

DEFINING AND CONTEXTUALIZING AMERICAN MODERN HISTORICAL
DOCUMENTARY EDITING: AN ANALYSIS OF EARLY MODERN EDITORIAL
THEORY, METHODS, AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS, 1943-1970

By

Robert Barnet Riter

B.A., University of Cincinnati, 2004

M.L.I.S., University of Pittsburgh, 2005

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
School of Information Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Robert Barnet Riter

It was defended on

May 2, 2011

and approved by

Geoffrey C. Bowker, PhD, Professor

Bernadette G. Callery, PhD, Assistant Professor

Ronald J. Zboray, PhD, Professor

Dissertation Director: Richard J. Cox, PhD, Professor

Copyright by Robert Barnet Riter

2011

DEFINING AND CONTEXTUALIZING AMERICAN MODERN HISTORICAL
DOCUMENTARY EDITING: AN ANALYSIS OF EARLY MODERN EDITORIAL
THEORY, METHODS, AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS, 1943-1970

Robert Barnet Riter, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

The practice of documentary editing is concerned with the publication of editions of letters, diaries, public papers, and other forms of documentary evidence. The materials contained within these editions are intended to function as historical and cultural evidence. In this role, documentary publications operate as surrogates for original sources. However, though these published reproductions are intended to function in the same way as the originating source, documentary editions are unique objects in their own right. Editors of these works make choices regarding the selection, presentation, and publication of the documentation. These choices determine the scope of these published collections, their physical form, and the reliability and authenticity of the materials that they contain.

The choices that editors make have their basis in editorial theory and editorial method. Editorial theory consists of the ideas, attitudes, and beliefs that influence the procedures for editing texts. Editorial methods, guided by editorial theory, are the frameworks developed by editors, that when applied, determine how documents are edited, and the editions produced. Theory and method are the supporting elements of the practice of documentary editing.

Though the practice of documentary editing within the United States dates to the 18th century, the foundations of the modern editing that defines current scholarship, can only trace its origins to the publication of Volume I. of Julian P. Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, a project articulated in 1943. This dissertation is an examination of these foundations. The period 1943 -1970 represents a formative period of modern historical documentary editing, which can best be defined as the early modern period of historical documentary editing. During this period, documentary editors were involved in the development of new approaches for creating documentary editions, were active the refinement and re-articulation of previous methods, and redefined the role and function of documentary editions.

Through an examination of editorial thought and practice, published documentary editions, and editorial contexts, this study documents the currents of editorial thought that were present during the early modern period of editing and defines the nature of their influence on the process of documentary editing, and the creation documentary editions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	x
DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS	xii
I. PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	1
A. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
B. BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	5
C. FOCUS OF THE STUDY	15
1. Themes	15
2. The Early Modern Period.....	16
D. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	19
E. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	21
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	22
A. INTRODUCTION	22
B. GENERAL CONTOURS OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH ON HISTORICAL DOCUMENTARY EDITING	23
1. General Discussion	26
2. Biography.....	26
a. 20 th Century Editors	28
3. Institutional History	30
4. Historical Case Studies: Editorial Projects	34
5. Conclusions.....	37
C. DEFINING THE INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EDITING	38
1. General Discussion	38
2. Defining the Role and Function of the Documentary Editor	39
3. Defining the Role and Function of Documentary Editing	45
4. Documentary Editing, the Treatment of Documentation, and the Construction of Archival Texts	46
D. SUMMARY	49
III. METHODOLOGY	49
A. INTRODUCTION	49
B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH	50
C. RESEARCH METHODS.....	55
1. Historiography	56
2. Book Studies	58
3. Archival Studies (Archival History)	61

D. SOURCES.....	63
1. Editorial Methods.....	64
2. Documentary Editions	66
3. Contexts	68
E. LIMITATIONS	70
F. SUMMARY	71
IV. DOCUMENTARY EDITING IN THE UNITED STATES	72
A. INTRODUCTION	72
1. A Historical Overview	72
2. Modern Documentary Editing: Definition and Function.....	76
3. Process	80
B. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MATERIALS PRODUCED	85
1. Edition Level Characteristics.....	87
a. Letterpress Editions.....	88
b. Microfilm Editions.....	90
c. Electronic Editions.....	90
2. Relationship between Medium and Presentation.....	93
3. Document Level Characteristics	93
4. Topical Characteristics.....	95
C. THE FUNCTION OF THE EDITOR	97
D. EDITING IN CONTEXT: RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE ALLIED DISCIPLINES	98
E. SUMMARY	103
V. DEFINING EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING.....	104
A. INTRODUCTION	104
B. DEFINING EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING	107
1. Summary	114
C. EDITORIAL PRACTICE IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD	116
1. James F. Hopkins and the Henry Clay Papers	117
a. Practices	117
b. Unique Challenges	118
2. Robert B. Eckles and the Frank B. Gilbreth Papers.....	120
a. Practices	120
b. Unique Challenges	122
3. Leonard W. Labaree and the Benjamin Franklin Papers	123
a. Practices	123
4. Editorial Practices: Summary	125
D. OBJECTIVES OF EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING	125
1. Editorial Objectives	126
E. SUMMARY	133

VI. EDITORS, EDITING, AND INTENTION IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD	136
A. EDITORS, EDITING, AND INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS	137
1. The Role and Function of the Documentary Editor	137
2. Clarence E. Carter and the Primacy of the Text	139
3. Lester J. Cappon and the Communication of Documentary Texts	144
4. Julian P. Boyd and the Creation of Context	149
5. Lyman H. Butterfield and the Construction of Documentary Collections	156
B. SYNTHESIZING EDITING PRACTICES	167
1. Construction and Creation	167
2. Editorial Description	170
3. Editorial Context	172
C. EDITORIAL INTENTION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS	175
1. L.H. Butterfield's <i>Diary and Autobiography of John Adams</i>	177
a. Theory and Method	177
b. Examination of Documents	183
c. Summary	185
2. Lester J. Cappon's <i>The Adams-Jefferson Letters</i>	185
a. Theory and Method	186
b. Examination of Documents	190
3. Conclusions	193
D. SUMMARY	193
VII. EDITORIAL CONTEXTS	195
A. INTRODUCTION	196
B. THE INFLUENCE OF ARCHIVAL FUNCTIONS ON DOCUMENTARY EDITING	201
1. Archival Engagement and the Function of Documentary Editing	201
2. Disseminating Archival Evidence and Its Relationship to Editorial Knowledge	205
3. Using Archival Concepts	210
C. DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF HISTORICAL EVIDENCE	213
1. The Requirements of Sources	214
D. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND DOCUMENTARY PUBLICATION	217
E. SUMMARY	221

VIII. A DOCUMENTARY UNIVERSE, 1943-1970.....	224
A. REPRESENTATION OF ORIGINAL SOURCES DURING THE EARLY MODERN ERA	224
B. WALTER RUNDELL, JR., AND THE REINVENTION OF EDITORIAL KNOWLEDGE.....	231
1. Context.....	233
2. Understanding Documentary Editions.....	238
a. Introduction.....	238
b. Findings.....	239
3. A New Category of Editorial Knowledge.....	243
C. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.....	245
D. CONCLUSIONS AND SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS.....	248
E. SUMMARY	263
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 264

PREFACE

An important theme of this dissertation is that editors developed their ideas through evaluating and engaging with the thoughts of others. The unique threads of editorial thought that I examined bore the influence of others. The same can be said of the process of researching and writing a dissertation. I have been fortunate to be part of a supportive academic community that has allowed me to explore, refine, and develop my ideas.

I offer my sincerest thanks to my dissertation committee: Dr. Geoffrey C. Bowker, Dr. Bernadette G. Callery, Dr. Richard J. Cox, and Dr. Ronald J. Zboray. Each was generous in offering their unique advice, thoughts, and perspectives. This kindness aided me in refining the ideas presented in this dissertation. Dr. Bowker offered valuable advice on evaluating the influence of international editorial activities on American practice. This helped to open up a new research direction. Dr. Callery asked critical questions regarding the relationship between editors and standardization. These helped me to refine my approach in reviewing the relationships between the differing threads of editorial theory. Dr. Zboray offered valuable and useful advice on giving precision to the concepts and terms developed in this dissertation, which allowed me to both refine my approach and offer a more concrete statement on documentary editing.

I express my deepest gratitude to my graduate and dissertation advisor Dr. Richard J. Cox, both for his supervision of this study and his support and mentorship during my doctoral studies. The roots of this study date to a seminar I took with Dr. Cox during my first semester in the doctoral program (Fall 2005) titled “Defining Information Ages.” During this seminar I became interested in the construction and circulation of historical evidence, and with his advice,

began writing in the area of documentary editing. I was very fortunate to find my primary interest early in my doctoral work. Beginning with my first efforts in exploring this topic, Dr. Cox has been generous with his constructive feedback, discussion, and time. This dissertation is a culmination of a project that we began during that first semester. Beyond the dissertation, I will always remain appreciative of his mentorship regarding life in the academy. As I begin my career as an academic, I recall his wise counsel every day.

I will always remain appreciative to the Program in Library and Information Science, the School of Information Sciences, and the University of Pittsburgh for these institutions' generous support through teaching assistantships and fellowships. I also offer my thanks to the staff of the University of Pittsburgh's Hillman and Information Sciences Libraries. Mr. Matthew Holm, formerly of Interlibrary Loan, and Mr. Marc Ross, of Hillman Library, aided me in acquiring research material that was central to this project. I thank them both for their time and for sharing with me their expert knowledge.

During my studies in the Program in Library and Information Studies I was fortunate to be part of a community of students that was congenial, serious, and terribly bright. When I reflect on my years in the program it is the gifts of friendship, conversation, and discussion that I will value most. Here, I offer my thanks to my LIS colleagues Allen C. Benson, Joel Blanco, Janet Ceja, Brian Cumer, Rebecca Morris, Healim Rhee, Elisabeth Rodriguez, Stephen Slota, and Heather Soyka, with whom I shared many interesting conversations and benefited from their own unique ideas and perspectives.

DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Within this section the primary terms and concepts developed and used in this study are listed and defined. These terms are presented in the order in which they appear in the dissertation.

Editorial Theory: The intellectual structures and ideas that define the practice of editing and that are developed during the consideration of editing, the role of the editor, and the function of the edition. A consideration of editorial theory can be seen as resulting in the development of *editorial methods*.

Editorial Practice: This term is defined as the processes involved in the editing and publishing of documentary materials and original sources. Editorial practice is the result of applying *editorial methods*.

Editorial Methods: This term can be defined as usable concepts and principles and are used in, and that guide, editorial practice.

Editorial Presence: Editorial presence can be described in terms of the level of influence the editor has on the text in terms of the degree of his or her alteration to the document. Editorial presence can be evaluated in terms of the editor's view regarding the role of annotation, description, and textual alteration. An editor whose philosophy is more in line with the idea of the editorial function as that of description, would have a different degree of editorial presence than an editor whose philosophy places more emphasis on the role of the editor as a disseminator of evidence.

Editorial Contexts: In this study the term is used broadly to define the environment within which editorial practice took place. More specifically, I am referring to elements related to the editorial operation, but not directly involved with the primary editing process.

Descriptive Research: This term refers to studies that report, or reported on, the ongoing activities of editorial projects. These studies did not provide an evaluation of methods, or editorial philosophy, but they did provide examples of the implementation of an editorial philosophy or set of methods. In simple terms, these writings described the editing process.

Editorial Philosophy: This concept is used to refer to the overarching viewpoint of an editor that influences his or her approach in reproducing original and primary sources in printed form. This is the macro view the editor holds regarding the role and function of the edition, documentary editing, and his or her own function.

Editorial Transparency: This concept refers to the degree to which an edition reveals the character of its construction. This refers to the mechanics of transcription, the originating source of the printed documents, and other decisions made by the editor, which affect the presentation of the sources. The information associated with editorial transparency is needed for the user to evaluate the integrity of the work as a primary source.

Textual Alteration: This term refers to any revision in the presentation of the documents, which differs from the information contents' form in the original document. Policies regarding alteration varied amongst editors. Though it was agreed that the editor should not disrupt meaning, the editor's concern with providing for clarity was where policy and belief differed.

Editorial Criticism: Editorial criticism refers to the close examination of documentary editions and practices, carried out by editors, in evaluating their practices and the works that editing produced. This criticism focuses attention on the works themselves as a source of this

knowledge. The attitudes, concepts, and ideas developed by early modern editors can be viewed as being created through this practice.

Reading Practices: Early modern editing practice, in terms of the artifacts it produced, assumed that the users of these editions would perform multiple readings, which is demonstrated by the final form these works took in published form. This influenced a concern with providing documents along with contextual information that supported the documentation.

Editorial Knowledge: Editorial knowledge refers to the information that editors possess regarding their practice and the works that they produce. The beginning and ending points of the early modern period of editing are both defined by particular categories of editorial knowledge. Editors working during the period of 1943 – 1970 developed editorial knowledge through examining the editions and practices themselves. This is knowledge generated by looking inward. However, Walter Rundell, Jr.'s study demonstrated an instance of generating editorial knowledge through examining instances and attitudes regarding use. This was editorial knowledge generated by looking outward.

Theoretical and Physical Edition: The term, *theoretical edition*, refers to the work as envisioned or idealized by the editor. Theoretical editions can be found in editorial discussions where the intent, function, and form of documentary editions are discussed. Editorial statements serve as the most formal category of theoretical editions. The *physical edition* is the actual object that is produced during the editing process. It is possible to evaluate the relationship between the physical edition and the theoretical edition.

Editorial Intention: This principle recognizes that editing is a creative act. The process of documentary editing is defined by procedures that are defined by editorial choices. Because of this, understanding editorial intention is a central element to understanding the practice of

documentary editing, and the particular work of an editor. The editor constructs a narrative through documents.

Editorial Disruption: Editorial disruption can be defined as any intervention of the editor that adversely affects the edited document's ability to convey the meaning of the original source document. The variation in approaches advocated in using annotations can be viewed as being related to this concept.

I. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This study is an examination of the theoretical and methodological foundations of American documentary historical editing.¹ An understanding of these foundations can be acquired through examining the early modern period of editing, which I believe can best be defined as the period 1943-1970.² The fundamental premise underlying this dissertation is that published original sources, the products of documentary editing, are a unique form of historical evidence.³ In this regard, documentary editions function as a specific category of original sources with their own unique characteristics. As a means of definition, these works can be

¹ The formal term used in this dissertation to describe the practice of publishing documentary materials within the United States is *American Documentary Historical Editing*. Popularly, and professionally, the practice is currently referred to as *documentary editing*, and this is the term that is adopted by the author as a means of abbreviation. During the period up till the late 1970's the practice was commonly defined as *historical editing*, in reference to the materials with which these individuals were principally concerned. To avoid confusion, the contemporary language is adopted in referring to this activity. For use of terms, see: Gregory D. Massey, "The Papers of Henry Laurens and Modern Documentary Editing," *Public Historian* 27:1 (Winter 2005): 39-41 and Mary-Jo Kline and Susan Holbrook Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

² The importance of these dates is explored in greater depth in this study. As a cursory introduction, the year 1943 marks the publication of Julian P. Boyd's formal report, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission on the Need, Scope, Preparation, Probable Cost, and Possible Means of Publishing a Comprehensive Edition of The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, which presented a set of recommendations for the publication of Thomas Jefferson's personal and professional papers. This work has served as a marker for defining the modern beginnings of documentary editing. The year 1970 marks the publication of Walter Rundell, Jr.'s, study, *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*, of use and instruction related to original sources in the American historical community. This study marks a redefinition in the landscape of editorial knowledge.

³ In this study, the documentary edition is conceptualized as a particular category of evidence. This is influenced by the author's consideration of the documentary edition as a unique form of historical evidence, and by the consideration of archival materials as evidence. For comprehensive statement on archives as evidence, see: Richard J. Cox, *Managing Records as Evidence and Information* (Westport: Connecticut: Quorum Books, 2001).

described as documentary, or archival texts. These works can also be conceptualized as published collections.⁴ Through the processes of selection, editing, annotation, and publication, editors have created, and continue to create, unique works from bodies of, primarily unpublished, source materials.⁵ The final forms that this category of works take is defined by the methods that the editor employs and his or her overarching editorial philosophy. Editorial intention and philosophy combine to create an overarching editorial theory that influences the methods that prescribe how the primary source material should be edited and presented.⁶

Historically, the publication of original sources within the United States dates to the 18th century.⁷ However, the methods and procedures that define contemporary, or modern, editorial practice, are a relatively recent invention.⁸ The development and refinement of these methods can partially be viewed as a reaction and response to past editorial practices. Changes in method are also representative of editors' evolving attitudes regarding the role and function of their

⁴ The documentary edition can be viewed as a hybrid object. It is both bibliographic and archival scope, possessing traits that are characteristic of published works, as well as characteristics of manuscripts and records that develop organically as a result of activities. Additionally, documentary editions also possess characteristics that are similar to that of manuscript collections. Documentary editions are created and developed through processes of selection, appraisal, and description. For this reason, these works can appropriately be defined as archival texts and as published collections.

⁵ Documentary editions can be described as both conscious and unconscious objects. This characteristic results from the two actions that resulted in the work. These actions consist of the activities that resulted in the source documentation, and the editing of this source documentation by the editor. A defining property of the materials contained within these works is that they generated organically as a result processes and activities.

⁶ The principal of **editorial intention** recognizes that editing is a creative act. The process of documentary editing is influenced by procedures that are defined by the choices that editors made in developing their projects. Because of this, understanding editorial intention is a central element to understanding the practice of documentary editing, and the particular work an editor. The editor constructs a narrative through documents.

⁷ Richard J. Cox, "Chapter 8: Archives, Documentary Editing, and the Quarrel about Preserving Our Documentary Heritage," *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives & Records Management* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000), 201-202.

⁸ Frank G. Burke, "Not by Vaults and Locks..." in *Research and the Manuscript Tradition* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1977), 212-216.

editions as tools for research, other categories of reading, and the perceived needs of their intended users.⁹

The early modern period of editing, viewed historically, can be defined as a period of transition, maturation, and editorial intention. In this dissertation I have examined the theoretical foundations of early modern American documentary editing theory and practice. Focusing on editors' discussions of the practice and process of editing allows for an understanding of the *ideas* of editing, and their influence on the publication of original sources.¹⁰ As noted, this period is most appropriately defined as the period of 1943-1970. It was during this era that the methods that have come to characterize *modern editing* were initially conceptualized and applied.¹¹ Another defining characteristic of this period was the depth of discussion regarding editorial theory and practice.¹² Documentary editors offered commentaries on the role and function of the editor, the relationship between editor and text, and the process of transmitting edited documents and documentary editions.

⁹ As will be described in this study, the form that the edition takes is defined by the purposes envisioned by the editor. How items are described through annotations and descriptions is directly influenced to the nature of use that individuals perceived to be potential users. Not all editors of the early modern period maintained the same views regarding the nature of this audience.

¹⁰ Viewed historically, and in reference to contemporary editorial practice, the primary distinction between modern editing and that of previous eras is an increased concern with maintaining the fidelity of the original source documents. This was accomplished through the application of more stringent transcription procedures and the systematic application of explanatory notes.

¹¹ This central theme is examined in this dissertation. As a point of introduction, the primary characteristics of early modern editing practice was an increased concern with fidelity to the original document, increased discussion regarding the concept of editorial completeness, a concern with the nature of editorial description, and a reevaluation of the role of the editor and the editorial function.

¹² The concepts of **editorial theory** and **editorial practice** are important distinguishing characteristics in the context of this study. Here, **editorial theory** refers to the intellectual structures and ideas that define the practice of editing and that are developed during the consideration of editing, the editor, and the edition. A consideration of editorial theory can be seen as resulting in the development of **editorial methods**, which can be defined as usable concepts and principles and are used in, and that guide, the editorial practice. **Editorial practice** can be defined as processes involved in the editing and publishing of documentary materials and original sources. **Editorial practice** is the result of applying **editorial methods**.

A critical aspect of this discussion was a shared concern with defining the role and function of the documentary edition, and the processes of production that would bring these objects into being. Essentially, documentary editors were commenting on the role, function, and properties of a specific category of historical evidence.¹³ Central to this discussion was the evaluation of the nature and characteristics of the relationship between the editor and the documentary materials. Editors contributing to the critical discussions of editing recognized that they functioned as intermediaries between edited documents and their readers. However, the role, or *presence*, of the editor within the documents was where theories of editing varied greatly.¹⁴

Why is it appropriate to define this period as the early modern period of editing? When evaluating the editorial work of this era, its defining characteristics are illustrative of a practice that cannot be defined as completely modern. Within these two boundary points, editorial ideas were exchanged, the scope of editorial practice expanded, and the orientation of editorial knowledge was altered. Because of these conditions, the practice of editing during these years can be thought of as moving towards increased formalization and maturation. Though modern in spirit, the finer details of theory and practice were still in refinement.¹⁵

¹³ See note 4. In this study documentary editions are conceptualized as a particular category of historical evidence. Though the materials contained within documentary editions serve as surrogates for existing materials, they can be viewed as unique objects in their own right. Because of this, documentary editions can be viewed as a unique category of historical evidence. An edited document is produced from existing source content, but this content can become supplemented with varying degrees of description, context, and interpretation. For this reason, documentary editions should be viewed as a particular category of mediated historical evidence.

¹⁴ The concept of **editorial presence** is a central element of this study. Editorial presence can be described in terms of the level of influence the editor has on the text in terms of the degree of his or her alteration to the document. Editorial presence can be evaluated in terms of the editor's view regarding the role of annotation, description, and textual alteration. An editor whose philosophy is more in line with the idea of the editorial function as that of description, would have a different degree of editorial presence than an editor whose philosophy places more emphasis on the role of the editor as a transcriber and disseminator of evidence.

¹⁵ The period between the early 20th century and 1943 can be viewed as a transitional period between the editorial practices that defined the 19th century and the practices that defined modern documentary editing. Specifically, this transitional period can be viewed as the period of editorial work and discussion that occurred during the period of J.

The underlying premise of this study is that the origins of the methods and debates that have defined modern documentary editing can be found in these early decades. An examination of editorial methods, practices, and contexts, offers an avenue for evaluating the editorial thought of this foundational period.¹⁶ Secondly, this understanding will provide an examination of the ideas that define contemporary documentary editing practice and offer a description of its intellectual roots.

B. BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Scholars of documentary editing have generally identified the year 1950 as the formal beginning point of modern practice.¹⁷ Marking this occasion was the publication of Julian P. Boyd's Volume I. of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*.¹⁸ Boyd's work was lauded for its accuracy of the transcription, the quality and depth of the footnotes and essays, and the comprehensive inclusion of *all* relevant documentation.¹⁹

Franklin Jameson's reevaluation of editorial methods and Julian P. Boyd's authoring of the *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, which defined the methods and procedures that would define modern editing practice.

¹⁶ In this study I use the term **editorial contexts**, broadly, to define the environment within which editorial practice took place. More specifically I am referring to elements related to the editorial operation, but not directly involved with the primary editing process.

¹⁷ In assigning a beginning point, both functional and symbolic, to the modern practice of documentary editing, there is agreement that it begins with Boyd. However, different years have been used as descriptive markers for this point. The most commonly assigned date is the year 1950, which correlates to the publication of Volume I. of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, its presentation to President Harry Truman, and Truman's call of the NHPC to investigate the nature of documentary publication within the United States. In this study I have adopted the year 1943 as a beginning date. 1943 marks the intellectual beginnings of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Boyd's work dates back to this report. Because of this, the intellectual origins of documentary editing can be seen as dating back formally to 1943.

¹⁸ Charlene B. Bickford and others, "Documentary Editing: Its History and Meaning," *Prologue* 18 (Fall 1986): 49-50.

¹⁹ Volume I. of Boyd's edition was the subject of extensive reviews. See John Melville Jennings, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1776 by Thomas Jefferson; Julian P. Boyd," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 58:4 (October 1950): 529-530; David M. Potter, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. I, 1760-1776 by Julian P. Boyd," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37:2 (September 1950): 312-314; W.O. Farber,

This praise considered the edition at both the object and document level. At the document level, the editorial apparatus was evaluated as quite innovative and was seen to illustrate a change in American editorial thought, regarding what constituted an accurate collection of published papers.²⁰ At the object level, the project was praised for its ambitious goal of publishing a full record of the documents related to Thomas Jefferson. These materials included outgoing and incoming correspondence, speeches, and both personal and public papers. This initial volume was the first in an anticipated set of, at the minimum, fifty volumes.²¹ In focusing on these aspects, reviewers identified two critical roles of the editor. Though not explicitly stated by reviewers, Boyd was evaluated in his capacity as editor of individual documents, as well as in his function of building collections. His work was defined as innovative on both accounts.

Though the publication of Boyd's edition has been contextualized as the formal starting point of modern era documentary editing, it is important to recognize that the publication of

"Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I, 1760-1776," *Western Political Quarterly* 3:4 (December 1950): 640-641; Richard Beale Davis, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Volume 1, 1760-1776: by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan and The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Volume 2, January 1777 to June 1779. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Modern Language Notes* 66:6 (June 1951): 412-414; Howard Mumford Jones, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I. 1760-1776. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *American Literature* 22:4 (January 1951): 540-543; Charles Farnsley, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Journal of Politics* 12:4 (November 1950): 714-715; Richard Hofstadter, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I: 1760-1776. Vol. II: 1777 to 18 June 1779, Including the Revisal of the Laws, 1776-1786. By Julian P. Boyd," *Political Science Quarterly* 66:1 (March 1951): 152-154; Theodore Hornberger, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *American Quarterly* 3:1 (Spring 1951): 87-90; and Brooke Hindle, "Review: Thomas Jefferson: Scientist by Edwin T. Martin and The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I (1760-1776) by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Isis* 43:3 (September 1952): 281-282.

These reviews appeared in a variety of disciplines, including the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. One of the stated strengths of the comprehensive approach to editing was that it would create a work that could be used by a number of subject disciplines. Boyd defined the idea of completeness as a "relative term," stating that producing a complete edition was "theoretically possible put practically unattainable and in some respects undesirable." He viewed his work as complete to the extent that the editors "aimed at the inclusion of everything legitimately Jeffersonian." See Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xiv.

²⁰ One of the most noteworthy aspects was the inclusion of correspondence that Jefferson had received. Previous editions of Jefferson's papers typically contained only the letters that he had authored. Boyd, in providing the receiving correspondence, offered a more complete collection of Jefferson's exchanges.

²¹ Boyd, *Papers*, xiv.

Boyd's edition is also illustrative of a dialogue and discussion regarding the role and function of editions and editors. More importantly, Boyd's edition is representative of the application of a particular form of editorial theory. In the context of the history of documentary editing, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* is most important when considered as a manifestation of a collection of attitudes and ideas regarding the role and function of documentary editions, how original sources should be represented in printed form, and what is required for surrogates to function as original sources.

What was the nature of this dialogue and discussion? For the most part, discussions of documentary editing were descriptive in nature.²² These studies offered valuable case studies and detailed descriptions of editorial practice. This work was also useful in that it provided overviews of editorial practices, and helped to illustrate the distinctions that existed regarding selection, transcription, and publishing practices.²³ However, there was also a strand of the literature that addressed more theoretical and conceptual issues and their consequence on practice. This body of work can be viewed as complementing the descriptive research.²⁴

²² In the context of this study, **descriptive research** refers to studies that report, or reported on, the ongoing activities of projects. These studies did not provide an evaluation of methods, or editorial philosophy, but they did provide examples of the implementation of an editorial philosophy or a set of methods. In simple terms, these writings described the editing process.

²³ Examples of this category of work include: Memory F. Mitchell, "Publishing the Papers of a Contemporary Governor," *American Archivist* 33:1 (January 1970): 11-18; Donald H. Mugridge, "The Adams Papers," *American Archivist* 25:4 (October 1962): 449-454; William H. Runge, "The Madison Papers," *American Archivist* 20:4 (October 1957): 313-317; Lyman H. Butterfield, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Progress and Procedures in the Enterprise at Princeton," *American Archivist* 12:2 (April 1949): 131-145; Burl Noggle, "Predilections to Politics and the Lures of Love: The Further Education of Young Woodrow Wilson," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 9:4 (Autumn 1968): 373-387; and Clarence E. Carter, "The Territorial papers of the United States: A Review and a Commentary," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 42:3 (December 1955): 510-524. The defining characteristic of these works is that they offer descriptions of editorial project and methods, but they do not discuss more theoretical concerns.

²⁴ The primary conceptual issues that editors have been concerned with are related to selection, description, and replication. Three overarching concerns that guide these more precise elements are the nature of audience, use, and the role of the editor in disseminating historical evidence. Editors contributing to the more conceptual and theoretical literature wrote on these themes.

The methods that Julian P. Boyd developed and refined influenced the editorial climate of the 50's and 60's and the work of his colleagues. The nature of this influence was both direct and indirect. In some cases, Boyd had direct influence through the teaching and training of his fellow editors.

