained that our early volumes changed their impression of John Marshall as an imposing, even austere judicial figure, to an engaging, gregarious, although legally trained, public figure. The documents contain much of this insight, but some of them would have been very limited in their use without annotation. Marshall's account book proved to be a fascinating document full of information that only came to light as the annotation progressed.

The adoption of an adherence to high standards of annotation, coupled with equal commitment to the application of the best principles of establishing authenticity, transcription, and completeness, will justify the large amounts of money and time required to carry out the editorial function. If the teaching of editing is combined with excellence in the craft, the historical profession will benefit broadly and we can perhaps begin to work together to write better history by joining forces and sharing skills that are more complimentary than divergent. Good editing, especially in the area of annotation, can lubricate the wheel of scholarship in a unique and highly beneficial manner, but it is essential that we adopt a set of principles for annotation that recognizes the application of scholarship in our craft and rewards those who adhere to them with the satisfaction of producing lasting contributions to history.

NOTES

1. Lester J. Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," in *In Support of Clio; Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kollar* (Madison, Wise, 1958), 182.

2. For concise summaries of the history of editing, see Lyman H. Butterfield, "Historical Editing in the United States: The Recent Past," *American Antiquarian Society, Proceedings*, LXXII, Pt. 2 (Oct. 16 and 17, 1962), 283-308; Lester J. Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing Past and Present," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., XXIII (Jan. 1966), 56-75; and National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents: A Report to the President* (Washington, D.C., 1954).

3. Cappon, "Rationale," 72-73.

4. Stanley J. Idzerda, "The Editor's Training and Status in the Historical Profession," in Leslie W. Dunlap and Fred Shelley, eds., *The Publication of American Historical Manuscripts* (Iowa City, 1976), 18-19.

5. Clarence E. Carter, *Historical Editing*. *Bulletins of the National Archives*, Number 7 (Washington, D.C., 1952), 25.

6. James H. Hutson, review of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XV, in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XCVI (1972), 534.

7. Rutland quoted in *Annotation: Newsletter of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission*, IV (April 1976), 2-3.

8. An example that is not hypothetical is discussed by Leonard Levy in his review of the Madison papers when he takes the editors to task for a long note on Edmund Randolph's hat. See *Journal of American History*, LIX (June 1972), 116-117.

9. Julian P. Boyd, *Number 7: Alexander Hamilton's Secret Attempts to Control American Foreign Policy* (Princeton, 1964), xv. Boyd goes on to say that the historical editor "must employ all discoverable texts and to each of these he must address questions that the historian or the biographer usually does not have the need or the time to ask. What, for instance, called this particular text into being? What purpose did it serve? In what respects and why does it vary from other texts? What is the significance of these variations for the author or for the reader? It goes without saying that the editor like the historian must ask first of all: Is this document authentic? But even on this primary obligation there is a vital difference. The editor asks the question invariably, habitually, and searchingly of every document that he encounters and his ears must be attuned to the ring of a false note or he fails in the first test that justifies his existence, that of presenting a dependable body of authenticated documents. . . . His method is no more guaranteed to produce truth automatically than any other, but his systematic effort to meet this overriding obligation seems more likely to result in the isolation of unreliable texts than is the case with other means of historical investigation." The significance for annotation is obvious.

10. Levy in *Journal of American History*, LIX (June 1972), 116-117.

11. Wilmarth S. Lewis *et al*, eds., *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence...* (New Haven, 1965), XXXII, xxxiv-xxxv.

