

**REPRESENTATIONS OF TEACHING, CURRICULUM REFORM, AND THE
FORMATION OF COLLEGIATE ENGLISH**

by

Malkiel Aaron Choseed

Honors BA in English and Philosophy, University of Delaware, 1997

MA in English, University of Pittsburgh, 1999

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2007

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Malkiel Aaron Choseed

It was defended on

January 10, 2007

and approved by

John Twyning, PhD, Associate Professor, English Department

Paul Kameen, PhD, Associate Professor, English Department

Dennis Looney, PhD, Associate Professor, French and Italian Department

Dissertation Advisor: Jean Ferguson Carr, PhD, Associate Professor, English Department

Copyright © by Malkiel Aaron Choseed

2007

REPRESENTATIONS OF TEACHING, CURRICULUM REFORM, AND THE FORMATION OF COLLEGIATE ENGLISH

Malkiel A. Choseed, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2007

A close examination of the Shakespearean material in approximately two hundred British and American literary textbooks from the mid nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries reveals that the professionalization of the American professoriate influenced the formation of English literature as a field in American colleges and universities. Professionalization changed the character of the study of English literature from one centered around moral instruction dependent on an a-contextual framing of literary material to one characterized by specialized studies dependent on interpretation. The representation of pedagogy in these textbooks is an index of the effects of this professionalization on the developing professoriate and field of English literature. This dissertation also explores the connections between pedagogy, research, and field formation.

Chapter One identifies these institutional changes in American higher education through archival research examining the print history of the Variorum Shakespeare series, begun by Shakespearean scholar, editor, and autodidact Horace Howard Furness and eventually taken up by academic institutions, most notably the University of Pennsylvania, and ultimately the Modern Language Association. Chapter Two examines the implicit and explicit changes in pedagogical theories and practices through the representation of Shakespeare's work in literary textbooks printed between approximately 1850 and 1875. Chapter Three continues this work with literary textbooks printed between approximately 1875 and 1930, focusing on the textbooks

produced by prolific textbook author and future president of Delaware College (1888-1896), Albert Newton Raub. Chapter Four extends this work by performing a curricular history of English at Delaware College between approximately 1850 and 1930 through a detailed examination of archival sources. The conclusion draws an analogy between this historical study of pedagogy and disciplinary formation and composition in the present moment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	IX
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 PEDAGOGY AND TEXTBOOKS	16
1.2 ARCHIVES	22
1.3 CHAPTERS	27
1.4 ORIGINS	35
2.0 THE PRINT HISTORY OF THE NEW VARIORUM SHAKESPEARE SERIES	37
2.1 INTRODUCTION	37
2.2 VARIORUM: FORM AND FUNCTION	39
2.3 THE THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE VARIORUM EDITIONS...	49
2.4 FURNESS: HIS LIFE AND INVOLVEMENT WITH HIGHER EDUCATION	56
2.5 TEXTUAL PRINCIPLES OF THE VARIORUM AND CHANGING NOTIONS OF “SCHOLARSHIP”	63
2.6 ENTRUSTING THE VARIORUM TO THE “PROFESSIONAL” SCHOLARS	69
2.7 THE VARIORUM AFTER 1930	80

2.8	TRANSITION	95
3.0	TEXTBOOKS 1850 – 1875.....	96
3.1	INTRODUCTION	96
3.2	TEXTBOOKS DEFINED	104
3.3	TEXTBOOK FORM AND FUNCTION.....	112
3.4	EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT DEFINITIONS OF “LITERATURE” AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO “PEDAGOGY”	116
3.5	SHAKESPEARE	125
3.6	NATIONAL IDENTITY	141
3.7	MORALITY AND CHARACTER	152
3.8	TRANSITION	155
4.0	TEXTBOOKS 1875-1930	156
4.1	INTRODUCTION	156
4.2	UP TO AND BEFORE 1879.....	165
4.3	1880-1890	169
4.4	1891-1899	176
4.5	1900-1915	192
4.6	1916-1930.....	202
4.7	ALBERT NEWTON RAUB	210
4.8	TRANSITION	221
5.0	CURRICULUM REFORM: DELAWARE COLLEGE AND THE CHANGING ROLE OF ENGLISH STUDIES	222
5.1	INTRODUCTION	222

5.2	ORIGINS OF DELAWARE COLLEGE	224
5.3	THE MORRILL ACT AND ITS IMPACT ON THE COLLEGE	226
5.4	THE RAUB ADMINISTRATION.....	235
5.5	CURRICULUM REFORM AS REFLECTED IN THE FACULTY MINUTES, 1892-1900.....	239
5.6	PRIMARY SOURCES OTHER THAN MINUTES AND CATALOGUES....	243
5.7	CHANGES IN CURRICULA AS REFLECTED IN BULLETINS AND CATALOGUES	255
6.0	CONCLUSION.....	266
6.1	SHAKESPEARE	268
6.2	TEXTBOOKS, PEDAGOGY, AND COMPOSITION.....	271
6.3	POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS	279
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	287

PREFACE

As I write these words in Syracuse, New York, I cannot help but reflect on the long journey which has led me to this point; so many years, so many miles, and so many hours spent reading and writing. I have read many prefaces and acknowledgements from many textbooks and am now thinking about the genre of the preface. The nineteenth century preface is a rather proper and formal thing. Usually it serves as an introduction of sorts for the textbook. There is no one single formula for the preface, but patterns do emerge. Many prefaces begin by stating why the text needed to be written, by illuminating the gap that the text fills. This dissertation, it is hoped, will shed a new light on that space, which, although it defines our lives as academics, is itself so hard to define, the collegiate English classroom.

Then the prefaces usually turn to their institutional contexts and origins. Along these lines I would like to thank Jean Ferguson Carr whose support and guidance in the dissertation process and over the course of my graduate career as a whole has been invaluable. This project would not be possible without her help and direction. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, John Twynning, Paul Kameen, and Denis Looney, whose kindness, patience, and intellectual rigor have made it possible for the dissertation to progress despite great distances and busy schedules.

I would also like to thank Nicole Constable, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Pittsburgh, whose tuition scholarship in the Fall of 2006 helped me to complete this project.

Because so much of this dissertation depends on archival research, I am forever indebted to the curators and staff who maintain the collections with which I worked. First and foremost, I would like to thank Mr. Charles Aston of Special Collections, University of Pittsburgh for his help and support during this long process. Additionally, I need to thank William Daw whose constant presence at the desk made my research possible. I also need to thank the staff at the University of Pennsylvania's Walter J. and Leonore Annenberg Rare Book & Manuscript Library. Even though my first visit was unannounced and unplanned, the staff there went out of their way to help me get situated. I owe a special thanks to Dan Traister, Nancy Shawcross, and John Pollack. While at the University of Pennsylvania, I also spent many productive hours working in the University Archives and Records Center. That work would not have been possible without the diligence of Dianna Hemsath. Finally, the work of Chapter Four of this dissertation would not have been possible without the hard work, intelligence, generosity of spirit, intellectual enthusiasm, and archival savvy of Ian Janssen, Assistant Archivist in the University of Delaware Archives.

Many of the prefaces written before 1900 would end here, and, if there was a personal note present, it would be in the form of a one or two line dedication after the title page. They

might, as I do now, end by thanking those countless authors without which their work and careers would not be possible.

But those prefaces written after 1900 may make a sentimental turn and, if the reader will indulge me, I will do the same. So many friends have contributed to this work. I am lucky to have had the support and love of so many. The boys from back home, and the fellas, who, while they might not have always understood everything that I was doing, encouraged me anyway. My many friends and colleagues at the University of Pittsburgh also assisted me in innumerable ways, such as the late night telephone conversations and last minute deadlines with Tanya Reyes which helped me get to this point. I would be remiss if I did not mention that I am indebted to Jeff Aziz, Jeff Hole, Rich Purcell, and Chris Warnick for their feedback in our dissertation study group. I need to especially acknowledge Jeff H. and Chris though, for their constant and unyielding commentary, criticism, and even the occasional denunciation. I am lucky to have such a smart and articulate cohort of friends who were able to help me and each other through this process.

Of course, as so many prefaces do, I have saved the most emotional “thank you’s” for the very end. Without the emotional (and financial) support of my family this entire effort could not have been possible. My parents, Carl and Barbara Choseed, and my older brother Noam Choseed, were my first teachers and exemplars of good thinking. Each of them helped me grow and learn and continually showed an interest in my studies when even I had tired of them. My parents have been there for me my entire life, and this is just another example of their love and support. My mother, however, took an especially active role, sending me books, scouring the used bookstores of Philadelphia for old school texts and Shakesperiana. I must dedicate this work, in part, to her. All of them, my parents and my brother, have worked hard to help me achieve the life I have now and I constantly strive to be worthy of their love and respect.

And speaking of family... in the time it has taken me to start and finish this dissertation, I have made a new family with Deborah Pollack. Deb has been there almost from the beginning of the formal dissertation process. Through her examples, she has shown me what hard work and discipline can achieve. She has shown me how to be passionate about something and yet to still keep a sense of humor about it. Most of all, she beat me to the PhD by over a full year and knew that I would do anything to catch up with her. The dissertation might have been completed without you, Deborah, but it wouldn’t be as good, and it certainly wouldn’t mean as much. So it is for these reasons, and a million more, that I dedicate this document, such as it is, to you.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This dissertation endeavors to add to a series of ongoing conversations about the relationship between institutions of higher education in America, pedagogy, and the formation of the disciplinary and professional identity of English literature in particular and English studies in general. I explore this relationship by focusing on pedagogical practice as represented in textbooks. I begin by examining changes in the practice of literary scholarship by looking specifically at Shakespeare scholarship. I then move into an extended, chronologically organized analysis of literary textbooks, and end with a case study of an American institution of higher education.

Why would a contemporary academic look to the past? What is the “big picture” that the myriad of historically themed studies that are now circulating try to construct? Why do we, as a profession, continually look to the past and is it even possible to escape the ideological confines of the present moment? Lawrence Levine comments in Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America, that we are always trapped in our present moment, that we must read the past through our present. To paraphrase Levine, “Shakespeare,” and consequently what it means to read, watch, or teach it, may not mean the same to someone on the frontier in 1850 as it means to someone in a theatrical audience in 1950, or in a college classroom in 2007.

And yet, so much of our contemporary culture is shaped by our *perceptions* of traditions and historically determined meanings. Fundamentally, academics want to understand their

present by turning to the past. Brereton writes in The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925: A Documentary History that “Recent years have witnessed a resurgence of interest in the history of English studies, part of an attempt to understand how the present got to be the way it is” (xi). This may say more about the present moment (of anxiety, mood, or simply a desire for critical reflection) than it does of the past, but, as Carolyn Steedman’s work in Dust: The Archive and Cultural History implies, any historical reflection tells us as much about the investigator as it does the object of investigation (what does the investigator value, how, why, etc.—in short, his or her own historical situatedness). Of course, often the past, when looked at closely, becomes much more complex than we originally gave it credit for. It is this complexity, I would argue, that allows us to understand our present moment more fully and comprehensively. Carr, Carr, and Schultz state in their Preface to Archives of Instruction: Nineteenth-Century Rhetorics, Readers, and Composition Books in the United States that many textbooks and their impact have been forgotten or are objects of unreflective nostalgia. Their “study of nineteenth-century rhetorics, readers, and composition books in the United States, seeks to unsettle this forgetfulness” (xiii). Their project seeks to surface the complexity (of ideas, of the material conditions of production) of the past which is so often buried by the passage of time. They, and I, seek to bring into relief the layers of the past that the passing of time has flattened.

By looking at textbooks which represent English literature in various forms and institutions and by examining the complex interactions of the two (which simultaneously exerted an influence upon, and yet were influenced by, the developing and professionalizing field and professoriate), we can perhaps better understand our role as professors, as pedagogues *and* researcher/scholars today. Jean Ferguson Carr writes that nineteenth century readers were filled

with a variety and range of texts and styles, from both English and American sources. “Many of these passages,” Carr writes, “were the staples of public performances, declamation contests, and parlor gatherings and circulated as quotations in literary and literate culture of the day” (104). This dissertation examines the shift from the study of literature in textbooks as a combination of grammar, elocution, composition, rhetoric, etc. to a discipline and field of study with canonical texts and customary approaches and with a research oriented professoriate. It is at once a question that is highly personal to me and also extremely relevant to the field of English studies as a whole. From a professional standpoint, the stakes for understanding a productive relationship between teaching and research are under constant debate by many professional organizations, most notably the Modern Language Association. The dissertation seeks to add to this ongoing conversation.

The question of the origin and formation of English as a university or college discipline has been approached with a variety of methodologies and schemata. For example, although this was not F. O. Matthiessen’s explicit goal in American Renaissance, his work on Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, Hawthorne and Melville can be understood as an attempt to assess the cumulative effects that the works of art produced by these writers had on the American literary landscape. By defining to some extent what literature was and could be for future generations from the perspective of the professional literary critic, he, by extension defined it for future students of literature. Matthiessen created a canon through his work, determining what would be the objects of serious literary inquiry. John Brereton’s The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925, on the other hand, is an explicit documentary history of composition and literature that reflects the evolving institutional relationship between the two through reports, exams, student papers, etc. Likewise, Kermit Vanderbilt’s American Literature

and the Academy: The Roots, Growth, and Maturity of a Profession takes a textual approach to his historical study, tracing the development of the academic discipline of American literature through the textual histories of the Cambridge History of American Literature and the Literary History of the United States, highlighting the material conditions and the significance of this kind of intellectual labor. These approaches (and those discussed below) do much to illuminate the shared origins and development of college composition and literature both as a set of practices and as a disciplinary formation. Gerald Graff's Professing Literature: An Institutional History, however, has been the most influential in the formulation and organization of this dissertation. Indeed, much has been written chronicling the rise and fall of different literary critical schools of thought in the American intellectual milieu, but this work approaches this subject through the lens of pedagogical practice as revealed through textbooks and institutional histories.

Many within English studies have sought to understand the present through an examination of the past. The questions have been enduring ones, but the answers one finds may vary radically, depending on what reasons one has for asking the questions, the different emphases or expectations one brings to the project, or what archive of materials one draws from in the answering. Some, like Gerald Graff, look for origins of a field in order to situate and explain the current state of affairs in the profession and the academy. Still others seek to make an historical inquiry into the teaching and/or theorizing of English or one of its sub-disciplines, like composition, as a legitimating move. In response to a variety of economic or institutional forces operating today, these researchers show that the teaching of reading, writing, literature, etc. has always been central to the work of advanced education. Some broaden the shape of a field through historical inquiry. And, still others (and I think, perhaps, the majority), like Ian

Michael, perform these inquiries because it helps to situate or contextualize their work, either in the classroom or on the page in the present moment.

Michael writes eloquently about the nature and wonder of archival research. His project in The Teaching of English: From the Sixteenth Century to 1870, is, however, primarily concerned with tracing historically just for how long English had been a part of the curriculum in British education and exactly “what happened in the [English] classroom itself” (1). Michael tries to do this through his examination of textbooks.¹ In this regard he is similar to John A. Nietz in Old Text Books and The Evolution of American Secondary School Textbooks, who writes “An analysis of the school textbooks used in the past reveals a truer history of what was taught in the earliest schools than does a study of past educational theories alone” (Old Textbooks, 1). This project, on the other hand, questions the assumption that textbooks provide some sort of window into the world of practice and seeks rather to understand the representation of pedagogy in these textbooks as a representation *qua* representation. This approach allows me to draw on the work that has come before and also to examine the subtle relationship between the representation of classroom pedagogy in a textbook and the professionalization of English in the American academy, marked by the expectation of academic research.

¹ I think that most scholars who do historical research or consume it, however, would agree with Michael when he writes,

I believe that most of us find that our teaching has greater depth and more interest, for us and often our pupils, if we have a picture of what earlier generations were trying to do, and some awareness of our professional roots and of the variety of soils through which these roots strike. Such considerations, however, are less important than the pleasure, which it is pointless to analyze, of entering imaginatively a little way into the mind of someone doing work which seems to resemble your own (though how close the resemblance it is not always easy to say) in circumstances which are very different (though how different it is, again, not easy to say). (Michael 4)

There is a delight and sense of wonder present in Michael’s prose that is immediately recognizable. It is this pleasure, “pointless to analyze,” that one feels in reaching across time and space to connect with another human being, however briefly and in whatever form. I suspect that this, in part at least, informs all good scholarly work, as commented on by Richard D. Altick in The Scholar Adventurers. Michael’s end result, however, is engendered by archival research into textbooks and teaching.

My dissertation project examines the influence of pedagogy as represented in literature textbooks on the formation of English as a university discipline in America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. My primary objects of study are the textbooks themselves (examined in chapters two and three), which I then situate in their cultural and institutional contexts (chapters one and four). Working with textbooks that focus on the teaching of literature opens up space to ask many different kinds of questions: what theories of reading were at play during the time period, what ideas of culture circulated, how were judgments of quality made, and what was represented and why? One could try to answer these same questions by looking at the literature textbooks in different ways.

The study of literature can be understood in its essence as the study of particular reading practices and instruction. Mitford M. Mathews, for example, proposes a history of reading instruction in his Teaching To Read, Historically Considered. He focuses on the teaching of basic literary skills (there were no strict demarcations between beginning and advanced, between “school” and “college,” until the well into the twentieth century). Mathews’ work, while arguing for a particular, contemporary approach to the teaching of reading, may also be understood as an historical inquiry into pedagogy itself. Mathews looks at primary and secondary sources from the same time period and produces a pedagogical and subject history which surveys methods and their inventors or chief proponents. It is not until much later in the nineteenth century that literature, or English, began to break away from what are now understood as other disciplines, like reading.

A study of the influence of textbooks and pedagogy on the formation of literature as a university discipline could also be read as history of canon formation. This work has been admirably done by Lynn Z. Bloom (“The Essay Canon”), John Guillory, and others. Guillory,

for example, in his Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation, performs a Marxist reading of the issues and problems attendant on the formation of a literary canon by performing case studies of various literary critical movements and figures. His focus in the school as an institution is invaluable. He writes,

The largest context for analyzing the school as an institution is therefore the *reproduction* of the social order, with all of its various inequities. The particular authors who happen to be canonical have a minor role in this system of reproduction, but the far larger role belongs to the school itself, which regulates access to literary production by regulating access to literacy, to the practices of reading and writing [...] Literary works must be seen rather as the vector of ideological notions which do not inhere in the works themselves but in the context of their institutional presentation, or more simply, in the way in which they are taught. (emphasis in original, ix)

Here Guillory asks his readers to look at a school as an institution which provides a set of meanings. This formulation allows us to divorce a text from aesthetic concerns and consider it as a representative of this larger system, as historically and culturally situated and determined. This system, of course, tells us more about the culture which produced it or values it than about the actual piece of literature itself. Guillory looks primarily at the public statements made in critical texts by intellectual figures. My project extends this project by looking directly at textbooks, to show how some of these critical positions were put into practice.

Ian Michael, in his The Teaching of English, takes up this question of how textbooks function within institutions in the context of the educational system of Great Britain. His focus is primarily on textbooks, but he also refers to other kinds of archival materials. Given the complex print and publication histories of many of the American textbooks studied in this

dissertation—that is, the fact that many of them were originally published either in part or entirely in England or Scotland, it only makes sense to look at what was happening in Great Britain. Michael’s definition of a textbook is a useful one. He writes “The enquiry is based on a study of textbooks, but it is not always easy to say what a textbook is [...] By a textbook I mean a book used by pupils in a class; or a book read out of school in preparation for work to be done in class; or a book used by teacher or parent for practical guidance; or a manual of self-instruction” (6). He further complicates the idea of a textbook, commenting on its fluid nature, when he states, “Works of literature, whether anthologies, selections from a single writer, or individual plays, are not necessarily textbooks. They become textbooks if they are used in school” (7-10). This quotation from Michael speaks to a set of issues that I have encountered in the process of doing this research and will, it is hoped, become apparent to a reader; namely, textbooks or their influences are everywhere. Because of their very nature as material and ideological objects (their wide dissemination, their multiple printings, the ways in which they are and were valued by the public and scholars, indeed, their very ‘commonness’ itself), they are very difficult to see in the archival or historical record unless one is specifically looking for them. Once we know how to look for them, or how to recognize the signs of their influence, though, they become potentially more and more important.

Michael is important to the study of textbooks and institutions because he treats his textbooks like objects; he wants to know *how* they were used and not necessarily only how the author or editor represents their use in a preface or introduction. Although Michael may be looking for an insight into classroom practice via these textbooks, he acknowledges that in many instances he only has the representations in and of the textbooks themselves with which to work. As Susan Miller astutely reminds us in Textual Carnivals, teachers and students can and often do

use textbooks in ways that complicate or contradict the authors and editors, or even in ways that the authors could not have imagined.² The textbooks suggest practices through explicit directions and implicitly through their organization, but ultimately, all they are is a representation of an idealized pedagogical moment or set of moments. Examining in detail some 2,700 books, Michael takes the books at face value, looking to see how they represent themselves to a user, but at the same time he also calls this into question and asserts that the context in which a book is used determines everything about it.

Michael, doing some basic quantitative analysis, also identifies certain figures as showing up repeatedly in the textbooks he studies. In his section, “The teaching of literature: from 1770,” he analyses the anthologies he looked at (table 7, page 198) and found that Shakespeare is ranked fourth in terms of frequency of representation, behind Pope, Thomson, and Cowper (ranked one through three, respectively). In his section “Analysis of the anthologies, 1802-1870,” Michael shows that the representation of Shakespeare has increased immensely in textbooks (ranked number two, behind Cowper) (table 9, page 236). Although Michael is loathe to compare the time periods, roughly those before and after 1800, because of the vast difference in the number of books and the lengths of the time periods under consideration, I wanted to look at what the changing patterns of the presence and treatment of Shakespeare’s work in American textbooks might mean by situating Shakespeare in his American context.

Shakespeare makes the ideal case study for a project which attempts to get at large currents in pedagogy and field formation, because Shakespeare acts as a synecdoche for

² In my own research, I have encountered several instances where an owner or user of a literature reader has used the book as a kind of scrapbook, pasting in articles and pictures of favorite sports teams, remembrances of trips, and as an autograph book. Also, people have occasionally written in naughty verses, rewritten titles and text ironically or satirically, drawn pictures of toilets (from the 1890’s), etc. I have commented on these kinds of marginalia in Chapters 2 and 3 of the dissertation when relevant.

literature as a whole. Scholars who study Shakespeare in an American context, like Gary Taylor, Lawrence Levine, and Thomas Cartelli have demonstrated that Shakespeare was represented, in some form or another, on all strata of American society, existing adaptively and mutably to currents in American society. He is read in schools, colleges and seen in performances (both in English and other foreign languages), but also appears in or is referenced in minstrel shows, advertisements, and other popular media.

Performance was an important means of circulation for Shakespeare. Both Taylor and Levine comment on the Astor Place Riots in which working class theatergoers, favoring an American actor, rioted against “society” members who favored a British actor with twenty two deaths resulting. This dramatically underscores the fact that Shakespeare, and the manner in which he was performed and received by audiences, was extremely important to Americans on every economic and social class level (Taylor 63, Levine 64). Shakespeare, however, was not just enjoyed and disseminated through performance; his existence was highly textual as well with Shakespeare appearing in a large variety of print sources, from expensive home library editions, to cheap quotation books, to school and college textbooks.

Why does Shakespeare have such a marked place in the American canon? A close examination of the discussions of linguistics in the textbooks examined for this dissertation illuminates a sense of national identity which is rooted in a shared language and a desire to claim a British past for an American literary and cultural identity. What is fascinating, however, is the extent to which Shakespeare is *used* to disseminate what are identified as American cultural ideals. Shakespeare was part of a uniquely American cultural landscape and seen by Americans as one of their own, a distinct part of American history and culture equal to that of England. Taylor, Levine, Cartelli, Westfall, etc. demonstrate that Shakespeare existed on all levels of

American culture and this fact enables me to see the emergence and growth of the split between “amateur” and “professional” which is the hallmark of academic professionalization as represented in textbooks.

Michael and Carr, Carr, and Schultz also brings up an important point about the material condition of these texts. Jean Ferguson Carr asserts that often literary readers were the product of complex corporate authorship. Authoring readers, she writes, “remained a complex activity, more collaborative than singular, borrowing on the expertise of editorial committees, educational consultants, and unnamed assistants, and usually extended through multiple revisions well beyond the oversight of the initial ‘author’” (117). Of anthologies, Michael writes, “Very often a piece in an anthology was not taken directly from its parent work but from another anthology [...] All that can be inferred is that the later compiler thought the piece suitable; it is not possible to infer that he thought it more suitable than alternative pieces by the same author, or of the same kind” (169). The material conditions of textbook production make it extremely difficult if not impossible to read these objects as coherent statements or theories, because the things that we usually recognize as indicative of a particular position (what is included and how is it represented, what is excluded and why) are often not the product of a set of conscious decisions by one person. Therefore, when we look at textbooks we are necessarily limited in what we can say about them by the conditions of their material production. Of course, this is probably true in the case of all literature or printed work, but the textbook form and function highlight this phenomenon.

When talking about how to “assess the educational significance of readers,” Michael states, “Their educational significance depends as much on what the teachers did with them as on the nature of their contents” (247). Michael references Nietz, Carpenter, and Belok here, and

states that in spite of their thorough work, it is very difficult to see how readers influenced the teaching of literature. One could also add Apple, Black, and Elson to this list. For these scholars, textbooks are analyzed as reflections on the larger society and not necessarily reflections of specific institutions. Michael states “American readers [...] reflect more directly, and more quickly, cultural changes that were nearer the surface of society than in Britain” (246). Michael Apple writes that textbooks are “embodiments and the results of the class, race, and gender dynamics that organize society” (7). I agree with this statement, but I also investigate the link between textbooks and changes in the structure and organization of educational institutions which depended on faculty with advanced degrees.

Michael looks at the books and tries to determine what sort of narrative they tell, on their own, about institutional development. Often, this narrative may be one that is at odds with these other kinds of histories or official stories. My dissertation takes up this issue of the textbook as a marker of institutional change. I hope to add to this conversation by simultaneously placing my analysis of the form, structure, and content of these textbooks in a broad institutional context and, perhaps paradoxically, understand it through the narrowed lens of the study of Shakespeare. By narrowing the approach, I argue we can get a broader view of these textbooks as records of, and influences on, institutional change.

As stated earlier, the conversation that this dissertation is most directly engaged with is that of institutional change articulated by Gerald Graff in Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Graff sets up the terms of the debate that I find most interesting and productive. It is out of Graff’s work that the phrases “institutional history” and “professionalization” come. Graff asks, what for me, are key questions. His project is to lay bare the conflicts within the academy of his contemporary moment by exploring those of the past. He does this by looking at the crises

and controversies which contributed to the formation of the field of literature in American higher education. My dissertation uses his terms and his rough chronology which highlights 1876 and the founding of Johns Hopkins University and the first modern graduate degree program based on a research model as a watershed moment.

Graff's goals in his book are to lay bare the unexamined history of literary studies as a university discipline and to get at the conflicts which shaped what is now literary studies. Graff identifies in the time period relevant to this dissertation the split between philology/linguistics and historical research and the traditional kinds of Arnoldian humanism. My dissertation adds to this by focusing on this debate from a standpoint of pedagogical practice as revealed through textbooks.

In many ways, I take as a starting point Graff's assertion that "there is a sense in which all teachers of literature are 'theorists' and have a stake in theoretical disputes. For that matter, there is a sense in which a literature department (curriculum) is itself a theory" (2). This position, evident throughout Graff's text, opens up a space for the use of textbooks as objects of literary and historical research. Graff does an excellent job in tracing out these educational movements of professionalization and research based graduate study to Germany and the model of the Prussian research university. Graff identifies two main camps in his narrative, the generalists and the specialists. My dissertation adds to this conversation by looking at what was showing up in textbooks throughout this time period. When Graff mentions textbooks he does so mostly in the chapters dealing with the pre-professional era (before 1876) and focuses primarily on an analysis of the questions appended to various chapters and treatments (Chapter 3 "Oratorical Culture and Teaching of English"). I think this is the case because what we tend to think of as the public record (professional journals, minutes, agenda, and proceedings from

professional associations, for example) did not exist or their written records were comparatively sparse before 1876. For Graff, textbooks may be one of the few ways that he can represent the profession before 1876. Textbook authors, however, are present throughout Graff's text but are not named as such. Edwin Greenlaw and Hiram Corson, for example, are cited throughout, but their textbooks *qua* textbooks are not explicitly addressed.

Hiram Corson, for example, has seven entries in the index of Graff's book. In each instance, Graff writes about Corson as an influential historical figure and author (a "generalist" who opposed the "philologists"/specialists in Graff's oppositional binary). Graff names two books that exemplify Corson's evolving position, The Aims of Literary Study (1895) and The Voice and Spiritual Education (1896) (47, 48 respectively). Graff does not, however, discuss any of the explicit textbooks that Corson edited and published. Corson is named in Graff's text because he taught at colleges and universities, most notably Cornell in the 1890's, where he chaired the English department. By focusing on academics, as opposed to textbook authors, however, Graff may not see the entire field that is, in my opinion, defined at least as much by the textbooks that circulate at any given time as the explicit critical statements that are made and disseminated. Further, I would argue that although the textbook is a form of this critical dissemination it is different than a monograph, journal or magazine article, or public speech. They reflect a variety of interests, ideologies, and conditions. As Jean Ferguson Carr points out in her chapter in Archives of Instruction, many textbooks, especially those from the early period before English literature was recognized as a discipline, were collaborative efforts. She writes,

many readers can be seen as borrowing expertise and juxtaposing different kinds of pedagogical concerns into a meaningful order. A reader borrows the insight of the rhetorical theorist who addresses the topics of importance and the order of their

instructional value, of the advanced educator who has analyzed how students learn and has a command of educational aims and discipline, and the social purpose of the public intellectual who articulates the culture's changing interests and priorities [...] Many of the compilers of school readers brought varied expertise to the task: they included dictionary makers, lawyers, publishers, missionaries, clergy, teachers, school principals, natural historians, geographers, and newspaper correspondents. (121-122)

I want to add to this conversation by looking at textbooks as objects of study in their own right and not as necessarily transparent insights into actual classroom practices or even into the minds of their authors.

Textbooks can provide a unique insight into the process of professionalization. Graff defines "professionalization" as the process of becoming part of the modern professoriate which defines itself largely by research. Graff elucidates his distinction with useful descriptive binaries like "dilettante" and "specialist." I adopt his definition and seek to expand and complicate this process even further through two categories, expertise and qualification. Graff's other key term is "institutional history." He asserts (in a way that is, for my dissertation, complimentary to Guillory) that his project is concerned "not only with particular scholarly and critical practices, but also with what has happened to those practices once they have become institutionalized in modern universities—in ways that are not the only possible ones" (5). Graff wants to look beyond single, influential figures and see what universities do as complex institutions, with multiple and often competing forces and goals working simultaneously at cross purposes and towards common goals. This view of institutions is a valuable one to apply to textbooks because the many factors at work in textbook productions, the many mediations and layers of meaning,

suggest a metaphorical and productive comparison that my project makes between a textbook and an educational institution when seen in this light.

1.1 PEDAGOGY AND TEXTBOOKS

In the history of American higher education and its various institutions, the act of teaching is often discussed in an ancillary manner, as a byproduct of some other movement or formation. This can be seen to an extent in the work of Graff, Guillory, and Vanderbilt, for example. This may be the case because the various emphases of these authors and their particular projects privilege a particular form of textual production (like the monograph, the article, or the explicit critical statement). They trace out an historical record in journals, critical articles, books, and other aspects of the public record or the private manuscript collection or other archival sources like letters, unpublished notebooks, etc. I posit, however, that teaching is not an end result of scholarship and primary research as they authors imply; that it is not the final result of a series of intellectual processes separate from the space of the classroom and students.³

By focusing on literature and representations of Shakespeare in nineteenth century American textbooks, my dissertation understands pedagogy as constitutive of disciplines and not merely ancillary to them, which will help teachers see their classroom work as connected to and part of the research process. In recognizing and arguing for this understanding of disciplinarity

³ It is tempting to focus on various individuals, either alone or grouped into institutions, theorizing (either implicitly or explicitly) what the proper objects, methods, and goals of the field should be. Graff, for example, looks at how these theories and ideas (the conflicts) circulate, either through individual communications, via students who become teachers, or through publication, influencing each other, and when taken collectively, constitute the field of literature as it is practiced in American universities and colleges. Vanderbilt, on the other hand, looks at the publication history of two sets of historical criticism and all of the theoretical and practical assumptions and negotiations that go into the production of these kinds of things. I want to bring textbooks to this set of conversations.

and field formation, the dissertation historically situates pedagogical theories and practices in academia and it opens up avenues for research into the dynamic interrelatedness between discipline specific epistemologies and pedagogical practices. My original research into advanced literature textbooks and university archives from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries shows the extent of the influence of pedagogy on the formation of literature as a field. Pedagogical theories and practices are not the only ways that the field of literature defined and shaped itself as it emerged, but they are rich and productive ways which will reward further exploration.

The approximate dates which bracket the historical research and theorizing of the dissertation are 1850 and 1930. 1850 is a convenient, if somewhat arbitrary, starting date and really serves as a place holder for the first part of the nineteenth century. My historical research, however, indicates that American printing and educational institutions had developed to the point that, by 1850, American were producing textbooks in large numbers for use in American educational institutions. This claim is partially substantiated by the research on textbooks done by Carr, Carr, and Schultz (62). In terms of literary study, Graff argues that the “new university” and the advent of “professionalism” in American colleges and universities (the move from what we might now call small liberal arts colleges which emphasized moral education to the large, degree granting universities which privileged research), is exemplified by the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. Johns Hopkins University housed the first, modern, graduate school in the United States and was explicitly modeled on Prussian and other European systems of research and education. Regardless of how any particular institution reacted to or ignored these events, this model exerted enough influence on the major institutions of higher education and the community who resided in them to mark a sea change in American higher

education (Graff). By 1930, the shape of American colleges, universities, and high schools had come to most closely resemble their contemporary form, with teaching and research firmly entrenched in their respective places in the academy.

This dissertation sits at the interstice between a number of different established disciplines and methodologies. As such, it is responding to a number of different conversations in a number of different fields. My project attempts to synthesize these disparate, but related, threads of inquiry into a coherent whole. From a methodological and content standpoint, the dissertation touches on or borrows from Shakespeare studies, English studies, educational history (both in its broad sweep and in its particulars, i.e. specific institutions), American studies, cultural studies, composition, pedagogy, and, to a limited extent, book history and print culture. By looking at textbooks as both independent, discreet objects, collectively, and in their social, historical, and cultural context, I hope to ask some new questions of old materials, or, rather, to look at a set of old questions in some new ways, extending the questions and work done by others in these fields. I also propose that the textbook form be understood as a genre with its own sets of formal conventions.

Within the realm of Shakespeare studies, many writers have explored and continue to explore the manifestation, impact, and circulation of Shakespeare in an American context. Levine, Taylor, Cartelli, Westfall, and, to some extent, Bloom, have documented or popularized different aspects of the cultural and historical study of Shakespeare in an American context. Through their different emphases, their work provides a comprehensive guide to understanding Shakespeare in America in that they name areas of study and investigation that exist outside of the boundaries of traditional literary study. Gibson, Turner Kean, and Hunt have looked specifically at the variorum form of Shakespeare in an American context. Levine, for example,

shows that the split between Shakespeare as the province of the cultural elite and the populace did not occur until the very end of the nineteenth century, documenting Shakespeare within a variety of surprising contexts (such as soap advertisements, minstrel shows, etc.). My project will, in part, seek to add to this body of knowledge by looking at the circulation of Shakespeare *through* textbooks in American schools and colleges. When we think about the multitude of American college, university, and private academy students who were reading and being taught Shakespeare through a textbook or in a school environment, it becomes clear that, even though this was certainly not the only way students were exposed to Shakespeare, it is an important and potentially significant way. It is a way that deserves, at the very least, to be looked at critically. I hope to begin to shed some light on this topic and to propose a partial answer to the question of how Shakespeare circulated in an educational environment. Additionally, I situate the variorum form in its historical context and trace out the implications of changes in its production, dissemination, and critical reception.

Much has also been written about American higher education from a standpoint of its institutional history. Writers like Brereton, Graff, and Vanderbilt have done a great deal to clarify and elucidate the formation of the disciplines of English literature and composition on American college campuses. To a large extent this work, however, is predicated on a notion of a defining split between what happens in the classroom (or what is imagined to happen in the classroom) and research, publication and intellectual differences. Vanderbilt, for example, writes in great depth about the institutional ties to the formation of American literature canons, but hardly mentions pedagogy or textbooks. My dissertation seeks to question how and why research became the dominant epistemological model and its possible implications. Additionally, these institutional histories often posit a disconnect between the role and place of

pedagogy in a disciplinary formation and the intellectual research activities that drive it. My dissertation seeks to highlight and understand the possible connections between these seemingly incongruent aspects of the profession.

My way of investigating these questions is to look at textbooks, specifically the representation of Shakespeare in these objects. It is here where the methodology of book history and print culture is helpful. Although I did not perform traditional book history analyses, such as a longitudinal study of a particular book or related set of books, tracing its circulation, commercial success or failure, and print history over the life of the text (some of these textbooks came out in editions that had forty plus years between them, long after the author had died), the habits of mind of print culture historians like Zboray and Saracino Zboray, Eisenstein, and Greetham, aided and complicated my analysis. An awareness of the particular problems and pitfalls of this kind of research into the material lives of these texts is present in Carr, Carr, and Schultz' Archives of Instruction. Jean Ferguson Carr writes "Readers were published in large numbers, at multiple locations and in multiple versions, and they were also remarkably resilient, remaining in print for decades" (131). The multiple printings and long lives of these texts make for extremely complicated print lives. Carr demonstrates some of the complex ways in which these texts circulated and what these different modes of circulation might mean when she writes,

Although nineteenth-century readers have been idealized as vehicles that produced a shared national culture and that promoted "correct" English as a national language, they circulated a complex valuation of multiple languages and modes of speaking. Reissued in translated and bilingual versions, the readers carried out ideological concerns about the importance of the English language and "American" culture. (127)

I tried to look at each text as an individual object with its own complex history of production and dissemination, to be aware of different editions, issues, unmarked citations, and the economic factors that influenced all of these things. At the same time, however, the print historian teaches one to look at books that share a title with a sort of Abelard-ian nominalism, in that every book with the same title shares in that book's identity, but it is an identity that exists in name only and, especially, in the American nineteenth century, can never be taken for granted. Change the context, as Carr points out, and everything changes.

Textbooks are, because of these reasons, difficult objects of analysis to work with and make large scale claims about. With these caveats in mind, however, it is possible to work with textbooks in productive ways. Writers like Nietz, Carr, Carr, and Schultz, Apple, Black, Tyson-Bernstein and Woodward, Armbruster and Ostertag, and others have done such work. This dissertation asks similar kinds of questions, focusing on the college or "advanced" textbook. Additionally, my project aims to take a close look at the representations of pedagogy in these texts in order to see what they say about the development of English literature as a field of study, the connections between these two things, and the growing impact of the professionalization of academics on the field itself.

An institutional history is one way of testing and tracing out the conclusions made by looking at these textbooks. The University of Delaware makes for an ideal case study because of its small size and connection to Albert Newton Raub, noted textbook author. Much has been written about the University of Delaware, most notably by John A. Munroe and Carol E. Hoffecker, both Delaware faculty members, working individually and together. These historians have produced excellent histories both general and specific of the institution (focusing on the history of the library or the women's college, for example), but have not done an in depth study

of the changes in curricula and what they might mean, especially the changing place of English at Delaware College (eventually the University of Delaware). My dissertation, using the work of other institutional historians, like Graff and Vanderbilt for example, examines in detail these curricular changes and the changes in the understanding of the college's pedagogical practices, intellectual pursuits, and epistemological models.

1.2 ARCHIVES

As is often the case in archival research, the archive itself determines the shape and scope of the project. This dissertation relies primarily on archival research performed at five main sites in three different institutions, the Nietz Old Textbook Collection housed in the University of Pittsburgh's Hillman Library Special Collections department, the Annenberg Rare Book and Manuscript Library housed at the University of Pennsylvania and the University Archives and Records Center at the University of Pennsylvania, and the University Archives at the University of Delaware and the Special Collections Department of the University of Delaware.

This dissertation relies on two main kinds of archival research. The first is that done with a collection of textbooks. The second is archival/historical research which works with unpublished letters, personal effects, teaching materials, notes, etc. As Stephen L. Carr claims in Archives of Instruction,

I take it for granted that we always read from an interested position, that there is no neutral recovery of the past, but only selectively reconstructed versions of it. Yet archival research that attends to the details of individual books and to the differences across texts can keep the past a plural and contested resource. The material diversity of

the archive, that is, can prompt or support a critical history that unsettles far more than it confirms present dispositions to the disciplinary field. (20)

Through my work with textbooks, I have come to a similar conclusion as Carr, Carr, and Schultz, seeing textbooks as part of a larger, pedagogical genre all their own, with specific conventions and traditions.

Brereton's The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925 provided an initial model of sorts for the archival work with textbooks. Brereton writes "I wanted to publish the public record, what composition specialists said to each other, to their students, and to concerned citizens. Most of the documents here were *not* obscure at the time; the majority were part of the common knowledge of composition teachers and administrators. They were once available for many to read; now they are again" (emphasis in original, xv). My dissertation might add to this conversation in the way it looks at textbooks as objects of study. These too were public objects. Textbooks, not often made central in the study of institutions of higher education, are, by their very nature, designed to travel, to be conspicuously public. Like Brereton does with his materials, textbooks as archival materials cannot be taken at face value. For example, Brereton's book, if read through the right lens, can be seen as a kind of archival history of Shakespeare in American higher education. By putting together into one place these particular sources, he has inadvertently shown the extent to which Shakespeare circulated in higher education, via a gatekeeper function on entrance examinations or through class reading and writing assignments.

Archival research presents its own unique set of problems and possibilities, which are further complicated by the contingencies of time, place, and organization at each site. Much of the initial work in the archives was simply an orientation to the collection. Even having done

extensive research in the various online catalogues and finding aids, I was not necessarily prepared for what I encountered. Archival work, in its essence, comes down to the methodology of the researcher and that of the organizer of the archive. Interfacing with a collection through a searchable catalogue, like that of the Nietz Old Textbook Collection, allowed me to search very quickly and efficiently for particular keywords and subjects. This enabled me to compile a list of initial sources very quickly. While at the Annenberg Rare Book and Manuscript Library, I made extensive use of the collection description and catalogues, and by requesting whole boxes of materials rather than individual folders, I was able to browse through collections and find things of interest (and even get caught in a few dead ends).⁴ Although there is always the potential for serendipitous discovery, the bulk of the research for the dissertation comes from immersion in the archive, averaging six to eight hours per day during the most intense periods of activity, for periods as short as four days and as long as several months. My note taking style was ‘thick description’ of both the tangible and intangible elements of the materials (not simply an awareness of the materiality of the object, but the overall impression of the book, the page, the handwriting, etc.) which filled up hundreds of pages of transcriptions and photocopies. Archival research emphasizes the tactile and the haptic quality of research, working one on one with primary sources allows for the discovery of those intangible elements that scanned images or transcriptions alone cannot. For example, I was able to hold in my hands the minutes from the Philadelphia Shakespere [sic] Society, to note the effect of the invention of the typewriter, to

⁴ Archival research is also about fitting oneself into the organizational schema of another person or persons, usually unknown. When working at the University of Pennsylvania Archives and Records Center, for example, I wanted to see course materials from those professors who had a hand in the production of the variorum series. My first pass returned a very limited array of materials. On the day before I was slated to leave, I worked with another archivist who, having asked different questions and having searched the records in a different manner, was able to find whole shelves of potentially relevant materials. Likewise, while at the University of Delaware Archives, I was informed that a previous archivist from the 1950’s had reorganized the collections, purging much and preserving what was left in a series of scrapbooks. His criteria and system of organization are still rather mysterious.

examine first hand Furness' first try at a variorum of Hamlet, with the pages cut and pasted into a large scrapbook.⁵ In the vast majority of instances, the information that I had collected during all of the time spent in various archives, only made sense later. As I went along I tried to construct a narrative, but it was a narrative that was constantly being rewritten and revised in light of new ideas and evidence that would come to light. Names, for example, took on a new valence and webs of significance grew after another type of textbook was examined or the author was cited in the preface of yet another textbook.

In Dust: The Archive and Cultural History, Carolyn Steedman writes "The archive gives rise to particular practices of reading. If you are a historian, you nearly always read something that was not intended for your eyes: you are the reader impossible-to-be-imagined" (150). Archives highlight this issue because they are the constructs of a person or group of people who decided, based on some principles, whether explicit or implicit, what is worth saving and what is not. Because this is the case, "historians read for what is *not there*: the silences and the absences of the documents always speak to us" (emphasis in original, 151). What is left out of textbooks is just as important to understand as what is included. Likewise, what is saved in the university archives, who and what receives the place of privilege, tells a part of the story, but never the whole story. Granted, Steedman is writing about the work of social history, of those dedicated to giving some kind of voice to the nameless and faceless masses who passed into oblivion. Our projects are dissimilar in outcome, but what Steedman does and how she talks about it are potentially very important to my project. She writes that we need to take into consideration the

⁵ I recently attended a lecture presented by the Brodsky Endowment for the Advancement of Library Conservation featuring Gary Frost entitled "The Aesthetics of Conservation" (public lecture, E.S. Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, 11/03/06). Among the many topics touched on by Prof. Frost, he spoke at length about the "haptic quality" of book conservation, about how through a sense of touch and movement, sometimes independent of conscious thought, a book conservator is able to make the right choices about a book he or she is working on. There is a parallel to this thought in the archival research process. Touching a book or a manuscript gives one an insight into the object that a transcription cannot.

fact that “the historian [...] makes the stuff of the past (Everything) into a structure or event, a happening or a thing, through the activities of thought and writing: that they were never actually *there*, once, in the first place” (emphasis in original, 154). I take her to mean in this quotation that when an historian reconstructs a past it is never more than a reconstruction; the work of an historian can never capture or recapture the essence of a time or place and is always, ultimately, only a representation. This is illuminating not only for the work in the university archives done for this project (the letters and notes to editors, faculty, deans, provosts, and publishers), but also for the work with textbooks and the way they represent pedagogy. If, on some level, all we are left with is mediation, then we need to study the mediation itself.

When I approached the archival sources upon which this dissertation depends, I did so with the intent of constructing a coherent narrative out of seemingly disparate pieces. The materials out of which I constructed my narrative were primarily the texts themselves and the letters, meeting minutes, and miscellaneous records of the primary players. I was keenly aware, however, in all of my archival work, that the very structure of an archive which allows it to be catalogued and searched also decontextualizes and to some extent alienates individual things, be they letters, books, student writing, or what have you. The story that I am able to tell is dependent on the organization of the archive, the historical contingencies, and the accidents of time and space which effect an archive. Resources at the University of Delaware Archives, for example, are very sparse before the 1880’s. This fact necessarily limits the kinds of historical narratives that a researcher can create out of these materials. Doing this kind of archival, historical research forces the reflective researcher to constantly question not just what story he or she tells, but how they are able to make any claims at all. They are, by necessity, tentative and

provisional. There is always space for revision and modification of any claims made by this kind of work.

I have endeavored to construct a reading of the archival record which examines teaching as it is represented in these textbooks. In order to most efficiently do this work, I have used the representation of Shakespeare in these works as a case study. I have examined approximately two hundred textbooks, focusing on literature in English, both British and American, as the basis of this project. In order to situate this work in its proper historical, social, cultural, and institutional context, I have done original historical and theoretical research into the publication history of the New Variorum Shakespeare Series, originally produced and edited by Horace Howard Furness, Sr. and, eventually, by university academics and the Modern Language Association. Additionally, the ideas and issues identified in the first three sections of the dissertation are tested and traced out in a curricular history of the department of English and the teaching of literature and writing at Delaware College up to its becoming the University of Delaware in 1921.

1.3 CHAPTERS

Chapter One, “The print history of the New Variorum Shakespeare Series,” examines the publication history of this groundbreaking American edition of Shakespeare’s plays, edited by Horace Howard Furness, his son, and, eventually, members of the English departments at Yale and the University of Pennsylvania. While interesting in its own right, this work becomes important in that by tracing out the print history of these complex literary critical objects, a reader is able to see the shift in academic culture from what I am calling a culture of expertise to

what I am calling a culture of qualification. This shift had very real effects on institutions and the production of knowledge. This chapter illustrates and demonstrates that there was a shift in the meaning of scholarship and the way it was performed. I accomplish this through an analysis of the Variorum Shakespeare editions from different time periods as well as original, archival research into the Furness family papers and the correspondence and materials of University of Pennsylvania faculty members and officers of the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Modern Language Association of America.

The chapter begins by surveying the available materials which focus on the New Variorum Shakespeare series. The publication history of the New Variorum Shakespeare series reflects and illuminates the history of higher education in America as well as the position of Shakespeare in the culture at large. Although a fair amount has been written about Furness, no historical or theoretical work has been done on the significance of the connection between the variorum editions and the developing university system in America. This work begins by examining the form and function of a variorum edition and establishing just what the scope of Furness' project was and also its implications. The form of the variorum itself is also discussed as well as Furness' early involvement with the project and textual principles in order to provide a social and historical context. Furness' editions are then contrasted with the work done by the later, "professional" university academics and scholars who took on the oversight and publication of these editions in 1930, after the death of Horace Howard Furness, Jr. Eventually, the editions end up in the official care of the MLA. The series transformed from what was essentially a private enterprise to being part of the professional, academic, institutional sphere. It is this "how" and exploring the possible meanings of this process that comprise the heart of this chapter.

Why look at Shakespeare in order to do this cultural, literary-historical, institutional work? Shakespeare makes for an ideal case study when studying literature in the United States of America because of his canonical position. Shakespeare often acts as a synecdoche for literature as a whole. The qualities that mark Shakespeare as “great” and worth the reading or viewing, are those things which mark all “great” literature. This is especially true when looking at America in the mid-nineteenth century, when the rigid distinction between “American” and “British” literature was not yet firmly in place. Additionally, as has been pointed out by those who study Shakespeare in an American context, Shakespeare pervaded nineteenth and early twentieth century popular culture in a manner unlike anyone else. An examination of available materials (both primary sources consulted in this dissertation and secondary sources) clearly demonstrates that Shakespeare not only circulated widely in America, but also was thought to personify American cultural values. As such, Shakespeare’s circulation in American institutions of higher education takes on at least two valences, the popular and the elite, the local and the foreign, and, as an object of study, which is perhaps most important for this dissertation, the amateur and the professional. The birth and growth of the rift between “amateur” and “professional” is the result and hallmark of the development of the discipline as it is professionalized.

The University of Pennsylvania’s Horace Howard Furness Memorial Library holds detailed records on the meetings and members of the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society, the group which helped to some degree to produce the twenty volumes of the *New Variorum Shakespeare* (1871-1913), arguably the height of American Shakespeare scholarship. Examining these records will illustrate the changing roles academics played over time in the production of the *Variorum* editions and in the Society itself. I will look at these records in order to trace out

how and what role academics played in the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society. I picked this society out of the myriad of social/public Shakespeare interest groups in existence at this time, for example the all female West Philadelphia Junior Shakespeare Club, or the New York Shakespeare Society, because the Philadelphia Shakespeare society helped provide the material and intellectual resources for Horace Howard Furness, Sr. and Jr. to start and finish the Variorum Editions of the plays. At the time of their publication, they represented perhaps the greatest piece of Shakespeare scholarship ever produced in the United States of America. In terms of the textual history of Shakespeare, the publication of the first volume is a seminal point, a point that marks one of the highlights, according to Alfred Van Rensselaer Westfall of the rise of American Shakespearian scholarship to the heights of that of English and German scholars.

The Philadelphia Shakespeare Society is important to my dissertation project because of its connection to the University of Pennsylvania in particular and academics in general. Like most societies it was comprised mostly of lawyers and professional men with the money and leisure to devote to the pursuit of Shakespeare-iana both physical and intellectual. Housed at the H. H. Furness Memorial Library, in the Rare Book and Manuscript collection at the University of Pennsylvania are fifteen boxes which comprise the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society's meeting minutes as well as related materials like correspondence and publications. The materials range in date from 1851 to 1995. Using this material as a basis I investigate what role the society played in the publication of the Variorum Shakespeare. In 1990 James M. Gibson published The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story, a biography of Furness in which he details Furness' life and friendships, but does not go into great detail about the workings of the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society itself. Gibson infers that Furness eventually broke away from the Society, keeping up

only the appearance of membership. Part of my investigation will be to try to understand why this might be the case.

Having established the context of this shift and the effects of this professionalization of academics in Chapter One, Chapter Two, “Textbooks, 1850-1875,” examines the implicit and explicit changes in pedagogical theories and practices through the representation of Shakespeare in literature textbooks which circulated in American higher education. It is in this time period that American colleges and universities were beginning to assume their modern shape and English literature was becoming recognizable as a discipline. Textbooks reveal much about the culture and place in which they originated or were used. This chapter attempts to examine pedagogical practices from a range of institutions and figures as they are represented in textbooks. The chapter defines textbooks as any text which is edited, written, or assembled with explicit or implicit pedagogical uses in the creator’s mind. The chapter categorizes textbooks according to the way they represent Shakespeare. These textbooks are broken down further and analyzed into categories. My reading of these textbooks suggested five related categories of analysis. This chapter lays out the form and function of textbooks, the explicit and implicit definitions of literature and their connection to pedagogy, the representations of Shakespeare, nationalism and racism in the texts, and explicit moral instruction. This is all done in order to make an historical argument about the general character of educational institutions as represented in these textbooks. I argue in this chapter that the shifts in American higher education which can be attributed to the growing sense of professionalization and field formation, as seen in chapter one, are evident in a specific form in the textbook. Textbooks represent pedagogy in a stable manner, presenting one highly textual aspect of a dynamic process. This chapter also begins my explicit argument that pedagogy is constitutive of disciplines through my analysis of textbooks.

This project is continued in Chapter Three, “Textbooks 1875-1930.” 1930 marks the approximate end date of the textbook study because by 1930 the field of English literature, as a part of professional American academics, was firmly established and because universities and colleges had, for the most part, taken the form that they would hold to the present day. If Chapter Two was a broad survey of textbooks, showcasing the possibilities of textbook research and the variety of uses to which they can be put as objects of study, Chapter Three is a narrowly focused, chronological study of a specific aspect of these textbooks. The chapter splits textbooks into sections which mark periods of approximately five, ten, or fifteen years. Through this close examination of Shakespeare sections and pedagogical apparatuses from textbooks which I take to be representative, we can see that as the field of English literature emerges and solidifies there is a definite shift to an engagement with literature that focuses on an interpretative approach which, I argue, is extremely pedagogical. It is this understanding and theory which allows me to claim that pedagogy is constitutive of disciplines and not merely ancillary to them.

The chapter ends by paying close attention to the textbooks authored by Albert Newton Raub and one of his associates. Raub, who served as president of Delaware College from 1888 to 1896, can be best understood as a transitional figure for this dissertation. His textbooks look and function rather conservatively and place him in a pre-professional era, but his institutional position as president of Delaware College and his progressive actions and policies in this position mark him as someone very interested in the modernization and professionalization of the Delaware College faculty and facilities. If we understand textbooks as existing along a continuum, with an older, pre-professional model which functions primarily through an a-contextual engagement with texts with a moral imperative on one end, and the professional

model of academics with the emphasis on interpretation, then by 1930, the majority of textbooks can be identified as being closer to the professional end of the spectrum in form and function.

Textbooks are, of course, only one way of investigating and mapping the changes in American higher education. I argue, however, that textbooks potentially offer an insight into the formation of disciplines, pedagogical practices, and institutional history that is unique. This is because textbooks exist at a nexus of forces, social, institutional, economic, and ideological. As has been commented on by the Nietz and others, textbooks at once exert an influence on a field of study and are influenced by existing practices within that field. In that they represent in print the highly ephemeral practice of teaching, they function as a record, however, imperfect of idealized classroom pedagogical practices and formulations. Textbooks are a durable record not only of mores and values of a given culture or society, but also of how individual students and teachers were imagined to engage with literature in a formal educational setting. As practicing teachers and students know, however, it is always possible, and indeed probable, for students and teachers to use textbooks in ways that the author could not have imagined, but it is the representation of teaching qua representation that is most useful to us in this context.

The fourth and final chapter, “Curriculum reform: Delaware College and the changing role of English studies,” presents a curricular history of Delaware College as it slowly transformed into the institution that would become the University of Delaware. Having shown the textbooks incrementally in chapters two and three, and having established a cultural and academic context for the shift in textbooks form and function in Chapter One, Chapter Four extends this conversation by examining how these shifts play out on a macro level, for an entire college campus. Chapter Four is a curricular history which focuses on English at Delaware College between approximately 1850 and 1930 which relies on original, archival research. The

chapter begins by briefly examining the origins of Delaware College to establish and understanding of its values and academic culture. I argue that the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 at the federal level, and the relationship that developed between individual states and colleges and universities and the federal government as a result of this passage, helped, at least in part, to establish research as a dominant paradigm in American institutions of higher education. This can be seen, for example, in the construction and maintenance of the college's library facilities. A library can be understood as an index of a specific institution's epistemological and ontological understanding of itself. The chapter demonstrates a connection between changes in the structure and function of the library and curricular reform in English at Delaware College. The chapter pays special attention to the presidential term of Albert Newton Raub. Through archival research in catalogues, bulletins, faculty and trustee minutes, and other ephemera, I have traced the changing place of English in the curricula at Delaware College as a function of academic professionalization. Once again, I argue that this phenomenon of professionalization must, like textbooks, be understood as existing on a continuum.