An illustrative example of this influence can be found in the editorial work of Lyman H. Butterfield, the originating editor of *The Adams Papers*.²⁵ Butterfield formerly worked on Boyd's *Papers* as an associate editor and acknowledged the influence of this relationship, and experience, on his own editorial work.²⁶ Less directly, Boyd's influence was extended through his writing and editorial work. His thought regarding the nature of the comprehensive edition influenced the publishing strategy advocated by the National Historical Publications Commission (NHPC).²⁷ The example set by *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* exerted great influence on the development and encouragement of the large-scale Founding Fathers projects that were initiated during the 1950's through the early 60's, most visibly in the reports issued by this organization.²⁸

However, other individuals, with divergent attitudes regarding the proper methods for transmitting documents, also contributed to this dialogue of editing. Julian P. Boyd's work can be described as the most prominent and dominant of this period, but other theorists contributed valuable discussions to this narrative of editing. In my view, it is best to view Boyd's "new

²⁵ As will be later discussed in this dissertation, Lyman H. Butterfield was instrumental in sculpting the identity of *The Adams Papers*, most visibly, through the development of an overall strategy for publishing the papers. During the early modern period, Butterfield was responsible for editing the following works: L.H. Butterfield, ed., *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961); L.H. Butterfield, ed., *The Earliest Diary of John Adams* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966); L.H. Butterfield, ed., *Adams Family Correspondence, Vols 1-2* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963).

²⁶ For a characterization of Butterfield's work with the Jefferson Papers, see Butterfield, "Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Progress and Procedures," and Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, xxxv-xxxvii.

²⁷ From this point on in this dissertation referred to as the NHPC.

²⁸ National Historical Publications Commission's *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents: A Report to the President by the National Historical Publications Commission* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954) and *A Report to the President Containing a Proposal by the National Historical Publications Commission* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963).

editing” as an illustrative example of an editorial discussion that developed during the early 1940’s and continued through the late 60’s, while remaining cautious not to neglect other valuable contributions to this era’s editorial thought.²⁹

During this period, projects of the same scale as the Jefferson Papers began the task of identifying, gathering, editing, and publishing the documents of individuals whose papers were determined to merit similar treatment.³⁰ Also of note were specialized projects that, though smaller in scale, were of no less importance, from an editorial standpoint, both when viewed in their own contemporary context and when viewed historically. Lester J. Cappon’s, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, is the best example of this category of publication, and his work can be viewed as a pioneering example of selective documentary editing.³¹

While this increased output of documentary publications is very interesting, also of note is the period’s increased dialogue regarding conceptual issues associated with editing. Here editors discussed the methods of documentary editing and how documentary editions should be produced.³² While there were central principles, editorial functions, and objectives that editors generally agreed upon, subtle differences in editorial philosophy did exist.³³

The discussions that emerged from prominent editorial thinkers reveal the presence of multiple attitudes that defined the role and function of documentary editions and the specific

²⁹ The other principle editors contributing to this dialog were Lyman H. Butterfield, Clarence E. Carter, and Lester J. Cappon.

³⁰ In addition to *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, the other prominent founding era projects established during the early modern period of editing were *The Adams Papers*, *The Papers of James Madison*, *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, and *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*. See: National Historical Publications and Records Commission, *A National Program*, 17-19.

³¹ Lester J. Cappon, ed., *The Adams-Jefferson Letters* (Chapel Hill: Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia by the University of North Carolina Press, 1959).

³² These critical discussions could be found in the pages of archival and historical journals, such as *The American Archivist* and the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. This body of literature also took the form of critical book reviews, and through the form of critical editorial statements provided by editors in their editions.

³³ In this dissertation the concept of **editorial philosophy** is used to refer to the overarching viewpoint of an editor that influences his or her approach in reproducing original and primary sources in printed form. This is the macro view the editor holds regarding the role and function of the edition, documentary editing, and themselves.

subtleties in editorial thought that influenced these attitudes. Though these discussions occurred within the particular context of documentary publication, at their most basic level, these were discussions regarding the requirements of historical evidence in the form of original sources, and how this evidence could be represented in an edited and published form. In this regard early modern editing can also be described as a more self-conscious editing.

The primary distinction between this form of editing and that of previous periods, as described by the critics, was the application, and consideration of, more rigorous editorial procedures that would meet a *scholarly* standard.³⁴ The publication of original sources in the United States dates to the 18th century.³⁵ These projects printed and disseminated editions containing collections of laws, state documents, and personal papers of notable individuals.³⁶

However, the reliability and accuracy of some of the editions published during this early period, and during the 19th century, was later questioned by historian-editors working during the early decades of the 20th century. In their criticism of previous editions, editors found examples of documents being sanitized and excised, or published in incomplete and inaccurate forms.³⁷ In

³⁴ Douglass Adair, "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I: 1760-1776 by Thomas Jefferson; Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 74:3 (July 1950), 407-408.

³⁵ Richard J. Cox, "Chapter 8: Archives, Documentary Editing, and the Quarrel about Preserving Our Documentary Heritage," *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives & Records Management* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000), 201.

³⁶ A detailed general survey of 19th century editing can be found in the work of Frank G. Burke, O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr., and Richard J. Cox. See: Frank G. Burke, "Not by Vaults and Locks...", in *Research and the Manuscript Tradition* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1997): 211-236; O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr., "Preservation and Dissemination of Historical Evidence," in *Beneath the Footnote* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1969): 340-378; Richard J. Cox, "Archives, Documentary, Editing, and the Quarrel about Preserving our Documentary Heritage," in *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives and Records Management* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000), 197 -202.

³⁷ The most visible example of this early 20th century re-analysis can be seen through a study of J. Franklin Jameson's reviews of early 20th century documentary publications. An example is Jameson's 1903 review of Gaillard Hunt's edition, *The Writings of James Madison*: see J. Franklin Jameson, "Review: *The Writings of James Madison*," *The American Historical Review* 8:3 (April 1903): 559-661. In this review, typical of the style Jameson used in his reviews of the period, the book review functions as a space to both evaluate the specific work under review, but also to place the reviewed work within the context of the history of editing. This consists of evaluating

defending the work of their predecessors, critics were careful to note that there were also highly skilled editors working during this period that produced editions of great accuracy. Critics were also careful to take into account the issue of editorial intention in offering their evaluation and assessment.³⁸

Critics also found that a number of earlier editions lacked transparency.³⁹ This was best exemplified by quality of the provenance information that was printed alongside the documents.⁴⁰ Failure to include this type of information, or the inclusion of inaccurate information, would leave the reader unable to determine whether the printed document was a copy from a previously published edition, which may have contained its own inaccuracies, or if it was an original transcription.⁴¹

An additional concern was transparency in regard to the editorial device.⁴² Descriptions of editorial decisions, in the form of editorial statements, were not always included within the

the edition in comparison to previous editions of similar material. In doing so, Jameson provides commentary regarding the strengths and weaknesses of a number of editions, and provides comments on methodology.

³⁸ Cappon, "Jared Sparks," 187-189.

³⁹ The concept of **editorial transparency** refers to the degree to which an edition reveals the character of its construction. This refers to the mechanics of transcription, the originating source of the printed documents, and other decisions made by the editor, which affect the presentation of the sources. The information associated with editorial transparency is needed for the user to evaluate the integrity of the work as a source.

⁴⁰ This study is concerned with provenance in both the archival and editorial context. In the archival sense, provenance, in short, refers to the genealogy of the document. Contained within this genealogy is the context of a documents creation and its custody. In the editorial context, this study is concerned with editor-based provenance and user-based provenance. During the process of creating the edition, editors were greatly concerned with evaluating the origins of a document in order to ensure its reliability, authenticity, and accuracy. Additionally editors were also concerned with placing provenance information within their editions, so that users could evaluate the edition as a source.

⁴¹ J. Franklin Jameson, "Review: *The Writings of James Monroe*. Edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton. Volume VI. 1817-1823.," *American Historical Review* 8:4 (July 1903), 781-782; J. Franklin Jameson, "Review: The Writings of James Madison by Galliard Hunt," *American Historical Review* 8:3 (April 1903): 559-561.

⁴² In this dissertation *editorial device* is synonymous with *editorial apparatus*. Both of these terms refer to the structure that editors applied to documents during the processes involved with transcription and editing. This mechanism states how notes are constructed and used, the procedures involved in transcription, and the policies that pertain to abbreviations, deletions, and alterations.

editions.⁴³ Absence of descriptions of decisions made pertaining to textual alterations was also a concern identified by editors.⁴⁴ Editorial attitudes and philosophies partially account for these findings. It was not a universal practice for 19th century editors to note where text had been altered, describe why documents had been selected or omitted from an edition of papers, or from what sources the documents had originated.⁴⁵

While early 20th century editors were critical of some of the works their predecessors had produced, in carrying out these evaluations, critics were careful to take into account the historiographic era in which their predecessors worked, and the intended function of the artifact. These editors had their own specific editorial objectives and goals, which guided practice.⁴⁶ Secondly, the period possessed its own conditions, definitions, and intentions that defined the characteristics of use. Lastly, the overlying historiographic condition of the period defined what

⁴³ J. Franklin Jameson, "Review: *The Writings of James Monroe*. Edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton. Volume VI. 1817-1823," *American Historical Review* 8:4 (July 1903), 781-782. In this review Jameson illustrates the difficulty that can come from not providing the full genealogy of the printed material. In this case, Jameson focuses on a specific printed letter, tracing its origins to a corrupted copy, published inaccurately in a prior edition.

⁴⁴ In this dissertation, **textual alteration** refers to any revision in the presentation of the documents, which differs from the information contents' form in the original document. Policies regarding alteration varied amongst editors. Though it was agreed that the editor should not disrupt meaning, the editors concern with providing for clarity was where policy and belief differed.

⁴⁵ J. Franklin Jameson, "Review: *The Writings of James Monroe*. Edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton. Volume VI. 1817-1823," *American Historical Review* 8:4 (July 1903), 781-782. In evaluating Murray's edition, Jameson also draws attention to liberties taken in the alteration of text, either intentional or through error, that are present in some of the transcription.

⁴⁶ An important concept discussed and debated by editors during this period was that of use. Editors argued that documentary editions served two primary audiences. Students and researchers were the primary audience that was intended to use the editions during research practices (scholarly use). Editors were of varied opinion regarding their ability to conceptualize specialized audiences within the category. Clarence E. Carter, for example, stated that beyond historians, editors were unable to assume an audience of users. Julian P. Boyd, however, argued that scholars, beyond historians, would be able to use the editions to support their work, which was a primary reason for his advocacy of the comprehensive editions. In addition, Boyd and the National Historical Publications Commission, and later the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, argued that published documentary materials would also serve a more general audience, that the works produced by editing were a public good. This study demonstrates that these varying attitudes regarding use influenced editorial theory and the development of documentary editions.

was acceptable and required of the published source materials, depending on the nature of their use.⁴⁷

The analyses by the early 20th century editors would be of great importance to Boyd's generation in further refining its work.⁴⁸ In addition to identifying pitfalls to avoid during the editorial process, these editors also offered a valuable assessment of the relationship between the editor and the document, and the nature of editorial intention. These editors provided a model and framework for providing a useful criticism of editorial practice.⁴⁹

A study of editorial writings demonstrates that early modern editors asked two fundamental questions in their study of previous editions. First, how did the editions operate within their own specific period, and were they successful, in relation to expectations as a source? Critical questions also addressed the issue of standards. Were there standards? What were these standards? Secondly, editors evaluated past projects in terms of what previous editions accomplished, and what editors felt historical editing and editions could, and should, allow for. However forgiving the reviewers, these assessments were used to illustrate the need for more stringent standards in producing editions that could be defined as authoritative, and that could be used in the service of scholarship.

In comparing 20th and 19th century editions, the determining factor that influenced their formulation and construction was related to expectations regarding audience. An edition was

⁴⁷ Kline and Perdue, *Guide*, 4.

⁴⁸ A defining characteristic of modern editing was a more explicit intent in publishing documents that could function as historical evidence. In illustrating the failures of 19th century editing practices, in terms of producing editions that could function as evidence, Jameson identified critical flaws and also illustrated the requirements of documentary editions, if they were to be used as evidence.

⁴⁹ An important concept in this study is called **editorial criticism**. Editorial criticism refers to the close examination of documentary editions and practices, carried out by editors in evaluating their practices and works that editing practices produced. This criticism focuses attention on the works themselves as a source of this knowledge. The attitudes, concepts, and ideas developed by early modern editors can be viewed as being created through this practice.

created with a specific audience in mind, for example, popular as opposed to scholarly use. The selection of material was also defined by interest and utility. Publication was warranted by an expectation of use. While in some cases the preservative value of reproduction was articulated, most famously by Jefferson himself,⁵⁰ primarily, reproduction was to assist with the dissemination of materials through publication.⁵¹

This description contains the essence of editorial intention. Editorial intention has been discussed in terms of two primary types. These include, broadly, the audiences that would use a given edition, and secondly, how these editions would then be used. Reference, general reading, and research are all reading activities that a user could perform when using a documentary edition.⁵² Though there were a number of different potential readings the edition would allow for, the success and capacity of the reader to engage in these different varieties of reading was determined by the editor. Editorial method governed the creation of the documentary edition and influenced its final structure, greatly affecting its possible use. The ideas that editors developed, and their methods for applying these ideas, determined the final forms that these works took.

⁵⁰ In a letter to Ebenezer Hazard (1744-1817), Postmaster-General, publisher, and historical editor/collector, Jefferson wrote “The lost cannot be recovered; but let us save what remains: not by vaults and locks which fence them from the public eye and use, in consigning them to the waste of time, but by such a multiplication of copies, as shall place them beyond the reach of accident.” Quoted in Lester J. Cappon, “American Historical Editors Before Jared Sparks: “they will plant a forest...,”” in Richard J. Cox’s, *Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004), 166.

⁵¹ Cappon, “American Historical Editors,” 166-167.

⁵² The idea of **reading practices** is an important concept in this study. Early modern editing practice, in terms of the artifacts it produced, assumed that the users of these editions would perform multiple readings, which is demonstrated by the final form these works took in their published form. This influenced a concern with providing documents along with contextual information that supported the documentation.

C. FOCUS OF THE STUDY

1. Themes

The dissertation is guided by three primary arguments. First, the practice of historical editing results in the production of a specific type of work that can best be described as a published documentary or archival text. In addition to being a specific type of published work, documentary editions are also a particular form of historical evidence. Hybridity is a primary characteristic of documentary editions, both as conceived, and as constructed.

The publishing of original sources, by necessity, resulted in a movement from the original documentation. The information can be reproduced, but this is information removed from the artifact. Content is taken from its original context and framed within a new container. In addition to being placed within a new container, this historical information is supplemented with tools that the editor thinks will best support its access. These tools take the form of explanatory essays, editorial notes, and textual corrections and clarifications. Documentary editions are the result of this weaving together of editorial description/narration along with original source content.⁵³

Second, the development of documentary editions is supported by a complex body of ideas that influence the physical forms that editions take, and because of this, the history of editing can best be approached through identifying and analyzing the philosophies and ideas that influence and guide editorial methods. This study has identified and described the intellectual frameworks that were developed, and that supported, early modern documentary editing practice.

⁵³ D.F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 12-14.

This was accomplished through analyzing editorial discussions, documentary editions as physical objects, and editorial contexts.

Lastly, this study argues that when considering the history of American documentary editing, the period 1943-1970 is unique and can best be defined as a more specialized period within the modern era of editing. I have defined this as the early modern period of American documentary editing. While the publication of Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* functions as a useful temporal marker for the development of modern editing, the formation of modern American editing as a project and editorial practice was not solidified or codified at that time. This date can be best used to identify a period of increased discussion regarding editorial methods and the role and function of documentary editions. Related to this point is that while Boyd's edition was the most prominent of this category of comprehensive editing, other editorial projects were operating concurrently, and other editorial ideas were circulating. In addition to Julian P. Boyd, other critical editors contributed to these dialogues regarding the editing and publication of original and primary sources.

2. The Early Modern Period

In this examination the years 1943 and 1970 function as book ends. Genealogically, the origins of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* can be traced to the 1943 report of The Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission. This report, authored by Julian P. Boyd, serving in his capacity as Historian of the committee, presented a set of recommendations regarding the publication of Thomas Jefferson's papers. Boyd argued for the establishment of a systematic

project with the goal of publishing all relevant papers, both authored and received by Jefferson.⁵⁴

The popularization of the systematic approach to editing in the United States can be traced to the ideas within this document, and the use of Boyd's *Jefferson* as an example of a suitable model.⁵⁵

A secondary characteristic of the early modern period of editing was the increased involvement of the federal government in systematically assisting with the publication of documentary materials. As previously stated, the publication of the first volume of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* served as an impetus for this activity. Encouraged by the publication of the initial volume of this work, President Truman, himself possessing a great interest in history, and an appreciation for historical scholarship, instructed the NHPC to investigate the landscape of the nation's documentary publishing activity and to develop a set of recommended guidelines for publishing original sources. In addition to this protocol, the Commission was instructed to compile a listing of American figures whose papers merited similar attention and publication.⁵⁶

This resulted in the publication of a series of government reports during the 1950's and 1960's, which offered a set of recommendations regarding the nature of government involvement in assisting with documentary publication. These reports offer insights into the federal government's attitudes and values regarding the proper role of documentary publications, its

⁵⁴ Julian P. Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission on the need, scope, proposed method of preparation, probable cost, and possible means of publishing a comprehensive edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943).

⁵⁵ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program*, 13.

This report emphasized that the additional founding era figures should be edited using the approach used in the publication of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*.

⁵⁶ Keith Donohue, "Documenting Democracy," *Prologue* 36, no.3 (Fall 2004): 30-33. Additionally, the history of the federal government's involvement in documentary publication during this early period is provided in H.G. Jones' *The Records of a Nation* (New York: Athenaeum, 1969), 117-133, and in Donald R. McCoy's *The National Archives: America's Ministry of Documents, 1934-1968* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 262-273.

responsibility in aiding this enterprise, the function of documentary editions, as well as how these works should be produced and the materials that they should contain.⁵⁷

The year 1970 functions as a boundary point of this period and of this study. Evaluated as a whole, the period 1943-1970 consisted of a period of formative discussions regarding editorial theory, method, and philosophy, which resulted in the development of new editorial knowledge. The year 1970 marks a critical boundary point in the development of editorial knowledge and what was known about the essential characteristics and nature of documentary publications. As a boundary point, 1970 is notable because it marks the publication of Walter Rundell, Jr.'s, *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*.⁵⁸

This work represents an outward turn in the nature of editorial knowledge and discussion.⁵⁹ The knowledge generated by Rundell identified and evaluated the social aspects and consequences of editing through studying the status of documentary editing amongst the historical community, available instruction in using published editions of original sources, and historians attitudes regarding documentary editions and editing. Accomplished through the use of surveys and interviews, Rundell provided an understanding of documentary editions through

⁵⁷ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President containing a Proposal by the National Historical Publications Commission to Meet Existing and Anticipated Needs Over the Next Ten Years Under a National Program for the Collection, Preservation, and Publication, or Dissemination by Other Means, of the Documentary Sources of American History*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963). The prior reports were issued in 1951 and 1954: National Historical Publications Commission, *The National Historical Publications Commission, 1934-1950, A Report to the Commission* (Washington: General Services Administration, 1951) and a finalized report that offered a plan for documentary publication, National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents, A Report to the President by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954).

⁵⁸ Walter Rundell, Jr., *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970).

⁵⁹ The concept of **editorial knowledge** is a central concept to this study. Editorial knowledge refers to the information that editors possess regarding their practice and the works that they produce. The beginning and ending of the early modern period of editing are both defined by particular categories of editorial knowledge. Editors working during the periods of 1943 – 1970 developed editorial knowledge through examining the editions and practices themselves. This is knowledge generated by looking inward. However, Rundell's study demonstrated an instance of generating editorial knowledge through examining instances and attitudes regarding use. This was editorial knowledge generated by looking outward.

examining users. In doing so, he documented the attitudes, beliefs, and values of users, which offers a portrait of the relationship between the work and the reader or researcher. This is a very different type of editorial knowledge.⁶⁰

Julian P. Boyd and his contemporaries examined editions and methods in order to understand and construct effective surrogates. This editorial knowledge was created from looking within and examining the sources themselves. Rundell illustrates the necessity of the outward gaze in understanding documentary editing and editions. The early modern period can be defined as ending with this outward gaze. Another way of stating this point is that the early modern American documentary editing can be viewed as beginning with the thought of Julian P. Boyd and ending with the thought of Walter Rundell, Jr., with both representing unique developments in the generation of editorial knowledge.

D. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This dissertation was guided, and its findings bounded, by four primary overarching research questions. These four questions defined the topics and concerns that are evaluated, analyzed, and presented in this dissertation. In addition, these questions also guided the research process in approaching these topics and subjects. These research questions are presented below. Nested within each research question is a brief bullet-point narrative that defines and describes the primary elements that were examined, and that are presented.

⁶⁰ Rundell, Jr., *In Pursuit of American History*, ix-xiv.

Question #1:

What are the primary characteristics of the editorial methods developed and implemented during the period 1943-1970? What are the general characteristics of this period? To what degree does this period differ from previous periods of editing, in terms of methods, practices, attitudes, and external factors?

- Distinctions between modern and pre-modern documentary editing.
- Characteristics and functions of early modern documentary editing (1943-1970).

Question #2:

To what extent did underlying attitudes regarding the function of historical sources, editorial theory, and conceptualizations of editorial practice influence the development and application of editorial theory and methods?

- Intellectual foundations of editorial practice.
- Relationship between original sources and published surrogates (documentary editions).
- Requirements of primary sources as evidence.
- Requirements of documentary editions as scholarly sources.

Question #3:

As defined, articulated, and illustrated by editorial methodology, what is the relationship between the edited documents and the originating source materials, in terms of their function as historical evidence? How did the nature of this relationship determine the form the edited documents, and documentary editions, took in their final published forms?

- Relationship between original source material and edited documents.
- Editors' conceptualizations of edited documents.
- Influence of editorial Intention.
- Relationships between original sources, documentary editions, and readers.

Question #4

What was the effect of external factors, including allied professions, governmental institutions, and research standards, on the development of editorial methods? What was the extent of their influence?

- Role of the federal government in assisting with editorial activity.
- Historiographic environment in which the editions were produced.
- Influence of the archival and library professions on editorial practice.

E. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This dissertation offers a critical history of the intellectual foundations of historical documentary editing, as practiced within the United, during the period 1943-1970. Though documentary editing has been studied from a historical perspective, this work has primarily been

descriptive in nature. The findings of this dissertation will allow for a better understanding of the ideas that served as a foundation for documentary editing practices. In exploring these foundations, it is possible to obtain further insight regarding the history of editorial thought by placing greater emphasis on the ideas that influenced editorial practice. This will supplement existing historical scholarship on the subject.

This dissertation also offers an evaluation of a specific category of historical evidence, produced during a particular period. A small number of historical editors, in addition to their roles in producing documentary editions, functioned as theorists and critics of historical evidence. Just as archivists have been defined as scholars of records and record keeping systems, historical editors can similarly be defined as experts of a particular category of textual evidence. Editors have focused their attention on the creation of published surrogates that can accurately, reliably, and usefully function as original sources. The study of documentary editing contributes to what is known regarding the characteristics and properties of edited documents as evidence, their construction, and their intended use.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

Considered broadly, the history of documentary editing consists of multiple research areas. Scholars have produced studies of collecting practices, biographies of editors, analyses of individual projects, editorial procedures and methods, scholarly publishing, and institutional histories. This has resulted in a diverse body of work that has evaluated and described the varying aspects of editorial practice.

In this review of the literature, I will concentrate on the work that has focused on the role of the editor and the documentary edition from a historical perspective, with a specific focus on discussions and evaluations of how editors conceptualized their work. This survey will not consist of the literature that I am treating as a primary source. As a means of definition, writings included within this category consist of works that do not possess a primarily historical evaluation of editorial theory or practice.

Boyd and his colleagues wrote extensively regarding editorial practice, commenting on both their own individual projects and those of their peers. Editors frequently published descriptive evaluations of their projects that are useful in evaluating editorial theory and practice. This type of documentation is treated as a primary source, within the context of this study. In this review, my objective is to present, evaluate, and discuss the research literature that evaluates

editorial theory and practice from a historical perspective, and that places emphasis on evaluating editors' conceptualizations of the role and function of documentary editions.

B. GENERAL CONTOURS OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH ON HISTORICAL DOCUMENTARY EDITING

Before I begin this discussion, it is appropriate to comment on the general character of the existing body of research. Currently, this work can best be defined as falling within three primary categories: critical research, descriptive overviews of projects/practices, and surveys of editing. There have been a number of general surveys written, which are helpful in obtaining a general historical overview of documentary editing. These works offer an overview of the primary periods of editing (18th, 19th, and 20th centuries), critical figures in the history of editing (Ebenezer Hazard, Jared Sparks, Peter Force, J. Franklin Jameson, Julian P. Boyd), and the nature of institutional involvement in assisting with the practice of documentary editing (NHPC and NHPRC).

Works of this type vary in their analytical depth, but do offer a succinct overview of editing. Typically, these works are contained within survey works related to documentary and archival practices. Editing is discussed within this larger context of documentary practices. Examples of these works include Frank G. Burke's *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, Richard J. Cox's *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives and Records Management*, and O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr.'s *Beneath the Footnote: A Guide to the Use and*

Preservation of American Historical Sources. In addition to providing a succinct discussion of the history of editing, these works place editing practice within its larger documentary context.¹

A significant portion of the literature functions as a collection of descriptive case studies, which offer historical examinations framed around a specific project, practice, or a particular edition.² This work is very useful because it offers a description and assessment of the work of a particular editor, or of a particular project, but it does possess its limitations in terms of providing an understanding of editorial practice. Editorial choices, practices, and projects are evaluated within this category of the research literature, however, an analysis of the underlying theory and method is not provided. From this work it is possible to obtain a description and evaluation of editorial practices, but it is not possible to obtain an understanding of the nature of editorial theory and its foundations. Research of this type operates at a macro level and seeks to inform an audience of these descriptive aspects, but it does not necessarily offer an examination of the

¹ Frank G. Burke, "Not by Vaults and Locks...", in *Research and the Manuscript Tradition* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997); O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr., "Preservation and Dissemination of Historical Evidence," in *Beneath the Footnote* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1969); Richard J. Cox, *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives and Records Management* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000): 197-202; David D. Van Tassel, *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America 1607-1884* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960): 103-110; and L.H. Butterfield, "Worthington Chauncey Ford, Editor," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d Ser., 83 (1971): 46-82.

² Walter Muir Whitehill, *Independent Historical Societies: An Enquiry into their Research and Publication Functions and their Financial Future* (Boston: Boston Athenaeum, 1962); Leslie W. Dunlap, *American Historical Societies 1790-1860* (Madison, Wisconsin: Cantwell Printing Company, 1944); H.G. Jones, *For History's Sake: The Preservation and Publication of North Carolina History 1663-1903* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966); Worthington Chauncey Ford, "The Editorial Function in the United States," *American Historical Review* 23:2 (January 1918): 273-278; Richard N. Sheldon, "Editing a Historical Manuscript: Jared Sparks, Douglas Southall Freeman, and the Battle of Brandywine," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 36:2 (April 1979): 255-263; George H. Callcott, "Antiquarianism and Documents in the Age of Literary History," *American Archivist* 21:1 (January 1958): 17-29; Galen Broecker, "Jared Sparks, Robert Peel and the State Paper Office," *American Quarterly* 13:2 (Summer 1961): 140-152; Burt Noggle, "Predilections to Politics and the Lures of Love: The Further Education of Young Woodrow Wilson," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 9:4 (Autumn 1968) 373-387; George Pilcher, "Ebenezer Hazard and the Promotion of Historical Scholarship in the Early Republic," *Pennsylvania History* 56:1 (January 1989): 3-13; Brent Tarter, "Long Before the NHPRC: Documentary Editing in Nineteenth-Century Virginia," *Documentary Editing* 30:1&2 (2008): unnumbered; and Lester J. Cappon, "Two Decades of Historical Activity in Virginia," *Journal of Southern History* 6:2 (May 1940): 189-200.

underlying editorial concerns. This is not a criticism of this category of research, but this observation does illustrate the need for additional studies of documentary editing that address other aspects of this subject.

There is a smaller body of literature that addresses these theoretical concerns, but it is narrower in its scope. Critical studies of documentary editing differ from descriptive research in terms of their scope and of the aspects of editing that are given scholarly attention. An increased emphasis is placed on theoretical editorial concerns. While editorial practice is an important point of study within this body of work, the discussion of editorial processes places greater emphasis on the nature of editorial thought and on editorial decisions. Editorial procedures and methods are often discussed in the context of the editor's treatment of a collection of documents. In addition, emphasis is placed on critiquing and evaluating the documentation itself and the relationship that exists between the documentation and the editor. Close attention is given to issues of reliability and authenticity, and the influence of these attributes on editorial procedures.³

The preceding discussion of these general research categories contains examples of this critical work. In these discussions, the specific examples presented can be categorized as critical research. While these are illustrative of a category in terms of genre, they are not representative of the depth of this work. Primarily, the overall body of research is more discussion/descriptive focused, but there are good examples that can be used as models for how certain topics in editing have been approached from a critical historical perspective.

³ This study is an expansion of this aspect of the historical literature.

1. General Discussion

Before I discuss the focused area of this literature review, it is appropriate to comment on the general character of the historical work that has been performed in this area. A number of subjects, including editors, institutions, and specific works, have been evaluated by scholars writing in this area. Though these subject areas cover a diverse number of individual topics, common themes and approaches can be identified.

The primary categories of research can be defined as biography, institutional history, and historical case studies of editorial projects. These are illustrative of the approaches taken in historical examinations of documentary editing. This categorical approach is taken in evaluating this body of scholarship. Research on editing has occurred primarily at the macro-level, focusing on the individual, institution, and project. This is not a criticism, but the body of research does illustrate the need for micro-level historical research that focuses on methods and theoretical discussions of editorial practice.