12. Aida DiPace Donald, review in *American Historical Review*, LXXV (1970), 2133.

13. Idzerda, "Editor's Training and Status," 26.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PUBLICATIONS

Library Series

Editor, JAMES HELYAR

1. *University of Kansas: List of Publications*. Compiled by Mary Maud Smelser. 1935. available on request
2. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1888-1947*. Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1949. *
3. *Two Augustan Booksellers: John Dunton and Edmond Curll*, by Peter Murray Hill. 1958. \$1.00
4. *New Adventures Among Old Booths: An Essay in Eighteenth Century Bibliography*, by William B. Todd. 1958. *
5. *Catalogues of Rare Books: A Chapter in Bibliographical History*, by Archer Taylor. 1958. *
6. *What Kind of a Business is This? Reminiscences of the Book Trade and Book Collectors*, by Jacob Zeitlin. 1959. *
7. *The Bibliographical Way*, by Fredson Bowers. 1959. *
8. *A Bibliography of English Imprints of Denmark*, by P. M. Mitchell. 1969. \$2.00
9. *On the Burning of His Library and On Medical Travel*, by Thomas Bartholin, translated by Charles D. O'Malley. 1961. *
10. *A Bibliography of the Frank E. Melvin Collection of Pamphlets of the French Revolution in the University of Kansas Libraries*, by Ambrose Saricks. 1961. 2 vols., \$7.50
11. *Observations on Paper as Evidence*, by Allen H. Stevenson. 1961. *
12. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1948-1958*. Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1961. \$2.50
13. *Six Variant Readings in the First Folio of Shakespeare*, by Charlton Hinman. 1961. \$1.50
14. *A Petition Regarding the Conditions in the C.S.M. Prison at Columbia, S.C., Addressed to the Confederate Authorities* by Col. John Eraser. Edited by George L. Anderson. 1961. \$1.50
15. *William Dampier: Seaman-Scientist*, by Joseph C. Shipman. 1962. \$1.50
16. *Maps of the 16th to 19th Centuries*, by Thomas R. Smith and Bradford L. Thomas. 1963. *
17. *Looking at an Early Map*, by R. A. Skelton. 1965. *
18. *A Bibliography of James Joyce Studies*, by Robert H. Deming. 1963. *
19. *Maps of Costa Rica*, by Albert H. Palmerlee. 1965. *
20. *A Checklist of Linneana, 1735-1835*, by Terrence Williams. 1964. \$1.50
21. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Kiichler. Volume 1: North America. 1965. *
22. *Four Centuries of Shakespeare Publication*, by Giles E. Dawson. 1964. \$1.00
23. *A Guide to the Ssu Pu Ts'ung K'an*, by Karl Lo. 1965. \$1.50
25. *Censored: Books and their Right to Live*, by Elmer Gertz. 1965. *
26. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Kiichler. Volume 2: Europe. 1966. \$10.00
27. *Bibliography and Natural History: Essays presented at a Conference convened in June 1964 by Thomas R. Buckman*. 1966. \$5.00
28. *A Bibliography of 17th Century German Imprints in Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein*, compiled by P. M. Mitchell. Volumes 1-2. 1969. \$15.00
29. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Kiichler. Volume 3: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Asia, and Australia. 1969. \$7.50
30. *Rilke's last year*, by George C. Schoolfield. 1969. \$1.50
31. *The Two Worlds of University PublisJing*, by Roger W. Shugg. 1968. \$1.00
32. *Bibliographical Contributions*, 1. 1969. \$2.00
33. *A Bibliographical Catalogue of the Ellis Collection of Ornithological Literature*. Vol. 1. 1972. \$10.00
34. *The Cuban Revolution of Fidel Castro Viewed from Abroad: an Annotated Bibliography*, by Gilberto V. Fort. 1969. \$3.00
35. *Growth and Change in the Early English Press*, by Richmond P. Bond. 1969. \$1.00
36. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Kiichler. Volume 4: Africa, South America, and World Maps. 1970. \$12.00
37. *Gilbert and Sullivan: Papers presented at the International Conference held at the University of Kansas in May 1970*. Edited by James Helyar. 1971. \$6.00
38. *Watching the Ps and Qs: Editorial Treatment of Accidentals*, by James Thorpe. 1971. \$1.00
39. *A Bibliography of 17th Century German Imprints in Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein*, compiled by P. M. Mitchell. Volume 3. 1976. (Supplement to No. 28) \$6.00
40. *Bibliographical Contributions*, 2. 1976. \$2.00
41. *Rilke and his Reviewers: an Annotated Bibliography*, by Henry F. Fullenwider. 1978. \$4.00
42. *The Dress of Words: Essays on Restoration and Eighteenth Century Literature in Honor of Richmond P. Bond*. Edited by Robert B. White, Jr. 1978. \$12.00
43. *A Critical Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell*, by F. F. Madan. Edited by W. A. Speck. 1978. \$15.00
44. *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: a descriptive checklist*, compiled by W. R. and V. B. McLeod. 1979. \$12.00
45. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Kiichler. 2nd ed. Section 1: South America. 1980. \$15.00
46. *Literary and Historical Editing*, edited and with introductions by George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones. 1981. \$6.00

* Titles marked with an asterisk are now in short supply, and are normally only available to complete the files of institutions maintaining exchange agreements with the University of Kansas Libraries.

The Library Series and other University of Kansas Publications are offered to learned societies, colleges and universities, and other institutions in exchange for similar publications. All communications regarding exchange and sales should be addressed to the Exchange Department, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas, 66045. Communications regarding reviews and forthcoming publications in the Library Series should be addressed to the Editor of Library Publications, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas 66045.