My conclusion comments explicitly on why those who teach primarily composition in the twenty-first century, up to a hundred plus years after the time period in question in the body of the dissertation, should pay attention to this complex phenomenon. The conclusion also explains some of the potential classroom and institutional implications of the questions raised through the dissertation. One of the results of the professionalization of English literature in the academy is, I argue, the perceived split between research and pedagogy. I maintain that this dichotomy is a false one, and, I argue, might be profitably reconsidered in today's institutions of American higher education. This is as true at the four year, graduate degree granting, research university as it is at the open admission, two year college

1.4 ORIGINS

Teaching is, and continues to be, the most difficult thing that I have ever done. This dissertation arose directly out of my preoccupation and concern with my role as a teacher in the classroom. My historical work with textbooks and pedagogy, which led me to other forms of archival work, began in an effort to theorize and understand my own pedagogical work. As a teacher and scholar, I identify myself primarily as a compositionist whose work focuses on the teaching of expository prose writing. It may seem strange, then, that the explicit subject of this dissertation is the development of English literature in American higher education. The four chapters which comprise the body of the dissertation may not, at first glance, seem to be directly related to one another. Taken separately they constitute four historical studies of three different aspects of the emerging system of American higher education, ranging from approximately the 1850's to the 1930's and beyond. When taken together, however, they constitute a marking of, and explanation for, a shift in pedagogical practice and theory in the study of literature. Additionally, they combine to make an argument about the possible relationships between pedagogical practice and the act and theory of scholarly research.

As I discuss in the conclusion of the dissertation, it is this argument about the relationship between teaching and scholarship that makes my project relevant to contemporary compositionists and those who teach literature. Those of use who teach composition in America's universities and colleges today, however, are in a unique position to reassess this link. What composition instructors do in the classroom and what they do in their scholarly research are inextricably linked and yet are often discussed separately. It may be that in order to become an 'academic' discipline, this split is necessary. I hope, however, that this is not the case and that

some of the ideas discussed in this dissertation might show those of us in composition and literature a way to productively combine our teaching and scholarly work.

2.0 THE PRINT HISTORY OF THE NEW VARIORUM SHAKESPEARE SERIES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

For a series with such potential importance to the history of Shakespeare and Shakespeare Studies in America, a surprisingly small amount has been published which historically and critically situates the New Variorum Shakespeare editions. A search of the MLA International Bibliography, online edition, reveals only twenty two records remotely related to the New Variorum editions.⁶ This chapter will critically examine the extant literature on the Variorum, demonstrate why telling the extraordinary story of the origination, development, and continuation of the series is important, and, finally, will retell this history with a subtlety and nuance which illuminates the intertwined cultures of American academic intuitions and American popular culture. This story is primarily one about the shifts in the complex negotiation of authority (textual, intellectual, academic, and institutional). Seen in terms of the dissertation project as a whole, this chapter uses the story of the New Variorum Shakespeare series to illustrate how these shifts take place and what they mean. The chapter relies primarily upon original archival research done in the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg Rare Book

⁶ Accessed on 07-15-05. I used a non-case sensitive keyword search for "shakespeare" and "variorum" or "furness." Most of these cannot be considered critical examinations of the New Variorum Shakespeare series. Those entries which specifically reference the New Variorum Shakespeare Series begun by Furness are primarily records of bibliographical updates released by the MLA or reviews of editions or of James Gibson's biography of Furness (see below).

and Manuscript Library, housed in the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center and the University of Pennsylvania Archives and Records Center.

Understanding the particular history of the editions helps us to understand Shakespeare in America and the links that the developing university system and professionalism in academics had on the Shakespeare “industry” and on American culture around the turn of the century in general. The Philadelphia Shakespere Society [sic], a reading and study group founded in 1856 by law students, is an important part of the story of the New Variorum editions and also helps to illustrate the changes in Shakespeare studies over time. This chapter will constitute a partial, cultural history of these pieces of textual criticism. The primary argument of this chapter is one about the nature of authority. This chapter theorizes the changes in response to, as well as the influence on, the professionalization of English studies.

Horace Howard Furness, the originator and first editor of the series, makes an interesting figure for historical analysis apart from his work with Shakespeare. Through him, several important cultural and educational trends coalesce and can be traced. Not only did Furness edit *the*, arguably, most important and influential piece of American Shakespeare scholarship when considered from an international perspective, but he also exerted a tremendous influence on the shape and organization of the English Department at the University of Pennsylvania. The public and intellectual life of Furness can be usefully understood as a bridge between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. This is true in terms of his Shakespeare scholarship and editing, but also, as I will demonstrate, of his involvement with the American university system.

Philadelphia lawyer Horace Howard Furness published Romeo and Juliet in the first Variorum edition in 1871. The last volume published that lists him as editor was The Tragedie

of Anthonie, and Cleopatra in 1907, his fifteenth volume.⁷ When failing health forced him to turn the series over to someone else, he chose his son and sometimes assistant editor, Horace Howard Furness, Jr. Furness, Jr. took graduate courses in astronomy and music and taught physics at the Episcopal Academy, but in terms of his Shakespeare editing, he, like his father, was an autodidact (Gibson 257-258). Furness, Jr. edited the series from 1908 to 1919, overseeing the publication of five volumes.⁸ When it became clear to him that he would not live to finish editing and publishing the remaining corpus of Shakespeare's plays and poetry, Furness, Jr. turned to professional academics, professors of English literature, in the English departments of Yale and the University of Pennsylvania. What followed—the intellectual turf wars, the wrangling over authority and ownership, the influence of material conditions in two American universities during the Great Depression and the eve of WWII, and the eventual sponsorship of the Modern Language Association of America illustrates the development and gradual professionalization of English studies in American higher education.

2.2 VARIORUM: FORM AND FUNCTION

A variorum edition is dependent on the idea that there did or does (perhaps “should” is the best word) exist a complete, finished, and “authorized” (in every sense of the word) text in the world.

⁷ Horace Howard Furness edited (Volume 1) Romeo and Juliet in 1871, (Volume 2) Macbeth in 1873, (Volumes 3 and 4) Hamlet in 1877, (Volume 5) King Lear in 1880, (Volume 6) Othello in 1886, (Volume 7) The merchant of Venice in 1888, (Volume 8) As you like it in 1890, (Volume 9) The Tempest in 1892, (Volume 10) A midsummer night's dreame in 1895, (Volume 11) The winter's tale in 1898, (Volume 12) Much adoe about nothing in 1899, (Volume 13) Twelfth night, or, What you will in 1901, (Volume 14) Luces labour's lost in 1904, and (Volume 15) The tragedie of Anthonie, and Cleopatra in 1907.

⁸ Furness, Jr. edited (Volume 16) The tragedy of Richard the Third: with the landing of Earle Richmond, and the battell at Bosworth field in 1908, (Volume 17) The tragedie of Ivlivs Cæsar in 1913, (Volume 18) The tragedie of Cymbeline in 1913, (Volume 19) The life and death of King John in 1919, and (Volume 20) The tragedie of Coriolanus in 1928.

For a variorum to exist, this text must necessarily be absent. If one were to find a “reliable” copy of Lear or Hamlet, in Shakespeare’s own hand, for example, there would be no need for a variorum edition. A variorum attempts to contain and record all possible textual variants and the important (understood as “influential” in this context) interpretations that arise from a reading of the text.

The term “variorum” comes to English studies out of classical scholarship; “an edition of a Latin author *cum notis variorum* is one with notes by various commentators” (Turner 157). In terms of textual editing and scholarly work, D.C. Greetham, in his 1994 Textual Scholarship: An Introduction, states that any edition must be classified as either “*critical* or *non-critical*, that is, whether it is to attempt to establish a text . . . or whether it is simply to reproduce a text already in existence, and perhaps to use this text as a vehicle for annotation or interpretive criticism” (347). For Greetham, a variorum edition is “*non-critical*.” He writes

This sort of edition (‘commentary’ is probably the better word) has long been a tradition in classical scholarship, where line-by-line interpretation of the work in question is the major purpose of the book. A related form is the variorum critical commentary, where again the text is inherited from some other authority; or in certain cases may simply be the *textus receptus* as it has been established, modified, and clarified through the history of transmission. The critical variorum (e.g., of Shakespeare) does not pretend to be primarily a work of *textual* scholarship, but rather seeks to focus on the various critical response to the text in a cogent and consistent manner [...] (347-8)

The distinction is necessary for Greetham because the defining characteristic of a variorum edition is that “Cumulatively, a variorum can ...present a cultural and critical history of the transmission and reception of a text, but it does not usually try to create a new text” (417).

Greetham's definition is, perhaps, useful for textual scholars, but I contend that when dealing with Shakespeare, the lines begin to blur. As the reader will see, Furness originally tried to establish the "best" text of Shakespeare's plays and only later began to reproduce the First Folio text as a base text. Furness' work with the variorum straddles both sides of this definition.

Turner, in an article dealt with in detail below, gives a brief history of Shakespeare's work as it appeared in variorum editions. "The first edition of Shakespeare recognizable as a variorum was published in 1773" in ten volumes edited by Samuel Johnson and George Stevens (Turner 157). Six more editions of varying repute appeared over the next fifty years, until in 1821 James Boswell published his twenty-one volume Plays and Poems (Turner 157). This edition held sway as the standard reference work until the 1860's, when, according to Turner, the Cambridge Shakespeare began to come out in England and Horace Howard Furness began to take an interest in Shakespeare editing (158).

What does a variorum edition look like and how does it work?⁹ In order to answer this, I would like to draw the reader's attention to the first volume of the series ever published, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare Romeo and Juliet, edited by Horace Howard Furness and published in 1871.¹⁰ The edition itself is split into roughly three parts, the prefatory material, the text of the play, and the appendices. Aside from an eleven page Preface (pages v-xvi) which explains how to use the book, there is also included a "List of Editions Collated in the Textual

⁹ Turner does an excellent job of describing and illustrating the various functions and implications of a variorum edition of Shakespeare and I am indebted to him for it. He uses as his example the 1980 edition of *The New Variorum Shakespeare Measure for Measure* edited by Mark Eccles, published by the MLA of America. While this presentation and explanation of the features of a Variorum has influenced my own, I wanted to use as an example an edition that Furness edited, providing some insight into Furness' textual practices.

¹⁰ The edition consulted for this section of the chapter is a 1963 reprint with a "Supplementary Bibliography" by Louis Marder. I was able to check this edition against the original in the University of Pittsburgh's Hillman Library and can confirm that it is a photographic reproduction of the original, just on a slightly smaller scale (9x6 inches as opposed to 10x7). I used it because it was in slightly better physical condition. Marder's bibliography begins on page 481. Furness' original ended on page 480.

Notes” (xvii). There are forty-four in all, ranging in date from 1597 to 1865, and represent English, American, and German editions. The front matter is finished off with a cramped, three page “List of Books Quoted and Consulted in the Preparation of this Volume” (xviii-xx). There are one hundred and nine different entries listed by author’s last name, with some authors represented more than once. This is followed by a small bibliography of other editions (such as acting editions) and foreign language translations (xxi-xxiii).¹¹

This is followed by the presentation of the text of the play. Opening to a page at random, the reader encounters, and is potentially overwhelmed by, the enormity and massiveness of the textual/editorial apparatus. A typical page is divided into three strata. The top layer contains the text of the play as derived from a source text or set of texts established by Furness with lineation, act and scene numbers, line numbers, stage directions, prefixes to indicate speaker, and everything else normally presented with a play text. The font and spelling are modernized (for example, “live” appears in the text, when it should look like “liue” in the Elizabethan typography). This section is in twelve point type. The second or middle layer contains all of the textual variants, or *variae lectiones*, from the various folio and quarto editions, as well as significant variants established by past editors, also called “emendations” which are keyed to line numbers and often spelling or punctuation. This is the most technically complex section, where the reader must be able to decipher a form of shorthand in order to reconstruct different readings. This section, along with the third, is in ten point type. The third and final layer at the bottom of the page (and usually the largest and longest individual section) contains the various readings of the text, that is, interpretations and notes concerning relevant historical facts that could influence

¹¹ Furness lists translations into German, French, Italian, Dutch, Swedish, Bohemian, Wallachian (now called “Romanian”), and one in “Bengalee,” referring to one of the major languages of India.

interpretation, such as what a word might have meant in Shakespeare's day, the original plot that Shakespeare is thought to have adapted, or, most commonly, what a word or line means.

This variorum edition also contains a variety of supplementary materials. Immediately following the play text of Romeo and Juliet is a "Reprint of the Quarto of 1597" (the first known printing) with Furness' own collation of the textual variants from three different reprints that he had access to (Furness 301). This reproduces the Elizabethan lineation and orthography. This is followed by a thirty-three page presentation of the critical interpretations, in chronological order, of the chief problem lines of the text, "That runaway's eyes may wink, and Romeo—III, ii, 6, p.166" (367). The interpretations range from a few lines to page long discussions of their significance, beginning with Warburton in 1747 and ending with A. M'Ilwaine in 1869.¹² Furness then presents the famed Shakespearian actor and theatre manager David Garrick's version of the "Death scene, beginning V, iii, 118" (395). Furness was interesting, and perhaps unique, in his desire to include acting editions as legitimate "scholarship."¹³ Then come separate sections entitled "Source of the Plot," "Date of the Play," "The Text," and "Costume" in which Furness has "digested and arranged the Prefaces to various editions, together with additional matter from other sources" (396). Following this are twenty-four pages of excerpted criticism and commentary from other influential or important editions, several of which are translations into English from foreign languages, most notably German.¹⁴ Furness ends his edition with an

¹² Some of these names are immediately recognizable to me in the history of Shakespeare studies and some are completely alien. This reinforces the fact that the importance of any particular editor or scholar waxes and wanes.

¹³ Furness' relationship to the theatre will be touched upon later in the chapter. As this chapter illustrates, the term "scholarship" with its 21st century connotations is somewhat anachronistic. Furness was looking for interpretations of meaning, so those by a great actor like Garrick or Kimble are as valuable to him as those by any "scholar" or man of letters.

¹⁴ German scholarship played an enormously important role in the history of Shakespeare studies via the Romantic movement. For example, see Jonathon Arac's work on the Romantic period in English literature, especially Chapter 13, "The Impact of Shakespeare" in The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol. 5, Romanticism, edited by Marshall Brown.

eleven page, truncated version of a Spanish language play “Castelvines Y Monteses” by Frey Lope Felix De Vega Carpio, which interested Furness “noting the different treatment that the same story received at the hands of Shakespeare’s greatest dramatic contemporary out of England” (470). In short, the Variorum Shakespeare attempts to put in one volume, however, unwieldy or bulky, the entire recorded history of “important” textual scholarship and scholarly interpretation of Shakespeare’s plays and poetry as well as anything that could impact those interpretations.

In order to demonstrate how the Variorum works, let us look at the following example. Of the approximately 3000 lines that comprise Romeo and Juliet, fourteen of them merit more than the usual attention. Turning to page 79 in Furness’ text, a reader sees the three strata that typically mark a variorum edition page. The page tells the reader that he or she is looking at Act I, scene v of Romeo and Juliet, and the line numbers tell the reader that he or she is looking at lines 85 to 94 of the scene. Lines 91 to 105, however, present Romeo and Juliet’s first conversation, only moments after having seen each other for the first time (Furness 79-81). The fourteen lines comprise a sonnet embedded within the normal blank verse, with Romeo and Juliet alternating stanzas, then lines within the last quatrain, and ultimately sharing the heroic couplet. For the sake of example, let us focus our attention on the first quatrain, spoken by Romeo:¹⁵

Rom. [To Juliet] If I profane with my unworthiest hand

This holy shrine, the gentle fine is this,

My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand

To smooth that rough touch with a tender kiss.

¹⁵ I have attempted to the best of my ability to reproduce the spacing and page layout that Furness used.

(lines 91 – 94, page 79)

A look at the list of emendations for these lines reveals a brief history of changes to the text. There were six changes substantial enough to merit inclusion by Furness into this section of the text. Some of them are relatively minor, such as “91. [To Juliet] Rowe. drawing up to her, and taking her Hand. Capell” which lets the reader know that Rowe was the first one to include the “[To Juliet]” stage direction (Furness 79). Flipping back to the list of sources on page xvii, a reader learns that Rowe’s edition came out in 1709. Capell included his changed version of the stage direction in his 1768 edition. Others are more important, potentially changing the meaning of a word or line. Take for example, the note from line 92:

92. *fine*] Theob. (Warb.) *sin* Q₂

Q₃Ff, Knt. (ed. I) Ulr. Del. Sta. *sinne*

(Q₁)Q₄Q₅.

is this] *be this* Han.

When decoded with the help of the list of abbreviations and the “List of Editions Collated in the Textual Notes,” this note tells the reader that this particular line has been read at least three different ways. Theobald in 1733 was the first editor to introduce the word “fine,” although it was a reading first suggested by Warburton (in some form other than an edition of the play). The note tells us that the Second Quarto of 1599, the Third Quarto of 1609, the First Folio of 1623 (which the list informs the reader was collated from Staunton’s photolithograph) all list the word in question as “sin.” Knight, in his first edition of 1838, Ulrici in 1853, Delius in 1855, and Staunton in 1857 all read the line as “sin.” The First Quarto of 1597, which is the earliest known edition of the play, as well as the undated Fourth Quarto, and the 1637 Fifth Quarto give it as “sinne.” Hanmer, in his 1744 edition, changes the end of the line from “is this” to “be this.” A

reader can see that “is this” is the reading that all the other editions present, and Hanmer was the first and only editor to change it. To sum up, in its earliest printing of 1597, line 92 read “This holy shrine, the gentle sinne is this.” This presentation persisted, albeit with a variant spelling, until Theobald changed the line in 1733 to read “This holy shrine, the gentle fine is this.” This reading persisted until approximately the mid- 1800s, when the word in question was changed back to “sin” (by Knight in his first edition) and this was followed by most editors. By default, all other editions in the “List of Editions Collated [...]” use “fine” and this is the reading that Furness prefers.

The third and last section of the page is the “Commentary.” Here Furness lists first the “notes adopted by modern editors from the Variorum of 1821, and at the end of every note the names in *Italics* of all the editors by whom it has been adopted” (Furness xii). This is followed by the notes that Furness has collated for the first time. This particular set of notes is so long it spills on to the next page and I have reproduced the bulk of it (with some omissions) in order to show the variety and depth of the notes:

92. **gentle fine]** Warburton. All profanations are supposed to be expiated either by some meritorious action or by some penance undergone, and punishment submitted to. So Romeo would here say, If I have been profane in the rude touch of my hand, my lips stand ready, as two blushing pilgrims, to take off that offence, to atone for it by a sweet penance. [*Knt. Dyce, White.*

COLL. *Sin* for ‘fine’ is an easy misprint, when *sin* was written *sinne* with a long *s*. *Sin* scarcely affords sense, while ‘fine’ has a clear meaning. [*Verp. Huds.*

ULR. Warburton’s correction is needless,--nay, it disturbs the connection. ‘Gentle’ formerly signified not only ‘noble,’ ‘distinguished,’ &c., but sometimes also

‘pious’ [*fromm*] (e.g. *3Hen VI* : I, iv, where ‘gentle-hearted’ stands for ‘pious-hearted’). Romeo says in effect [. . .] That ‘romeo’ in Italian signifies a pilgrim is evident from the last sonnet but one of Dante’s ‘Vita nuova’ [. . .] Dante’s remark shows us why Romeo chose a pilgrim’s mask, and throws light also upon the ‘palmer,’ of whom Juliet speaks; and it proves also that Sh. Understood more Italian than the learned writer in *The Quarterly Review*, who lately questioned whether ‘*romeo*’ have the meaning of pilgrim.

QUARTELY REV. (vol. lxxxi, p. 524, 1847). *Romeo* is the familiar contraction of *Romualdo*, the famous Lombard name [. . .] but never could have meant a *pilgrim*.

DEL. Romeo, in taking Juliet’s hand, says, in reference to that hand : If I with my unworthy hand profane this holy shrine, it is (a sin in truth but) the gentle sin. If the emendation *a gentle sin* or *the gentlest sin* were allowed, there would be no difficulty in the passage. The idea of the *sin* is also kept up in the succeeding dialogue, and the word *sin* in line 105 is used in manifest reference to this place.

[Substantially the same note as in Del. ‘Lexikon.’]

(Furness 79-80)

What does all of this mean? These notes tell us, for example, that even though Knight followed the Q₂ reading of “sin,” his edition contained Warburton’s note which argued for “fine.” This note was included or referenced (“adopted,” in Furness’ language) in the editions of Knight, Dyce, and White, even though Knight, in his first edition, for example, preferred the reading of “sin.” Collier’s note, which in essence agrees with Warburton, and therefore Theobald who first included this change in his edition of 1733, was adopted, or included, in the texts of Verplanck and Hudson (two of the very few American editors included in the bibliography). However, because Verplanck and Hudson’s abbreviations do not show up in the

textual emendation (the section immediately following the play text) section, a reader can deduce that their editions presented the word “fine,” which due to the absence of a note, a reader can assume was printed in the Cambridge edition of 1865.¹⁶ Ulrici and Delius (both Germans), on the other hand, prefer the reading of “sin” and provide various external and internal arguments for their reading, with Furness even going so far as to include the quotation that Ulrici proves as incorrect in order to make his point. The final note tells the reader that Delius has another note in another text, but that it does not add anything significant to his explanation. Furness’ *Variorum* is a complex text which strives, in essence, to be every other “important” edition (as judged by Furness), as well as itself.

It is difficult to read this book. It is not a quick and easy reference. Rather, one must know how to use it or expend a fair amount of energy trying to figure it out. Physically the book is hard to navigate. The original edition (which I examined in the University of Pittsburgh’s Hillman library) is large and cumbersome. These are big volumes, not meant to be carried around. The original is approximately 11 x 8 inches and 2 inches thick, with 480 pages total. In my experience, the *Variorum* editions are not intuitive. It is difficult and takes some practice to learn how to use one. The apparatus is extremely complex. The abbreviations make one refer to the list of titles at the front, constantly flipping back and forth between the play text and the bibliography and introduction to make sense of a page. If reading is comprised of a series of steps which the experienced reader takes for granted and knows intuitively, then a *Variorum* edition can easily call this process into question. As I read it, I had to flip back and forth to the

¹⁶ This is not definite, however, because in the Preface Furness writes that although he used this as a base text, “in consequence of unforeseen obstacles, I altered my plan, and have, as a general rule, adopted the reading of a majority of the ablest editors, but not always: in some cases I have followed only one editor” (viii). Here we see evidence of Furness’ attempt to, sometimes silently, establish his own text. The textual principles influencing Furness will be addressed in detail later in this chapter.

Introduction. All editions of Shakespeare, however, are in some ways silent archives – a Variorum only foregrounds the archival nature of the preservation and reproduction of Shakespeare’s texts by bringing it to the surface.

2.3 THE THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE VARIORUM EDITIONS

There are very few pieces of scholarly work which attempt to engage with the New Variorum editions as pieces of scholarship, as theoretical works (works which, through their practice, theorize Shakespeare and/or textual editing), or as cultural objects. The Variorum is mostly viewed as a resource for scholars, teachers, and students, but it can and should also be understood as a living record of Shakespeare studies in America and the changes which have taken place in the way that the culture views education, expertise, qualification, and the work of Shakespeare himself. Of the few pieces of relatively recent criticism which exist, two interesting and revealing articles are Robert Kean Turner’s, “The New Variorum Shakespeare” from the Dictionary of Literary Biography Yearbook, 1985 and Maurice Hunt’s 1995 “On the Value of the New Variorum Shakespeares in a Postmodernist World.”¹⁷ The defensive tone of both these pieces is striking. Both authors are attempting to mount apologies for the variorum form. The very nature of variorum editions cannot help but call into question the stability of texts and literature in general. Common to both pieces is a rhetorical attempt to speak back to the

¹⁷ Hunt also published “New Variorum Shakespeares in the Twenty-First Century” in the 1999 volume of the Yearbook of English Studies. This eleven page article reproduces his 1995 article word for word except for a slightly changed introduction (one and a half paragraphs) in which he explicitly situates the variorum form within the larger field of textual editing, specifically referencing Marvin Spevack’s article “The End of Editing Shakespeare,” in the 1996/97 issue of Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate about his work editing the New Variorum edition of Antony and Cleopatra.

perception that these texts are old-fashioned in their organization and in their intellectual aims and to assert that they continue to have value for contemporary students of Shakespeare.

As befits an entry into a reference work, Turner's essay, on the surface at least, is primarily descriptive of the form of the variorum. He focuses on Mark Eccles's 1980 edition of Measure for Measure, reproducing two pages and discussing in detail what the physical layout of the pages mean and what information is potentially gleaned from the complicated text.¹⁸ Implicitly, the article asserts that the makeup of a variorum edition of Shakespeare emphasizes and argues that "Shakespeare's text is in flux," that "the Variorum's notes show [...] that Shakespeare's intended word may be gone forever," and that all criticism and choices regarding the text are contingent—that is, they are culturally and historically situated and always reflect an editor or commentator's context rather than what may have been in Shakespeare's brain (Turner 156). As he brings his article to a close, Turner rhetorically asks his reader "Is the effort worth it?" (158). Turner, of course, knows the answer to this already. He writes in the last lines of the article:

To the student, the theatrical professional, and the general reader the Variorum gives answers and some sense of the intellectual struggle involved in achieving them. For the scholar and critic it clears the ground by laying out what has been accomplished, and if the prospect is dim he is challenged to clarify it. If a vast work cannot be perfectly done, it can nevertheless be well done. So is it worth it? Of course. (158)

Maurice Hunt, on the other hand, is explicit in his defense of the Variorum editions of Shakespeare. He attempts to situate the editions within the contemporary critical moment in literary theory as a whole and Shakespeare Studies in particular. Hunt positions as antagonists

¹⁸ Turner does not mention that the edition was begun in 1947 (Gibson 265). This is a testament to the complex publication history that will be dealt with later in the chapter.

Michael Bristol, Stephen Orgel, and Margreta de Grazia (Hunt 75). The author states “I want to reassert the usefulness of variorum editions of Shakespeare, mainly in terms of postmodernist aesthetics that are often used to debunk the methodology and worth of variorum texts” (Hunt 75). Jean Baudrillard and Frederic Jameson are the two names invoked to stand for “postmodernism” (Hunt 75). In his essay, Hunt specifically addresses the textual criticism debates that have characterized Shakespeare studies in the United Kingdom and the United States of America since the 1980’s. For my purposes, the two most provocative moments in the essay are when Hunt asserts “Variorums are not meant to be ideal texts, fashioned by Platonic editing. If we realize and grant the provisional status of variorum texts, many of their detractor’s criticisms vanish” and “only Shakespeare variorums reproduce the literary history of editing the words and lines of the playwright so that readers might understand the successive recreations of Shakespeare to meet the cultural needs and reflect the tastes of different centuries” (Hunt 76 and 83, respectively).

I cite these articles not to critique their discussions of Postmodernist thought, but to bring up the fact that the Variorum is, and has always been, tied to textuality and textual editing. The very nature of the project forces a reader to engage with text as material object and in a sense, demystifies it. This discussion is important, because I am going to talk about the New Variorum Shakespeare series as giving some insight into these very debates when I discuss Furness’s notes, methods, and motivations for constructing them. I situated these texts as critical objects because I engage with them as such. It is not just their history, but what and how they say things that is important.¹⁹

¹⁹ Here is one explicit link to the discussion of the textbooks later in the dissertation. All texts exist as a result of, and reproduce, archival functions. The variorum foregrounds the constructed and archival nature of Shakespeare in particular and all texts/literature in general.

Every edition of a Shakespeare play, from the most scholarly and erudite to the faux leather bound editions published and sold by large, corporate bookstores, exists as what can be termed a “silent” archive. By this, I mean that any given edition of a Shakespeare play or poem, whether it is acknowledged in the text or not, is the product of a series of editorial choices that stem not solely from the editor(s) in question but rather are the result of a set of collective decisions whose genesis can be traced backward to the first appearance of a play or poem in print. A form of this argument could be applied to all works of literature that appear in print, but it is especially relevant and necessary to any responsible discussion of Shakespeare as he appears in textual form.

I hope to make a deceptively simple point; namely, that any given method of reading or interpretation is dependent upon the theory of textual editing used in the preparation of the text of the play. The ways in which we imagine a text enable certain modes of reading or teaching it.

Because Shakespeare never “authorized” any of the printings of his plays or poems, any two editions of a Shakespeare play can vary widely. Shakespeare’s plays were published in several unauthorized Quarto sized editions both during his life and afterwards and in several Folio sized editions, the most famous of which has come to be known as the 1623 First Folio, published 7 years after his death and which contained thirty-six plays. The Folio was edited by two colleagues from Shakespeare’s acting company (John Heminges and Henry Condell) and therefore has been taken to be authoritative. Some of the quarto editions are thought to be memorial reconstructions (Elizabethan “bootlegs,” as it were), but also sometimes offer coherent and plausible, if different, play texts. It is a well known fact that no play manuscripts have ever been found in Shakespeare’s handwriting and so that any edition of the play can only be at best a mediated version—that is, the text as prepared by another person or persons.

Othello makes for an interesting example of the potential differences between editions.²⁰ Othello was probably written and first performed around 1603-1604. It first saw publication as a quarto in 1622. It was published again in the First Folio in 1623. The Folio contains around 160 lines that are not in the quarto version, and the quarto contains around 12 lines that are not in the Folio, as well as hundreds of differences in individual words. Until relatively recently in the history of Shakespeare scholarship, the theory held that all of these texts could be potentially flawed, because they were not prepared by the hand of the immortal bard himself, and that through textual scholarship and comparison of all the extant versions of a play, an ideal text could be produced, a text that would reflect what was in the mind of Shakespeare himself. It is this kind of thinking that led, for instance, to Harold Jenkins spending 28 years in the preparation of the 1982 Arden edition of *Hamlet*.

The 1898 Rolfe edition of Romeo and Juliet will serve to illustrate this point. Rolfe constructs an edition of the play which approaches the ideal and is based on not only Rolfe's interpretations, but also on the authority of other editions. This edition has extensive prefatory material and notes.²¹ Shakespeare editing was and is often considered to be a highly specialized field, but is unique in that it circulates widely, between experts, students, and, through the texts themselves, a general readership. Rolfe includes a rather lengthy discussion of the differences between quarto and folio editions. Rolfe even spells out some of the contemporary debate over Shakespeare editing. He writes:

²⁰ King Lear and Hamlet would also make for very fascinating studies, but I choose Othello because the differences in text exist on a smaller and therefore somewhat more manageable scale. The play works very well as an introduction to textual criticism for undergraduates.

²¹ For points of reference I was able to examine King John, Romeo and Juliet, Two Gentlemen of Verona, Merry Wives of Windsor, and Macbeth, published and republished by various houses.

The first quarto is much shorter than the second, the former having 2232 lines, including the prologue, while the latter has 3007 lines (Daniel). Some editors (among whom are Knight and Verplanck) believe that the first quarto gives the author's first draught of the play, and the second the form it assumed after he had revised and enlarged it; but the majority of the best critics (including Collier, White, the Cambridge editors, Mommsen, Furness, Daniel, Dowden, and Stokes) agree substantially in the opinion that the first quarto was a pirated edition, and represents in an abbreviated and imperfect form the play subsequently printed in full in the second. (Rolfe 11)

The notes after the body of the play text rely heavily on the scholarly and editorial work of numerous other scholars. These are extremely detailed and sometimes extensive explanations, emendations, and discussions of editorial choices and themes and ideas from the play. All of the notes are geared towards the production of the best possible text, the text which most closely resembles the missing ideal. A very basic example is from page 216, in a note keyed to line 137, Act V, Scene iii. This is how the note appears "137. *Yew tree*. Pope's emendation for the 'yong tree' or 'young tree' of the early eds." Rolfe has made a decision to use "yew" in the body of the text and relies on Pope's authority to do so.

But the notes get even more complex. On page 163, there is a very lengthy note for line 13, Act II, scene i. I will reproduce part of it thus:

13. *Young Abraham Cupid*. The 2d and 3d quartos have "Abraham : Cupid;" the other early eds. "Abraham Cupid." Upton conjectured "Adam Cupid," with an allusion to the famous archer, Adam Bell (see *Much Ado*, p. 124), and was followed by Steevens and others. Theo. Suggested "auborn," and it has since been shown that *Abraham*, *abram* [. . .] were all forms of the word now written *auburn* [. . .] "Auburn" is adopted by H. and W.

and is explained as = “auburn-haired,” but that surely is no *nickname*. K. retains “Abraham” and take it to be = “Abraham-man,” or cheat [. . .]

In this note and the others like it, Rolfe is highlighting that this edition of *Romeo and Juliet* can only exist because of the complex web of historical and inter-textual connections. A potential future editor (one who will perhaps refer to Rolfe as “R.” in his own “notes” section) can see that Rolfe has relied upon a reading of *Much Ado About Nothing* in order to establish a word for an entirely different play, as well as the philological research, and, of course, the educated decisions of former great editors of Shakespeare. This kind of work is present in *all* editions of Shakespeare’s plays and poems, whether or not the editor/publisher acknowledges it or is even aware of it.²²

²² Some contemporary Shakespeare scholars, however, have embraced what is considered to be a new idea of Shakespeare. For these scholars, Shakespeare is fractured. Heminges and Condell, the two contemporaries of Shakespeare who prepared the First Folio state in it that they “have scarce received from him a blot in his papers.” For many generations scholars seemed to have taken this common Elizabethan compliment at a kind of face value, as is shown with the belief in the one perfect, ideal text. But at a conference of the Shakespeare Association of America in Cambridge Mass in April of 1980 a group of scholars (Steven Urkowitz, Randall McLeod, Gary Taylor, and Michael Warren) first publicly put forth the idea that Shakespeare might have revised his plays and that the different editions reflect the author’s different takes on the play at a given time. Gary Taylor sums up the impact of this view nicely in his 1989 book, Reinventing Shakespeare: A cultural history from the Restoration to the Present, with

In contending that Shakespeare revised his work, these scholars themselves revise the accepted paradigms of editorial and critical practice. Their collective challenge to 250 years of Shakespeare texts does more than alter or displace hundreds of lines and stage directions in a dozen plays. Revisionism insists that texts are made; they become—they do not flash instantaneously into perfect and unalterable being. Over a certain period an author makes a text; during a later period, in response to internal or external stimuli, that author remakes the same text; the revised version results from a kind of posthumous collaboration between a deceased younger self and a living older self. Later, the text is remade again, by eighteenth-century editors. Thereafter, the text is continually remade, in small ways, although the received structure remains intact. Now we see that text being remade again, fundamentally. (359)

This raises a distinct pedagogical problem. It can be difficult for both scholars and students to accept the idea that “Shakespeare” as we have come to know him is only and can only ever be a textual construction. Shakespeare (in this view) exists only as the collective efforts of editors, publishers, compositors, and scholars of the last 400 years or so.

2.4 FURNESS: HIS LIFE AND INVOLVEMENT WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

Furness was a man of wide ranging interests and abilities. James M. Gibson's 1990 The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story: Horace Howard Furness and the New Variorum Shakespeare presents many of the facts of his life. A study of Furness' life provides a fascinating insight into the intellectual and cultural world of the United States of America. Horace was born on November 2, 1833 in Philadelphia, the son of William Henry Furness and Annis Furness, *née* Pulling Jenks (Gibson 5-6). The Furness family originally settled in Boston in the early 1700's. As a family they adopted the Unitarian religion (Gibson 3). This is potentially important because it put them into direct conversation with the thriving intellectual life of Boston. For example, William Henry Furness, a Unitarian minister, maintained a life long friendship with Ralph Waldo Emerson. He could read and speak German fluently and made sure his children could as well (the influence of which was felt in Horace Howard Furness' scholarship). The Furness family was a decidedly middle class family—transplanted Boston Brahmins, perhaps, but certainly not economically well off. Gibson does an excellent job of detailing the intellectual and artistic influences which entered into Horace Howard Furness' life, especially the role of actors and theatre patrons on the development of his love of Shakespeare.²³ What this chapter

²³ Furness was one of the first Shakespearean scholars to take seriously the interpretations of actors and include them in his Variorum editions. He also enjoyed a life long relationship with the theatre and cultivated it.

One could look at Furness' life and see how several significant cultural and intellectual events played out in the world of middle and upper class individuals and the roles that these individuals played in the intellectual life of the country as it developed. For example, Furness grew progressively deaf over the course of his life and one could read his life with an eye toward the history of disabilities in American intellectual life. Also, he served as a consultant for hospitals for the Sanitary Commission during the Civil War (Gibson 48). Even the mass of his Shakespeare scholarship is so varied that one could productively trace out a number of different trajectories. For example, Furness was fluent in German and was one of the first to unify German, English, and American scholarship in his Variorum editions. A sustained study of his integration of these distinct scholarly traditions could yield an insight into the formation of modern, international Shakespeare studies. Also, Furness became interested in spiritualism after the death of his wife and took part in a sustained scientific study that the University of Pennsylvania did to investigate spiritualism (Gibson 139).

will focus on, however, is his involvement with higher education, specifically the University of Pennsylvania, and the ways that his work circulated in the culture of American higher education generally.

Furness' work on the New Variorum Shakespeare originates with the Philadelphia Shakespere [sic] Society. Furness joined the Philadelphia Shakespere [sic] Society in November of 1860. The Philadelphia Shakespere Society was made of a group of "amateur" Shakespeare enthusiasts from Philadelphia who would meet throughout the year to read and discuss Shakespeare's poetry and plays. "Amateur" is placed in quotes because, in this case, it is a somewhat anachronistic term. Perhaps it is most fair to characterize the men who made up the society by saying they did not support themselves through their Shakespeare activities. Most of them were lawyers, clergymen, the occasional professor from the University of Pennsylvania, and other members of Philadelphia's social and intellectual elite. As the members of the society began to prepare for a discussion of a particular play, they were assigned by the "Dean" or leader of the group, to be responsible for various critical works and editions in order to report back to the society. According to Gibson, Furness was preparing for the study of Hamlet in 1862 or 1863 when he began to assemble his own variorum style edition of the play (59).²⁴ It is clear, however, that the first play that Furness wanted to publish as a Variorum edition was Romeo and Juliet, which corresponds to the reading and study schedule of the Philadelphia Shakespere Society.

Although Furness was listed as the single editor of the Variorum editions, and shouldered the emotional and financial burdens that it engendered, it is important to remember that its

²⁴ I have examined this impressive volume, kept in the personal papers of Furness, housed at the University of Pennsylvania Annenberg Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Furness had literally cut and pasted text and commentary from several editions into a large bound book with blank pages. He then added his own, usually substantial, notes to the text on the bottom of the page.

origins were in a communal study group. Additionally, it is easy to imagine Furness as a heroic, solitary figure who pushed through with his enormous project by himself. It is a familiar narrative of scholarship, perhaps one engendered by the very system of professionalization that Furness' work would later be interpolated by, but ultimately flawed. It is clear through Gibson's research and even a cursory look at the archives of correspondence that Furness' was very much a collaborative project. Horace Howard Furness, Jr. and other family members helped in various ways throughout the process. Ultimately, the New Variorum Editions can be best understood as artifacts which report on and produce a series of textual arguments. In the early days of the Variorum, Furness was also trying to create the best possible text, and thus was consumed by textual difficulties (he later moved to the First Folio as a base text – a move which is indicative of the change in Shakespeare scholarship as the field of literature professionalized). For example, Gibson reports that Furness writes to Hiram Corson, Professor of English at Cornell University (and a name that that will be recognizable in the chapters on textbooks) about a textual problem in Macbeth. Furness writes: "In Macbeth I, vii 66 'That memory the wonder of the brain, Shall be *a fume*' can this be parallel to *a flame*, *a fire*? And ought it not be printed as one word? Do you know of any parallel instances of its use?" (quoted in Gibson 83). Furness wrote letters and kept voluminous correspondence with Shakespearian scholars from around the world, but especially in the United States. By way of example, two other, prominent names which show up repeatedly in Furness' correspondence (as quoted and reported on by Gibson) are Rolfe and Hudson. Furness is such a useful figure for this dissertation because he lived in a transitional movement. As an editor and historical figure, Furness marks the change from the time of the gentlemen scholar motivated by 'love' of the poetry and beauty, to the professional

academic, whose personal feelings, while perhaps important, must be balanced by an institutional environment of higher education which values and rewards “original” scholarship.

Much of Furness’ textual scholarship was financed by his wife’s family fortune. After his wife inherited \$750,000 in 1870, Furness was free to devote himself to scholarship, philanthropy, and other pursuits befitting a scholar-gentleman of Philadelphia heading into the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Although this chapter tells the story of the continuation of the New Variorum Shakespeare editions as it relates to the changing face of higher education in America, it is also important to trace out Furness’ personal relationship to higher education, specifically to the University of Pennsylvania. It is important to trace out the connections of the Variorum to formal higher education because the transition that Horace Howard Furness, Jr. makes in giving stewardship of the Variorum series to professional academics was not totally unexpected. Furness himself helped put into motion the changes in American culture which were to make his own brand of scholarship outmoded. The changes writ large across American higher education were being played out on a smaller scale at the University of Pennsylvania and Furness played a not insignificant role in them. Gibson has documented much of this, so this section begins by briefly establishing what he has done and then assessing what questions remain to be asked.

Horace Howard Furness was part of the modernization of the University of Pennsylvania. In January of 1880, Furness was elected as trustee of the University of Pennsylvania and would serve the university in some fashion for the next 25 years (Gibson 111). For the purposes of this dissertation, however, it is important to focus on his committee work with the library and the Committee on the Department of Arts (Gibson 145). He modernized the library in terms of its holdings, administration, and cataloguing, not to mention paying for a new building. The library

is one of the most important knowledge assets of a university and becomes more and more important as universities transition into the modern research oriented university. Today, a university or college's library is often seen as an indicator of its worth or value. Gibson writes that, thanks in part to Furness, "the Library [. . .] was securely established as a major research library" (149).

Furness was instrumental in creating the English department at the University of Pennsylvania and modernizing the curricula there as well. Interestingly, although Furness received the classical education of his day and was largely an autodidact when it came to Shakespeare, a large portion of his energy, and probably his money, went toward the creation of a modern University. I would not claim that there is a definite causal connection between his Shakespeare scholarship and this part of his life (although it is tempting to do so). Rather, I would say that Furness was caught up in this cultural moment of the birth of the modern university system in America. F. E. Schelling is another of these transitional figures at Penn. Gibson paints Furness around 1889 as potentially influenced through the coursework of his sons at other Ivy League schools, like Harvard, and perhaps a sense of Victorian practicality, which favored a curriculum in English over the classical languages (151).

But Furness was not given *carte blanche* to reorganize the department as he wanted it. Gibson writes

College curricula [...] are not changed lightly, and Furness faced [...] open opposition from McElroy, who had been teaching rhetoric since 1867 and since 1876 had directed the Department of English. Rhetoric, consisting of practical rules for writing and speech, argued McElroy, must be taught throughout the college course beginning in the freshman year. Literature illustrative of rhetorical principles could be taught along with rhetoric,

but literature was secondary and any proposal to defer rhetoric, grammar, and philology to later in the college courses would irreparably harm the instruction of English. Furness did, however, find an ally in Felix Schelling, a young Instructor of English Literature, who had been appointed in 1886. (152)

What Gibson is describing here is a similar conflict that was happening in American higher education generally around this time. We see this in the histories of composition and literature by John Brereton, Gerald Graff, and Kermit Vanderbilt. Putting this conflict into its proper context is necessary to understand what cultural forces were being worked out in this particular instance of departmental reorganization. This conflict may also be understood as curricular in nature.

McElroy died suddenly in November of 1890 and, with this obstacle out of the way, Furness was able to move forward with his reforms (Gibson 153). Gibson places before his readers two letters written by Furness to the Provost about the possible reorganization of the English department. One of the difficulties with Gibson's biography is that while he does a fine job in presenting the events of Furness' life he does not very often speculate as to *why* Furness did something. For example, Furness was highly invested in the organization and shaping of Penn's English department, but Gibson's readers are never told "why?" Understanding Furness' letters and actions as curricular arguments illuminates these ideas and actions in a new, productive way. In a December 1890 letter to the Provost, Furness writes

In speaking to Moulton, I think that it should be borne in mind that whatever subject he takes up with his classes, be it Goethe's Faust, Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Cervantes, it is all to be considered as within the English Department. Let Moulton range over the whole

field at will. Let Schelling be restricted to the Elizabethan or modern field, whichever he prefers [...] (quoted in Gibson 153)

Furness goes on to outline other proposed changes in the teaching of modern languages, most of which argue for a distinction to be made in what professor teaches the advanced language course and philology and who must teach the introductory courses. To give an example, Furness calls Oswald Seidensticker, professor of German Language and Literature a “real scholar,” and suggests that the librarian teach the introductory courses while the scholar focuses on the “highest German Literature” (quoted in Gibson 153).

Implicit in Furness correspondence is an argument about specialization and discipline.

A follow up letter in February of 1891 goes into even more detail about the undergraduate English curriculum. Furness breaks the work of the English department down into three categories, Literature, Themes, and Elocution. He further subdivides literature into “Early (i.e. Anglosaxon & Chaucer)” for seniors, “Middle (i.e. Elizabethan & Milton & a touch of Dryden),” which should be continuous from the middle of the sophomore to the senior year, “‘Tis the spinal column of our Literature,” and “Modern (i.e. Pope to Carlyle),” for the freshman and sophomores (quoted in Gibson 154).

There is a connection to the semi-formal study of rhetoric here as well:

Themes—very short, not more than a page or two—and solely for style, spelling & punctuation, paraphrases of Johnson, Macaulay, Carlyle &c &c and translations from what the class is reading in Latin and Greek [...] For the Junior & Senior years—one theme each month will be sufficient—and these should be exercises in *thinking* or *disputation* [...] Elocution may be taught only in the senior year [...] as a preparation for

Commencement & to break down the dreadful monotony which predominates on that occasion. (emphasis in original, quoted in Gibson 154).

It is interesting to note that, as Gibson reports it, Furness' most vocal critic was the professor of rhetoric, McElroy. McElroy had begun teaching rhetoric at Penn in 1867 (Gibson 152). Furness put the considerable weight of his influence behind young Felix Schelling who joined the faculty in 1886, and eventually became a recognized expert in Elizabethan literature (Gibson 152). Almost twenty years separate the start of the Penn careers of these two men. Schelling represents the future, a specialist in the discipline of English, whereas McElroy, the rhetorician, is part of an older educational and cultural world view. What these two men can be made to represent will be played out on a larger scale at Delaware College and through the discussion of the textbooks in the following chapters. The explicit connections between rhetoric and the modern field of English will be dealt with in more detail in the textbook chapters.

2.5 TEXTUAL PRINCIPLES OF THE VARIORUM AND CHANGING NOTIONS OF “SCHOLARSHIP”

Editing the Variorum editions of Shakespeare comprises a life long project, and Furness and the other players in this game were bound to change over the course of almost forty years. What I would like to emphasize, however, is that whereas Furness seemed to have fairly definite ideas as to what should be taught in the college English curriculum and who should be teaching it, he himself was not a product of the kind of intellectual environment that produced the academics of the very late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His take on editing the Variorum did change between 1871 and 1912, certainly, and these changes do warrant some comment,

especially in terms of the implicit and explicit textual arguments. To a certain degree, I would argue, Furness was professionalized by the kind of work he did with Shakespeare. One important difference, however, must be noted. Furness played the role of the gentleman scholar and he played it well. His wife's inheritance allowed them both to live a life devoted to philanthropy and intellectual pursuits (Helen Kate Rogers Furness was a fairly accomplished scholar in her own right, producing indexes and a concordance of Shakespeare's poems and related works). The New Variorum Shakespeare Editions were not immediately profitable and had to be subsidized by Furness himself in order for them to see print at all. That Furness was not interested in making money through his scholarship is also illustrated by a letter he wrote to D.C. Heath & Company of Boston, which wanted Furness to edit an expurgated edition of Shakespeare in 1889. He writes that such an enterprise would be "a manifest attempt at moneymaking, which is not in my line" (quoted in Gibson, 200). It should also be noted that Furness was not against the expurgation of Shakespeare for different audiences, so his objection was not on grounds of textual purity or completeness (Gibson 200). Money will, of course, become much more of an issue for the New Variorum Shakespeare as it progresses into the twentieth century and into the 1930's and beyond.

For purposes of this dissertation, the chief change that Furness undergoes is to begin using the First Folio, when available, as his base text. As Gibson points out, Furness started this practice with Othello, originally printed in 1886 (Gibson 64-65). Gibson devotes a large part of his biography to the discussion of what he calls Furness' "increasingly conservative textual criticism" and traces a shift from the Classical models of scholarship applied to Shakespeare, which postulated an ideal, but unknown, 'perfect' text which could be reconstructed using all of the extant corruptions, to a model which wanted only to record the available readings (Gibson

167). Furness changed from someone who was trying to establish the best possible text through editorial selection to someone who was trying to establish an historical record.

This change is related to the growing professionalization of Shakespeare and English as a discipline. By their very nature, disciplines have rules and Furness is being interpolated into these rules. There are, of course, always other considerations, such as the fact that Gibson points out, that using the Folio made his editing and compiling task easier as he was no longer constructing a text, merely noting variants. In the Preface to Romeo and Juliet, Furness writes that he “adopted the reading of a majority of the ablest editors, but not always: in some cases I have followed only one editor; and this I have felt at liberty to do, since, in such an edition as the present, it makes very little difference what text is printed *in extenso*, since every other text is also printed with it on the same page” (viii). Let us compare this to the preface of Othello, where Furness says “Who am I that I should thrust myself in between the student and the text, as though in me resided the power to restore Shakespeare’s own words? Even if a remedy [to the problem of the editing of Shakespeare’s plays] be proposed which is by all acknowledged to be efficacious, it is not enough for the student that he should know the remedy; he must see the ailment” (vi).²⁵ By the time Furness prepared and published the text of Othello, his idea of textuality has changed to such an extent that he is now presenting Shakespeare’s plays as a textual problem in their very essence. In some sense, Furness’ comments from Othello should be understood as stating that Shakespeare’s plays are in their very essence unstable, problematic, highly textual objects.

²⁵ There are, of course, parallels to the intersection between Classical scholarship and textual scholarship. One need only look at the work of impact of the classical scholar and giant of textual editing, Karl Lachmann. This influence is born out in the Shakesperian scholarship (influenced by the Lachman method) in the first half of the twentieth century of Gregg, Pollard, and McKerrow. This would have been a tradition of textual editing with which Furness would almost certainly be familiar through his own study of the classics and which could have served as a model for him.

Arguments based on text are dubious at best when the text itself is in flux, but that is where the variorum form becomes so important for Furness. As an example of this, let us return to line 105 of I,v, of Romeo and Juliet in the extended example above. Delius uses this line to bolster his ‘sin’ argument. Furness’ text lists no *variae lectiones*, or various readings. So for line 105, then, at least according to the texts that Furness was able to use for his collation, there are no variants. That piece, at least, is stable, and from this one may be able to build an argument for stabilizing another piece of text. One can see, that this method could build outward, with the “Sin” of line 105 acting as a cornerstone, on which to build bigger and bigger semantic edifices. If line 105 reads “sin,” then one could argue that to keep the sense, the contested word in line 92 should be “sin” also. We can find another piece of unstable text and make an argument about it based on the cumulative collective imagery, meaning, metaphor, etc. established in lines 92 and 105, and so on and so on, until the text is totally stabilized. But how do you decide where to begin? Where is the point of access? How does one editor or reader establish this access verses another? It is how and why Furness made these decisions tht is interesting for purposes of this project.²⁶

Furness, however, accounts for this instability on page xi of the Preface to Romeo and Juliet. He writes

Were there any evidence that Shakespeare had ever corrected the proof-sheets of this play, or that it was ever printed from his manuscript, every comma should be held sacred, but when we know that we have to get at Shakespeare oftentimes [sic] through the

²⁶ The answer is potentially anywhere, if the world and the author are rational, at least. Someone reading after the advent of Post-structuralism might claim that this practice may still never gets us back to authorial intention, because our sense of logic and connection (what is “obvious”) is going to be inflected by our time and circumstance (--that is, what is “obvious” to me is not obvious to someone from another culture or time period). This is a reading and understanding inflected by a materialist philosophy. An idealist would say it is possible to reconstruct Shakespeare’s play *in toto*, and this is perhaps why it is perfect for the Modernist period into which Furness was moving.

interpretation of an ignorant compositor, and that copies of the very same date differ, such minute collation verges on trifling and caricature. The punctuation adopted by such critics as Dyce, or Staunton, or the Cambridge Editors appears to me of much higher authority than that of the Quartos and Folios. Of course the case is very different in doubtful or disputed passages, where the student should have before him every aid that the old copies can afford, and no misspelling nor misprint is too gross, nor punctuation too minute, to be recorded.

Furness is complicating this idea somewhat when it comes to his own textual principles. On page viii, Furness writes “as a general rule, adopted the reading of a majority of the ablest editors, but not always.” Furness is not going by a majority rule and is, through his editing, constructing a play text that, while heavily influenced by other editors, may be called his own. All this changes when he begins work on Othello.²⁷

Why does Furness shift his editorial practices with Othello? Gibson does a very good job in situating the response in both the popular and specialized press to Furness’ change in editorial policy, but, again, he does not speculate as to why the change occurred in the first place. It appears to me that Furness is engaged in a conversation of some kind with the other Shakespearians of his day. In his Preface, Furness argues that students of Shakespeare (and by this he means anyone who reads the plays and poems carefully) should have “Shakespeare’s own words before us” (v). Since this is impossible we are relegated to the First Folio of 1623, at least for the sixteen plays which appear in no other form. Furness is arguing that even an admittedly corrupted version of the original is better than an emended copy of a copy. The Folio has the

²⁷ In the Preface to Romeo and Juliet, Furness acknowledges that “copies of the very same date differ” (xi). In this awareness, he is akin to Elizabeth Eisenstein in her seminal 1980 work The Printing Press as an Agent of Change, Vol 1 and 2. Eisenstein points out that there are variations in print runs of “original” texts, i.e., that compositors made changes in the middle of print runs. This fact further erodes the idea of a stable text.

benefit of being the closest in proximity to the physical personage of Shakespeare. What is fascinating about this argument is that it still supposes an ideal, platonic text which is missing. Unlike Plato, who taught that it is possible to know the forms, for Furness, it seems like there is no hope of ever getting back to the original. Textual editing and criticism is of paramount importance to Furness though. When it comes to the “one object of elucidating the text,” he writes, “We do not go to Shakespeare to study grammar or scanning, but we study his grammar that we may understand him, and arrange the scansion, that every charm which rhythm can yield may be his, as of right” (*Othello* vii). For Furness, Shakespeare is the end in and of itself, and should not be instrumental to anything else.

In one of the appendices, “The Text,” Furness argues in somewhat more detail why he used the First Folio copy of the play (339-343). On page 341 and 342 he argues that “the Folio was printed from a stage copy, seems probable. In either case Shakespeare’s personal friends vouched for its accuracy, and no similar authority vouches for any other. This, then, the text of the Folio of 1623, becomes the text of the play” (342). He also relies on arguments from authority when he cites Dyce “whose opinion on such matters is of very great weight” and who claimed that the First Folio was printed from a theater transcript (342). One of the interesting things about Furness that his editorial apparatus and appendices reveal is that he is deeply imbedded in the editorial traditions of Shakespeare. He often relies on the authority of influential past editors like Dyce.

2.6 ENTRUSTING THE VARIORUM TO THE “PROFESSIONAL” SCHOLARS

On the surface, the Variorum editions from different periods look remarkably similar. There are some differences over time, like the increase in the number of editions referenced and the source texts used, but, on the whole, the texts all resemble each other. Of course, if one were to look below the surface; to see the books as objects for analysis and not to take them at their word, but to study them, then one begins to see important differences. There are two essential differences between the Variorum editions edited by Furness and those edited by the professional academics.²⁸ Both differences are related to the very idea of professionalism as it relates to English studies.

The first of these ideas is related to the idea of objectivity. A primary question is “Who were these editions made for?” The New Shakespeare Variorum editions have their origin in the private study of an elite group of “amateur” scholars in post-Civil War America. The later editions, like those of Black and Hemingway, were produced in and for a professionalized, highly specialized institutional context. Both sets of these texts (Furness and the professional academics, with Jr.’s texts understood as a kind of transitional, if extended, intermediary moment) engage in a critical conversation with the “field” of Shakespeare editing and scholarship which existed at the time. (“Field” is in quotes because in terms of Furness’ beginning stages of work, it is somewhat anachronistic. Perhaps the term could be more usefully defined here as the collective history of Shakespeare publishing, editing, interpretation, and

²⁸ In terms of the project of this dissertation, the work of H. H. Furness, Jr. is not of paramount importance and his work will not be discussed in detail. He can be understood as a transitional figure. Contemporary reviewers of Furness, Jr.’s work, as well as the personal correspondence of F. E. Schelling, indicate that Furness, Jr. was seen only as a serviceable editor. What Schelling and the others said about him is more interesting than what he does with his Variorum editions. Gibson sums up his career with “neither the quantity nor the quality of his work matched that of his father” (261).

production.) The difference lies in how these conversations are inflected and nuanced. The second, and most telling or pronounced difference, is the presence of the personality of the authors, however artificial or constructed it may be, in the text.²⁹ Both types of difference are linked to the idea of professionalism as it emerges in American higher education. Part of the work of this dissertation is to explore and complicate terms like “field,” “discipline,” “scholarly,” “popular,” etc.