A secondary characteristic of this research is the emphasis scholars have placed on the general editing process. Evaluations of this type can best be described as process focused. This is particularly important in evaluating biographical scholarship and institutional history. Editors and institutions carried out a number of functions, ranging from collecting, to publishing, and to advocacy. Two examples that illustrate this aspect is the scholarship written on the historian J. Franklin Jameson and the related research that evaluates the role the National Historical Publication Commission (NHPC) in formalizing and encouraging editorial projects. These categories will be described and discussed below.

J. Franklin Jameson, while a pioneering editor, also maintained a pivotal role in the professionalization of the historical discipline, the formation of a National Archives, and the movement to strengthen the United States' holdings of original sources. The multiple facets of his work in this capacity has been evaluated by scholars, and published in a series of monographs.⁴ Less focused attention has been given to his work as a documentary editor.⁵ Though this aspect of Jameson's career is evaluated within the monographic literature as an element of work, these provide only a survey of his work as an editor. This aspect of his work has not been the focus of a specific extensive study. However, this part of Jameson's career has been evaluated and discussed in the periodical literature.⁶

Work evaluating the role of the NHPRC's efforts in assisting with the care, publication, and management of documentary materials is another illustrative example. With the 1975 reorganization of the National Historical Publications Commission (NHPC), the newly renamed

⁴ J. Franklin Jameson's life and career has been the subject of numerous studies, focusing on different aspects of his work. Victor Gondos, Jr.'s *J. Franklin Jameson and the Birth of the Nation Archives 1906-1926* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1981) focuses on Jameson's activities in strengthening the infrastructure for providing access to, caring for, and providing access to documentary materials. Elizabeth Donnan and Leo F. Stock's edited volume, *An Historian's World: Selections from the Correspondence of John Franklin Jameson* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956), is a collection of selected correspondence. This collection contains both personal and professional correspondence, and serves to present a series of cross sections of his career. The letters are divided chronologically, and in terms of his varied professional affiliation, beginning with The Johns Hopkins University and concluding with correspondence from his time at the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress. Lastly, Jameson has been the subject of a comprehensive multivolume work that documents his life and career, from his student days to his professional responsibilities as an academician and administrator. This collection also reproduces original sources, including correspondence and reports he had authored: Morey Rothberg and Jacqueline Goggin, eds., *John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic Scholarship in America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993)

⁵ A discussion of these activities can be found in an essay issued after his death. See: "John Franklin Jameson," *American Historical Review* 43:2 (January 1938): 243-252.

⁶ Morey Rothberg has written extensively on J. Franklin Jameson, exploring in specific detail, aspects that he has addressed in his survey of Jameson's life and career. Topics he has addressed are Jameson's activities as an editor, his place in the international historical community, and his work at the Carnegie Institution of Washington. See his: "The Brahmin as Bureaucrat; J. Franklin Jameson at the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1905-1928," *Public Historian* 8, no.2 (1986): 46-60; "John Franklin Jameson and the International Community," *History Teacher* 26, no.4 (August 1993): 449-457; and "'To Set a Standard of Workmanship and Compel Men to Conform to It': John Franklin Jameson as Editor of the *American Historical Review*," *American Historical Review* 89:4 (October 1984): 957-975.

NHPRC took on the added responsibility of assisting institutions in caring, managing, and collecting documentary materials through the coordination and management of projects and the administration of grants.⁷ The history of the NHPRC's, and the preceding NHPC's, involvement in sponsoring and supporting the publication of documentary editions is represented in this scholarship, along with discussion of the NHPRC's other activities, namely its sponsorship of records surveys. This work focuses on the programmatic influence of these institutions in setting out guidelines that would guide the nature of governmental assistance and support for documentary publication.

2. Biography

a. 20th Century Editors

Biography, as a scholarly approach, has focused on critical figures associated with documentary editing. Predominantly, this work has focused on the editors working in the 18th century through the 20th century. In terms of the period that I am working, the most critical attention has been given to Julian P. Boyd, J. Franklin Jameson, Clarence E. Carter, and most recently, Lester J. Cappon. The scholarly analysis of these figures varies in terms of depth, approach, and focus.

Of this pioneering group of editors, the greatest attention, in terms of depth of analysis, has been the scholarship on J. Franklin Jameson and Lester J. Cappon. J. Franklin Jameson has been the subject of a number of monographs and articles. In this scholarship, the multiple

⁷ See: Constance B. Schulz, "'From Generation Unto Generation': Transitions in Modern Documentary Historical Editing," *Reviews in American History*, 16, no.3 (September 1988): 337-350 and Fredrika J. Teute, "Views in Review: A Historiographic Perspective on Historiography," *American Archivist* 43, no.1 (Winter 1980): 43-56.

aspects of his work have been evaluated. Views of Jameson as historian, editor, and administrator, have all been presented to readers and researchers.⁸

The archival educator Richard J. Cox's recent work on the historian, archivist, and documentary editor Lester J. Cappon provides a good model for critiquing editors that worked in multiple domains, individuals whom often carried out a number of related, but distinctly unique, duties. In his study of Cappon, Cox provides a biography and intellectual history of the individual and his ideas, fixing both within their professional and intellectual contexts.⁹ In his discussion of Cappon the editor, historian of editing, and analyst of editorial theory, Cox succinctly presents his editorial philosophy and also illustrates the place of this philosophy within the narrative of editorial theory, which Cappon himself contributed to through his writings.¹⁰

The work of Julian P. Boyd and Clarence E. Carter has been the subject of some scholarly attention.¹¹ However, writings on these figures have been strictly biographical, focusing primarily on their careers as historians, editors, and administrators. The specific nuances of their thoughts and ideas have not been isolated, evaluated, and described. These individuals have not been subject to any large-scale systematic study related to editorial methods. The existing research literature is effective in contributing to a general understanding of these figures and in offering an entry point for further study and investigation. However, more systematic biographical research, along the lines of intellectual biography/history of ideas, would

⁸ See notes 3 and 4.

⁹ Richard J. Cox, "Lester J. Cappon and The Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory," in *Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004): 3-31.

¹⁰ Cox, "Lester J. Cappon," 23-25.

¹¹ Noble E. Cunningham, Jr., "The Legacy of Julian Boyd," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 83 (1984): 340-344; Clarence E. Carter, "The Territorial Papers of the United States: A Review and Commentary," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 42:3 (December 1955): 510-524.

be a useful contribution to this body of work, and aid in the understanding of documentary editing generally. A closer examination of the editorial methods developed and applied by these individuals would also contribute to the small body of work that addresses editorial methods from a historical perspective.¹²

3. Institutional History

The institutions that have supported documentary publication efforts have also been the subject of historical study. This work can be divided into two primary categories. This first category consists of studies of governmental agencies. In studies of 20th century editing, the NHPRC, and its preceding body, the NHPC, have both been given scholarly attention.¹³ Scholars have addressed the role of these two organizations in supporting documentary editing practices, in particular, their efforts in coordinating these projects and in assisting with financial support.¹⁴

There is a fairly significant body of work that evaluates the roles of these institutions and their existence within the larger context of the federal government's documentary and archival initiatives. Two important works authored by H.G. Jones and Donald R. McCoy address the role of these organizations in supporting documentary publication. H.G. Jones's *The Records of a Nation* gives significant attention to the role of the federal government, through the NHPC, in

¹² The distinction that I make is between the descriptive study of methods versus the examination of editorial methods as they affect the creation of documentary editions.

¹³ The NHPC was originally formally organized in 1934. However due to a lack of resources, both monetary and material, the organization was fairly inactive until 1950 when President Truman called for a more extensive examination of the potential for government-sponsored assistance in publishing documentary materials. In 1975 the NHPC was restructured as the NHPRC, recognizing the expanded focus, responsibilities, and operations of this organization.

¹⁴ See note 5: Charlene B. Bickford, "Documentary Editing: Its History and Meaning," *Prologue* 18 (Fall 1986): 147-151, and Keith Donohue, "Documenting Democracy," *Prologue* 36:3 (Fall 2004): 30-33.

supporting documentary publication during the period 1934-1968.¹⁵ Particularly noteworthy is his discussion of the federal government's financial support of documentary projects during the period of 1965-1968.¹⁶

Jones also documents the federal government's role in supporting editing through the development of infrastructure. An example of this is the NHPC's sponsorship of the *Survey on the Use of Original Sources in Graduate History Training*, which was led by the historian Walter Rundell, Jr.¹⁷ The findings of this study were derived from an extensive collection of interviews with librarians, professors of history, and history graduate students. The subjects of this study were gathered from a set of seventy universities, which offered formal training in American History, and in addition, forty state archives, private libraries, and historical societies.¹⁸ The primary objectives of this study were to evaluate the relationships that existed between users and original sources, demonstrated by their experiences in using original sources, and to determine what instruction was available to students in learning how to effectively use primary source materials.¹⁹ In the context of this dissertation, Jones' study is noteworthy because of the attention he gives to the NHPC's concern in developing evidence-based procedures to assist with understanding the role of documentary publication.

Donald R. McCoy's *The National Archives: America's Ministry of Documents 1934-1968*, also merits discussion.²⁰ McCoy's study is important because he provides a concise early institutional history of the NHPRC and provides a consolidated discussion of an important set of

¹⁵ H.G. Jones, *The Records of a Nation: Their Management, Preservation, and Use* (New York: Athenaeum, 1969)

¹⁶ Jones, *Records of a Nation*, 117-133.

¹⁷ H.G. Jones contributes to what we know regarding the history of this project, the findings of which were published in 1970 by Walter Rundell, Jr.

¹⁸ Jones, *Records of a Nation*, 130.

¹⁹ Jones, *Records of a Nation*, 130.

²⁰ Donald R. McCoy, *The National Archives: Americas Ministry of Documents 1934-1968* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

directives given in early Commission reports regarding the publication of documentary materials. While his analysis does not provide the level of detail offered by H.G. Jones, McCoy creates a useful synthesis of facts, and successfully places the function of the NHPC within the context of the National Archives overarching activities.²¹

Analyses of the relationship between the federal government and documentary editing practice can also be found in the periodical literature. Waldo Gifford Leland, in a 1964 article appearing in the *American Archivist*, documents the events that led up to the formation of the NHPC in 1934.²² Leland's treatment focuses on J. Franklin Jameson's early efforts to garner support for the creation of this organization. This essay is unique because Leland evaluates Jameson's role as advocate for the historical/archival profession. In doing so, he positions Jameson as a unique figure who was able to work within the archival, historical, and editing communities.

Leland's article is illustrative of a category of work that attempts to define the complex relationships that existed between the governmental agencies that assisted with and encouraged the practice of documentary editing and the historians and editors. Research appearing in the late seventies through the early nineties, authored by Richard W. Leopold, Richard H. Kohn, and George M. Curtis similarly investigated the relationships that existed between the federal government and historical and editorial practices. This work also describes the influence that both groups had on one another, in terms of organizational structure and historical practices.²³

²¹ McCoy, *The National Archives*, 162-174.

²² Waldo Gifford Leland, "The Prehistory and Origins of the National Historical Publications Commission," *American Archivist* 27 (April 1964): 187-194.

²³ For a discussion of the influence of the federal government and the practice of editing within the United States, see: Richard H. Kohn and George M. Curtis III., "The Government, the Historical Profession, and Historical Editing: A Review," *Reviews in American History* 9, no.2 (June 1981): 145-155; Richard W. Leopold, "The Historian and the Federal Government," *Journal of American History* 64, no.1 (June 1977): 5-23; Paul McCarthy, "Insights from the Outside: The NHPRC Records Program at Twenty-Five," *American Archivist* 63 (Spring/Summer

The second category of institution focused studies evaluates the nature of the immediate home institutions that housed, managed, and provided support for documentary editing projects through the form of staff and physical resources.²⁴ Research in this area consists of evaluations of the relationship between the editorial project and the home or sponsoring institution. Typically, these institutions were university presses, research libraries, or historical societies.²⁵ An example of this category of scholarship is William E. Lingelbach's article on the relationship between the Benjamin Franklin papers and the American Philosophical Society.²⁶ Lingelbach uses the 1954 announcement of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, a joint venture between the American Philosophical Society and Yale University, to frame his paper.²⁷

In evaluating this project, Lingelbach first situates the *Papers of Benjamin Franklin* within the context of similar editorial projects, aligning the objectives of the Franklin project with those of Julian Boyd and his edition of the Jefferson Papers. In doing so, Lingelbach places the Franklin project within the narrative of the new modern editing.²⁸ It is after this initial discussion that the author provides his definition of the relationship between the papers and the

2000): 90-96; Frank G. Burke, "The Beginnings of the NHPRC Records Program," *The American Archivist* 63 (Spring/Summer 2000): 18-42; Mary A. Giunta, "The NHPRC: Its Influence on Documentary Editing, 1964-1984," *American Archivist* 49:2 (1996): 134-14; Mary A. Giunta, "Assisting Documentary Publishing," *Scholarly Publishing* 21:1 (October 1989): 33-39; Elizabeth Hamer Kegan, "A Becoming Regard to Posterity," *American Archivist* 40:1 (January 1977): 5-15; Frank G. Burke, "The Historian as Editor: Progress and Problems," *Public Historian* 4:2 (Spring 1982): 4-19 ; and E. Berkeley Tompkins, "The NHPRC in Perspective," in *The Publication of American Manuscripts*, edited by Leslie W. Dunlap and Fred Shelley (Iowa City: University of Iowa Libraries, 1976).

²⁴ Allen Weinberg, "Publication Program of the Philadelphia Archives," *American Archivist* 25:2 (April 1962): 193-197; Fred Shelley, "The Publication of the Maryland Historical Society," *American Archivist* 15:4 (October 1952): 309-320.

²⁵ Whitehill, *Independent Historical Societies*; Dunlap, *American Historical Societies*; Jones, *For History's Sake*; Van Tassell, *Recording America's Past*; Clarence E. Carter, "The United States and Documentary Historical Publication," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25:1 (June 1938): 3-24; and Burl Noggle, "A Note on Historical Editing: The Wilson "Papers" in Perspective," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 8:3 (Summer 1967): 281-297.

²⁶ William E. Lingelbach, "Benjamin Franklin's Papers and the American Philosophical Society," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 99:6 (December 1955): 359-380.

²⁷ Lingelbach, "Benjamin Franklin," 359.

²⁸ Lingelbach, "Benjamin Franklin," 361.

institution. Providing a genealogy of the papers, Lingelbach traces the origins of the papers, from their dispersal at Franklin's death, to their transition into collections, and eventual dissemination through publication.

The author accomplishes this task by providing a discussion of the *Papers'* chain of custody, from Franklin as the creator, to the individuals and institutions that the papers passed to upon Franklin's death, to their eventual public dissemination through publication. Lingelbach charts the process of how the collection came to reside within the American Philosophical Society and how it was later managed and used, both as a collection, and as the basis for a publications program.²⁹ An important aspect of this article is that it documents a specific instance of the survival and transmission of a set of historical evidence, both as a collection of original sources, but also, as it came to exist in a particular published form.

Lingelbach's piece also serves as an interesting case study of an institution's treatment of a collection, in terms of managing the documents as a set of physical objects and in editing and publishing its contents during the process of creating reliable and authentic surrogates. As a category, this type of research addresses specific aspects of particular collections and operates as a form of institutional history. Lingelbach's work documents the treatment of collections, including documentary publications as a category of collections.

4. Historical Case Studies: Editorial Projects

The third primary category of this body of literature is the case study approach. Work within this category presents historical studies of specific editorial projects.³⁰ Here, the project's

²⁹ Lingelbach, "Benjamin Franklin," 363-368.

³⁰ Carolyn Hoover Sung, "Peter Force: Washington Printer and Creator of the American Archives," (PhD Diss., The George Washington University, 1985); Roland M. Baumann, "Samuel Hazard: Editor and Archivist for the

topical and temporal coverage, the themes and documents contained within the work, and the publication history is often included. Research in this category can be further subdivided into two categories: project focused and methods focused. In project focused research, the work serves to document a period, providing information regarding the editors, the project, and the publications that it produces. However, the editorial methods themselves are not always given a close examination.

Studies of this type possess great explanatory power and can offer insight into the workings of specific editorial processes, through their description of editorial practices. This work itself may also be used as a source for research on editorial methods. The distinction between these two categories is whether the primary focus is placed on, methodology specifically, or the project as a whole.

An illustrative example of project focused research is Matt Blessing's study of Reuben Gold Thwaites and his edition, *The Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expeditions: 1804-1806*.³¹ Blessing's paper consists of commentary on Thwaites work in gathering, editing, and publishing these source materials. Careful attention is given to describing and commenting on the edition that Thwaites created. The author describes the physical layout of the work, and in careful detail, describes the characteristics of the maps and illustrations contained within the edition.³² Another aspect that is given particular attention is the process the editor undertook in locating material for publication. His process of contacting the descendants of expedition

Keystone State," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107:2 (April 1983): 195-215; Gregory D. Massey, "The Papers of Henry Laurens and Modern Historical Documentary Editing," *Public Historian* 27:1 (Winter 2005): 39-60; Julian P. Boyd, "These Precious Monuments of ... Our History," *American Archivist* 22:2 (April 1959): 147-180; and L.H. Butterfield, "The Papers of the Adams Family: Some Account of their History," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d Ser., 71 (October 1953): 328-356.

³¹ Matt Blessing, "Reuben Gold Thwaites and the Historical Resurrection of Lewis and Clark," *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 88:2 (Winter 2004-2005): 42-49.

³² Blessing, "Reuben Gold Thwaites," 47-49.

members in attempts to acquire additional material is described in great detail.³³ Blessing's essay frames the edition by revealing the processes that led to its creation. This occurs primarily at the project/edition level.

The second category is the methods focused historical analysis.³⁴ Research within this category focuses on editorial work, discussing issues related to transcription, selection, and annotation. Here, emphasis is placed on examining and describing editorial choices and their influence on the physical form of the edition. Clear examples of this category can be found in the body of criticism on *The Foreign Relations Series of the United States*, published by the United States Department of State.³⁵ This is the longest ongoing documentary editing project in the United States, and has been the subject of methodological study.³⁶ Lees' and Treadway's critique of the *Foreign Relations Series* is one such examination. In establishing the purpose of their article, Lees and Treadway write that "a critical assessment of the editorial character of this ambitious project is long overdue, particularly in light of current interdisciplinary efforts by documentary editors to define sound standards for editorial scholarship in the humanities and social sciences."³⁷ Here, the authors put forth the idea that in order for editors to develop and refine editorial methods they must have an understanding of their application and use within existing editorial projects is required. In short, a close critical reading of editorial projects can provide this type of understanding.

³³ Blessing, "Reuben Gold Thwaites," 45-67.

³⁴ The previous articles I evaluated discussed the editorial project at a more macro level. Lees and Treadway discuss the *Foreign Relation Series* at the methodological level.

³⁵ Richard W. Leopold, "The Foreign Relations Series Revisited: One Hundred Plus Ten," *The Journal of American History* 59:4 (March 1973): 935-957.

³⁶ Lorraine M. Lees and Sandra Gioia Treadway, "Review: A Future for Our Diplomatic Past? A Critical Appraisal of the Foreign Relations Series," *Journal of American History* 70:3 (December 1983): 621-629.

³⁷ Lees and Treadway, "Diplomatic Past," 621.

This study is a means to evaluate and discuss the series' "integrity as a documentary source."³⁸ The treatment of the *Series* places greater emphasis on the mechanical aspects of the work. Evaluating the work, and the methods and procedures that produced the work, is a method for evaluating how the documentary edition functions as a *representation* of primary source materials. Lees and Treadway accomplish this through an evaluation of the editorial statements, the editorial apparatus, and the work's annotations. In addition, characteristics of the *Foreign Relations Series*' production, such as the time it has taken to complete and publish the volumes, were also studied.³⁹ This specific study is contextualized by the author's discussion of previous assessments of the *Foreign Relations Series*, illustrating that many of their concerns, such as transparency in terms of document inclusion/exclusion, had a historic origin.⁴⁰

5. Conclusions

In this section I have identified and described the primary historical orientations that have been used by scholars in approaching historical editing. The strength of this literature is that it illustrates that there are a number of valid approaches and orientations for studying issues related to documentary editing. These categories also illustrate that there are a number of valid sites for study. However, this body of work also illustrates the need for additional research. While the categories and studies that I have described effectively document and offer evaluations of instances of documentary publication and its related elements, they do not adequately examine the intellectual foundations of the practices they document.

³⁸ Lees and Treadway, "Diplomatic Past," 621.

³⁹ Lees and Treadway, "Diplomatic Past," 628-629.

⁴⁰ Lees and Treadway, "Diplomatic Past," 627.

An intellectual history of documentary editing can aid in understanding the nature of editorial practice, and that other areas of research, particularly the aspects noted in this document, warrant further study. Research that examines the foundations of documentary editing will augment existing research by providing a foundation for the individuals and practices that scholars have drawn attention to. This will also provide for a better understanding of the role and function of documentary editions, through defining the frameworks that have guided their creation. It is within this category that this study fits. This evaluation provides an analysis of the intellectual foundations of modern editing through an examination of editorial conceptualizations of early modern editing.

C. DEFINING THE INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EDITING

1. General Discussion

My interest in this topic came through my engagement with a select number of texts, whose authors critically evaluated the role of the documentary editor, the nature of editorial practice, and the role and function of the documentary edition as a scholarly device. In studies of editing, grounded in discussions of their own contemporary periods of editing, Lester J. Cappon, Clarence E. Carter, Julian P. Boyd, and Lyman H. Butterfield have provided the most concrete and critical analyses of editorial theory and principles, in addition to critical examinations of the editorial function and the role of the editor. Lester J. Cappon's and Julian P. Boyd's work is particularly interesting for its attempt to investigate and provide a theoretical foundation for historical documentary editing. Clarence E. Carter's work is noteworthy for his close reading of

the functions and form of the editorial apparatus and the nature of editorial responsibility in its application.⁴¹

It was in reading and studying the work of these individuals that I became more concerned with systematically evaluating how editors conceived of their projects, the practice of editing, and the role and function of the documentary edition as a method for disseminating original source material. The questions that I ask, and the overall objectives of this study, are influenced by the questions and commentary presented by these scholars.

The remainder of the discussion of this literature will consist of an examination of relevant works authored by Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, and Lester J. Cappon. These scholars have analyzed documentary editing from a historical perspective while also offering commentary on editorial practice, focusing on the role and function of editing.⁴² In presenting this literature, I will define the genealogy of the study's research questions, and its overall purpose. Secondly, as in discussing the general categories of research on editing, this review will narrowly frame my study, presenting the most specific scholarly narrative that it will fall within. The research presented in the remainder of this discussion provides context for the research questions that are addressed further in this study.

2. Defining the Role and Function of the Documentary Editor

The archivist-historian-documentary editor Lester J. Cappon wrote extensively on topics and questions related to archival practice, collecting, and historical editing. His work in the area

⁴¹ For an understanding of more contemporary foundations, outside the scope of this study, please see Nathan Reingold, "Reflections of an Unrepentant Editor," *American Archivist* 46:1 (Winter 1983): 14-21; Teute, "Views in Review"; Charles T. Cullen, "Casual Observer Beware: The Need for Using Scholarly Editions," *Prologue* 21:1 (Fall 1989): 68-74.

⁴² This work is distinguished by its careful evaluation of historical methods from a historical perspective, placing editorial theory within a larger context.

of editing presents both theoretical and practical concerns. Here, I offer a discussion of two of his papers. These are his 1958 book chapter titled “The Historian as Editor” and his 1966 article titled “A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present.”⁴³ In these two pieces, Cappon provides a study of the editorial function, principles of editing, and the role of the editor.

Cappon’s, “The Historian as Editor,” focuses on concerns related to editorial practice, emphasizing the skills required of the editor, the practices that the editor engages in during the process of editing and publishing original sources, and lastly, the value of editorial work.⁴⁴ As a point of introduction, Cappon seeks to dispel the misconception held by some in the scholarly community that editorial work is a less intellectually demanding exercise than the writing of traditional history. Cappon uses this point to frame his argument. In doing so, he provides a view of the historical editor as a particular type of scholar who possesses a unique set of skills, and also, a “keener insight into the significance and meaning of the raw materials” with which he or she works.⁴⁵ Cappon frames the historical editor as a scholar and expert in original sources, and more specifically, the processes of their publication.

The traits ascribed to the editor are the ability to understand the relationships that exist between documentary materials, patience, diligence, and attention to detail. Editorial work is described as requiring careful attention to process. Cappon describes an alignment that exists between the multiple functions an editor carries out when preparing a set of papers for publication.⁴⁶ In addition to being described as scholar of original sources, the editor is also defined as a scholar of relationships, both textual and human. During the editorial process the

⁴³ Lester J. Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3d Ser., 23:1 (January 1966): 56-75.

⁴⁴ Lester J. Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” in *In Support of Clio: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*, ed. William B. Hesseltine and Donald R. McNeil (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1958): 173-194.

⁴⁵ Cappon, “Historical Editor,” 173.

⁴⁶ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 176-177.

editor creates, and structures, the relationships that exist between documents and that determine how the reader will engage with a documentary edition and the documents that it contains.

One of the strengths of Cappon's treatment is his ability to situate the documentary editor historically. In his discussion of the characteristics of the editor Cappon uses an editor or editorial project as an example to illustrate his argument. An example of this is the use of Reuben Gold Thwaites's work on *The Original Sources of the Lewis and Clark Expedition* to illustrate the role of the editor as collector and the importance of specialized knowledge in becoming a successful editor. Thwaites was successful in locating additional material for his edition because of his expert knowledge of the materials with which he was working. This allowed him to perform the additional work of locating the descendents of the records creators as a strategy for locating additional documentation.⁴⁷ Through this method, Cappon successfully describes and defines the nature of editorial work through a discussion of the characteristics of its practitioners. Because of this, the author is able to successfully define the characteristics of editorial practice and its practitioners.

Cappon also provides a secondary discussion in evaluating and defining the function of the documentary editor and the documentary edition. The editor is defined and described as an intermediary. In a sense the editor places him or herself within the documentation. This is best illustrated by Cappon's statement that when evaluating the role and function of the editor "it cannot be denied that the editor stands between the reader and the text."⁴⁸ Cappon writes this statement in reference to a discussion of Clarence E. Carter's editorial approach, philosophy, and theory. Carter wrote that "the editor must eschew any and all forms of interpretation; he cannot

⁴⁷ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 178.

⁴⁸ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 182.

deal with his documents in a subjective manner.”⁴⁹ However, Cappon recognizes that the editor, by the very nature of his or her enterprise, is involved in an interpretative process. In Cappon’s words, the editor is “in a strategic position for good or evil.”⁵⁰ The editor has the potential to “cast shadows” over the documentary materials, or to “illuminate them.”⁵¹ An editor can aid in clarifying the documents he or she collects, edits, and publishes, or the editorial presence can be disruptive.

These statements were written in regard to the edition that the editor creates. “Casting shadows” consists of any action by the editor that obscures the ability of a scholar or reader to gather meaning from the documentation. Examples of elements that detract from document clarity are obtrusive annotation, withholding documentary material, or distorting this material during the processes of transcription and publication.⁵² The greatest consequence of these offences is the detrimental effect on the ability of the documents to function as evidence, and more specifically, as surrogates for original sources.

In functioning as an editor, the scholar serves as a translator between documentary forms. The editor makes explicit the relationships that exist between documents. Contextualization is also a critical aspect of editorial work, and one of the editor’s primary functions. Through annotation, the editor provides an interpretive lens, which allows for the reader/researcher to more directly engage with the material. Cappon recognizes the editor’s role in functioning as an intermediary in creating these published collections. Editions contain documents that serve as evidence for activities and events, but the editor also identifies the nature of the relationships that exist between the sources, through description.

⁴⁹ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 182.

⁵⁰ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 182-183.

⁵¹ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 182-183.

⁵² Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 181.

This discussion of editorial characteristics is similarly placed within a historic context. Cappon's evaluation operates as an evidence based discussion of the role and function of the documentary editor and the documentary edition. He comes to his thoughts through a careful consideration of how editorial activity contributes to the narrative of editing. This is best illustrated by his positioning of his view, or theory, of editing with that of the editor, Clarence E. Carter. Carter advocated a strict and unobtrusive form of editing, which he presented in a series of writings, editorial statements, and a manual on editing.⁵³ This approach argued for a strict adherence to the original form of a document's text. Carter also advocated a lean annotation that would serve to clarify factual information. But he cautioned against annotation that acted as interpretative statements.⁵⁴ Carter's editor, in his conceptualization, is not an interpreter.

Cappon, however, notes that the editor is by necessity an interpreter. He states "but it cannot be denied that the editor stands between the reader and the text."⁵⁵ Inherent in this statement is the recognition that the reader of the edited original sources, placed within the context of the documentary edition, to a degree, reads an interpretation filter through the editor's own view of the documents and how they should be presented in a printed form. Cappon interrogates this view and asks of what tasks the editor should focus his or her gaze. Should the editor present Carter's "naked text," or, cognizant of the interpretive nature of the editorial function, provide "illuminations" of documents?⁵⁶ Cappon argues that it is the task of the editor to illuminate, but he provides examples of other frames of analysis, demonstrating the

⁵³ Clarence E. Carter, *Historical Editing*, Bulletins of the National Archives Number 7 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952).

⁵⁴ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 182.

⁵⁵ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 172-173.

⁵⁶ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 182-183.

complexity of defining the editor as an interpreter of documentary evidence and a creator of surrogates.

The strength of Cappon's critique is in its ability to parse out the different editorial approaches that influence and affect the editorial process. This approach succinctly illustrates that there are specific schools of editing, with different perspectives on how to treat materials for publication. More importantly, Cappon configures the editor as an active agent in this treatment of the material and in the production of texts. It is difficult to define the editor as a strictly *active* or *passive* agent, in terms of presence *in* the text, within Cappon's theoretical frame. Editorial decisions mark each document.

Lyman H. Butterfield also offers an interesting discussion regarding the role of the editor. Butterfield writes that the role of the editor is "to discover, organize, and convert valuable sources from their unique, perishable, and often cryptic and confusing state into a form that is intelligible to, and readily circulated among, those who wish to understand the past."⁵⁷ The editor, in Butterfield's definition, is not strictly concerned with the transmission of texts as a publication process, but recognizes that the editor is concerned with many different aspects of transmission. Butterfield recognizes that the editor, by the necessity of his or her concern with the circulation of documentary materials, must be concerned with the shifting of documentary forms. In addition, the editor must also be aware of the relationships contained within original sources, so that the materials will be presented properly in a printed edition.

If the process of editing is the practice of transforming unique, perishable, and cryptic sources into objects that can be circulated, then this is a process influenced by editorial

⁵⁷ L.H. Butterfield, "Editing American Historical Documents," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 78 (1966): 82.

intention.⁵⁸ As a point of reference in his evaluation, L.H. Butterfield refers to the 19th century editorial endeavors of publishing the papers of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. As with similar papers, letters, records, and documents, these materials were altered in what the editor perceived to be the service to the creator of the materials. The unreliable edition, too, is the result editorial intention.⁵⁹ But in this instance, unreliability would have had a different meaning when evaluated from the perspective of the editor and from that of the reader. Unreliability, like transparency, can also be viewed as a fluid editorial concept.

3. Defining the Role and Function of Documentary Editing

Cappon, in his essay, “A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present,” offers a description and evaluation of multiple theories of editing, as described by prominent editors, and illustrated by their respective projects.⁶⁰ In this article, Cappon provides an introduction to the intellectual foundations of editing by examining the editorial frameworks that influenced editorial practice, and the resulting editions.⁶¹

This essay is noteworthy because it illustrates the possibility of examining the foundations of editorial practice, and more importantly, the importance of comparative analysis in evaluating unique editorial theories and approaches. In his discussion of editorial theory, Cappon performs two levels of comparative analysis. In terms of his own period, Cappon offers a discussion of the distinct approaches recommended by Julian P. Boyd and Clarence E. Carter, demonstrating that there are multiple theories of editing and that the publication of original

⁵⁸ Butterfield, “Editing American Historical Documents,” 82-83.

⁵⁹ Butterfield, “Editing American Historical Documents,” 92-97.

⁶⁰ Lester J. Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3d Ser., 23:1 (January 1966): 56-75.

⁶¹ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 57-59.

sources is a complex activity. An application of differing approaches to the same set of documentation would result in editions of distinctly different types.⁶²

In offering a discussion of the intellectual frameworks that defined the modern editorial practice, Cappon makes clear that there are underlying principles of editing, which guide a successful editorial project. His comparison of the modern period of editing with that carried out during 19th century projects is also used to demonstrate this idea. Cappon draws attention to the relationship between the editorial methodology articulated by the editor and the nature of the edition that is produced.

The varying quality of 19th century editions of papers was related to the differing degrees of concern editors had with providing a discussion of their underlying theoretical approaches and offering transparent documents. Cappon illustrates that there is a relationship between editorial philosophy (the intended or theoretical edition) and the physical object that results from its application (manifested object). He grounds this through a comparison of contemporary and historic editorial practices.⁶³ The characteristics of these documentary relationships warrant further attention and are examined in this study.

4. Documentary Editing, the Treatment of Documentation, and the Construction of Archival Texts

In his article “God’s Altar Needs Not Our Polishings,” Julian P. Boyd surveys three centuries of editorial practice. Boyd places specific emphasis on two elements: the relationship between editors and the texts they create, and the process of carrying out an editorial project. Similar to the orientation of Cappon’s work, Boyd is also concerned with probing the nature of

⁶² Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 58.

⁶³ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 57-59 and 69-72.

the relationship between the editor and documentation. Here, I will discuss Boyd's treatment of editors and their works.⁶⁴

Within the context of this study, the critical aspect of Boyd's work is his illustration of the role of editorial intention in the production of documentary editions. Boyd describes several categories of intention: the production of accurate *pure* texts, the production of editions that disseminate documents which honor the figure while not necessarily honoring the fidelity of the documentation, and lastly, the production of editions that serve to correct previous printings deemed to be inaccurate or unsuitable.⁶⁵ There is a close relationship between intention and editorial method. The methodology devised guides the process of creation, which defines the characteristics of the edition. Boyd evaluates this issue in his discussion.

These categories of intention illustrate, historically, the presence of different approaches and goals oriented towards producing a collection of documents. The concern with producing authoritative texts results from the need to produce works that are *free from impurities*, that are authoritative, and that can serve as *accurate* surrogates for primary sources. Here, the primary concern is with providing an edition that accurately presents the documents, true to their original character.⁶⁶ Related to this point is the production of editions that are intended to correct the work produced by previous editors. In these instances, the editor, upon reviewing inaccurate or incomplete editions of a work, ventures to "establish the true text."⁶⁷

A particularly relevant example of these categories is the publication history of the editions related to Thomas Jefferson's document output, in particular, Julian P. Boyd's edition.

⁶⁴ Julian P. Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," *New York History: Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Society* 39:1 (January 1958): 3-21.

⁶⁵ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," 7-10.

⁶⁶ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," 7.

⁶⁷ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," 7.

Boyd's edition can be defined as a unique transmission and as a corrective edition. It was a unique transmission in that the work included previously unpublished material, but this work also corrected a set of flaws Boyd felt were present in existing editions. First, documents had been printed inaccurately. These misprintings occurred as a result of intentional alteration, accidental misprinting, and previously applied editorial standards. Secondly, Boyd addressed the issue of incompleteness. A *complete* edition, in the Boydian sense, had not to date been produced. Boyd's development of a systematic strategy for the publication of the Jefferson Papers addressed these concerns.⁶⁸

In the last category, production of texts that respect the subject at the expense of textual fidelity, editions may contain editorially conscious revisions, excisions, and re-workings of documentation. An example, cited by Boyd, is William Goddard's 18th century edition of Major-General Charles Lee's papers. Goddard, in his *Proposals*, wrote, "I have taken care to suppress many passages that might be offensive, in the General's Pieces and Correspondence. While it was my duty to preserve what was useful in military and political knowledge, I took the liberty to suppress such Expressions as appeared to be Ebullitions of a disappointed and irritated mind."⁶⁹ This act, though thoughtful, was not carried out in the spirit of producing an accurate representation of Major-General Lee's documentation.⁷⁰ As Boyd illustrates in this case, there is a distinction between representing an individual and representing a set of documentation.

The variations that exist amongst these categories of texts, their production, and their finalized forms, are a result of editorial intention. Editorial intention is directly related to the issue of how an edition is conceptualized by the editor. The instances noted here, illustrate

⁶⁸ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 10-14.

⁶⁹ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," 10-11.

⁷⁰ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," 10.

different types of intention, influenced by differing conceptualizations of editorial projects. As shown by Boyd, how the editor conceives of the edition, defines how the materials will be evaluated, treated, and edited. The issue of editorial intention is an aspect of editorial work that warrants further consideration and is addressed within this dissertation.

D. SUMMARY

This review presents an examination of the research literature that frames the primary questions and ideas that are evaluated in this dissertation. These works are presented to verify the validity of this subject as an area of study, to contextualize the questions that I have evaluated, and lastly, to identify and define the key concepts with which I am concerned. In addition, this review also provides an introduction to the primary figures, and their ideas, which is the subject of this work.

The creation of documentary editions, as a specific category of published works, is greatly influenced by intellectual frameworks devised by the editor. These frameworks are influenced by views regarding the function of documentation, editing, and the editor. This relationship has been illustrated by historical analyses carried out by Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, and Lester J. Cappon. However, this relationship has not been the subject of a focused critical study. Here, I offer a contribution to this research area by providing a framework for studying, and an examination of, the intellectual foundations of the relationship between editors, documentary editing, and documentary/archival texts.

III. METHDOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

The underlying principle of this dissertation is that the work of editors, the practice of documentary editing, documentary editions themselves, and the larger context within which they were created can be studied historically and that this type of work is of scholarly importance. Research in this subject has the capacity to contribute to the areas of archival studies, book studies, and historiography. The methodology developed to address these aspects of documentary editing focuses on these elements as the primary points of emphasis. The methodology discussed in this section allows for the identification and evaluation of the intellectual foundations of the early modern period of documentary editing, with particular emphasis on identifying and evaluating editors' attitudes towards historical evidence, the resulting physical artifacts that editorial theory and practice produced, and the relationships between editors/documentary editions and the allied professions and user populations.

This methodology addresses three primary categories: **methods**, **editions**, and **editorial contexts**. These categories are representative of, and contain the elements, systems, and approaches that I have evaluated. Giving attention to these multiple areas allows for the creation of a richer narrative that takes into account multiple facets of editorial practice. In the paragraphs

that follow, the framework of this approach, the specific methodologies that have been employed, and the sources consulted, will be described and discussed.

B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

This work is a study of ideas (editorial theory), practices (editorial methods), physical objects (documentary editions), and influence (related communities).¹ More specifically, this consist of theories of editing, the procedures and mechanics of implementing editorial theory in the form of editorial methods, the artifacts produced by editorial practices, and lastly, selected contextual elements that are related to the editorial environment, but that are secondary to the editorial process. Evaluating these different elements requires a multi-pronged approach to provide a full description and assessment of the early modern period of editing. This was accomplished through implementing a methodology based on this **methods, editions, and editorial contexts** model.

Each of these categories consists of specific elements, practices, and attitudes that can be identified and evaluated. Studied together, these categories and elements can offer a more holistic understanding of this period of editing. Within the category **methods**, the primary points of focus are editorial theory and editorial practice. While the two are closely related, there is a fine distinction. This distinction can most clearly be described as the difference between the *articulation* and *consideration* of editorial theory contained within discussions of editing and the *implementation* of editorial theory during the process of creating documentary editions. Editorial

¹ These terms are defined in the “Definition of Concepts” section.

theory consists of the underlying attitudes, ideas, and beliefs, which influence an editor's methodological perspective. Editorial practice is the implementation of this methodology.

Editorial theory, as an articulation, consists of multiple process-based linkages to other areas that influence the creation of a documentary edition. The process of producing a documentary edition can be thought of as the application of a specific treatment to a set of documentary materials. In creating the documentary edition, editors produce a representation or surrogate of the primary source materials, through publication. How a document is edited and published is determined by the editor's views regarding the function and purpose of edited documents, and his or her function as an editor.

Mechanically and structurally, the organization, presentation, and construction of the edition define how the reader will engage with the object, as a tool for reading and research and as evidence. Documentary publications are rule and procedure defined objects, whose properties and characteristics are largely influenced by the editor. The nature of this influence encompasses multiple editorial concerns ranging from textual concerns, such as procedures regarding spelling corrections, to structural concerns, an example being the use of annotations and explanatory notes. Overarching programmatic concerns are also influenced by editorial theory. These include the defined scope of a project (is it comprehensive or selective?), as well as more specific concerns regarding document selection and inclusion criteria.

Editorial practice, the process of performing editorial work in fulfilling the objective of defining, gathering, editing, and publishing documentary materials, is an application of theory.² Theory, put into action through practice, guides and influences the creation of documentary texts. This process can be analyzed independently of editorial theory. At the most basic level, it is

² Kline and Perdue, *Guide*, 1-4.

important to determine and evaluate how editorial work was carried out. This is an analysis of process. The question is one of defining the tasks that editors performed, and how these tasks were accomplished.

However, although the development and articulation of editorial theory can be differentiated from the physical action of creating documentary editions in research and discussion, it is important to note that these are not completely separate processes. The physical realities of moving informational content from an artifact to a surrogate can be seen to influence the theoretical approach. For this reason, though the theoretical aspects of editing can be studied independently, these discussions are never too far removed from the nature of the materials with which editors are concerned. For this reason, the relationship between editorial theory and editorial practice is an important aspect to evaluate. In the context of this dissertation, this is defined as the relationship between the intellectual construct (the theoretical edition) that defines the edition and the edition's physical manifestation (published edition of documents). In evaluating the relationship between editorial theory and practice, a primary concern is in determining how editors' considerations of the documentary edition's role and function, form, and structure, aligned with the actual physical objects produced.

This is the study of representation. The documentary edition is a consciously created object. The form that the work takes is related to the editor's image of the edition. By focusing attention on the editorial thought, which guides the editorial process, it is possible to identify the characteristics and qualities of the edition as a representation, and better understand its underlying framework. This allows for an understanding of the intellectual and theoretical construction of the edition. Documentary editions, as objects, can similarly be evaluated. The actual physical work that can be read, used, and subjected to criticism during the process of

research is the physical manifestation of a set of ideas, attitudes, and beliefs that comes into being through publication. This aspect will compare the degree to which the articulated representation and the physical manifestation relate to one another.

In summation, studying the elements contained within the category **methods** (editorial theory and editorial practice) allows for an understanding of *conceptualizations* of editing and their *implementation* as theory in the form of editorial methods. From studying these frameworks it is possible to identify, evaluate, and concretely describe the principles of editing developed during the early modern period of editing. The result is that it is then possible to consider the editor's intended role and function for the edition, providing further insight into how the products of editing were to operate as tools for disseminating original sources in a published form.³

The second category of elements evaluated in this study is **editions**. Present within this category are the editions themselves. As stated, published documentary materials function as representations of existing artifacts, either printed or in manuscript form. As a surrogate for the original object, these published editions carry out specific functions. A close reading of editorial methods makes it possible to define and describe what these functions are. Once identified, it is possible to determine how editors devised their editions to fulfill a given function and how this influenced their development. In short, once the purpose and role of a specific set of

³ The **theoretical edition** and the **physical edition** are important concepts within this study. The term, *theoretical edition*, refers to the work as envisioned or idealized by the editor. Theoretical editions can be found in editorial discussions where the intent, function, and form are discussed. Editorial statements serve as the most formal category of theoretical editions. The *physical edition* is the actual object that is produced during the editing process. It is possible to evaluate the relationship between the physical edition and the theoretical edition.

documentary editions is determined, as stated by the editors, it is necessary to identify the mechanics of carrying out these tasks.⁴

The physical form of the edition determines how it will provide access to the source materials. There is a great distinction between how a microfilm edition will provide access to content as opposed to a letterpress edition. The quality of access that an edition allows for is influenced by factors including transcription, use of explanatory notes, structural organization, and presentation. These elements define the relationship between the user and the work.

This study uses two different approaches in addressing this concern. First, a historical treatment of intention, perception, and reception allows for a contextual understanding of how editorial theory influenced the way in which documentary editions provided access to original sources. Secondly, an analysis of a selection of documentary editions, examined as artifacts and in relation to editorial theory, will allow for an understanding of how an edition structures documentary materials and documentary relationships.

Documentary editions can be examined as physical objects using these two approaches. This occurs through an evaluation of editorial intention, and in offering a discussion of how the selected editions structured and described the relationships that existed between documentary materials, edited documents, and the works that contain them. A review of this type allows for an assessment of the relationship between the theorized edition and the actual edition that is produced.

Lastly, this dissertation examines editorial **contexts**. Editors were actively engaged in an access and dissemination function, which aligned them with related professional communities.

⁴ In this study **editorial intention** refers to the goals and objectives of the work, as conceived of by the editor. This refers to form, how the edition should be used, the types of documents it should contain, etc. This concept is important because it recognizes that a characteristic of early modern editing was its higher level of consciousness with formulating evidence.

Documentary editions were not produced within a vacuum. In this sense, each period of documentary editing can be seen as being influenced by its own unique **contextual factors**. Standards and requirements of acceptable historical evidence, historiographic trends, the needs of researchers, users, and readers, and the relationships between primary sources and their published surrogates are among the influences that documentary editors were aware of, concerned with, and influenced by.

These editorial contexts likely had an influence, either directly or indirectly, on the process of documentary editing. In serving as sources for research, documentary editions were required to meet standards of accuracy and reliability. In order for the representation to serve as an accurate surrogate, it had to be perceived as reliably presenting content. Editors, researchers, librarians, and archivists were all involved in establishing and maintaining standards of reliability and authenticity. These elements are evaluated in this dissertation.

This general environment may have influenced how editors carried out their work. These groups primarily consisted of the users of documentary materials, researchers and readers, and librarians, archivists, and curators. Individuals in these categories either made use of documentary materials, or facilitated their use. It is important to determine to what degree these practices influenced editorial work, as well as the attitudes of these populations towards editorial work and documentary editions.

C. RESEARCH METHODS

This study is historical in scope. Not all historical topics are amenable to the same methodological approach. Specific topics, periods, and questions will present subtleties and

unique aspects, which may require more specialized procedures. In this study, my framework is informed by methods borrowed from historiography, book studies, and archival studies. While the basic operation performed in each of these practices is similar, there is a difference in orientation. The differences lie in the questions posed and the specific aspects that are given attention. Making use of these unique perspectives allows for a number of different facets of the research problem to be addressed.

1. Historiography

A particular area of concern in this study is with evaluating documentary editions as a specific type of original source material and evidence. Research methods oriented towards evaluating historical sources and historical methods are one of the approaches that have been adopted. This is particularly relevant in evaluating elements contained within the editorial methods and editorial contexts categories. Evaluating the process of creating the documentary edition considers the creator of the original source, while a discussion of context is concerned with attitudes that govern use.

The thoughts, attitudes, and views of editors, regarding the editing function, is another primary area of emphasis in this dissertation. This topic concerns the discussion and creation of tools for providing access to historical materials. Central themes addressed are issues relating to historical methods, standards for adequate historical research, the role of the edition in facilitating historical research, and lastly, how the edition contains and presents edited documents. Evaluated in this discussion are the editors' considerations of their editions as

primary sources. This is accomplished through studying the context of their creation, as evidenced by editorial intention.⁵

The context of use will be evaluated by using this same methodological approach. The primary audience for documentary editions, as defined by editors, has been defined as academic researchers.⁶ Historians were the group that editors felt would benefit most from the publication of original sources, but other specialists in fields such as political philosophy and economics were also defined as potential users.⁷ In considering the context of use, this study is concerned

⁵ The idea of intention is an important characteristic of the edition. In their work, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier distinguish between “intentional” and “unintentional” sources. The primary factor that distinguishing these two categories of intentionality, is the degree to which the source was created, “with the historian’s questions in mind (18).” This is a complex question when evaluating documentary editions. As collections of pre-existing sources, editorial intention defines how they are constructed. The edition as a whole, and the original sources gathered and displayed within in, are defined by the constraints applied by the editor.

⁶ This use has been defined by historical editors. The NHPC, while strongly emphasizing the potential service of documentary publications to scholarship, is also careful to define the general public as a secondary primary user. Published editions were conceived of as a public good. This issue will be addressed in evaluating the role of the federal government during this period.

⁷ The following provides representative examples of these reviews. These appeared within a number of different disciplinary journals. Editors used this condition as a form of evidence regarding issues of perceived readership and use. See W.W. Abbot, “*The Papers of James Madison*, Volume I, 16 March 1751-16 December 1779; Volume II, 20 March 1780-23 February 1781, edited by William T. Hutchinson and William M.E. Rachal,” *American Historical Review* 68:2 (January 1963): 476-478; Bernard Bailyn, “Essay Review: Boyd’s Jefferson: Notes for a Sketch,” *New England Quarterly* 33:3 (September 1960): 380-400; Samuel Flagg Bemis, “Review: *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 331 (September 1960): 174; Daniel J. Boorstein, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1760-1776*. Julian P. Boyd, Editor; Lyman H. Butterfield and Mina R. Bryan, Associate Editors,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 7:4 (October 1950): 596-609; Lester J. Cappon, “*The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Volume I, January 6, 1706 through December 31, 1734*. Leonard W. Labaree, Editor; Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., Associate Editor; Helen C. Boatfield and Helene H. Fineman, Assistant Editors,” *New England Quarterly* 33:2 (June 1960): 246-248; Lester J. Cappon, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1760-1776*. Edited by Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, and Mina R. Bryan,” *Southern Historical Association* 16:4 (November 1950): 532-534; Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., “*The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume I, 1856-1880, Volume 2, 1881-1884*,” *New England Quarterly* 40:4 (December 1967): 592-597; Richard Beale Davis “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 1, 1760-1776 and Volume 2, January 1777 to June 1779*,” *Modern Language Notes* 66:6 (June 1951): 412-414; W.O. Farber “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I, 1760-1776*,” *Western Political Quarterly* 3:4 (December 1950): 640-641; Charles Farnsley, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I*,” *The Journal of Politics* 12:4 (November 1950): 714-715; E. James Ferguson, “*The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. Vol. III, 1782-1786 and Vol. IV January 1787-May 1788*,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49:3 (December 1962): 506-508; Brooke Hindle, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I (1760-1766) by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan*,” *Isis* 43:3 (September 1952): 281-282; Richard Hofstadter, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I: 1760-1766. Vol. II 1777 to 18 June 1779, Including the Revisal of the Laws, 1776-1786.*,” *Political Science Quarterly* 66:1 (March 1951): 152-154; Theodore Hornberger, “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 1,*

with determining what researchers defined as the requirements of a source, and what methods were suitable for examining these sources.

This is illustrative of two primary objectives. First, this offers a better understanding of how the edition functioned as a text by defining and documenting the attitudes that affected its reception as a source. Secondly, in defining this environment, it becomes possible to evaluate to what degree these attitudes influenced editorial work. Evaluating the documentary edition in this manner treats the early modern documentary edition as a specific variant of a primary source.⁸

2. Book Studies

This study is also influenced by methods and theoretical approaches that have come out of book studies. Research performed within this framework, though related, is somewhat distinct in character from the historiographic approach. In approaching early modern historical editing through a historiographic lens, emphasis is placed on evaluating the edition in terms of its role as a primary source. In the context of book studies, the concern is with requirements, attitudes, and frameworks, as they relate to the editor's role in providing access to primary source materials. This is more focused at the document level.

The methods and disciplinary approach adopted from book studies, as have been applied in this specific instance, are concerned with the context of an edition's creation. My particular interest is with what the bibliographer D.F. McKenzie has defined as the "sociology of the text."⁹

1760; Volume 2, 1777 to 18 June 1779, Including the Revisal of the Laws, 1776-1786," *American Quarterly* 3:1 (Spring 1951): 87-90; Edmund S. Morgan, "John Adams and the Puritan Tradition," *New England Quarterly* 34:4 (December 1961): 518-529; Merrill D. Petersen, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volumes I-III," *The New England Quarterly* 24:4 (December 1951): 533-536; and Jesse H. Shera, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I," *Minnesota History* 31:3 (September 1950): 179-180.

⁸ Howell and Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources*, 20-27.

⁹ D.F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 12-15.

McKenzie illustrates that the process of textual production and circulation is quite complex. For example, in the context of this study, there is a complex textual relationship that exists between the original creators of the documentation, the librarians and archivists that may have originally managed the artifacts, the editors that evaluated, selected, and edited documents for publication, the individuals responsible for printing the works, and ultimately the researcher or reader.

This is only a barebones outline of what could be fleshed out into an even more complex model. In this study, I am focusing on one aspect of this relationship, the nature of editorial involvement. Here, I place emphasis on the role of the editor in articulating and formulating an intellectual foundation of the edition, affecting the object's physical form, and influencing its reception.¹⁰ In this model the editor is conceptualized as an intermediary in the creation of a specific type of work; the researcher is articulated as the reader.

The questions that I am concerned with have also been informed by Robert Darnton's work, including his conceptual model of the communication circuit in print culture. Darnton's model is quite complex, modeling the relationships between constructive, functional, political and social processes.¹¹ At a more specific level, he illustrates the functional relationships that exist during the construction of a text and its reception. Darnton provides a map, illustrating the different relationships that occur between and amongst different spheres and different categories of creators. This is one of a number of useful models developed by scholars working in book

¹⁰ McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Text*, 2.

¹¹ Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books," in *The Book History Reader*, 2d ed., eds. Albert Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (London and New York: Routledge, 2006): 12; Robert Darnton, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990): 112.

history.¹² These allow for the mapping of what Jerome McGann has termed “the socialization of texts.”¹³

These historiographic and book studies approaches are related, but serve distinct functions in addressing the questions posed in this dissertation. The difference between these two approaches is the distinction in thinking of the edition as a primary source, accomplished through a historiographic lens, as opposed to considering the topic through a book studies approach, which places greater emphasis on the editorial intervention, influence, and intention. Evaluating the edition through a book studies approach also requires evaluating the work in relation to the larger context of reception and use. This includes researchers/readers and the professionals that govern the relationship between the work/source and the user.

Underlying this approach is the supposition that documentary editing and documentary editions can be better understood through examining the intellectual foundations of the process/practice that produces this type of work. And further, the role and function, both intended and actual, can best be understood through evaluating the context in which the work would be used. The methodologies and theoretical approaches associated with book studies are instructive in guiding this approach.

More precisely, these methods can be categorized as a “history/literature” variant, using Leslie Howsam’s mapping of the interdisciplinarity of the study of book history.¹⁴ This model was useful in formulating the structure of this methodology. The processes and objects to be studied are those of a specific type of publishing, which result in a specific category of texts.

¹² Another noteworthy model is Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker’s *Book Centered Model* (1993).

¹³ Jerome McGann, “The Socialization of Texts,” in Finkelstein and McCleery, *Book History Reader*: 66-73.

¹⁴ Leslie Howsam, *Old Books & New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 17.

This approach is also necessary given this study's concern with the documentary edition as a constructed object, with specific emphasis on issues related to the reproduction of original artifacts. Editorial practice is defined by decisions. Editors make choices regarding what materials to include and exclude from an edition, how these documents should be clarified and described through the use of notes, and lastly, general structural decisions that determine how a researcher or reader can potentially make use of the material. Because of these numerous sites of intervention, the documentary edition, and the process of its creation, can be viewed as a topic within book studies. Documentary editing can be evaluated regarding its practices, objects, processes of the creation, and their edition's reception.

3. Archival Studies (Archival History)

Lastly, this study is informed by the approaches used in the practice of archival history. A defining characteristic of archival studies research generally, and archival history specifically, is its focus on the nature of documentation and evidence, its management, and the societal functions of archivists and archival institutions. Documentary editions, as a specific category of publications, are derived from original sources. Within this domain, documentary editing can be evaluated in terms of its relationship to the management and custody of primary sources.

In particular, I am influenced by two particular strains of archival discussion. First, this dissertation is greatly influenced by the concept of archives as evidence. In evaluating archival materials, and in studying archival topics, practitioners and scholars are greatly concerned with issues of value. Archival values are described in terms of primary, secondary, cultural, informational, and evidential. This dissertation is most greatly influenced by the concept of evidential values, the idea that a record can serve to represent an event, activity, or action. In

conceptualizing the documentary edition, I consider the materials to be a form of surrogate archive and a particular category of historical evidence.¹⁵

Secondly, my archival approach is influenced by Terry Cook's use of the history of ideas approach in evaluating archival practice. In his article "What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift," Cook presents a framework for isolating archival ideas as a method for evaluating archival practice from a historical perspective.¹⁶ Here, he places emphasis on the ideas that archivists developed and maintained, and the consequences of these ideas on the development of archival thought and practice. This is the approach that I have taken in this dissertation. In this dissertation the work of editors and their editorial practices have been evaluated through isolating and evaluating their ideas, attitudes, and beliefs regarding documentary editing, the editorial function, and the role of their works as evidence.

In addition, work in archival studies places emphasis on the relationship that exists between archives as an object, and the relationship between that object and the user. Because documentary editions are created out of archival materials, the relationship between published documentary materials and the original sources, in the context of the professions that traditionally provide access to these materials, should be evaluated.

Archivists, and librarians who had experience working in special collections, were responsible for establishing and maintaining standards that would allow for access to authentic and reliable primary sources. These materials could be used in the reference room by the

¹⁵ Richard J. Cox, *Managing Records and as Evidence and Information* (Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 2001).

¹⁶ Terry Cook, "What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift," *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997): 17-63. This approach is also used in Terry Cook's, "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape," *Canadian Historical Review* 90:3 (September 2009): 497-534.

researcher or patron and also by the editor during the process of creating their edited surrogates. The printing of these materials was aided by the standards of custody developed and maintained by archivists and special collections librarians.¹⁷ This study evaluates the role of the archival profession in establishing these standards, as they relate to historical documentary editing, and the nature of this influence.

This approach allows for an understanding of documentary editing as it relates to “the nature and significance of recorded information.”¹⁸ Of additional importance is the emphasis placed on the history of documentation and collections. This also includes the role of information professionals in engaging with these materials.

The combination of the varied perspectives employed in this study allowed for the evaluation of a diverse class of objects, professionals, and practices. The subtleties each of these elements possessed required the adoption of specific perspectives based upon the particular research question being asked. These provided methodological specificity, and offered conceptual guidance, in carrying out this study.

D. SOURCES

Distinct sets of documentation were evaluated as evidence of editorial activity. These sets of documentation are related to the unique individuals, practices, and professions surveyed

¹⁷ It is important to note that though archival and library holding were the primary source for documentation, editors surveyed private collections as well as the holdings of rare book and manuscript dealers during their search for materials. But in all of these cases, the editor would have been meticulous in evaluating and establishing the chain of custody to ensure the reliability and authenticity of the document.