A survey of any of Furness’ texts reveal that Furness stamped his imprint on his Variorum editions. Although the text as a whole is Furness’ critical intervention, the notes represent the critical conversation. Their importance lies in the way that Furness engages with these other authorities.³⁰ He is not only attempting to report all that has been said about the plays, but he is also trying to form the best text and to make cases for various points of interpretation. Furness is a complex and complicating figure and this comes out in his work with Shakespeare. In order to demonstrate how Furness does this, let us look at Othello, the first edition in which Furness adopted the First Folio as a base text. Some of Furness’ notes are what one would expect in that they are written in a scholarly (detached, factual, objective, and scientific) tone. For example, in the almost six full pages of notes for the famously obtuse act I, scene i line 23 “(A Fellow almoft damn’d in a faire Wife.),” Furness ends the extremely long note by saying simply “In conclusion [...] I have nothing that I can, with any approach to confidence, propose” (10).

²⁹ Any assertion of a personality in a text is, of course, a construction or performance. However tempting and even efficacious it is to speak of a particular author inserting him or herself into a text, I am aware that it is a construct or performance liable to the same material influence of print and the page as the Shakespeare text on which it is commenting.

³⁰ In some ways this process of reading the notes for “traces” of the editor as well as for the editorial and theoretical positions which constitute an editorial position is somewhat akin to the narrative technique used in Nabakov’s Pale Fire. In the case of the novel, the narrative is in the hundreds and hundreds of notes which comprise the annotations to a long poem. In Furness’ case, the “story” is also in the notes.

Academics is about engaging with authorities, deferring to authority, and challenging authority in very circumscribed and even ritualistic ways. Furness' authority comes from expertise. He can agree, disagree, or chastise the others because of the authority he has claimed for himself. The professional academics, on the other hand, get their authority through institutions which vetter them and their qualifications, such as the letters "PhD" after their names, as opposed to MA, LL.D., or even H.D.³¹

The notes with the objective, scientific tone exist in stark contrast to others. In Act II, scene i, line 58, Cassio utters the line "Therefore my hope's (not furbetted to death)." An entire page of notes is devoted to tracking the various interpretations of this line. Furness presents eleven different readings of these lines from scholars from Johnson to Hudson to D'Huges, representing two continents and three nations. He ends this note with his own take on all of these critical evaluations. He writes, "These paraphrases are all of them intelligible, and would be entirely satisfactory could we only forget the text, which as it now stands is unintelligible to me" (98). What truly stands out as unique, to this reader at least, is the humor that Furness employs. Some of his notes are laugh out loud funny. This is what separates him from the later commentators and editors. In the almost five full pages of notes that comprise the commentary for the textual problem of "Judean" or "Indian" in Othello's last speech in Act V, scene ii, line 421, Furness quotes Stevens, who argues for "Judean," based on a folk tale he had read "in some book, as ancient as the time of Shakespeare, the following tale, though at present I am unable either to recollect the title of the piece or the author's name [That obliging, and yet treacherous, memory!—ED.]" (327-8). What is the purpose of this note? It is evaluative in the sense that he

³¹ Negotiating authority is the link back to classroom practices. This issue of authority, how it is negotiated, given, or taken, is something that contemporary teachers of composition have been dealing with. The textbooks discussed in chapters two and three of this dissertation can also be read through this lens. It is through the act of teaching, through pedagogical practices, that students can gain a sense of authority over a text.

is obviously impugning Stevens' interpretation here, but the manner in which he does it is most telling. As Furness progressed in his work with the Variorum editions, he became more and more critical of some of the flights of fancy to which Shakespeare interpretation was prone.³²

These kinds of notes abound in Othello. Some of the notes are humorous, some scathingly critical. Some (like that on page 309) are reverent memorials to friends and colleagues, but all represent a personality, however constructed, that is inserted into and interacting with the text. There are no explicit or implicit claims to objectivity in the sense that Furness would ever claim to be a disinterested editor, merely presenting facts devoid of a context or point of view.

For the sake of comparison, let us compare these notes to those of two later editors, Samuel B. Hemingway from Yale University and Matthew W. Black from the University of Pennsylvania. Hemingway in the 1936 edition of Henry the Fourth, Part I, the first edition to be edited by a professional academic and after the death of H. H. Furness, Jr., does not invoke the same tone when dealing with the various texts. Certainly some of his comments are evaluative, but they do not have the same sense of wit and humor that Furness had. For example, on page 48, while referencing a note to line 183 in Act I, scene ii, Hemingway challenges a comment made by Cowl in his 1914 edition. Critics were trying to explain the character Poinz leaving the stage. Cowl claims that no emendation is necessary to this particular line. Hemingway writes "But is not this, then, a very strange farewell to Poinz [...] This surely implies that the meeting is

³² Although highly critical of it, in many ways Furness was simultaneously part of, and yet apart from, the Shakespeare tradition. This is a tradition that his publisher, Lippincott was necessarily aware of. In a letter to his sister he writes "You speak of *Macbeth* and few 'Ed's' therein. Down to *Lear*, I was still wincing under old Josh. Lippincott's sneer that my proposed edition would be mighty good for the Editor but mighty poor for the publisher, implying that I was self-seeking in wishing him to undertake the publication" (quoted in Gibson 173). After the publication of Othello, he wrote to Corson that "In the way of editing I have done just what I pleased, followed no rule, but every whim [...] As I have worked solely for my own sake, the verdict of the public is absolutely indifferent to me" (quoted in Gibson 173).

to be before the robbery. Steevens's point is well taken [referring to work cited earlier in the note]" (48). Hemingway is polite and deferential even when he is correcting or arguing with a critic. Rhetorically, he lets Steevens do the work of reproving Cowl. Unlike the Furness notes, Hemingway's notes are not primarily about himself. He assumes a kind of invisible, editorial personae which does not speak in the first person. His language is measured and judicious (note the use of "surely" in the above example).

Even when he is being the most evaluative, his on the page persona is still calm as compared to Furness. On page 261, Hemingway directly contradicts the reading of H. Ax in a note to line 134, Act IV, scene i. Hemingway quotes Ax saying "Hotspur seems to have a foreboding of the catastrophe...These words contrast a little too much with his former confident speeches. [On the contrary, they are perfectly in character. [. . .] True, he tries to find comfort, and he answers the fears of others with a reckless enthusiasm and boldness; [...] the Doom's-day note at the end not only serves a general dramatic purpose, but is, as well, in character.—ED]." Yes, this is still evaluative and Hemingway is putting forth a distinct reading of the text here, but it is of a different character from those of Furness. It relies on a two-pronged argument extrapolated from a study of character and from dramatic theory. It is also humorless. Although Hemingway shaped his text in almost the exact same manner as Furness, as any editor or author does consciously or unconsciously (making an indelible print on the object, making it uniquely their own) has done an excellent job of restricting his presence in terms of his grammar, tone, and syntax. Hemingway, conforming to the professionalized models of his day, adopted a very objective tone in the sense that he has restricted his personality, at least the obvious expressions of it.

Black, on the other hand, does use first person language somewhat more frequently than does Hemingway. Like Hemingway, however, he does not employ humor or sarcasm. Rather, Black assumes the persona of a teacher in his notes and commentary. Most of Black's editorial interventions are informational—that is, they direct the reader to another source/reference or cross-reference with other relevant notes or lines in the play. When Black does put forth his own reading it is not done with the force or verve of Furness. For example, on page 34 of King Richard the Second, Black gives a gloss for “impeach'd” from line 177. He writes “Accused.—I see no trace of the original sense of ‘hindered.’ See 1. 198 n.” This is one of the few lines where Black makes a statement which is not in reference to someone else. He has a relationship to the established authorities which is fairly different than Furness (and which will come across more forcefully in the discussion of the introductions of Furness, Hemingway, and Black). When Black is critical of another editor, the tone he uses is one of mild reproof, almost as if gently correcting a student. For example, when responding to Wilson's 1939 explanation of a redundant line in the play, the sense of which depends on assuming actions by the printers, he writes “WILSON's explanation is ingenious and quite workable. It has an unnecessary amount of speculation about details, however. Some sort of confusion [...] is all we can be reasonably sure of” (94-95). Another telling example occurs on page 215, where he writes “When doctors disagree so thoroughly as they do here [...], the wise editor stands by the quartos and folios.” Black's relationship to the editorial tradition is certainly conservative and deferential to authority.

The characteristic of Black which stands out the most is the deliberate measure of his language. When he does make an intervention which uses the first person it is always qualified with words like “I think” (103), “safer” (272), “even so” (158) and other similar phrasing. The

only time in the notes that Black shows some excitement is on pages 110 and 111, when Black is evaluating a note from Deighton's 1890 edition. He writes "An extraordinary note! Surely Richard means [...] Can DEIGHTON possibly be suggesting some sort of anticipatory word play [...]? If so, his gloss is a minor masterpiece of mistaken ingenuity." The alliteration, the rhythm, the almost poetic pace of this sentence is unique in Black's text. As far as I can tell, this is the only note like this in the text and the only exclamation point that Black uses.

I would not claim that I could use the notes from three different texts in order to "read" the changing landscape of all American academic institutions. Certainly, all three editors that I have referenced exhibit distinct personalities, turns of phrase, idiosyncrasies, etc. They all use first person language in some form and in some instances. All insert themselves in some form, however recognizable or subtle, into the texts that they produce. What I am emphasizing, however, is that the relationship between these personalities (recognizing that they are constructs produced for some imagined public or audience) and their texts, subjects, and audiences, differs. These differences are played out in the presentation of these personalities through the writing of notes, introductions, the arrangement of material in the appendices, etc. For Furness, the connection to Shakespeare is deeply personal. He is engaging in this monumental work of scholarship outside of an institutional context and outside of any formal, specialized training. His relationship to the "field" of Shakespearian scholarship, as we would name and understand it today, is different than that of Black and Hemingway. Because of, and in conjunction with, this, his relationship to "authority" is different. This is evident in the prefatory material of these texts.³³

³³ Of course, I am aware of my own relationship to authority and institutional structures. In my own writing of this document I am grappling with issues of authority – what is it, how does one gain it, what do I need to say or do before I can then make some claims about something, what is responsible and what is not responsible? My

How do these editors situate themselves in these texts relative to other editors and texts? How is the “field” constituted in these books? What is the relationship to the field? How is each editor constructing his field and situating himself and his work within the critical conversation of Shakespeare editing? Beginning with Furness’ 1871 Romeo and Juliet, a reader can see that Furness explicitly situates his edition relative to the 1863 “so-called Cambridge Edition” edited by Glover, Clark, and Wright (vi). Gibson points out the semi-public nature of the controversy caused by Lippincott’s book prospectus (62-68). Furness had originally intended to use the collation of Quartos and Folios compiled by the Cambridge editors, but after Wright’s public outcry that Furness was misrepresenting his work, Furness chose to do the collations himself.³⁴ Furness justifies his work in the Variorum with the comment “In the fifty years that have elapsed since its publication [Boswell’s 1821 Variorum Edition], Shakespearian criticism has made great progress, greater in fact than during any other preceding half-century; and, although in the list of recent editors are found no such world-renowned names as Pope and Johnson, yet Shakespeare has never had critics who brought to their task greater learning, keener critical sagacity and more reverential love than have been shown by his more modern editors” (v). Furness situates the Germans and other foreign language critics in his preface. He also thanks Professor George Allen of the University of Pennsylvania and includes a reference to his discussion of textual emendations based on Elizabethan pronunciation in the Appendix. Because Allen was a member of the Philadelphia Shakespere Society he is discussed as an equal to Furness (Gibson 69). They

academic work comes out of my own investigation into the questions and problematics of curriculum, of teaching, and of academic authorities. This dissertation exists as a response to these issues. As I write it though, new issues emerge for me and get incorporated. The real question I have at this point is how to grapple with these issues. Do I keep them out of the dissertation altogether, do I surface them in different forms, like footnotes. Do I keep them as a form of running commentary and, most importantly, how do I avoid sentimentality and self indulgence? Perhaps this is material that might be most explicitly discussed in the conclusion, but it needs to be linked to something outside of myself, like teacher training and education.

³⁴ This outcry is undoubtedly one of the “unforeseen obstacles” that he mentions on page vii.

are on the same level. Perhaps Allen has had more experience in his field, but in no way does Furness ever defer to him or anyone else.

Furness' texts exhibit a complex relationship to authority. He criticizes the Cambridge edition because "while it gives the readings of the old editions, it omits to note the adoption or rejection of them by the various editors, whereby an important element in estimating these readings is wanting [...] in disputed passages it is of great interest to see at a glance on which side lies the weight of authority" (Romeo and Juliet vii). The Variorum for Furness is a manual not only of the historical changes that the manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays have gone through, but also, to paraphrase his contemporary Arnold, of the best that has been thought and written about it. Furness himself is able to enter into this conversation, indeed to rise to the heights of American and world Shakespeare scholarship, based on his knowledge and expertise. Certainly, this knowledge was engendered by the social and economic context in which he lived, the resources and networks which existed, or which he was able to call into existence, which allowed him to purchase or have access to various copies of Quarto and Folio editions, private libraries as well as the growing, private library of the Philadelphia Shakespere [sic] Society. In a very real sense, his social and economic class position allowed him to access existing Shakespeare scholarship and to be taken seriously as an editor.

By the time Furness publishes Othello in 1886, the first edition that he would edit which used the First Folio as its base text, he would not need to situate his public text so explicitly as he had with Romeo and Juliet. He had joined the public debate over the textual issue, but he is the authority by now. He does not mention any other editors in the Preface except for Dr. Johnson (viii), and this is only to explain Furness' own comment that "the selection of notes for this volume has been influenced by my own preference" (viii). Furness continues "what numberless

busy ‘expositors,’ high and low, wise and simple, learned and ignorant, clerk and lay, at home and abroad, have been, down to this hour, poring over every Act, and Scene, over every line, and syllable! Is there anything left for us to explore or to discover? (viii). Furness answers his question by way of analogy from Dr. Barclay’s anatomy lectures which compare anatomy to a harvest field. There are reapers, then gleaners, and, last of all, geese, who “‘still continue to pick up a few grains scattered here and there [...] poor things, cackling with joy because of their success’” (viii). This will change by the time that Black and Hemingway begin to do their work. When these two scholars begin their work in the 1930’s, there will be an explosion of Shakespeare material. I argue that this is the case because the nature of academic institutions and Shakespeare “professionals” will have radically changed by this time.

Black writes in the “Preface” to his 1955 King Richard the Second that “To provide, as Dr. Furness intended, all the material about each play which may be sought by the great variety of readers, from the most learned to him who can but spell, reprinting what is not generally and easily available, was a reasonable goal in the middle of the last century. It has become less attainable with every passing year until now it is impossible” (xxiv - xxv). Furness had written that all the great work on Shakespeare had been done and that anything left to discover would be scraps or minutiae. But, as Black states, there is now too much material on Shakespeare to include it all. This is the case because of disciplinary reasons. By this time, Shakespeare studies has become cemented in the professionalized world of the academic. No longer is criticism reserved for the cultural scholar-stars like Dr. Johnson, nor is it the domain of men of letters, gentlemanly literati and society men, like Gullian C. Verplanck. Even men like Rolfe and Hudson, Americans, who wrote explicitly for schools and published schoolbook editions, are included. A mass, popular Shakespeare industry had existed at least since the end of the 1700’s

and perhaps before, what I am talking about is the development of a professionalized academic industry where people produce scholarship (“original research” which is traditionally thought of as distinct from pedagogical practice) in order to cement their place in that world. The scholarship is a marker of, and comes out of, their inclusion in this world.

When discussing the delay between his 1955 edition of Richard the Second and its inception as an idea in 1930, Black lists the comparative advantages of having waited 25 years to publish. Among these are the ability to include the notes of important editors and commentators that published in the intervening years, such as Dover Wilson, Kittredge, Tillyard, Campbel, and the stage production directed by Miss Margaret Webster. If he had published the play in 1932 or 1933, as he had originally intended, he would have been “deprived, in other words, of some of the most important new light shed upon the play since a young and comparatively unknown scholar named E. K. Chambers brought out his thorough and valuable edition of it (disguised, alas, as a textbook and now almost completely extinct, even in university libraries) in 1891” (v). Black’s specific word choice is interesting in the way that he disparages textbooks. That he did is not surprising, but what about this edition marks it as being a textbook? What are the features that make it a textbook? It does not come as a shock that this book, because it was marked as a textbook, was not preserved. It was understood as a textbook, something inherently pedagogical, which was understood as not “scholarly.” In most universities today publishing a textbook will not be rewarded in higher education the same, or at all, as publishing a scholarly monograph.³⁵ Pedagogical acts are de- or undervalued in certain spheres of the academic world right now. It is illuminating that Furness wrote there was very little left for scholars to do with Othello in 1886 (and analogously for the rest of Shakespeare), and yet Black, seventy years later, is arguing that

³⁵ There is always hope for the future, and of course, one would hope that Composition studies will complicate this.

the valuable or interesting material has not decreased as Furness implied it would, but rather increased exponentially. Now, another fifty years later, what should a complete variorum edition of Richard the Second or any Shakespeare text look like? Analysis and criticism have only increased over the years, multiplied and expanded because the professional academic environment demands and creates it.

Rolfe and Hudson, however, were able to exist in both worlds. They are liberally referenced in the Variorum editions. Furness maintained a working correspondence with both of them throughout his time working on the Shakespeare Variorum editions (see Gibson). I argue that one of the reasons that Rolfe and Hudson, who published both “scholarly” editions and those marketed explicitly as being for “school,” were able to exist fairly comfortable in both worlds was because these professional lines had not yet been drawn to the extent that they would be in the 1890’s and early 1900’s. Hudson, like Furness, was self educated, an autodidact (Westfall 142). Furness and his son both held several advanced degrees, but those related to literature were honorary. As has been documented by Gibson, Furness exerted a lot of control over the building and direction of the University of Pennsylvania library and English departments, as well as other academic and administrative departments. The distinction that must be made, however, is that both Furness and Furness, Jr., circulate within the academic world, but they are not of that world.

2.7 THE VARIORUM AFTER 1930

This section of the chapter presents the narrative of how the Variorum editions eventually came under the stewardship of the Modern Language Association. This story is important to tell

because of how strikingly it illustrates the change in American higher education.³⁶ The model of academic work goes from one centered around expertise to one focused on qualification. The fundamental questions change—that is, “Who has the *expertise* to edit the Variorum editions of Shakespeare?” changes to “Who is *qualified* to edit it?” This change is indicative of a substantial shift in American educational and popular culture. These questions reflect a change in the way that authority is given, recognized, and negotiated. This issue of authority, foregrounded in this chapter, will be explored through the textbooks and in the institutional setting at Delaware College. The material in this section came primarily out of original archival research done at the University of Pennsylvania Department of Special Collections at the Van Pelt – Dietrich Library and at the University Archives and Records Center.

The story of the publication of the New Variorum Shakespeare Editions can be summed up rather succinctly. Horace Howard Furness began publishing the Variorum editions in 1871, editing fifteen volumes, ending with Anthony and Cleopatra in 1907. Furness, Sr. died on August 13, 1912. Horace Howard Furness, Jr., like the rest of Furness’ family, had been helping his father, collaborating with him on editions throughout the series, even revising and reissuing Macbeth in 1903. After Furness the elder died, however, Furness, Jr. took over the series and began editing and publishing the volumes himself. Armed with his own working knowledge of Shakespeare editing and his family fortune, he published five volumes between 1908 and 1928. Furness, Jr. died on April 15, 1930. Gibson sums up what happens next in a few sentences:

During the 1930’s, aided by grants from the American Philosophical Society, Matthew Black and Matthias Shaaber continued work on *Richard II* and *2 Henry IV*, [...] but they alone could not guarantee the future of the Variorum [...] in December 1932, a

³⁶ Although both the YES article and Gibson’s biography of Furness touch very briefly on this subject (roughly a paragraph each), they do not present the details not attempt to explain how and why these details matter.

committee of [the Modern Language Association of America], headed by Felix Schelling, recommended sponsorship of the entire project and appointed Joseph Quincy Adams, director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, as general editor. Over the next twenty years the Shakespeare Variorum Committee of the Modern Language Association, aided by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, oversaw the publication of six new Variorum volumes. (Gibson 264-265)

Gibson's is a hagiography. It is true that this is generally the outline of events, but what Gibson does not do and what this chapter will do, is to tell the significance of these events, to peel back the layers of meaning wrapped up in these events.³⁷

The principle players at the beginning of this story are Felix E. Schelling, Mathias Shaaber, Mathew Black, and Samuel Hemingway. The protagonist of the early part of the story is Felix E. Schelling, professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania, and long time friend and associate of Furness, Sr. and Jr. After Furness, Jr.'s death the question became how and in what way would the Variorum editions continue? Based on my research into archival sources, an intellectual turf war broke out over who had the right or obligation, legal and intellectual, to continue the work of the series.

In 1930 the continuation and editing of the New Variorum Shakespeare series was considered a great prestige. Felix E. Schelling, a noted Elizabethan scholar in his own right, wanted to keep the editions associated with the city of Philadelphia in general and the University

³⁷ By way of analogy, I can compare this to the primary and secondary sources surrounding an incident that took place between two feuding classes at Delaware College in the late 1800's found during my research in the University of Delaware archives. A student was murdered by another student during an escalating prank war. What is interesting about this is not so much that this was or was not a defining moment in the history of the University of Delaware or even of higher education. Rather it is important as a moment of crisis, a moment when the ontological and epistemological assumptions are stretched thin and one is able to glimpse what lay underneath. The actual facts of the particular case are not so important themselves, but rather looking at what the moment revealed about the intersections between students, higher education, social class, etc. is valuable. Likewise, the crises faced by the Variorum serve a similar function

of Pennsylvania in particular. Furness, Jr.'s will bequeathed the Furness Shakespeare collection to the University of Pennsylvania (where it continues to form the basis of an ever growing collection). Furness, Jr., however, unbeknownst to those at the University of Pennsylvania, had made some sort of arrangement regarding a Variorum edition with Professor Samuel B. Hemingway of Yale as early as 1923. In a letter dated May 15, 1930 from Hemingway to M. W. Black of the University of Pennsylvania, Hemingway writes:

[Prof. Seronde, son-in-law to Schelling and a Yale faculty member] tells me that Dr. Furness recently appointed a committee [...] to carry on the work; and he also intimated that you are yourself preparing the I Henry IV volume. It is this latter possibility that alarms me, for my summers, for the past seven years, have been spent on I Henry IV, which Dr. Furness released, and bestowed upon me, in 1923. I have practically completed the textual work, and am well on with the commentary: so you will understand how eager I am to know just what the situation is [...] My last conference with Dr. Furness on this subject was in the Spring of 1927.

At that time we also discussed having four volumes done at [the English department at] Yale; and he assigned four plays as follows:

Two Gentlemen of Verona to Professor Witherspoon

The Taming of the Shrew to Professor DeVane

All's Well that Ends Well to Professor Case

Measure for Measure to Professor Gee³⁸

³⁸ Quoted from page 1 of 1 of a typed copy of a letter with handwritten edits from "Prof. Hemingway," New Haven, CN, to "Mr. Black," Philadelphia, PA, dated May 15, 1930. This is an enclosure in a hand written letter to "Dr. Penniman," Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, from Felix E. Schelling, dated May 17, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 53, "Correspondence, 1930-7"], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

Prof. Matthew W. Black responds to Hemingway in a letter, dated May 17, 1930. He writes:

some fifteen months ago [February or March of 1929] Dr. Furness came to Professor Schelling in obedience to a wish of his father's that he should consult Professor Schelling about any difficulty which arose in carrying on the Variorum. For this reason, as well as because he had recently become a Trustee of the University (as his father also had been) Dr. Furness desired to have the series continued by members of the department of English here, under his own general editorship [...] One of my colleagues, Mr. M.A. Shaaber, and I were selected, and at a meeting with Dr. Furness were constituted, in his words, "the staff". [sic] We began work on II Henry IV and Richard II respectively, these plays being chosen because they were – together with your I Henry IV – the closest in content to Henry V, which Dr. Furness himself has well under way [...] no other editor except yourself was named in these discussions. It is therefore our expectation that –save for I Henry IV – the series is to be continued under the general editorship of Professor Schelling, by Mr. Shaaber and me, and such other editors as the department of English may call into collaboration.³⁹

Black is here staking his claim, trying to make Hemingway understand that he must back off. The "department" here is the University of Pennsylvania English department.

In a letter dated May 12, 1930, to Professor Joseph Seronde, New Haven, Conn., Felix Schelling writes to his son in law that he wants some "confidential information." Schelling lays

³⁹ Quoted from page 1 of 1 of a typed copy of a letter with handwritten edits from "Professor Black," Philadelphia, PA, to Samuel B. Hemingway, New Haven, CN, dated May 17, 1930. This is an enclosure in a hand written letter to "Dr. Penniman," Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, from Felix E. Schelling, dated May 17, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 53, "Correspondence, 1930-7"], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

out the situation as he sees it and what is at stake for both himself and the University of Pennsylvania. He writes:

Several months ago the late Dr. Furness, Jr., came to see me and spoke about the impossibility of his hoping to finish the Variorum [sic] or of proceeding much further with it. He said that he had been recently approached by a Mr. Hemingway of Yale, who offered himself somewhat confidently as an associate editor for the continuance of the work, and added that he could very readily find him several other Yale men who would bring such a work as that to completion in very short order. Possibly I state this with a little exaggeration.

Dr. Furness then proceeded to say that, although he was a Harvard man, as a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania and one whose father had been a Trustee before him, he felt that any work of this kind in continuance of the Variorum should first be offered to those of the University and should be continued under the auspices of the University. I was much gratified at this attitude of his, and, at his request, selected from amongst our younger men Professor Black and Dr. Shaaber, both of whom had specialized more or less in the Elizabethan age, and both of whom have published theses definitely marking their status as younger scholars [...] He said to them, upon at least one occasion, that he considered them with himself a committee concerned with the policy as well as the continuance of the Variorum Shakespeare.

This morning I received a letter from Mr. Hemingway [...]

With all due respect to the scholarship of Yale, as of any other university, I have always regarded the Yale Shakespeare (between you and me) as something of a joke. Of course the work has the superintendence of Tucker Brooke, who is an excellent scholar,

but this business of calling together thirty-seven members of the Department of English and assigning to each, off-hand, a play by Shakespeare to edit definitely and with ripe scholarship, seems to me a little absurd. I cannot feel that any of these gentlemen, however prominent, have as yet the experience to undertake work such as a Variorum volume of Shakespeare [...] I am schooled to think of this distribution of his [Dr. Furness'] work into young and inexperienced hands. Moreover, there ought to be somewhere a central guidance in an undertaking such as this, and I cannot but feel that as the University of Pennsylvania was definitely selected by Dr. Furness for the gift of the Library, that something ought to be done before this work is thrown open to a "go as you please". [sic] [quoted from pages 1-3]⁴⁰

There is a lot at stake here for Schelling. His perception of the importance of the Variorum series is correct. Also, note the language which Schelling uses to talk about the series and the potential editors. It is a language which creates an inside and an outside to Elizabethan and Shakespeare scholarship. His letter is resplendent with the language of qualification; he rhetorically asks "What entitles someone to edit an important edition of Shakespeare?" In a letter to Dr. J. H. Penniman, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, dated June 11, 1930, he rhetorically asks Penniman through a series of questions, if Penn has some special obligation to oversee the continuation of the series. His final question asks "If we should feel that the Variorum is best left concluded as it is, and if we should likewise feel that the University is not under any special obligation to continue it, may I ask a fifth question? Would we be pealed, or

⁴⁰ Quoted from a typed copy of a letter to "Professor Joseph Seronde," New Haven, CN, from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated May 12, 1930. This letter is 4 pages long with an additional post script on page 5 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, "Correspondence, 1930-7"], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

could we consider it altogether good policy to permit some other university to take up the continuation of the Variorum?"⁴¹ He is here, of course, alluding to Yale.

On May 17, 1930, Felix Schelling wrote the following to Dr. Penniman:

I called on Mr. Windsor, as you suggested and have received from him only today a letter, quoting Dr. Furness's secretary to this effect: "I know of no correspondence between Dr. Furness and Mr. Hemingway of Yale University. The only persons of whom I have heard him speak in connection with his Variorum work were Mr. Black and Mr. Shrabber [sic] of Dr. Schelling's Dept. of the University of Pennsylvania. They have done some work on the Variorum already."

Now I recognize, despite my deep interest in the work of Drs Black and Shaaber whom I recommended to Dr. Furness at his request, that personally, I have not status in this matter, as my connection with it begins and ends with my membership on the committee to which your appointed me, to look into the question of the disposal of Dr. Furness's bequest to the best interests of the University. At the same time, I cannot but feel deeply concerned as to the possibility of an untoward fate for the Variorum Shakespeare and in particular as to the project which Dr. Furness broached to me of carrying it on under the immediate auspices of the University. It seems a pity that we should have the continuance of so notable an undertaking snapped up from us by a group of young men who, whatever their backing by a University of great name, can not be accepted as experienced scholars. And the suggestion of a subvention in money to continue the work, which Mr. Hemmingway makes, as you will see, opens up a view of

⁴¹ Quoted from page 1 and 2 of a two page, typed copy of a letter to "Dr. J. H. Penniman, Provost, University of Penna." from Felix E. Schelling, dated June 11, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, "Correspondence, 1930-7"], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

the possibility of a definite proposal—perhaps even now on its way—to take the Variorum Shakespeare wholly out of our hands.⁴²

In a letter dated December 18, 1930 to Penniman, quoted below, Schelling concedes that Hemingway is correct and that “Dr. Furness requested his co-operation on I Henry IV, on which he has in consequence worked for some time” (from page 5, see footnote 43).

By October of 1930, the committee that Black referenced in his letter to Hemingway had come to some definite conclusions regarding the Variorum. Chaired by Felix Schelling, the committee reported to Dr. J. H. Penniman, the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. In a letter to Penniman from Schelling dated October 18, 1930, Schelling writes “A. That they deem it most desirable that this important and successful contribution to our knowledge and understanding of Shakespeare be continued, both in view of its value to scholarship and in view of its substantial financial success [...] B. it is altogether fitting—if not incumbent—on the University that it should assume responsibility for the continuance and future guidance of this important publication.” Schelling goes on to say that he feels “it would seem best to keep the committee within the University” (from page 2, see footnote 43). Additionally, Schelling advises investigating the money required for the University of Pennsylvania Press to take over publication from J. B. Lippincott. He also states:

Should the University of Pennsylvania assume the responsibility for the continuance of the Variorum Shakespeare, it is the opinion of this committee that any prospectus which may be issued should be conservative, announcing the proposed publication on two or at

⁴² This is quoted from pages 1 and 2 of a 2 page, handwritten letter addressed to “Dr. Penniman,” from Felix E. Schelling, dated March 17, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania. Schelling’s allusion to the “subvention in money” toward the end of the quote is a reference to the letter quoted in footnote 43. Hemmingway informed Black that he had procured some funds from the General Education Board for secretarial assistance in the summer of 1930.

most three plays and continuing as circumstances may permit. Your committee can not but feel that a distribution of the remaining plays to be edited [...] to several scholars, however eminent, outside of the University, would be precipitate and ill advised [...] With respect to the financing of this project to continue the Variorum Shakespeare, your committee has but one suggestion, and that is that it considers that if possible the University should keep financial control. To seek the subversion of extraneous bodies, such, for example, as the General Educational Board or some Foundation, would, in our opinion, be a serious mistake. If money is to be gathered extraneously for a purpose such as this, let it come through the University and the University alone. (from pages 4 and 5, see footnote 43)

He finishes his letter by commenting “on the delicate question of such compensation as may remain possible to those who actually do the arduous editorial work [...] some arrangement by way of compensation in time, that this work may be done not in the tired hours after a strenuous day of teaching but in an approach to that perished leisure which in former times begot so much sound scholarship” (from page 5).⁴³

From the correspondence, it appears that Schelling had to really fight to keep Penn associated with the project. Of course, one must remember that is during the beginning of the Great Depression. Schelling’s letters let us see that there is a link to the corporate, university identity that has replaced the individual scholar. The honor of editing goes to an individual of course, but Schelling’s insistence that the University of Pennsylvania keep the series close to home tells us something. Additionally, Schelling’s comments that the age of the gentleman

⁴³ These quotes are from a 5 page, typed copy of a letter to “Dr. J. H. Penniman, Provost, University of Pennsylvania,” Philadelphia, PA, from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated December 18, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”].

scholar are now over are very telling. The particular institutional constraints and responsibilities of working in a university setting make this way of producing scholarship outdated. Indeed, the teaching responsibilities of a university faculty member actually impede scholarly activity.

In a draft of a letter, dated January 19, 1931 to Dr. J. H. Penniman, Felix Schelling writes:

In regard to the Variorum looked at in general, we must recognize two things. One is that Horace Howard Furness, Jr., was not able to rise to the heights of his more scholarly father. There was a falling off in what might be called the judicial function, that of sifting out and appraising in the volumes which were done by the younger man. A second point to be confessed concerning the Variorum Shakespeare is that its method with respect to bibliography, index and other like apparatus is a little old-fashioned, and that form was maintained by the younger man. Any continuation of such a series would take these matters into consideration and correct them.

While I am willing to confess that there is not the same need for a book of this kind that there was when it was projected, I cannot feel that the work is valueless, and I assuredly do not feel that it is work which anybody can do. [...]

Still again, I cannot bring myself to face the disgrace to the name of the University that our throwing this project to the wolves will bring us. I am quite certain that the moment that our refusal to do anything with the Variorum is known, it will be taken up, most likely by Yale, and financed, if not there, by some one of the foundations

such as the American Council of Learned Societies of the Social Science Research Council.⁴⁴

In what appears to be the second draft of this letter, dated January 20, 1931, Schelling ends by saying “To put it frankly, would the University be willing to sanction the continuance of the Variorum Shakespeare, provided first that I personally will give my approval of any volume which shall be offered, and secondly, that the University shall not be asked to enter into any financial obligations?”⁴⁵ Schelling seems to have changed his tune somewhat and now wants to go outside the University for funding. Perhaps this is because he now sees himself as having no other choice in the matter. Financially, the university cannot undertake the project. Schelling concedes this to Penniman in a letter dated December 17, 1930, where he states that the cost is prohibitory and they need “some name that would carry weight in a work of this kind.”⁴⁶ He does not understand himself to have such a name. As such, the variorum struggled and limped its way through the 1930’s and 40’s, desperate for money and resources in a time of near universal need. On December 30, 1932, the Shakespeare group of the MLA at New Haven adopted a resolution that they oversee the development and completion of the project. This gave the project the official backing of an organization, but monetary problems persisted.

An important question for Schelling as the project progressed, is who the members of the committee and the editors should be. How, and in what ways, are they qualified to make judgments about the Shakespearian texts and the overall project? In fact, much of the later

⁴⁴ From pages 2 and 3 of a 4 page, typed copy of a letter to Dr. J. H. Penniman, Philadelphia, PA, from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated January 19, 1931 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

⁴⁵ From page 2 of a two page, typed letter (unsigned) addressed to Dr. J. H. Penniman, Philadelphia, PA, from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated January 20, 1931 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

⁴⁶ From page 1 of a one page, typed letter (unsigned) addressed to Dr. J. H. Penniman, Philadelphia, PA, from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated December 17, 1930 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

correspondence from 1934 and 1935 is concerned with who will fill various positions on the committee and how decisions affecting the entire project will be made. Schelling and his committee fight with Percy Long, Associate Secretary of the MLA of America about who has authority to say and do what. As late as April 7, 1934 Schelling is concerned with the maneuvering on the part of Long and other funding agencies to get Yale more involved in the project and to get three scholars from Yale to commit to edit editions.⁴⁷

In a letter to Schelling by Joseph Quincy Adams dated April 9, 1934, Adams writes “As yet I have not made much progress with Hemingway’s bulky manuscript [originally over 800 pages, Hemingway wanted to publish it in two volumes, I Henry IV]. It is good, so far as I have read; but it could be much condensed, I think. A great deal of trash is preserved for its historical value, and to keep the volume uniform in content with the earlier volumes. So much water has gone by the mill since Furness started the series, that I sometimes wonder whether we are wise in reprinting so much of the earlier textual criticism.”⁴⁸

In a historical summary of the project written by M. A. Shaaber, possibly in 1934 or 1935 (Gibson quotes what I think is a paragraph from it on page 262-263, and cites as a source in his notes “M.A. Shaaber, “The Furness Variorum Shakespeare,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 75 (1935): 283.” This might be a rough draft of that article), Shaaber sums up the history of the project until that point rather succinctly. He writes

Those interested in them [the Variorums] felt that they owed it not only Dr. Furness but to the world of scholarship to carry out his work. It seemed to them as to many others a

⁴⁷ This refers to a 2 page typed copy of a letter to Dr. Joseph Quincy Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C., from Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, dated April 7, 1934 [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

⁴⁸ From a 1 page, signed letter to Felix E. Schelling, Philadelphia, PA, from Joseph Quincy Adams, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 9, Folder 54, “Correspondence, 1930-7”], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

shame to allow so great an undertaking to lapse. But we found our resources inadequate to carry it on. Dr. Furness and his son were gentlemen of means, who could give the Variorum their undivided attention and pay for the publication of their work out of their own pockets. Their successors were college teachers who could give the Variorum only those rare hours of leisure which their duties left them and who had no resources for financing the publication of these sumptuous volumes. Accordingly, they applied to the M.L.A.A., and through it to the A.C.L.S., for assistance. In December 1932 the M.L.A. appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Professor Schelling to consider this problem and on its recommendation the association undertook the sponsorship of the whole project, appointed Dr. J.Q.A. [John Quincy Adams], director of the F.S.L. in W. as genrl ed. [Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, as general editor] to supervise the continuation of the work, and assumed responsibility for the publication of new parts of the series as completed. It was at this point, by a happy inspiration, that the committee of scholars, which the M.L.A. placed in charge of the work invited the A.P.S. to assist in carrying out its plans.⁴⁹

The vast majority of money which enabled the production of books was from the American Philosophical Society. Many of these letters are from Schelling arguing for money and course release time for Shaaber and Black, which underscores the material conditions of scholarship; people need time and money to produce scholarship. Schelling and the others are worried about making the editorial board as well as ensuring the individual editors are

⁴⁹ From page 7 of a 10 page typed document with handwritten notes and edits, written on the back of pages labeled with either "English 120 / First Term 1934/35 / Schedule for Dictation" or "English 120 / Dictation Assignment A." The document is titled "Report of the Furness Variorum Shakespeare Project," and the first page, labeled "Summary," is signed by M. A. Shaaber [Furness Family Papers, 1765-1937, Ms. Coll 481, Box 19, Folder 63, "Correspondence, 1930-7"], Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.

“qualified” and “competent” Elizabethans. This is only one of the many factors which influenced the narrative of the production of the Variorum Shakespeare editions after 1930. The most important factors are economic and institutional. The Great Depression, of course, influenced the money and resources available for this monumental project. As Schelling (ironically?) lamented in his letter to Penniman (see footnote 43), the project is not dependent only on some scholar-gentleman writing by himself in some garret. Rather, it is dependent on an institution or set of institutions for support. These editors are “professionals” in every sense of the word. Their livelihood is dependent on their academic or scholarly output. It is no longer an avocation, a side project that someone does purely out of love, duty, or pride— it has become a job. The age of Hudson and Furness had passed and the rules of the game had changed, with very real, material effects and implications. The academic world is one in which we like to pretend that money plays no factor (which is interesting, considering how much money textbooks can make, and considering how little institutional respect they garner, perhaps because of the baldly economic forces at work with textbooks).

In the post-1930 era, the Variorum project generated a lot of interest from influential institutions. The MLA took over the project and the newly formed Folger library was involved almost from the very start. They received grants from the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Association, and the Carnegie Foundation. The universities involved represented the top schools from up and down the eastern seaboard (Penn, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Princeton). Even though Felix Schelling wanted it to remain at Penn, it was really a corporate enterprise in many ways – in some ways it could even be said to represent higher education as a whole. At the very least, one could say that American higher education in general had a stake in the project.

2.8 TRANSITION

I want to draw attention to Schelling's question of who will edit and oversee these editions. Whether from Penn, Yale, or some other elite school, the answer is university academics. The real questions are "why?" and "how?" Certainly, this is an issue of "qualification" as already discussed in this chapter.

The shifts in qualification, in the understanding of what it means to be a scholar and the relationship between American institutions of higher education and scholarship is a difficult one to pin down. The succeeding chapters will trace out and track the changes in the developing field of English literature as seen through the representations of the field and in its relationship to pedagogy in textbooks.

3.0 TEXTBOOKS 1850 – 1875

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The work of this dissertation examines the implicit and explicit changes in pedagogical theories and practices through the representation of Shakespeare in literature textbooks which circulated in American higher education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. An examination of the primary source textbooks reveals that there was a shift in the emphasis of pedagogical practices and theories away from stressing moral development through an exposure to literature to the stressing of analysis through demonstrable, rhetorical categories as the prescriptive or best way to study literature. Simply put, the work of literature changed. The way that literature was practiced changed from producing a ‘moral’ reading of a text to producing a highly ‘rhetorical’ reading of a text. This dissertation argues that this shift is the result of the increasing professionalization of the practice of English as it became formalized as a university discipline. The changes in the theory of literature and how it should be taught were due primarily to the institutional, material demands of the professionalizing field of English. This chapter demonstrates the emphasis on moral development and gradual shift away from this found in literature textbooks published in America between approximately 1850 and 1875. The chapter consists of a survey of textbooks found in the Nietz Old Textbook Collection housed in Special Collections at the University of Pittsburgh’s Hillman Library. This chapter is divided

into six sections (Textbooks Defined, Textbook Form and Function, Explicit and Implicit Definitions of “Literature” and their Relationship to “Pedagogy,” Shakespeare, National Identity, and Morality and Character), which, when taken as a whole, represent a comprehensive analysis of these textbooks. The goal of this chapter is to take up in part this challenge and attempt to trace out the intellectual development of the field of literature in the United States of America by doing a reading of historical materials—that is, the textbooks themselves.

Of course, textbooks were only one way among many in which literature as a university, college, or simply “advanced” educational discipline was being shaped and professionalized. One of the qualities that make the study of textbooks so interesting and potentially productive is that textbooks exist dynamically. They serve a dual role in doing a history of the formation of English literature as a university discipline. Textbooks simultaneously record influences and shifts in the field as well as exert influence themselves. It is for this reason that they make such interesting and fruitful objects of study. Textbooks exist at a nexus of forces: social, institutional, economic, and ideological. They function as a record, however imperfect, of idealized classroom pedagogical practices and formulations of the field of literature.⁵⁰ I argue

⁵⁰ Several scholars have alluded to the usefulness of textbooks as both educational and cultural artifacts. In the essay “Regulating the Text: The Socio-Historical Roots of State Control,” Michael Apple states that education in general, and textbooks in particular, function as

embodiments and the results of the class, race, and gender dynamics that organize society ... The textbook is uniquely qualified to help us understand these complicated relationships. It is an economic commodity, bought and sold in the United States and in many other countries under the conditions of capitalist market. Because of this, it is subject to intense competition and to the pressures of profit. However, the text is not only an economic artifact, but is through and through political as well. (Apple 7)

Hillel Black wrote in The American School Book that

Of all the artifacts produced by a modern civilization ... none compares with the schoolbook as a mirror of that civilization's aspirations and failings ... As the most important educational tool of the past and the present, the textbook is instrumental in molding the attitudes and passions of the young and thus both reflects and shapes the beliefs of the nation itself. (Black 73).

Black echoed John Nietz, the noted textbook and scholar of the history of education in America, in the seminal *Old Textbooks*, when Nietz wrote:

Those who greatly helped mold the beginnings and the continuing development of our American civilization were the products of the schools of the past. The study of the textbooks in those schools

for and demonstrate that it is through the pedagogical aspects of English literature that these changes can be traced.

In order to better present my findings, I have approached the organization of the textbooks roughly chronologically. This chapter examines textbooks which were originally printed or were reprinted between approximately 1800 and 1875 in what is now the United States of America. Of these books, the vast majority consulted for this chapter were published or republished between 1850 and 1875. Chapter Three examines textbooks which were printed or reprinted between approximately 1875 and 1930. 1875 and 1930 correspond roughly to the formation and development of the modern, American research university, the principles of which, scholars like Gerald Graff in Professing Literature posit, were first put into practice with the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. All of the textbooks consulted for chapters

certainly greatly influenced their thinking and ideals. Thus an understanding of the textbooks of the past should throw considerable light upon the evolution of our culture and civilization. Certainly the McGuffey *Readers* did much to mold the character of the culture and ideals of the Middle West for more than half a century. (Nietz vi)

The very title of Ruth Miller Elson's textbooks survey, Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century, betrays a similar stance. Elson writes "However ill qualified to do so, the authors of schoolbooks both created and solidified American traditions ... [Schoolbooks] were a compendium of ideas popularly approved at the time" (Elson vii).

Nietz opens his study of late eighteenth and nineteenth century textbooks, *Old Text Books*, with:

An analysis of the school textbooks used in the past reveals a truer history of what was taught in the earliest schools than does a study of past education theories alone . . . The teachers in the early days of our country were so meagerly trained and educated that they depended strongly on the textbooks for what to teach and how to teach. Most authorities agree that in the United States the old textbooks in use in any particular school largely constituted the school's course of study. (Nietz 1)

This was true for the Nineteenth century and it is widely acknowledged today that the majority of primary and secondary school teachers are extremely dependent on textbooks to provide the curriculum for their teaching. The textbooks determine what, how, and in what order a subject is taught. In "Questions in Elementary Science and Social Studies Textbooks," Armbruster and Ostertag quote a 1988 article to this effect, saying "'According to virtually all studies of the matter, textbooks have become the *de facto* curriculum of the public schools'" (69). Harriet Tyson-Bernstein and Arthur Woodward in "Nineteenth Century Policies for Twenty-first Century Practice: The Textbook Reform Dilemma" write "as much as 90 percent of instructional time is structured by some sort of instructional material" (91).

All of these authors, however, are talking chiefly about primary and secondary school textbooks and education. This dissertation extends this conversation into the realm of higher education. Although college and university professors today seem to have much more individual freedom to choose to use textbooks, primary sources like novels or editions of plays, or some combination of these, as well as in the structuring of their classes, college textbook publishing is still a huge, multi-million dollar industry. It is impossible to tell exactly how any of these books were used, whether or not in conjunction with other texts or as a stand alone curriculum.

two and three were designed to circulate in American higher education by their authors or publishers as is indicated by their titles or places of publication⁵¹. Through a sustained examination of the representation of Shakespeare in these textbooks, Chapters Two and Three show the shift over time in pedagogical practices and their concomitant theories from primarily emphasizing moral development through an exposure to Literature to pedagogies which emphasized the demonstrable, reproducible categories of rhetoric as the proper way to study Literature.

Textbooks are a durable record of how individual students and teachers were imagined to engage with literature in a formal educational setting, predominately in the classroom but not always necessarily so. Although it may be possible to find enough detailed notes, diaries, or letters to piece together an approximation of how a particular textbook was used, or how a particular piece of literature was taught, in a specific classroom space, for the vast majority of cases, this would be impossible. The space of the classroom has been imagined, theorized, and fretted over for as long as there have been teachers and students. And yet, for all of this anxiety over what is now called ‘best practices’ there is very little record of what actually takes place in a given classroom. What material traces are left after a given class has finished, for the day or the term? Conversations, recitations, notes put on the chalkboard and all the other innumerable and completely transitory things that make up so much of the work of the classroom are unrecordable. Often, what can be saved, the archival record of papers, notebooks, tests, quizzes, etc. has not been saved or is so geographically scattered and not named (that is, it may exist, but

⁵¹ A textbook that was originally written and published in and for the British Empire, for example, but was reprinted in New York or Boston, must have been intended for sale and use in those American cities. Thomas Shaw’s textbooks are a good example of this phenomenon. Shaw was a British academic who worked in Russia. His textbooks were originally published in London, but the two in the Nietz Collection have New York listed as place of publication. These books were edited for an American audience.

just not be named in such a way that facilitates finding it) that it is, except in rare cases, extremely difficult to put together.⁵² And when relatively complete collections do exist, it often provides an insight limited to a particular individual or institution. My contention is that the textbooks should not be seen as a key to something else, but rather are themselves a rich written tradition in the history of literature's evolving role in higher education which explicitly and implicitly discuss pedagogy and field formation.

⁵² Archival records travel in unpredictable ways. While doing research at the Manuscript department at the University of Delaware Library, I found several diaries, collections of letters, and class notes which talked about college life in the mid and late Nineteenth century. One collection focused on a class at the University of Pennsylvania, recording how the student's daily schedule changed, his comings and goings from the physical space of his recitation, but there was no specific mention of a year, the professor, or the books read. Likewise, I found other records for college level work done in Philadelphia and, I think, Baltimore, but not specific to the history of the University of Delaware.

Ronald J. Zboray and Mary Saracino Zboray, in A Handbook for the Study of Book History in the United States, discuss the importance of "mediation" in terms of the methodology of book history. Their discussion is relevant to all archival research. In the section entitled "What is the field about?" they write "The several disciplines that touch book history all share an understanding: printed artifacts do not give direct insight into the past; rather, that insight is *mediated*" (4). By this they refer to all of the different layers that go into the production of a printed text and its reception: the "market," editors and publishers, booksellers, the various ways in which a book is used by readers or buyers. Zboray and Saracino Zboray end their discussion with "Some scholars see these mediations as distortions . . . but book historians take these mediations as their principal objects of study. Why? Because the mediations of producers, disseminators, and consumers of printed materials provide insight into how a society produces meaning" (4-5). And this does not even speak to the specific editorial and textual complications which are endemic to contemporary Shakespearian historical scholarship. I bring this up because a similar type of mediation is at work in terms of the construction of an archive. Any conclusions made, for example, from the study of the textbooks in the Nietz collection, have to be understood through the boundaries, the laws of inclusion and exclusion, which govern the collection's holdings.

Using Zboray and Saracino Zboray's work on book history as a jumping off point, I would like to make an extended analogy between the book as an object of study in book history and the archive in this project. Zboray and Saracino Zboray identify the contribution of book history to cultural knowledge, to "provide insight into how a society produces meaning" (5). I would contend that a similar argument can be made about archives. Archives allow us to read across a range of individual texts and read these texts in relation to one another (as long as we try to take into account the ideological and material contexts of the archive itself). But as book history endeavors to see the book as an artifact, a material object, we can see the archive as a kind of material object as well. If to study a book through the lens of book history is to attempt to understand something about its place in material culture, the ideological and material conditions under which it was produced, disseminated, and consumed, with all of these things enabling a reading of the others, then in order to understand the contents of an archive, we must understand the material and ideological conditions of its beginning and maintenance (after all, most collections "grow" over time). As is reading a literary text (or any text for that matter), this is also a question of semiotics. If we define reading as the making of meaning (in opposition to the definition of reading as the simple transmission of meaning through a code) then when we read the contents of an archive we can produce a narrative, a collection of semiotic events which when taken together tell us a story. But, this story is a story conditioned by the structure and organization of the archive itself.

This chapter focuses on the representation of Shakespeare in textbooks intended for use in higher education in the United States of America. Shakespeare makes the ideal case study for a project which attempts to get at large currents in pedagogy and field formation, because Shakespeare acts as a synecdoche for literature as a whole. Scholars who study Shakespeare in an American context, like Gary Taylor, Lawrence Levine, and Thomas Cartelli have demonstrated that Shakespeare was represented, in some form or another, on all strata of American society, existing adaptively and mutably to currents in American society. Shakespeare was used and recognized by different forms of entertainments such as minstrel shows and advertisements, like the use of Hamlet's 'To be or not to be' soliloquy to sell dry goods (Levine 54). In his Shakespeare on the American Yiddish Stage, Joel Berkowitz discusses the origins and reception of the 1892 Yiddish language adaptation of *Der yiddisher kenig Lir* (Berkowitz translates this as "The Jewish King Lear") (Berkowitz 39). Mark Twain also made a nod toward the pervasiveness of Shakespeare through his inclusion of a Romeo and Juliet scene in Huckleberry Finn. Thomas Cartelli detailed the adaptation of The Tempest for public use in a turn of the century New York City festival in Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations.

The performance was an important means of circulation for Shakespeare. Both Taylor and Levine comment on the Astor Place Riots in which working class theatergoers, favoring an American actor, rioted against "society" members who favored a British actor. Twenty two people were killed as a result. This dramatically demonstrates that Shakespeare and the manner in which he was performed and received by audiences was taken extremely seriously, sometimes with deadly consequences (Taylor 63, Levine 64). Shakespeare, however, was not just enjoyed and disseminated through performance. His existence was highly textual as well. John Brereton

implicitly showed the importance of a knowledge of Shakespeare's plays to the Harvard entrance examinations in his The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925.

Why does Shakespeare have such a marked place in the American cannon? A close examination of the discussions of linguistics in these textbooks illuminates a sense of national identity which is rooted in a shared language and it makes sense to see the desire to claim a British past for an American literary and cultural identity. For example, William Spalding's 1859 The History of English Literature: with an outline of the origin and growth of the English language: Illustrated by extracts: for the use of schools and of private students includes a section entitled "Contemporary American Literature. By An American" which reads:⁵³

In the few remarks which we shall bestow upon the rising literature of the New World, it will be our object rather to notice its peculiar feature, than the characteristics of its writers. It is almost within the last half-century that these writers have attracted any particular attention abroad. In truth, it is only within this period that the American mind has manifested any strong distinctive features of its own, not only in literature, but in a large number of other departments of intellectual activity.

To the inhabitants of the United States, more particularly, belongs the arduous task of settling and subduing a wild and rude continent [...] (409)

Similarly Francis H. Underwood writes in his 1871 A Hand-book of English Literature: Intended for the use of High Schools, as well as a companion and guide for private students, and for general readers that:

The laws and customs of each people, their cultivation of the arts of war or peace, their agricultural or maritime pursuits, their fertile plains or mountain fastnesses, their easy

⁵³ The full title of every textbook will be given the first time it is mentioned. After that, the title will be abbreviated.

obedience to rulers or their fierce contests for independence, their local attachments or their roving, marauding disposition,--all these native tendencies and social and political influences were soon evident as well in their speech as in their character. And, if we did know the speech of a single modern European nation, we could, upon the basis of its original stock of words, with a knowledge of its wars offensive and defensive, its migrations and governmental changes, its wealth, customs, and general cultivation, predict with a good degree of certainty the prevailing character of its language and literature. (ix-x)

What is fascinating, however, is the extent to which Shakespeare is *used* to disseminate what are identified as American cultural ideals.⁵⁴ Shakespeare was part of a uniquely American cultural landscape and seen by Americans as one of their own, as a distinct part of American history and culture as much as that of England. Shakespeare was not an “import.” Levine attributes Shakespeare’s general popularity partly to his moral position, emphasizing individual responsibility, partly to the current dramatic preference for melodrama, and partly to his pervasiveness in American educational culture (Levine 39-42). He writes, “This ideological equation, this ability of Shakespeare to connect with American’s underlying beliefs, is crucial to an understanding of his role in nineteenth-century America” (Levine 42) and “The profound and longstanding nineteenth-century American experience with Shakespeare, then, was neither accidental nor aberrant. It was based upon the language and eloquence, the artistry and humor, the excitement and action, the moral sense and worldview that Americans found in Shakespearean drama” (Levine 45). Taylor, also stressing the democratic streaks which Americans saw in Shakespeare, also brings up developments in printing technology which made

⁵⁴ Not “appropriated,” as that would imply something foreign or belonging somewhere else, not for its intended use

the production and distribution of printed texts much cheaper and more widely available. Taylor quotes Alexis de Tocqueville from 1831 when he writes, “There is hardly a pioneer’s hut which does not contain a few odd volumes of Shakespeare” (quoted in Taylor 197) Shakespeare existed on all levels of American culture and this fact enables me to see the emergence and growth of the split between “amateur” and “professional” which is the hallmark of academic professionalization.

Shakespeare’s collected works have been, and to a large extent are, understood as representing all of literature. The qualities which are ascribed to the plays are those qualities which are ascribed to all great works of literature. For whatever reasons, Shakespeare’s plays act as a kind of cipher, with every new generation of scholars, critics, and readers seeing the qualities which speak to the essence of literature at that particular moment. Shakespeare works synecdochically, representing all literature. As Shakespeare goes, so goes literature, and vice versa. Harold Bloom in his Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human is not the first and will not be the last critic to place all of western literature or philosophy at the feet of William Shakespeare.

3.2 TEXTBOOKS DEFINED

For purposes of this dissertation, a textbook is defined as any text which is edited, written, assembled, or used with explicit or implicit pedagogical principles in mind. According to this model then, an edition of a particular Shakespeare play, Hamlet for example, with no explicit references to teachers, students, or classroom use, could be considered a textbook if it is used for purposes of teaching students. In terms of literature, this project identifies textbooks as those

texts which purport to represent or instruct students in the history, appreciation, practice, or study of literature, either originally in English or as translated into English.

This chapter shows the results of my extensive survey of textbooks for advanced students found in the Nietz collection that were originally published before or around 1875. Reprints of books were considered if they were substantially changed, added to, or subtracted from. Several books, for example, considered in this section were reprinted into the 1880's or longer but have been included because their original publication date was earlier than 1876. Thirty-six individual textbooks, that is thirty-two different titles including four reprints were closely examined for this chapter during my time spent doing research at the Nietz collection in March and April of 2004.