¹⁸ Richard J. Cox, “On the Value of Archival History in the United States,” in *American Archival Analysis: The Recent Development of the Archival Profession in the United States* (Metuchen, N.J. & London: The Scarecrow Press, 1990), 186.

within this dissertation. The methodological approach also exerted influence on the nature and character of the sources used. Specifically, the objects of study in this dissertation are the editorial thoughts, ideas, and theories put forth by American documentary editors working during the early modern period. In this instance, the study's primary concern is with the theory and methods that influenced the production of documentary editions. Additionally, a secondary concern is with the works that resulted from the application of these ideas. This requires evaluating the intellectual production of editors, historians, archivists, and librarians, in the form of published research, reports, case studies, and published documentary editions. These categories of evidence are discussed in greater detail in the sections that follow.

1. Editorial Methods

In evaluating editorial methods, the primary sources consulted are the writings of editors. Editors wrote extensively. This output consisted of writings that commented on editing, both generally and in reference to specific aspects of editorial practice, and that presented case studies of the editors' respective projects. Mirroring the structure of the research presenting in the literature review, the majority of this literature is descriptive in nature, offering descriptions and discussions of editorial work. A smaller body of work addresses theoretical concerns and comments on the role and function of the editor. This study's emphasis is on the intellectual foundations of documentary editing, and as a result, relies more heavily on the smaller body of critical work, however, the general body of descriptive work is useful in obtaining an understanding of the character of editorial practice.

From these writings, it is possible to gather evidence that will allow for an identification and description of the characteristics of editorial methods developed and discussed during this

period. In commenting on these writings, it is important to distinguish between critical and descriptive writings. As noted, though editors wrote extensively, the body of writings that offered critical comment on the role of the editor, editorial methods, and the role and function of the documentary edition was small. These writings were authored by what can be described as a core group of scholars who defined themselves as “scholar-editors” and “historian-editors.”¹⁹ These individuals contributed to the theoretical literature and discussions.

The foundations of editorial practice can be found in the work of these individuals. However, the larger body of descriptive writing, which is made up principally of descriptions of projects and book reviews, also has evidential value. These writings illustrate the influence of editorial thinkers on editorial practice and can be used to evaluate the overall character of this period of editing.

The editorial statements that accompanied the editions are also an important source of evidence. These statements included commentary on the editorial methods used in the production of an edition and provide information regarding the specific editorial apparatus that was applied.²⁰ These are of use in identifying and defining the characteristics of editorial methods, theory, and practice.

Reviewing this evidence makes it possible to identify, analyze, and comment on the characteristics of editorial methods, which serves as a description of the intellectual frameworks created by documentary editors. An editor’s methods can be viewed as a set of value-based guidelines and procedures, which define how to represent a set of documentary materials. This

¹⁹ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 58; Julian P. Boyd, “Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning,” *Daedalus* 86:1 (May 1955), 49-56; and Paul H. Bergeron, “True Value Seen: Historical Editing,” *American Archivist* 34:3 (July 1971): 259-264.

²⁰ The editorial apparatus is the structure that prescribes how the transcription process will occur. It defines the structure of editorial markings in cases where the text is altered. For an example see: Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxix-xliii.

study examines these conceptualizations and this is a primary focus of this study. Through studying the relationship between these conceptions and the physical documentary editions, this dissertation provides an interpretation of the editorial activity in this period and offers comment on the specific characteristics of early modern historical editing, thoughts regarding editorial theory, and attitudes regarding historical documentation.

2. Documentary Editions

The editing of this period can also be understood through the critical examination of the volumes editors produced. The concern here is with analyzing historical editions as physical objects that structure documents. Just as a published literary work contains a representation of a manuscript, the same model applies to the historical edition, which provides a representation of historical sources.

The concern here is not with strict textual criticism in terms of evaluating document accuracy or textual variations. This evaluation does, however, consist of examining a set of editions in terms of how they operate as surrogates for original sources. Primarily, this evaluation will focus on the editorial choices made in creating these works and their final printed forms.

Two primary tasks are carried out in this evaluation. First, a specific concern is with comparing the theoretical edition, as described by an editorial methodology, and the actual published edition. Secondly, this involves tracing the elements present in the physical text, back to this theoretical edition, illustrating these theoretical underpinnings. Lastly, a functional analysis of the selected editions evaluates how the objects function as mechanisms for providing access to historical sources.

Evaluating documentary editing in this manner requires giving careful attention to the supportive elements included in the edition. Editorial notes, footnotes, essays, and textual clarifications, are all included within this category. Examining the physical edition provides an understanding of the relationships that exist between the theories of editing and the processes of an edition's creation.

A representative sample of historical editions is used to evaluate these relationships.²¹ Published editions have taken two primary forms. These are selective and comprehensive.²² Julian P. Boyd's edition of the Jefferson Papers is an example of comprehensive editing. Projects of this type sought to publish a complete record of relevant correspondence, as well as personal and public papers. Because of the scope of these projects, decades and multiple volumes would be required to complete these projects.²³

Other projects were more selective in scope. Editors also chose to develop more focused editions, publishing materials related to a specific event, or a specific exchange of correspondence. An illustrative example is the archivist-historian-documentary editor Lester J. Cappon's work, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*.²⁴ This two-volume edition contained specific exchanges of dialogue. This approach is quite different from that taken in the production of comprehensive editions, where the objective is to publish a complete record of an individual's printed and written intellectual product. These two categories of editing are represented in the selected sample.

²¹ This sample consists of an evaluation of three case studies. In addition, two documentary editions are examined to illustrate the relationship between the theoretical and physical edition.

²² Kline and Perdue, *Guide*, 216-219.

²³ Kline and Perdue, *Guide*, 6-7.

²⁴ Lester J. Cappon, ed., *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959).

3. Contexts

This dissertation's evaluation of context is primarily concerned with identifying and describing the related practices that were carried out within the same general environment as editorial processes. Also of concern is the nature of the influence that these contextual elements had on editorial practices. Attention to context serves two functions. First, this defines and evaluates the larger documentary environment, and secondly, this identifies and assesses the degree and nature of editorial influence.

This contextual environment consists of intellectual constructs, scholarly practices, professions, custodial practices, and institutions. Each of these can be examined using specific types of documentation. In this dissertation, the contexts are divided into three primary categories. These are defined as the **historiographic**, **archival**, and **governmental** contexts.

The primary function of these editions was to present documents that could function as surrogates for original sources. Editors were concerned with extending the access of original historical sources.²⁵ Because of this, in order to understand the characteristics of the edition as evidence, it is important to understand what was required of historical evidence.

Through an evaluation of the writings of historians, including both historiography and reviews of documentary editions, this information can be determined. This allows for an examination of what was acceptable, in terms of what was written regarding historical research methods, most specifically, regarding the requirements of source materials. Secondly, it is possible to identify what sources were historically acceptable. A critical reading of these texts will offer an understanding of the perceptions, expectations, and requirements of primary

²⁵ Leonard W. Labaree, "Scholarly Editing in Our Times," *Ventures* 3 (Winter 1964): 28-31.

sources, from the perspectives of researchers that would potentially use documentary editions in their work.

Examining the work of the archivists, librarians, and related professionals whose duties centered on the management and preservation of source materials, is also essential in understanding this context. Archivists and librarians, in preserving and facilitating access to primary source materials, assist in providing for the integrity and accessibility of original sources. This has been accomplished through the development of procedures and practices. Fully understanding the nature, characteristics, and requirements of primary sources requires an evaluation of these professionals, and their archival/library structures.

Providing a concrete understanding of the function and conceptions of the documentary edition during this period is dependent on understanding these procedures and practices. Historical editions, in presenting documentation, function, to an extent, as an enclosed documentary universe. Primary sources, housed within a repository, are supported by structures, both human and technical, that assist in facilitating access. An examination of the influence of custodial practices on the construction of historical editions, and the degree to which editors implemented similar structures within their works, can be evaluated through this type of review. In addition, the degree to which custodial practices influenced their development can also be evaluated.

The evidence required to identify and analyze these contexts can be obtained from critically evaluating the writings of archivists, librarians, and related professionals working during this period. Specific emphasis will be placed on identifying these professionals, and their respective professions', thoughts regarding the requirements of a primary source, in terms of the supportive structures required in making materials accessible to researchers. Reports, case

studies, and other documentation will also be evaluated in considering these attitudes, structures, and procedures.

The early modern period of editing saw a great shift in the nature of government involvement in the process of producing documentary editions. This period saw the increased formalization of the National Historical Publications Commission and its later expansion as the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. During the mid 20th century this body issued methodological statements that presented a program for supporting documentary publication within the United States. Specifically, the reports issued by the Commission presented suggestions regarding the projects that should be initiated and supported, as well as the manner in which the documentary works should be produced.

My interest in evaluating the governmental context is in evaluating the nature of this influence, in terms of what the NHPC/NHPRC hoped to accomplish, as well as the editorial communities reaction to this government involvement. This will be evaluated through a careful review of the reports issued by the Commission and of editors' writings regarding the effect of governmental involvement on editing practice.

E. LIMITATIONS

This study was concerned with obtaining a very particular type of understanding regarding documentary editing. Here, the approach to understanding editing came through identifying and analyzing editorial thought. The understanding of editing that this study provides is through offering an evaluation of editorial thought and its influence on the development of editorial methods and practices. Though physical editions and case studies were an important

site of evaluation within this study, the primary concern was with identifying and offering a critical review of editorial thought. This approach allows for an understanding of how editorial attitudes and thought affected practice, but this view of editing is very different from one that would be obtained through a process focused approach. A process focused approach would allow for an understanding of the mechanics of editorial activity and would offer a different view of the editorial endeavor.

Secondly, this dissertation examines a specific period of editing and focuses primarily on a category of editors that is unique in terms of its members' contributions to the theoretical discussions surrounding documentary editing. These editors are also unique in terms of their association with the era's leading editorial projects. Because of both of these limits, this study functions as an evaluation and analysis of a particular period of editing and a specific strand of editorial thought.

F. SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a discussion of the theoretical approach developed for completing the research presented within this study. In addition, this has included a statement of the study's research questions and a presentation of the specific research methodology that was employed in addressing these questions. The following chapter, "Documentary Editing in the United States," presents an evaluation of contemporary documentary editing and its historical foundations. This chapter provides contextual information that assists in understanding the distinguishing characteristics of the early modern period of editing.

IV. DOCUMENTARY EDITING IN THE UNITED STATES

This chapter provides contextual information regarding the practice of documentary editing within the United States, which will provide a frame of reference for the specific discussions of early modern documentary editing. Primarily, this chapter provides a general introduction to the practice of documentary editing in the United States. Included in this overview are a discussion of the traditional function of contemporary documentary editing, an introduction to its historical context, characteristics of the documentation produced by the practice, and lastly, a discussion of the relationship between documentary editing and its allied professions.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. A Historical Overview

This discussion provides an episodic historical overview, which describes critical practices, editors, and methodological developments. Modern documentary editing, including its most immediate contemporary practice, underlying philosophies, goals, and objectives can be traced to a set of historical foundations. This cursory overview provides an analysis of the historical antecedents to contemporary editing practice, which is necessary for understanding the

primary functions of documentary editing. In addition, this information is also helpful in considering the analysis of the early modern editing, theory, and methods presented in this dissertation.

The origins of the practice of editing and publishing original sources in the United States can be found in editorial efforts undertaken during the 18th century. While this marks the beginning of the practice of producing published collections of original sources, more importantly, the underlying spirit of editing, demonstrated by the objective of transmitting texts, emerged during the concluding decades of the 18th century.¹ The most notable editor working during this period, and the individual responsible for the development of much of this spirit, was Ebenezer Hazard.

In 1774, Hazard began to develop a strategy for the publication of a series of American State Papers. In his words, this work would provide the “foundation of a good American history.”² The function of this work was documentary in nature. In publishing this collection, the intent was to provide a comprehensive record through the inclusion of materials from “all of the states.”³ Hazard’s intent was to create a work that would “present the rise and progress of the British colonies in America through the essential documents.”⁴ Hazard completed two tasks in preparing this edition. First, he disseminated documentation through publication. But, secondly, he also assembled a collection out of selected documents.

In the context of the history of editing, both the approach Hazard discussed, and the project itself, are noteworthy. First, Hazard ascribes a narrative property and value to the original

¹ Cox, *Closing An Era*, 201-202; Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 211-212; Burnette, *Beneath the Footnote*, 343-345.

² Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 165.

³ Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 165.

⁴ Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 165.

sources that he was to edit. Within his framework, original sources, edited and published properly, could function as a narrative device for the events and activities that they documented. Hazard's edition, in this regard, would describe events and activities through the presentation of original sources.

Hazard's editorial endeavors were assisted by his work with the mail service. From the period of 1775 – 1789, Hazard was employed by the postal service. His work required extensive traveling and took him up through the New England area. Because Hazard wanted to collect materials related to a diverse geographic area, he took advantage of the opportunities offered by this travel and began to acquire copies of relevant documentary materials for publication.⁵

The result of Hazard's work, *Historical Collections*, was published in two volumes. Volume I. was issued during the year 1791, while Volume II was published during the year 1794. The documents contained within Hazard's edition were arranged chronologically. His editing was generally accurate, in comparison to other editors of the period, while scholars of editing have noted that there was some inconsistency in the manner in which spelling was modernized. In terms of contextual information, Hazard did supply information regarding the origins of the original documents, and provided brief explanatory notes.⁶

As the editor, Hazard placed himself within the documentation. This is important when considering the debate regarding the nature of editorial presence in later editorial discussions. These elements were considered innovative. Hazard's primary objective was present the documents accurately with as little disruption to the material as possible.

Regarding the utility and function of his work, Hazard stated that his edition would bring together source material that would "form the best history," and that would "furnish the glosses

⁵ Cappon in Cox, "American Historical Editors," 165-166.

⁶ Cappon in Cox, "American Historical Editors," 166-167.

free of commentators.”⁷ From this we can infer that Hazard considered his work to be a form of historical evidence. He was also concerned with the accuracy of the documentation and its interpretation. Hazard himself could also be counted as a commentator, if too intrusive in his commentary, which illustrates a degree of considered editorial constraint. This shows the potential for collected editions of original sources to narrate and document events, but only if presented in the proper manner.

It is also important to note the emphasis on presenting documentations that would be “free of commentators,” which would disrupt the function of this narration.⁸ In Hazard’s work, one can find discussion, which described practices, functions, and values, which would be discussed by later generations of editors. The concepts of editorial intention, disruption, and document purity have long been on editors’ minds.

More importantly, the underlying spirit that underpins editorial practice, the objective of providing wider access to documentary materials, partially finds its origins in the larger editorial project initiated by Hazard. Thomas Jefferson was an important supporter of Hazard, supplying him with documentation and encouragement. In response to Hazard’s efforts, Jefferson stated, in reference to the publication of original sources, that “The loss cannot be recovered; but let us save what remains: not by vaults or locks which fence them from the public eye and use, in consigning them to the waste of time, but by the multiplication of copies, as shall place them beyond the reach of accident.”⁹ Jefferson’s statement is frequently cited and alluded to by contemporary editors when describing the value of documentary editing and documentary editions. Published collections of documentation, as described in this statement, were conceived

⁷ Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 166-167.

⁸ Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 166-167.

⁹ Cappon in Cox, “American Historical Editors,” 166.

of as being able to function to both preserve intellectual content and also provide for its wider access. These values and currents were to found in the editorial thought of proceeding generations of editors.

The 19th century saw great growth in the area of documentary publication. This increase in editorial projects has been defined by scholars as being one aspect of a larger movement that has been defined as “documania.”¹⁰ In addition to increases in the publication of edited documents, there was also an increase in the development and formalization historical societies, the growth of autograph collecting, and the self-publication of narrative accounts.¹¹ The 19th century also saw the professionalization of the historical discipline and a more formal recognition of editorial practices. Illustrative examples of this formalization can be seen in the founding of the American Historical Association (AHA) in 1884 and the establishment of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1895).¹²

A greater number of historical editors practiced during the 19th century. Notable figures, in the context of this study, include Jared Sparks, Peter Force, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, William Templeton Franklin, and Charles Francis Adams. Randolph, Franklin, and Adams, each published editions of papers related to their own notable relatives and their work later influenced future generations of editors working with the Founding Era Papers. These individuals were illustrative of category of editors that published editions related to their relatives.¹³

The editions produced by these individuals are noteworthy in the history of editing because they are illustrative of the initial treatment of individuals that would later be given great

¹⁰ Cox, *Closing an Era*, 201-202; Van Tassell, *Recording America's Past*, 103-110.

¹¹ Cox, *Closing an Era*, 201-202; Lester J. Cappon, “Walter R. Benjamin and the Autograph Trade at the Turn of the Century,” *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series, 78 (1966): 20-23; Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 211-213.

¹² Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 212-213.

¹³ Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 211-212.

attention by documentary editors. From an editorial standpoint, these editions suffered from the alteration, removal, and deletion of material. Often such changes were made to preserve or protect the reputation of the individuals documented by the records.¹⁴ The intended function of these works was not necessarily scholarly, and is important in illustrating the importance of the nature of editorial intention.

Taken as a whole, the editing of the 19th century does not represent a refinement of method to the degree that was seen in the mid-20th century, when considered as a practice with the objective of publishing and disseminating historical evidence. However, this period does represent an expansion of the editorial domain, both in terms of scope and in terms of editorial possibility. During this period the number of editions published increased greatly, as did the variation of the subjects covered. In addition, the editorial attention given to notable American political figures, become a trend that would influence editorial practice through much of the 20th century.

2. Modern Documentary Editing: Definition and Function

In contemporary terms, documentary editing is formally defined as “the practice of publishing collections of writings, letters, and/or speeches by leading figures.”¹⁵ In addition to individuals, editions of papers also use specific events and institutions as central organizing themes. The materials that are published by documentary editors can best be categorized as original or primary sources. Materials of this type are unique, both in terms of form, but also in terms of the context of their creation. These materials usually originated as manuscripts, though

¹⁴ Boyd, “God’s Altar Needs Not Our Polishings,” 10.

¹⁵ Association for Documentary Editing, “A Brief History of Documentary Editing,” Association for Documentary Editing, <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/about/history.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).

printed materials are also included in documentary editions, particularly in the context of speeches, where it is customary for drafts to be included along with an original.¹⁶ The primary objective of contemporary documentary editing practice is to increase access to these materials through publication in print, microfilm, and digital forms.

The access that editors are concerned with can be described in terms of two types. These are physical and intellectual access. Each of these definitions are described in greater detail below, but as a cursory definition, physical access can be described in terms of the availability of the documentation, while intellectual access refers to the ability to engage with the contents of the documents. The objective of the editorial function is to allow for both of these forms of access.

In creating documentary editions, editors redefine the physical relationships that exist between documents. Often, the documents that are published as concrete collections have been derived from originals that had been geographical dispersed from one another. In publishing materials that are intellectually related, but physically separated, as cohesive works, editors attempt to address physical and intellectual access constraints that might result from the dispersal issues that they address. In bringing together intellectually related, but physically separated documents, editors attempt to address a category of physical restraint.

This issue is related to the second category of access. Documentary editors are also concerned with intellectual access. Often, physically separated documents may have shared intellectual relationships. An illustrative example of this can be seen in the treatment of

¹⁶ Association for Documentary Editing, "A Brief History," Association for Documentary Editing <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/about/history.html/> (accessed April 20, 2011); Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 136-138.

correspondence. This is a category of materials that documentary editors are often principally concerned with in their projects.

Correspondence, both originating and departing, is often widely dispersed from its originating point. The dispersal is a natural consequence of the very function of letters. A letter is a tool for communicating thoughts, words, and ideas across distances.¹⁷ As a consequence of this function, correspondence becomes separated from its creators. It is for this reason that correspondence originating from one individual may be found in a number of different libraries, archives, or private collections. In publishing collections of papers, editors also edit intellectual relationships. The editing process is supported by the idea that its works assist in providing greater access to original sources that are valuable because they serve as evidence of events and activities. In their view, in order to document an event most effectively, it is necessary to provide a complete set of documentation.

Publication, in this context, unifies documentation based upon shared relationships. This is a foundational aspect of modern editorial practice, with Julian P. Boyd's implementation of this approach in *The Jefferson Papers* being a prominent early example. In the case of edited collections of correspondence, or comprehensive editions that include correspondence, it is typically a best practice to include correspondence that the individual sent, as well as that which the individual received. Publishing both aspects of correspondence provides a full record of a communication. This same principle applies to the practice of publishing drafts of speeches along with the formal official document.¹⁸

¹⁷ For a discussion of the letter as a document type see Richard J. Cox, "Yours Ever (Well, Maybe): Studies and Signposts in Letter Writing," *Archival Science* 10:4 (December 2010): 373-388.

¹⁸ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xi-xiv.

There are other means through which editors provide intellectual access to original sources. In addition to publishing original sources, editors also contextualize and offer a documentary record of the materials with which they are concerned. This is accomplished principally through the use of descriptive notes that provide information regarding the physical characteristics of the source material for the edited documents and explanatory notes that describe and clarify the contents of the documents.¹⁹

The underlying editorial philosophy is that the practice of providing contextual information will allow for a better understanding of the individuals, events, and activities documented by the source materials. This also provides valuable information regarding the source of the printed document, in the event that the reader needs to consult the original or verify its authenticity. In summary, though the primary mission of documentary editing is to provide wider access to collections of documents, by necessity, editors also become directly involved in the process of managing complex textual relationships.

3. Process

Documentary editing is a practice, but this term also defines a process that begins with the consideration of developing a project and that ends, if successful, with its ultimate publication. To summarize the process, documentary editing consists of a defined set of structured activities that result in the publication of collections of documentation that can function as surrogates for original sources. This process consists of procedures that involve definition, selection, editing, and publication. A documentary edition initially comes into being as a concept. In developing a project, editors first define the scope of the project. This includes

¹⁹ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvii.; Carter, *Historical Editing*, 32-33.

establishing the subject of the edition, determining the categories of documentation that are to be included within the edition, and lastly, the project's comprehensiveness.²⁰

These decisions determine the form that an edition will take and the nature of the materials that it will contain. An editor may decide that he or she wants to focus attention on an individual or an event, and elect to undertake a selective project. The categories of documentation will also vary. An editor may decide to include all relevant documentation, or the project may focus on editing and publishing a particular category of documentation, such as correspondence or a collection of speeches. Issues of scope and selection are very important in the context of editing. These processes determine the nature of the sources that will be made available. Access is defined during these initial steps.

Related to this point is the issue of comprehensiveness. A project may attempt to obtain, edit, and publish the whole of an individual's documentary record. This type of editing has been referred to as comprehensive documentary editing.²¹ The best example of this type of project is Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, which published its first volume in 1950 and is still ongoing.²² Or, the editor may choose to be more selective, and focus attention on producing a specific category of documentation. Similarly, the editor could select documentation related to an individual's particular function, or a particular event. This was the approach taken by Lester J. Cappon in his edition, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, a notable example of this type of work, and one that remains in print. These decisions are critical because they determine the identity of the edition. This form determines how the subject will be represented through documentation, and to a degree, fixes the categories of use that the edition will allow for.

²⁰ Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 39-40.

²¹ Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 39-40.

²² The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, "Volumes," The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, <http://www.princeton.edu/~tjpapers/volumes.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).

The next step consists of the process of evaluation and selection of the documentation. During this process the editor identifies and locates all of the relevant documentation that could potentially be included within the edition. Once all of this documentation is surveyed and evaluated, the editor then makes further refinements and selects the items that will be included within the work.²³

There are a number of factors that influence editorial decisions regarding what particular sources to include. First, the selection function is governed by the overall scope of the project. Secondly, the decision to select documents for publication is also influenced by the absence or presence of pre-existing edited documents in other publications. The process of editing is resource intensive, both in terms of the time, physical, and human resources required. Because of this condition, editors attempt to be very precise in their selection process. If a document within the project's scope has already been published, the editor may make a decision to include a note referring the user to the existing published document, or a summary may be provided. This process also consists of the microfilming of these materials, which the editor will both make available, and consult, during the editing process.²⁴

The next step in this process consists of the procedures involved in transcription. This activity consists of two primary processes. These are transcription and annotation. During these activities the documents are transcribed and supplemented with editorial notes. A device called an editorial apparatus guides this process. This serves as the intellectual framework for an edition. The editorial apparatus defines how the transcription and annotation will present the

²³ The Association for Documentary Editing, "What do Editing Projects Do?," The Association for Documentary Editing, http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/about/projects_do.html (accessed April 20, 2010).

²⁴ Lyman H. Butterfield, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Progress and Procedures in the Enterprise at Princeton," *American Archivist* 12:2 (April 1949): 136-140.

text. Points related to presentation are how the documents will be transcribed, in terms of textual presentation, and lastly, how editorial notes will be used to supplement and describe the documents. It is helpful to conceptualize the editorial apparatus as a translation device and a contextualization device.

In editing, the intellectual content is taken from its original form and location and placed within a new context. This is a context defined by the intended use of the edited document. These contexts may be in print, microfilm, or digital mediums, but each involves a shifting of form. It is for this reason that editors may be concerned with context. When removed from the context of an archival repository or collection, certain crucial aspects may become lost during this process of documentary translation.

The editor makes choices regarding how he or she will reproduce texts. An editor may choose to regularize text to increase its intelligibility. Clarifications may be placed within the text to address misspellings and abbreviations may be expanded in cases where the editor thinks that they could not be inferred. In contemporary practice, all of these decisions would be documented in the text.²⁵ Because the intent is that these works will be used as research tools, as historical evidence, any alteration of the intellectual content from its original form must be noted if the edited documents are to be used as reliable sources for research.

Annotation fulfills a similar function. Just as the editor may alter text for the purposes of clarification and intelligibility, editors also supplement documents with annotations in the form of descriptive and explanatory notes. While transcription involves the production of a textual reproduction, the process of annotation involves the production and creation of editorial context. Documentary context takes two primary forms. First, descriptive notes provide contextual

²⁵ Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 264-272.

information related to the documents themselves. Essentially, descriptive notes provide the genealogy of a given document and provide an overview of its origins.²⁶

This is similar to the archival concept of provenance, which informs archivists concern with documenting context as a means of ensuring the reliability and authenticity of archival objects.²⁷ Editorial context fulfills a similar function. The information appearing in descriptive notes typically includes notations regarding the location of the original source, a physical description of the document, and a description of any other printings. Contextual information of this type allows for the verification of a document's reliability, which is related to how well it will function as a surrogate for an original source. This information also provides a path back to the source document, in the event that the reader needs to consult the original. Because of these functions, descriptive notes assist in providing for the internal integrity of the documents.

A second category of contextual information is provided through the use of explanatory notes. While descriptive notes are used to preserve the *internal* integrity of the documents, explanatory notes provide *external* information that may assist the user in interpreting the information found within the documents. The intended function of this category of context is to create a more usable document. Usability, in this sense, is considered in terms of a document's clarity and intelligibility.²⁸

The level of detail contained within these notes, and the nature of the content is determined by the editor's philosophy of editing. Notes may be quite brief and provide factual information. Notes of this type provide language translations, information regarding obscure

²⁶ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv.

²⁷ For a discussion of the concept of provenance, see Shelley Sweeney's, "The Ambiguous Origins of the Archival Principle of 'Provenance'," *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 43:2 (2008): 193-213.

²⁸ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxvi.

name/place/geographic clarifications, and brief descriptive summaries of the activities documented by the text.²⁹

However, these notes can also be quite extensive. Critics of editorial practice have commented that extensive annotations can become acts of interpretation themselves and blur the line between re-producing a scholarly source and producing scholarship.³⁰ Amongst editors, attitudes have varied regarding the appropriate function of annotation and there are varied perspectives regarding what level of depth is acceptable. Arguments for a more interpretive approach to providing context have been issued as have those arguing for greater austerity in annotating texts and providing context. The critical point that this discussion illustrates is that editors make choices in editing, which determine the form and use of their editions. These choices and approaches are discussed in greater depth in Chapters 5 and 6 of this dissertation.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MATERIALS PRODUCED

Because the editing process results in unique physical objects, it is important to consider the material characteristics of documentary works. A critical question to ask is how the process of documentary editing, and the varied forms that documentary works take, affect their presentation of documents? The evidential function of these works also makes this an important discussion.

²⁹ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxvi.

³⁰ Richard J. Cox, "Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates: Quarrelling About the Preservation of the Documentary Heritage of the United States," *First Monday* 2:8 (August 1997): 12-13, available online at <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/543/464> (accessed March 9, 2006); Robert L. Brubaker, "The Publication of Historical Sources: Recent Projects in the United States," *Library Quarterly* 37: 2 (April 1967) 209-210.

Archival and other categories of primary source materials are influenced by the contexts of their creation. When viewed from a genealogical standpoint, documentary editions can be described as having archival properties. Though the documentary edition is a conscious object, and the printed documents contained within the edition are conscious objects, the informational content is archival and unconscious. The documentary edition possesses the organic properties of archival materials along with the inorganic properties of a published work.

Because of this hybridity, context is complicated by the editing process that influences how the materials are arranged, and determines the character of the access structures that allows them to be used. Chapter 6 of this dissertation addresses the issue materiality in greater depth, but here I offer a general discussion regarding the characteristics and properties of the objects that are produced by documentary editing, giving particular attention to the issue of publishing medium.

The physical properties of documentary editions can best be described in terms of *edition* and *document* level characteristics. Collections of edited source materials operate at both of these levels. Though related to one another, the documentary edition as a whole, and the edited documents as individual entities, have specific characteristics.

As a whole object, the edition is constructed out of a specific medium, it contains specific documents, and an edition level arrangement scheme is used to structure the documents contained within the work. These aspects are related to the physicality of the edition and are related to the edition as a whole or as a unified collection.

However, there are also document level characteristics. These aspects are primarily influenced by the relationship between the editorial apparatus and the text of the documents. The editorial apparatus influences how the individual documents are structured and described. The

manner in which the text appears on the page is also influenced by this device. Examples of document level characteristics include the depth of descriptive and summary notes, the placement of these notes within the edited document, whether or not spelling is regularized, and lastly, the manner in which these alterations are noted. All of these affect the appearance of the materials at the document level, which influences how they will be perceived and engaged with. This description is a general introductory overview of these characteristics. They are discussed in greater depth in the sections that follow.

1. Edition Level Characteristics

The most prominent characteristic of this category is the choice of physical medium used to *print* the documentary edition. Medium selection determines how the texts will be presented to the reader, whether the documents will be presented as transcriptions or facsimiles, and the nature of the explanatory comment that will be included within the edition.³¹ Most importantly, the publication medium determines how the edition will be transmitted.

Traditionally the letterpress print edition has been the preferred mechanism for disseminating edited documents.³² However, microfilm has been used by editors as a secondary publication format for quite some time. The relationship between letterpress and microfilm is complex. Considerations of letterpress and microfilm bring up issues related to time, expense, and usability.³³ Documentary editors have also begun working more extensively with the World Wide Web as a means of publishing and providing access to documentary materials in online environments. This form of publication has been supported and encouraged by the National

³¹ Kline & Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 264-272.

³² Kline & Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 263-266.

³³ Brubaker, "The Publication of Historical Sources," 210-216.

Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and the Association for Documentary Editing (ADE).³⁴ The best example of an electronic edition is *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, which has made the complete edition freely available online.³⁵

Though medium is most directly an edition level characteristic, the medium that is used to publish the documents has a direct influence on the nature of the document level characteristics. As a container, the medium influences the nature of the documents that are contained within it. These three primary mediums: letterpress, microfilm, and web based, are discussed in more specific detail below.

a. Letterpress Editions

Traditionally, editors have described letterpress as the preferable medium for disseminating documentary evidence.³⁶ The primary reasons cited have been usability, portability, and readability.³⁷ Additionally, the documents contained within letterpress editions possess specific characteristics that editors feel are best suited to documentary publications. Documents contained within letterpress editions are edited, transcribed, and supplemented with editorial notes. Another stated advantage of the letterpress edition is that as a medium is that it allows the editor to provide context. Here the nature of the content that the editor can produce is directly linked to the medium used.³⁸

³⁴ National Archives and Records Administration, "The Founder's Online: Open Access to the Papers of America's Founding Era: A Report to Congress," Washington, DC, National Archives and Records Administration, 2008. Available online at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/publications/founders-report.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2010); Committee On Electronic Standards, "Minimum Standards for Electronic Editions," Association for Documentary Editing, <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/> (accessed on April 20, 2010).

³⁵ *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* may be accessed online at: <http://franklinpapers.org/franklin/> (April 20, 2010).

³⁶ Charles E. Lee, "Documentary Reproduction: Letterpress Publication—Why? What? How?," *The American Archivist* 28:3 (July 1965): 363.

³⁷ For criticisms of this form of publication, see Brubaker, "The Publication of Historical Sources," 216-219.

³⁸ Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 231-234.

Additionally, letterpress editions reproduce content in the form of edited transcriptions. Because the editor is producing transcriptions, not surrogates, he or she has the opportunity to provide textual clarifications and embed editorial notes, which address textual concerns.³⁹ A concern regarding letterpress publications is that editions of this type are timely to produce, with large-scale projects taking decades to produce. This is not as much of a concern for editors working with selective projects where they are working with smaller bodies of documentation. As a consequence of this, the user may not have access to materials that are needed, or instead may need to rely on a microfilm edition.

However, critics, both contemporary and historical, have questioned whether the use of print as a medium for large-scale projects is appropriate or effective, given the time and cost involved in producing these editions. The most recent critical evaluation of editing practice developed in response to the 1994 NHPRC funding controversy. In his article “Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates: Quarrelling About the Preservation of the Documentary Heritage of the United States,” Richard J. Cox evaluates the practice of documentary editing within the context of the 1995/1996 NHPRC funding controversy. Central to this debate was concern with how the NHPRC should use its funds to best provide access to America’s documentary heritage. In this piece, Cox evaluates letterpress documentary editions within the context of access and preservation devices, drawing attention to the point that heavily annotated letterpress print editions may not be the most effective means for preserving or providing access to documentary materials.⁴⁰

³⁹ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxix-xxxiv.

⁴⁰ Cox, “Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates,” 24-28; Brubaker, “The Publication of Historical Sources,” 19-21.

b. Microfilm Editions

Microfilm is also used by editors as a medium to disseminate documentary materials. This format is used during the process of creating a letterpress edition, as means to gain control over a body of documentation, or is used as the primary medium for providing access to surrogates of original sources. The primary advantages of microfilm over letterpress can be described in terms of the cost to produce the edition, and in terms of the time required to produce the work.⁴¹

However, the documents produced are facsimiles and are not edited in the same manner as letterpress editions. Because of this, microfilm provides a particular type of access. It is important to recognize, that even in the case of microfilm editions, where the level of editorial intervention may be less visible, editing still does take place. A collection of documents captured on microfilm may have been refined from a larger group of documents. Issues related to scope, use, and intention influence this construction. However, these materials have not been annotated or transcribed in the strictest editorial sense. Accessibility is provided, but clarification and context are not. As a medium, microfilm allows for the physical access, but editors to not as concretely address issues related to intellectual access, through this medium.

c. Electronic Editions

In recent decades the documentary editing community has demonstrated a concern with evaluating the affect of emerging technologies on editing activities. This concern relates to the

⁴¹See John M. Blum, "Editors' Camera: The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt," *American Documentation* 1:4 (October 1950): 17-19; Fred Shelly, "The Choice of Medium for Documentary Publication," *The American Archivist* 32:4 (October 1969): 364-365; and Henry M. Silver, "The Publication of Original Research Materials," *American Documentation* 1:1 (January 1950): 182-183.

processes involved in creating documentary editions and in considering the tools that are used to provide access to these works.⁴² In providing access to documentary materials editors have also created digital editions that have made their work accessible through online environments. The primary advantage of these works is in regards to accessibility. A user can access the online version of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* online without any fee. The user is presented with transcriptions of documents. Though these texts of this specific edition are not annotated, the reader is presented with clear transcriptions. In addition, the online edition allows for different forms of document accessibility. The online edition may be browsed chronologically and by name. Additionally, keyword searching is available, providing a level of accessibility not presented within the print edition. The editors are careful to note the absence of a regular spelling may make keyword searching difficult.⁴³

Documentary editors' exploration of this medium is fairly recent within the context of the history of editing. Editors have been encouraged to explore the use of online formats for presenting documentation. This encouragement has come both from the Association for Documentary Editing (ADE) and the federal government. The ADE has issued a set of recommendations regarding the development of digital editions that are designed to assist editors in formulating these types of projects.⁴⁴ Additionally, the NHPRC has issued its own reports

⁴² Frank G. Burke, "Automation and Documentary Editing," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 20:1 (January 1987): 73-79; David Chesnutt, "The Model Editions Partnership: Historical Editions in the Digital Age," *D-Lib Magazine* (November 1995), available online at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november95/11chesnutt.html> (accessed April 20, 2010); Charles T. Cullen, "20th-Century Technology and the Jefferson Papers," *Scholarly Publishing* 13 (October 1981): 45-53; Clinton R. Lanier, "Electronic Editing and the Author," *Technical Communication* 51:4 (November 2004): 526-536; and Jenifer E. Stertzer, "Yet Another George Washington Website: The Digital Edition and the Future of Documentary Editing," *Documentary Editing* 30:1 & 2 (Spring and Summer 2008): unnumbered.

⁴³ The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, "Searching," The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, available at http://franklinpapers.org/franklin/info_search.jsp (accessed April 20, 2010).

⁴⁴ Committee on Electronic Standards, "Minimum Standards for Electronic Editions," Association for Documentary Editing, <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/> (accessed on April 20, 2010).

regarding the publication of digital editions, offering a potential strategy for long term development of these types of projects.⁴⁵

2. Relationship between Medium and Presentation

Each of these mediums structures the documents in a unique manner. Letterpress, microfilm, and electronic editions each present documents in specific ways and make use of particular editorial devices, which are medium specific. This in turn influences how they will be accessed and used. Print and microfilm editions are typically arranged chronologically. This influences how the edition's documents will be accessed. Print editions may have a name index, which allows for additional access points, but they do not offer the search utility of the online edition. The electronic edition, allows for multiple entry points into the text. These instances illustrate the unique way in which edition formats structure the relationship between the user and the documents. Contemporary editors make use of these different medium types in constructing their editions.

The publishing medium also has an affect on the document level characteristics. Documents contained within a letterpress edition will be edited, transcribed, and annotated. In this instance the editor combines both a transcription of the document along with editorial context. Microfilm editions typically present facsimiles without contextual information. This form of transmission removes some of the risk of transcription errors associated with the editorial process. Additionally, microfilm editions can be made available in a timelier manner. However, some documentary editors have stated reservations regarding usability issues

⁴⁵ National Archives and Records Administration, "The Founder's Online: Open Access to the Papers of America's Founding Era: A Report to Congress," Washington, DC, National Archives and Records Administration, 2008. Available online at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/publications/founders-report.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2010)

associated with microfilm editions. *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, illustrating an example of a digital edition, provides transcriptions of documents without annotations. Each of these containers influences the form that the documents take and how they will be arranged. Editors take into account these issues when addressing issues related to format.

3. Document Level Characteristics

The documents contained within the editions of published sources exhibit specific characteristics, some of which are influenced by medium. These characteristics include how the text is represented in its new form, the nature of the editorial notes used to supplement text, and the character of the alterations made to the text.

In documentary editions, text is reproduced through two methods. This is accomplished through transcription, as is seen in letterpress editions, and in facsimile, as is seen in microfilm editions. Both represent the text in unique ways. The advantage of transcription is readability, while the advantage of microfilm, is the speed with which the reproduction can be produced and a reduction in the risk of editorial error.⁴⁶

An additional document level characteristic is the nature of the editorial notes used to supplement the documents. Editorial notes are used to contextualize the document, through providing information about the document, and information that is related to the document's contents. As stated, these may be descriptive or interpretive in nature. Documents that are annotated become hybrid objects. The document comes to contain original informational content, supplemented with interpretive editorial comment. The issue of annotation has been a subject of debate among documentary editors and other scholars. These discussions have

⁴⁶ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 168-171.

centered on the role of the editor in clarifying and contextualizing documentary materials and whether the editor's function is scholarly or interpretive in nature.

In addition to augmenting edited documents with notes to provide context, editors also edit the text itself. Edited documents may reveal evidence of varying degrees of editorial intervention. Alterations of text, when made, are done so in accordance with the editor's objective of providing access to a document that will be widely accessible. Textual alterations are used in manner similar to editorial notes. The underlying philosophy of editorial notes is that they can be used to increase the intelligibility of the document through the description of names, places, and events, which may be obscure or that the editor feels deserves greater editorial attention.⁴⁷ Editors approach textual alteration in this same manner.

Textual alterations are designed to increase the intelligibility of a document's language. Because documentary editions function as evidence, it is critical that the editing process not alter the text in anyway that would alter meaning. This would disrupt the authenticity and reliability of the object. Because of this, editors are highly conscious of their influence. However, though editors are producing evidence, they are also producing editions that are designed to be more accessible than the original sources they represent.

The primary categories of these alterations are spelling regulations, corrections, and expansions of abbreviations. In addition, if written text is in a foreign language, ancient Greek for example, the editor will provide a translation of the text in an editorial note.⁴⁸ A defining feature of contemporary practice is that all of these textual alterations are performed with complete transparency. Editorial notations are embedded within the documents to draw attention to these textual alterations. When considering this aspect of the editor's work, it is important to

⁴⁷ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvii; Carter, *Historical Editing*, 32-33.

⁴⁸ Klein and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 104-106.

consider that just as there is a threshold of intelligibility that defines whether an editor will alter the text of the document, there is also a concern with the threshold of editorial disruption. The editor will not alter the text if it would alter the meaning of a document or disrupt its usability as an original source.

4. Topical Characteristics

A characteristic of contemporary editorial practice is the diversity of the subjects whose papers are the subject of documentary publication. The papers of scientists, artists, political activists, and literary figures have been issued in documentary form.⁴⁹ In the context of the history of editing, this diversification of documentary publication is a fairly recent development. Up until the 1970's the papers of Founding-Era and related individuals were the most prominent examples of documentary publishing.⁵⁰

The reason for this can be identified in the perceived needs of the documentary record and its gaps.⁵¹ Following the publication of Boyd's edition of the Jefferson papers, President Truman assembled a committee to evaluate the state of documentary publication within the

⁴⁹ A listing of these individuals is provided in the NHPC report.

⁵⁰ During the late 1970's scholars began to question the diversity of the published documentary record. The historian Jesse Lemisch was a leading figure in this discussion. See Jesse Lemisch, "The American Revolution Bicentennial and the Papers of Great White Men: A Preliminary Critique of Current Documentary Publication Programs and Some Alternative Proposals," *AHA Newsletter* 9 (November 1971): 7-21; Jesse Lemisch, "The Papers of A Few Black Men and a Few Great White Women," *Maryland Historian*: 60-66; and Jesse Lemisch, "The Papers of Great White Men," *Maryland Historian*: 43-50. Also see LaWanda Cox, "Review: From Great White Men to Blacks Emerging from Bondage, With Innovations in Documentary Editing," *Reviews in American History* 12:1 (March 1984): 31-39. Here, she evaluates this point within the larger context of documentary editing.

⁵¹ The concept of the historical "gap" in the record has been an important impetus for collecting and editing activities. See J. Franklin Jameson's, "Gaps in the Published Documentary Record," *American Historical Review* 11:4 (July 1906): 817-831.

United States. This committee was charged with identifying figures whose papers merited publication, and to develop a strategy for their publication.⁵²

In the final report, emphasis was placed on the need to support and encourage the ongoing Founding-Era projects.⁵³ Developing projects related to similar figures was also described as a priority. The publication of the papers issued by the founding era political figures was defined as a public and democratic good. While the primary objective of historical editors was to provide access to researchers, the committee report emphasized the view that these papers belonged to a citizenry that should have access to them.

This trend continued for the next two decades. However, in the 1970's, prominent historians drew attention to the gaps that were present in the published documentary record. This evaluation occurred in relation to the areas represented by the published documentary record, and the individuals documented by it. A leading figure in this evaluation was the historian Jesse Lemisch. In a series of writings appearing in *The Maryland Historian*, Lemisch evaluated the published documentary record.⁵⁴ He was particularly concerned with what he felt was the lack of diversity amongst the body of published original sources. While evaluating the body of published original sources, Lemisch also offered suggestions for expanding what he saw to be its narrowness.

This example aids in defining the role of the editor in structuring documentary evidence. While the most immediate of the functions involves the treatment of specific texts, at a more macro-level, documentary editors construct a cultural record of published original sources. In this regard, the documentary editor is similar to the archivist. Both groups are concerned with

⁵² Donohue, Keith. "Documenting Democracy," 30-33.

⁵³ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program*, 18-20.

⁵⁴ See note 11

disseminating different categories documentary materials, and both of these activities are defined by choice.

This discussion emphasizes editorial selection at the macro level, the creation of the published documentary record. However, topical coverage also operates at the project level. First editors make choices in terms of what materials will be included within an edition. This very act itself places a constraint on what information will be included within the edition. In turn this aids in defining how the edition will be used and by whom.

This discussion of characteristics illustrates two critical aspects that influence the editing and publishing of original sources. First, the actions of the editor influences the final form an edition takes and how it will be used. And secondly, the characteristics of the work can be viewed as evidence of editorial endeavor and philosophy. The documentary editor carries out a specific function.

C. THE FUNCTION OF THE EDITOR

Put succinctly, the editor is an active participant in the construction of documentary editions. An examination of editorial characteristics, properties, and processes reveals evidence of the affects of implementing an editorial philosophy or theory. Fundamentally, this is a matter of editorial intention. Editorial evidence, in the form of the editorial apparatus, illustrates how a group of documentary materials was treated. This in turn reveals the editor's theoretical views

regarding how a documentary edition should operate, and how it should be used. In this regard, the documentary editor defines the characteristics of transmission and use.⁵⁵

The role of the documentary editor has been defined as that of “transmitting text.”⁵⁶ While editors agree that they have an active role in creating historical evidence in the form of documentary editions, the nature of editorial responsibility has remained a point of discussion. A primary question editors and critics of editing have asked relates to the issue of how present the editor should be within the documentary edition. *Editorial presence* refers to the degree of editorial intervention that is visible in the text, as evidenced by the use of descriptive notes, explanatory notes, and textual clarifications.

In considering editorial intervention, it is important to recognize that during the editorial process the editor constructs a unique documentary reality. The user engages with the documents viewed through the editor’s lens. This lens is defined by the editorial apparatus, which is influenced by editorial theory and methods. How the documents are presented to the reader is determined by the editor’s underlying editorial philosophy and approach, as well as the implementation of this philosophy.

D. EDITING IN CONTEXT: RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE ALLIED DISCIPLINES

Documentary editors have a shared relationship with other professions that have shared concerns with the transmission of evidence. Principally, these groups are archivists and textual critics. Both of these groups carry out functions that are similar to the practice of documentary editing. Archivists are concerned with selecting, preserving, and making accessible materials

⁵⁵ McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Text*, 214-216.

⁵⁶ Cappon, *A Rationale for Historical Editing*, 147.

that generate organically as a result of activities. Government records, correspondence, and diaries are examples of the varieties of evidence that archivists are concerned with in their work. These categories are also examples of the source materials that editors use in creating documentary editions.

In managing these records, archivists are concerned with preserving the reliability and authenticity of records. This is provided for through the use of systems and working sensibilities that allow for the capture of contextual information, and for its access. Like the editor, the archivist is active in influencing a documentary record. A clear example of this influence is the practice of archival appraisal. Through the process of archival appraisal, the archivist determines what materials will be selected or destroyed, in affect, assessing whether an item remains part of the documentary record. Documentary editors and archivists are linked by their concern with context and their shared objective of providing access to reliable and authentic documentary materials.

Textual critics are concerned with evidence of a different category. Textual critics are primarily concerned with literary evidence. The primary objective of textual criticism is the establishment of authoritative texts in the form of critical editions. This process involves evaluating copies of variant literary texts, in order to establish the critical edition, or in cases where the original text does not exist, reconstruct this text from existing evidence. Like documentary editors and archivists, textual critics are concerned with textual evidence, and the concept of authenticity.⁵⁷

Documentary editors and textual critics share a similar concern with the idea of the authoritative text. A critical aspect of editorial work can be described as reconstituting evidence.

⁵⁷ Kline and Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 17-22.

The published editions of Jefferson, Washington, Adams, and Franklin, produced during the 19th century were found to contain varying degrees of inaccuracy and incompleteness.⁵⁸ Editors, in reevaluating and editing these editions, attempted to produce an edition that was an accurate representation of the existing documentation.⁵⁹

However, there is an important distinction between the practices of documentary editors and that of textual critics. While documentary editors are concerned with accuracy, their editions are to be used as surrogates for primary sources. There is also a concern with intelligibility. Editors do, in cases, alter text as a means of providing clarification, if it will not detract from the meaning of the document. This aspect distinguishes their work from textual critics.

Because these three groups carry out similar functions, but in different contexts, the relationship between documentary editing and that of textual criticism, and archival theory and practice, is complex. Documentary editors can be described as existing within an intermediate position between textual critics and archivists. Like the archivist, the documentary editor is concerned with providing access to documentary evidence. However, documentary editors and archivists, in the contemporary environment have disagreed regarding the appropriate means for disseminating these materials.⁶⁰ Documentary editors have articulated that providing document level description, in the form of annotations, is an instrumental element of their work. This is also a characteristic that makes editorial work a time intensive practice. This differs from archival principles of description where context is provided in the content of a finding aid, and

⁵⁸ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 260-262.

⁵⁹ J. Franklin Jameson, "Review," *American Historical Review* 7:4 (July 1902): 781-783.

⁶⁰ An illustrative example of this contemporary condition is the 1995/1996 controversy regarding the reduction in funding for the documentary editions and the increase in funding for projects related to electronic records. This episode draws attention to the differing access concerns. See Cox, "Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates: Quarrelling about the Preservation of the Documentary Heritage of the United States." *First Monday* 2:8 (August 1997), available at http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue2_8/cox/index.html (accessed March 9, 2006).

where description occurs primarily at the series level.⁶¹ Archivists and documentary editors maintain different attitudes regarding the nature of context and the degree to which the intermediary should be present within the collection.

Similarly, though textual critics and documentary editors have shared practices, there has been some tension between the two communities. The bibliographer G. Thomas Tanselle has criticized the documentary editing community for its practices regarding textual alteration. Tanselle identifies the central difference between the practice of documentary editors and textual critics to be that “historical editions in general give more attention to explanatory annotation than to the detailed recording of textual data, whereas the literary editions reverse this emphasis.”⁶² Here, the historical editor is more concerned with the explanatory function, disseminating meaning. The primary concern is with intelligibility. On the other hand, the literary editor’s primary emphasis is on producing an authoritative text. Despite both groups’ shared concern with transmitting text, in Tanselle’s words, each “have gone their separate ways.”⁶³

In a 1981 review essay, the historian Gordon H. Wood addresses Tanselle’s criticisms of documentary editing. Wood, is careful to provide a balanced view of editing, recognizing that the practice of documentary editing has not been free from criticism. Among the concerns noted by Wood, are historians’ criticisms of over annotation and the inclusion of unnecessary documents. But, also noted is the reality that the methods developed by Julian P. Boyd and

⁶¹ The Society of American Archivists’ Glossary defines series as “A group of similar records that are arranged according to a filing system and that are related as the result of being created, received, or used in the same activity.” Editors and archivists both concerned with documentation in terms of groupings. However, editors are not as concerned with the concept of original order. Their primary concern is with the primary relationship between the records and the creator. Definition included in Richard Pearce-Moses, “Series,” *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*, (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005): available online at <http://www.archivists.org/glossary/index.asp> (accessed August 3, 2010).

⁶² Tanselle, “The Editing of Historical Documents,” *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 2.

⁶³ Tanselle, “The Editing of Historical Documents,” 1.

adopted by other editors, made “the last half of the twentieth century the greatest era of historical editing ever known.”⁶⁴

In responding to Tanselle, Wood questions the assumptions that historical and literary texts are of the same type, and that the needs of literary scholars and historians are the same. According to Wood, the needs of historians and literary scholars differ in regard to their orientation to the document. The literary scholar’s attention may be focused on selected number of texts, while the historian may work through extensive quantities of documentation. Each scholar carries out different reading practices. Rather than studying the works of authors, historians read through bodies of documentation as a means of “extracting significance.”⁶⁵ While it is important that the documentary editing process produce reliable documentation, Wood puts forth the idea that intelligibility and clarity are also critical characteristics. This is a point that he views as a critical distinction between the two practices.⁶⁶

These communities each have shared concerns regarding the nature of textual evidence, its preservation, and its dissemination. However each are also concerned with particular forms of documentation, users, and methods for presenting and providing access to material objects. These additional characteristics also link these allied communities to one another. First, intention is a critical aspect to their work. How the object is intended to be used, and by whom, influences the procedures developed for allowing access. And lastly, each group maintains ideas regarding a perceived group of readers and researchers.

⁶⁴ Gordon S. Wood, “Historians and Documentary Editing,” *The Journal of American History* 67:4 (March 1981): 872.

⁶⁵ Wood, “Historians and Documentary Editing,” 874-875.

⁶⁶ Wood, “Historians and Documentary Editing,” 874-875.

E. SUMMARY

This chapter provided an overview of the practice of documentary editing within the United States. In doing so, this chapter provided an examination of the practice's historical foundations, a discussion of editorial procedures, an overview of the objects produced by editors, and lastly, the editing profession's relationship to related communities of practice. The purpose of this discussion is to provide a context for the chapters that follow. In the next chapter, "Defining Early Modern Documentary Editing," the specific period of this study is defined, described, and evaluated.

V. DEFINING EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING

This chapter provides a description, evaluation, and assessment of early modern American documentary editing. In this chapter the general characteristics of this period are defined. Additionally, the character of the theories and methods developed during this period, the nature of the editorial practice, and the properties of the editions produced are described and evaluated. Lastly the early modern period is placed within the context of modern editing.

A. INTRODUCTION

The publication of Julian P. Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* in 1950 is used to mark the beginning of modern editorial practice. Julian P. Boyd's edition was heralded for its methodological innovation and departure from previous methods. Boyd's edition, in some regards, can be viewed as a natural refinement of editorial methods, a reaction to the editorial work carried out during the 19th century. His writings reveal him to be a careful student of editorial practice and he was well aware of the flaws present in previous editions.¹

¹ Boyd's critical statements on editing are contained in a selected set of writings. See Julian P. Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vii-xliii; Julian P. Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Pollishings," *New York History: Quarterly Journal of New York State Historical Association* 39:1 (January 1958): 3-21; Julian P. Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission* (Washington, D.C., 1943); Julian P. Boyd, "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lighting," *Daedalus* 86:1 (May 1955): 47-57; Julian P. Boyd, "The Next Stage?" in Butterfield and Boyd, eds., *Historical Editing in the United States* (Worcester, Mass: American Antiquarian Society, 1963): 29-48.

However, this characterization is too simplistic. Upon closer examination, this work and approach contains more subtle distinguishing aspects. There are three primary characteristics that made this work unique. Boyd's editing illustrated a greater concern with issues of authenticity and reliability. The documents contained within his volume were supplemented with contextual information that would allow the reader to trace the genealogy of the individual documents.²

Another unique aspect of Boyd's work was the nature of the presence of the editor within the text. The editor's influence on the development of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was revealed in two noteworthy instances. First, the edition documented the context of its own creation. In a lengthy editorial statement, Boyd described the processes of selecting and gathering materials for the edition, the underlying objective of his editorial apparatus, and information regarding the usage of editorial notes and the procedures for providing textual clarifications. This was a highly conscious edition.³

Secondly, in addition to reproducing documents, Boyd constructed a context for the documents. The use of introductory essays and descriptive and explanatory notes provided a form of translation between time periods, that of the individuals documented by the edition and that of its contemporary audience. Boyd, in reproducing artifacts from a past era, provided information that he felt was necessary to understand and accurately interpret the documentation. This editorial innovation operated primarily at the document level and is illustrative of a redefinition and refinement of the nature of editorial context.

At the object level, Boyd's *Papers* can be seen to illustrate a re-conceptualization of the function of the documentary edition and its essential characteristics. Boyd's emphasis on the production of comprehensive editions shifts the attention from the publishing of documents to

² Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvii.

³ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vii-xliii.

the publishing of collections. The comprehensive edition was intended to serve as a container for presenting all of the relevant documentation required for understanding Thomas Jefferson and his time. In the context of the history of editing, this is a noteworthy development.

The strict editorial guidelines, and intensive canvassing procedures for gathering and selecting documents, articulated a strategy for creating usable surrogate archives.⁴ Boyd's creation was developed through the processes of evaluating previous editions of papers and through his own redefinition of the function of the documentary edition. His work contributed to a narrative of re-evaluative editing that developed during the early decades of the 20th century. But, this edition is also influenced by original editorial thought. The comprehensive project described by Boyd emphasized the publication of collections, instead of the publication of documents. The project also presented a form of editing that was more descriptive in nature.⁵

The *Jefferson Papers* would come to define a significant period of development in American documentary editing. Boyd's edition motivated President Truman to authorize the NHPC to develop a strategy for the systematic publication of American figures. The comprehensive edition was described as the ideal, and this attitude influenced the approaches encouraged in publishing the papers of the other individuals that made up the Founding-Era editions. Boyd's edition ushered in an era of increased governmental support and an increase in the attention given to the development of editorial endeavors.⁶

However, these are not the characteristics that best define the period of modern editing. Julian P. Boyd's edition was illustrative of new ideas, approaches, and discussions. His edition of *The Jefferson Papers* can be viewed as representative of the increased consideration and

⁴ See John Y. Simon, "Editorial Projects as Derivative Archives," *College & Research Libraries* 35 (July 1974): 291-294.

⁵ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 13-14.

⁶ Donohue, "Documenting Democracy," 30-33; National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program*, 17-19.

contemplation regarding the role and function of documentary editing. The period of modern documentary editing is defined more by ideas than it is by physical editions, which can be seen to represent the application of these ideas.

Though Julian P. Boyd was the most prominent of the editors working during this period, he is an example of a category of “scholar-editors” who contributed to editorial theory and thought through discussions regarding the role and function of the documentary edition, the role of the editorial function, and issues related to editorial method. Among the individuals included within this category are Clarence E. Carter, Lyman H. Butterfield, Lester J. Cappon, and Leonard W. Labaree.⁷ These individuals contributed to a dialogue that aided in establishing an intellectual foundation for modern documentary editing practice.

More precisely, these individuals belong to a period that I have defined as the early modern period of documentary editing (1943 – 1970). These early stages of the modern period of editing were defined by discussions regarding the foundational aspects of editorial practice, including the role and function of the editor, and of the edition. It is from the study of these foundations that a definition and description of the period can be obtained.