The Nietz Old Textbook Collection holds approximately 16,000 textbooks, many of which have not been reproduced in microform or appear in reprinted editions (19th Century Schoolbooks website).⁵⁵ The Nietz collection contains a variety of textbooks from different time periods but the majority (at least 10,000 out of 16,000⁵⁶) were printed between 1800 and 1925, 8,660 have publication dates ranging between 1850 and 1925. By looking at the Nietz textbooks one can see these changes as they do or do not happen across time and space. In a sense the Nietz collection functions as a kind of historical laboratory where empirical research can be done. Given the size and reputation of the Nietz, working within that collection provides a basis for evaluating American higher education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The textbooks can be thought of as a gauge of the intellectual milieu of the country during this time period.

⁵⁵ Because this part of the study looks at the foundation of literature as a formal field of study or university discipline, the type of texts examined vary to some degree in how they name their subject matter. Of the thirty six textbooks examined, eighteen contained explicit references to William Shakespeare or his corpus of work. One of the distinct advantages of using the Nietz Old Textbook Collection is the way in which it is catalogued and in which it can be searched. Not only are the individual book title searchable by title, keyword, and author, they are also grouped into subject areas.

⁵⁶ It may be more. The search engine can only return a maximum of 10,000 entries.

The textbooks examined in this chapter can be broken down into two principal types. The first are textbooks in which the study of literature itself is made primary. These are textbooks which are very recognizable to the modern reader as being about literature and designed for use in a pedagogical environment. Two examples are Underwood's A Hand-book of English Literature... and John S. Hart's 1874 Class Book of Poetry: Consisting of Selections from Distinguished English and American Authors, from Chaucer to the Present Day, the Whole Arranged in Chronological Order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks. These types of texts contain either biographies, critical appraisals of authors, literary excerpts, or some combination of all of these.

The second principle type of textbook is that in which literature is greatly represented or discussed, often as much as or more than books of the first type, but where the literature is used as a means to get at something else. In this type of textbook, excerpts of literature or critical appraisals may be present, but they are presented instrumentally as a means to an end. That end could be the study of rhetoric, elocution, history, the study of formal English grammar, etc. Examples of this kind of text are Hiram Corson's 1867 An Elocutionary Manual: Consisting of Choice Selections from English and American Literature, Adapted to every Variety of Vocal Expression: Designed for the Higher Classes in Schools and Seminaries, and for Private and School Reading: With an Introductory Essay on the Study of Literature, and on Vocal Culture in its Relation to an Aesthetic Appreciation of Poetry, H. D. Hodge's 1852 Parsing Book: Containing Choice Gems of Thought and of Literature, Together with a Practical System of Analyzing Words and Sentences, and Henry Coppée's (originally from 1872, this edition 1881) English Literature Considered as an Interpreter of English History: Designed as a Manual of Instruction.

The dissertation focuses on what I call “advanced” students and books because higher education in the United States of America and its Territories in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was much less rigidly stratified than it is today. The textbook market was likewise flexible in terms of its potential audience. As the titles imply, authors and publishers tried to appeal to the broadest possible spectrum of buyers. In an era when students could attend a public high school, a degree granting private academy, college or university, not to mention those involved in reading clubs or pursuing the Victorian passion for self-improvement through self-directed study, textbooks were aimed at some or all of these groups. For example, Hiram Corosn’s 1867 book lists “Higher Classes in Schools and Seminaries, and for Private and School Reading” as potential audiences.

I also want to place “advanced” in opposition to “elementary” or “primary.” This study is interested in literary readers and not books that teach the rudiments of reading or writing such as primers or spellers. The study focuses on texts which assume a high degree of literacy skills, both in reading and writing. For example, the study does not consider the American editions of the immensely popular Lamb’s Tales From Shakespeare; not because it isn’t a fascinating piece of Shakespeariana in America, but because it marks itself through Lamb’s introduction as being for beginners.

Dictionaries, although not textbooks in the strict sense of the word, shed at least partial light on the generally accepted usage for important terms (like “author,” “literature,” “belles lettres,” etc.) and can illuminate some social ideas about what literature is in American society and how it shifts during this time period.

Given Noah Webster's importance to the development of American letters, it is useful to recognize Webster's dictionaries. In an 1857 edition of Webster's dictionary, edited by Chauncey A. Goodrich, the definition of "literature" is

1. learning; acquaintance with letters or books. 2. the collective body of literary productions, embracing the entire results of knowledge and fancy preserved in writing. 3. *In the more distinctive and usual sense of the term, literature excludes the positive sciences, and embraces history, grammar, rhetoric, logic, criticism, languages, &c. In a still narrower sense, it is sometimes used as synonymous with the belles-lettres, or polite literature.* [emphasis in original] (669)

"Belles-lettres" is defined as "Polite literature; a word of very vague signification. It includes poetry and oratory; but authors are not agreed to what particular branches of learning the term should be restricted" (114). "Polite literature" is not given a separate entry in this edition.

These are not exhaustive definitions. The more Webster tries to narrow his definition, the broader it becomes, pointing the reader to "Belles-lettres" which is itself defined by an explicit vagueness and ambiguity. The question that any self-aware study of literature as an academic discipline which is housed in institutions must ask is what counts as literature and why? Let us compare Webster's 1857 definition to a 1994 edition of Webster's New World Dictionary "1 the profession of an author; production of writings, esp. of imaginative prose, verse, etc. . . . [2] b) all of such writings considered as having permanent value, excellence of form, great emotional effect, etc. . . ." (taken from the 1994 edition of Webster's New World Dictionary).⁵⁷

⁵⁷ The work of Raymond Williams in *Keywords* makes a good jumping off point for this kind of archival work which spans potentially hundreds of primary sources. Going back to the eighteenth century Raymond Williams demonstrates how the word "Literature" slowly changed from a rough equivalent to "literate," the ability to read or

In a section of his essay entitled “Origin of Language” which served as the introduction to the first edition of his Dictionary, Webster writes:

[W]e may infer that language was bestowed on Adam, in the same manner as all of his other faculties and knowledge, by supernatural power; or in other words, was of divine origin...It is, therefore, probable, that *language* as well as the faculty of speech, was the *immediate gift of God*. [emphasis in original] (xxiii)

For Webster and many in the nineteenth century, the use of language, and therefore, I infer, of literature, is of cosmic importance and comes with an awesome responsibility. We can see this importance being played out in the work of textbooks. This idea runs through the textbooks of the nineteenth century. Literature, as the recorded form of human language has a divine purpose. Even secular writing is ultimately a divinely inspired proposition. This is not to say that everyone involved in textbook production or education believed in this interpretation of the Christian Bible, but this importance of the written word as something special and fundamental to human experience and understanding was and is pervasive. I cite this material to show that literature was and still is a serious business with a lot at stake in it. This definition of language and writing helps partly to explain the connection between literature and moral improvement and education.

write, to refer to printed matter which contributed to “polite learning” (184-185). Williams lays out a challenge of sorts in his discussion of the following problematic: “What has then to be traced is the attempted and often successful specialization of **literature** to certain kinds of writing [. . .] [emphasis in original]” (185). This “certain kind of writing” is that which can be said to belong to “**English Literature**” [emphasis in original] (186). Books in this category are “understood as well-written books of an imaginative or creative kind. The teaching of English, especially in universities, is understood as the teaching of **literature**, meaning mainly poems and plays and novels . . . [emphasis in original]” (186). Williams notes that before “Literature” was associated with “imaginative writing,” “poetry” served that function in the language. The definition of “poetry” from the 1857 edition of Webster’s dictionary is fairly descriptive (defined as “metrical composition”), but “poet” is much more interesting (840). The second part of the definition reads “One skilled in making poetry, or who has a particular genius for metrical composition; one distinguished for poetic talents. Many write verses who can not be called *poets* [emphasis in original]” (840). This 1857 edition of Webster’s dictionary contains Webster’s original 1828 “Introduction,” which is described in the full title of the dictionary as a “dissertation on the origin, history, and connection, of the languages of western Asia and Europe, with an explanation of the principles on which languages are formed.”

Because of the importance of it to Webster's definition of "literature," and because it is often understood as a precursor to the modern category of literature, it is necessary to examine and comment on "Belles Lettres." This phrase rose to prominence through Hugh Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (first authorized publication in 1783). Blair's popularity throughout the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries has been noted and his work must have exerted at least some influence on American textbook authors⁵⁸. While I cannot assume a genealogy, there are similarities between Blair and Webster's philological essays. Although Blair does not define "Literature" or "Belles Lettres" *per se*, he does present and discuss the different kinds of literature. The phrase "Literary Composition" does appear in the original index in Volume 2, but there is no explicit definition given.

There are, however, implicit definitions given throughout the forty-seven lectures, especially in those that deal with "criticism." Given the various forms and subject matters treated in Blair's lectures it would seem that Belles Lettres (or Literature) refers potentially to any written matter artfully done and adhering to the standards of taste.⁵⁹ In his introductory lecture (Lecture I) Blair writes "To apply the principles of good sense to composition and discourse; to employ ourselves in distinguishing accurately between the specious and the solid, between affected and natural ornament, must certainly improve us not a little in the most valuable part of all philosophy, the philosophy of human nature" (9-10). Blair continues

⁵⁸ Stephen L. Carr's essay "The Circulation of Blair's *Lectures*" counts 283 versions of this text that appeared between 1783 and 1911 in a variety of formats and targeted at a variety of audiences (Carr, S. 78).

⁵⁹ We can see this kind of thinking at work in the 1865 textbook of James P. Holcombe, Literature in Letters, or, Manners, Art, Criticism, Biography, History, and Morals Illustrated in the Correspondence of Eminent Persons. "Literature" is here defined as taking part in all of the different branches of writing named in the title. The text is split into six sections or "Books," each one devoted more or less to a particular subject area. The fifth book is "Literary biography, anecdote, and criticism in letters." Some of the authors that he cites are Milton, Pope, Newton, Locke, Hume, Smith, Johnson, Wharton, Gray, Gibbon, Thomas Jefferson, Hannah More, Robert Burns, and several others whose names do not circulate much in the twenty-first century.

Belles Lettres and criticism chiefly consider him [Man] as a Being endowed with those powers of taste and imagination, which were intended to embellish his mind, and to supply him with rational and useful entertainment . . . All that relates to beauty, harmony, grandeur, and elegance; all that can sooth the mind, gratify the fancy, or move the affections, belongs to their province. (10)

He states in Lecture XL “The ultimate end of all Poetry, indeed of every Composition, should be to make some useful impression on the mind” (361, vol 2). Inextricably bound up with the study of literature is a philosophical and moral imperative. Earlier in the text, on page 4, Blair states that the basis for any public speaking or writing must be the extension of “knowledge,” but when the knowledge, as that gained from a Shakespeare play is of human nature, the discussion enters into a different register from that of a treatise on farm irrigation in rhyme and meter.⁶⁰

Whereas the dictionary definitions from different time periods shed some light on the changing phenomenon that is the definition of “literature,” when we look at the textbooks themselves we get a snapshot of these different definitions in practice. All the books in some form or another, explicitly or implicitly define “Literature.” Although following the model of the dictionaries I am using the language of “definition,” what I am really talking about is the clarification of a set of prescriptive practices for the proper study and teaching of Literature.

For example, Richard Parker and G. and J. Madison Watson’s The National Fifth Reader: Containing a Treatise on Elocution, Exercises in Reading and Declamation, with Biographical

⁶⁰ Shakespeare shows up in several places throughout Blair’s Lectures. As far as I can tell he is never quoted, only discussed. The two definite references to specific plays are a quick reference to Desdemona (502, vol 2, Lecture XLVI) and a detailed discussion of Macduff’s expressions of emotion in Macbeth in the same Lecture (511, vol 2). All other references are critical discussions of Shakespeare’s work either by Blair himself or other critics, like Dryden.

Sketches, and Copious Notes: Adapted to the Use of Students in English and American Literature, originally published in 1857 and republished in 1863, never explicitly defines what literature is or should be. Its commentary about William Shakespeare, however, sheds some light on the matter:

Shakespeare is, above all writers—at least above all modern writers,—the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and life. His characters are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpracticed by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers; or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions; they are the genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply, and observation will always find. (344)

Working backwards from this description it is possible to see all “literature” as participating in these qualities. Those things which do not measure up to this high standard cannot, then, be called literature. In this definition universality becomes the measure of literary merit. If this is what Literature (note the capital “L”) does, then Literature finds its personification through Shakespeare.

3.3 TEXTBOOK FORM AND FUNCTION

All theory implies a practice or set of practices and all practices imply a theory or set of theories. It is often difficult or impossible to know what theories were informing the construction of a particular textbook. Because of distances of time and space our only recourse is to go the texts

and allow them to speak for themselves through an examination of their form and function.⁶¹

This section of the chapter examines the eighteen textbooks that make some use of Shakespeare and their materials describing, commenting on, or analyzing the form, function, and potential audience of the textbook, including discussions of hypothetical students as well as defining characteristics of literature. In my investigation of these textbooks I found three primary, explicitly stated goals; to show the progress of the English language, to provide an historical record, and to serve as a springboard or guide to further reading on the part of the student.

The physical layout of a book always functions as pedagogically as the content. John S. Hart's 1875 edition of A Manual of English Literature: A Text Book for Schools and Colleges does this explicitly⁶². The three or four different sizes and fonts of types are keyed to the needs of different readers. Hart writes

⁶¹ Naomi Silverman, a textbook editor, and Joel Spring, a professor of education and textbook author, wrote about the complex process of writing and assembling a textbook in Textbooks in American Society. Silverman, in "From the Ivory Tower to the Bottom Line: An Editor's Perspective on College Textbook Publishing," and Spring, in "Textbook Writing and Ideological Management: A Postmodern Approach" discuss the conservative, market forces and the corporate structures that effect textbook production, resulting in conformity of style and content. I would maintain that even if we had access to all of these textbook authors we should still let the texts speak for themselves over and above the authors. All teaching practices imply theories and whereas explicitly held theories can and often do exert influence over classroom practices it is false to assume that there is always merely a transparent or 'one to one' correlation between explicit theory and practice in the classroom. The translation into practice or enacting of the theory changes it. As Paul Kameen has shown in "Rewording the Rhetoric of Composition," a 1980 article on several then contemporary composition textbooks, a textbook author like Frank D'Angelo who cites Coleridge as his theoretical influence for composing might create a textbook that asks for practices which have nothing to do with Coleridge's theories (74). One could see this as the textbook author's inability to read Coleridge, or, perhaps more productively for this dissertation, as what happens in the disconnect, in the gap, between explicit and implicit theorization. This example is from the field of composition, a field whose practitioners purport to be and generally are very concerned with teaching and pedagogy. The potential for an even bigger disconnect exists in a field like literature, where teaching has historically been seen as secondary to, or entirely separate from, scholarship and research. It is this gap that my work will explore. As academics fought over and tried to define what the proper boundaries and practices of the field of literature were through MLA addresses, departmental and institutional hiring practices, scholarly and popular publishing and speaking, course offerings, etc. they were also doing it through their teaching. Along with the explicit theorizing and defining of the field through research and scholarship there existed simultaneously an implicit theorizing of the field through pedagogical practices.

⁶² Another textbook by Hart is A Manual of Composition and Rhetoric: A Text-book for Schools and Colleges, originally published in 1870 (this edition 1878). A stand-out feature of this textbook is the sample compositions included in the back of the text. Hart has included in this text a "method" for correcting papers that teachers can use. The compositions are identified by the age and gender of the writer and range from the very young to the

As a Text-book, the whole of it should be read by the student, but that part only which is in the larger type should be made the subject of recitation. By adhering to this rule, the student, even with the very limited time given to the pursuit in our institutions of learning, will be able without difficulty to compass the whole subject of English Literature, in all its departments, and, at the same time, will learn where to look for those minor details which, in the course of his studies, form a frequent subject of inquiry, but with which it is not necessary or expedient, in ordinary cases, to burden his memory.

(Preface iii)

That the book is indexed also facilitates its use as a potential reference source.

This discussion raises the question as to the primary sources (or supplemental readings) to which students and teachers were expected to have access. In the third British edition of Henry Morely's A first Sketch of English Literature, the "Preface" states that English literature is an extremely large subject and his textbook is not going to give its reader a complete picture of the subject. Rather, it is a sketch intended to help students to figure out what to read on their own. While each period is being studied, students should read some social and political history along with one or two of the best, complete pieces. A short appendix gives the names and prices of some of these complete works.

Moses Coit Tyler's revision of this text for an American audience is even more directive.⁶³ He writes explicitly to teachers that:

college student. The sample compositions look like engravings as are the sample corrections. This would perhaps be interesting for a future historical study on how teachers respond to/comment on written student work.

⁶³ The full title reads A Manual of English Literature; Thoroughly Revised, with an Entire Re-arrangement of Matter, and with Numerous Retrenchments and Additions, edited by Moses Coit Tyler and printed in New York for Sheldon and Company in 1879.

It is of the utmost importance, even in the use of a text-book on English literature, that students should be saved from lapsing into a passive and listless attitude toward the subject, and should be so skillfully steered in their work that they may come to know for themselves the exhilaration of original research. If I may refer to my own experience as a teacher, I would say that in my introductory course upon English literature—in which course only I use a text-book—I have found it a great advantage, while my pupils were engaged in reciting from the text-book upon the earlier periods of English literature, to parcel out among them, for direct study in the library, the most celebrated works in prose and poetry belonging to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries; with the understanding that each student, in his turn, is to have the opportunity of reporting upon the topic assigned to him, as it shall be reached by the class in the regular process of the work. For some such method, this Manual is particularly adapted. (ix-x)

Here we have a teacher instructing potential teachers to use the textbook as a *de facto* curriculum, letting it set the pace for the class in English literature. The textbook serves as a guide for “introductory” classes for understanding the whole of English literature. The next section of the chapter will address how this field of Literature was imagined to be constituted, defined, and how teachers simultaneously defined and were defined through their interaction with the forces which meet in the textbooks.

3.4 EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT DEFINITIONS OF “LITERATURE” AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO “PEDAGOGY”

There is no way to account for a textbook author’s idiosyncratic understanding of literature. It is possible that some of the authors and/or publishers were considered old fashioned, some cutting edge, and still others so eccentric as to defy categorization. When taken together, however, these textbooks constitute, in part, a written tradition within American advanced education in the middle and later part of the nineteenth century.⁶⁴ As one would expect the term “literature” gets more and more specialized as the century progresses⁶⁵.

As textbooks are designed for students, they are also designed with teachers in mind. There is actually very little material directly and explicitly addressing teachers, but there is a lot, perhaps everything, indirectly or implicitly addressing the teachers, or more precisely the figure of the imagined or ideal teacher.

Textbooks are “read,” but they should also be understood as being “used” by both teachers and students. Textbook authors physically and rhetorically construct their texts in order to regulate a user’s knowledge (either that of the student or teacher). This regulatory function is dependent upon the self-referential nature of the textbooks—that is, the way in which they are constructed. Unapproved knowledge about an author or literary work could destroy the ennobling qualities of the literature that is being taught.

⁶⁴ Presenting this material in a rough chronological order gives one the advantage of being able to track the changes in the implicit definitions of “Literature” over time.

⁶⁵ Henry Reed and the University of Pennsylvania’s position and importance in the history of the teaching of literature in the United States cannot be overlooked. I have decided to deliberately exclude him from this chapter because although he was ahead of his time (having died in 1854) this dissertation is more interested in the time period in which the practices that he pioneered became more acceptable to the mainstream.

A telling example is the Rev. O.L. Jenkins' The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature: Containing Sketches Biographical and Critical of the Most Distinguished English Authors: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day: With Selections from their Writings, and Questions Adapted to the Use of Schools, published in 1876. In the "Author's Preface," Jenkins address the teacher's roles in regulating the morality of students. He writes:

But to secure so desirable a result, much care and discrimination are necessary. Young persons should not be left to their own inclinations solely in the choice and perusal of literary works. They should be especially cautioned against such as inculcate a loose morality, pervert the truths of history, or grossly insult the religious convictions of the reader. Franklin says of himself, that the reading of Cotton Mather's Essay to Do Good, gave him a 'tone of thinking that had an influence on some of the future events of his life.' It has been well said in one of our text-books of English Literature: "We may be made, for our whole existence, better as well as wiser, by an hour of well-advised study, which has led to earnest meditation on our won character and destiny; whereas an impure image, a false doctrine, a groveling or malevolent wish excited by a book we read, may be the opening of a gate that will lead us downward into the abyss of moral depravation. Whenever it has been found necessary to allude to writings of this latter class, an effort has been made in these pages, either to point out the danger, or offer an antidote to the poison. (vii-viii)

By examining pedagogy through its representation in the textbooks via the lens of Shakespeare, my research has led me to the conclusion that textbooks rhetorically construct the teacher as a gatekeeper, or archon, of literature as it pertains to American culture and

knowledge.⁶⁶ This study acknowledges simultaneously the existence of two levels of gatekeepers. The first is the figure of the teacher or pedagogue as imagined by the larger cultural institutions that comprise schools and schooling. The second is the authors, editors, and book publishers taken collectively. Both the teacher who uses a textbook and the editors and publishers who compile and produce the books in question function as archons, or gatekeepers.

The teacher assumes the role of the archon. He or she controls access to the information contained in the archive through the textbook. This proposition, however, is further complicated by the existence of a complex web of social forces influencing the production of any actual edition. These influences could range from physical issues like the cost and availability of production materials, like paper and leather, to the pedagogical and educational theories prevalent in the society. What makes this formation of teachers and knowledge unique is that the archon in this case is constructed and informed by the archive and not the other way around. Traditionally, as Derrida reminds us in Archive Fever, “The citizens who thus held and signified political power [the archons] were considered to possess the right to make or to represent the law ... They do not only ensure the physical security [of the documents] ... They have the power to interpret the archives” (Derrida 2). I argue that in the case of textbooks the teacher exists as a function of the archives, interpolated by the archives they are supposed to maintain.

Charles D. Cleveland’s A Compendium of English Literature: Chronologically Arranged from Sir John Mandeville to William Cowper: Consisting of Biographical Sketches of the Authors, Selections from their Works, with Various Criticism: Designed as a Text Book for the Highest Classes in Schools and for Junior Classes in Colleges, as well as for Private Reading

⁶⁶ The use of this term is inspired by and adapted from the etymological work in Jacques Derrida’s Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression. Derrida uses it to situate his discussion of archives in contemporary society. Because of its explanatory power, I made use of it here.

(this edition published in 1868) is interesting, and in my experience unique, in mentioning the different editions of writers circulating and trying to direct readers to the “best editions of the writers.” This small comment indicates the author’s recognition of his book and (potentially) all books as objects that circulate and are represented in different textual editions. Cleveland is one of the few authors that I came across who acknowledge or even conceive of the materiality of text and book. At the end of the Preface of the second edition Cleveland writes that he proofread all the author entries with “*the best original edition of each author*. One would be surprised to see how many errors have crept into the various reprints” [emphasis in original] (6). Although this view of texts implies a stable and unified ideal text on which other texts should be copied (a “form” to borrow the Platonic concept, which modern Shakespeare scholarship would discount), it still recognizes texts as material objects⁶⁷.

Cleveland’s stated purpose for his textbook, a purpose which shows up several times in other textbooks, is to show “the best British poets and Prose writers, arranged in a chronological order, to show the progress of the English language” (3). “Progress” should be understood as the operative word here. “Literature,” for Cleveland is a tool to demonstrate a philological principle of progress.⁶⁸ He includes poets, dramatists, theologians, philosophers, novelists, writers of political tracts, as well as of imaginative literature. This is interesting given that in the Preface to the first edition he states that he will include a “portion of such pieces as all of any pretensions to taste have united to admire. Milton’s ‘Invocation to Light,’ Pope’s ‘Messiah,’ Goldsmith’s ‘Village Pastor,’ and Gray’s ‘Elegy’ are illustrations of my meaning” (3). All of the works of

⁶⁷ Scholars like Jerome McGann, Stephen Greenblatt, Gary Taylor, Roger Chartier, and Elizabeth Eisenstein have all done much work to show the influence of material culture to the interpretation, reception, and dissemination of Shakespeare’s plays and poems. This theoretical approach stands in stark contrast to a critic like Bloom who understands Shakespeare’s work as the product of a godlike intelligence.

⁶⁸ While this is similar to what Gerlad Graff describes as one half of the ideological split in the developing academy in Professing Literature, this is not the same phenomenon and it serves to complicate that historical narrative to some degree.

literature which are representative of “taste” are poetry and it makes one wonder how the other works are understood by the textbook author.

William Spalding’s The History of English Literature..., originally published in 1853 (1859 edition consulted) defines its area of interest as “Literary History.” In the “Preface,” Spalding writes:

I have frequently invited the student to reflect, how closely the world of letters is related, in all its regions, to that world or reality and action in the midst of which it comes into being: how Literature is, in its origin, an effusion and perpetuation of human thoughts, and emotions, and wishes; how it is, in its processes, an art which obeys a consistent and philosophical theory; how it is, in its effects, one of the highest and most powerful of those influences, that have been appointed to rule and change the social and moral life of man. (3-4)

Based on the above quotation, Spalding’s definition of literature seems to be those written works which can effect changes in the social and moral life of readers. It is implicit that these changes will be for the better. Although, if one admits that reading literature can affect someone’s character for the better, one has to admit that it could do so for the worse. We will see how textbook authors attempted to control this influence, using it only for the good. This idea of “Literary History” is directly linked to philology. Philology, the study of language development in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was tied to nationalism and race theories grounded in the “biology” of the time. Linguistics was thought to shed a light onto the physical and moral identity of the group of people studied. Linguistic identity in these textbooks is almost always akin to national and moral identity.

There is an increasing specialization in the definition of literature found in these textbooks as the nineteenth century progressed. John S. Hart's A Manual of English Literature: A Text Book for Schools and Colleges (originally published in 1872) contains an interesting definition of "literature." In the Preface to the 1875 edition Hart writes:

It will be obvious, from the barest inspection of the volume, that the subject has not been considered in that restricted view which has been too much wont in the works of this kind. The Literature of a people contains something more, surely, than poetry, plays, and romances. Whatever makes a part of popular reading, and influences thereby, to any considerable extent, the opinions and the actions of men, is a part of the national literature. It does not include strictly professional works, or works on pure science, the use of which is necessarily restricted to a select few; but it does include, most assuredly, works on religion and morality, which concern all men alike. It includes school-books and other books for the young, the fugitive tract, the daily and weekly newspaper, secular and religious, and periodical literature in all its forms, as well as the ponderous tomes that fill the shelves of the public library [...] Yet the reader of the present treatise will, it is believed, get a fair and symmetrical view of the whole subject, in all its departments, and through its whole range, from the simple rhyming chronicle of the semi-Saxon age down to the "In Memoriam of Tennyson" and the thundering periods of the London Times. (iii – iv)

Hart is taking part in a debate about what constitutes the literature of a nation here. He seems to be calling for a more inclusive definition of "Literature" along national or linguistic lines, going

back to the first half of the nineteenth century.⁶⁹ According to the frontispiece Hart is an American and is described as “John S. Hart, LL. D, Professor of rhetoric and of the English language and literature in the College of New Jersey, late principle of the New Jersey State Normal School, author of a series of text-books on the English language, etc. etc.”

In the Preface Hart’s A Manual of English Literature there is a section entitled “To Teachers” (xxiii) located immediately after the table of contents. Hart lets the reader/teacher know how the book was designed to be used. This may be indicative of a change in practices in higher education around the time that the book was published, but Hart goes to great length to let the teacher know that “much of the matter here contained is not meant to be studied for the purpose of recitation” and that the purpose of such a textbook is to provide the student with a “cheap and convenient form for reference, information, so far as practicable, in regard to all those writers who have contributed in any considerable degree to the body of our literature, and to have this information properly classified and brought together under suitable heads” (xxiii). Through the classification and categorization work of the textbook author, the student can better grasp and understand the whole of English literature. Hart feels it is necessary to once again emphasize the idea that “it by no means follows that all these minutiae are to be regularly studied” (xxiii). I would posit that what we are seeing here is a comment about the development of literature as a field of study separate and unto itself. Literature in the academy was a tool- a tool to teach reading, elocution, and history, but here it is posited as something worthwhile in and for itself. It may lead to moral improvement as well, but that is not the primary goal.

⁶⁹ Hart does not include any American born writers in his textbook. He does, however, comment on how the work of some British writers was received in America and even includes a London Times journalist covering the American Civil War.

Henry Coppée's English Literature Considered as an Interpreter of English History..., originally published in 1872 (the edition consulted for this project was the 7th edition from 1881) defines Literature in the following manner. On page 14, Chapter 1 "The Historical Scope of the Subject," Coppée writes:

English Literature may then be considered as comprising the progressive productions of the English mind in the paths of imagination and taste, and is to be studied in the works of the poets, historians, dramatists, essayists, and romancers—a long line of brilliant names from the origin of the language to the present day." (15)

He goes on to state that the "General Principle" of this work is "that the life and literature of a people are reciprocally reflective" (15). This formulation of literature and the historical circumstances are of course tinged with nationalism and, I would argue, Victorian, biological race theories. An observer can glean the history of a "people" out of their literature and, conversely, the history of a people can illuminate its literature.

J. Willis Westlake's Common-School Literature, English and American: With Several Hundred Extracts for Literary Culture lists a series of definitions for its readers. In his Introduction to the 1877 edition (originally published in 1876), Westlake defines Literature as:

Definitions.—Literature is thought expressed in writing.

English Literature is the literature of the English language, wherever produced; but it is sometimes divided, for convenience, into English literature proper—the literature produced in England; and American literature—the literature produced in America . . .

Further showing the increase in specialization over time is Rev. O. L. Jenkins's posthumously published textbook, The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature.... This makes for an interesting study because Jenkins was a priest and the textbook

was published by Catholic Publication Society in 1876. In an “Author’s Preface” Jenkins defines Literature as:

The restricted sense in which the word Literature is now used, enables the compiler to confine his treatment of English writings to that particular department of Letters which comprise the Belles-Lettres, or Polite Literature, as distinguished from purely scientific treatises. In this acceptation, Literature has reference to that species of writings which finds a ready response in the thoughts and feelings of men in general, to the exclusion of writings that are merely technical or professional. Its distinctive traits may be summed up in the definition of the distinguished philosopher and publicist, Viscount De Bonald: “Literature is the expression of society.”

Whatever has relation to our common humanity, and interests all men alike, whether it be fictitious or real, in poetry or in prose, comes within the appropriate province of Literature. Even *popularized* science is not excluded. (v - vi)

“Literature” as Belles Lettres is completely separate from the scientific treatise.⁷⁰

In A Manual of English Literature by Henry Morley, revised by Moses Coit Tyler (published in 1879), Tyler begins to address the teacher on page viii of the “Preface.” In so doing he comments on the material conditions of working in American higher education around 1879. Tyler has rearranged Morley’s original, British textbook, to suit the needs of an American audience as he understands them. Tyler asks the rhetorical question as to what the teacher

⁷⁰ What makes the Catholic textbooks interesting for purposes of this dissertation is that the writers and compilers are responding to the writings of Cardinal Newman on the subject. In the 28th revised edition of the Student’s Handbook of English Literature: With Selections from the Writings of the Most Distinguished Authors published in 1912 the editors (C. C. Berkeley and J.J. Jepsen) of the text in their “Preface” state: “The purpose of this text-book is to give a general outline of the main trend of English Literature, keeping in mind Cardinal Newman’s definition of Literature as summarized by Professor Winchester, that Literature consists of those books that have permanent interest, appeal to the intellect through the imagination, which are founded on truth and are fittingly expressed” (preface).

should focus most on. The answer is, of course, whatever the students need the most help with. Tyler, interestingly enough, identifies this as the first ten centuries of English literature. He writes “for the ten centuries of English literature prior to the eighteenth, the materials in most American libraries are far less abundant, and from many of them are to a lamentable extent wanting” (iix-ix).

3.5 SHAKESPEARE

Although the majority of these books had gone (and would continue to go) through various reprintings (often making for a complicated print histories), I am going to use the dates of publication for the edition on hand to establish a rough chronology.⁷¹ Because I am not going to do sustained, extended comparisons between editions it makes sense methodologically to look at the books as discrete objects. For example, Charles D. Cleveland’s A Compendium of English Literature... was originally published in 1848. The edition consulted for this project was printed in 1868. Because this text circulated in 1868, I treat it as an object from 1868, although always aware of, and trying to account in some ways for, its previous and subsequent incarnations.

⁷¹ An example of this complexity is Richard Parker and G. and J. Madison Watson’s The National Fifth Reader: Containing a Treatise on Elocution, Exercises in Reading and Declamation, with Biographical Sketches, and Copious Notes: Adapted to the Use of Students in English and American Literature, originally published in 1857 and republished in 1863. This book seems designed almost as a catch-all, perhaps as the title implies, re-issued to take advantage of another market in English and American literature. Using WorldCat I was able to determine that this book was reprinted at least once in 1858 and 1859. These editions of the textbook have a slightly different title: The National Fifth Reader: containing a treatise on elocution, exercises in reading and declamation, with biographical sketches, and copious notes. There is no mention of English or American literature in these early editions.

There is an interesting note on the title page. It reads “New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr . . . sold by booksellers, generally, throughout the United States. 1863.” How were these books being shipped around during the middle of the American Civil War? To what geographical area does “throughout the United States” refer to? Also, how would “national” be understood during this conflict, which was deciding the definition of that very word?

As I hope to demonstrate in the following pages, the key to understanding the uses to which Shakespeare is put in these textbooks and the various ways in which representations of him and his work function (intentionally or not), is dependent on understanding the context into which the work is placed. This statement is meant in two ways. The first is the immediate context in which a reader would encounter the Shakespearian material in the textbook and how the textbook conditions the reader to understand that material. Understanding this will provide clues to the theories of literacy and literature that underlie a particular text. The second is the cultural context in which these representations of Shakespeare circulate and how they may have been understood given the received notions of Shakespeare in the society at the time.

Shakespeare is represented in four primary categories in these textbooks. It is possible for a single text to represent Shakespeare in one or all of these categories. 1.) The first is through a purely critical appraisal of Shakespeare. This often takes the form of a reproduction of a famous piece of commentary, such as by Johnson or Dryden, or some other authority, and sometimes by the textbook author himself. Some texts contain only these commentaries and no actual passages from or attributed to Shakespeare. These texts tell their reader about Shakespeare but do not show their readers any examples of the Bard's work.⁷² The final three categories are related in that they all have to do with the representation of work or excerpts from Shakespeare's corpus. 2.) The second category is excerpted, attributed pieces of the plays or poems. Here a piece of text is reproduced in whole or in part and the characters and source play or poem are provided.⁷³ 3.) The third category reproduces text through thematic headings, such

⁷² Only three of the eighteen texts represent Shakespeare in this manner and these are texts that represent themselves via their titles as being primarily literary histories.

⁷³ Plays are represented in these texts far more than the poetry. The plays are often treated or described as poetry, but often function like the Bible might be imagined to function; containing moral instruction. The performance

as “Mercy,” “The value of a good name,” “Filial Duty,” etc., which are identified as belonging to Shakespeare but are not given much of a context by identifying the characters, plots, or source plays for the quotations. In essence, this is text without context. 4.) The fourth most common way that Shakespeare’s words may show up in these textbooks is silently or without attribution, a-contextually. Usually these serve as examples of something else unrelated to the study of Shakespeare. These could be to illustrate some formal aspect of literature, such as metaphor, simile, etc. The textbooks which focus on rhetoric and elocution, especially, have sections devoted to pronunciation and vocal style. These often include silent Shakespeare quotations used to illustrate ways of speaking or of reading aloud with proper inflection, emotional affect, etc.

The last three categories of representation identified here relate to context. We can see that Shakespeare’s words show up in these textbooks in one of three possible ways (keyed to the final three categories discussed above): 2. an authorial and situational context relative to each play or poem, 3. an authorial context but without reference to situation or source, and 4. a-contextual, with no source or author given.

Of the eighteen books which contain Shakespearian material, eighteen different plays have been identified and ten individual sonnets represented. This count includes all works which are attributed to Shakespeare in some way or are easily recognizable as Shakespearian in origin.⁷⁴ By far the most represented play is the Merchant of Venice with 13 quotations/representations, followed by As You Like It with 7 representations, Hamlet with 6,

history of the plays may partially explain this phenomenon, but I contend that Shakespeare existed and was prevalent in textual form as well. I am arguing for a reading history of Shakespeare in America.

⁷⁴ I could only use myself as a gauge for this criterion. It is certainly possible that I am more or less aware of certain plays, poem, and speeches, than an average nineteenth century reader was expected to be due to cultural differences. I checked all quotations that appeared Shakespearian in meter, style, or subject matter against different searchable, electronic databases, via the Google search engine, of Shakespeare’s corpus on the World Wide Web.

Julius Caesar, Henry V, and Henry VIII with 5 each, and Romeo and Juliet and Richard III with 4 each. The other plays represented with 3 quotations or less are Troilus and Cressida, Othello, Macbeth, Love's Labors Lost, Richard III, Much Ado About Nothing, King John, The Tempest, Henry IV, Part 1, and A Midsummer Night's Dream.

The popularity of The Merchant of Venice in the mid and late nineteenth century as well as the importance of Hamlet in America has been discussed in some detail by Levine and others. The popularity of As You Like It is not as well accounted for in the historical and critical materials. Given their sheer number of representations in these texts, these three plays must have had some important resonance to a mid to late Nineteenth century reader. Examining in detail the representation of these three texts will not simply shed light on the ways in which these three particular plays circulated, but also on how Shakespeare as a whole (that is, understood comprehensively as figure who had come to represent a corpus of work as well as an ideal) circulated in nineteenth century educational culture and how this representation interacted with theories of literacy and literature.

Richard G. Parker and J. Madison Watson's 1863 edition of The National Fifth Reader... presents Shakespeare in a fascinating light. On page 344, Shakespeare is summarized as being above all writers—at least above all modern writers,—the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and life. His characters are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpracticed by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers; or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions; they are the genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply, and observation will always find.

If literature does this in general, than Shakespeare is the essence of this.

The goal of the modern “writer,” as Parker and Watson describe it, is to reflect a faithful image of “manners and life” (344). Shakespeare excels at this and is posited as “above all” other modern writers. I contend that in this context Shakespeare is being represented as encapsulating the literary. This is also telling in how Shakespeare is getting used by these authors. The text is entitled the “National” Fifth reader. The common goals of the “writer,” as exemplified through the figure of Shakespeare, are what binds the Anglo and American cultures together. There is more than a linguistic bond being posited here.⁷⁵

Parker and Watson’s representation of the Shakespeare material is a mix of excerpts without any sort of context alongside those which are highly contextualized. For example, on page 349 the reader is presented with “111. Cardinal Wolsey, on being cast off by King Henry VIII,” which is accompanied by a long footnote about who Wolsey was and who his servant Cromwell is, as Wolsey addresses him in the speech although he does not have a speaking role in this excerpt. Interestingly enough, this speech is laid out like a long poem; not as a dialogue. Meanwhile, on page 408 and 410 respectively the reader is given “Value of Reputation.—Shakespeare” and “ingratitude.—Shakespeare.” There is no mention of the characters who speak the lines or any indication given of their meaning within the larger context of the plays. The “Value of Reputation” is of course, Iago’s lines to Othello about the value of a good name and “Ingratitude” is from As You Like It, Act 2, scene 7. These lines should be read in the context of the play, in which Iago evokes this idea to destroy Othello, Cassio, and Desdemona’s good names. Iago is so dangerous because of his ability to make falsehood appear to be truth. Othello

⁷⁵ Even though the title tells a reader that the book was “adapted” for use in the study of literature, the principles which saw it as adaptable still operate because the book can still be used. The adaptation of a book from one context into another (elocutionary to literature, British to America) is a fascinating process and may be the subject of future work.

presents a slightly different relationship to truth than a play like Macbeth, for example, but the concept of ‘truth’ or ‘honesty’ is at the very least troubled in the play. If the reader were to consider this, he or she might have to reconsider the truth value of this statement. The “ingratitude” lines come from the beginning of As You Like It when Duke Senior, who has been banished to the Forest of Arden, is pathetically trying to convince himself and his followers that life in the forest is better than that in the court. Of course, when the opportunity arises, the speaker of these lines immediately returns to the world of the court.

Two of the Merchant of Venice quotations provide interesting examples of the context given for excerpts. On page 484 the reader is presented with “Moonlight.—Shakespeare.” There is a footnote, however, explaining that Jessica is the “daughter of SHYLOCK, in the “Merchant of Venice.” On page 485 the reader sees “Music.—Shakespeare.” Although this is also spoken by Jessica in the Merchant of Venice, the only note present is one about the proper pronunciation of a word and two others about classical myths.

It is hard to draw any principles from these examples because it is not clear how these excerpts were first gathered and arranged. Because of the inconsistent format of the quotations, I speculate that these may have been lifted from other books and sources and just placed in. As I have noted in the two separate but related editions of the Westlake texts, sometimes it is possible to see where the stereotype plates have been physically cut and had new material inserted into them. Although at this point I can only speculate about the origin of these quotes, what I can comment on is how they function in the text. One imagines that the reader would recognize Shylock. There are two quotations from The Merchant of Venice in this text, and neither one is spoken by Shylock.

Charles Cleveland's A Compendium of English Literature, this edition 1868, begins the Shakespeare entry with a biographical and critical discussion of Shakespeare. The table of contents (page 10) lists the excerpts by a thematic title and not by the source play, such as "The Seven Ages" (134) and "Clarence's Dream" (135). The only exception is "From the 'Merchant of Venice,'—the Three Caskets" (130). In the table of contents, Shakespeare is represented not by the names of his plays or poems, but rather by the themes or central conceits that Cleveland has identified as emblematic of certain pieces, speeches, etc. Certainly one would imagine that the nineteenth century reader knew Shakespeare not through his plays or poems, but through these thematic excerpts or set pieces.⁷⁶

Cleveland identifies a problem with any form of representation of Shakespeare. "So many authors," writes Cleveland, "having written upon Shakespeare and his dramas [...] it is deemed unnecessary here to go into critical examination of his character. Indeed it would be hardly possible to say any thing new. The subject seems to be exhausted" (129). Cleveland is beginning to name one of the biggest and most important issues with which have come to light in the process of researching this dissertation. Shakespeare is, in essence, unrepresentable, and yet, all of these authors take on the daunting task of trying to represent him.

By way of introducing the excerpts Cleveland writes:

The difficulty of making selections from Shakespeare must be obvious to every one. So numerous and diversified are his characters, so varied his style, suited to every

⁷⁶ As a reader what piqued my interest the most was the bourgeois characterization of Shakespeare's life which is provided in a one page biography. Cleveland gives a very middle class description of Shakespeare's retirement to the British countryside. Only two critical statements are presented for the reader/student; those of Ben Jonson and Dryden. Dryden's is significant because it is that passage which in essence sums up Shakespeare as a naturally gifted idiot savant. Is there a connection between the bourgeois characterization of Shakespeare and the Dryden "Encomium?"

description of poetry and of fiction, and so many gems of wit, humor, satire, and pathos, everywhere present themselves, that the mind is perplexed what to choose. But we must begin. (130)

Cleveland encapsulates the problem that any textbook editor, indeed *any* writer faces: how does one decide where to begin, what to include, and how to present the material once chosen?

Cleveland provides an answer by starting his presentation of the selections, but he leaves implicit the selection process and theories of literacy and literature which informed it in the first place.

One clue is given in the preface to the second edition which is included in this text. Cleveland writes “‘Othello’s Defense,’ being more common, is left out for two choice extracts that are less known” (5). So one stated principle of inclusion and exclusion is the familiarity with which Cleveland’s imagined public is going to have with the material.

This raises a potentially very important question, with what is the public supposed to have familiarity with, the play Othello or the excerpt “Othello’s Defense?” In the textbooks surveyed for this section this “Defense” only shows up in two different books. Given the way that Cleveland named the piece, I think it is fair to say that he means the excerpt over and above the play text as a whole, although this does not necessarily exclude familiarity with the text through performance. And later on in the entry itself, a note to the “Fame to be kept bright by Activity” speech reads “This admirable speech of Ulysses to Achilles, to induce him to leave his tent, and come again into the field of action, though not much read, is scarcely inferior to any thing in Shakespeare” (141). That these lines are from Troilus and Cressida is never mentioned.

The Merchant of Venice is represented twice in this text. In the first one the reader is provided with a context for the reading and in the second one he or she is not. On page 130 the reader is presented with materials under the heading “From the ‘Merchant of Venice,’—the

Three Caskets.” The play text presented is from Acts 2 and 3 and shows the Prince of Morocco, Arragon, and Bassanio picking from the three caskets as one long scene. There is a note at the end of the excerpt which says that this is from two different acts, but this would not be clear from the presentation of the text itself. There are, however, notes in this selection which are mostly explanatory as to the meaning of a word or phrase. Individual words are usually defined denotatively and are not found in standard usage. For example, “wroth” is defined for the reader as “misfortune.” When phrases, on the other hand, are defined it is usually to explain metaphorical or poetic effects. There is a small note of two or three sentences which gives a partial explanation of the plot for The Merchant of Venice. This explanation, however, only explains Portia’s problem in finding a husband and does not discuss any other aspect of the play.

This should be contrasted with the entry on page 141 which is labeled only as “Mercy.” There is no summary, notes, identification, or context of any kind given here. This is of course Portia’s famous speech, but based solely on this book, the reader would have no way of knowing what character delivered these lines and under what circumstances. Indeed, a reader would not know if this excerpt was even part of a play or from some sort of poem. It is important to rehearse the fact that The Merchant of Venice is the most represented play in the textbooks that were examined for this part of the dissertation. Why include selections of Shakespeare texts that were so often reproduced in other forms?

For Cleveland and other textbook editors, the “Mercy” entry apparently has some sort of quality which allows one to read it and understand it immediately without any other context given. Comprehending “The Three Caskets” scene requires some knowledge, at least of the characters involved and of the strict rules of the marriage game. The important distinction being made here is one between that of the presentation of a moral lesson (Mercy) or description and

the presentation of a dramatic or imaginative scene (literature *per se*). The principle operating here is that when literature is read for moral insight no context needs to be given because it speaks for itself and is immediately recognizable for what it is. At the same time one recognizes this definition of Mercy however, one is also being taught the definition of mercy. It is a duel process, one simultaneously recognizes and is taught to recognize Mercy for what it is through the inclusion of this type of entry in a textbook. The opposite is true when a piece of literature is displayed as a piece of literature with formal qualities, such as style, tone, character development, poetics, etc. As in “The Three Caskets” scene, in order to appreciate it as such, one needs at least a minimum context about the characters to understand Bassanio and Portia’s cleverness, etc. Irony, or lack thereof, is very important to understanding how these entries work as *literature* in these texts. The set of circumstances and character attitudes and actions which engender Portia’s “Mercy” speech are extremely complex. This speech may be taken somewhat ironically because the Christian characters are talking about Christian mercy which they themselves are not capable of exercising when it comes to Shylock. But when it comes to presenting moral lessons the complexity of plot and character are ignored. Irony is a function of context and cannot be understood without it. For Cleveland, Shylock and the bond for the pound of flesh are not as important or interesting as Portia and Bassanio’s courtship.

However, the entry for “The Seven Ages” provides its readers with a very lengthy setup which starts with the character of Orlando attempting to rob the Duke and narrates the events up until Jacques gives his famous “Seven Ages of Man” speech which is reproduced in full in the entry. The amount of context given helps us as modern readers to decipher the theory underlying the inclusion of the piece in the textbook as a whole. This speech and the Troilus and Cressida

material lie in between the two poles of the model. While this includes a moral lesson it is still necessary to give some context for these speeches.⁷⁷

Unlike Cleveland, Coppée avoids the problem of having to represent the work of Shakespeare in his textbook. Coppée's English Literature Considered as an Interpreter of English History does not include any excerpts or examples of Shakespeare's work whatsoever. By way of explanation of this Coppée writes "It is also singularly true that, even in such a work as this, Shakespeare really requires only brief notice at our hands, because he is so universally known and read" (137). Shakespeare's corpus is then discussed, along with the Bible, as being two of the most necessary books in the English language. This comparison is not unexpected given the way in which Shakespeare's work is excerpted and presented in these textbooks. On page 145 the editor states that analyzing specific plays will be

left for the private study and enjoyment of the student, by the use of the very numerous aids furnished by commentators and critics. It will be found often that in their great ardor, the dramatist has been treated like the Grecian poet:

[Shakespeare's] critics bring to view

Things which [Shakespeare] never knew.

[Brackets are original to quote.]

Copée is responding to the massive accumulation of criticism around Shakespeare by 1881.

Copée does not so much teach a student how to read Shakespeare as he situates Shakespeare in an Elizabethan context for his reader. This is also a problem of representation – how does a

⁷⁷ This edition of the text contains two separate prefaces, the Preface to the first edition dated November 2, 1847 and the Preface to the second edition which was written 10 months after the original publication. That would place the date of the second edition in either 1848 or early 1849. In listing the changes to the second edition, which is described as being in a "*permanent* form," ... The text is stereotyped and dated in 1872. I speculate that this is the 1868 edition which may be the 1848/1849 edition which was reprinted from plates made around 1868. Cleveland does not tell his reader what the additions are, only what has been left out.

textbook author represent Shakespeare to his readers? I think this particular problem may be unique to Shakespeare as a figure.

The 1874 edition of John S. Hart's Class Book of Poetry contains an interesting entry on Shakespeare. The Shakespeare entry goes from page 53 to 124 and is one of the longest entries found during my research. While providing the reader with various critical and biographical comments, the actual excerpts are split roughly into three sections. The first section is approximately 12 pages (56-68) from King John on the death of Prince Arthur and the grief of his mother. A note tells the reader that although this is not a continuous selection it is edited to make it appear as if it is. The second selection which takes up approximately 21 pages (68-89) presents approximately three quarters of Hamlet, edited and with prose transitions between discreet sections/scenes. The third and last section covers approximately 35 pages (89-124) and contains different selections. In all cases the source plays are given in small italics under the title of the entry.

The title for the entries in the third section are more descriptive than anything else. For example, although we are given "Love" from Love's Labors Lost and "Mercy" from The Merchant of Venice, the reader is also given a certain amount of context in the very titles of the other selections themselves. A reader might read the Mercy speech to learn about Mercy—what it is, how to talk about it, or when it is warranted. The "Entrance of Bollingbroke into London from Richard II" is not a representation of how to make an entrance the same way that the Mercy speech is so often presented. It is a specific instance or example out of Richard II in order to illustrate some thing, whatever it may be; whether it is the poetic description of the act of entering London or some other illustration of some literary principle.

John S. Hart's A Manual of English Literature recommends the following "Method of Study:" "The best, perhaps the only good method for the beginner to approach Shakespeare, is to discard rigorously all notes, essays, and commentaries, and, taking a handy edition in legible type, to read through play after play as rapidly as possible. . . [Finishing] the thirty-five plays in as many consecutive secular days" (84). Hart would like his readers to immerse themselves in Shakespeare's work. Of course, this method is not without some difficulties. Hart's hypothetical student will "overlook many of the subtler beauties in thought and diction and many real difficulties. But he will be more than compensated by gaining a general idea of the poet's wonderful versatility and range of thought, such as can be obtained in no other way." (84). The metaphor that Hart uses to describe this reading is a telling one. "A literary excursion of this kind," Hart asserts, "will resemble a trip across the American continent by rail in seven days. The traveler sees nothing very near at hand, and remembers nothing very distinctly. But he gains an impression, vague but ineffaceable, of magnitude and diversity" (84). This metaphor takes on a particular resonance given the connection between the American landscape and the corpus of Shakespeare. Hart could have just as easily said that the reading would resemble a trip across the landscape of England, but he chose to directly associate the American landscape, the physical geography of this country, with Shakespeare.

Hart is aware of the problem that all textbook authors face and that Cleveland described so succinctly—what does one include or exclude; where does one begin? In a sense, Hart is asserting that Shakespeare is unrepresentable in a textbook format. He writes: "The majority of Shakespeare-readers labor under this difficulty, that they know the poet only in part. They judge him by a few of his leading plays, such as Hamlet, Othello, The Tempest, or the Merchant of Venice, and know of King John, Richard II, and the Henrys [sic], only by reputation or by stock

quotations” (84). And yet, Shakespeare must be represented in some form. The genre of the textbook demands it. Shakespeare’s position in American education, as read through the Hart text, is a complex and contradictory one. To *know* Shakespeare you must know him completely, but it is an impossible task. Hart writes “After the reader has familiarized himself with Shakespeare in outline, he can then take up single plays and subject them to minute analysis. (84)” An example of this impossibility is found on page 87 and 88:

In the background of all lies the poet’s wonderful style, his way of looking at things and expressing himself. There is no other style that in the least resembles it. Its peculiarity does not consist so much in an exact use or arrangement of words—although no writer ever used or arranged words more scrupulously—as in a peculiarly Shakespearian turn of phrase and thought. Thus hundreds of writers before and after Shakespeare have expressed, in as many different ways, the general idea that kings, as makers of laws, are exempt from a too scrupulous observance of them; but it may well be doubted whether any other than Shakespeare would ever have thought of saying that “nice customs curt’sy to great kings.” The more we ponder this simple phrase, the more we will realize its wonderful expressiveness, which no amount of rhetorical analysis can fully account for. There are thousands upon thousands of such passages scattered through these dramas with lavish hand.

No amount of rhetorical analysis can account for the power of this phrase. The contemplation of this phrase alone could fill an infinity, and there are thousands of these types of phrases.

The principles underlying the presentation of excerpts discussed in the Cleveland text are also found in Rev. O. L. Jenkins’ The student’s handbook of British and American Literature.... As the title page tells the reader, Jenkins was a Catholic priest and a president of a Catholic

college. Although Jenkins includes several pages of critical examination of Shakespeare, quoting or paraphrasing several noted critics, he does not set up the excerpts in any way, but rather launches directly into them. Whereas the source plays are provided to the reader there is very little attempt at contextualization. The excerpts are named for the themes addressed in them, such as “The Exiled Duke’s Philosophy” (148) or “Fidelity” (149) from As You Like It and “Innocence contrasted with guilt” from Henry IV, Part 2 (159). Two notable exceptions to this rule are two scenes taken from King John and Henry VIII, which include stage directions, asides, and characters entering and exiting. These are presented and treated in the text as if they actually came out of dramas to be performed and were not Holy Scripture.

Moses Coit Tyler’s 1879 re-edition of Henry Morley’s A Manual of English Literature... presents an interesting view of Shakespeare as well. There are no quotations in this textbook and Shakespeare is dealt with in prose criticism and biography only. One imagines that Tyler felt similarly to Hart in terms of the representation of the Bard’s body of work, but there are no explicit directions for how to approach the actual reading of the plays or poems. When Tyler writes “There is no evidence whatever that this marriage was other than a happy one (276),” he seems to be making an intervention into several debates about Shakespeare’s biography. Tyler writes “In studying Shakespeare’s life it is needful to distinguish firmly between facts of which there is evidence, and idle fancies,” and yet he seems to construct Shakespeare in the image of his own time, the essence of bourgeois gentility, a family man who leaves his loving family only because he must provide for them (278). Tyler was explicitly talking about the myths surrounding Shakespeare for his motives for leaving his family, dear stealing or his theatrical butchering of a calf as a youth, his presentation of the life of Shakespeare seems, to this reader at least, full of “idle fancies” (278). For Tyler, Shakespeare’s bourgeois identity is fixed and self-

evident. Shakespeare, in this conception is an intellectual capitalist, a man literally trading on his literary ability for profit. Tyler writes “There is also other evidence that by this time Shakespeare’s prudent management, and his success in London, had enabled him – the first man in our literature who did so – to save money earned, not indirectly, by the free use of his genius” (279). Shakespeare does not just personify the literary; he creates the whole category of identity of the modern author.

Shakespeare’s theatre and home life mirror the distinction between the domestic and working worlds that was occurring in Victorian society:

His wife and babies he would not take with him into the unwholesome atmosphere of the great town, or bring into contact with the wild life of the playhouse wits. The children would be drawing health from the fresh breezes of Stratford; the wife would be living a wholesome life among her old friends, neighbors, and relations; while he worked hard for them where money could be earned, took holiday rests with them when theatres were closed, and hoped that he might earn enough to enable him to come home for good before he was very old, and live a natural and happy life among the quiet scenes of his birthplace, among relatives who loved him, and among the old friends of his childhood and his youth. (277)

Tyler cuts a lengthy discussion of The Merchant of Venice that was present in the original Morely text. There is a brief discussion of the other plays and Shakespeare’s financial investment and retirement, his children, the will, and the folios. All of this is done in prose without even a single quotation presented or used as an example.

3.6 NATIONAL IDENTITY

In this section of the chapter I am going to discuss the appearance of American national identity as it appears in various incarnations amongst these textbooks. Many of these textbooks, however, lead interesting double or even triple lives, some having been written originally for a British audience and adapted to an American context, or having a course in American or English Literature revised onto an existing elocutionary reader, for example. The emerging split between English and American literature will also be examined as it is represented in these textbooks.

The nineteenth century was a time of great change and consolidation for the United States of America. After the American Civil War and the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution, the United States begins to take part in global empire building. During the nineteenth century many in the United States attempted to solidify and codify a national culture and identity. Education played a large role in this. There is of course a huge debt to the people of the British Empire but it is the attempt at individuation that is interesting. Although this dissertation concerns itself primarily with representations and teaching of Shakespeare in American educational culture, examining the manner in which Shakespeare continually blurs the boundaries between national identities is at the heart of this work.