B. DEFINING EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING

The nature of the work that developed during the early decades of modern editing practice can best be defined by examining, describing, and analyzing the activities of editors and their projects. In describing early modern editing, the most prominent characteristic of this

⁷ Clarence E. Carter served as editor of *The Territorial Papers of the United States*. Within the context of the history of editing he is notable for the publication of his manual on documentary editing titled *Historical Editing*. Lyman H. Butterfield worked with Julian P. Boyd as an associate editor for *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. He then went on to become editor of *The Adams Family Papers*. Lester J. Cappon edited *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*. In addition he also authored critical and historical essays on the topic of documentary editing. Leonard W. Labaree served as editor of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*.

editing is the systematic nature of the process. Two primary factors are related to this development. First, a critical development was the creation of protocols and procedures for editing documentary materials. Clarence Carter's *Historical Editing* (1951) served as the best explication of the systematic approach to editing developed during the first half of the 20th century. In this work, the process of preparing documentary material for publication is broken down into thirteen processes and described and evaluated in great detail.⁸

These processes consist of procedures that govern the selection of materials, their editing, and their preparation for publication. Such a systematic approach was designed to serve as an editorial corrective. Carter states that it was not until the beginning of the 20th century that strict editorial procedures were developed. These procedures were influenced by two primary developments. The first development was textual. Carter notes that the English work *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain*, established the "foundations of modern standards of editing" in the western world, but that the adoption of similar procedures in the United States was delayed.⁹

A secondary influence on the development of a more systematic editing was the work of J. Franklin Jameson. During the early 20th century, Jameson began a project of systematically evaluating what he believed to be the flaws present in 19th and early 20th century documentary editions. In a series of reviews, he made clear that there was a need for greater editorial consistency during the process of publishing original sources. Particular points of concern included the the inclusion of inaccurate documents within published editions, and the absence of provenance information that could be used to detect and evaluate these irregularities.¹⁰

A secondary aspect related to the development of a systematic editing was the rise of large-scale comprehensive editorial projects. Leonard W. Labaree, editor of *The Papers of*

⁸ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 7.

⁹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 6-7; Burnette, *Beneath the Footnote*, 342-343.

¹⁰ This point is best illustrated by Jameson's work in his reviews on the Monroe papers.

Benjamin Franklin, noted that a number of the issues facing the project were organizational in scope, both in terms of working with a diverse set of individuals and institutions, but also a large amount of documentation.¹¹ Because of the increase in scale, a systematic approach was required to manage this complex activity.

The evolving concept of completeness is also a defining characteristic of this period of editing. Editorial procedures, in logically providing a framework for surveying and selecting materials, emphasized a logical unity in terms of the documents selected. Completeness came through the unity of documentary relationships. In describing completeness, as it related to the *Jefferson Papers*, Julian P. Boyd stated that completeness, in regards to exhaustive documentary editions, was a “relative term” and was “theoretically possible but practically unattainable, and in some respects undesirable.”¹²

Boyd goes on to state that though the editors of the *Papers* were liberal in their definition of a Jeffersonian document, correspondence received was considered to be part of this class, documentation that was only technically related to Jefferson was not included. The concept of completeness operates within the context of a given edition. Completeness and relevance are closely intertwined as editorial principles. Examples of this category of materials excluded from the edition includes statutes and other documentation that Jefferson may have signed during his capacity as a public servant, but that he did not have sole responsibility for in terms of intellectual responsibility. Including these types of materials would have made the edition impractical from a publishing standpoint.¹³

¹¹ Leonard W. Labaree, “In Search of ‘B. Franklin’,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser. 16:2 (April 1959): 188-191.

¹² Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xiv-xv.

¹³ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xiv-xv.

The principle of completeness is influenced by, and related to, the idea of editorial intention. Within the context of Boyd's edition, the nature of the documentation included and excluded from the work is described in the editorial statement. The editor is quite clear in defining the scope of the project. This principle of completeness also applies to selective documentary editions. Editions that focus on a particular set of correspondence, or one event or activity, can exhibit completeness if they contain all relevant documentation. This principle is related to the shift in conceiving of documentary editions as collections of documents, which became more prominent with the publication of the *Jefferson Papers*.

These two principles are related and influenced the practice of documentary editing as it relates to a practice that produces objects (documentary editions). However, the treatment of the documents themselves was also a defining concern addressed and discussed by early modern editors. A primary characteristic of early modern editing, as it relates to the documents themselves, was an increased concern with their authenticity and reliability. Evidence of this concern can be found in the editorial statements of documentary editions where transparency, in terms of the editorial apparatus became very important, and in editors' reviews of documentary editions.¹⁴

As noted, editors revisiting 19th century practices were faced with examples of editions that contained texts that had been altered, were incorrectly transcribed, and, in some cases, that were forgeries. These instances illustrated the necessity for editors to provide provenance information, which would inform a reader of a document's authenticity. This was also an impetus for the methods that ushered in modern documentary editing. Boyd's formulation of an

¹⁴ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxv-xliii; Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxv-xxxii; Labaree, *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, xxi-xlvi; Butterfield, *Diary & Autobiography of John Adams*, lii-lxii.

agenda to edit and publish his edition of Jefferson's papers was in response to the presence of inaccurate and incomplete editions.¹⁵

A secondary aspect of these principles of reliability and authenticity relates to providing the genealogy of the documentation. In addition to providing information regarding a particular document's origin, editors were also concerned with providing transparency in terms of their treatment of the documentation. Editorial statements and descriptive case studies offer insight into how editors addressed this concern. Editors of this period had a responsibility to the documents that they were working with and to the users of their editions. The primary objective was to produce accurate representations of original sources; however, the editors also wanted to reproduce documents that could be understood and interpreted.

Typically, the major projects were quite strict in regards to the degree of alteration that would be allowed. Regarding the editing of the *Jefferson Papers*, Boyd stated that "spelling and grammar will be preserved as they stand in the original manuscripts."¹⁶ An area where the Boyd edition did differ from the original texts was in the case of capitalization.¹⁷

In the editor's statement, Jefferson's unique writing style is described, as well as the challenges it posed during the transcription process. In writing, Jefferson is described to have used capitals letters irregularly and began each sentence with a lowercase letter. An editorial decision was made that in letters issued by Jefferson, the capitalization was to be preserved. However, letters at the beginning of his sentences were to be capitalized. Considerations of clarity and meaning were taken into account in developing this policy. In cases where the "literalness" of the document is integral to meaning, no alteration would be made.¹⁸

¹⁵ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 10-11.

¹⁶ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxx.

¹⁷ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxx.

¹⁸ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxx.

Not all editors were comfortable treating the documents in this manner. Clarence E. Carter argued that a more critical and formalist approach was appropriate. In the approach argued by Carter “each document is to be copied exactly, following with fidelity the capitalization, spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing.”¹⁹ He places particular emphasis on the issue of punctuation, further stating, “with respect to punctuation, vigilant care must be exercised to reproduce on the copy every mark,” citing the possibilities for misinterpretation if these marks are not transcribed properly.²⁰ Issues regarding differing editorial approaches will be discussed further in this dissertation.

Early modern editing was also defined by an increased concern with matters of editorial context. While editors of the period generally agreed on the point that there was a need to supply contextual information, varying attitudes regarding what defined appropriate or necessary contextual treatment were present. *The Jefferson Papers* exerted a great deal of influence in regards to the editorial procedures developed by other projects. Boyd’s *Jefferson Papers* was lauded for the presence of extensive explanatory notes and descriptive notes. Boyd’s apparatus consisted of three different categories of notes. These are descriptive, explanatory, and textual notes.²¹

Descriptive notes were used to provide information regarding the “physical description of the document and a record of all known versions.”²² This category of information can be defined as provenance information. Explanatory notes were used to provide “a short commentary on the document.”²³ This category of note provided information that related to the historical context of the document. The last category of notes employed in *The Jefferson Papers* was the

¹⁹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 26-27.

²⁰ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 26.

²¹ Shera, “Review,” 179-180; Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvi.

²² Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv.

²³ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxvi.

textual note. Among the information included in these notes is information related to document deletions and variation between drafts of documents, corrections, differences between variant copies of documents, insertions, and ill-punctuated or illegible passages.²⁴ A more regimented approach in terms of the development and applications of editorial notes is also a characteristic of this period of editing. However, there were differing attitudes regarding the appropriate use of these devices.

Boyd believed the editor should be an active agent in the text, and enrich text through explanation. This differed from other strands of editorial theory. Carter argued for a more restrictive use of editorial comment and advocated for a minimalist approach to annotation, particularly explanatory notes. While Boyd conceptualized this type of note as a form of comment on the document, Carter believed that the note's proper function was to report statements of fact, "without editorial comment."²⁵ Examples cited by Carter as acceptable uses of explanatory notes include those that provide commentary on points related to problematic authenticity, the historical evolution of public documents, and descriptions of political offices and appointments.²⁶

Carter also provided a separate provision for identification notes. These notes were to be used to identify obscure people and place names. Carter states, for example, that it would not be appropriate to provide a descriptive note for George Washington or Robert E. Lee. For Carter, there is a strict standard when considering the threshold of intelligibility.²⁷

Lester J. Cappon described an approach regarding editorial intervention that was more restrained than that of Boyd, but this was one which was not as strict as Carter's stance. Cappon

²⁴ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxvi.

²⁵ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 34.

²⁶ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 34.

²⁷ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 14-15.

emphasized the role of the editor as an intermediary between the reader and the documentary text. In this capacity, the editor serves to clarify and elucidate the document. The role of the editor is not to produce bare text.²⁸ This approach recognizes the nature of the editor's interpretive function, but this editor offers more of a restrained interpretation.

Each of these perspectives illustrates the different currents of editorial thought regarding context that circulated during the early modern period. These three editors share a similar stance regarding the descriptive notes. All three perspectives verify that a primary aspect of the editors' work, and concern, is in providing the necessary descriptive information that would increase the intelligibility of the document. The variation derives from attitudes regarding how present the editor should be within the documentation.

This evaluation also demonstrates that early modern editing can best be defined by evaluating the primary concepts and functions of the editorial process. Modern editing, as a project, was defined by concepts, as editors formulated what their primary concerns were, regarding the production of editions, and their methodological stances.

1. Summary

In summary, modern editing can be defined by its increased concern with maintaining fidelity to the text. Editors of this period placed greater emphasis on providing provenance information, allowing for an understanding of the genealogy of the published document. This concern began with J. Franklin Jameson. Jameson, in one of his reviews of 19th practice, described the difficulty posed by not knowing the source from which documents were translated. He cited a case where a printed document was taken from an inaccurate existing document,

²⁸ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 138-139.

rather than the authentic original. However, because of the absence of usable provenance information, this could not be determined without close analysis.²⁹

Jameson drew attention to these concerns regarding editorial practice, beginning in the early 1900's. Early modern editors responded to these evidential concerns. In this regard, the primary concern was whether the editor and reader would be able to verify both the authenticity of the documentation, as well as its originating source.

Concern with fidelity took other forms. This concern with preserving authenticity influenced the approach editors developed for carrying out the process of transcription. Again, though there are variations in the editorial stances taken by these figures, there is a shared concern regarding accurate transcription, and a shared objective of providing documentation that is an accurate representation of the original source.

An increased emphasis on the construction of historical context is another important characteristic that defines this period. Though the creation of context is not unique to the early modern period of editing, editors during the 18th and 19th century, too, provided introductory statements and commented within their editions through the use of supplementary and descriptive notes. However, in the early modern period of editing, it is possible to see a formalization of the discussion of context and the practice of creating context. This is directly related to an overall concern with providing a stable and consistent editorial apparatus.

An examination of the editorial apparatuses developed by Carter, Boyd, Cappon, and Labaree reveal devices that explicitly described the nature of the editorial context provided within their works. In addition to these formal statements, editors also discussed the matter of context in journal articles, conference proceedings, and book reviews. This dialogue enriches

²⁹ Howard K. Beale, "Is the Printed Diary of Gideon Welles Reliable?," *American Historical Review* 30:3 (April 1925): 547-552; Jameson, "Review: Madison," 559-661; and Jameson, "Review: Monroe," 781-782.

these formal fixed statements, illustrating that in this formative period, editors continued to evaluate and consider their roles and functions.

Generally, editorial concern with these concepts illustrates the development of a form of self-conscious editing. Editors can be described as being conscious of their involvement in the creation of documentary evidence. Because of this, formal editorial methods, though present in fixed forms in documentary texts, existed alongside fluid dialogues regarding how documentary texts should be created. In the following section I offer an examination of a selection of these dialogues.

C. EDITORIAL PRACTICE IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Editors of the early modern period have left a valuable record of their editorial endeavors. Editors often published narratives in which they described the ongoing activities of their projects. At the time of their publication, these operated as progress reports and descriptions of methods, however, viewed as evidence, they provide an avenue for understanding the operations of editorial projects, as viewed and evaluated by the editor. The formal editorial statements present within published documentary editions offer an understanding of a formal apparatus. In addition, these statements also allow for an understanding of ongoing practices and challenges that editors encountered during the process of managing a documentary project. These descriptions draw attention to the presence of shared editorial concerns and common practices. Often, these descriptions were authored by editors who were not actively engaged in the conceptual discussions of editorial practice, but do provide valuable examples of editorial practice.

Because of these conditions, this category of work is useful in understanding the characteristics of editorial practice. The remainder of the chapter consists of analyses of editorial projects, evaluated through this descriptive literature. I present these in order to illustrate further the characteristics of early modern editing, and to ground this chapter's earlier conceptual discussion in practice.

1. James F. Hopkins and the Henry Clay Papers³⁰

a. Practices

The character of editorial work is often defined by the nature of the materials that the editor is working with. This aspect is emphasized in James F. Hopkins' discussion of his experiences editing the Henry Clay papers. However, Hopkins also describes the application of editorial practices that have their roots in the discussions and editorial apparatus's of Julian P. Boyd and Clarence E. Carter.

First, a description of the general editorial practice will be provided, before proceeding to a discussion of the unique issues that Hopkins encountered in his capacity as editor of this project. In terms of scope, the edition of the Henry Clay papers was devised as a comprehensive edition. This edition was to include the letters written by Clay, the letters that he received, speeches, documents that he authored, and lastly, important items about the figure. The editors of the project stated that it would be difficult to publish this material and emphasize the value of making the materials available, through both print and microfilm.³¹

³⁰ James F. Hopkins, ed., *The Papers of Henry Clay, Volume 1: The Rising Statesman 1797-1814* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1959)

³¹ James F. Hopkins, "Publishing the Henry Clay Papers," *American Archivist* 20:3 (July 1957): 231-233.

As is the case with many comprehensive projects, Hopkins had to address the issue of dispersal. In locating items, the editor consulted with archivists, librarians, collectors, booksellers and autograph dealers, and lastly members of the Clay family, which allowed the project to obtain copies of relevant documentation.³² It is important to note that during this process of gathering documents, both formal and informal sources were consulted.

Clay also describes the process of obtaining intellectual control of the documents. When the project received copies of documents they were either on microfilm or photostat. These copies were then transcribed. The editor reported that these materials were “transcribed as near as can be done on a typewriter.”³³ There is a great concern with preserving the integrity of the content during the process of transcription. Here, the editors illustrate the complexity of translating between document forms. The mechanics of the process influence the character of the transcription.

b. Unique Challenges

Hopkins also reported a number of interesting editorial challenges that resulted from the unique characteristics of the original sources. The initial process of gathering materials was complicated by the lack of personal records created by Henry Clay. As a point of comparison, while Thomas Jefferson kept extensive documentation regarding his correspondence, Clay left no such record. Nor did he systematically save copies of the letters that he sent, or those that he received. Because of this, the project developed and relied on its external relationships, which could provide copies of relevant documentation.³⁴

³² Hopkins, “Publishing the Henry Clay Papers,” 232-233.

³³ Hopkins, “Editing the Henry Clay Papers,” 234-235.

³⁴ Hopkins, “Editing the Henry Clay Papers,” 232.

Also described in this description are challenges that the editors encountered during the transcription process. These are related to two factors. First, while the script that Clay wrote in was neat and consistent, the handwriting of his correspondents was not always of the same legibility. This was further complicated by the poor condition of some of the manuscripts, which as result, did not copy well. Hopkins also writes of challenges involved in transcribing from microfilm. In addition to eyestrain, the quality of the film itself can present difficulties when attempting to distinguish between precise aspects of punctuation.³⁵

Another unique textual challenge the editors of the Clay papers encountered was in assessing the provenance in certain cases. Hopkins describes difficulty in identifying facsimiles on microfilm. This would present difficulties when attempting to evaluate the accuracy of a document. In one notable example, what was thought to have been an original letter was found to be a facsimile, which was published a century before.³⁶

Speeches also presented a unique challenge for the Clay papers. Hopkins reports that Henry Clay often stated that his congressional speeches were not recorded correctly in the *Register of Debates*. However, for the most part Clay did not report the corrected versions, so the inaccurate versions remained on record. Determining the accuracy of these speeches was a challenge for editors of Clay papers.³⁷

This episode illustrates the challenges encountered during the process of editing, but more importantly, this description documents the application of an editorial methodology. In particular, Hopkins offers an interesting presentation of the issues encountered during the processes of selection and transcription. The methods employed in this case, are similar to those used by Boyd and other leading editors of the early modern period of editing.

³⁵ Hopkins, "Editing the Henry Clay Papers," 235-236.

³⁶ Hopkins, "Editing the Henry Clay Papers," 235.

³⁷ Hopkins, "Editing the Henry Clay Papers," 236-237.

These involve the processes of obtaining physical controls of the materials, verifying the reliability and authenticity of the documentation, and of safeguarding textual integrity.

Secondly, the unique conditions encountered by this project illustrate the challenges that editors encountered when working with unique original sources.

2. Robert B. Eckles and the Frank B. Gilbreth Papers³⁸

a. Practices

Robert B. Eckles's discussion of his work editing the Frank B. Gilbreth papers offers a description of the process of editing an engineer's papers, and in publishing materials from a unique context, an archive organized and constructed by the creator of the documentation. Frank B. Gilbreth's papers resided at Purdue University's Industrial Library, where the materials were organized according to a scheme developed by the creator of the archive. Eckles's report is a discussion of a completed project, which consisted of editing and creating a microfilm edition of his papers.³⁹

In constructing this edition, Eckles made a number of interesting choices. First, in arranging the documents within the edition, Eckles decided to preserve the original order imposed upon the papers by Gilbreth. The editor, in this situation, was faced with a unique body of documents, given the nature of the materials that editors typically work with. These materials were not dispersed. They were arranged orderly within an archives, which preserved the original ordering scheme. Because of this, Eckles had access to the original manner in which the

³⁸ The Selected Papers of Frank B. Gilbreth: The Gilbreth Records, N File, 4 reels. The Micro Photo Division of Bell and Howell Co., 1700 Shaw Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 44112.

³⁹ Robert B. Eckles, "The Organization and Publication of the Frank B. Gilbreth Papers," *The American Archivist* 29:1 (January 1966): 83-85.

documents were represented and displayed. In addition to providing access to documentary materials, the editor can also choose to represent this original ordering.⁴⁰

This brings up a critical issue. Typically, comprehensive projects of this era would use chronology as an organizing device. In cases where the editors were publishing extensive amounts of varied documentation, such as the Adams Family papers, documentary form may be an initial organizational scheme, and the edition may be published in a set of different series.⁴¹

However, Eckles's treatment of the papers is unique, given the nature of the materials that he was working with. Here, the editor is engaged with a highly specialized collection of documentation in a controlled and contained environment. This instance illustrates how the editorial function is defined by the characteristics of the documentation.

The creation of this edition was influenced by editorial principles. Echols narrowed the scope of his edition to contain materials that were related to Gilbreth's research area. As a result of this decision, the editor went through the process of evaluation and selection, in order to gather only the relevant materials. This practice is directly related to the concepts of comprehensiveness and completeness that are central to early modern documentary editing practice. In this collection, the unifying theme is the figure in conjunction with the specialized function, Gilbreth as the creator of documentation and as a researcher. Eckles' edition published documentation related to the research activity of Frank B. Gilbreth. While the edition is not comprehensive in the sense of publishing all materials related to this individual, it is comprehensive in terms of selection and publishing according to an activity or function. This illustrates the fluidity of the editorial notions of comprehensive and selective.⁴²

⁴⁰ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 147.

⁴¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adam*, xxxvii-xli.

⁴² Eckles, "The Organization and Publication," 85.

b. Unique Challenges

In constructing this edition, Echols encountered three unique challenges. Two of these concerns were related to the disruption of the artifacts. Because the source material for this edition was housed within an highly organized archives, the editor was particularly careful to not disrupt the original order of the collection. This concern also applied to the collection's filing system, a system devised by the creator called the N File. Originally, the editor wanted to move this file to a private workspace; however, moving the file was determined to be too disruptive.⁴³ While editorial concerns can be very theoretical, as in his formulation of the edition, many editorial concerns are quite practical nature, as in these instances.

The second category of challenges was related to cost. While the editor was able to obtain funds from the Purdue University library to support the editing process, funding was not provided for assisting with the photocopying of this edition. The editor worked with a commercial publisher who agreed to underwrite the cost of publication.⁴⁴

The challenges that the editor encountered in publishing this edition were both practical and theoretical in scope. In terms of practical concerns, physical resources influenced the viability of the project. The project described in this case study is a highly specialized edition. Microfilm was the most effective means for producing this edition, from an economic standpoint. Similarly, physical resources, in terms of workspace are also important to an editing project. In this instance, though the editor did have access to space, elements of the collection could not be moved. Practical considerations and constraints can have an important influence on the operation of an editorial project.⁴⁵

⁴³ Eckles, "The Organization and Publication," 84.

⁴⁴ Eckles, "The Organization and Publication," 84.

⁴⁵ Eckles, "The Organization and publication," 84-85.

Additionally, there are also theoretical matters that presented unique challenges for the editor. In determining what documents would be selected, the editor had to consider his audience. This is matter of intention. How the editor intends the edition to be used will have an influence on its final form. In this instance, the materials were intended for individuals working in engineering, or individuals with an interest in the work of Frank B. Gilbreth. Because of these factors, the intention was that the edition would be used as a research tool. As a result, only materials related to his research activities were included. Classes of materials, like personal papers, would not be included in the edition if they were not related to this primary organizing theme. This is an example of the type of work involved in developing a project with a specific scope and function.

3. Leonard W. Labaree and the Benjamin Franklin Papers⁴⁶

a. Practices

In this discussion, Leonard W. Labaree documents the procedures and practices involved in gathering documentation for his edition of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, during the period of 1954-1957. While Labaree began his work with access to extensive collections of Franklin documentation, he was required to carry out a wider search. Regarding the role of his project, Labaree described his project in terms of the ideal of the comprehensive edition. He stated that, though unattainable, a comprehensive edition should include every surviving relevant piece of documentation.⁴⁷ This articulation is similar to Boyd's remark regarding the fluid nature of the concept of completeness; it is a shifting ideal.

⁴⁶ Leonard W. Labaree, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 1. January 6, 1706-December 31, 1734* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).

⁴⁷ Labaree, "In Search of 'B. Franklin'," 189.

The primary editorial objective of the project was to produce a comprehensive edition of the Franklin papers. Multiple approaches were taken in obtaining this documentation. First, Labaree surveyed the item listings and catalogs of prominent libraries and collecting institutions. This consisted of institutions both within and outside of the United States. The project also received unsolicited photocopies of documents.⁴⁸

In discussing the process of surveying documentation, Labaree draws attention to the somewhat serendipitous nature of this document gathering process, describing instances of locating previously unknown documents and the “sudden appearance” of source material.⁴⁹ While the editorial project could organize a well-structured collection strategy, much is dependent on the characteristics of document dispersal.

Similarly, the editor is dependent on the degree to which documentation survived. Labaree draws attention to the 1911 fire at the State Library in Albany and the resulting destruction of a collection of Franklin letters.⁵⁰ This example is also related to the complex nature of the idea of documentary completeness. The extent to which an edition can be comprehensive is also related to the nature of the materials that are able to be located, or survive.

Labaree also draws attention to the need for the editor to be an expert in documentary materials. This is demonstrated through a discussion of forgery. In the project’s search for documentation, the editors located examples of this class of materials within private collections and prominent public institutions. The number of forgeries that the editors identified was small, but this illustrates the challenges that editors faced during the process gathering and selecting documents.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Labaree, “In Search of ‘B. Franklin’,” 190-191.

⁴⁹ Labaree, “In Search of ‘B. Franklin’,” 191.

⁵⁰ Labaree, “In Search of ‘B. Franklin’,” 194.

⁵¹ Labaree, “In Search of ‘B. Franklin’,” 194-195.

Though the primary activity of locating documents, ended in 1957, it was noted that the process of locating documentation was to continue for the duration of the project. Again, editorial completeness is a fluid concept, and the editor can never be completely certain whether all of the relevant documentation has been identified. The document survey practices carried out by the staff of the Franklin papers illustrates the complexity of the nature of dispersal. In obtaining copies of documents, they engaged with 325 unique owners within the United States and Europe. For Labaree, one of the most challenging tasks was related to the issue of maintaining control over a complex body of documentation. In addition, the work on the Franklin papers nicely emphasizes the idea that editing is partially a collecting activity.

4. Editorial Practices: Summary

These discussions illustrate the relationship between the conceptual definition of early modern editorial practice and the practice itself. Early modern editing is characterized by a concern with context, reliability, authenticity, and the nature of completeness. These elements are present within each of these discussions. The activities of transcription, evaluation, and selection described in these discussions, have a shared conceptual foundation. A primary motivation is towards developing a usable collection. Usability is defined by the editor, and it is directly related to the intended role of the edition, and the anticipated nature of its use.

D. OBJECTIVES OF EARLY MODERN DOCUMENTARY EDITING

The objectives of early modern editing can be viewed within two different contexts. First, editorial objectives can be evaluated in terms of the values, functions, and goals stated by

documentary editors. Secondly, editorial objectives can be evaluated in terms of the procedures and approaches advocated by the federal government. Though Boyd's 1943 report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission established a methodological and functional foundation, this was later augmented by the increased role of the government in encouraging and influencing editorial practice. Both of these contexts need to be understood in order to understand the objectives of this period.

1. Editorial Objectives

As stated, the early modern period can be seen to fulfill a corrective function, when viewed in relation to previous editorial work. In Julian P. Boyd's report, he states that the primary objective of the Thomas Jefferson papers would be to edit and publish to such a degree of quality that they would never need to be published again. In the specific context of the Jefferson Papers, this was a reaction to the existing editions of the Jefferson papers, which were inaccurate and incomplete.⁵²

However, in the broader context, Boyd's mission can be viewed as extending to the practice of documentary editing generally, when considered from a methodological perspective. All of the papers of the founding fathers that were edited and published during the 19th century were edited and published again. This process began in the 1950's, with the encouragement of the National Historical Publications Commission. Put succinctly, the primary objective of early modern editing, in this regard, was the production of a seamless surrogate that could function in the place of the original artifact. The process was oriented towards producing published surrogates for original sources.

⁵² Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 30-32.

Related to this aspect is the issue of dissemination. A primary value ascribed to the editorial process was its role in providing wider access to the documentary record.

Dissemination can be divided into two primary categories. These are physical and intellectual access. Documentary editing provides for the physical access to documentation through bringing together and publishing related original source materials. This value is best illustrated by the increased emphasis placed on the development of projects that would produce comprehensive editions. The emphasis was placed on constructing collections, rather than simply reproducing documents.

Additionally, greater value was assigned to issues related to intellectual access. The methods and practices that defined this access will be discussed in Chapter 6, but here, access as a defining characteristic of the period will be discussed in a cursory manner. Intellectual access can be defined in terms of the relationship that exists between the reader and the published document. This relationship is influenced by the editor's treatment of the source material. Lester J. Cappon described this process in terms of transmission and communication, with the editor operating as a form of intermediary who "stands between the reader and the text."⁵³

In terms of the documents that are contained within a documentary edition, intellectual access occurs at both the collection and the item level. Because editors bring together and publish related items, they construct *artificial collections*. Scholars of documentation have referred to textual reproductions, like documentary editions, as "derivative archives."⁵⁴ The cohesiveness of these collections is directly related to the scope of the project and the selection of the materials.

⁵³ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 138.

⁵⁴ Simon, "Derivative Archives," 291-292.

A comparison of Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* and Paul Leicester Ford's *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (published 1882-1899) can be used to illustrate the nature of this collection level access. The edition produced by Ford was of a high quality and offered access to accurate copies of original documents. Typically, the documents contained within his edition consisted of Jefferson's outgoing correspondence and related primarily to his political life and work. Ford's collection possessed a specific defined scope and contained materials that would be of interest primarily to historians. Boyd's concern with the Jefferson papers was influenced by collection level concerns, primarily, the absence of a comprehensive collection of edited documents. He believed that a comprehensive edition would appeal to individuals interested in diverse fields, such art, government, mathematics, and literature, and would be used by a wide audience.⁵⁵ This same belief, that publishing collection level editions was an effective method for disseminating documentary editions, influenced the comprehensive editions of the other founding era papers during this period.

The difference between these two editions of the Jefferson papers is in terms of editorial philosophy, not in approach. Selective editions continued to be published during this period. However, during the initial decades of the modern period of editing there was an increased emphasis on the production of systematic editing projects that would create comprehensive editions. This is related to two primary factors. These are changing attitudes regarding the intended audience for documentary editions and the role of the NHPC in advocating an agenda that placed emphasis on the production of comprehensive editions.

The objective of access is directly related to the editor's perception of his or her readership. Ideas regarding access were also influenced by the editor's conceptualization of the materials, and subjects, that were being edited. Boyd did not conceive of Thomas Jefferson as

⁵⁵ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 14-15.

strictly a political figure. Though a significant amount of his documentation was generated by activities related to his political life, his documentation also developed as a result of interests in architecture, agriculture, music, mathematics, as well as other domains.⁵⁶ Because of this, Boyd considered Jefferson's papers to be of interest and value to a larger audience, meriting comprehensive publishing.