Henry Coppée's English Literature Considered as an Interpreter of English History invokes the national in its very title. But what is also interesting about this book is that the author, who was the president of Lehigh University in Pennsylvania thought it necessary to explain *why* his 'manual of instruction' did not include a discussion of American Literature. The text consulted for this project was the 7th edition, published in 1881. The first edition was published in 1872. The epigraph on the title page is a quote from the Rev. C. Merivale who is listed as the author of *History of the Romans Under the Empire*. The quote states that the Roman

epic gives the most complete picture of the Roman national mind and the era that produced it. The analogy is clear: if this holds true for the Romans than it holds true for the English as well. As to why Coppée would not include a section on American Literature he states:

After a somewhat elaborate exposition of English literature, I could not induce myself to tack on an inadequate chapter on American literature; and, besides, I think that to treat the two subjects in one volume would be as incongruous as to write a joint biography of Marlborough and Washington. American literature is too great and noble, and has had too marvelous a development to be made an appendix to English literature (iv).

If time constraints will allow, Coppée writes, he will write an entirely separate textbook on American Literature, organized by period (“Colonial,” “Revolutionary,” “Constitutional,” “Present” [iv]).

We can chart a progression of the idea of a distinct national literature in the textbooks of John S. Hart. The original publication date of the Class Book of Prose: Consisting of Selections from Distinguished English and American Authors, from Chaucer to the Present Day, the Whole Arranged in Chronological Order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks is listed as 1845 (this edition is from 1858). Hart is identified on the title page as “John S. Hart, LL.D, Principle of the Philadelphia High School, and member of the American Philosophical Society.” This was published in conjunction with the Class Book of Poetry: Consisting of Selections from Distinguished English and American Authors, from Chaucer to the Present Day, the Whole Arranged in Chronological Order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks, originally published in 1844 (this edition from 1874). The two books share the exact same Preface and much of the same material. In the introductory paragraph of the Preface to the Class Book of Prose, Hart writes:

The literature of a nation [cannot] fail to contain within itself that which has made the nation what it is. Those great ideas, which in the course of centuries gradually developed by its master minds, are the moving springs that have set the nation onwards in the career of civilization. Great ideas precede and cause illustrious achievements. The ideal Achilles made the real heroes of Marathon and Granicus. In the Anglo-Saxon race, from the days of Alfred until now, men of superior genius, the original thinkers in each successive generation, have given birth to ennobling thoughts, which continue to endure, and are perpetuated not only in the language but in the race itself. We are what preceding generations have made us. Englishmen and Americans of the present day are living exponents of the thoughts and truths elaborated by the illustrious dead (iiv).

It is clear from this passage that the people of England and America share a common intellectual and literary heritage according to Hart.

On the title page of a textbook originally published in 1872 Hart is identified as “John S. Hart, LL. D, Professor of rhetoric and of the English language and literature in the College of New Jersey, late principle of the New Jersey State Normal School, author of a series of textbooks on the English language, etc. etc.” (1875 edition). In the twenty five plus years between this and the Class Book of Prose... and the Class Book of Poetry... English literature and American literature have separated on some fundamental level. Hart seems to be taking part in a debate as to exactly what constitutes the literature of a nation.

One interesting example of a textbook that crosses international borders are the books that were originally prepared for British audiences and then revised and reprinted for American audiences. An example of a text like this is A Manual of English Literature by Henry Morely. The full title of the 1879 American edition is A Manual of English Literature by Henry Morley;

Thoroughly Revised, With an Entire Re-arrangement of Matter, and with Numerous Retrenchments and Additions, prepared by Moses Coit Tyler. On the title page Tyler is described “Professor of English Literature in the University of Michigan.” Tyler sees particular problems in presenting this text to an American audience. Enumerating some of these in the Preface he writes:

But for the average college-student, even though tolerably advanced in literary knowledge, the case is very different: the vast majority of these once famous names are new and strange to him; their separate individuality cannot easily be grasped and remembered by him; and after some scores of them have flitted in and out before his vision, he finds it hard to collect around each name the facts pertaining to it as they lie dispersed over so many pages; he begins to get the wrong man into the right place, or the right man into the wrong place; and finally, unless supported by uncommon help from his teacher, he is in danger of surrendering to discouragement and disgust. (vii)

The basic knowledge that an American student will bring to the table is represented as being much different from what a British student would bring to the table.

Tyler references the international exchange of books toward the end of his Preface, stating “It is my earnest hope that this book may prove to be the means—among others developed originally in this country, as well as drawn hither from England, France, and Germany—of giving a healthy impulse and guidance to the study of English literature in America” (x).⁷⁸

⁷⁸ In the Tyler text there seems to be almost an embarrassment about the lack of knowledge that American students have. This perception of a lack of particular sets of skills and knowledges is dealt with in a different manner by R. McK. Ormsby in his 1845 reprint of The American Reader, or, Exercises in Reading: Designed to Accompany the American Definition Spelling Book, To Be Put into the Scholar’s Hands as Soon as He Has Finished the Reading

Like Tyler's revision of Morely's textbook, Thomas B. Shaw's various textbooks on English literature were revised and reprinted for American audiences. Shaw's texts become even more interesting when one learns from reading the Preface to the New History of English Literature prepared by Truman J. Backus in 1881 that Shaw was a British academic from London who taught in St. Petersburg University, Russia (xiii-xv). Backus goes on to write in his "Brief Memoir of the Author" that Shaw taught Russian princes and that "In 1846 his leisure time was entirely occupied in writing his 'Outlines of English Literature,' a work expressly undertaken at the request of the authorities of the Lyceum [of St. Petersburg], and for the use of the pupils of that establishment. The edition was speedily sold, and immediately reprinted in Philadelphia" (xv). It is telling of the kind of representation that is going on in these textbooks that a British academic writes a book in order to represent English literature to a Russian audience and it achieves a thriving second life in the United States of the 1840's.

Backus had rearranged, added, and deleted, parts of Shaw's original book. Most of the changes are not marked, so it is hard to tell what text belongs to what writer, but I assume that it was Shaw who wrote the following part of the introductory chapter:

Lessons of the Book: With Introductory Exercises in the Principles of Articulation, Pronunciation, &c., &c. (originally published in 1844). He states definitively:

The American ploughman is an American prince, and should not be inferior, in all the qualities of mind and heart, to his British brother. There is nothing in American institutions and American pursuits, to preclude Americans from becoming learned and polished; but every thing to facilitate a consummation which would bring with it such happy consequences. And if Americans, as a mass, do not obtain a love of letters, and acquire the poser of speaking the English language in its purity, the fault is not to be charged to their want so such advantages as arise from time, means, and opportunity; but should rather be attributed to some radical error in their prevailing system of common school education. (Preface iiv – iv)

Ormsby also states that because this textbook is intended for the "common school scholar" he has kept the selections mostly American in origin or "American in sentiment" (iv). Many of the reading lessons are bible verses and Epistles, illustrating what values Ormsby attributed to American sentiment. This can also be understood as an attempt to define a distinctly American literature; what are those things that characterize American culture and the identity.

In their literary inheritance, the readers of the English language are the richest people that the sun shines on. Their novelists paint the finest portraits of human character, their historians know the secrets of entrancing and philosophical narration, their critics have the keenest acumen, their philosophers probe far into the philosophy of mind, their poets sing the sweetest songs. But before beginning a discussion of the lives and the works of the great men who have contributed to the riches of our literature, it is well for us to remind ourselves of the long centuries of ignorance and of conflict that passed over England before her nationality and her language were developed.

The body of the text is divided into two “Parts,” the first English and the second, much smaller part, American. The table of contents, however, does not list “A Sketch of American Literature” at all, nor does it represent the various “parts” of the book. It appears as if the Sketch has just been added on. Of the “Sketch,” Backus writes “The *Sketch of American Literature* was written by the late Henry Theodore Tuckerman in 1852 . . . It is adapted to the wants off the classroom, supplying to the teacher just the outline needed in explaining to his students the marvelous growth and variety of American literature, and giving to the students a model of easy and genial criticism” (xi) [italics in original].

An 1867 edition of Thomas B. Shaw’s A Complete Manual of English Literature; Edited with Notes and Illustrations, by William Smith; with a Sketch of American Literature, by Henry T. Tuckerman represents another type of nationalism. In an introductory section of the book, entitled “English Literature. Chapter I. Origin of the English Language and Literature.” (11) a reader finds the following discussion:

Within the limited territory comprised by a portion of the British Isles has grown up a language which has become the speech of the most free, the most energetic, and the most

powerful portion of the human race; and which seems destined to be, at no distant period, the universal medium of communication throughout the globe. It is a language, the literature of which, inferior to none in variety or extent, is superior to all others in manliness or spirit, and in universality of scope; and it has exerted a great and a continually increasing influence upon the progress of human thought, and the improvement of human happiness. To trace the rise and formation of such a language cannot be otherwise than interesting and instructive. (11)

Smith is described on the title page as “LL.D., Author of Bible and Classical dictionaries, and classical examiner in the University of London.”

William Spalding’s The History of English Literature..., originally published in 1853 (this edition 1859), is an American reprint of an English literature and history textbook prepared by a Scottish professor. As might be expected there is an emphasis on Scottish writers. For Spalding, literature is a key to understanding history, or perhaps the two are in essence the same thing. What is particularly interesting about this text is the presence, at the very end of the text, of an essay entitled “Contemporary American Literature” (409). The author is not identified except for a line that reads “By an American” (409).

The author of this piece attempts to give a brief “summary glance at the physical history of the American mind, [which] will enable us to infer its progress in its career and some of the features which it has manifested” (410). The settlers of what will become the United States of America are described as having “the arduous task of settling and subduing a wild and rude continent” (409). Whereas the author sees a link between America and England he states “It is somewhat unreasonable to compare English with American writers, and English literature with American; any otherwise than Grecian writers are compared with Roman; French or Spanish

with English; or German with either” 410). Throughout his essay, the author seems to be saying that America is a special place which the standards of the Old World cannot adequately judge or understand. Some of the “prime elements on all true literature” are “[t]hose profound sympathies with freedom [...] that ready and just appreciation of passions, motives, and impulses of others [...] that “life of the thing,” if we may so express it, which meets a recognition everywhere” (411). The author goes on to describe the different facets of American Literature, listing “Theology,” “Romance,” “Modern Romance,” “Poetry,” “History,” and “Biography.” I assume that Modern Romance is another way of describing a novel.

The essay as a whole is trying to make a case for an understanding of American literature that judges it based on American standards. Much of the essay is a description of the ways in which the American “temperament” or “spirit” is different from the European (due to the physical geography) and how that results in a distinctly American literature which cannot be judged on outmoded European standards. The author ends the essay by saying “There are many imperfections characteristic of our labours in literature which take their origin in the circumstances surrounding our writers. These time alone can remove. But one far greater than all others springs from an unworthy deference to foreign standards” (413). Interestingly enough, the author writes of poetry “When this shall be done by a Shakespeare of our own, it will present ‘the last best gift to man’” (412). This appears to echo the idea circulating in American culture about the maturation of American civilization becoming evident through the production of an American Shakespeare. These ideas circulated in various forms, such as implicitly in the work

of Ralph Waldo Emerson through Representative Men and “The American Scholar” as well as through the theorizing of writers like Melville.⁷⁹

The author states that the “English mind” laid a foundation for the development of, and is, to a large degree, still present in, the American mind. (410) But that “It is impossible at this day to detect the combinations which will manifest themselves in consequence of thus pouring the blood of the English, Scottish, Irish, French, Spanish, German, Italian, Swede, and Mexican nations, with an occasional infusion of Indian and African, into one common reservoir” (410). While this author is hopeful about the future of the American people, this essay participates in a debate about what should constitute American literature and what standards should be used to judge it.

Nationalism exists in at least two different forms in these textbooks. The first is of the kind that I have been documenting and which usually centers around questions of American culture and how it should be understood relative to English literature and culture. The second is linked to philology and linguistics and doesn’t so much recognize a distinction between English and American letters as it places people into ‘racial’ categories based on their native languages. There is a one to one correlation between language, ‘stock’ or race, and nation in this construction.

It is useful at this point to rehearse a passage that was quoted earlier from Francis H. Underwood’s A Hand-book of English Literature.... On page ix, the “Historical Introduction,” Underwood writes:

⁷⁹ F. O. Matthiessen discusses the influence of Shakespeare on the development of American letters in American Renaissance. Matthiessen places Melville and Emerson on opposite sides of what he identifies as the central conflict in American intellectual and artistic development, but shows how both authors were influenced by Shakespeare. Of Melville, he writes “his possession by Shakespeare went far beyond all other influences, and, if Melville had been a man of less vigor, would have served to reduce him to the ranks of the dozens of stagey nineteenth century imitators ... Shakespeare’s phrasing had so hypnotized him that often he seems to have reproduced it involuntarily, even when there was no point to the allusion” (424).

The laws and customs of each people, their cultivation of the arts of war or peace, their agricultural or maritime pursuits, their fertile plains or mountain fastnesses, their easy obedience to rulers or their fierce contests for independence, their local attachments or their roving, marauding disposition,--all these native tendencies and social and political influences were soon evident as well in their speech as in their character. And, if we did know the speech of a single modern European nation, we could, upon the basis of its original stock of words, with a knowledge of its wars offensive and defensive, its migrations and governmental changes, its wealth, customs, and general cultivation, predict with a good degree of certainty the prevailing character of its language and literature. (ix-x)

This somewhat resembles the majority of the other textbooks in stating that the physical geography influenced language and culture.⁸⁰ This intellectual move makes sense given the prominence and persistence of European Enlightenment biological race theories circulating in the culture which centre on geography. Examples of this include Hegel and Cuvier in Europe and Thomas Jefferson in the United States.⁸¹ Each wrote about the interplay of geography, race, and culture. I argue that this kind of race theory permeates the culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century West, culminating in Nazi Germany. Given this, its presence in the

⁸⁰ By way of comparison to the historical development of modern English, Underwood writes “French, Spanish, and Italian are but three slightly-varying corruptions of Latin. Underwood asserts that French is Latin mixed with Gallic and Norman pronunciation, Italian is closest with only slight inflections to the original, and “Spanish is the same noble tongue corrupted by an admixture of Arabic and by the indistinct articulation that prevails among the indolent dwellers in hot climates” (ix). Underwood’s evaluative language is interesting here. His choice of value laden terms to describe these linguistic-historical changes strikes a modern reader as ignorant and racist. He then does move very similar to that in George Orwell’s 1946 essay “Politics and the English Language,” when he shows the reader a paragraph “wholly composed of Anglo-Saxon words, and the second of mostly Norman-French origin” (x).

⁸¹ For a fuller treatment of these ideas in Enlightenment thought see *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*, edited by Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1997. Eze shows the origins and development of these ideas so prevalent in Western thought through the work of Linné, Leclerc, David Hume, Kant, Blumenbach, Diderot and d’Alembert, Jefferson, and Hegel.

textbooks is not surprising. In The American Textbook, Hillel Black writes “It was in the nineteenth century that textbooks developed a racist theory of history that was applied not only to people of different skin color but to different religions and nationalities” (85).

Underwood invokes the Elizabethan era as part of his discussion of English literature. He writes “During this period [Spenser to Milton] our language probably attained its highest development, certainly as a vehicle for poetry. The authors whom we term “Elizabethan” seemed to use words with a certain vital meaning” (xxiv). Along these same lines J. Willis Westlake wrote in his 1877 edition of Common-school literature, English and American: with several hundred extracts for Literary culture, originally published in 1876, that the “Elizabethan Age. 1550-1625. (Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.)” is:

the most glorious era of English literature. No other age presents such a splendid array of great names, such originality, such creative energy; and no other has added so many grand ideas to the mental treasures of the race [...] Within a period of eleven years (1554 to 1564) she produced three writers—Spenser, Shakespeare, and Bacon—either of whom would have made any age illustrious; besides many others, who [...] would have stood in the first rank of authors. (12)

Westlake is saying that all literature should be judged against the literature produced in this time period. Indeed, he is implying that the very idea of what an author is or should be comes from this time period.

3.7 MORALITY AND CHARACTER

Based on the textbooks from the period between approximately 1850 and 1875, I would conclude that knowledge was often considered to be an agent of moral improvement. This claim needs to be qualified, however, because, as so many of the editors and authors of these textbooks took great pains to point out, only knowledge of specific facts and ideas could lead to moral improvement. If left unguarded it is possible for a student to stumble across the wrong kind of knowledge, some fact or idea that he or she is not prepared to deal with and thus be morally corrupted. So, for many of these textbook editors, texts need to be controlled before they can be unleashed upon students. In effect, the best edition of any text is a Bowdlerized text.⁸²

So, whereas any set of concerns or issues taken from these textbooks could be made to speak to questions of morality, this section will only deal with those sections which make a fairly direct and explicit discussion of them.

Charles D. Cleveland's 1859 English Literature of the Nineteenth Century: On the Plan of the Author's "Compendium of English literature" and Supplementary To It: Designed for Colleges and Advanced Classes in Schools, as well as for Private Reading also deals with the idea of Christian morality. Cleveland writes that his book was written "not to please any clique or sect, or to favor any particular latitude or special market, but to promote the cause of sound learning and education in harmony with pure Christian morals, the best interests of humanity, and the cause of universal truth, I now commit it to the judgment of an intelligent public" (4).

⁸² Charles Cleveland, in his A compendium of English literature (1868), explicitly names Bowdler's text as the best; stating "The best family edition is Bowdler's 'Family Shakespeare,' 8 vols. 8vo, recently printed in one large octavo (127)." That sentence's immediately sequel is "The best critical edition is the variorum of Isaac Reed, London, 1813...with the Prolegomena and Addenda (127)." This distinction between family and critical is interesting in that the student is left out of this schema, and if we imagine them as poles on a continuum, perhaps the student lies somewhere in between, not yet fully mature to enough to be exposed to the critical edition, but perhaps too advanced for the family version.

This concern is carried over from his earlier work, originally published in 1848. This edition of A Compendium of English Literature... was published in 1868. In the “Preface,” dated 1847, he writes “I should hope that my own work would give the reader a greater longing to extend his inquires into the same most interesting subject—one so rich in every thing that can refine the taste, enlarge the understanding, and improve the heart” (3) and

In the preparation and execution of this work, I trust I have not been unmindful of the great, the solemn responsibility that rests upon him who is preparing a book which may form the taste, direct the judgment, and mould the opinions of thousands of the rising generation; and I hope and pray that it may contain not one line, original or selected, which can have the least injurious effect upon a single mind [...] it may render good service to the cause of sound education; may exert [...] a wholesome moral influence, and impress upon the minds of the young, principles essential to their well-being and happiness for time and for eternity—principles in harmony with everlasting truth. (4)

John S. Hart’s 1858 edition of his 1845 Class Book of Prose... states in the “Preface” that:

In making, then, a compilation like the present, intended chiefly for the use of those whose character and opinions are still but partially formed, it has been deemed important to select not only master-pieces of style, but also master-pieces of thought. It is believed to be a defect in some of the more recent publications, intended as reading-books for schools, that sufficient care has not been used in regard to the sentiments contained in them [...] But they are not of that masculine character that stimulates the mind to action, or that gives it materials to act upon; and they not unfrequently [sic]cultivate a taste for reading of the most unprofitable description [...] It should be a constituent part of

Common School education, to furnish the youthful mind with some at least of those rich stores of wisdom that lie scattered through the writings of our distinguished authors. There is something contagious in the fire of genius:-- the mind receives an impulse by the mere contact with one superior intellect. The minds of the young especially receive growth and strength by being made early acquainted with whatever is best of its kind in every field of English literature. (iiv-v)

Jenkins published The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature... for the Catholic Publication Society in 1876, so a concern with the moral world is not surprising. He writes:

Works of this kind, when the materials are carefully selected, are well calculated to strengthen the mind and discipline the character of the student. They inspire him with a love for whatever is just and beautiful in thought and expression; they awaken refined and elevated feeling, and lead to a relish for whatever is moral in tendency, and noble in sentiment [...] But to secure so desirable a result, much care and discrimination are necessary. Young persons should not be left to their own inclinations solely in the choice and perusal of literary works. They should be especially cautioned against such as inculcate a loose morality, pervert the truths of history, or grossly insult the religious convictions of the reader. (vii-viii).

That Jenkins was a priest does not make his concern for the moral well-being of his readers peculiar. The vast majority of the textbooks surveyed for this chapter all contained at least some passing reference to the moral improvement or maintenance of potential readers. This is true even if it is in the negative, as when stated that material that has been deemed potentially harmful

for readers has been left out. This is another example of the archon function that teachers and textbook editors wield.

3.8 TRANSITION

This chapter has demonstrated the power of literature to influence and shape a distinct, culturally American morality and character as defined through the textbooks which circulated between approximately 1850 and 1875. The next chapter will look in detail at Literature textbooks which circulated approximately between 1875 and 1925. When taken together, these two chapters will demonstrate the increasing specialization in the definition of Literature and the increase in the use of rhetorical analysis as “the” way of studying and appreciating Literature in American higher education and place it in the context of increasing professionalization and insitutionalization. In doing this work, the next chapter will pay special attention to the textbooks authored by Albert Newton Raub, who went on to serve as President of Delaware College between 1888 and 1896. An examination of the archival records of Delaware College serves as the basis for the fourth chapter.

4.0 TEXTBOOKS 1875-1930

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter was very much a broad, thematic, survey of the textbooks and the information that they contained. This chapter, on the other hand, is much more contained in that it will focus on the representation of Shakespeare and pedagogical practices related to Shakespeare. Unless directly related to or illustrative of pedagogical practices, many potentially interesting avenues of research and explication have been ignored because of the exigencies of time and space. There are many varied subjects of historical interest in these textbooks for which one could mine them, for example, the relationship between literature and rhetoric, history, elocution, canonicity, the developing sense of nationalism through American literature and its relationship to British literature, and the evolving form and function of the textbook, are just a few of the possible areas of inquiry.

My study, however, is not an exhaustive survey. I make no pretences to that, rather it is an intervention into an archive (the Nietz collection) in order to study pedagogy in hopes that it lessons can be useful to teachers of literature and composition today.

I examined first hand almost 150 textbooks that were identified as having to do with literature either through their title or OCLC catalogue description for this chapter. To my knowledge, this is every textbook held in the Nietz collection which discusses literature or

contains substantial amounts of literature that was printed between approximately 1875 and 1925, with the addition of a few other books such as school editions of Shakespeare's plays and other relevant texts encountered (sometimes serendipitously) during my research (primarily through the Nietz collection but also through used bookstores, etc.).

For this chapter, I am going to analyze these textbooks chronologically, presenting an historical argument in which I show a correlation between the developing field of literature as represented in these texts via the Shakespeare sections and changes in the pedagogical practices and ideas represented in these texts. The dissertation as a whole argues a causal connection between the two, but there is an undeniable correlation between the representation of pedagogy and the influence of professionalism in American higher education over time. Unless otherwise noted, all textbooks consulted for this chapter were accessed through the Nietz Old Textbook collection at the University of Pittsburgh Hillman Library.

Any attempt to do a chronology of these textbooks is complicated by their remarkably complex print histories. As I alluded to in the previous chapter, to a certain extent any chronology I construct may be somewhat arbitrary. With this caveat in mind, I have decided to try to account for, as much as possible, past and future editions or issues of any particular book in my analysis. The following are some examples, discussed at length, of the rather complicated print lives and authorial ownership of some of these textbooks.

One example of this is that of O.L. Jenkins' Student's handbook of English literature: with selections from the writings of the most distinguished authors, this edition from 1912. The particular book examined for this study is the twenty-eighth, revised edition. According to the author note of the OCLC record (accessed via PittCat), however, Jenkins died in 1869. This particular text, or some form of it, was circulating forty-one years after the author's death.

Compared to a modern textbook, this is an incredibly long lived work. When one looks at what I believe is a first edition of this text, published posthumously in 1876 by the Catholic Publication Society, an editors note informs the reader that Jenkins died while in the process of preparing this textbook and an unnamed editor, a “member of the same society [of St. Sulpice]” finished it for him as a kind of memorial. The 14th edition of this book, however, includes a preface by “G. E. Viger.” Is this the same, unnamed editor from 1876 or a new figure? Can an attribution of this text, which circulated so long after the author’s death and which was handled by so many different figures, really be considered Jenkins’ text and reliably dated to 1912?

In some cases, it is fairly clear that these books or at least pieces of them, were reprinted verbatim in subsequent editions, and /or sometimes were appropriated wholesale, silently and without attribution. These print practices raises important questions. If the text itself does change, how is that change marked, if at all? Additionally, how does a textbook change when the content remains the same but the context in which it is presented changes?

Sometimes there are clues that indicate how a particular book was used and just how long it circulated. For example, stamped on the inside front cover of the edition of William J. Long’s 1925 Outlines of English literature: with readings, published by Ginn and Company, is “George Washington High School, 192nd St. and Audubon Ave., Manhattan, NY City.” The title page here records three other dates of publication, 1917, 1919, and 1923. According to a record stamped on the inside book cover, we know this particular edition was given to five students to use, between February 8, 1928 and February 10, 1930. But then what happened to it? Was it thrown or given away? Retired to make way for a new edition? Replaced with a different textbook? How did it circulate after its official, institutional use was over? It is a mystery, but one that highlights the complex intersection between print, material, and institutional histories.

Long's text underscores some of the major difficulties of this kind of archival research. As much as these books are representative of a particular print run or issue, a member in a collective identity known as (in this case) Outlines of English literature: with readings, they are also discrete, material objects, each one with an individual history. In this case, the marginalia provides a clue to this book's use that an unmarked book would not have. Often marginalia is the only record we have of a book's past or potential uses. One is tempted to try to understand these books from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as one does with manuscripts and the printed books from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Yes, a particular text might hold a nominal identity with all the other particular books that share its title, but, given the exigencies of hand copying or the changes, corrections, and revisions that occurred throughout even an individual "print run," much less from edition to edition (as Elizabeth Eisenstein demonstrates), it makes the most sense to treat them as individual texts and not assume a commonality between them.

The final example demonstrates the different and often unpredictable ways a text can be transmitted and reproduced. English Literature, a textbook by Stopford Brooke, has a publication date of 1900 by the American Book Company. The title page, though, indicates that this text was published three other times and by at least one other publisher (in 1879 and 1882 by D. Appleton and Company and 1894 by the American Book Company). Additionally, the 1900 edition is identified by its title as a "new edition, revised and corrected" and "with chapters on the Victorian age, by Charles F. Johnson." This book appears to be part of a series, "Literature Primers," edited by John Richard Green. Who had what authorial or editorial control and when did they have it are questions with few clear answers. These questions, however, may be partially answered if we do a close, comparative, textual study, in this case looking at the

Shakespeare entries in various editions. Since this dissertation focuses on pedagogy, it makes sense that we would look at the those explicitly pedagogical moments which take the form of editorial intervention or questions directed at students. The 1900 edition has questions keyed to the Shakespeare entry which start on page 232, well after the Shakespeare section which begins on page 96. This, and evidence from other of Brooke's books which will be brought to light in a moment, indicate that Brooke did not write these questions. But who did? Green? Johnson? Some unnamed writer or editor? Why does it matter?

There are several layers of authorial and material intervention here that need to be accounted for. This is further complicated by the fact that, excluding pagination, the Shakespeare entry in this text is identical, including footnotes, to that of English Literature "by Stopford A. Brooke, with Students' readings and questions by Harriet L. Mason," published in 1896 and 1898 by the Norwood Press in Massachusetts. Ms. Mason's lists of questions, keyed to the entries in the main text, are presented as if they were a totally separate book, with its own pagination, title page, and even publisher. Mason's title page indicates that she is affiliated with the "Drexel Institute" (now Drexel University in Philadelphia) and that the book was published in New York and London in 1898 by The MacMillan Company (although on the back of this title page appears the phrase "Norwood Mass, USA," perhaps indicating that Norwood has republished it?). The first, shared title page lists only "Brooke, M.A." and "Mason, Drexel Institute." These are two separate books with separate publication histories, which appear to share one title page and a binding, which have been joined to give them a new life. Isolating the Shakespeare entry, we can surmise that we have the same text, perhaps written by Brooke, in at least six different editions, in runs by three different publishers, and with different editorial and pedagogical apparatuses.

To further complicate matters, Brooke's text, with minor sentence level variations (but with the same basic outline) shows up in English Literature by Stopford Brooke, "New ed., rev. and corr. with an appendix on American literature by J. Harris Patton," dated 1895 and published by the American Book Company.⁸³ This is also part of the series "Literature Primers" edited by Green. The title page shows three other publication dates, 1879 and 1882 by D. Appleton and Company and 1894 by the American Book Company. The questions appended to this edition are identical to those which appear in the 1900 edition "with chapters on the Victorian age, by Charles F. Johnson." Perhaps they were written by Green. If someone were trying to trace the history of Brooke's text, and took his title pages at their word, he or she would miss several instantiations of the text.

As the Brooke example shows, it is extremely difficult to get a complete picture of the various incarnations and lives of one of these texts, especially those from the nineteenth century. The work with Brooke done above does not even take into account forms or editions of the work that were issued after 1900. Ultimately, I am not so sure that it even matters, but I want to acknowledge the limitations of an historical inquiry and then move on, knowing that my research and my claims are open to complication and revision. This kind of historical, archival work with print sources forces one to rethink commonplace notions about the role and function of the author. Textbooks, especially those produced and circulated before the field of literature in American higher education was more professionalized, highlight the corporate and complex nature of authorship. As Zboray and Saracino Zboray state, any printed text, except for the rare text authored, printed, and distributed by one person, exists at the center of a series of

⁸³ Here is the first sentence of the Shakespeare entry from this 1895 Brooke/Patton edition; "75. William Shakespeare, the greatest dramatist of the world, now took up the work of Marlowe, and in twenty-eight years made the drama represent the whole of human life" (96). Compare this to the Brooke/Mason edition from 1898; "82. William Shakespeare in twenty-eight years made the drama represent almost the whole of human life" (133).

mediations, of producer, distributor, buyer, and institution. Textbooks underscore this in that they exist at a nexus of social, intellectual, pedagogical, and commercial forces. What should the provenance of a textbook that originally saw publication in 1876 but was still circulating in 1912 be? Should it be considered to be from the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, or from the beginning of the twentieth? These textbooks resist these kinds of temporal categorization. On some level, however, if perhaps only nominally, it is fair to say that a text that was produced in 1912, even if the author has been dead for forty three years, tells us something potentially important about 1912, because someone or some group of people (some publisher or editor) decided that this book was going to be worth the financial effort to produce. Although it is impossible to say exactly how and in what ways these texts were used, if at all. (Was it a success? Did the books sit in a warehouse untouched?) It is important that someone imagined that they would be, or could be, used.⁸⁴

Interestingly, for the most part, as the field of English becomes more professionalized, as the authors of textbooks become more highly credentialed, the textbooks seemingly become easier to categorize and less complex from a print history perspective. In this chapter, I am going to do a close read of the Shakespeare sections of these textbooks and analyze them for what they have to say about an approach to pedagogy and correlate this with the changes that we see in the field of literature that are apparent in the historical record. Acknowledging the limited nature of the historical record, I am now going to analyze the Shakespeare sections of the various textbooks circulating between approximately 1875 and 1925.

⁸⁴ Even the very language that I am continually tempted to use to talk about this historical record assumes that there should be a neat, linear advancement and record of these books. But I think this very notion is in itself anachronistic, imposing a contemporary sense of book history and production, even of the field of literature in English itself onto the past. The historical record is not “flawed.” Perhaps it is more accurate, however, to say it is “necessarily incomplete.”

Of the approximately one hundred and fifty textbooks consulted for this chapter, sixteen of them (in various subjects) were authored by Albert Newton Raub, and, therefore, will be considered in a separate section, by themselves and in comparison to the work done in the main section, of this chapter. This leaves approximately one hundred and thirty five textbooks for consideration in the main section of this chapter. Of these, only forty three contain explicit sections or chapters devoted to Shakespeare. This is not to say that the other approximately ninety texts contain no references to Shakespeare, but rather these are usually the kind discussed in chapter two, such as those used in examples to demonstrate tone, pitch, literary device, or as a comparative tool to perform some sort of analysis. For example, Shakespeare often shows up in books on American literature as a marker of a time period (i.e. the English literary Renaissance); “the year of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth [...] and three years later appeared the first collected edition of Shakespeare’s works, the ‘First Folio,’ a book that marks the most glorious epoch in the history of the human mind. These products of English genius must be used as the basis of all interpretation of the early literary experiments in colonial America” (Abernathy 1902 14).

Shakespeare was also employed as as an ideal that America was striving to produce (or would produce given the right circumstances), or even an indication that America had produced great literature; “Shakespeare proposed no harder problem than the one in *The Scarlet Letter*, - the problem of the expiation of sin” (1911 edition, Halleck 215). Literature textbooks that do not explicitly treat Shakespeare usually describe themselves as American literature, as focused on prose, a later time period, or are designed for a less advanced audience that is included in this study’s purview. Exactly how and in what ways Shakespeare does circulate in these textbooks is an important question, especially because of Shakespeare’s complex position in light of

American literary history and theory. Is he a link to a shared literary tradition, or does American literature constitute a completely separate national literature?

Thirty two of the textbooks examined for this chapter identify themselves as being wholly or partially about American literature and authors. An historical analysis of these texts could provide some new insight into the understanding of the formation of what we think of as American literature. Is Shakespeare a common ancestor to both Whitman and Longfellow? In what ways are these traditions imagined to be linked? What is at stake in these positions? More importantly for this dissertation, how does it effect curricular and disciplinary development? How is the shared language and its traditions imagined by textbook authors and pedagogues? How do these textbook authors situate Shakespeare and the English literary tradition relative to American letters? From a teacherly perspective, is a student imagined to need to understand Shakespeare in order to understand Hawthorne, and if so, how is this relationship depicted in the textbooks? An understanding of this complex relationship would help to illustrate the formation of literature as a discipline in American higher education. Initial research reveals that even past the turn of the century, just how English and American literature were to be understood relative to one another was a topic of debate and we can see this debate being played out in the pages of these textbooks. It is a mark of professionalization and the specialization that follows from it in American higher education that, ultimately, British and American literature were separated (and continue to be so from an institutional perspective).

Along these same lines we can turn to an examination of Shakespeare in these textbooks. As the introduction to this chapter indicates, although a chronological model may not necessarily

reflect an “accurate” or “complete” historical narrative, it is the most useful way in which to begin this analysis.⁸⁵

4.2 UP TO AND BEFORE 1879

We will begin with those texts that were published approximately in the 1870’s (or more accurately all the textbooks that the Nietz collection contained which were dated after 1875 and before 1880). Eight textbooks fit this category. Of these, four have been dealt with in some detail in chapter two (those written by Hart, Jenkins, Morely, and Gilman.⁸⁶ This is an interesting time for printing. Stereotyping, electrotyping, and the advent of other technologies were advancing to the point where nineteenth century readers could have expectations for printed material similar to those of twentieth century readers. Those technologies allow for the reproduction of identical texts in a relatively inexpensive and accessible manner. The remaining four textbooks, those which do not exist in an earlier version housed in the Nietz Collection, present some interesting moments of analysis.⁸⁷

The first of these is William Francis Collier’s textbook. According to the title page of A history of English literature: in a series of biographical sketches (1877), Collier is a British academic associated with Trinity College, Dublin. This publication note tells a reader that this book was published in London, Edinburgh, and New York. The preface is dated 1861.

⁸⁵ The chronological model is one tool, not necessarily “the best” or only tool, but an extremely helpful one in presenting this analysis.

⁸⁶ Even though this edition of Gilman is the tenth edition and is dated 1876, it is identical in every detail, even down to the advertisements in the back, except for its binding. A note is present on the title page that says that the book was stereotyped and printed by H.O. Houghton and Co. for Riverside, perhaps explaining to some degree the reproductive exactitude.

⁸⁷ Cathcart’s Literary Reader, 1878, will be addressed in detail later in the chapter when I do an extended comparison between this version and one from 1892.

Although this is a British textbook, published in America, we can assume that because it circulated in America, it reflects someone's idea of a fitting text, even if it does not reflect the controversies and institutional changes occurring in the United States system of higher education. Collier's sophisticated prose emphasizes Shakespeare's language, its beauties and difficulties. According to this preface, Collier wants to show "how the books, which we prize among the brightest of our national glories, have grown out of human lives" (iii).⁸⁸

In what ways does an American revise an English textbook for an American audience? Morely's text, A manual of English literature; thoroughly revised, with an entire re-arrangement of matter, and with numerous retrenchments and additions, edited and added to by Moses Coit Tyler (1879 edition) is also a textbook originally by and for a British audience. The original by Morely (published in 1873, according to Tyler's preface) was published in London. What is interesting here is that this 1879 edition is "thoroughly revised, with an entire re-arrangement of matter, and with numerous retrenchments and additions." Tyler, a professor of English Literature in the University of Michigan, writes in his preface "It seems to have been intended as a text-book for college-students in England. However well it may be suited to the methods and conditions of English studies there, it has certain peculiarities that hinder its successful use by students in this country" (iii). What makes Morely's original work, while excellent in content, unsuitable for Americans is the arrangement of it, "synchronistically and in fragments" as well as its dense, small type, unclear headings, and a lack of historical perspective (i.e. separating the "essential from the non-essential") (iv and vii, respectively). All of this is fine for British students, but, "for the average college-student, even though tolerably advanced in literary

⁸⁸ It is interesting to see how he characterizes the split between American and British literature. He writes in his "Appendix on American Literature" that "Upon the opposite shores of the Atlantic a branch of our literature is flourishing in green and vigorous youth" (539).

knowledge [...] begins to get the wrong man into the right place, or the right man into the wrong place; and finally, unless supported by uncommon help from his teacher, he is in danger of surrendering to discouragement and disgust” (vii). Tyler then begins to address the issue of representation in his section addressed to teachers, “In any proper account of these twelve centuries, how much space should be given to each century” (viii)? Tyler grounds his discussion of teaching in his own experience. He writes, “It is of the utmost importance, even in the use of a text-book on English literature, that students should be saved from lapsing into a passive and listless attitude toward the subject, and should be so skillfully steered in their work that they may come to know for themselves the exhilaration of original research” (ix). What does this say about his idea of teaching? For Tyler, it is the idea of students knowing something for themselves. Oral recitation and direct reading of literary texts are tools for this. Tyler writes “It is my earnest hope that this book may prove to be the means—among others developed originally in this country, as well as drawn hither from England, France, and Germany—of giving a healthy impulse and guidance to the study of English literature in America” (x). Tyler seems very conscious of the fact that he, given his temporal and institutional position, is on the cusp of large scale change. He wants to help “guide” the study of English literature in America, to get it off to a good start. This reflects the early formation of a discipline. Of course, people had been reading and studying Shakespeare and other English language authors in America since the first English speaking colonists arrived, but they had not been *studying* it (a distinction made clear by Tyler on page x of his Preface).

This sense of “study” takes us to the last textbook examined in this section, Hippolyte Taine’s Histoire de la littérature anglaise / History of English literature / by H.A. Taine, D.C.L.; translated from the French by H. Van Luan” and published in New York in 1879. Luan is listed

as “One of the Masters at the Edinburgh Academy.” A handwritten note on the first blank page lists a name and “1883 University of Toronto.” Here is a French language book, translated into English (in Scotland), published in New York, and used in Canada. Taine/Luan’s text is important because it highlights this sense of growing professionalization and institutional change. Although, based on my research, its effect on American higher education, if any, was not apparent in the other textbooks. This text originally came out in a set of four volumes in 1863-64 in France and in England for the first time 1871-72 (MS Encarta). The text positions Shakespeare as a “genius” and has a heavy emphasis on biography. Taine writes that “if we are to seek the man we must seek him in his works” (211). Tipped into the back of the book is an advertisement for what I can only assume is the same text but from a different publisher (it says nothing about the translator). Critics reproduced for the advertisement say that Taine is a “scientific” critic and that he moves the study of literature into “philosophy,” getting at the principles motivating literature’s production. The advertisement claims that Taine takes into account, race, climate, politics, manners, customs, etc. A metaphor that one reviewer used is of a pebble; someone could pick it up and admire it for its color, shape, etc., or a scientist could identify it and understand what forces went into producing it. Taine does not use the term “scientific criticism,” but the advertisers do. How, if at all, is this linked to the professionalization of English in America?

The term itself does not get repeated in any of the other textbooks I have encountered, so it could be that in America it simply just never took hold. But I think that the advertisements are indicative of some of the changes that were happening in European higher education and intellectual life and which find some shape or form in the United States (i.e. what Tyler was talking about). Of course, it only makes sense that even if this idea was present in American

scholarship, it would change shape after crossing the Atlantic, in American contexts and for American institutions. There is a definite sense through these ads that there is an ongoing conversation between several sets of critics, but biographical and period criticism (lambasted in the ads) persists in American textbooks for a very long time. These advertisements show that how one *does* (“studies,” *a lá* Tyler) English literature was changing (or at least how they were characterized) and it is these changes that I track through the textbooks. From my perspective, *doing* English literature is teaching literature. All of these books, whatever form they take or position their authors endorse, are essentially pedagogical.

4.3 1880-1890

Literature textbooks contained in the Nietz collection with publication dates between 1880 and 1890 number twenty one. Of these, fourteen contain explicit Shakespeare sections or chapters. Four of these fourteen have been or will be dealt with in detail in other sections of this dissertation. In addition to looking at the explicitly pedagogical and content matter, it is also important to look at the credentials of authors provided on title pages and prefaces. A majority of writers in the 1879 and before section do not have academic credentials listed after their names. Most, if they list anything at all, list other textbooks they have authored. In contrast to this, six of the twenty-one authors in this section list academic credentials (five Americans and one British author). Additionally, two authors list current or past affiliation with Normal schools (as well as authorship of other textbooks) and only one lists his credentials as “PhD.” The rest of the credentials, when given, are either M.A., A.M., or LL.D. At this stage, as graduate degree granting institutions are beginning to take firm root in America, the textbook market is still

dominated by traditional textbook authors, who's authority is based off of expertise and not necessarily credentials or qualifications. These men and women write across a variety of subjects, from literature, to grammar, to geography, to history, to mathematics. They are not subject experts, rather they must be understood as experts in pedagogy. Raub, who wrote textbooks across a range of academic subjects, should not be understood as an expert or a subject specialist like someone with a PhD may be considered. For these writers, this understanding of credentials and qualification is anachronistic. Rather, I propose that we understand them as master pedagogues, not as masters in a particular subject area. I would argue that those associated with normal schools, because of the emphasis on the practice of teaching are in a different category than the college or university professors. Certainly the position of principle or president of a state normal school must have carried prestige, but seems a kind apart from professional academic life as it would come to be practiced.

As an example of this, William Swinton, a professional textbook author, published a book entitled Studies in English Literature, being typical selections of British and American Authorship, from Shakespeare to the present time, together with definitions, notes, analysis, and glossary as an aid to systematic literary study for use in high and normal schools, academies, etc. published in 1888, by Harper and Brothers. Swinton's text speaks rather usefully to the general trends mentioned above. There is an interesting link between rhetoric and literature in Swinton's text. He writes in his Preface that:

In the prescribed curricula of most high-schools, English literature and rhetoric find an important place. Yet, perhaps, no subjects are less satisfactorily taught. The study of English literature is, for the most part, confined to a cram on the personal biography of authors; at the best, it is a reading about literature rather than a reading in literature. The

study of rhetoric, is, for the most part, confined to the learning of abstract definitions and principles [...] This volume of masterpieces is designed to occupy a place at the meeting-point of literature and rhetoric—to restore the twain to their natural and fruitful relationship [...] (iii)

Swinton's text is broken up into two main sections, the first is a series of definitions of rhetorical figures. The second is the presentation of the literary material. Swinton goes on to say in his preface that many literature textbooks are compilations of biographical and critical entries. He, on the other hand, is trying to do something else. According to him, he is revolutionary in actually providing literary material for study and review in his text. It is interesting to speculate what it is that teachers were imagined to be doing with Swinton's textbook. Swinton provides a series of questions and comments he calls "Literary Analysis" which ask a reader to analyze literature through rhetorical terms.

Where is the figure of the teacher in a textbook like Swintons? Swinton's Shakespeare chapter, for example, is divided into three sections, a critical appraisal consisting of Johnson's and Milton's tributes and excerpted scenes from Julius Caesar and The Merchant of Venice. Each page of play text is divided into three strata, the text, notes keyed by line number, and finally, "literary analysis" in the form of questions and brief exercises which are tied to the numbered rhetorical definitions in the first part of the book.

Even though this is not a textbook for a normal school, or even a textbook where the pedagogical elements figure prominently, we can still perform a reading of this text to ascertain some of the theory behind the practice. The teacher is almost conspicuously absent from this text. And certainly from the multiple potential audiences listed in the title, it is possible that one imagines a solitary reader, without the class and teacher to guide him or her. But most of the

uses for which this book could be put require the presence of a teacher. Let us look at the “literary analysis” for the famous “Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears” speech:

Literary Analysis –77. Friends, Romans, etc. In this speech, the aim of Antony (unlike that of Brutus) was to move the feelings of his audience. But it was necessary for him to do so covertly; for when he obtained permission to speak, he was, by Brutus, placed under this limitation—

“You shall not in your funeral speech blame us”

Considering the delicacy of the task, what do you think of the speech? Give reasons for your opinion.

77. lend me your ears. What figure of speech? (See Def. 29) Change into plain language.

(9)⁸⁹

Based on this excerpt, it is the teacher’s role, then, to guide his or her students through these exercises, to correct and discipline the students. “Discipline” is here used in the sense of to keep order and also to introduce students to a discipline. Teaching is here figured as a guide to rhetoric, so a user of this textbook could learn how to see rhetorical figures in these texts. The teacher seems almost incidental. The preface is for the teacher. In a sense, however, the whole book is for the teacher, at least as much for the teacher as it is for the student, perhaps more so. The teacher’s job is to present this material to students and in so doing to construct a narrative of what constitutes great literature and what makes it great.

Teachers in the classroom, through the act of teaching, are creating a field, not just reporting on it to students. As such, teachers are vitally important. Another way to read these

⁸⁹ Definition 29 is “Metonymy.”

textbooks is in the ways that they themselves discipline teachers. If teachers are imagined by the textbooks to serve as a sort of archon, as a gatekeeper and guardian, not just of knowledge, but of technique and the sense of the discipline, then the textbook itself must function to regulate the teacher. It is important to note that I must stress the word “imagined” used earlier in this paragraph. As teachers ourselves, we know that we can adapt, modify, and even resist textbooks.

Louise Maertz’s 1882 A new method for the study of English literature (previously published in 1879) is a collection of questions and blank pages. In the preface, she writes “In the compilation of these questions I have limited myself to such as can be answered by the standard works usually found in private, school, and public libraries. I have also considered the amount of time ordinarily at the disposal of the student” (3-4). Her questions are predicated on what reference books she assumes students will have access to. In the section addressed to students, she writes “A multitude of facts committed to memory by students of literary biography have no relation whatever to the growth of literature nor to the works of the authors to whose lives those facts relate” (6). What this text promises to deliver, however, is “the principal causes that produced certain effects” (5). Maertz wants her students to become “thoroughly acquainted with English literature,” but this can only be “attained by extensive reading and careful comparison” (5). The manual is imagined to facilitate this through the answering of the questions.

N. K. Royse, in A manual of English literature: designed for the use of advanced grades, this edition 1882, comments on the number of manuals on the market. He writes “If the *matter* of the present work shall fail to apologize satisfactorily for its appearance in the already numerous family of manuals of English Literature, it is hoped that the *manner* in which such matter is presented—the *arrangement* of the work—will commend it as something unlike and possibly superior to its sister manuals as a *normal* guide to the student” (emphasis in original,

iii). Royse starts at the present moment with contemporary writers and works his way backwards to the past.

Thomas Sergeant Perry's 1883 English literature in the eighteenth century is interesting for our purposes because he is explicitly arguing with another textbook author, Mrs. Margaret Oliphant, a novelist born in Scotland, but who lived in England (<http://www.mrsoliphant.com/life.htm>). According to Perry's introduction, Mrs. Oliphant argues in "Literary History of England in the End of the Eighteenth and the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century" (vi) that although society is progressing with the passage of time, "literature and art are outside of law" because "we have not advanced upon Shakespeare, Bacon, Chaucer and Fra Angelico" (vii). Perry, on the other hand, tries to counter this argument and demonstrate through his book, first delivered as a series of lectures in Philadelphia during the winter of 1881-82, that if society is advancing, and a writer is a product of his or her circumstances and experience, and "a general, though not uniform, progress is acknowledged to exist in society, literature may also be said to be under the sway of law, or, rather, to move in accordance with law" (v and ix). According to the brief biography of Perry, he was a member of the faculty at Harvard University and studied in Germany with William James.⁹⁰ Perry taught at Harvard from 1877 to 1882. This text comes from that period. I see in Perry's argument a sign of the changing institutional status of knowledge. It is not surprising then that Harvard was leading the way. Certainly, we see the influence of modernism here, with its emphasis on progress and natural laws. By extension, Oliphant is arguing that literature cannot be understood by laws or principles as a universal progress through history. Perry, however, was trained in

⁹⁰ This information was compiled from a brief biography posted on Washington State University's website, www.wsu.edu/~campbelld/amlit/perry.htm, and the Historical Register of Harvard University, 1636 to 1936, www.math.harvard.edu/history/officers/0172.html.

Germany as a professor of literature and it is his job to determine principles with which to understand literature. The terms of the debate and how it gets framed is important. As America's educational institutions enter into the modern era, the very questions that are asked change.

Henry A. Beers wrote two textbooks examined in this chapter. The first is An outline sketch of American literature, 1887, which is exactly the same text as Initial studies in American letters, 1895, except for the addition of illustrations and margin headings. Beer's credentials are listed as "Professor of English Literature in Yale University. Author of 'Life of N. P. Willis,' 'The Thankless Muse,' 'A suburban Pastoral and Other Tales.'" Beers, who taught literature at Yale from 1875 to 1916, aimed "to present the subject in a sort of continuous essay rather than in the form of a 'primer' or 'elementary manual'" (iii). He states that the book is meant to be mainly a history of American belles lettres, and is to be used in conjunction with the historical sketch of English literature (iii). Beers wants his text read in conjunction with other texts in circulation. He writes, "In the reading courses appended to the different chapters I have named a few of the most important authorities in American literary history, such as Duycknick, Tyler, Stedman, and Richardson" (iii-iv).

I am going to close this section with O. H. Longwell's 1890 Outline of English and American literature. According to the title page, Longwell was Principle of Western Normal College, Shenandoah, Iowa. This is a workbook. Every other page is blank so the student/reader can fill it in with his or her notes. Longwell writes in his Preface that "It is hoped that this short outline will afford the student of English and American Literature a place for a comprehensive classification of his work; that it will afford the teacher a suitable means of reviewing the salient points that have been passed over; and that it will afford the private worker in literature a means

of pursuing a classified course of reading that will give real culture.” The only mention of Shakespeare appears on page 8, under the heading, “The Elizabethan Age.”

2. Dramatic

1. William Shakespeare (1564-1661) [sic]

1. Hamlet

2. Othello

3. As You Like It.

Why Longwell arranged and selected these three plays out of all of the possibilities is a mystery. Perhaps these plays were the most popular or perhaps they were imagined to do a particular kind of work that the other plays could not.

4.4 1891-1899

Textbooks contained in the Nietz collection with publication dates ranging between 1891 and 1899 number thirty. Of these, seventeen contain explicit references to Shakespeare or have Shakespeare sections.⁹¹ Two of these texts were already examined in detail in Chapter Two, and have not undergone significant enough changes to warrant a comparison. The one exception to this is George Cathcart’s Literary Reader, originally published in 1874. The two editions compared in this chapter are from 1878 and 1892. The textbooks which do not mention Shakespeare explicitly are for the most part surveys of American literature, focus on other time

⁹¹ This batch of texts gives an example of the extraordinary life of the word “reader.” One of the texts found while doing the initial research for this section, The third reader for standard III : written to meet the requirements of the new code and in accordance with the instructions to H.M. inspectors from 1891 is a geography textbook for British elementary school children.

periods, or genres like prose. Again, as with the texts examined in previous decades, Shakespeare is often mentioned or shows up in indices, often as a marker of period, genius, or a point of comparison (as in comparing Benjamin Franklin to William Shakespeare in Julian Hawthorne and Leonard Lemmon's 1891 American Literature: a text-book for the use of schools and colleges).

A quick survey reveals an interesting, but perhaps unsurprising fact. Academic credentials or affiliation are listed for thirteen authors represented in this section. Of these, four are either British or Scottish authors whose books have been reprinted in the United States by American publishers (this includes the ambiguous Stopford Brooke text of 1895, English Literature, "with an appendix on American literature by J. Harris Patton"). The remaining nine are affiliated with American institutions. The make up of these institutions is also interesting. Three authors are affiliated with high school and or normal schools: Leonard Lemmon, George Smith, and Harriet Swineford.⁹² The remaining six authors are affiliated with, or listed academic credentials from, American universities or colleges. The normal school teachers and high school teachers all show up in texts with publication dates between 1883 and 1891 (all editions consulted for these chapters are from 1891). Although this could be an accident of the historical record and of this particular archive, it also jives with the trends in American education at this time that this dissertation is establishing. Normal school and high school teachers are in a different position relative to teaching than university or college professors were. We can see the slow encroachment of an academic culture of qualification verses expertise in these texts. This academic culture centers on research or the absence of that expectation. In some ways, this

⁹² Swineford claims an affiliation with the State Normal School, Lock Haven, PA, where A. N. Raub taught and served as its head. Swineford's book was also published by Raub's publishing company. As such, her text will be considered in detail in the A. N. Raub section of this chapter.

historical study is an analysis of epistemology, the ways in which knowledge is created, disseminated, etc. It is during this time that we also see the number of non-religious university granted degrees listed by authors increase. For example, in books published between 1880 and 1890, only one author listed himself as having a PhD (Hunt in his 1887 text). In this section by contrast, there are two, but there are more degrees and college affiliations in general. Of course, these trends could simply be “accidents” of the construction of this particular archive and not necessarily constitutive of a larger pattern. When viewed in the context of the rest of this project, however, it is enough to begin to make an assertion, however tentative or qualified.

Part of the work of this chapter is to examine what constitutes an advanced course of study as it is represented in these textbooks. What are the differences between a text authored in 1865 by a preacher on English literature and those authored by a university trained and affiliated professor in the 1890’s? How and in what ways are the assumptions about pedagogy different or the same? Again, as with much else about these books and this time period, there are always complications to any attempt to construct a linear, historical narrative. Take, for example, Julian Hawthorne and Leonard Lemmon’s 1891 American literature: an elementary text-book for use in high schools and academies. Clearly, just by looking at the title, one could imagine that this book was designed as an elementary (understood as introductory) textbook for high school or even younger students. But this idea is complicated by the fact that this text is almost identical to the 1893 American literature: a text-book for the use of schools and colleges. The only differences, aside from the titles, are that the 1893 college level text does not include the full page portraits and/or photographs of authors present in the earlier edition and the fact that the 1893 version includes D C Heath’s catalogue of teaching related materials. In this case, what

determines the audience and title? Advertising? Students in a normal school using this text might need to purchase materials that a high school student does not.

Let us begin with the two authors who list PhD's as part of their credentials. Hinsdale, a "Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching in the University of Michigan" lists a Ph.D and LL.D. His 1895 text, The teacher in literature as portrayed in the writings of English, French, German and American authors: including a biographical sketch and characterization of each author and an introduction, is part of a series entitled "The Working Teachers' Library, The Teacher in Literature, The Werner Series." Hinsdale's book is an anthology of literature that shows teachers as characters and also gives a history of teacher training and education from classical times to the 1880's. This text is interesting in that it shows an intense interest in teaching and, most importantly for our purposes, representations of teaching. Although it is unclear who the intended audience is, it may be normal school students. That having been said, however, we must also bring up the important distinction between "teachers" and "professors." Ultimately, I think that this is a distinction that we need to certainly complicate, if not blur all together. I propose that the relevant distinction between these two terms is the inherent primacy and relationship of each to the act of classroom teaching and to research and the production of knowledge. This idea of the production of knowledge as an integral part of the role of the professor comes out of this time period with the professionalization of the professoriate.⁹³

The second text with a PhD author is the 1895 edition of English Literature by Stopford Brooke "with an appendix on American literature by J. Harris Patton." The complex print history of Brooke's text is discussed in the introduction to this chapter. Patton lists an MA and PhD as his credentials along with "Author of 'Four Hundred Years of American History,'

⁹³ I do not want to be teleological here. Rather, I am trying to track these changes as they occur over time. Refer to chapter four of this dissertation.

‘Natural Resources of the United States,’ ‘Political Economy for American Youth,’ Etc.” This diverse array of textbook subjects implies that he is from the older generation of textbook authors, who were not subject specialized. The set of Brooke texts is interesting in that it shows that even though the core text, by Brooke, may remain relatively unchanged over the years, the secondary material changes in order to reflect the times. It is important to note that even though Brooke was a Reverend with an MA and his texts were fairly long lived, it finds itself as part of a series that attempts to emphasize its ties to formal, academic culture through the institutional affiliations listed by editors as well as the academic credentials listed. Mason, the secondary author of the 1898 edition, was affiliated with the Drexel Institute, Johnson from the 1900 edition is Professor of English Literature at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, and Patton (1895 edition) lists an MA and PhD as his credentials.

As was discussed in the introduction to this chapter, it is difficult to know for certain who wrote the questions that are appended to the Shakespeare chapters in the various incarnations of Brooke’s text. But one substantial difference that potentially gives some insight into pedagogical practice and theory are the questions present for students. A question, test, or writing assignment highlights what was considered to be most important by the teacher or institution. The questions in Brooke’s 1895 edition with the Patton material are the same as those in the 1900 edition with Johnson, leading me to think that they were written by Brooke or Green, the series editor. These questions, however, are substantially different from those written by Harriet L. Mason in the 1898 edition. The difference in the presentation of Shakespeare in Mason’s text is interesting. Mason writes in the introduction to her study guide that:

There is a tendency at the present time to make the study of literature in schools too detailed, too microscopic, too specialized, so that the general sweep, the large view, is

lost sight of. We are in danger of losing the capacity for catholicity in literature. Mr. Brooke, with rare power, has given us the broad view. And to see through his eyes is the best possible equipment for any student of literature, either for general knowledge or as the basis for special knowledge later on.

But as a text-book, the hand-books, of course, must be supplemented, and this requires an infinite amount of labor for each teacher, and much hectograph work,--perhaps personally done. (7)

The explicit purpose of the handbook is to ease the teacher's work load, but Mason, perhaps unconsciously is setting forth an expectation for what the work of teaching should look like. For example, in Brooke's text Shakespeare is part of a larger chapter on the Elizabethan era, but in Mason's text he gets his very own section, serving as a major figure and period marker. In her outline "Study of Shakespeare," Mason places asterisks next to certain plays indicating that they should be read (Romeo and Juliet, Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Twelfth Night, Julius Caesar, Hamlet, Othello, and The Tempest) (44). The Brooke/Patton and Brooke/Johnson texts lists thirteen questions keyed to the Shakespeare material. Here are the first three by way of example, "1. Give a sketch of Shakespeare; his domestic life; how he became a playwright. 2. What is the theory in respect to his first play? when written? 3. Trace his progress from 'touching up' old plays till the time he composed them himself" (232). I expected that Mason's questions would be different and reflect her institutional setting somehow, but they are, in essence, of the same character. Both sets of questions direct the student back to the text to simply read and reproduce exactly what it was Brooke said in the first place. No original thought is asked for. What is different, and what may reflect Mason's institutional context to some degree, is her organization of the study guide chapter. Two sections of her outline which stand

out to me are “Famous Editions” and “Famous Critics” (45). Under “Famous Editions” she lists the following:

“Cambridge,” edited by W. Aldis Wright (Macmillan).

“Rolfe,” edited by William J. Rolfe (Harper Bros.).

“Hudson,” edited by Henry N. Hudson (Ginn & Co.).

“Temple,” edited by Israel Gollancz (Dent).

“New Variorum,” edited by Henry Howard Furness (Lippincott).

This listing of authoritative editions, while not unique, is certainly interesting in that it reflects, by its choice of editors, a particular critical opinion. It is 1898 and Mason is referring reader to Shakespeare editors who are largely outside or peripheral to the university system, largely autodidacts on the part of the Americans. And yet, these were the men whose editorial work shaped the presentation of Shakespeare for American audiences.

These textbooks are extremely useful for discussing pedagogical issues in that they often name particular issues or controversies in pedagogy. Here we see the connections between the developing fields of American literature and its connection to British literature as well. Painter writes in the Preface of his 1894 Introduction to English literature, including a number of classic works : with notes that:

This work is an attempt to solve the problem of teaching English literature. The ordinary manuals, it is believed, have ceased to give general satisfaction. This result was inevitable; for the principle upon which they are based is fundamentally at variance with educational science. While containing a great deal *about* English literature, these works do not teach English literature itself; and it is not unusual for a student to finish them without being acquainted with a single classic work, or having acquired the least

fondness for sterling literature. It is the recognition of these facts that has caused many teachers to desire and seek something better. (emphasis in original, iii)

Painter puts into words a general sentiment of his day and one which is repeated several times by authors during this time period. In terms of the development of American literature as a separate and distinct form of study, we can look to the work of Fred Lewis Pattee in his 1897 A history of American literature : with a view to the fundamental principles underlying its development : text-book for schools and colleges. He writes:

In the preparation of this history of the rise and development of American literature the author has had clearly in mind the limitations to which every text-book on literature must be subject. Such a work can be at best only directive. It can trace the influences of race, environment, and epoch, and indicate causes and results; it can insist that the student follow the logical order, rejecting everything not worthy of his attention and emphasizing sufficiently the emphatic points; it can furnish him with a plan for estimating the personality and influence of each individual author; but more it cannot do. No one ever learned literature from a text-book, not even when it was supplemented by copious extracts from the authors considered. Fragments of an author's writings, like fragments of any work of art, give only vague ideas of the whole. He who has studied merely "Thanatopsis" or "Evangeline" knows very little of Bryant or Longfellow. A knowledge of "Rip Van Winkle" provides the key to only a very small part of Irving's domain. Actual contact with all of the important writings of the leading authors is imperative if one would understand a literature. The text-book that does not emphasize this and aims merely to guide the student and supplement his efforts is superfluous. The coining of names and dates, of details and characteristics, of criticisms of books that the pupil has

never seen, if not supplemented by copious draughts from the living fountain heads, can but result in mental stagnation and a loathing of the entire subject.

Throughout this work the author has endeavored to follow the development of the American spirit and of American thought under the agencies of race, environment, epoch, and personality. He has recognized that the literature of a nation is closely entwined with its history, both civil and religious. As far as possible he has made the authors speak for themselves, and he has supplemented his own estimates by frequent criticisms from the highest authorities; but in presenting these criticisms he has not aimed to do the student's work for him, nor to furnish ready-made estimates for him to commit to memory without having examined the works criticized; but, rather, to provide information that should lead to an intelligent study of the author or book in hand.

This book implies other books. It should not be taught without them. (iii-iv)

Pattee is listed as "Professor of English and rhetoric in the Pennsylvania state college" on the title page. This fact gives the reader some potential insight into his institutional position and the way it positions him relative to this evolving debate over the role of primary and secondary texts in teaching literature.

The dual editions of George Cathcart's Literary Reader, eighteen years apart in terms of their initial dates of publication, offer an interesting glimpse into an act of revision of a textbook in response to this very controversy. In 1874, the original publication date, Cathcart wrote that:

In the ordinary catalogue of common-school studies literature, practically, holds but a humble place: its value to the mass of scholars has been underestimated, and it has been esteemed a branch of knowledge really useful only to the few who aspire to a "liberal education." Public sentiment has fortunately undergone a change touching this matter,

within a few years; and in the hope of furthering that change and confirming literature in its true place among school studies, this book has been prepared. (v)⁹⁴

Shakespeare begins the textbook, serving as an historical marker of sorts, for Cathcart. In the Preface to the 1892 edition, Cathcart writes:

a new edition is now put forth, embodying such changes and improvements as the higher and severer demands of the time seem to make necessary. This work, not less than the former edition of the “Literary Reader,” is intended for the use of schools as a text-book, by the means of which the learner may acquire, simultaneously, proficiency in reading and no inconsiderable familiarity with some of the best pages of English literature. Still, it is believed that, even ore than its former shape, the book will be sound serviceable by the general reader. (iiv-iv)

What are the “severer demands of the time?” In terms of the differences that Cathcart acknowledges in his new edition, he writes:

Among the leading features of this revision are the Definitions and Outline of Study, which the form the introduction to the book; the chapter on the Beginnings of English Literature, which covers the period previous to the time when our language took its permanent form; and the subdivision of our literature into the four great periods of Elizabethan Literature, the Literature of the Commonwealth and Restoration, the Literature of the Eighteenth Century, and the Literature of the Nineteenth Century. The biographical and critical notices have been rewritten and much extended, and an introductory chapter has been prepared to each of the four grand divisions of our

⁹⁴ Although this book is meant to be the “‘Sixth’ or ‘Advanced’ Reader,” it is useful to this study because of the close ties between college curricula and high school curricula, as demonstrated by Brereton in Origins of Composition and the fourth chapter of this dissertation.

literature. Each one of these periods is marked by distinct and definite outlines; each one has its own character, and arranges itself in something like systematic order around certain great central names. It has therefore been possible to make the book orderly and continuous in its character, and to give it an historical perspective which shows forth the masters and masterpieces of our literature in their true proportions. (iv – v)

When looking at these two editions side by side, what stands out most are the changes in organization to the book. The Shakespeare chapter itself begins with a small biography of the writer, acknowledging that very little is actually known (and most of what is is speculative), moves on to quote some authorities on Shakespeare like Samuel Johnson and Thomas De Quincy, and ends with the presentation of various extracts from Shakespeare's plays which are given thematic titles. The text of the Shakespeare chapter changes relatively little in 1892, except for the deletion of one sentence which ends the discussion of Shakespeare's biography. The deleted sentence reads "In his works, however, he lives, and will live while written records survive" (1). Why cut this? In general, everything in the 1892 edition is more systematized and organized. Cathcart has added explanatory notes to the text of the plays and added six more entries to the chapter, "Ingratitude Rebuked" and "Five Sonnets," each of which is numbered and given a thematic title. What is interesting about Cathcart is that these Shakespeare pieces exist in and out of context. All of the play extracts are identified thematically, but only two are given contextualizing footnotes, "The Winning of Juliet" which references the play and "Wolsey on the Vicissitudes of Life," which is given an historical context. The reader can refer to chapter two of the dissertation for a discussion of the implications of this contextualizing.

In the later edition, systemization, the putting into order, is present. Even the table of contents has been rearranged. In the earlier 1874 edition, the table of contents is listed by

thematic subject alphabetically, and this is followed by an alphabetical “Index of Authors.” Contrast this to the 1892 version which is arranged in outline form, in named, historical periods. What I find so interesting about these texts is that they are very much like modern anthologies. Interestingly, Cathcart does not speak of his text in his Preface as a gateway to primary source reading.

I would maintain that Cathcart’s reissue and revision of his text reflects, to some degree, the desire to systematize, discover, and elucidate principles of literature and history.⁹⁵ Is this evidence that the study of literature was becoming more organized and systematized; in short, more professionalized? Yes.

I will end this section with a brief discussion of Frank V. Irish’s 1896 American and British authors: a text-book on literature for high school, academies seminaries, normal schools, and colleges: also a guide and help in the private study of the best authors and their writings. Irish’s text is interesting in that it explicitly foregrounds pedagogical issues. Irish describe himself only as an “educator and author,” but a search on WorldCat reveals that he primarily wrote texts having to do with the study of literature, grammar, and spelling. In the prefatory material Irish is quite explicit about the beneficial effects of literature on students. He writes in the first paragraph of the “Preface” that:

As a love of the pure and beautiful in literature leads to a love of the pure and beautiful in thought and word, and this love is a winning invitation to the pure and beautiful in conduct and life, the choicest thoughts of the noblest writers have been generously scattered through the pages of this book with the confident hope that they will surprise, delight, and bless like rare wild-flowers discovered in meadow or woodland. (1)

⁹⁵ Please note the connection between this and the Oliphant versus Perry debate discussed earlier in this chapter.

He goes on to write that a love of American authors inspires a love of the country which produced them and even goes so far as to write that the British greatly admire American literature because it promotes such good citizenship in its readers.

Irish has a special section of the preface devoted especially for teachers called “Hints for Teachers.” Although it makes for a somewhat lengthy quote, it will be useful to reproduce these hints in full:

1. The teacher should keep constantly in mind that the lifegiving power of noble literature is what the young need most. All focus *about* an author and his works are of minor importance, and should only be used to lead to an appreciation of his choicest writings and his noblest traits of character.
2. As all truly great literature is universal, and depends but slightly on time and place, periods of literature, dates, etc. are of secondary importance. To study British authors in *groups*, using such works as Green’s *Short History of the English People* instead of the so-called Histories of Literature, is an excellent method.
3. As our best writers have gleaned their finest thoughts and illustrations as well as caught their noblest inspirations from its pages, so that the beauties of our literature are lost to one who is not familiar with the Book of books, the author has given the Bible a place, as a literary work, in this book. “We hear the echoes of its speech everywhere; and the music of its familiar phrases haunts all the fields and groves of our fine literature.”
4. Send ten cents to Houghten, Mifflin & Co. for their illustrated catalogue to use in your school. Ask parents to aid in putting the best books in your school library. Urge each pupil to start a library of his own, adding choice books as he can.

5. Literature should bring our pupils noble ideals. Avoid speaking of the personal deformities or failings of authors. Hold before your pupils what is beautiful and noble. A beautiful poem or a piece of noble prose is a work of art. You have no more right to mar it than to mar a beautiful statue or fine painting. Do not ask pupils to change poetry into prose. Read or have some pupil read fine productions to the school. Let the pupils enjoy the beauty, drink in the noble sentiments, and carry the music and the melody in their hearts to enrich and beautify their lives. (5)

“Nobility” seems to be Irish’s watchword. The teacher takes on the role of the conservator of a culture here and, by extension, a conservator of the citizenry of democracy. In fact, a collection of knowledge and facts can be hazardous to the moral development of pupils—if it is deployed without hint number 5 in mind. Number 5 seems much too directive to be called a “hint” and this point should probably be called a “rule for teachers.” The teacher figure is disciplined before instruction even begins (assuming that the teacher has read this material and in the order in which it is presented). Irish’s fear may be that if a student sees that something beautiful and “noble” can be produced by someone whose life does not reflect these qualities, then they will stop trying to cultivate these qualities in themselves. Another probable reading is that the figure of the author and his intention (in the Barthes-ian sense) are given so much weight that his moral flaws would, if known, destroy the moral qualities which recommend the piece in the first place. Whether or not the teacher actually follows this advice, the teacher and the student are understood to be in a different relationship to the material presented in the textbook. The exact nature of Irish’s concern is not necessarily an issue, what is important for our study is that teachers are imagined to be able to cope with this knowledge and students will not. If the students run the risk of being corrupted, why not the teacher? Presumably, the pieces are not

ruined, either aesthetically or morally, for the teacher even if he or she knows unsavory biographical facts. The focus on a piece of literature over and against authorial biography makes sense in this context.⁹⁶ In this context, the teacher is assumed to have some knowledge, a potentially dangerous knowledge, outside that provided by the textbook.⁹⁷ We can now see how this becomes relevant by looking at a “selection” (or chapter) from Irish’s book.

How does Irish enact his ideas about literature? It is important to note that although Irish makes a distinction between British and American writers (the book is split into two sections), he treats them both the same except for one important difference. The difference between the treatment of British and American authors is that for American authors Irish has provided an

⁹⁶ The authorship debate around Shakespeare’s works that emerged during the 19th century is particularly relevant here. On page 75 of *Highbrow/Lowbrow*, Levine writes “It is hardly coincidental that in this atmosphere there was a blossoming of books and articles maintaining that Shakespeare’s plays were the product of another writer. The loftier Shakespeare’s position became, the more untenable it was that a man of his low social standing and dubious education . . . could have risen to the heights of his drama, which must have been the creation of someone better trained, better born, more nobly situated.”

⁹⁷ Students can also resist in interesting ways, and even though student writing is not a primary focus of this dissertation, I think the following bears looking at. The title page of a copy of William Minto’s 1895 A manual of English prose literature : biographical and critical, designed mainly to show characteristics of style, “Authorized American edition,” contains the following (italics represent handwritten pencil marks, brackets represent my best guess at unintelligible letters):

A Manual
O! Would that such it was not!
of
English Prose Literature
It might ha[ve died] in caricature-
Biographical and Critical
Tyrannical + Dry withal,
Designed Mainly To Show
Characteristics of Style
Horribilities of Fashion,
By
William Minto, M.A.
Professor of Logic and Literature in the University of Aberdeen
Better silent than heard.
Authorized American Edition
Should have been sold in England
Boston, U.S.A.:
Published by Ginn & Company.
1895.
instead of a copy of.
1985 B.L.

engraving of not only the author, but also his house—that is, the physical structure in which he lived. Often pictured like a landscape scene, this detail is important because it shows the connection between the author and the land that Irish tries to stress in his construction of good citizens. Also, home ownership, then as now, is a mark of stability and middle or upper class social status. In the case of all the authors, Irish begins with a critical and historical introduction, giving an evaluation of the author's corpus (incorporating the author's own relevant literary material), as well as what other literary figures, friends, cultural luminaries, etc. said about the author. He then provides the “selection of works to be memorized,” followed by a list of prominent friends of the author.⁹⁸ For someone who claims to want to de-emphasize secondary material he provides a remarkable amount of it.

Let us now look at the Shakespeare entry on page 299 of Irish's text. The entry shows us the change in perception about the playwright that Levine describes in his book. Irish writes in a footnote that:

It is far better to *read* Shakespeare's plays than to see them *acted*. The ordinary stage manager is quite unable to resist the temptation to make a brilliant stage effect by omitting or passing lightly over the finest literary passages . . . Except in the case of a scholarly, refined, and famous actor it is better not to see these plays on the stage. The best way is to make a careful study of each play, marking and memorizing the noblest lines, and reading the best criticism.

Reading the play is important because it is “the” play. Any production is subject to the whims of a director, cutting, actor's lousy recitals, etc. I think this is evidence of the shift of ideas into

⁹⁸ This inclusion puzzled me and I wondered if Irish is trying to establish a genealogy of sorts for these writers? Or recommended reading? Perhaps, but the “friends” listed are politicians and spouses as often as they are fellow writers.

systematization. Irish provides some selections from three plays, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, and *Julius Caesar*. The text asks a series of questions, all of which fit neatly onto a single page, in a section entitled “Literary Gleanings” (Irish 303). It is interesting, given Irish’s insistence on direct knowledge of a piece of literature, that his first question is “quote what Milton, Dryden, Emerson, Lowell, and Mrs. Jameson say about Shakespeare.” These sources are, of course, provided in the critical material at the beginning of the chapter. It is also important to note that each author mentioned here receives their own chapter; the book is completely self-contained.

4.5 1900-1915

Of the thirty titles examined for this section of the chapter, eleven contain chapters on Shakespeare or substantive discussions of his work, one of which is in an American literature textbook. Of all of the American authors and editors, thirteen list advanced degrees or affiliations with institutions of higher learning, with schools like Yale, Brown, Swarthmore, Stanford, Columbia, and Colgate mentioned. William Edward Simonds, a “Professor of English Literature in Knox College,” lists his Ph.D. as being from Strassburg. There are two authors who claim affiliations with high schools. As we have seen, there is a substantial jump between the number of advanced degrees and institutional affiliations in this time period. If my theory is correct, then, we should see some impact of all of these institutions on the actual presentation of material and on the pedagogical practices found in the texts.

In terms of pedagogical practices, we will begin by examining George Rice Carpenter and William Tenney Brewster’s 1906 Modern English prose. Although it does not explicitly

deal with the teaching of Shakespeare, it does illustrate concisely what the very function of a textbook was imagined to be. Both men are listed as “Professors in Columbia University.” They write in their Preface:

Our aim in compiling this volume has been to present the largest possible amount of illustrative material for classes in rhetoric and English composition. In proportion as the secondary teaching of English becomes more adequate, the need of instructing freshmen in elementary rhetorical principles tends to disappear, and with it much of the importance of a text-book of rhetoric. Even where the text-book cannot be dispensed with altogether, the experienced teacher will wish to have it supplemented as much as possible by the reading and study of good models. Practically, as we have all found, this must be done by using a volume of illustrative material. But the available books of this sort are few. They contain comparatively little matter, and this matter consists mainly of short extracts, often illustrative only of one special form of composition. Our aim has been to present a rich store of materials in complete essays, stories, chapters, or component parts of larger works, to provide illustration for all the main forms of composition, and to offer as little annotation and explanation as possible. (v)

This textbook functions like a contemporary anthology is imagined to function. What is interesting, though, is that the authors explicitly situate the design of the textbook, and, by extension, the freshman college course in changes rooted in American high schools. This relationship will be explored further in the case of Delaware College in the next chapter.

Additionally, William P. Trent’s 1909 A brief history of American literature imagines how his textbook will be used as well. Trent, “Professor in Columbia University /Author of A History of American Literature, 1607-1865 / The Authority of Criticism, Etc., Etc.,” writes:

In this book, which is designed for the use of schools, I have endeavoured [sic] to furnish a condensed account of the development of American literature, rather than a series of connected essays on leading American authors [...] I have aimed to minimize tentative criticism and to give only such details of historical setting as could not well be spared. I have condensed the bibliographical information to dimensions more or less proportionate with the resources of school libraries and have divided it into sections according to chapters [...] An appendix gives important dates, which may be used in lieu of those scattered through the text. Topics for essays and class reports will be often suggested by the paragraph headings, and teachers may sometimes find it advantageous, when time permits, to have reports made on writers and books mentioned in the Appendix but not in the text, as well as on topics treated more fully in my larger book, "A History of American Literature, 1607-1865" (1903, Appleton).

Lists of questions have been dispensed with, because the main topic of each paragraph has been plainly indicated, because unessential biographical and bibliographical facts have been in the main eliminated, so far as I can judge, and because it seems preferable that teachers and pupils should ask their own questions and make their own comments upon the criticism. With regard to the opening pages of Chapter VI, which deal with the origins of the Transcendental movement and could not have been omitted without loss of continuity, or expanded to secure increased clearness without sacrifice of proportion, I must leave it to the individual teacher to determine what portion, if any, is suited to the wants of his pupils. It is needless to say, in conclusion, that every one who has taught literature, especially in schools, knows how difficult it is to

prepare a suitable handbook of literary history, and that I shall be greatly indebted to those teachers who will call my attention to any errors they may discover. (v-vi)

He assumes teachers and students will always use the textbook as it is laid out and that they will follow it blindly, as it were. Also, we have a university professor writing a textbook for high school teachers. Again, we see the stated connection between secondary school training in English and that on the collegiate level. In some sense, then, the high school teaching is determining the pedagogical approaches used in colleges and universities. Certainly, these authors, affiliated with colleges and other institutions, are trying to exert a downward pressure. On the surface, they can be read as ‘we want students to be able to do x, y, and z when they get to college,’ but also it is a statement about what constitutes “real” college level work and what is merely remediation. The era of the professional textbook author is over, at least for the advanced levels. Here we see an expert, whose expertise and qualifications lie at least in part in his institutional position, dictating a high school curriculum in the service of an imagined college curriculum.

A textbook that does deal with Shakespeare and highlights pedagogical issues relevant to this discussion is Alfred M. Hitchcock’s 1913 Rhetoric and the study of literature. Hitchcock, affiliated with Hartford Public High School, writes:

Views in regard to what the course in English should be are changing year by year, an encouraging sign of growth. Three fundamental ideas seem to be winning wide acceptance. They are as follows: First, emphasis during the earlier years of the secondary school course should fall on practice in expression through the medium of simple, interesting, carefully graded exercises, with rhetorical theory well in the background; during the later years this practice should be continued, the tasks in composition less

frequent but calling for longer, maturer [sic] effort, and something of rhetorical theory should be placed before the pupils. Second, the course in literature during the earlier years should be exceedingly simple, designed to break up careless reading habits and lead gradually to an appreciation of better things; during the junior and senior years the study of literature should become more and more systematic, not only acquainting the pupil with a few choice masterpieces but fixing in his mind methods of study, supplying him with the vocabulary necessary for intelligent discussion of books, and familiarizing him with the greatest names in English literature, so that after school days are over he may be equipped to continue his reading along profitable lines and in an intelligent way. Third, as the course progresses, practice in composition and practice in literary criticism should, within reasonable bounds, be correlated, this to be managed in part through the study of rhetoric.

This volume, designed for use in the last two years of the secondary school course, contains such textbook matter as I think is needed to carry out these three ideas in an economical way: a brief review of rhetoric, including a little vocabulary of terms commonly employed in talking about books; a general classification and discussion of the various literary forms—fiction, drama, essay, etc.—together with suggestions both general and specific concerning how these forms may be studied; a summary by periods of English literature, containing what I think is the minimum that the pupil should know upon graduation—such information as an intelligent man or woman surely ought to possess. I have not hesitated to include, in revised form, some matter that has already appeared in an earlier manual; but the exercises and questions, which form a considerable part of the whole, are new—new and yet old, for little has gone into this book that has not

been tried out repeatedly in class room. Indeed I have neither the courage nor the inclination to put forth in textbook form anything experimental. (iii-iv)

Shakespeare is only listed once in the index, on page 273, but a quick look reveals that he is all over the text. When I opened to a page at random, 232, in the “Study of Poetry” section, two quotes, attributed to Shakespeare but with no context, are used to illustrate an appeal to the senses in poetry. Also Macbeth is listed in the index. An appendix entitled “questions on typical masterpieces” (360) is included in the back of the book. The typical masterpieces consist of eight works, George Eliot’s Silas Marner, The De Coverley papers, Macaulay’s Samuel Johnson, Scott’s Lady of the lake, Goldsmith’s Deserted Village, Milton’s L’Allegro, Milton’s Il Penseroso, and Shakespeare’s Macbeth. He asks very specific questions, going through scene by scene of Macbeth. The questions for Act 1, scene 1 are:

Scene 1. If you were arranging a stage for this scene, how would you represent a *desert place*? How would you have the witches enter and how leave the stage? Describe their appearance and actions. Did those who witnessed the play when it was first given consider this scene serious or comic? Does the scene accomplish anything, either in starting the story or in throwing light on any of the characters? Had the rest of the play been lost, what conclusion might have been drawn in regard to the nature of the entire drama? Is the last line onomatopoeic? (399-400)

The questions get even more specific. An example from page 401, questions for Act 1, scene 3 “What *suggestion* is referred to in l. 134? Is the thought the same in the asides (143, 146-7)?” Interestingly enough, it does not specify what edition to use and absolutely none of the play text is provided. These questions have a much different character than the questions examined in the previous section of the chapter. The reader of this dissertation will see in chapter four that this

list of questions mirrors almost exactly that of a college entrance examination in English. This textbook is simultaneously a response to curricular changes in higher education and also a way of exerting pressure on the college curriculum.

Another text with questions similar to this is William H. Crawshaw's 1909 The making of English literature. In many ways, Crawshaw's text can be seen as representative in its treatment of Shakespeare. There are a category of books which begin to emerge during this time period which represent Shakespeare and other authors in a consistent manner. The Shakespeare chapter consists of a biographical essay mixed with critical statements about the plays and poems which divide Shakespeare's life into various periods and read his literary works as reflections of his life. No extracts or readings as such are provided, but the essays include numerous short quotations. This treatment is similar to that given by Henry S. Pancoast in his 1907 (1894 original) An introduction to English literature, William J. Long in his Outlines of English literature: with readings, and Charles F. Johnson in his 1900 Outline history of English and American literature.

In his Preface, Crawshaw writes:

The author's main purpose has been to write a compact yet broadly suggestive historical introduction to English literature for use by students and by general readers. The method is somewhat different from that ordinarily pursued. In the first place, direct and separate discussion of general English history has been avoided, in the belief that so brief a book in literature ought not to turn aside for a moment from its proper aim of treating great literary works, personalities, and movements. Yet opportunity has been constantly sought to suggest and imply the historical background indirectly through the literary treatment, and an outline of historical facts and movements has been furnished in the

Appendix. In like spirit, biographical details have been given mainly for the sake of their significant relation to the literature. The principle has been applied with moderation and restraint and with care to avoid forcing its application to unwise extremes.

Unity has been given to the discussions by a reasonable emphasis upon the great life forces which from age to age have determined the general character of English literature, and by a continuous endeavor to illustrate the working of those forces through a discussion of leading authors and works. The purpose has been to present the spirit of the literature as well as the essential facts, the great movements as well as the individual writers [...] aim has been to make clear the relation of each writer to the general movement, whatever that relation might be. (iii-iv)

Crawshaw's Shakespeare section, contained in a chapter entitled "Age of Shakespeare" runs for approximately fifteen pages. But Shakespeare is not confined to only one part of this text. If you look at "Shakespeare, William" in the index on page 471, there are around 40 entries from all over the book. Shakespeare shows up everywhere as a reference and a point of comparison. He also appears in the book's "study aids," chronological charts of English literature, a fold out four color map of "Literary England," and a Reading and Study List arranged alphabetically by subject (history, language, literature, and individual authors). Shakespeare has 35 separate entries under this Reading and Study list. On page 436, Crawshaw writes:

Shakespeare.—Furness's *Variorum Shakespeare*, so far as published, is the authoritative edition for reference or for critical study. Good school editions are the Temple, the Arden, and the Rolfe. A wide range of reading on Shakespeare's life and work is suggested in the Reading and Study List. Some one play or more should certainly be read. For the beginner, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Macbeth* may be

recommended. The first thing to be done with Shakespeare is to read him, for pure delight in his fascinating plots and his wonderful pictures of life and character. Beyond this, his work will bear the most careful and critical study; but such study should be vital and distinctively literary rather than linguistic or textual. Minute criticism is well for the scholar; but the living interest of Shakespeare should not be spoiled for the younger student by too close attention to details. (emphasis in original 436-437)

Crawshaw makes a distinction between the student and scholar that is indicative of this professionalization that I have been talking about. For example, of King Lear he writes “The meaning of the drama lies in the words: How sharper than a serpent’s tooth it is / To have a thankless child” (131). It is interesting how the author attempts to sum up all of these different plays with platitudes and one line descriptions. On the whole, it is very reductive, ignoring or eliding complexity, not to mention the important textual issues with which Furness grappled. Crawshaw does this for all the plays.

As far as I can tell, Crawshaw’s is the first book that I have looked at that, when it asks questions, does not have a ready made answer to be found in the chapter itself. He directs his readers to:

Study some one of Shakespeare’s characters (Shylock, Portia, Brutus, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, etc.), illustrating each characteristic by reference to the drama. Analyze one of Shakespeare’s dramatic plots, showing the connected series of events presented in each scene and in each act. Find illustrations of Shakespeare’s power to represent human passions. Show the range of Shakespeare’s sympathy with a great variety of human beings. Find illustrations of Shakespeare’s poetic power. Give examples of Shakespeare’s vivid imagination. Which does Shakespeare portray best—men or

women? Illustrate. Show how the plot of Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* illustrates the classical unities. (437)

Nowhere in the Shakespeare chapter does he ever say what gender Shakespeare portrayed best, for example. What is also interesting is that he asks students to then prove it.

It is important to end this section with a discussion of Rueben Post Halleck. Halleck authored several textbooks over the course of his life, but the one we are going to focus on is New English Literature from 1913, a revised edition of the 1900 History of English literature. In the Preface to this text, Halleck writes "It was necessary for several reasons to prepare a new book. Twentieth century research has transformed the knowledge of the Elizabethan theater and has brought to light important new facts relating to the drama and to Shakespeare" (v). The differences between the two versions of the chapters are not stark, but they are intriguing when the context of university and college research is taken into consideration. There is a fair amount of rearranging of material with some minor rewriting. What stands out, though, are three new sections, titled "Twentieth Century Discoveries" (page 180), "Publication of this Plays" (page 183), and "Development as a Dramatist" (page 186), as well as a two page long "Table of Shakespeare's Plays" (pages 188-189).

By themselves, these different sections of Halleck's essay on Shakespeare wouldn't seem to merit a new edition, but when taken together, they may imply something about the times in which they were written. In "Twentieth Century Discoveries," Halleck writes "In the first decade of the twentieth century, Profesor C. W. Wallace discovered in the London Record Office a romantic story in which Shakespeare was an important figure" (180). He goes on to tell a story about Shakespeare acting as a matchmaker to a couple which ended with a contested dowry, and which incidentally proves that Shakespeare lived in the "Mountjoy house at the

corner of Silver and Monkwell streets” between the years 1598 and 1604 (Halleck 180). He also tells his readers that Shakespeare held financial interests in both the Blackfriars and Globe theatres at the time of his death, which makes “more doubtful the former assumption that he spent the last years of his life entirely at Stratford” (Halleck 181). In the “Publication of his Plays” section on page 183, Halleck writes:

The twentieth century has seen one of these careless reprints of a single play sell for more than three times as much as it cost to build a leading Elizabethan theater. If Shakespeare himself had seen to the publication of his plays, succeeding generations would have been saved much trouble in puzzling over obscurities due to an imperfect text.

The newer version of the text also contains “Suggested Readings with questions and suggestions” at the end of the chapter, but are remarkable only in that he mentions that “Furness’s *Variorum* Shakespeare is the best for exhaustive study” (218). Again, we see potentially the difference between exhaustive, scholarly, specialized study and what a general reader or student was expected to do.

4.6 1916-1930

Of the ten titles examined for this section, eight have a separate or distinct section on Shakespeare.⁹⁹ Of the thirteen different authors represented in this section, nine listed advanced degrees and university affiliations, such as the University of Chicago, University of North Carolina, Johns Hopkins, University of Pennsylvania, and Miami University of Ohio. Only one

⁹⁹ As was stated before, one should not assume, obviously, that because the *Nietz* contained no books that were explicitly about American literature and were published between 1916 and 1930 that American literature was not being taught in colleges and high schools or that textbooks on the subject were not being produced.

author, Clarence Stratton, co-author of Literature and life, lists his credentials as “Director of English in High Schools, Cleveland, Ohio.” Also, several of the authors list their various ranks and appointments to English departments specifically. This is important because, by this time, it shows the development of literature as a distinct and separate “field.” Literature and the very existence of English departments implies that English is now a discipline. One must have not only the right qualifications, but be in an English department proper. Literature has slowly left the province of the gentlemen scholar and become the property of professional academics. It is now under the sway of university and college trained men, and to some degree, women.

In terms of the presentation of issues in pedagogy, three of the texts from this time period stand out. The first is Alfred H. Upham’s 1917 The typical forms of English literature: an introduction to the historical and critical study of English literature for college classes. In his preface, Upham, a professor of English in Miami University, writes:

This book, derived from several years of experience with college classes, is intended primarily to be used with the now popular introductory courses in literature that approach their subject by way of representative type or literary forms. It undertakes to provide for a number of these typical forms a somewhat extended account of their development as phases of art, a briefer statement of their accepted standards of technique, a suggestive list of topics for study, and a bibliography of collections and critical discussions. It is not intended to supplant the reading and interpretation of literary documents, but rather to supply a basis of understanding and conviction, upon which such interpretations can be made more intelligently. Hitherto such material has been brought to the attention of students by means of lectures, or through assigned readings in various books of reference. But freshmen and sophomores in college are not skilled in

note-taking, and the reference reading they do is often poorly digested. It should be an immense advantage to have in their hands a readable syllabus of this fundamental information.

Just how the book may be employed most effectively must be determined by individual instructors. Some will omit certain types and chapters, as the time allotted to the course may require. The author himself presents the drama in a separate course. The various divisions of the book are planned to suggest class-room discussion, where that is preferred, or may be assigned as private reading and tested largely by the student's ability to apply theory to the specimens of literature under consideration in class. In any event the first-hand acquaintance with the literature is all-important. Collections or anthologies of the various types have been described at some length in the bibliographies. The examples they contain should be analyzed and compared according to schemes easily derived from the sections on technique in this book. For the shorter forms actual attempts at developing the student's own imaginative impulses into finished products will clarify his mind surprisingly. The subjects for reports should serve the several purposes of enlarging the student's knowledge, of giving him practice in organizing and expressing information, and of further illustrating the substance of the course by more extended comparisons.

It will be a matter for regret if the usefulness of this book is limited to classes and class rooms. The entire treatment rests upon the assumption that the students who use it are already readers of reasonably good literature and will continue to be so throughout their lives. Its aim is to enable them to approach all their reading with more intelligent judgment, and keener, richer appreciation. Literature is presented as a vital thing,

inspired by very real and immediate impulses, and responding readily to the increased demands made upon it by the complex experiences of today, or the still more complicated ones of tomorrow. The book is submitted even to the reading public outside college halls, many of whom find it difficult at times to give a reason for such literary taste and discrimination as they practice.

Obviously a book of this sort is full of obligations. Certain larger features of indebtedness are indicated in the text or in footnotes. Numerous others are implied in the lists of critical discussions appended to each chapter. Two special instances, of a more personal sort, are gratefully acknowledged here. One is the genuine patience and apparent interest of three successive college classes, who permitted this material to be tested upon them until it took final shape. The other is the constructive advice and friendly cooperation of the General Editor of this American series of Oxford publications, whose experience and judgment have contributed largely to make the book what it is. (iii-v).

Present in Upham's Preface is an anxiety over the preparedness of students. The students are imagined to be unprepared and in need of help. This anxiety is also present in other textbooks of this time period. Chapter four of this dissertation will show that this anxiety is being played out at institutions like Delaware College. I argue that, while anxiety over student ability and preparedness is perhaps as old as education itself, this particular instantiation is tied to the professionalization of English. I am able to make this claim through my analysis of the rhetorical representations that these authors leave in their introductions, notes, etc. and the arrangement of their texts.

Following up on this idea we can turn to A syllabus of English literature by Edwin Greenlaw, 1921. This text is just that, a syllabus and outline, with every left hand page giving the history and critical response to texts and literary periods, and every right hand page blank. This particular edition has extensive hand written notes all over it. In his preface, Greenlaw writes:

This book is designed primarily for college courses in the history of English literature. Its object is three-fold: to supply the facts essential to the intelligent reading of the selections; to point out the characteristics which render each author significant in the development of our literature; to set the student at work for himself by encouraging him to find in the texts illustrations of the significant points named in the outlines and in the studies. It is expected that the book will be used in conjunction with one of the anthologies, such as *English Poetry* and *English Prose*, edited by Professor Manly; *Century Readings in English Literature*, edited by Professors Cunliffe, Pyre, and Young; *Twelve Centuries of English Poetry and Prose*, edited by Professor Newcomer; or the older volumes of selections such as Ward's *English Poets* and Craik's *English Prose*.

We no longer regard a jumble of facts culled from a hand-book and mixed with bits of criticism as proof of a knowledge of literature; in theory, at least, we send the pupil to the poem or the essay. But every experienced teacher knows that in the present method two dangers lurk: the failure of the pupil, through his ignorance of fundamental facts, to grasp the full significance of a piece of literature, or of a writer, or of a period of literary development; and the extreme difficulty of intelligent reading. These dangers we seek to avoid through the lecture, the conference, and the examination. But if the lecturer finds it necessary to dictate pages of dates, bibliographies, and summaries of criticism, and the examination tests only the memorizing of these facts and the knowledge of the

stories or the themes of the works studied, wherein have we advanced beyond the old method? Moreover, it is not sufficient to ask a pupil untrained in methods of literary study to read several pages of selections without at the same time giving him some hints as to the significance of the material he is to consider. This book seeks to aid the instructor by presenting in convenient form the facts that must accompany the reading, and to suggest to the pupil some of the things he should look for in the work assigned him for study. With such preparation, the student comes to the class-room with a mind alert, not passive, while the instructor, freed from that most deadening of educational processes, the dictation of elementary matter, may make the most of this alertness. (iii-iv)

We see the beginnings of what will become the modern literary anthology in George Wm. McClelland and Albert C. Baugh's 1925 Century types of English literature: chronologically arranged. Both are professors of English at University of Pennsylvania (Baugh is listed as an Assistant professor). In their introduction they write:

Century Types of English Literature has been prepared in the hope that it will fill what the editors believe has been a long-felt want in the survey course in English literature. In such courses the use of an anthology is already very general and is becoming every year more so. The expense of separate texts and the difficulty of obtaining the books wanted—when they are wanted—are everywhere felt. As an alternative to separate texts, however, the anthologies in general use do not provide a precise equivalent. They are based rather on the principle of offering relatively brief extracts from a great many works instead of complete texts in a more limited number. And admirable as these extracts are, they do not, in the opinion of many instructors, give the student, except in lyrics and short

pieces, a conception of works of literature as a whole. It is to meet this objection that the present anthology is offered. (v)

This moves us into the texts that present Shakespeare in interesting ways. John Matthews Manly's 1916 text, English prose and poetry (1137-1892), presents the poems and songs found in Shakespeare's plays. In terms of the justification of his book, he writes in his Preface:

This book has been made in response to the wishes of teachers who need a collection of English prose and poetry in a single volume and who desire to have the selections provided with notes. It contains no selection not included in its predecessors, *English Poetry (1170-1892)* and *English Prose (1137-1890)*. The condensation of the two volumes has been made with care, and it is believed that no selection has been omitted which is necessary in a rapid survey course.

For the texts previous to Chaucer translations have been made and printed side by side with the texts [...] The effort to preserve the tone of the original has often rendered the task of translation or paraphrase difficult because of the necessity of excluding ideas and sentiments foreign to the original as well as diction out of harmony with it.

The briefer and simpler notes are placed on the same page with the text, because the editor feels that turning frequently to the back of a book to consult notes or a glossary disturbs the reader's enjoyment and thereby interferes with, if it does not destroy, the effect of a piece of literature. The more elaborate notes, containing general information about the texts or authors, or discussing difficulties, or quoting interesting parallels, are placed at the end of the volume for the same reason—that is, to avoid interference with the enjoyment of the reader while he is engaged in reading. They may be consulted

beforehand, in preparation for reading, or later, in explanation of difficulties that have not been solved by the reader himself. (v)

“Notes” for the Shakespeare section go from page 707 to 710. These notes are interesting in that they talk about the material history of the poems, their print history especially. When taken together, the notes imply that we can infer that the erudite material will interfere with the enjoyment of the poems. This is, implicitly, a subject for experts and professional academics, not students. William J. Long’s 1925 Outlines of English literature: with readings is very similar in tone and layout.

Several of the texts in this period are organized around the same lines as that of Crawshaw (discussed in the previous section of this chapter). These include William Vaughn Moody and Robert Morss Lovett’s revised A history of English literature, published in 1925, and William J. Long’s 1919 English literature, its history and its significance for the life of the English-speaking world : a text-book for schools. What is particularly interesting about Long’s text is that it is aimed at high school students who want to pass college entrance exams. The same is true for Greenlaw and Stratton’s 1927 Literature and life, volume 2. What identifies these texts as preparatory for college exams and instruction is in the ways in which they position the student relative to the material. In their Preface, Greenlaw and Stratton write:

Nevertheless, the books are not merely anthologies made up of masterpieces chosen from the various published lists, such as those of the *Report on Reorganization of English*. In continuity, emphasis, and progressive plan, the series constitutes an initiation in to literature. This means that the problem of the teaching of literature in the high school is here regarded as a unity, like the problem of teaching composition [...] The fundamental reason for the failure of many college freshman to keep up with their work

is that they do not know how to read. They do not know, because they have not been taught. (iii-iv).

The above quote should be understood in light of the Preface to Long's 1919 English Literature, in which he writes:

We have laid emphasis upon the delights of literature; we have treated books not as mere instruments of research—which is the danger in most of our studies—but rather as instruments of enjoyment and of inspiration; and by making our study as attractive as possible we have sought to encourage the student to read widely for himself [...] (vi).

The reader sees that coming to the surface is an anxiety about reading. Students must be taught how to read in a specialized manner. Basic literacy is no longer enough. Teachers with specialized reading skills are needed to teach these skills to students. This is a version of the expertise verses qualification debate in that these reading skills are recognized as existing within an institutional sphere. They cannot be discovered serendipitously or accidentally; they must be taught.

4.7 ALBERT NEWTON RAUB

Albert Newton Raub (born 1840, died 1904) served as president of Delaware College from 1888 to 1896. He was a prolific textbook author and received his earned degrees from normal schools and even served as principle of the State Normal School at Lock Haven, PA. It was under Raub's tenure as president that Delaware College moved away from the nineteenth century models of education and into the twentieth. It was a slow change to be sure, but change definitely took place. This section of the chapter will examine the textbooks and pedagogical

treatises penned by Raub during the course of his career and look to extract the various principles and ideas about pedagogy present in them. Raub is himself an interesting figure. For purposes of this study he is a transitional figure. Raub's textbooks embody both the older and newer models of specialization in higher education simultaneously.

A. N. Raub was born on March 28, 1840 in Leesburgh, PA (Janssen 1). Raub had a multifaceted career, working in various normal schools and public high school systems in Pennsylvania. He also ran his own publishing company, publishing his own textbooks and those of other authors, as well as his treatises on educational management. Little else is known about the press. Raub came to Delaware to run the Academy of Newark (Newark, DE) in 1886. In 1888 he was appointed president of Delaware College (now the University of Delaware). Raub's career at Delaware College was extremely eventful, especially as he tried to usher Delaware into the modern educational era. This will be taken up in detail in the chapter four of this dissertation. This section, however, will explore Raub's various textbooks and extract patterns, principles, or ideas about pedagogy and English literature.

According to Janssen (4), Raub published at least twenty-five different textbooks and manuals on educational practice, policy, and theory. While most focus on subjects like grammar, spelling, English and American literature, and school management, several are beginning mathematics textbooks. Sixteen different textbooks in the Nietz collection were consulted for this study. Raub can be seen as a figure that bridges the gap between the older educational culture and the newer one of the professionalized academic. Most of the textbooks that I could find were first published in the 1870's and 1880's, with a few publications in the 1860's and 1890's. His texts enjoyed a fair measure of success and were reprinted well into the twentieth century.

Raub's mathematical textbooks (I was able to examine four) stand out to me because he argues for a connection between oral (called "mental") and written arithmetic instruction. He argues that it is only through a combined approach that students can truly learn the subject. In his 1877, The complete arithmetic: combining oral and written exercises in a natural and logical system of instruction, Raub writes in his preface that "Teachers everywhere seem to be awaking to the reality that what has been called Mental or Intellectual Arithmetic is best taught, and only properly taught, in connection with Written Arithmetic. The two are inseparable, and together constitute but one subject or branch of study" (4). This sentiment is echoed across all of his mathematics textbooks. What I take from this is that Raub saw a connection between written and oral work. Raub's literary texts may have also been intended to have a strong oral component. For Raub, literature was intimately and inextricably tied to elocution and recitation. This is clearly demonstrated in Raub's Normal Fifth Reader (discussed below).

In many ways Raub's treatment of literature in general, and Shakespeare in particular, is rather unremarkable. His texts are very much representative of the time in which they were produced. Raub is particularly useful, however, because he wrote a complete curriculum in his series of readers, from the first reader all the way up to the Normal Fifth Reader and Studies in English and American Literature, a textbook designed for use on the advanced level. By looking at the series, a reader is able to see what principles he is consciously trying to impart to students. Shakespeare appears in the series of readers, usually as thematic texts or short quotes ("gems"). In the preface to his 1878 The Normal Fifth Reader, Raub writes:

The author claims no special merit for doing what others should have done. All he has tried to do was to prepare a series of practical progressive Readers which would meet the demands of the thoughtful teachers of the times.

One of the main points he has tried to keep constantly in view, while adapting the books to the capacity of the pupils, is that of presenting only natural discourse to be read. He has also at the same time given hints on the language culture, which, if properly made us of by the judicious teacher, cannot fail to prove of much benefit.

This number embraces a great variety of selections from a large number of authors, embracing nearly all the standard writers of the language. But while trying to represent the best authors of English, variety in sentiment and expression has not been forgotten, and it will be found that ample and varied elocutionary exercise is afforded by the diversity of character of the lessons. (iii-iv)

This text focuses on elocution. Shakespeare shows up as the subject of four lessons (along the lines of the McGuffey's Readers) as well as in numerous other, unattributed examples of pronunciation, tone, aspiration, etc. Students are presented with four speeches from four plays (no play context, characters, or historical information is provided). It is clear that these lessons are intended to be recited (note his connection between oral and written mathematics). On page 34, in a note entitled "To Students," he writes:

- 1. Study and understand fully what you attempt to read before reading it to others.*
- 2. Let your position, whether sitting or standing, be both easy and graceful, with the chest fully expanded.*
- 3. Breathe with ease and freedom, always taking breath before you feel the need of it, and before the lungs feel fatigued.*
- 4. Read loud enough to be heard by those who are your auditors.*
- 5. Cultivate a pleasant, musical voice, and adapt your tones to the spirit of the piece to be read.*

6. *Speak deliberately and distinctly, but be careful to avoid a stilted or over-nice style of articulation.*

7. *Read as if you were expressing your own thoughts, and felt the importance of making them understood by those to whom you read.* (italics original)

This says nothing about composing texts to be read aloud. One could see how this might lead into literary analysis in the sense that one has to have a sense of the text before one reads it, but what does this public reading even inculcate? At least rhetorical study has the chimera of teaching people how to compose and persuade.

Raub's 1886 (originally 1882) Studies in English and American literature, from Chaucer to the present time: with standard selections from representative writers for critical study and analysis : designed for use in high schools, academies, seminaries, normal schools, and by private students is almost identical in its layout and presentation of Shakespeare to Swinton's 1880 Studies in English literature: [...]. Even the titles are remarkably similar. I would not necessarily say that one is derivative of the other, rather they are representative of the time period. The major difference is that the "Analysis" in Raub's textbook in the bottom third portion of the page is mostly focused on rhetorical figures and grammatical analysis of the play scene, in this case the "Trial-Scene from 'The Merchant of Venice'" (36). This is a very traditional use of these texts, where literature is seen as vehicle to learn pronunciation, grammar, elocution, etc. and is not an end unto itself.

This idea can be seen in his preface to this textbook. Raub writes:

This book has been written because there seems to be a necessity for a work of the kind in order to teach literature successfully.

Too often the drill in rhetoric and grammar which our young men and women received in schools ends with the mere technical drill, without any application of the principles of either science to the critical analysis and study of our literature. The study of literature as pursued in the usual way is the study of special biography, and in no way helps the young student either to appreciate the classics of our language or to prepare himself for authorship [...] The book does not aim to be a complete history of English Literature: it seeks, rather, to combine the study of English Classics with the study of the history of English Literature, and thus awaken such an interest as will lead the student not only to read biography, but also to seek culture through the study of masterpieces of English style and thought. (3-4)

Harriet B. Swineford's 1883 (this edition 1891) Literature for beginners: containing biographies of the most prominent authors, British and American, with extracts from their writings, also gems of thought, birthdays of authors, pseudonyms, contemporaneous writers, etc was published by Raub's printing company. Swineford gives her affiliation as being with the "State Normal School, Lock Haven, PA." Raub's influence is acknowledged on page 3. She writes "The author desires to express her recognition of the invaluable assistance rendered in the preparation of this work by Dr. Albert N. Raub, author of 'Studies in English and American Literature.'"

As in so many other texts, Shakespeare is all over this book. He has a chapter devoted exclusively to him, but his work also appears in the sections "Gems of Thought," page 243-269 and "Popular Album Sentiments" (270-274). The Shakespeare section begins on page 20. By way of an introduction, she presents a brief biography, about one and a half pages in length. The biography is very simple, providing the reader with the few known facts of Shakespeare's life

and some of the myths surrounding it. Swineford gives one paragraph of evaluation, extolling Shakespeare's universal qualities. Thirteen "extracts" follow. They are completely acontextual, but in her introduction/biography she presents the value of Shakespeare as comparable to the value of "proverbs." Proverbs are short sayings which express obvious truths. I do not believe that Swineford meant this comparison to mean Biblical proverbs, which express a profound truth in a mysterious way. Many of other texts do this, but she is the most clear about why. This approach to Shakespeare dictates the way she presents this material, granted the other extracts are very short also but perhaps this is because of her idea of what literature is (proverbs), which is exemplified in her Shakespeare entry and treatment.

Two books that Raub authored on pedagogy and school management are relevant to this discussion. They are Methods of Teaching: Including the nature, object, and laws of education, methods of instruction, and methods of culture (originally published 1883, this edition 1884) and the 1882 School Management: Including a full discussion of School economy, school ethics, school government, and the professional relations of the teacher. Designed for use both as a textbook and as a book of reference for teachers, parents and school officers.¹⁰⁰ These books offer a fascinating insight into how school teachers were imagined to function. Although our discussion is about advanced education and Raub is mostly writing about "school" teachers here, the distinction in 1882 is a blurry one with tremendous overlap. Additionally, as we have seen, the curricula of high schools and colleges were continually influencing and exerting pressure on one another, sometimes in unpredictable ways. Raub's position at Delaware College must have been considered more prestigious than his being principle at Central State Normal School, Lock

¹⁰⁰ These books are not housed in the Nietz collection.

Haven, PA, because it takes the place of this in the list of credentials under his name on the title page. In the Preface to Methods of Teaching, Raub writes:

The aim of the author in preparing this work has been to write a book which would commend itself to all progressive teachers for its practical value. He has endeavored to present only such methods as have proved valuable in practice, and such as every young teacher will be safe in adopting. Where a method has seemed to him either unphilosophical or of little value in practice, the author has not failed to condemn it, however eminent the theorists who have been its advocates.

The book is designed not only as a textbook for the use of Normal Schools and Normal Classes, but also as a handbook for the use of students who are preparing to teach, but have not an opportunity of taking a course of professional instruction. It is designed also to afford help to those who are already engaged in teaching, and are desirous of improvement by professional reading. (3)

Specifically on the teaching of English literature, Raub writes

Few studies afford so wide a scope for mental culture as does the literature of one's language. Too little attention has been given to the subject of English literature in our American schools. Much, however, may be done toward creating and cultivating a taste for literature, even in an informal way, in connection with reading and history, but is best that a definite method be pursued. (265)¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ It is not entirely clear what Raub means by "culture" as he uses it in his book. At first glance I thought it was culture in the sense of the collective ideas, art, beliefs, etc. or in the sense of refinement in an Arnoldian sense (the best that has been thought and written), but upon closer examination I believe that it was intended in the sense of its Latin root, that is to improve a student so that they are ready and able to gain new information, receive moral improvement, etc.

Raub splits the study of literature into three steps, “I. First Steps in Literature,” which consists of the study of biography and the memorizing of extracts, “II. Studies in Literature,” which focuses on rhetorical and grammatical study, and the final stage, “III. History of Literature.” In this last and most advanced stage of study, students are asked to write biographical sketches of authors as well as produce “critiques” of literary works, the effect of which “will be not only to give them valuable literary training, but also to cultivate a pure literary taste” (269). Raub writes:

The Literature of a language is closely connected with the history of the people speaking that language, and to a great extent the history of a literature is the history of a nation. The current history of a nation has much to do with shaping the literature of that nation from age to age, and the progress or the decline of a people may be traced in its literature. (268)

Raub’s School Management is another rich and fascinating text, but what I will focus on is Raub’s explicit discussion of textbooks and school libraries. This book provides us with a rare opportunity to see exactly how one pedagogue wanted textbooks to be used. Again, this is with the caveat that Raub is directly addressing “school” teachers and not college professors, but given the time period in which this book was published (during Raub’s reign as president of Delaware College) and the time period in American education in general (the distinction, as commented on before, is not always that great), I argue that it is relevant to how textbooks may have been used in college, university, and private academy classrooms. Raub writes seven pages on the use and potential role of textbooks in the classroom. Raub’s main point about the usefulness of textbooks has to do with their systematizing effect and logical organization. According to Raub, “The mind is disciplined by study, and the requisite study can be secured only in connection with a properly-arranged book [...] Clearness of statement and logical

arrangement of parts in a textbook will tend to make pupils systematic. Indeed, a well-arranged textbook is a great aid to students in systematizing their methods of thought and work” (50-51). Generally, textbooks ought to be “logically arranged,” “clear,” “interesting,” brief, a model of writing, adapted to the capacity of the student, and attractive in appearance (51). Perhaps the most interesting part of the chapter, however, is that part called “The Abuse of Textbooks” (54). Raub writes:

No greater educational fallacy has been presented than that which urges teachers to do away with the textbook. The ultimate result is found to be a breaking up of habits of study and a destruction of mental discipline. The only compensating result is a mass of fragmentary knowledge which hardly deserves the name [...] under the present condition of things, to urge teachers to throw aside the textbook and attempt to impart all instruction orally is worse than absurd; it is criminal. The difficulty lies not in the too frequent use of textbooks, but in their abuse. (54)

Of course it makes sense for a man who made his living producing and selling textbooks to argue for their utility, but there is also an epistemological argument being made here. Raub is engaging in a public debate over the place of textbooks in the classroom. For Raub, textbooks can serve as a unifying device, drawing together in one place all the things that make a discipline a discipline. Raub, for the first time, is here arguing explicitly that textbooks are constitutive of disciplines. This is an important distinction for this dissertation.

The abuses that Raub is talking about number three. The first is the memorization of facts which would be better understood in the student’s own words (please note that Raub is a supporter of memorization, but only of definitions and principles). The second is “The Teacher’s Use of a Single Textbook, with no knowledge beyond [it]” (55). Raub’s third and final abuse is

when teachers do not supplement the textbook properly. A teachers should “inform himself thoroughly on the subject-matter of the textbook by consulting similar works, and give his pupils the benefit of his reading, while he at the same time stimulates the pupils to greater effort. He should make the textbook matter the text or groundwork on which to base additional instruction.” (55).

In terms of the school library, I wanted to see if Raub imagined that students using his literature textbook, for example, would have had access to some version of the complete Shakespeare play. Raub advises school masters to first get reference books like dictionaries and “cyclopedias,” then add historical works focusing on not only the United States, but also Europe and the Classical world. Finally, the library should include:

the works of the most prominent British and American poets, and with these the prose-writings of Irving, Prescott, Dickens, Thackery, Scott, Hawthorne, Cooper, Macaulay, Carlyle, Holland, and others. A taste could thus be created for the elegant in both prose and poetry, while the vitiated taste created by the cheap, flashy literature of the day might be anticipated and supplanted. (57)

The library of a school (as will be commented on in chapter four of this dissertation) can be read not only as repository of books, but also as indicative of the kinds of epistemological and ontological assumptions that an institution of higher education makes. For Raub, the library is inherently pedagogical and archival as well as containing a moral imperative. We will see some of these ideas getting played out in Delaware College when he assumes the presidency in 1888.

4.8 TRANSITION

Raub is a transitional figure in several ways. Not only do his textbooks reflect the changing currents in American higher education, but he himself occupied an ambiguous position professionally. Raub, the professional pedagogue, trainer of teachers, and textbook author of subjects as varied as mathematics and grammar, served as administrative head and faculty member of a college. He had a foot in both the world of the secondary education and advanced or college level work. Raub helped Delaware College transition from an older epistemological and professional model to a more modern one. This story is primarily a curricular one, and it is this story that is told in the next chapter.

5.0 CURRICULUM REFORM: DELAWARE COLLEGE AND THE CHANGING ROLE OF ENGLISH STUDIES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Rumor-mongers and dissatisfied faculty led students to think that the university cared little about good teaching and placed too much emphasis on research. President Hullihen and many department chairmen were indeed trying to encourage faculty scholarship [...]

From John A. Munroe's The University of Delaware: A History

What is now the University of Delaware in Newark, Delaware assumed the status of a university in 1921. Before that it was known as Delaware College (having assumed that name in 1843). Prior to that it was called Newark College (declaring itself a college for the first time in 1834). The College traces its roots back to the Academy of Newark (founded in 1769), and ultimately to a “Free School” in Pennsylvania opened in 1743 by Francis Alison, a Presbyterian minister (Munroe, Chapter 1). How is it that a school which spent so much of its long history training “ministers and other men of learning and refinement” developed into a research driven, graduate degree granting institution (Munroe, Chapter 1)? Versions of this story have been told already; for example, in the several books by Carol E. Hoffecker which focused on the development of

the Women's College at Delaware, in John A. Monroe's work, as well as in William D. Lewis and Gloria Marie Dean Bockrath's respective histories, various dissertations and theses, and several personal reflections and histories written by faculty, trustees, and others associated with the college. The version of the story that I want to tell in this chapter is one that has not been told before. This chapter will comprise a curricular history of the place of English in the development and growth of what would ultimately become the University of Delaware.¹⁰²

From a curricular perspective, resources are rather sparse. The chapter will begin by briefly reviewing already published information and supplementing this with original research done in the University of Delaware archives. There are two related stories in this chapter. One is about the changing place of English in the curriculum, how it moved from the periphery to the center, or the place of this discipline in the overall curriculum. The second story is about the professionalization of English and the English professoriate as reflected in the ascendancy of a research agenda as a defining characteristic for this same professoriate. I define a professional academic in the modern sense of the word as one who is judged through the construction of new knowledge via research activities, peer reviewed publications, etc. In many ways, what I am writing about is the formation of a discipline, but simultaneously the formation of the "professional" academic. This project, while historical in nature, is not simply a looking backwards to see where we have come from (although I suppose that it is that to some degree as well). Rather, it tries to understand the epistemological assumptions underlying changes and

¹⁰² What we learn from the history of Delaware College and its many incarnations, and what we should never forget when doing any kind of historical inquiry, is a lesson similar to what we learned from looking at the publication history of the Variorum Shakespeare, namely, that so much of higher education is at the mercy of economics and material conditions. It is tempting to think of this world, which is so concerned with ideas, as functioning purely in and for ideas, but to do this is to ignore an important and obvious truth.

practices in the American system of higher education and to see how these assumptions are playing out today and their potential impact on pedagogy.

5.2 ORIGINS OF DELAWARE COLLEGE

Throughout its early years, and, indeed, into the mid to late nineteenth century, Newark Academy, and the College that followed, was primarily concerned with producing ministers, professional men, and, eventually, school teachers to staff Delaware's notoriously poor and understaffed public school system. The academy founded by Alison, although officially non-denominationally Christian, was backed by a faction of American and European Presbyterians. The early years of the college were tumultuous ones in which rivalries, disputes, and schisms between various groups of Presbyterians put the academy square in the middle of church politics. These rivalries were played out on a global scale, often centering around the American institutions of higher education which would eventually become Princeton, Columbia, and the University of Pennsylvania (Munroe, Chapter 1).¹⁰³ Before the original academy was disrupted by the American Revolutionary War and forced to close for lack of students and funds, it taught a fairly standard kind of curriculum split into three parts.¹⁰⁴ Munroe describes the first part as an "English school, preparing young men for 'useful practical' careers, probably in business, teaching reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, geometry, and algebra as well as their

¹⁰³ Munroe writes that agents of Newark Academy on a fundraising expedition to Great Britain claimed that they were "handicapped from the start by the enmity of President John Witherspoon, of Princeton, who wrote friends in Great Britain that gifts to the Newark Academy would hurt his institution, that Newark was nothing more than a grammar school, and that its sponsors were unorthodox in their Presbyterianism" (1).

¹⁰⁴ This educational institution was plagued from the outset with severe financial problems. These problems persisted well into the twentieth century and almost caused the school to go under several times. In fact the school closed its doors three times, between 1777 and 1780, 1796 and 1799, and 1859 and 1870.

application in the trades and professions” (1). Secondly, according to Munroe, “was the traditional Latin grammar school” with public examinations (1). Finally, the “‘Philosophical’ school was the collegiate department, or the nearest thing to a college that it could be, lacking the power to grant degrees” (1). In these early days, the college functioned primarily as a seminary. As far as I can tell, the academy functioned along the traditional liberal arts model popular during this era in higher education, producing mostly preachers, ministers, and refined gentlemen. The academy served as much as a finishing school as anything else.

When the academy reopened after the American Revolutionary War, it functioned primarily as a Latin grammar school and Presbyterian seminary (Munroe, Chapter 2). In 1828, the trustees voted to reorganize the academy and two professors were to be hired. One was to teach Classical languages and history; the other to teach mathematics, modern history, and English grammar and composition (Munroe, Chapter 2). In 1833 the state assembly passed an act to incorporate Newark College (first opened in 1834), which was intended to be a liberal arts college, training men for the professions (Munroe, Chapter 2). This institution was considered separate from the Academy, even though they were closely related and probably shared many of the same faculty and staff. Throughout the early years of the college’s existence, its mission swung back and forth between a seminary and a liberal arts institution. Even after the school became Delaware College in 1843, it struggled with its identity. Munroe provides us with a snapshot of the “course of study” under college president Richard Sharpe Mason (1835-1840). Munroe writes:

Latin and Greek were basic to it, supplemented by English composition and declamation or elocution [...] The first two years of the four-year curriculum emphasized the classics, but always with some mathematics: algebra and geometry in the freshman year,

trigonometry and analytic geometry in the sophomore. Science began in the junior year, when calculus was also studied, along with logic and “moral philosophy,” or ethics. Physics, geology, and mineralogy came in the fourth year, with astronomy and some politics and other social sciences. Rhetoric and theology appeared in the sophomore year; the only history emphasized was the history of the classical world. (3)

In 1851 the college reorganized the curriculum again, this time offering students a choice between the classical curriculum and what was known as the “scientific curriculum” (Munroe, Chapter 4). A normal school was also officially listed as part of the college, although, according to Munroe, a normal school degree was never awarded (4). The college effectively closed (although the Academy, or preparatory school, remained open continuously) in 1859, due to budgetary problems. The chaos of the American Civil War only prolonged the closing.

5.3 THE MORRILL ACT AND ITS IMPACT ON THE COLLEGE

One primary reason that the school was able to reopen in 1870 was the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. This is, in my analysis, what is also primarily responsible for eventually transforming Delaware College from a liberal arts institution and seminary to a research oriented university. Certainly the seeds were planted with the passage of the Morrill Act, although they may have taken another sixty or seventy years to germinate. The Morrill Act not only provided for more financial stability, but is also helped to establish and then strengthen ties from the college to the federal government and, eventually, to the state government. It took several years for the Delaware state legislature and the college’s board of trustees to reorganize and to get the college ready to reopen, but in 1870 Delaware College finally reopened as a designated land

grant college (Munroe, Chapter 5). At this point the academy, which had remained open and functioning in essence as a separate institution, and which was never in as dire financial straits as the college, officially split from the college (Munroe, Chapter 8).

The Morrill Act specified that in order to receive federal funds the designated colleges in each state had to maintain

at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts, such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (ourdocuments.gov, sec 4)

In Delaware's case, this resulted in the eventual construction of an agricultural research station and experimental farm. Research became more important to the life of the college and began, in my estimation, to rival teaching for the first time. The first professor at Delaware with an earned PhD was Theodore R. Wolf, professor of chemistry, who joined the faculty in 1871 and ran the agricultural research station as well as taught classes.

I argue that the Morrill Act is largely responsible for the formation of Delaware College as a research institution. This relationship between Delaware College and the state and federal governments may be generalizable to a section of other land grant institutions in American higher education, especially those that transformed into the 'state schools.' It is not a coincidence that state and federal legislation and the rise of the research oriented graduate schools occur at the same time. There is something about this relationship which engenders research in a particular way, and also the professionalization of English as a discipline. They

appear to mutually reinforce one another. One could argue that they emerge concomitantly as part of a larger nexus of forces acting on the American cultural landscape. I argue, however, that they are causally linked and that this is not merely coincidental or correlational.

What is the relationship between the Morrill Act and the creation of the research university? I would argue that the turn from the liberal arts to a research based college is not simply the result of a translation from the Prussian model of higher education, so often discussed, to an American context. Certainly, this was an important factor, but this received idea ignores the role of the Morrill Act and other important pieces of legislation, such as the Hatch Act to name but one, which, at the very least, paved the way for the adoption of the German model. True, the Morrill Act specified training and instruction, and not research *per se*, but in this particular case, I argue that it paved the way for the formation of the modern research oriented university. It is difficult to argue causes here, to say that the legislation caused the creation of the research centered college and university, (indeed, one could equally argue that the shift toward research caused the legislation), but considering the potential impact of this kind of legislation on colleges, both big and small, adds nuance and texture and potentially some new questions for the traditional story of the formation of institutions of American higher education, and specifically, the formation of English as a university discipline.

None of the money from the second Morrill Act of 1890 could be used for buildings, so Raub and the trustees appealed to the state legislature and received \$25,000 in 1891 for, among other things, the “promotion of practical education” (Munroe 6).¹⁰⁵ Although this money appears to have been earmarked for building maintenance and new construction, this word

¹⁰⁵ In an interesting coincidence, according to Munroe, in 1891-1892, one of the new buildings erected was designed and built by Furness, Evans Company of Philadelphia, headed by Frank Furness, the brother of Horace Howard Furness (Munroe, Chapter 6).

“practical” is significant in this context, I argue, as much as it was in the wording of the original Morrill Act. In 1907, the Nelson Act gradually doubled the funds provided for in the Morrill Act.

The ideal of “practical education” is contained in the Morrill Acts. I think this is the key to understanding the transition between liberal arts and research based higher education. If the idea is to produce things (better bridges, better tomatoes, better chickens, etc.), then how does this get translated into the liberal arts? By the production of new “knowledge.” If one produces a better grade of steel, or a disease resistant lemon, then one also could produce a better understanding of Chaucer or a more “scientific” understanding of the origin of words in a Shakespeare play. Today, when we think of “practical” and English, the discussion usually turns to composition and the role that it plays in creating competent readers and writers, but I would argue that at Delaware College at least, the idea of the “practical” was what helped move the study of English away from the traditional liberal arts model and toward a research oriented faculty.

One of the primary and defining attributes of a research institution is the library. What is the relationship between a research institution and its library? Libraries provide an insight into the epistemologies of colleges and universities. The research oriented school understands itself as creating new knowledge, whereas the more liberal arts focused institutions, of the later nineteenth century at least, understood themselves as conservators of culture, as passing on a cultural tradition that had merit in its own right. (much like the textbooks themselves functioned). A research institution needs a library, it needs to stand on the shoulders of giants, as it were. From a practical standpoint, a library allows the institution to privilege novelty and originality in that it allows for the researchers in the humanities to see what has come before and

what potential new work can still be done. Also, the comprehensive research library allows for training of graduate students. The presence, absence, or makeup of a library relative to an institution of higher education illuminates the epistemological understanding that the institution has of itself.

At Delaware College, the library was in a perpetual state of crisis. For most of the early history of Delaware College, the librarian was a faculty member, sometimes in English and sometimes not. This persisted until Sypherd left the position, giving it to his then assistant in 1921. The assistant, Dorothy Lawson Hawkins, became the first professionally trained librarian at what was by then the University of Delaware (having officially become a university in 1921) (Hoffecker and Munroe 27). The timing of this was not coincidental. This is indicative of the specialization and growing sense of disciplinarity developing at the nascent university.

Hoffecker and Munroe point out another important point in their 1984 text, Books, Bricks & Bibliophiles: The University of Delaware Library, that the Morrill Act of 1890 allowed President Raub to expand and build up the college's library holdings. In their history, Munroe and Hoffecker quote Edward Vollandigham, class of 1873 and later professor of English, as saying that the library "did not amount to much," but that the independently run, student literary societies made up for it with their own libraries (22). Munroe and Hoffecker write "Collateral reading was then unknown, so Vollandigham's reference is to extracurricular reading" (24). These libraries were eventually absorbed into the campus holdings (24). Subject specific, departmental libraries were established in 1895 as well (24). Again, we can see the contrast between the 1870's and the 1890's, between the library as a repository of cultural classics and as a research tool.

According to Gloria Marie Dean Bockrath in Student Recruitment at Delaware College During the Purnell Era – 1870 – 1885, the Classical Course:

had traditionally been a “means of confirming one’s respectable place in society” for college students everywhere. In the post-Civil War years this began to change. If colleges hoped to maintain a dominant position in the society of the late 19th century their curriculum would have to change. The public and alumni were forcing even such traditional institutions as Harvard to add utilitarian courses to [sic] study to the curriculum. This was part of the fight between the acquisition of mental and moral powers and accumulated knowledge that caused change in the late 19th century colleges. (40-41)

We can also see this with Furness and his involvement in University of Pennsylvania’s English department, as discussed in Chapter One of this dissertation.

English studies as it is known today did not exist in the curriculum at Delaware college. When it appears it often is as a means to an end, either a liberal education or composition and elocutionary models for seminarians. When it did exist, it was instrumental to some other goal. There were inklings, though, of the gradual specialization in English that would come to characterize later academics. Students could continue to study at the college after graduation and if they exhibited “good moral character” and continued progress in their chosen field of study (Munroe, Chapter 5). In 1884 a thesis was required to graduate with an MA.

Munroe gives us a brief insight into some of the teaching methods of this time period. He writes:

President Purnell was professor of moral philosophy and English literature, and a student who entered college in 1883 left a brief reminiscence of the president's classroom

methods. Purnell, he wrote, required his students—this refers to a class in political economy—“to commit the text to memory,” four or five pages a day, three days a week. When they suggested that in reciting they might give the meaning in their own words, Purnell responded, “What conceit! Do you imagine you can improve on the author’s language? I doubt it. Proceed with the lesson.” (5)

If we assume this is representative in some way, then students may have been expected to memorize large chunks of the literature textbooks read for classes.

William Henry Purnell served as president of Delaware College from 1870 to 1885. As was stated before, the college closed in 1859 and it was only the passage and eventual implementation of the 1862 Morrill Act that allowed the college to reopen (Janssen “Purnell” 5).¹⁰⁶ Purnell had a varied career in politics and the law before he came to Delaware College as president (his first connection with an academic institution) (Janssen “Purnell” 2-3). It was under Purnell’s administration that Delaware College expanded the number of curricula, adding Agriculture, the Literary Course, and the Normal Course. Additionally, he instituted co-education (between 1872 and 1885). Purnell helped keep the college afloat during a time of severe economic and political turmoil. A lack of public support expressed through funding, declining enrollment, and political maneuvering led to Purnell’s eventual resignation (Purnell fought for the Union in the American Civil War, whereas Delaware’s state government was dominated by those with Southern sympathies).

In the Delaware College Faculty minutes of October 12, 1885, it is recorded with little fanfare that the faculty “decided to abolish the Literary Course.” What exactly is this literary

¹⁰⁶ It was also at this time that the college entered into the relationship with the state of Delaware that it still had to this day. Delaware College, now the University of Delaware, is fifty percent public and fifty percent private. This agreement allowed the trustees at the time to retain some control over the college but also allowed the state to receive and dispense the federal funds acquired through the 1862 Morrill Act.

course and what, if anything, does it have to do with literature? As the literary course was primarily intended for the women of the school, when the college dropped their co-educational program they dropped the Literary Course of study.

The 1884 catalogue (the 1885 catalogue is missing from the archives) describes the course as “specially designed for young ladies, and, therefore [...] time is allowed for music” (10). This course of study “included fewer classes in the languages than the classical course, omitting the Greek requirement altogether, and it included fewer courses of a technical nature than the scientific and agriculture courses, which were combined in 1873” (Munroe, Chapter 5). This is important for the purposes of this dissertation because in 1873 the college finally instituted a normal course for teacher preparation which resembled the literary course, except for the fact that it did not require foreign language instruction, but instead required “instruction in the higher essentials of a thorough English education and in the best and most approved Methods of Teaching” (quoted from the catalogue in Munroe, Chapter 5). In 1880 all courses of study were extended to four years (Munroe, Chapter 5). The Literary Course appears to have been designed for female students as a less rigorous version of the “standard” male oriented college course. The purpose of these courses is somewhat unclear. As first, I thought that the “literary course” would have something to do with literature, but it seems to be a general kind of liberal arts training. This is in contrast to the classical or engineering courses. When the college eventually discontinued co-education in 1885, the literary course was dropped from the catalogue. Although in theory anyone could have signed up for both the Literary and the Normal courses, it appears that they were designed to raise enrollment and tuition dollars by exploiting a new, female student population. Teaching school was one of the few jobs easily available for women during this era.

A student completing the Literary Course was eligible for a Bachelor of Literature, but not for a Master of Arts. Only students completing the Classical Course were eligible for this degree. According to the 1884 catalogue, to receive an MA, a student must continue his studies for an additional three years, maintain a good moral character, and “write a satisfactory thesis and submit the same to the President of the Faculty” (10).

Page 18 of the 1884 catalogue gives its readers a rare description of the offerings under “English Language and Literature,” taught by then president Purnell (18). This includes writing or composing as well as the study of formal literature. A class with this name was offered during the first semester of the Sophomore year for students in all three curricula. This entry, however, is a general description of how the subject matter was taught and disseminated throughout the college. The description reads “Students are impressed with the importance of becoming thoroughly acquainted with the structure and history of the English Language, and are made acquainted with the lives and the works of the great Authors who have written in that language.” Freshman, Sophomore, and Junior classes were required to write weekly essays and give declamation. Seniors “prepare essays and original orations to be read or spoken in the oratory in the presence of the assembled students” (18). Although students are writing often, they are writing in a context of the spoken word, they are not composing essays so much as they are preparing and practicing speeches.

Interestingly enough, the courses are named and defined by the textbooks that they use as well as by the major figures that they touch on. The catalogue reads, “The Sophomore class have Trench on the Study of Words during the first term, and English Literature (Shaw’s New English and American,) during the second term. Selections from Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton and other standard authors are read in connection with these studies” (18). There is also a list of

“Books of Reference,” but it is unclear if the students are expected to own or be able to consult this list or if the literature and writing requirements were constructed with this list. Is this for the faculty or the students? I suspect that the students were expected to have access to these texts. The books listed include “DeVere’s Studies in English; Earle’s Philosophy of English; Latham’s Hand-book of English Language; March’s Lectures on the English Language; White’s Words and their Uses; Whitney’s Life and Growth of Language; Allibone’s Dictionary of Authors; Duykinck’s Cyclopedia of American Literature; Bascom’s Philosophy of English Literature; Taine’s English Literature” (18).

Purnell was succeeded first by John Hollis Caldwell (1885-1888) and then by Lewis Potter Bush (1888). During this time, college enrollment dropped so much that the college was almost forced to close (Janssen “Purnell” 10). When Raub took office in 1888, the college was again on the brink of disaster.

5.4 THE RAUB ADMINISTRATION

Albert Newton Raub assumed the presidency of the college in 1888 and served until 1896. Raub’s years as president of Delaware College were not without controversy, serving during an exciting and ultimately productive period. As president, Raub was able to take advantage of the second Morrill Act of 1891 and the Hatch Act of 1887. The Hatch Act of 1887 called for the establishment of experimental and research agricultural stations at the land grant colleges. Most importantly, the act saw to it that funds were secured for the maintenance of these agricultural stations. Raub raised enrollment, helped get the school back on its feet financially, and helped to usher in what I take to be a new era for Delaware College. Based on my research, Raub was one

of the men who helped to germinate the seeds planted by the various governmental legislation at American colleges and universities, chief among them the Morrill Acts, helping to usher in the age of the professional academic and a research oriented humanities program.

Given Raub's corpus of textbooks, I was expecting him to emphasize English at Delaware College, but this was not necessarily the case. Although a more thorough reading of the catalogues shows the changing place of English in the curriculum, it is not the result of one particular individual or innovation. Rather, it is a slow, evolutionary process made up of small, incremental changes which become visible and meaningful when viewed cumulatively and over time. Also, it needs to be emphasized that, with records being so scarce, it is hard to say what initiatives were the work of any one man or group of men. What we do have are some pages from Raub's day book, a few reports for trustees and other interested parties, and the Faculty minutes. Since our story is mostly one of the curriculum, and hence best reflected in the course catalogues, this other material must serve a supplementary role.

For our purposes Raub is interesting not only because he was, in effect, a professional pedagogue and textbook author, but was also very interested in expanding the graduate curriculum at Delaware College. According to Munroe, "Right at the outset of Raub's presidency the trustees rejected one of his ideas, the suggestion that Delaware College (which had enrolled only sixteen students in the pre-Raub term just concluded) grant the Ph.D. degree for completion of a prescribed three-year course of readings, plus an approved thesis showing evidence of original research" (6). The board of trustee minutes do not discuss why they voted the way that they did, nor does it give any detailed explanation for why Raub made this proposal. Nothing is included in the faculty minutes either. One can only imagine that Raub wanted to increase the prestige of the school in the eyes of the public. The ability to grant a degree may

have here been understood as a marker of quality and perhaps a way to raise further revenue. That this degree was predicated on research is important because it established a connection between original research and advanced degrees at Delaware College. It should be noted that the college was not accredited by any of the agencies that then existed.

In order to raise enrollments one of the first things that the college did under Raub was to lower admission standards and offer free tuition to students from the state of Delaware. As remarked upon in his President's report, Raub also got rid of the Latin prose requirements for admission. Delaware College was in a precarious and interesting position in that its enrollments were so low. The college wanted to be the capstone in an edifice of public education in the state of Delaware, but, by the standards of the time, Delaware's public schools were notoriously under prepared and turned out students who did not have the rudiments of a classical education, hence making them unsuitable for college admission. Raub's response to this predicament was to lower standards, making due until the public schools changed. This is reflected in the curriculum as a move away from Classics and toward work done in the English language.

Two President's Reports exist from Raub's eight year term in office. The first is from March 26, 1889 and the second is from June 7, 1890.¹⁰⁷ The president's reports don't explicitly deal with issues of pedagogy, textbooks, or the place of English, but they do discuss the curriculum in general. Raub took office in 1888, after President Caldwell left under controversial circumstances, Lewis Potter Bush having served as an interim president before Raub was appointed. It is clear from the reports that Raub saw it as his job to assess the college's needs and wants and to rehabilitate it. He talks at length in the 1889 report of the lack

¹⁰⁷ Raub, Albert Newton. March 26, 1889. "President's Report." Unpublished manuscript. Contained in Hugh M. Morris Library Special Collections, George Gillespie Evans Papers, item #8352.

Raub, Albert Newton. June 7, 1890. "President's Report." Unpublished manuscript. Contained in Hugh M. Morris Library Special Collections, George Gillespie Evans Papers, item #5478.

of proper preparation that students from Delaware public schools had. The curriculum at Delaware College was changing at this time as well. The two are related. Raub writes “after July next the degree of Bachelor of Arts may be conferred on graduates of either the Classical or the Latin-Scientific Course, and that the degree of Bachelor of Science be restricted to the graduates of the General Science Course.” It is in this document that Raub recommends that Latin Prose and Cicero be dropped as an entrance requirement, “at least for the present.” It is fairly clear that this change is due to the overall changes occurring in the structure of the college.

The relationship between high schools, academies, and colleges is blurry at best. In order to show this, one need only look at the 1886 catalogue for the Academy of Newark and Delaware Normal School. Raub was principal of this institution during this time period. Under “Courses of Study” it states “The graduates of the Literary Course are prepared to enter the Sophomore year, Scientific Course, of College” (7). A student could stay an extra year and graduate ready to enter into the Junior year of college. Of the place of English in the curriculum, the author of the catalogue writes “Because of the importance of a thorough knowledge of English in a business sense as well as a means of culture, it will be the aim of the institution to give great attention to proper instruction in all the English branches, literary and scientific, these being the foundation of all business success and real culture” (10). English, or the study of literature, is still *useful* or in the service of some other goal.

5.5 CURRICULUM REFORM AS REFLECTED IN THE FACULTY MINUTES, 1892-1900

The Faculty minutes from September 8, 1893, show that twelve students were admitted to the college and that eight more were considered, but ultimately rejected. All twelve of these students had “conditions” on them in that they would have to make up a certain number of hours of coursework by a certain date in order to be considered eligible students and remain enrolled. Those who were rejected were rejected because “their conditions exceeded the number agreed upon, and were looked upon as not being ‘reasonable’ inasmuch as they made it impossible for the applicants profitably to [sic] themselves to undertake the work of the college, and no ‘good reasons’ appearing why these conditions should exist, such as lack of accessible schools...” (underlining original). English Grammar appears as a separate category from “Grammar,” which I assume means Latin grammar. Although by 1893 a student could enter one of the college courses without knowledge of Latin and Greek, he still needed them for the Classical course as well as the Latin-Scientific course. The other courses offered were Modern Languages and Science, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Agriculture.

Of these curriculum and admissions changes, Munroe writes:

In his first report to the board of trustees Raub explained that “one of the serious difficulties the Faculty have to contend with is the fact that most of the students who present themselves for admission have not the necessary training in the ancient languages ... Some who desired to enter have gone elsewhere because they could not meet the established requirements.” He recommended dropping the requirement of “Latin Prose and Cicero,” and he encouraged establishing a new program called the general scientific course, which had no Latin prerequisite. Another change was to grant the B.A. degree

instead of the B.S. to graduates of the Latin-scientific course, thus permitting the B.A. to be awarded for the first time to students who had not studied Greek. The problem, Raub explained, was that “few of the public schools to which we must look for students give any attention to Latin, and fewer still to Greek.” (ellipsis original, Munroe, Chapter 6)

Here we see that the condition of the public schools directly impacted the form of the curricula and spurred curricular reform.

Of the students listed for acceptance, six of the twelve have “Eng. Grammar” as a condition of their acceptance. None of the students rejected have English Grammar listed as a condition. I show this in order to demonstrate that a lack of knowledge of English Grammar was not considered such a handicap as to stop someone from getting into the college. The first reference to entrance examinations that I could find is in the 1874 college circular. It simply states that candidates seeking entrance to the various curricula must “be at least fourteen years of age, give satisfactory evidence of good moral character, and sustain an examination in the following studies, viz: *Arithmetic, Geography, English Grammar, History of the United States, Elements of Algebra, Latin and Greek Grammar, Greek Reader and the first two books of Xenophon’s Anabasis, Latin Reader, Sallust or Caeser, Cicero’s Select Orations, and Virgil*,--or what shall be deemed equivalent” (15). Different curricula changed or deleted some of these criteria. Although the 1874 catalogue describes “weekly exercises in English Composition” as well as “Classical Literature” lectures, there is no explicit mention of “English literature” at all in the catalogues until 1877 (15).

The Faculty minutes from September 18, 1894 show that a resolution was passed that any future students must pass “in at least six of the studies required for admission including English Grammar, Arithmetic and Elementary Algebra through quadratics.” The faculty agreed that “a

good foundation in English Grammar, Arithmetic, and elementary Algebra is indispensable to a student who expects to gain real educational benefit from any of our courses.” It is significant that the first explicit mention of this is as late as 1894.

Faculty minutes from September 20, 1897, mention, for the first time explicitly, that English Composition could be a condition of acceptance. The 1897 catalogue simply lists “English” as one of the subjects for examination (12). Faculty minutes reveal some interesting things about these entrance requirements. English must, at the very least, be made up of grammar, composition, American literature, and “literature” in general (which I can only assume is British, although possibly Classical, perhaps translated into English and perhaps not, depending on the curriculum).¹⁰⁸ On March 15, 1899, the faculty met to, among other things, consider the report from a committee which investigated making changes to the various courses of study. Of these, Section Six is most relevant to our discussion. It reads “The entrance examination in English grammar shall cover both grammar and rhetoric.” “American literature” and “literature” as entrance requirements are mentioned for the first time in the faculty minutes Nov 13 and Nov 20, 1899 respectively.

Graduate degrees were an issue being debated at Delaware College during this time period. On May 9th, 1898, the faculty minutes state:

Prof. Vallandigham made the following report which was adopted: -

“As to the thesis of Mr. Lattomus, the title and the subject matter do not agree; the style is slovenly; there are some blunders in grammar and spelling and many in punctuation;

¹⁰⁸ The faculty minutes also note that students, among them W. Owen Sypherd (who would later return to the college as a professor of English and act as a driving force behind its development at Delaware College), asked for and received permission to stage “Julius Caesar.” (Feb. 17, 1896)

there is a failure to cite authorities, and there is no evidence that the writer gave any serious investigation to his subject.

I recommend that the thesis be declared unsatisfactory and returned to the author with the suggestion that he treat exhaustively some part of the subject, and accompany a new thesis with a full citation of authorities.”

This was the only mention of a master’s thesis, successful or not, in the faculty minutes between 1892 and 1900.¹⁰⁹ I take it to mean that unless other graduate degrees were conferred and not recorded in the faculty minutes, between March of 1892 and January of 1900, only one graduate thesis was submitted.¹¹⁰ Vallandigham was “Professor of the English Language and Literature, and Political Science” (1897 catalogue), so one could assume that Lattomus’ thesis was in one of these areas.

This rejected thesis must have sparked some kind of conversation, because the following meeting, May 16th, 1898, Dr. Manning “bought up the matter of the Second Degree.” Vallandigham suggested that the president and a committee of his choosing review the degree requirements and make any necessary changes. The new language, little changed from the old read:

Such person as have taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts or that of Bachelor of Science, at this or at any other college where the requirements for these degrees are equal to those at this college, may become candidates for the degree of Master of Arts, or that of Master of Science, upon completing one year’s study in any department, or departments of the

¹⁰⁹ Raub, however, does make note of a successfully completed MA awarded to Rev. Harvey Ewing, a graduate of the Classical curriculum in his President’s Report of June 7, 1890.

¹¹⁰ At this time the college is not offering Ph.D degrees. The Faculty Minutes from February 10, 1896 read, in part, “A letter from the Rev. Edward Eckel of the Class of ’86 inquiring concerning upon which the College would confer the degree of Ph.D. the secretary was instructed to inform Mr. Eckel that the College had not a course for the degree of Ph.D.”

College; and on presenting a thesis giving evidence of scholarly and original work. (May 23, 1898)

Later, on June 13, 1898, some of this language was amended to include an “approved course of study,” which meant that the faculty were able to exert more control over the few graduate students and had to approve of their course of study and specialization.

In many cases the courses of study seemed to have been organized around textbooks. At this time textbooks are still very important. Even at the college level this seems to be the case. Interestingly, the faculty minutes of Nov 27, 1899 reflect this:

Joseph Frazer of Newark, Del., applied for admission to Freshman class, C. E. course. A certificate from Principal Ellis of Newark High School was read, in which he states “that Joseph Frazer has completed Wentworth’s geometry (plane) and algebra; Raub’s arithmetic and the larger part of Brooks’ higher; Raub’s rhetoric and has been writing compositions for two years; Raub’s grammar, Barnes’ history; Steele’s physiology [...]

5.6 PRIMARY SOURCES OTHER THAN MINUTES AND CATALOGUES

As to how the textbooks may have been used, on the other hand, that is a different story. In George A. Harter’s “copybook” (president of the college from 1896 to 1914) the following appears in a letter sent to John C. Stockby on September 22, 1897. He writes:

I watched with some concern the work of our Freshman class this year in the History of the English Language and was greatly pleased to find that the results justified the selection of the character of training work by Dr. Manning. This year he has adopted an abridged and simplified edition of the same book, and he expects even better results. I

confess the somewhat spiney [sic] character of the skeleton presented by a cursory glance at the book looks formidable for a Freshman's undertaking, but when clothed with flesh and blood by the help of a competent and enthusiastic teacher it has proved a fruitful story. All the language work of the college contributes to its interest and it in turns offers a unifying thread to run through our entire linguistic training. It is by no means the repellent subject it would appear upon first glance [...]

This fragment of a letter emphasizes the importance of textbooks and the importance of how a teacher presents the material. This is why I focus on the representation of teaching only. The historian of education is faced with a paucity of some materials and an overabundance of others. Only certain things are saved; only certain things can be saved. One learns to work with what one has and make conclusions, however tentative they may be.

As was stated before, primary materials from Raub's time period and before are rather sparse and somewhat haphazard. Sources which illustrate day to day, actual classroom practices or even more rare. One of the few surviving, documents, however is a handwritten manuscript entitled "Rhetoric-Freshman 3/39/82."¹¹¹ This appears to be a handwritten list of forty questions asking students to describe, explicate, and provide examples of and from British literature, both poetry and prose. Towards the end of the document the questions turn away from the analysis of literature and more toward the elements of elocution, debate, and oral composition. Whether it was produced by a student or the teacher is unknown. Certain key words appear to be underlined, like "feet," "epigram," "Spenserian stanza," "rhyme," and "blank verse," just to name a few. Shakespeare and his works do appear on this list in a few places. Specifically, Shakespeare appears in the following three, numbered questions: "(22. Describe the verse of (a)

¹¹¹ No author is listed. The document is contain in Delaware University Archives/William Ditto Lewis Papers, scrapbook 1882-1884, item 1882-5.

Spencer, (b) Shakespeare, & (c) Milton. (23.) Quote half dozen lines from Henry VIII [unreadable] feet and describe each line” and “32. Name three distinguishing marks of the poetical in composition. Quote from Shakespeare in illustration of this point.” What this document exactly is is unknown, but it is clear that the study of Shakespeare’s plays, in some form, was being taught at Delaware College in 1882 in a freshman “Rhetoric” class.

Based on the 1881 catalogue, President Purnell himself was probably responsible for teaching this course (22). Purnell may have been an experienced and practiced orator, given his long career in politics and the law, but he held an MA from Delaware College and did not hold any specialized or advanced degrees in English or publish any books on the subject. When the language, the shape, content, and form of the questions themselves, is compared with that found in textbooks from the period (see chapter three of this dissertation), the similarities are striking. It matches in form and style with the questions often found appended to chapters in literature textbooks. In fact, it reads as if the questions had been taken directly from a textbook or textbooks and assembled for use in the document. What this is exactly and how it was intended to be used is also unknown. An exam? A list of study questions? It is certainly comprehensive enough to be a semester’s final examination. Since the document is entitled “Rhetoric,” this indicates that formal literary consideration and historical periods in literature were considered under this rubric. This makes sense given the time period; “English” as a discipline was still in its infancy all over the country and especially at Delaware, and not as yet specialized to the extent it would be in the late 1890’s. An examination of the college catalogues later in the chapter will also reveal this.

What is clear from this document in terms of its style and context is that the textbook, considered as a genre, exerted an influence over classroom practices. This is supposition on my

part, but I would not be surprised to learn that his teacher relied heavily on a textbook or was certainly influenced by one or more (perhaps all the more possible given Purnell's lack of specialization). There are too many similarities for it to be coincidence.

Materials from later dates, especially after 1900, are much more plentiful comparatively. Edgar Dawson, hired after Vollandigham left and listed in the 1903 catalogue as "Professor of the English Language and Literature, and Political Science," wrote an article in the Delaware College Bulletin in December of 1904 entitled "College Entrance Requirements in English." Dawson held an MA from the University of Virginia and a PhD from Leipsic (this Ph.D. from a German university is significant, as the section on the college catalogues reveals). Delaware College was an extremely small school, and in many ways lagged behind other colleges (as with accreditation). But the very factors that may have detracted from the prestige of the college make it a useful site on which to conduct a case study. Changes both small and large can be tracked and productively traced out.¹¹²

Dawson's purpose in writing this document was to not only prepare perspective students as to the scope and requirements of the English portion of the entrance exam, but also to push Delaware high schools to adopt these as recommendations for courses of study preparatory to college. It is instructive and important that Dawson begins his article by showing the history of college English (in his introductory paragraph) to be chaotic and completely dis-unified. Different colleges, according to Dawson, had different expectations and requirements, while

¹¹² Delaware was a very small college. According to Bockrath, for example, between 1870 and 1885, only 292 students enrolled at the college, which averages out to approximately 20 students per year. Of these, almost half (41.44%) enrolled in the Scientific and Agriculture course (42). The Literary Course and the Classical Course were a close second and third respectively. Although these numbers would change as the college developed, it remained primarily devoted to science and agriculture. This is to be expected in a state with as small a population as Delaware and with such a focus on agriculture. If one looks at the places of publication for the college catalogues and bulletins, one sees that the first one actually printed in Delaware is dated 1870. Prior to this date, all of the college's materials were printed in Philadelphia. I suspect that this is a testament to the economic and technological development of the state before and after the American Civil War.

different schools taught a variety of approaches. What to me is extremely fascinating, relevant to the debate over higher education today, and worthy of further study is the lengthy discussion of the proper role of colleges in the process of remediation. Although it is never named as such, this is clearly what is going on. A debate over the role of high schools and colleges in teaching the “basics,” what these basics are or should be, and how best to teach them, ranges all over the archives. If we look today at the debates surrounding basic writing instruction in colleges today, we see a similar debate. Just as a little historical work reveals that there has always been a literacy “crises” (that every generation worries about the “declining” literacy of the succeeding generation) it would appear that the relationship between colleges and high schools and the role of “under prepared” students and college remediation classes has been raging for some time, at least as long as high schools and colleges occupied their the positions relative one another and the rest of society that they do in our contemporary moment. As has been demonstrated with Newark Academy and Delaware College, prior to the 1890’s (sometimes earlier, sometimes later, depending on the place) the borders between public and private schools on the one hand and colleges on the other were extremely blurry. Dawson writes “the latter [schools] were attempting much that was beyond their sphere and neglecting some things that they should have done thoroughly, while the former [colleges] saw themselves handicapped and their standard lowered because they were compelled to piece out the foundations that ought to have been taken care of by the schools” (1).

Dawson goes on to write that the current entrance requirements grew out of a conference was held “about ten years ago” (which would place it in approximately 1893) (1). These requirements are “endorsed and recommended” by “the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of

the Middle States and Maryland, the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, the North Central Association of Teachers of English, the Association of colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, etc.” (1). It is interesting to note that these groups serve as a governing body as such. Colleges are beginning to police themselves, producing standards, governing bodies, etc. These are hallmarks of a growing professionalization.

The bulk of the pamphlet appears to be directed toward high school and preparatory school teachers and, perhaps, concerned parents. It discusses many of the various goals and methods that a high school teacher might use to prepare his or her students for entrance into college. Dawson also is clear to emphasize that college preparation is not antithetical to the general knowledge that any high school attendee (graduate or not) would need in life (2). With this in mind, Dawson explains that in addition to rhetoric (understood as the rules of composition) and literature, all students should be able to write clear and mechanically correct prose.

One demonstrates this by passing a written exam. The list of books for the actual 1905 exam looked like this:

For study and practice, Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*; Burke’s *Speech on Conciliation with America*; Macaulay’s *Essay on Milton* and *Essay on Addison*; Milton’s *Lycidas*, *Comus*, *L’Allegro*, and *Il Penseroso*.

For reading and practice: Addison’s *Sir Roger de Coverly Papers* in *The Spectator*; Goldsmith’s *The Vicar of Wakefield*; Coleridge’s *The Ancient Mariner*; Scott’s *Ivanhoe*; Tennyson’s *The Princess*; George Eliot’s *Silas Marner*; Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* and *Julius Caesar*; Carlyle’s *Essay on Burns*; Lowell’s *The Vision of Sir Launfal*. (2-3)

Dawson then goes on to present what an actual exam might look like:

Questions for an Entrance Examination Paper in English.

(1) Describe using not more than three lines for each, the following characters:

Banquo, Comus, Portia, Godfrey Cass, Rowena.

(2) Which of the books mentioned in the “Requirements” have you read? Which did you like best? Why did you like it?

(3) Of each of the following works, name the author, tell in what century he lived, name one of his contemporaries and mention one important work by the contemporary: *The Princess*, *Comus*, *The Merchant of Venice*.

(4) Tell why *L’Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* should be studied together.

(5) Why did Shakespeare introduce the witches into his play *Macbeth* [sic]?

(6) Write a composition of not less than three hundred words on some subject connected with one of the books mentioned in the “Requirements.” If no subject occurs to you select one of the following: Shylock’s Discomfiture, Caesar’s Death, The Ancient Mariner’s Story.

(Your composition will be judged for neatness, unity, paragraphing, sentence structure, choice of words, punctuation, grammar and spelling. Add at the end a note saying which one of the four types of composition you have used.)

(Extra). You may substitute for any question except number three or number six, one hundred lines of poetry that you may have memorized from the “Requirements.”

(8)

As with the “Rhetoric-Freshman” manuscript from 1882, this entrance examination resembles, to a great extent, the literature textbooks of the late nineteenth century. The questions

resemble those found at the end of chapters. Again, the style and content of the textbook as a genre seemed to have exerted a profound effect on teaching and the formation of the discipline as evidenced by these various documents. Although it is difficult to say if this is a causal relationship (i.e. textbook styles caused these admission standards to be phrased in these ways), it certainly demonstrates some hitherto unremarked upon relationship.

In 1908 W. Owen Sypherd and George S. Messersmith approached the issue of student preparedness for college. Sypherd published “English in High School and College” in the April 1908 Delaware College Bulletin. Together with Messersmith, principal of the Newark Delaware School system, Sypherd published “The High School Course in English” in November of 1908. The two works are, as one might expect, very similar. Sypherd began his single authored article with:

The large increase in the number of students at Delaware College this year has made very evident the need of active co-operation between teachers of English in the high schools and the college [...] [the college] did accept [...] students who were markedly deficient in their knowledge of literature and also in their ability to write correct English. As a result of this inefficient preparation, the first year at college is necessarily given up to instruction in certain elementary aspects of composition, such as spelling, grammar, punctuation, and sentence construction. In other words, the college is doing high school, and in many instances grammar school, work in English. (3)

As for why this is the case, there are several reasons. The one most relevant to this dissertation, however, is the following:

Even within the sphere of English Literature itself, so much ground is supposed to be covered, so many books must be read and studied, that teachers too often, it must be

admitted, fail to accomplish the one essential thing—ability on the part of the pupil to express in correct English, either oral or written, the precise meaning of the literature studied, even if the ground covered should be but one-tenth of the broad stretch of country surveyed. (3)

According to Sypherd, English, as a discipline taught in high schools, is too broad and expansive. This is connected to the disciplinization of English. By way of improving the teaching of English in high schools Sypherd offers the following:

one realizes perfectly well that the desired improvement in the English training in our schools depends largely on the attitude of those who have this work directly in hand. In order to make their English work efficient and practical, teachers must be willing to sacrifice, if necessary, pleasant for unpleasant labour [sic]. Composition work is often drudgery. Yet, unless this dull, tedious, and often deadening part of the work in English is attended to, the result, in every instance, will be unsatisfactory. It is much more pleasant to study with a class the aesthetic aspects of a great piece of literature, such as Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, or Milton's Comus than to read patiently, with an eye open for errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, etc., compositions written by immature minds on subjects often uninteresting to the reader. (4)

For Sypherd, composition, whether oral or written, seems to be the key not only to clear, correct, and articulate writing, but also to an understanding of literature as well. Sypherd wants teachers to respond with written comments as well as suggests holding one on one conferences. He describes in detail a curriculum for the primary school grades, one through seven, and high school. Compositions should be assigned, according to Sypherd, at least once a week. Sypherd ends his pamphlet by giving the requirements in English for admission to Delaware College. By

1908 it seems that the exam has changed somewhat. Although the core set of books remains roughly the same (same authors, with some works staying the same and others added), the text informs its readers that in 1909, 1910, and 1911, ten books can be chosen off a list for additional questions. This is the difference between books for “Study” and books for “reading.”

Another fascinating document is the textbook in two parts produced by “Wilbur Owen Sypherd, PH.D. and George Elliott Dutton, A.M.,” both of the Delaware College English Department. The book, English Composition for College Freshman is divided into two volumes, Part I Principles and Part II Specimens (both printed in 1915). Sypherd and Dutton give examples of the different kinds of compositions by providing brief examples of both student writing and published pieces, excerpted from classics, short stories, magazine articles, etc. Sypherd and Dutton state that all writing can be grouped into four categories, exposition, argumentation, description, and narration. (They assert that one piece of writing might be classified multiple ways, but its chief aim will fall into one of these categories.) On pages two and three of Part I, the authors inform their readers that for writing to be “effective,” the writer must have three things: 1. a definite purpose to their writing and a definite audience, 2. a thorough knowledge of their subject, and 3. an understanding of technique. Sypherd and Dutton purport to give the student writer technique. Although the writing instruction is rather formulaic, it is instructive to see that was taught in composition classes. This gives us a potential insight into how Sypherd, at the very least, taught Composition at Delaware. The specimens include an Appendix which gives forms for letter writing as well as a brief Appendix of “Impromptus” materials.

If we leap ahead to 1939, we can see that the school had become firmly entrenched in the professionalized world of academics and defined by its research agenda. It had become the

University of Delaware in 1921. The University News from February, 1939 published part of a survey which was commissioned by the Board of Trustees to evaluate the university. Under the section entitled “Arts and Science,” five statements are listed (2). The first four have to do with the curriculum, the number and quality of offerings, and the quality of work being produced by students. The final comment reads as follows: “5. The total number of scholarly articles, treatises, etc. produced by the faculty is less than at other state universities but some members have a creditable record of production.”

The goals of the college, the ways in which it measures success, have professionalized by this point and are more similar when compared to contemporary universities. The faculty have changed as well in response to this shift in emphasis. W. Owen Sypherd, who taught at the college from 1907 to 1947 and even briefly served as President of the University from 1944 to 1946, was the first professional, English academic at Delaware College. With an M.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard, he actively pursued research throughout his career and published scholarly books and articles. Dawson also had an earned Ph.D., but he did not publish scholarly work in the way Sypherd did. Over the course of his career Sypherd published six books on scholarly subjects, mostly on the influence of the King James bible in English literature, eight articles which appeared in scholarly journals, and three textbooks on composition and technical writing.¹¹³ The records on Dawson and Vollandigham are not as complete, but a search of the OCLC records on WorldCat reveals that Vollandigham did publish several articles and at least one book. The articles, mostly magazine pieces about local or family history which focus on life during the American Civil War, were published in magazines like Putnam’s Monthly. The book, Delaware and the Eastern shore; some aspects of a peninsula pleasant and well beloved, appears

¹¹³ “Biographical Sketch W.O. Sypherd” contained in the University of Delaware Archives.

to be a travel guide of sorts. None of the listed publications treats literature directly. Dawson, who earned his Ph.D. from Leipzig, has an impressive life long publication record, but these focus primarily on social studies and civics. We must remember that Dawson's official appointment was as professor of English and political science. The only publication remotely connected to English literature is Byron und Moore, published in German in 1902. I suspect that this was his doctoral dissertation.¹¹⁴

Sypherd, on the other hand, is a professional, publishing, research oriented academic. Certainly, he taught continuously during this time and the various obituaries and other articles about his life that I saw laud his teaching ability, but this is not inconsistent with his professionalized identity. Here is an example of why Delaware's small size is a comparative asset to this study. Although resources and archival materials may be rarer than at a University of Pennsylvania, for example, it is easier to track small and large changes and shifts in the culture at Delaware. I can say with great confidence, since Sypherd almost certainly was the entire English department when he was hired, that the shift from an older pre-disciplinary model of English instruction to the more research driven, contemporary one occurred in 1907.

Sypherd's 1907 Studies in Chaucer's Hous of Fame certainly establishes him as a modern, professional academic. It is a dense text, comprised of four large parts, which when read together constitute an argument about the influences on Chaucer of "Old French love-vision literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries" (v). In his Preface, Sypherd states that his book is essentially his 1906 Harvard dissertation. The book is complex and speaks to a specialized audience. This kind of text, an expert speaking to other experts, may not be new to 1907, but its use as an indices of professional development as a scholar, I would argue, is (at

¹¹⁴ Munroe writes "Dawson left in 1906 for Princeton and then Hunter College, where he made a national reputation for leadership in the teaching of social studies" (6).

least at Delaware College). Rolfe, for example, may have been writing learned volumes about Shakespeare, but his audience is primarily a public one. Sypherd, on the other hand, is making an argument that, in order to follow, one needs highly specialized knowledge of Latin, French, Italian, and English languages and poetic traditions. It is densely quoted and cross referenced with other scholarly texts and arguments. It is this cross referencing that marks it, in part, as a “scholarly” book.¹¹⁵

5.7 CHANGES IN CURRICULA AS REFLECTED IN BULLETINS AND CATALOGUES

When we look at the college catalogues from between 1837 and 1911, we see the very gradual specialization of English in the curriculum. The institution became Newark College in 1834. As the study and teaching of English literature becomes more and more of a discipline and profession, we can see how this impacts on the research model and its effects on the nascent and burgeoning field.

Catalogues are to the college what textbooks are to the classroom and teacher/pedagogy. They are one way of portraying things, but a limited way, a way that cannot take into account the

¹¹⁵ Sypherd’s 1921 The English Bible: Being a Book of Selections from the King James Version reads almost like a textbook. This is intentional on the part of Sypherd. He writes “An attempt has been made to present these parts of the Bible in the form of a modern book of poetry and prose, with marginal and center headings to assist in an easy comprehension of the subject matter on the part of students in school and college and of the general reader in the home” (i). He continues, “the editor has endeavoured [sic] conscientiously to present what seems to be the generally accepted results of modern Biblical scholarship” (ii). Each of the sixty six books of the Old and New Testament bibles that Sypherd presents is introduced by a brief “Explanatory Note.” It is here that he gives his précis of biblical research and presents the difficulties or problems with a book. This text reads almost like a Shakespeare volume. In presenting his edited versions of the books of the bible, Sypherd is presenting as a seamless whole an entire editorial tradition. As a textbook, this may not qualify as scholarly work, but it is his interpretation of scholarly work for the public.

dynamic nature of a college, the give and take of committee meetings, the conflicts and struggles being played out amongst the faculty, trustees, and students. Still, it is a valid way to represent the college, especially in the sense that it was meant to be a public representation

An examination of the catalogues reveals, as we have seen, that English is in subservient position at Newark/Delaware College.¹¹⁶ In terms of pedagogy, we see that in the 1837-38 “Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Newark College,” in a section describing a senior Forensic class that the “**Mode of Instruction**” will be, “by text-books, lectures, and familiar remarks and illustrations on each lesson recited. Particular care is taken to teach correct, natural and impressive elocution, especially in the public delivery of original compositions” (emphasis original, 14).

The records are not complete and there are several tantalizing pieces of information that appear. For example, in the 1874 “Circular of Delaware College” several lecturers are listed, Page 6 “Lecturers, 1874-75. (In addition to the Members of the Faculty.)” The ones relevant to this study are “Sam’l W. Murphy, A.M., M.D., Rugby Academy, . . . Wilmington, Del. Subject:-*The English Language*” and “Prof. W. L. Boswell, . . . Philadelphia. Subject:--*Shakespeare*” (italics original). No other information is provided. Who were these men and what did they do? They may have taught something akin to a class or they may have simply delivered a lecture or series of lectures on their chosen topic. Based on my reading of announcements for similar sorts of lectures in the school newspaper, I suspect that these were public lectures delivered on campus for the educational and cultural benefit of the students. In that sense, then, they exist

¹¹⁶ Bulletins of the college and catalogues examined for this chapter range between and include the years 1837 to 1911, excluding 1836-37, 1840-41, 1849-50, 1853-54, 1856-57 thru 1869-70, 1876, 1879, 1882, 1885. The excluded catalogues are not in the University of Delaware archives and extant copies are unknown.

extracurricular-ly, but they are listed in the catalogue, thus imparting them some sort of official identity.

In the 1888 catalogue, the first year that Raub served as president, there is a section entitled “Remarks on Methods of Instruction.” The first department listed is “1. English Language and Literature,” which was taught by Raub himself. The description is as follows:

The studies in this department consist of Rhetoric, Study of Words, English Classics, and English Literature. In the study of Rhetoric proper, practice is united with theory, and ample exercise is given to the student in selection, criticism, and construction.

In the study of English Classics the student is trained to give a thorough analysis and criticism of some of the most important productions of both British and American authors, thus making a practical application of the principles of grammar and rhetoric previously learned.

In the rhetorical exercises, the Freshman class is limited to declamations and essays; the Sophomore, to essays and arguments; the Junior, to arguments and orations; the Senior, to orations. (21).

This brief description constitutes the entire description, which would remain unchanged until 1897. The first mention of the phrase “English literature” that I could find in the catalogues is in 1874, in the sophomore year of the Classical Course curriculum.

Although I am positive that literature was being taught in various capacities, as well as composition, rhetoric, oration, and elocution (as evidenced from the catalogues and archival sources cited earlier), there is no explicit listing for a professor of English language or literature until the 1891 catalogue. A professor of “English and Economic Science” is listed, but no name

is associated with it. It is possible that the position was not filled at the time of printing.¹¹⁷ The position, however, is not listed among the faculty in the 1892 catalogue. We do see a gradual specialization in other areas of the humanities, though. For example, in the earlier catalogues there is often a listing for a professor of “Modern languages,” but as time progresses this becomes a separate Professor of French, of German, etc. Not much in the catalogue changes between 1888 and 1897.

1897, however, appears to be a watershed year for the college. George A. Harter, a math and physics professor, was president, having assumed the office in 1896 (succeeding Raub). He would serve until 1914. The 1897 catalogue lists on page 32 “Methods of Instruction. English Language and Literature.” Under this heading is the sentence, “The studies in this department include Rhetoric, Composition, the History of the English Tongue, and Literature.” Edward Vallandigham, Ph.B., is listed in the catalogue as “Professor of the English Language and Literature, and Political Science” (6). Vallandigham was hired for the 1897 academic year. Rhetoric and the history of the English language are studied the first year, along with Composition. American and British literatures are studied in the sophomore year. The reader is told that the “object aimed at during the required course in American and English Literature is to cultivate a taste for the best reading rather than to cumber the memory with names, dates and mere biographical details concerning the masters of literature” (32). The description goes on to say, “A considerable amount of reading is required during this part of the course, and the lectures are made short in order that there shall be time for reading and discussion in class.” After the sophomore year, the study of literature is optional and the focus is on studying “the great masters

¹¹⁷ This is the theory of Ian Janssen, Assistant Archivist during the summer of 2004 and 2005, at the University of Delaware Archives.

and of the history and philosophy of literature” (32). By this time it seems as if textbooks are being supplanted by the reading of primary texts.

1897 is also the first year that a “Detailed Explanation of the Requirements for Admission” is listed. I do not think this is an accident. The two appear to be connected. In terms of English language and literature, candidates were expected to demonstrate a “fair knowledge” of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and “rhetorical form” (13). In terms of literature, students were told that they would have to “give evidence of acquaintance” (probably in written form) with works by Irving, Poe, Hawthorne, Bryant, Wadsworth, Longfellow, Holmes, and Whittier, as well as their biographies and information pertaining to their historical contexts.

1897 is the first time since 1891 that a professor of English is named as such. Much of the legwork of the hire would have been done in 1896, the year that Raub resigned. There is another professor of Modern Languages, Eugene W. Manning, MA, PhD who also teaches for the university. It is possible to speculate that Raub had a hand in the hiring of these individuals, given his desire and, indeed, explicit mission to modernize and reinvigorate the college. We cannot forget that Raub wanted to begin offering PhD degrees at Delaware College. Granted, this was certainly a way to boost the prestige of the school, but it could also be interpreted as a desire to become like the other colleges in the United States, to modernize in the sense of curriculum and degree granting. In 1897, “Elocution and Oratory” are listed as a separate department from English (6). English is now coming into its own as a discipline at Delaware College.

1900 is another watershed moment for the college, at least as far as the catalogues are concerned and represent it. In the “English Language and Literature” section, under “Methods of Instruction” on page 37 it reads:

Nearly all the work in this department is elective after the Sophomore year. The instruction is partly by text book and partly by lectures. In the case of Literature, both of these are subordinated to the reading of the great masters, British and American. The object aimed at during the required course in Literature is to cultivate a taste for the best reading rather than to cumber the memory with names, dates and mere biographical details. (37)

There is no mention of the freshman year course of study, so, by reference to past and present catalogues and the pamphlets published by Sypherd and Dawson, one can infer that this is devoted to remedial work and composition and rhetoric. The sophomore year is devoted to “Reading masters in American literature” like Franklin, Cooper, Emerson, Whitman, and “living writers,” just to name a few. The British section of the course starts with Chaucer and comes up to the contemporary moment, with “Brooke’s Primer of English Literature as an adjunct. History of the English Language once a week” (37). The purely elective junior year course warrants some attention here because of its explicit connection to Shakespeare. “Full term given to reading and study of Shakespeare. Like treatment of other masters, with critical readings and brief lectures. Lectures on development of the English sonnet, essay, drama, and novel [...] with illustrative readings and special studies of influence and tendencies” (37).

Edward Vollandigham is still “Professor of the English Language and Literature, and Political Science” in 1900 (1900 7). Bear in mind that the entire college has a faculty of 13 at this point. The senior class numbers only 15. In 1899-1900, there are four graduate students listed at the college. One of them, George McIntire, is listed as studying “French, German, Anglo-Saxon and English Literature” (88). Once again, Delaware College is a small and somewhat backward place. But, that is in part what makes it interesting. It is not a trendsetter or

innovator like Harvard or the University of Pennsylvania. Delaware is not an explicitly influential institution, and because of it, we can see how it may have been trying to emulate these other places. Delaware College was not breaking new ground or innovating. Instead, it was trying to catch up.

1902 is the first year that English Composition is listed as a separate course of study. It appears that Delaware students took mandatory composition classes until their senior year, when it was elective. Freshman and Sophomore years were taken up by “Lectures on Theory of Composition” with compositions (“themes”) written in class and out of class every two weeks. Junior year called for a “special study of prose style in master, British and American,” along with more theme writing (37). The senior year elective course was “directed toward a critical study of style with special reference to ease” (37).

The 1903 catalogue continues the trend found in the 1902 catalogue, with a more detailed description of the types of writing students would be doing in their courses. Here, the junior year seems more devoted to philology, and the elective, senior year course is a “study of the development of English poetry during the first term; the Poetry of the Romantic Era in the second; and the nineteenth Century Essay in the third” (30). Another course, only offered during the first term of the year focused on the “Development of the English Short Story.” The school year was split into three terms at this time.

By 1904 the description of the English courses at Delaware was becoming quite elaborate and textbooks were listed for each section of study. These catalogue descriptions have a modern feel to them. The catalogue describes the different courses of study in English that a Delaware College student would have to take through their four years at the college. “Composition and Rhetoric” is still required of all students their freshman year. “The object of this Course,” reads

the description, “is to enable the student to express himself simply, clearly and accurately, and to get the whole truth from correct English prose” (29). Themes were to be written on a weekly basis and the “laboratory method is pursued exclusively” (29). As for the required textbooks, “*Genung’s Working Principles of Rhetoric*” and “*Rhetorical Analysis*,” they are to be “used for reference and to unify the teaching” (29). Recitations were to be devoted to discussing the students’ writing and studying classic examples of prose. The textbooks appear to be an integral part of the course because “The student [...] is constantly referred to page and paragraph of the Rhetoric for rule and explanation thus referred to” (29). Once again, although it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the exact extent of the influence, it seems clear that textbooks exerted a strong influence on course offerings.

The 1904 catalogue continues into the sophomore year, stating that all students, except engineers, were required to take “Literature and Advanced Rhetoric,” the object of the course being “to enable the student to comprehend and appreciate Literature” (29). Students were expected to study and write examples of “Description, Narration, Exposition and Argumentation” (29). The second term of the year is devoted to the study and analysis of “Poetics.” The third and final term in the sophomore year consists of a review of the different defining “epochs of English Literature” and the reading of representative texts. The textbooks for this class are listed as “Besides those used by the Freshman class, *Baker’s Specimens of Argumentation*, *Pancoast’s Standard English Poems* and *Simond’s History of English Literature*” (29).

Junior year students, except for those in Agriculture or engineering, had to take “Introduction to the Study of the Development of the English Language” (29). Here students are given a short course on what amounts to “the elementary principles of Philology” and would

have written two “essays” and several “shorter papers” (exactly what constitutes an essay as opposed to a theme or a “shorter paper” is unknown) (30). The third term of this year consists of, “Shakespeare. This means the study of Shakespeare, not books about Shakespeare. Three plays are studied in class, three out of class, and a number of others are read. The professor gives informal lectures on the history of the drama and the author’s life and times, requiring reading in English history as parallel. One essay” (30). The textbooks listed in the 1904 catalogue are “*Smith’s Old English Grammar, Sweet’s Second Middle English Primer, Words and their Ways in English Speech by Greenough and Kittredge, Simond’s History of English Literature* and standard editions of the plays studied” (30). It seems that the writer of this description was reacting to something because of his emphasis on Shakespeare’s original work and “not books about Shakespeare.” It would be fascinating to know which particular editions were used in these classes and if or in what ways that was acknowledged.

As in earlier catalogues, the study of English was elective in the senior year. The course for the first term was named “The English Romantic Movement.” An elective in the second and third term focused on prose fiction before the nineteenth century (30). One essay along with substantial reading are required for this course. The textbooks listed are “*Phelp’s English Romantic Movement, Pancoast’s Standard English Poems, Perry’s Study of Prose Fiction, Simond’s History of English Literature*” (30). There is also a one term elective entitled “The Development of the English Short Story” (30). No textbooks are listed for the first and last elective courses.

Why were these courses chosen? I suspect it was because they represented some areas of expertise by the faculty. The final catalogue reviewed in detail for this project, that from 1908, shows this to some extent. Sypherd joined the faculty in 1907. It is very possible that he was the

only faculty member in the “English department.” If we compare his own publication history with the courses offered we can see this possibly in the focus on Chaucer in the Junior year course (25).

Edgar Dawson arrived in 1903. He had an M.A. from the University of Virginia and a PhD from Leipsic. The official title of his position was “Professor of the English Language and Literature, and Political Science” (6). By 1904 Dawson’s title had changed to Professor of English, History, and Logic” (6). In 1907 Sypherd arrives on campus. He is, according to my estimation and research, the first professional academic in English at Delaware College (note his publication record, previously remarked upon). Upon Sypherd’s arrival on campus, his official position is “Professor of English Language and Political Science” (6). The fact that Sypherd taught both English and Political Science probably bespeaks Delaware’s small size and limited resources at the time more than any sort of interdisciplinary or cross specialization. By 1911, he is listed only as “Professor of English” (6). English at Delaware College, soon to be the University of Delaware (in 1921), has entered into the beginnings of its modern phase.

Walter Hullahen became president of Delaware College in 1920 and left the office of the President of the University of Delaware in 1944. Delaware officially changed its charter and added the word “University” to its title in 1921. Although he had an earned Ph.D. in Classical languages from Johns Hopkins in 1900 and worked in academic institutions for most of his professional life, he did not see himself as a scholar or researcher (Munroe, Chapter 8). According to the letters and materials quoted by Munroe, he saw himself more as an administrator and businessman. What is interesting about this is that by this point in time, this distinction was already solidified. The different aspects of higher education in America, the professoriate, defined by scholarship and the administration, defined by business acumen, is

firmly entrenched. It was Hullihen who pushed for the change in the title from a college to a university (Munroe 8). Accreditation, one of the defining aspects of the modern educational institution was an issue. According to Munroe, Delaware was not on any list of accredited colleges or universities, in part, because it dared not enforce the admission standards set by the Carnegie Foundation and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Munroe, Chapter 8). By 1921, however, the college had gotten up to speed in this area and others and it was accepted on the Middle States Association's list of accredited colleges and universities in 1921.

The naming of itself as a university and the acceptance of this new role had greater implications for the institution than simply being recognized by an accrediting board and the ability to impart degrees to students. This move was the culmination of a series of changes in what is meant to "do" English on the college and university level. Looking back over the history of the University of Delaware, we can see the profound changes that this shift in the epistemological and professional identity of the college and faculty had on the institution.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The professionalization of academic practitioners as researchers with advanced degrees in American higher education changed the character of the study of English literature from one centered around moral instruction dependent on an a-contextual framing of literary material to one characterized by specialized studies dependent on interpretation. This professionalization contributed to the creation of the discipline of English literature. I argued this through a close examination of Shakespearean material in textbooks circulating in the United States of America between approximately 1850 and 1925, and in two case studies, one focused on the print history of the New Variorum Shakespeare Series and the other which looked at English at Delaware College. I further argued through these materials that pedagogy can be, and should be, seen as constitutive of a discipline.

Chapter One of the dissertation, entitled “The print history of the New Variorum Shakespeare Series,” was a case study that explored the effects of professionalization on the way that literary scholarship was conceived of and carried out by university and college academics. A subtle shift occurred from a culture of expertise to a culture of qualification. In this discussion, expertise is defined as an intimate and expansive knowledge which is the result of a direct engagement with the materials in question. Anyone could, potentially, possess this expertise. Many authors and editors, such as Furness himself, were never formally trained to be Shakespeare scholars and were primarily autodidacts. Qualification is established through

specialized research and institutional affiliation and vetting. Before academic professionalization, potentially anyone could join in the scholarly conversation about Shakespeare. The distinction between “popular” and “academic” is a result of this professionalization process. There is a change in the very definition of “scholarship,” who engaged in it, and how it was disseminated and read. This can also be understood as a question of the amateur verses the professional scholar. This shift in academic and literary culture is not dramatic so much as it is a slow movement across a continuum which correlates with chronology; as time progresses the shift becomes more and more pronounced.

Chapter Two, “Textbooks, 1850-1875,” illustrated the first part of this shift, the older, pre-professional model of studying and teaching literature in the academy. This consists largely of an a-contextual encounter with the literary material in question. Growing out of this research, this chapter also contends that pedagogy is constitutive of disciplines in that the way in which a subject is taught exerts an influence on how the field is constituted—its shape and scope. I argued that textbooks provide a valuable object of study for getting at pedagogical theory and potential practice, not only through an examination of their arrangement of materials into periods and spheres of influence, for example, but also in their pedagogical apparatuses.

Chapter Three, “Textbooks, 1875-1930,” addresses the second half of the shift, illustrating some of the effects of the changes taking place in the field due to the ongoing process of professionalization of English literature. The focus of this chapter is on the pedagogical elements and makeup of the textbooks. A textbook reader’s encounters with literature in the 1930’s are now more contextual as they are designed to foster an understanding of a field. This chapter continues to make the argument that pedagogy helps, in part, to form academic disciplines and tracks this disciplinary development through the textbooks. The chapter also

introduces the work of prolific textbook author and future president of Delaware College A. N. Raub. Raub's complex status positions him as a transitional figure, one who bridges gaps, such as those between secondary and higher education, pedagogy and research, and two different styles of studying and teaching literature (pre and post professionalization).

Chapter Four, "Curriculum reform: Delaware College and the changing role of English Studies," is the final case study, examining the impact of the professionalization of English on a state college. There we see that English literature slowly moves away from the margins of the curriculum, present but always in the service of something else, to eventually constitute its own discipline or field of study. By the end of this chapter, research became evident as a marker of what it means to be a full member of the academic profession. By this point historically the split between amateur or popular criticism and professional academic scholarship was firmly entrenched.

6.1 SHAKESPEARE

This dissertation performs a variety of work. It examines and traces (to the extent possible, given its sources) a print history of Shakespeare in American advanced textbooks that focus on literature. So what does this tell us about Shakespeare in America that we did not know before? This work is potentially important for understanding another way in which Shakespeare circulated in nineteenth and early twentieth century America *through* its systems of higher education and its potential effect on popular culture. An examination of textbooks and the impact of professionalization on the formation of English literature as a discipline adds to the discussion around the shift in Shakespeare's role in American culture. Lawrence Levine

identifies what is for me a key issue with the following statement, “By the turn of the century Shakespeare had been converted from a popular playwright whose dramas were the property of those who flocked to see them, into a sacred author who had to be protected from ignorant audiences and overbearing actors [...]” (Levine 72). This statement allows me to ask why this shift, however sudden or gradual, took place. Levine, while making a larger argument about the “cultural bifurcation” and the resulting shift in the understanding of the word “culture,” answers this specific question about the popularity of Shakespeare in a variety of ways (Levine 85). Shakespeare’s plays, Levine argues, fulfilled a specific cultural niche in America. He writes, “The profound and longstanding nineteenth-century American experience with Shakespeare, then, was neither accidental nor aberrant. It was based upon the language and eloquence, the artistry and humor, the excitement and action, the moral sense and worldview that Americans found in Shakespearean drama” (Levine 45). Levine shows his readers that tastes change, the skills and ideas an audience brings with them change, and the roles of print culture and oratory change, all resulting in the diminishment of Shakespeare’s mass appeal. Levine raises an interesting question for me through his work about the circulation of Shakespearean material in American culture. Building off of this work, a productive area of inquiry is to explore Shakespeare’s circulation in a specifically educational context.

Levine does not explicitly address this aspect of Shakespeare’s circulation in America, focusing primarily on the history of performance. It is quite possible that he sees Shakespeare’s role in the schools and colleges of America as a symptom of the cultural bifurcation he writes about and not a potential cause. I argue the opposite.

This dissertation addresses the question of the shift in the uses of Shakespeare by considering the role that changes in educational institutions played in this shift. As my

dissertation demonstrates, in some cases, Shakespeare's presentation in these textbooks was distinctly American. I argue that it was the professionalization and disciplinization of English literature in the academy which helped to push Shakespeare out of the public sphere, where his work was seen as resonating with an American ethos and sentiment, and into elite culture, where he and his work were considered "English literature." This is tied also to the discussion of qualification versus expertise which is carried on throughout the dissertation. The question becomes not only to whom does Shakespeare belong, but also who is considered qualified to discuss, teach, edit, or produce scholarship on Shakespeare. Shakespeare's passing out of the hands of the masses, and into those of the cultured elites is linked to the transformation of the professoriate to understanding themselves as producers of new knowledge via research.¹¹⁸

Of course, this is not to say that Shakespeare did not and does not still circulate in popular culture. One need only look at the myriad of references to Shakespearian drama and poetry, both direct and indirect in American popular culture, to know that Shakespeare references abound in our culture in the nineteenth century as well as the twenty first. I began this project with the idea that part of it would be to trace out how Shakespeare circulated in textbooks because it must have been an important way that Americans were exposed to that work in a textual form (even if that text was meant to be memorized, recited out loud, or performed in some manner), and I believe that this line of inquiry still has value, given the number of textbooks in circulation and the number of students attending institutions of advanced education. What has become apparent to me over the course of this dissertation, however, is that the study

¹¹⁸ I would not argue that the American university or college system necessarily has a stranglehold over the intellectual life and culture of this country (that is, "intellectual" work can and does go on outside of the rarified atmosphere of the academy), but it is in the moments that I am studying, the professionalization of the study of literature and letters, that in part must be looked at as a contributing factor to the shift of Shakespeare away from the public sphere to become the 'property' of the elite.

of textbooks as they are linked to institutions tells us, perhaps, also about how and why Shakespeare shifted to be perceived as the exclusive property of cultural elites in this country.

6.2 TEXTBOOKS, PEDAGOGY, AND COMPOSITION

The history of American higher education has been told in many ways, with different emphases, rhetorical strategies, and goals. Showing the history of American higher education through an examination of literature textbooks provides an insight into the historical questions around the development of English. Looking at literary textbooks and the representation of Shakespeare allows us to see something that is not readily apparent from looking at other forms of individual or institutional records. The study of a textbook allows us to see a proposed intersection of theory, practice, and disciplinarity by the authors, editors, publishers, and booksellers. As textbooks exist at the nexus of cultural, social, economic, and institutional forces, they potentially illustrate the impact, interplay, and interrelatedness of these forces. Examining textbooks over time reveals changes not only in the textbooks themselves, but also in the large cultural and institutional contexts.

John A. Nietz gives his readers one insight into this formation when he writes in his 1966, The Evolution of American Secondary School Textbooks that,

the literature books used in American secondary schools have gone through definite evolutionary stages: from the study of the ancient classics; to the history of literature by discussing chiefly the lives and works of English, and later also American, writers; to dealing with authors, but including excerpts or outside readings from their writings; and

finally to the use of large anthologies composed of their writings, with less attention to their lives. (42)

My dissertation confirms Nietz' findings, but it also tries to account for why this was the case and what these historical shifts in organization and practice (and, by implication theory) mean. This dissertation adds to and extends Nietz's findings by examining how these changes in textbook form, content, and organization, are tied to the development of the academic field of English literature in American universities and colleges.

Much of the research discussed in the introduction and the body of the dissertation looks in detail at American higher education and the "field" as it develops via monographs, course materials, and public statements in a variety of forms (and not intently or directly at the textbooks which might reflect these changes) *or*, like Nietz, in detail at textbooks on the various educational levels (and not directly at the intellectual, structural, and institutional developments of a given field like English¹¹⁹). If textbooks are by definition inherently pedagogical, and a university discipline or field is in many ways inherently oriented around scholarship as tied to the act of research (which is often conceived of as a solitary activity), then they are and must be separate from one another.¹²⁰ What follows from this view is that pedagogy is a secondary or ancillary extension of other parts of the field, i.e. the survey course, the introductory course, the special topics course, etc. What I wanted to do in this dissertation, however, is to make an overture, to productively point to ways in which these things might be connected. I maintain that

¹¹⁹ It should be noted, however, that this is often not the stated goal of these authors. Graff, for example, did not set out to examine textbooks. Likewise, a survey of institutional change and development was not Nietz's goal. Rather, like his 1961 Old Textbooks, Evolution explicitly takes as its goal a survey of the available textbooks in order to get a picture of what educational practices before 1900 were like. I want to understand them also as the expression of a kind of theory.

¹²⁰ Teaching is by definition a social activity. Research is understood, at least in terms of the contemporary academy, as solitary. Jointly authored or conducted studies, according to the MLA report on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, are not valued as much as single authored projects.

they *are* fundamentally connected. The connection between pedagogy and the construction and maintenance of a discipline is apparent in the literature textbooks studied for this project. This connection is an especially important one for contemporary composition specialists to study.

Contemporary compositionists should look to this formative time in the history of literature as a university discipline in order to reflect on their own, continually evolving position in the academy. The links between this historical study of the formation of the academic discipline of literature and the present moment in composition are both analogical and direct. Analogically, composition as a field is undergoing, and has undergone, similar kinds of changes. It is subject to similar kinds of institutional and curricular pressures and forces. Those in composition might learn from this study of literature in the academy the effects of these forces for epistemology, practice, and their intersection.

There is, I would argue, an advantage for recognizing this direct connection for the field of literature. The advantage of recognizing this link between pedagogy and field formation is that it opens up new areas of exploration in the classroom. It gives to work in the classroom a different kind of legitimacy than it currently enjoys in many institutions (as compared to research), yielding a different vantage point from which to view and understand classroom interactions. This vantage would understand pedagogy as potentially substantive of disciplines.

The advantage of recognizing this connection between pedagogy and field definition for composition is that it gives contemporary compositionists another way of looking at classroom practices and pedagogy as they relate to the definition of the field of composition. As composition continues to define itself in and through institutions of higher education, classroom pedagogy needs to be, and can be, central. Epistemological questions are central to this dissertation and, I would argue, to the fields of composition and literature. In terms of

disciplines though, these epistemological questions are asked and answered in institutional contexts.

Contemporary compositionists continue to ask and are continually being asked by others in the academy to reformulate the nature of their relationship to not only the larger field of “English,” but also to the entire collegiate curriculum as a whole. The status of composition as a discipline is continually shifting. Because of composition’s evolving, institutional position today, we in the field should look at the historical development of literature as an university and college discipline staffed by professionals through textbooks. Textbooks are the site where pedagogy and disciplinarity are, if not the same thing, at least simultaneously present and influencing one another. In some ways, due to the professionalization of the academy, the development of literature as a discipline may have been dependent on the split between pedagogy and research as knowledge production. My dissertation, however, argues that this dichotomy is a false one. Those who teach literature can learn from composition’s explicit connection between pedagogy and field formation, and those who teach composition can learn from literature’s institutional privileging of scholarly work. The binary, however false, may be a productive one. This research on literature textbooks attempts to show that pedagogy and research as knowledge creation are linked and as such legitimates a particular understanding of composition as both a set of practices and a body of ideas.

In other words, when a composition teacher walks into his or her classroom, or when he or she sits down to write a journal article, just what is he or she doing? How are we to value these separate, but related acts? The study of literature textbooks from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can help us to formulate an answer.

W. O. Sypherd (“Professor of English, Delaware College”) and George S. Messersmith (“Principal of Schools, Newark, Delaware”) give one answer to this question when they describe composition in their pamphlet “The High School Course in English,” published in November, 1908 in the Delaware College Bulletin. Sypherd and Messersmith write under “IV. The Teaching of Composition” that

Successful work in Composition depends first of all on the competence of the teacher [...] If there ever was a time when the English work in the high school could be given to *any* teacher, it has now passed. The English teacher must be trained for his work. He must have studied his subject thoroughly, so that he realizes the significance of all composition work—that it is a practical study and a study of the very first importance [...] Composition work, as we all know, is often wearisome and always exacting in its demands on the time and patience of the teacher; but if he expects to accomplish anything that is worth while he must be willing to accept the drudgery and the burden for the sake of the results attained. At the end of the year [...] the earnest, enthusiastic teacher will feel amply repaid if he sees that the pupil has gained the power to express with clearness and force what he thinks and feels about the things which mean so much to him.¹²¹ (6)

I reproduced this quotation at length because it embodies so many of the conflicting attitudes about composition that are prevalent in the academy even today. Composition is “of the very first importance,” and, yet, the term “practical” is here used in an almost derogatory sense. It is important and necessary, but it is also “wearisome,” “exacting,” and “drudgery.” Not just “any” teacher can do it, but who would want to? Composition is figured in this description as the preparation for advanced work of all kinds in a college or university. High school students need

¹²¹ This is a slightly different version of the characterization of composition given by Sypherd in “English in High School and College,” published in the April 1908 issue of the Delaware College Bulletin.

to learn it in order to express themselves clearly and succinctly about literature or some other, worthwhile subject. Composition on the college level, then, is automatically configured as remediation. By extension then, those who teach it are not teaching a real subject. They are not engaged in a discipline. If anything, according to this model, they are preparing students to enter the discipline of English literature. The work presented in Chapter Four of this dissertation demonstrates the evolving relationship between composition and literature as literature develops on the collegiate level.

If literature has been the object of study and investigation for a very long time, then English literature as a “discipline” is considerably younger (the first meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1883, for example, is one way to gauge this). Composition as a discipline has existed for even less time than literature (the first meeting of the College Conference on Composition and Communication having taken place in 1949). David Shumway and Craig Dionne, in Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives, define disciplines as “historically specific forms of knowledge production, having certain organizational characteristics, making use of certain practices, and existing in a particular institutional environment [...] The modern disciplines, which are necessarily inhabited by specialists, are social formations, and not merely intellectual categories or bodies of discourse” (1-2). They go on to say that disciplines in this sense are characterized and policed, *a la* Foucault, by “authority vested in an anonymous system of methods, of propositions considered to be true, of rules, definitions, techniques, and tools that may in principle be taken over by anyone who has been trained in them” (3). To see this connection, we can look, for example, at the changes in what it meant to study the works of William Shakespeare in America. We could also add to Shumway and Dionne’s definition that one effect that the professionalizing of the professoriate had on

disciplinarity is to privilege the “training” element of it above all else. The literature textbooks examined in Chapters Two and Three demonstrate that what it meant to be “trained” changes over time.

Paul Kameen writes about the issue of disciplinarity in Writing / Teaching: Essays Toward a Rhetoric of Pedagogy. Of composition as a discipline, he writes,

Composition has no textual canon in any of the customary, artifactual senses that characterize most other disciplines, or the other branches of English studies, like literature or criticism. The composition classroom tends to be constructed around less monumental kinds of texts than these. There are the ubiquitous *textbooks* for example, which lack the historical durability and intellectual standing we customarily accord to literary or even scholarly works. Or there are the “readers,” with assortments of texts that can range anywhere from a John Donne poem to an article on DNA to a business letter, none of which “belong to” composition in any necessary way [...] Because composition has no such obvious constraints, the subject of such a course can be really “anything,” which makes it appear to other specialists to be insubstantial, even irrational [...] Or there are, finally, the essays that students are producing, which, again, can be *about* anything at all that a particular student or professor or program happens to choose. In this instance, the subject is nominal and the texts that comprise the “canon” for the course are by long tradition predefined as arbitrary and unimportant. (emphasis in original, 204-205)

Kameen here describes the institutional position of composition. What is the “knowledge-as-information” that composition gives to its students (Kameen 204)? There is certainly an ever growing and expanding corpus of research on composition, both qualitative and quantitative, but

when we as teachers enter a classroom, we are not teaching this research in our first year composition courses. What are we teaching then? In my view, composition and pedagogy are intimately and inextricably tied together. We are teaching students how to read and write analytical, expository prose, but I am convinced that we are doing more than simply teaching the rules of grammar or some sort of template. Composition may be imagined to teach clear and “effective” written communication, but I do not see it as that and only that. We teach more than organization and mechanics, and, if anything, these are a byproduct of the teaching/writing process.¹²²

As the American college and university are continually evolving and redefining their work and the work of the disciplines which they house, composition and compositionists are answering this question in different ways. My response, informed by the work of this dissertation and my classroom experience, is that pedagogy is the key to understanding any discipline. Composition, though, is inherently pedagogical. A working definition is that composition is the act and self reflective teaching of writing for an academic environment. Composition as a field may be defined as the teaching of writing and the metadiscourse on the teaching of writing.¹²³

When we look at English textbooks and syllabi, whether historical or contemporary, it is easy to see that pedagogical acts are often understood as a way to *represent* the collective body of knowledge that has been previously assembled somewhere else (i.e. so that students know something about Romanticism, or the writing process, or ancient Greek drama, etc.). I maintain that pedagogical acts are more productive when understood as helping to *form* that body of

¹²² When students are asked to put these skills into practice they are asked to be kairotic, in the traditional, rhetorical sense of the term “kairos.” If we understand writing as a process which enables thinking in ways not possible verbally, as a tool of expression and thought and not simply of recording thought, then it is kairotic.

¹²³ I am indebted to Chris Warnick for his input and feedback on these ideas.

knowledge. To rehearse Kameen's question, what is the knowledge that composition creates? At one point the body of knowledge that was taught in composition was perhaps best understood as rhetoric, but I would argue that is not necessarily the case anymore. (Some, in rhetoric departments, might argue it is still the case, and we are still teaching rhetorical strategies but we are poorer for not having the names and rules at our fingertips).

6.3 POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS

As the academy continues to change and composition continues to grow and develop, as tenure becomes harder to get, as the academic job market becomes still more tenuous, as the MLA continues to debate what tenure guidelines in the humanities should be, we in composition could learn something valuable by looking at what happened in the formal study of literature.

Many of the professional organizations which represent professors of English studies and other languages and literatures, not to mention composition and cultural studies, are concerned, at the very least, about the state of academic publishing, its link to the research process, and the tenure process. This concern has been expressed by such diverse bodies as the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English and its offshoot organizations, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and The Two-Year College English Association (TYCA). At its heart, this discussion and debate is about what constitutes research or scholarship and what role this should play relative to teaching and service, either to the community or the institution, when considering tenure. Although tenure is certainly a measure of job security, it is also a measure of the long term potential for a

substantive contribution to the college, the field, or both. Philip Lewis equates the granting of tenure with deeming someone “worthy of citizenship in the academic community” (Lewis 75).

The report produced by the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion (to be officially released in December of 2006) identifies the idea that the monograph is synonymous with “research” and thus equates to tenure as one of the chief problems the academy now faces. Ernest L. Boyer, in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, concluded in 1990 that “for America’s colleges and universities to remain vital a new vision of scholarship is required [... and] if the nation’s higher learning institutions are to meet today’s urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered” (13). Boyer writes about the fact that even though research (sometimes in the form of a monograph, sometimes not) is the usual standard by which a college or university professor is judged, it may not be appropriate to all faculty at all institutions and at all times. Conversely, the opposite is true at many two year colleges which focus on teaching to the exclusion of all else. Spigelman and Day discuss this research “taboo,” as does the Two-Year College English Association in a 2004 report entitled “Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College.” Both the article and the report comment on how traditional ideas of scholarship, such as original research are often distrusted in two-year colleges as somehow taking away from the faculty’s emphasis on teaching. In much of the current discourse, teaching and research/scholarship are defined as opposites or mutually exclusive activities. Certainly Boyer, the MLA, the TYCEA, and a host of others want to complicate or deconstruct this overly simplistic binary. This dissertation speaks to the historical contingencies of this binary by showing how pedagogy is potentially constitutive of a field and not ancillary or secondary to research.

Drawing on the work of Boyer, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and others, the MLA states in their report on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion that “scholarship in the humanities constellates three activities: research, interpretation, and reflection” (23). Through this report, the MLA seeks to disseminate a new definition of what it means to do scholarship with these three categories. The three categories are defined as:

Research is not to be equated with scholarship; it is a component of scholarship that, in the fields represented by the MLA [...], can include archival, artifactual, or textual objects that essentially involve human matters. Scholarship in our field requires (re)interpretation, an analysis or critique that calls for a revision or reconfiguring of what has previously been thought [...] any serious work of scholarship in our field also demands a moment of reflection (or theorization) [...] and a self-consciousness about the method appropriate to the object of study. (23-24)

The MLA report asks those in academia to re-evaluate not only tenure and promotion guidelines, but also seeks to expand the definition of scholarship in ways that are not dependent on the publishing of a monograph and recognize the often implicit, component parts of scholarship.

What is research or scholarship and how is it tied to teaching? This is an issue that many are worrying and talking about. The most recent issue of the NEA Higher Education Journal, Thought and Action (Fall 2006), in a special focus issue on “The Academy at Work,” addresses the current state of the professorate in an article by Jack Schuster and Martin Finkelstein which reports on their newest book length study, The American Faculty. The journal also contains another article on the re-evaluation of tenure guidelines as tied to formal publication. The December 2006 issue of Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC) contains

Spigelman and Day's article entitled "Valuing Research at Small and Community Colleges." The Two-Year College English Association also released their 2004 report, "Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College." The relationship between scholarship/research and pedagogy/teaching, and the definition of what it means to be a professor, is, I would argue, also tied to the current crises in the academy around contingent labor. Stephen Greenblat, then president of the MLA, put out an open letter to the MLA membership to rethink the connection between the publication of research and tenure in May of 2002. According to both Schuster and Finkelstein and the MLA report on tenure and promotion guidelines, the academy is hiring more and more contingent labor. The MLA reports that "over 50% of faculty members in the field of English and literature are part-time" (14).¹²⁴

What is the connection between the current crises in academia around contingent labor and the privileging of a research agenda narrowly defined? Whereas the two things are not causally connected, I do think that they help to explain each other. Certainly, the economics of the current situation must be considered as a primary factor. But once those have been accounted for to some degree, I contend that the part time labor crises is a symptom of the binary that the professoriate should be defined *either* by the production of new knowledge (research or scholarship narrowly defined) *or* teaching (narrowly defined). At its heart this debate or crises is about who is considered qualified to produce "new" knowledge and in what forms it circulates. This reflects the changing epistemology of the professoriate that occurred over time in the later part of the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth centuries.

¹²⁴ This is a total of all faculty teaching English and literature across all types of institutions, from PhD granting universities to associate's institutions. This does not even count full time, non-tenure stream faculty. According to Schuster and Finkelstein in "On the Brink: Assessing the Status of the American Faculty", 34.8% of fulltime faculty are non-tenure stream (54).

I maintain that teaching and scholarship are not separate, but instead exist complementarily and symbiotically. I see the practice of teaching and research, or the theorizing of teaching about composition and literature, as two sides of the same coin; as mutually informative and reinforcing processes. Indeed, a person cannot do one without doing the other. All teaching requires either the explicit or implicit theorizing of the subject or process being taught. The reverse is also true in that all theorizing about a subject should have a potential influence on practice. I think this is true of any classroom, but in my classroom I always try to foreground the fact that the students and the teacher have to work together to create something new. This new “thing” may be a process of composing or revising or knowledge about or interpretations of a particular text, but it is new. Students are not simply reproducing knowledge, but creating it. This is done through individual writing assignments, class conversation, workshops, individual written and oral feedback, etc. I always tell my students that when I teach a text or process I always learn something new about it. This is a reflection of the idea that as individuals and as a group, when the class comes together to share ideas through discussion, writing, or even on an individual level responding to our group discussion, they are doing something unique, powerful, and special. The field of composition, for me, puts pedagogy in a rather special place.

My dissertation does many things, chief among them, however, is that it implies that teaching and the form of a field or discipline are, and have always been, intimately related and have exerted an influence on one another.

Why look at literature textbooks to do this work? I looked at literature textbooks (and not those entirely devoted to what would now be understood as composition, for example) for a number of reasons having to do with the educational milieu in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as well as today. There was no hard and fast divide of these subjects even into the

early twentieth century. Elocution often blended with literature, which often blended with rhetoric, which often blended with formal writing instruction, and so on and so on. This specialization into disciplines or sub-fields is a symptom and a result of the professionalization of American higher education. In terms of the contemporary moment, I have been continually intrigued by the divide between research and teaching that characterizes American universities and colleges. By this, I mean the emphasis on scholarly publication, in some form, that is a requirement of job security at many institutions of American higher education. The MLA report states the “percentage of departments ranking scholarship of primary importance (over teaching) has more than doubled since the last comparable survey [...] in 1968: from 35.4% to 75.7%” (4). What is interesting and potentially productive is the fact that 28.9% of departments surveyed for the study said that textbooks were rated “not important” in the tenure process (5).

This fact about textbooks raises an interesting discussion of practices in two-year colleges as well. Spigelman and Day comment on the research “taboo” at many two year colleges which see research or scholarship as somehow opposite of or taking away from good teaching.¹²⁵ It is not difficult to make a case for why research, in some form, should be encouraged in faculty whose primary job descriptor is that of teacher. The redefinition of scholarship by Boyer, the MLA, and others makes it even easier and more logical if we move away from the traditional understanding of the monograph as the only indicator of “scholarly research.” Scholarship in whatever form it takes connects teachers to their field/discipline content, keeps them current, keeps them in touch with the writing process, etc. The Two-Year College English Association’s report defines the “teacher-scholar,” in part, as *“that faculty member for whom teaching is informed both by reflective practice and by the application of the best available theoretical*

¹²⁵ The movement in higher education toward the scholarship of teaching and learning, SoTL as it has come to be abbreviated and which really came into its own in the 1990’s, does some of this work.

approaches. Moreover, we invite such faculty to employ the skills and knowledge base that will allow them to become capable researchers whose pursuit of knowledge enriches the intellectual lives of their students” (emphasis in original, 4). The authors of the TYCA report argue that those in associate’s degree granting programs are in a unique position to do research into pedagogy. Textbooks, according to the report, are one site where scholarship, theory, and practice all come together. “At their best,” they write, “textbooks represent legitimate research and scholarship and are strong examples of putting pedagogical theory into practical classroom use” (7). Certainly, a similar critical perspective is in effect in this dissertation. But textbooks, I argue, reveal more than just this.

Nietz looked at the textbooks to see what it is they revealed about classroom practices. For Nietz, much of a curriculum must have been determined by the textbook itself for various social and economic reasons. Whereas this may be true, there is no way to demonstrate it, however. Indeed, the very nature of the textbook itself as a cultural archive makes this improbable that there was a one to one correlation or translation into practice from the textbook in every case, or even in the majority of cases. A writer cannot control what happens to his text once it goes out into the world. The same is true for textbooks. What is so interesting about this study is the *representation* of teaching and disciplines in these texts, the kind of teaching that is imagined to travel, that people could respond to and react against. I don’t know if it is ever possible to reconstruct how a classroom transpired. In the Burkian model of the parlor conversation, knowledge exists only in conversation with other knowledge. I contend that this takes place in the classroom as well as within the traditional understanding of scholarship.

What makes the representation of the pedagogy so interesting, I think, and this is tied to my earlier point about the connection between research and pedagogy, is that it is in the

representation of pedagogy that we most clearly see this aspect of field formation. If the field is to some extent created in the classroom every time the students and teachers meet, then it is through the pedagogical act that this is imagined to take place. Pedagogy is constitutive of a field, both literally and figuratively. This has become the case because of the professionalization model. Take for example the lone individual who surrounds himself with books. Prior to the large scale implementation of this professionalism, a “scholar” could read the corpus of knowledge on the works of William Shakespeare and become the next Rolfe or Hudson. The distinction between “academic” and “popular” did not exist as it does today. Although it is possible that Furness studied Shakespeare in some formal manner in college, it is also likely that he did not. This would probably not happen today, because the thinker/writer/lecturer/etc. would not be considered “academic” or “scholarly” enough. Lots of books are published on Shakespeare and sold at commercial bookstores, but there is a difference between them and academic publication which has come to define “scholarly merit.”

This dissertation represents my own attempt to contribute something to the scholarly world. What I am arguing for, what I try to put into practice, is to understand the work of teaching, which is, at the present moment, my primary work, in all its theoretical implications. Those in four year research universities and those at two year, open admissions community colleges, and everyone in between, should give a renewed and sustained attention to the relationship between pedagogy and scholarly activity as it is imagined in our profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Materials: Textbooks

19th Century Schoolbooks. <http://digital.library.pitt.edu/nietz/index.html>. Online.

Abernethy, Julian W. American Literature. New York: Maynard, Merrill, & CO., 1902.

Adams, Oscar Fey. A Brief Handbook of American Authors. Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1884.

Beers, Henry Augustin, An Outline Sketch of American Literature. New York : Chautauqua Press, 1887.

---, Initial Studies in American Letters. New York: The Chautauqua-Century Press, 1895.

Blair, Hugh. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. 2 vol. edited by Harold F. Harding. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

Brooke, Stopford A. English literature. New ed., rev. and corr. with an appendix on American literature by J. Harris Patton. New York: American Book Company, 1895.

---, English literature; with Students' readings and questions by Harriet L. Mason. 1896. Norwood, Mass.: Norwood Press, 1898.

---, English literature. new edition, revised and corrected with chapters on the Victorian age, by Charles F. Johnson. Literature Primer. New York: American Book Company, 1900.

Carpenter, George Rice and William Tenney Brewster, eds. Modern English Prose. 1904. New York: Macmillan, 1906.

Cathcart, George R. Literary Reader. 1874 New York: American Book Company, 1892.

---, The Literary Reader: typical selections from some of the best British and American

authors from Shakespeare to the present time, chronologically arranged, with biographical and critical sketches, and numerous notes, etc., etc. New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor, and Company, 1878.

Cleveland, Charles D. A Compendium of English Literature: Chronologically Arranged from Sir John Mandeville to William Cowper: Consisting of Biographical Sketches of the Authors, Selections from their Works, with Various Criticism: Designed as a Text Book for the Highest Classes in Schools and for Junior Classes in Colleges, as well as for Private Reading. Philadelphia: J.A. Bancroft & Co.; New York: J.W. Schermerhorn & Co.; Chicago: E. Speakman & Co., 1868.

---, English Literature of the Nineteenth Century: On the Plan of the Author's "Compendium of English literature" and Supplementary To It: Designed for Colleges and Advanced Classes in Schools, as well as for Private Reading Philadelphia: E.C. & J. Biddle, 1859.

Collier, William Francis. A History of English Literature: In a Series of Biographical Sketches. New York: T. Nelson and Sons, 1877.

Coppée, Henry. English Literature Considered as an Interpreter of English History: Designed as a Manual of Instruction. 7th ed. Philadelphia: E. Claxton & Company, 1881.

Corson, Hiram. An Elocutionary Manual: Consisting of Choice Selections from English and American Literature, Adapted to every Variety of Vocal Expression: Designed for the Higher Classes in Schools and Seminaries, and for Private and School Reading: With an Introductory Essay on the Study of Literature, and on Vocal Culture in its Relation to an Aesthetic Appreciation of Poetry. Philadelphia: Charles Desilver, 1867.

Crawshaw, William H. The Making of English Literature. 1907. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1909.

Greenlaw, Edwin. A Syllabus of English Literature. 1912. Chicago: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., 1921.

---, and Clarence Stratton. Literature and Life. Vol. 2. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1927.

Halleck, Reuben Post. History of American Literature. New York: American Book Company, 1911.

---, History of English Literature. New York: American Book Company, 1900.

---, New English Literature. New York: American Book Company, 1913.

Hart, John S. Class Book of Poetry: Consisting of Selections from Distinguished English and American Authors, from Chaucer to the Present Day, the Whole Arranged in Chronological Order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother, 1874.

---, Class Book of Prose: Consisting of Selections from Distinguished English and American Authors, from Chaucer to the Present Day, the Whole Arranged in Chronological Order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks. Philadelphia : E.H. Butler & Co., 1858.

---, A Manual of English Literature: A Text Book for Schools and Colleges. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother, 1872.

Hawthorne, Julian and Leonard Lemmon. American Literature: An Elementary Text-book for Use in High Schools and Academies. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1891.

---, American Literature: A Text-book for the Use of Schools and Colleges. 1891. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1893.

Hinsdale, B. A. The Teacher in Literature as Portrayed in the Writings of English, French, German and American Authors: Including a Biographical Sketch and Characterization of Each Author and an Introduction. Rev. ed. Chicago: The Werner Co., 1895.

Hitchcock, Alfred M. Rhetoric and the Study of Literature. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1913.

Hodge, H.D. Parsing Book: Containing Choice Gems of Thought and of Literature, Together with a Practical System of Analyzing Words and Sentences. Boston: M. Cotton, 1852.

Holcombe James P., Literature in Letters, or, Manners, Art, Criticism, Biography, History, and Morals Illustrated in the Correspondence of Eminent Persons. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1866.

Hunt, Theodore W. Representative English Prose and Prose Writers. New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1887.

Irish, Frank V. American and British Authors: A Text-book on Literature for High School, Academies, Seminaries, Normal Schools, and Colleges: Also a Guide and Help in the Private Study of the Best Authors and their Writings. Columbus, Ohio: F.V. Irish, 1896.

- Jenkins, O. L. The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature: Containing Sketches Biographical and Critical of the Most Distinguished English Authors: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day: With Selections from their Writings, and Questions Adapted to the Use of Schools. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.; New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1876.
- , The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature: With Selections from the Writings of the Most Distinguished Authors. Ed. G.E. Viger. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1903.
- , Student's Handbook of English Literature: With Selections from the Writings of the Most Distinguished Authors. Ed. C. C. Berkeley and J.J. Jepson. 28th rev. ed. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1912.
- Johnson, Charles F. Outline History of English and American Literature. New York: American Book Co., 1900.
- Long, William J. English Literature, Its History and Its Significance for the Life of the English-speaking World: A Text-book for Schools. 1909. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1919.
- , Outlines of English Literature: With Readings. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.
- Longwell, O. H. Outline of English and American Literature. 1886. Indianapolis: The Normal Publishing House, 1890.
- Maertz, Louise. A New Method for the Study of English Literature. 3rd ed. Chicago: S.C. Griggs and Company, 1882.
- Manly, John Matthews. English Prose and Poetry (1137-1892). Boston: Ginn and Company, 1916.
- McClelland, George Wm. and Albert C. Baugh, eds. Century Types of English Literature: Chronologically Arranged. New York: The Century Co., 1925.
- Minto, William. A Manual of English Prose Literature: Biographical and Critical, Designed Mainly to Show Characteristics of Style. Authorized American ed. Boston: Ginn, 1895.
- Moody, William Vaughn and Robert Morss Lovett. A History of English Literature. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

Morley, Henry. A First Sketch of English Literature. 3rd ed. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin.
---, A Manual of English Literature; Thoroughly Revised, with an Entire Re-arrangement of
Matter, and with Numerous Retrenchments and Additions. Ed. Moses Coit Tyler. New
York: Sheldon and Company, 1879.

Oliphant, Margaret. The Victorian Age of English Literature. New York: Dodd, Mead and
Company, 1892.

Ormsby, R. M'K. The American Reader, or, Exercises in Reading: Designed to Accompany the
American Definition Spelling Book, To Be Put into the Scholar's Hands as Soon as He
Has Finished the Reading Lessons of the Book: With Introductory Exercises in the
Principles of Articulation, Pronunciation, &c., &c. Bradford, Vt.: A. Low, 1845.

Painter, F. V. N. Introduction to English Literature, Including a Number of Classic Works: with
notes. Boston: Leach, Shewell & Sanborn, 1894.

Pancoast, Henry S. An Introduction to American Literature. 2nd ed., rev. New York: Henry Holt
and Company, 1912.

Parker, Richard G. and J. Madison Watson. The National Fifth Reader: Containing a Treatise on
Elocution, Exercises in Reading and Declamation, with Biographical Sketches, and
Copious Notes: Adapted to the Use of Students in English and American Literature. New
York: A.S. Barnes & Burr, 1863.

Pattee, Fred Lewis. A History of American Literature: With a View to the Fundamental
Principles Underlying its Development: Text-book for Schools and Colleges. 1896.
Boston: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1897.

Perry, Thomas Sergeant. English Literature in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Harper
& Brothers, 1883.

Raub, Albert N. The Complete Arithmetic: combining oral and written exercises in a
natural and logical system of instruction. Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894.
---, The Elementary Arithmetic: oral and written. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1877.
---, Grammatical analysis by diagrams. Harrisburg, Pa. : Raub & Co., 1885.
---, Key to Raub's Complete arithmetic. Philadelphia : Porter & Coates, 1879.

- , Lessons in English: a practical course of language lessons and elementary grammar.
Chicago: Werner School Book Co., 1894.
- , Methods of Teaching, Including the Nature, Object, and Laws of Education, Methods of Instruction, and Methods of Culture. 1883. Lock Haven, Pa.: E.L. Raub, 1884.
- , The new normal fifth reader. New York: American Book Company, 1894.
- , The new normal fourth reader. Chicago: Werner School Book Co., 1894.
- , The normal fifth reader. Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1878.
- , The normal first reader. Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1878.
- , The normal fourth reader. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1884.
- , The normal second reader. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1885.
- , The normal third reader. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1878.
- , A practical English grammar: for the use of schools and private students. Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894.
- , School Management: Including a Full Discussion of School Economy, School Ethics, School Government, and the Professional Relations of the Teacher. Designed for Use both as a Textbook and as a Book of Reference for Teachers, Parents and School Officers. New York: Raub & Co., 1882.
- , Studies in English and American literature, from Chaucer to the present time: with standard selections from representative writers for critical study and analysis: designed for use in high schools, academies, seminaries, normal schools, and by private students. 1882. Philadelphia : Raub & Co., 1886
- , The Werner mental arithmetic: containing the principles of arithmetic with numerous problems for oral analysis and solution. Chicago: Werner Co., 1894.

Royse, N. K. A Manual of English Literature: Designed for the Use of Advanced Grades. 1881. Philadelphia: Cowperthwait & Co., 1882

Sanders, Charles W. Sander's Rhetorical, or Union Fifth Reader: Embracing a Full Exposition of the Principles of Rhetorical Reading; with Numerous Specimens, both in Prose and Poetry, from the Best Writers, English and American, as Exercises for Practice; and with Notes and Sketches, Literary and Biographical, Forming Together a Brief, though Comprehensive Course of Instruction in English Literature. New York: Ivison, Phinney, Blakeman & Company, 1864.

Shaw, Thomas B. A Complete Manual of English Literature; Edited with Notes and Illustrations, by William Smith; with a Sketch of American Literature, by Henry T. Tuckerman. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1867

---, New History of English Literature. Ed. Truman J. Backus. Shaw's Series in English Literature New York: Sheldon & Company, 1881.

Spalding, William. The History of English Literature: with an Outline of the Origin and Growth

of the English Language: Illustrated by Extracts: for the Use of Schools and of Private Students. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1859.

Swineford, Harriet B. Literature for Beginners: Containing Biographies of the Most Prominent Authors, British and American, with Extracts from their Writings, also Gems of Thought, Birthdays of Authors, Pseudonyms, Contemporaneous Writers, etc. 1883. Philadelphia: Raub & Co., 1891.

Swinton, William. Studies in English Literature: being typical selections of British and American authorship, from Shakespeare to the present time together with definitions, notes, analyses, and glossary as an aid to systematic literary study : for use in high and normal schools, academies, seminaries, & c.; with portraits. 1880. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881.

Taine, Hippolyte, Histoire de la littérature anglaise. Trans. H. Van Laun. New York: John Wurtele Lovell, 1879.

Trent, William. A Brief History of American Literature. 1904. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1909.

Underwood, Francis H. A Hand-book of English Literature: Intended for the Use of High Schools, as well as a Companion and Guide for Private Students, and for General Readers. Boston: Lee & Shepard; New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham, 1871-1873.

Upham, Alfred H. The Typical Forms of English Literature: An Introduction to the Historical and Critical Study of English Literature for College Classes. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1917.

Westlake, J. Willis Common-School Literature, English and American: With Several Hundred Extracts for Literary Culture. Philadelphia: Sower, Potts & Co. 1877.

---, Common-School Literature, English and American: With Several Hundred Extracts To Be Memorized. New ed., rev. and enl., Philadelphia: Christopher Sower Company, 1898

Other Primary Materials

The Academy of Newark and Delaware Normal School, 1886. Newark, Del.: Bowen & Bro., Printers, 1886.

Black, Matthew W., ed. The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. A New Variorum of Shakespeare. By William Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955. Vol. 26 of A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Hyder Edward Rollins, gen. ed.

Dawson, Edgar.. "College Entrance Requirements in English." Delaware College Bulletin 1.3 (new series) December 1904: 1-8.

Delaware College. Circular of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, 1874. Wilmington, Del.: Commercial Printing Company, 1874.

---, Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, 1877. Wilmington, Del.: 'Commercial Press' Print., 1877.

---, Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, 1881. Newark, Del.: Printed for the College, 1881.

---, Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark Delaware, 1884. Newark, Del.: Printed for the College, 1884.

---, Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware. 1888. Wilmington, Del.: Wilmington Printing Company, 1888.

---, Report and Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware. 1891. Wilmington, Del.: Wilmington Printing Company, 1891.

---, Report and Catalogue of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware. 1892. Wilmington, Del.: Wilmington Printing Company, 1892.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the Year 1896-97. And Announcements for the Year 1897-98. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press,, 1897.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the year 1899-1900, and Announcements for the Year 1900-1901. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press,, 1900.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the year 1901-1902 and Announcements for the Year 1902-1903. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press,, 1902.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the year 1902-1903 and Announcements for the Year 1903-1904. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press,, 1903.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the year 1903-1904, and Announcements for the Year 1904-1905. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press,, 1904.

---, Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Delaware College, Newark, Delaware, for the year 1907-1908 and Announcements for the Year 1908-1909. Wilmington, Del.: The John M. Rogers Press, 1908.

Delaware College Faculty. 1882-1899. "Minutes of Meetings: Volume III, 1882-1899." Contained in University Archives, Records of the Faculty, Minutes of Meetings (Record Group 28/0/1).

- Furness, Horace Howard, ed. Othello. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. 14th ed. By William Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1886, 1914.
- , Romeo and Juliet. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. By William Shakespeare with a Supplementary Bibliography by Louis Marder. New York: American Scholar, 1871, 1963.
- Harter, George Abram. Sept. 22, 1897. Letter to John C. Stockby in Copybook. Unpublished manuscript. In "Index to the University of Delaware Archives Including Papers Relating to the Town of Newark, Delaware 1901-1950." Contained in University of Delaware Archives.
- Hemingway, Samuel Burdett, ed. Henry the Fourth Part I. A New Variorum of Shakespeare. By William Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1936. Vol. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Joseph Quincy Adams, gen. ed.
- Newark College. Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Newark College, Newark, Del. 1837-8. Philadelphia: William Stavely, Episcopal Recorder Press, 1838.
- "Report of Survey Commission." The University News. University of Delaware. February, 1939 1-5.
- Rolfe, William J., ed. Romeo and Juliet. New York: American Book Company, 1898.
- Sypherd, W. Owen. The English Bible: Being a Book of Selections from the King James Version. Newark, Del. : Craftsmen of Kells, 1921.
- , and George Elliott Dutton. English Composition for College Freshmen, Part I Principles and Part II Specimens. Newark, Del., Priv. print., 1915
- , April 1908. "English in High School and College." Delaware College Bulletin. 4.3 (new series): 1-16.
- , and George S. Messersmith. November 1908. "The High School Course in English." Delaware College Bulletin. 4.4 (new series): 1-41.
- , Studies in Chaucer's Hous of Fame. London: Pub. for the Chaucer Society by L. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1907
- United States. "Transcript of Morrill Act (1862)." Act of July 2, 1862 (Morrill Act), Public Law 37-108, which established land grant colleges, 07/02/1862; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1996; Record Group 11; General Records of the United

States Government; National Archives. Online version 19 July 2006, at
<<http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=33&page=transcript>>

Webster, Noah. An American Dictionary of the English Language: Containing the Whole Vocabulary of the First Edition, the Entire Corrections and Improvements of the Second Edition, to which is prefixed an Introductory Dissertation on the Origin, History, and Connection, of the Languages of Western Asia and Europe, with an Explanation of the Principles on which Languages are Formed. Rev. and enl. by Chauncey A. Goodrich, With Pronouncing Vocabularies of Scripture, Classical and Geographical Names. Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam, n.d.

Secondary Materials

Altick, Richard D. The Scholar Adventurers. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

Apple, Michael W. "Regulating the Text: The Socio-Historical Roots of State Control." Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy. Ed. Philip G. Altbach, et al. USA: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Armbruster, Bonnie and Joyce Ostertag. "Questions in Elementary Science and Social Studies Textbooks." Learning From Textbooks: Theory and Practice. Ed. Bruce K. Britton, et al. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993.

Berkowitz, Joel. Shakespeare on the American Yiddish Stage. Studies in Theatre History and Culture. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2002.

Black, Hillel. The American Schoolbook. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1967.

Bloom, Harold. Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.

Bloom, Lynn Z. "The Essay Canon." *College English* 61 (March 1999): 401–30.

Bockrath, Gloria Marie Dean. "Student recruitment at Delaware College during the Purnell Era – 1870-1885." Master's Thesis. University of Delaware, 1977

Boyer, Ernest L. Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. USA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Brereton, John C. The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925. Pittsburgh : University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995.

Carr, Jean Ferguson, Stephen L. Carr, and Lucille M. Schultz. Archives of Instruction: Nineteenth-Century Rhetorics, Readers, and Composition Books in the United States. USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.

Carr, Stephen L. "The Circulation of Blair's *Lectures*." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (Fall 2002): 75-104.

Cartelli, Thomas. Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations. London ; New York : Routledge, 1999.

Derrida, Jacques. Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. The Printing Press as An Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Elson, Ruth Miller. Guardians of Tradition, American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Eze, Emmanuel Chukwudi. Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1997.

Frost, Gary. "The Aesthetics of Conservation." The Brodsky Endowment for the Advancement of Library Conservation Lecture Series. E.S. Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, 11/03/06.

Gibson, James M. The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story: Horace Howard Furness and the New Variorum Shakespeare. New York: AMS Press, 1990.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press, 1987.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "A Special Letter" to MLA membership. 28 May, 2002.
http://www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_scholarly_pub/scholarly_pub. 15 Dec., 2006.

Greetham, D. C. Textual Scholarship: An Introduction. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, Vol. 1417. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1994.

Guillory, John. Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Hoffecker, Carol E. and John A. Munroe. Books, Bricks & Bibliophiles: the University of Delaware Library. Newark, Del.: University of Delaware, 1984.

Hunt, Maurice. "On the Value of the New Variorum Shakespeare in a Postmodernist World." The Shakespeare Newsletter 45 (Winter 1995): 75-76, 83-84, 90.

Janssen, Ian. "Information on William Henry Purnell: Information Sheet 21." University of Delaware Archives. June 18, 2004.

---, "Information on Albert Newton Raub: Information Sheet 9." University of Delaware Archives. Sept. 4, 2003.

Kameen, Paul. "Rewording the Rhetoric of Composition." Pre/Text. 1980; 1(1-2): 73-93.
---, Writing / Teaching: Essays Toward a Rhetoric of Pedagogy. Pittsburgh Series in Composition, Literacy, and Culture. USA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000.

Levine, Lawrence W. Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America. The William E. Massey, Sr. Lectures in the History of American Civilization; 1986. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Lewis, Philip. "From the Institutional Text to Bicollegiality." Profession 2006 (2006): 75-86.

Mathews, Mitford M. Teaching To Read, Historically Considered. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Mathiessen, F. O. American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. 1941. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Michael, Ian. The Teaching of English: From the Sixteenth Century to 1870. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Miller, Susan. Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition. Carbondale : Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

MIR Data. <http://www.mirdata.com>. Online.

MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. Modern Language Association, 2006. http://www.mla.org/tenure_promotion_pdf.

MS Encarta. Microsoft Corporation, 2003.

Munroe, John A. The University of Delaware: A History. 1986. University of Delaware. 19 July 2006. <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter1.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter2.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter3.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter4.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter5.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter6.html>>.

---, <<http://www.udel.edu/PR/munroe/chapter8.html>>.

Nietz, John. The Evolution of American Secondary School Textbooks. Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Co., Inc., 1966.

---, Old Text Books. USA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.

Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College. Two-Year College English Association, 2004.

Schuster, Jack H. and Martin J. Finkelstein. "On the Brink: Assessing the Status of the American Faculty." Thought and Action 22 (Fall 2006): 51-62.

Shumway, David R. and Craig Dionne, eds. Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 2002.

Silverman, Naomi. "From the Ivory Tower to the Bottom Line: An Editor's Perspective on College Textbook Publishing." Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy. Ed. Philip G. Altbach, et al. USA: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Spigelman, Candace and Kami Day. "Valuing Research at Small and Community Colleges." Teaching English in the Two-Year College 34. 2 (2006): 135-150.

Spring, Joel. "Textbook Writing and Ideological Management: A Postmodern Approach." Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy. Ed. Philip G. Altbach, et al. USA: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Steedman, Carolyn. Dust: The Archive and Cultural History. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.

Taylor, Gary. Reinventing Shakespeare: a cultural history, from the Restoration to the present. New York : Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989.

Turner, Robert Kean. "The New Variorum Shakespeare." Dictionary of Literary Biography Yearbook 1985. Ed. Jean W. Ross. Detroit: Gale, 1986, 153-158.

Tyson-Bernstein, Harriet and Arthur Woodward. "Nineteenth Century Policies for Twenty-first Century Practice: The Textbook Reform Dilema." Learning From Textbooks: Theory and Practice. Ed. Bruce K. Britton, et al. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993.

Vanderbilt, Kermit. American Literature and the Academy: The Roots, Growth, and Maturity of a Profession. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Webster's New World Dictionary. 3rd college edition, Simon and Schuster, 1994. Distributed electronically by ZCI Publishing Inc, 1995.

Westfall, Alfred Van Rensselaer. American Shakespeare Criticism 1607-1865. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

Williams, Raymond. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Zboray, Ronald J., and Mary Saracino Zboray. A Handbook for the Study of Book History in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Center for the Book – Library of Congress, 2000.