This principle also influenced Labaree's *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. Franklin, too, was conceptualized as a statesman, scholar, and scientist.⁵⁷ This influenced the consideration of audience, and also the manner in which the documents were edited. Whitfield Bell, Jr., the associate editor of the project, commented on challenges of editing scientific data, which presented unique transcription challenges in producing accurate representations of his scientific findings. In addition to presenting the documentation of Franklin the political figure, Labaree and his colleagues were also concerned with presenting an accurate representation of Franklin the scientist. The early modern period of editing can also be defined by this reconsideration of audience.⁵⁸

The NHPC, in part influenced by Boyd's work, also placed an increased emphasis on comprehensive editions. Encouraged by Boyd's work, President Truman called on the NHPC to develop a report regarding a strategy for documentary publication within the United States. This resulted in a document titled, *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents*. In this document, the NHPC offered a series of recommendations pertaining to documentary publication. First, the commission recommended five priority projects related to individuals whose papers merited publication in the form of comprehensive editions. In addition to Thomas Jefferson, this category included Benjamin Franklin, the Adams Family, James Madison, and

⁵⁶ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 10.

⁵⁷ Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., "Franklin's Papers and *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*," 22:1 (January 1955): 1-17.

⁵⁸ Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., "Editing a Scientist's Papers," *Isis* 53:1 (March 1962): 14-20.

Alexander Hamilton. These figures were to be given the same editorial attention that Jefferson had received.⁵⁹

The commission also included a series of appendices which contained a listing of suggested individuals for documentary publication, a plan for a documentary history of the ratification of the Constitution and first ten amendments, and lastly, a strategy for the production of a documentary history of the First Federal Congress, 1789-1791. An underlying assumption of this report was that the original sources associated with the United States were a public good and would be of interest to an audience beyond that of scholars. The idea of general interest became important in the context of documentary editing.⁶⁰

There was some debate regarding this concept of the general reader, and the ability of the editor to make assumptions about a user group, beyond that of historians. Clarence Carter had earlier stated that, other than historical scholars, it is not possible to determine what populations would find utility in a collection of edited documents. Carter further stated that it was a “perilous adventure” for the editor to structure the edition in order to appeal to a specific group.⁶¹ In regards to this point, Carter’s primary concern was with preserving the idea of editorial objectivity as it pertained to the selection of materials.

While the editor of an edition would likely know it was to be used by historians, in Carter’s view, the function of selecting, editing, and publishing was carried out, primarily, in order to preserve “material which might otherwise be lost,” and to make documents “more easily accessible to historical scholars.”⁶² The loyalties of Carter’s editor reside first with the historical

⁵⁹ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President*, 13.

⁶⁰ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President*, 11-12.

⁶¹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13.

⁶² Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13.

evidence, not a specific user population. This view is different from that articulated by Boyd, whose view is more user focused.

While the NHPC report on documentary editing was noteworthy in its presentation of a structured set of publication recommendations, of greater consequence, was this definition of editing as a public good. In regards to the documentary heritage of the United States, the Commission stated that “many of these papers ought to be published in order that they may be read by all persons who wish to know and understand the history of the United States.”⁶³

In addition to these collection level access concerns, early modern editors were concerned with document level access. This type of access is concerned with the accuracy, intelligibility, and clarity of the materials being published. This idea is a defining characteristic of early modern documentary editing. Labaree provides a succinct statement that encompasses the editorial concern with maintaining “fidelity to the original.”⁶⁴ This editor is concerned with selecting the most accurate document for transcription and with producing documents that are free of deletions and distortions. These aspects are related to a concern with accuracy.

Clarity and intelligibility are provided for through the use of annotations. Labaree also notes a change in philosophy regarding the acceptability of these devices. He describes three critical editorial innovations: the identification of persons, places and events, the explanatory notes that discuss topics contained within the documents, and references are used for assisting with understanding these topics.⁶⁵ These descriptions were made in regards to the Founding Fathers’ editions, which adopted Boyd’s approach to annotation.

⁶³ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President*, 17.

⁶⁴ Labaree, “Historical Editing in Our Times,” 29.

⁶⁵ Labaree, “Historical Editing in Our Times,” 29-30.

An additional aspect related to intelligibility, at both the collection and the document level, is the concern with what can be described as the principle of unity of form.⁶⁶ This principle is related to the editing of collections of documents, which contain unique categories of documentation. *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* offers a clear example of this concept, and of a work that consists of unique categories of documentation. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., associate editor of the Franklin papers, offers the best example of how this principle affects the editing process.

In a piece titled “Editing a Scientist’s Papers,” Bell describes the complexity involved in working with Franklin’s scientific papers. Authored in 1962, the author describes the neglect of these categories of papers by librarians and collectors. One of the primary reasons for this treatment, Bell posits, is that librarians, historians, as well as the relatives of scientists, received training in using and handling literary and historical manuscripts, but were not familiar with scientific documentation.⁶⁷ This provides a context for discussing the difficulties involved in working with scientific information.

The Franklin correspondence presented unique challenges that resulted from his activities as both a humanist and a scientist. Because of this, the papers were described as “personal and official, commercial, diplomatic, scientific, and literary.”⁶⁸ Categorically complex collections of papers are defined as more challenging to edit than those that are unified in terms of type, because the different categories of documentation require specific treatments.

In terms of editing and publishing the Franklin documents, Bell notes that the approach taken in editing the papers was that the scientific papers should not be separated from the whole body of documentation. In editing these materials, the view was taken that separating the

⁶⁶ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 158.

⁶⁷ Bell, Jr., “Editing a Scientist’s Papers,” 14-15.

⁶⁸ Bell, Jr., “Editing a Scientist’s Papers,” 15.

scientific documentation for its own publication would amount to a distortion of Franklin and his work. His work was not compartmentalized in this manner. The ultimate decision was to treat the documentation as a unified whole and the documents were arranged in chronological order.⁶⁹ Doing otherwise would present a view of Franklin that the editors felt would not be accurate.

E. SUMMARY

This chapter serves to define modern documentary editing, specifically the early modern period, through a discussion, description, and analysis of its primary characteristics and practices. In distinguishing this era, the primary points of difference are in regards to the philosophy of access, the characteristics of editorial intervention, and the nature of editorial intention. An overarching characterization is that this period demonstrates an increased formalization of method, at the very least in terms of refinement of editorial theory that would allow for creation of scholarly sources. The application of editorial methods can be described as being increasingly influenced by the materials themselves. This issue is the subject of Chapter 6, but it is worthwhile to also discuss this point here.

If the history of editing is to be divided, generally, into two periods, the modern and the pre-modern, then the period between the close of the 19th century and 1943, is best described as a transitional period. The success of early modern editors, and the presence of structures to support their efforts, is directly related to the atmosphere developed during this intermediate period.⁷⁰

The pivotal figure of this period was J. Franklin Jameson. Jameson carried out a number of related functions. He was a historian, editor, administrator, and advocate for the development

⁶⁹ Bell, Jr., "Editing a Scientist's Papers," 15-16.

⁷⁰ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 150-154.

of institutions that would support the development of, and access to, usable research collections. Because of these functions scholars have described Jameson as a *cultural politician*. Beginning in the late 19th century through the middle 1930's, Jameson was active in the founding of the American Historical Association, of which he was president, served as director of the Carnegie Institution of Washington's Bureau of Historical Research, and lastly worked as chief of the Library of Congress' Manuscript Division.⁷¹

Additionally, he was actively involved in the movement to establish the United States' National Archives, and in conjunction with this movement, the establishment of the NHPC. It would be another decade and a half before the NHPC was active in supporting the publication of original sources, but the initial infrastructure was developed during this period.⁷²

In addition to these institutional functions, Jameson was an influential and critical documentary editor, and a careful reviewer of documentary publications. During his tenure as editor of the *American Historical Review* the journal became a vehicle for the publication and dissemination of edited documents. His work also drew attention to what he described as gaps in the published historical record. In his article, "Gaps in the Published Records of the United States," Jameson carries out a survey the uneven level of documentation, and offers commentary on areas that required further development.⁷³

Historically, Jameson's reviews of documentary editions can be viewed as systematic comments on the success and failures of editorial methods of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The primary concerns and characteristics of modern editing, a concern with provenance, reliability, and accessibility were discussed during these early reviews. His review of Hamilton's *The Writings of James Monroe*, addresses concerns relating to accuracy and

⁷¹ Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 213.

⁷² Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 213-214.

⁷³ *American Historical Review*, "John Franklin Jameson," 243-252; Jameson, "Gaps," 817-831.

authenticity, the nature of explanatory footnotes, and lastly, principles of editorial selection. In addressing the flaws of documentary editing, Jameson implicitly provides a statement on its requirements.⁷⁴ The origins of the editorial procedures contained within the formal statements on editorial methods issued by editors like Carter, Boyd, and Butterfield, can be traced to these articulations.

In the next chapter the editorial thought that influenced this period is carefully examined. Secondly, the influence of editorial intention on the development of editorial theory, methods, and practices, is explored, and lastly, a close examination of selected editorial editions is offered in order to demonstrate the relationship between editorial theory, intention, and practice.

⁷⁴ Jameson, "Review: Monroe," 781-782.

VI. EDITORS, EDITING, AND INTENTION IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

The documentary editor constructs editions out of original sources. These published works function as surrogates for the original source materials assembled together to create a unique collection. This work is defined by an editorial philosophy, which can be described in terms of editorial theory. In turn, the application of this philosophy, in the form of editorial methods, results in the creation of documentary editions. As representations of original sources, these works can mimic their functions, but they cannot mimic their form. In this respect, documentary editions are unique objects, though ideally their evidential function is not.

This chapter examines the nature of these surrogates through an analysis of editorial philosophy, editorial methods, and editions that have been produced by early modern documentary editors. This will define that attitudes and views that affected the development of editorial methods, their application, and their influence on the form and function of published editions. Chapter 5 provided a general study of the editorial processes and concepts of the early modern era of editing. Here, a detailed discussion of editorial thought and practice is offered.

A. EDITORS, EDITING, AND INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS

1. The Role and Function of the Documentary Editor

In order to understand the foundations of editorial methods, it is first necessary to obtain an understanding of the role of the editor. How the editor defined his or her role would influence the methods that were developed. Editors that considered their primary function to be that of disseminating text may approach the process of editing quite differently from that of an editor who considers the editorial function as one of clarifying and narrating documents. An editor that conceptualizes his or her role as one of dissemination may fit more within Carter's mold of the editor, while an editor that views him or herself as a narrator may align with Boyd's perspective, where greater emphasis is placed on describing the objects themselves.

What is the editor's role? Is it to narrate, or transmit, evidence? This study has illustrated that early modern editors possessed varying attitudes regarding the role and function of the editorial endeavor. The origins of these attitudes can be found in the methods themselves. Editorial methods serve as shorthand for views regarding the role and function of the documentary edition. But, first, it is necessary to examine the function of the editor itself.

Editions cannot be separated from their editors. As has been illustrated, though there were general guidelines regarding best practices for editing, editors still possessed a degree of flexibility in how they could approach their work. Because of this, varying attitudes, beliefs, and ideas regarding editorial practice were present. Primary points of variation existed regarding the use of annotations and methods of textual translation. These variations influenced the approach taken in producing documentary editions.

Clarence E. Carter argued for a strict approach, which would reproduce every mark of punctuation on an original document, placing primacy with the transmission of the document. Boyd was more liberal and was more concerned with the communicative power of the edited documents. In his view, textual alterations were permissible if they were applied to increase the intelligibility of the text, and if they did not alter the meaning of the document.¹ In these examples, both editors have shared loyalties to readers and texts, but both perspectives possess different orientations. Boyd's perspective places greater emphasis on intelligibility of the document, while Carter's method is more concerned with precise fidelity to the document.²

Editorial methods can be seen to possess a trickle down affect. Boyd influenced a generation of editors through his discussions of editing, without necessarily engaging in direct scholarly dialogue with these individuals. His work served as the guidepost for a particular editorial perspective. Carter's ideas on editing, contained in his manual, operate in the same manner. These articulations of editorial theory have the capacity to inform and influence editors, and serve as the practice's intellectual foundations.

The intellectual foundations of the modern period were developed by a smaller number of scholars that authored critical works regarding the editorial function. These are, principally, Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, Lester J. Cappon, and Clarence E. Carter. Though a greater number of editors contributed to discussions of editing through reviews and descriptions of their projects, a smaller body commented on the theoretical foundations of the editorial practice and offered commentary on the function of the editor and editing.

The following discussion provides an evaluation of these foundations through a discussion of these figures and their ideas. Each of these individuals can be viewed as

¹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 26 – 27.

² Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 156.

representing specific viewpoints, concerns, and aspects of editorial work. Their work is used as point of discussion to evaluate these ideas individually, and as they relate to one another.

2. Clarence E. Carter and the Primacy of the Text

Clarence Carter's editorial thought is succinctly presented within his 1952 work titled *Historical Editing*. He opens his discussion with a dilemma faced by editors, which in his view was the existence of a body of published documentary evidence that was of varying degrees of quality. To illustrate this concern, Carter describes the editorial practices of Jared Sparks in editing the letters of George Washington. Through this example he describes the instances of alteration, deletion, and correction that were made in order to preserve a particular image of the figure documented by the materials. He also describes similar problematic issues posed by the 1831 *American State Papers*. He notes that later comparison of these published documents, with the originals, revealed that sentences and passages had been deleted from the published work.³ The primary concern is that these practices produce editions that supply "the public texts replete with corruptions."⁴

In Carter's view, the first half of the twentieth century was noteworthy in terms of the methods devised for editing and publishing original sources. Though not explicitly stated, this period would have been preceded, and influenced by, changing attitudes regarding the role of the editor, from one whose loyalty lies with the subject of the documents, to the documents themselves. This idea is implicitly present within Carter's statements.

The essential characteristic that defines Carter's conception of the editor is that of fidelity to the document. Primarily, the role and function of Carter's editor is to produce accurate and

³ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 6-7.

⁴ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 6-7.

reliable copies of the text contained in original sources. On this function, Carter writes, “when human beings may be observed only through documentation, the characteristics that make them human should not be erased because an editor finds them irritating.”⁵ This reference is made in summarizing his discussion of editorial concerns with 19th century editing practices. Carter’s concern with the documented individual is not with the evaluation or judgment of the individual, but with the accurate preservation of the individual, as documented by their documentary evidence. This refers both to the content of the documentation, as well as its structure and form.

Carter also defines the editor as an intermediary that is placed between the original source document and the published surrogate. Boyd and Cappon similarly discuss the editor in the context of this function, but there is a slight difference in Carter’s orientation. While Boyd and Carter emphasize the role of the editor as an intermediary between the user and text, Carter deemphasizes this relationship and places primacy on the textual relationship that exists between the original document and its transcription. This line of thought can be found by focusing attention on discussions related to the relationship between the editor and his or her intended user and the function of transcription.

Carter is also concerned with the nature of the editor’s concern with audience. The view is put forth that the only audience that the editor can reasonable anticipate to have an interest in an edition of papers is that of historical scholars. With this point in mind, Carter poses a question for his reader. “To what extent, then, should his choice of documents be controlled by some one or more lay constituencies?”⁶

⁵ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 6-7.

⁶ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13-14.

Carter's response to this question is that the editor should not "design his work" for any specific population of potential readers, beyond historians.⁷ He further cautions that even when taking into account this population, the editor's primary function is to "preserve, through the medium of the printed page, material which might otherwise be lost, *and* to make the documents more easily accessible to historical scholars."⁸ Though the potential user is defined as important, editions are meant to be read, and the primary function of the editor is to represent the text accurately.

The idea of primacy of the relationship between the original and the surrogate is also illustrated through his discussion of transcription. Regarding transcription, Carter positions the editor as the primary determinant of whether a transcription will be accurate or inaccurate. In his view, almost any error can be traced back to the editor performing the transcription. In terms of an ideal category of transcription, Carter states that the most effective type falls in line with the principle of exact copy.⁹ Transcription following this principle requires that the document "be copied exactly," maintaining all spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing structure.¹⁰ This is slightly stricter than the moderate view that was advocated by Boyd. While Boyd also argues for maintaining all spelling, he allows for greater flexibility in regularizing irregular capitalization and punctuation, as long as it does not disrupt the meaning of the document.

In Carter's view, this presents a risk of textual disruption that is too great to allow for this type and degree of alteration. These differing attitudes result from Carter's emphasis on text, and Boyd's emphasis on dissemination and explanation. The distinction between these two

⁷ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13-14.

⁸ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13-14.

⁹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 26-27.

¹⁰ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 26-27.

views is a matter of orientation. Boyd's concern is with the nature of the relationship between the user and the text and the nature of dissemination. Carter is concerned with transmission as it is defined by the relationship between the original object and the surrogate. Another defining characteristic of the differences in these approaches is that Boyd's editing is more user focused while Carter's editing can be described as more document focused.

Carter does allow for some exceptions to the principle of exact copy. It is acceptable to regularize "extremely wide intentions" and "unusual spacing."¹¹ The editor also does not leave out paragraph indentations, if this aspect is absent from the text. These elements are acceptable because they are described as being more closely related to how the writing medium would allow the author to structure the document, as it related to how the typewriter would allow the editor to transcribe the document.¹²

In addition to maintaining this fidelity to the document, the editor must also be a careful interrogator of documentary evidence. Carter writes, "a document, like the person who authored it, is unique and, like its creator, will never again appear, except as reproduced in facsimile or on the printed page."¹³ In verifying this property of uniqueness, the editor must treat every object as suspect, in order to detect documents that are not wholly accurate and those have been altered in some manner. Carter discusses this aspect in terms of establishing what he describes as "purity from traditional variants and other corruptions."¹⁴

There are two stages in this process. First, the editor must determine whether the document is authentic. Secondly, the editor must determine whether the document has been corrupted. This aspect is particularly important when working with printed documents, or

¹¹ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 27.

¹² Carter, *Historical Editing*, 27.

¹³ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 20.

¹⁴ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 20.

printed versions of original documents. J. Franklin Jameson's evaluations of editions demonstrated that this category of documents could be particularly problematic, particularly when provenance information is absent.

This concern with authenticity and reliability is not restricted to Carter's editorial thought. Discussions of Boyd, Cappon, and Butterfield, will illustrate that these individuals were similarly concerned with the nature of documentary evidence and the editor's role in constructing this evidence. However, Carter is unique in discussing this issue in terms of what can be described as archival purity. The concept of editorial purity can be seen to influence much of his thought. Editors must be careful to produce transcriptions that are unpolluted from errors and alterations.

Editors, in his view, preserve historical materials "through the medium of the printed page."¹⁵ The strict editorial approach advocated by Carter can be evaluated as a process that seeks to capture this information with as little disruption to the item. Greater emphasis is placed on the preservative function of the editing than on its interpretive function. This viewpoint also influenced his thought regarding the use of annotations, which in his view, should be purely descriptive in nature.

Lester J. Cappon discusses this view in his essay "The Historian as Editor," responding that, "but it cannot be denied that the editor standards between the reader and text."¹⁶ Carter, with his focus on the relationship between the artifact and the surrogate, advocated a position that emphasized the functions of preservation and textual reproduction, while reducing the narrative and interpretive functions. But, Cappon would argue that, by necessity, the editor is involved in acts of interpretation during the process of editing.

¹⁵ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13.

¹⁶ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 138-139.

However, Carter's editor is one whose primary focus is on text, not interpretative context. By necessity, though, it appears that the editor is forced to become involved in some degree of contextual work. During this process, the editor brings together documents and highlights the relationships that link them to one another. The contextual work advocated by Carter is ideally restricted to supplying statements of descriptive fact. In his view, the editor allows for intellectual intelligibility through providing for the clarity of the documents, not contextualization or emendation of the text.

3. Lester J. Cappon and the Communication of Documentary Texts

The editorial function posited by Lester J. Cappon is different from that described by Clarence E. Carter. While Carter's position is that the editor's primary function is to ensure the accurate creation of surrogates, with as little disruption on the part of the editor as possible, Cappon conceptualizes an editor who is actively engaged in the creation and communication of documentary editions. Cappon, like Boyd, places emphasis on the relationship between the user and text. Cappon, too, is greatly concerned with issues regarding textual fidelity. However, the approach that he presents offers a more balanced position.

For Cappon, the documentary editor is, by necessity of his or her role, an intermediary who "stands between the reader and the text."¹⁷ This is not the result of any failure or irresponsibility on the part of the editor; the editor is not necessarily a disruptive presence. Here, the editor is simply positioned as an active agent. In Cappon's view, the editor is most appropriately conceptualized as a scholar and manager of bibliographic relationships. Of particular concern are the relationships that exist between documents, the provenance information that links the documentation to its larger context, and the relationships that exist

¹⁷ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 138.

between related bodies of documentation. Through the use of annotations, the editor operates as an active agent, in communicating with his or her readers regarding these elements.

In his essay “A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present,” Cappon offers a more formal definition of the editorial function and the documentary editor. The editor is defined by Cappon as a “historian whose responsibility consists, first, in transmitting authentic and accurate texts of all extant documents within a rational frame of reference, with due respect for archival principles, and, second, in making those texts more intelligible.”¹⁸

Here, the essential aspect of the editorial function, as described by Cappon, is its communicative function. This statement places emphasis on the role of the editor in managing a channel of communication that exists between the reader and a body of documentation. Secondly, this editor is described as an active agent in the construction of the edition.

Beyond this statement, Cappon further refines his definition of the editor’s function in an “exposition of principles.”¹⁹ These statements read as a set of guidelines and principles that should guide the editor’s work. Four stipulations are stated as defining the editor’s work. The first is that “authenticity of the document is the cardinal rule.”²⁰ This statement positions the editor as a scholar of evidence.

The roots of this statement date back to his 1958 article “The Historian as Editor.” It was in that piece that Cappon first discussed the editor’s responsibility in communicating contextual relationships. This includes information related to provenance, authorship, and the nature of documentary relationships. Through understanding these relationships, the editor can better evaluate a document’s authenticity.²¹

¹⁸ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147.

¹⁹ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147-148.

²⁰ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147.

²¹ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 138-139.

The second principle is that “textual accuracy, reinforces authenticity and often involves a choice among texts by comparative study and evaluation.”²² In addition to serving as a scholar of evidence, Cappon’s editor is also defined as a scholar of archival relationships and functions. The case stated in this second principle is an archival problem, the dilemma posed by complex archival relationships. An example of this problem is the selection of a speech, or speeches, to include in an edition. The editor may be confronted with a number of different copies of a speech that would need to be evaluated.

All of these may be authentic in the sense that they are not forgeries, nor have they been altered. But, if the editor is attempting to determine the final version of the speech, then the standard of accuracy becomes more precise, and the issue of authenticity becomes more complex. Through an examination of the relationships that existed between documents, and their contextual information, the archivist, or in this instance the editor, would be able to determine the appropriate document(s) for inclusion within the edition. Cappon’s editor would understand the nature of these relationships.

The third principle is related to the editor’s function as a collector. Cappon states that “the historical editor is frequently a discover of sources and a collector of manuscripts (or copies of them) who has not only made more usable but actually enlarged the stockpile of raw materials during the extended editorial process.”²³ A critical aspect of the editing function, and that of the editor, is in the identification of materials. In this context, the editor assists in the development of collections.

Here, the function of the editor is to create a comprehensive, unified collection out of separated, but related, parts. The editor, positioned as a collector, contributes to what is known

²² Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147.

²³ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147.

in several ways. First, the location and identification of original sources provides a contribution to the documentary record. Secondly, the editorial process provides the editor with the opportunity to contextualize and describe these objects, providing wider access. This attitude aligns with the principle of comprehensiveness.

The final principle relates specifically to the nature of the editor's role in creating context. Regarding annotation, Cappon wrote that "the contribution of the editor as historian ranges from brief notes elucidating obscure points and personal names in the text to interpretation of historical problems and controversies in headnotes and introductory essays."²⁴ It is through these elements that Cappon's editor communicates with the reader. This ascribes an additional role to the editor. The editor is engaged in the process of creating interpretative context. In addition to providing accurate transcriptions of the original sources, the editor is also concerned with placing the materials within their larger documentary context. This goes beyond the descriptive context described by Carter.

Put succinctly, the editor, defined by these principles, is an expert of documentary evidence, a scholar of textual relationships, a collector, and lastly, a scholar and communicator of context. The primary objective of this editor is to provide for a "wider accessibility and more intelligible use of historical documents."²⁵ In terms of procedure, this editor would follow the principle of "unity of form."²⁶ This principle, stated by Cappon, recognizes the necessity of alignment in terms of the multiple facets of editorial practice. Each aspect of the process, beginning with the established boundary of the collection, influences how intelligible, accessible, and accurate the documents will be in their final presentation.

²⁴ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 147-148.

²⁵ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 148.

²⁶ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 158-159.

The editor described by Cappon is quite different from that portrayed by Carter. This point merits further discussion. While both define the editor as a scholar of documentation, each describes one of a very different variety. Several factors account for these differences. First, the attitudes of Carter and Cappon are influenced by different concepts. Cappon's perspective was greatly influenced by archival principles. His perspective emphasizes the organic nature of archival materials and the complex relationships that these materials possess. Also influencing his view was his consideration of editing documents at the collection level. This places emphasis on the relationship between records. Additionally, he cautions against focusing too closely at the individual document level.

Carter was influenced by the principle of editorial purity. His concern is more at the document level, with emphasis on very precise transcription and the detection of textual variants. The approach that he describes is more mechanical in nature and attempts to reduce the potential for the editor to disrupt the editing process through overzealous interpretation or inaccurate transcription. In arguing for exact-copy transcription he eliminates the flexibility that is provided allowed for by Boyd's variant of editing and its derivative methods.

Cappon's emphasis, though too concerned with accuracy, places greater emphasis on the communicative power of edited documents, and of the editor in allowing for this to occur. This discussion places greater emphasis on the editor as an active agent in *constructing* editions of documents. Though transcription is a critical aspect of this process, it does not define the overall process of editing. Transcription is viewed as one element involved in the dissemination of documents, but this element does not define the practice, in Cappon's view. The most critical function of the editor, in establishing these works, is in defining how the edition will contain and provide access to documentation; the emphasis is placed on the nature of editorial relationships.

4. Julian P. Boyd and the Creation of Context

Of the characteristics of modern documentary editing, the creation of context through descriptive and explanatory notes was described as among the most innovative developments.²⁷ Julian P. Boyd was instrumental in redefining the role of editorial context. This concern with context was not a new development. Editors working during the transition period between the modern and pre-modern editing possessed a concern with context, which was evident in their evaluations of editing practice. However, Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* demonstrated a more formalized approach to the creation and use of descriptive and explanatory notes. As has been stated, the editorial approach of the Jefferson project influenced the methodological approach of other projects.

Boyd's editor can be defined by this modern concern with context. The editor has two primary points of concern in creating context. First, the editor, in Boyd's view, was concerned with creating and providing access to a reliable, authentic, and accessible surrogate.²⁸ This concern was addressed through providing information regarding the origin of the source documents in the form of descriptive notes, which would provide provenance information.

In cases where clarifications were made to the text itself, it was the function of the editor to draw attention to these changes through a notation that would draw attention to any alterations. Here, context was designed to reveal the mechanics of the editorial process and convey the editor's decisions. Descriptive context informs the reader of how an editor selected a given document, as well as his or her treatment of the material during the process of transcription.

²⁷ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 156-157; Constance B. Schulz, "Essay Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 109:1 (January 1985): 72-73.

²⁸ Boyd, "God's Altar Needs Not Our Polishings," 51-53; Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxv-xxxvii.

The second category of context was not concerned with the reliability and authenticity of the documentary material, but instead, with increasing its explanatory power. In Boyd's view, it was not the editor's role to simply "deliver ice."²⁹ Expanding on this comment, Boyd offered his thoughts on what he felt was his generation's view of context, in comparison to that of a century before. Boyd wrote, "I think we have a greater fidelity to accuracy, we take greater pains, we are more precise in our descriptions, we define our chosen corpus and documents lying within it more exactly, we are freer with our editorial commentary, and we serve the needs of learned disciplines rather than the cultivated gentleman who like to have the editions of the founding fathers on their shelves and were able to pay cash for them."³⁰ The essence of Boyd's remarks on audience and fidelity to the text are similar to those reflected in Carter's comments. However, Boyd does articulate an expanded role for the editor in the development of context. The editor functions as an interpreter and as a commentator on the documents.

This characteristic of Boyd's editing evolved over time. During his initial work on the Jefferson Papers, Boyd wrote that he and his staff decided that it was the function of the historian or biographer to provide analysis and commentary, while the proper function of the editor was "to deliver ice."³¹ Instead, a scheme was devised where editorial commentary was published in the form of journal articles while the edited documents, were transcribed, edited, and lightly annotated, aligning with a more descriptive approach, as opposed to more interpretive form of context. However, Boyd reports that this approach was disruptive to the editorial process and to the text.³²

²⁹ Boyd, "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning," 54-55.

³⁰ Boyd, "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning," 54.

³¹ Boyd, "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning," 55-56.

³² Boyd, "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning," 55; Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvii.

In describing his revised method for creating context, Boyd wrote that, “we now write our articles in the form of footnotes, and there we experience some of our most satisfying editorial moments.”³³ Though the work of the editor is interpretative, and the editor does engage with the material, Boyd does offer a statement on limits. Regarding the creation of interpretive context, he states “We attempt compactness, we never search out opportunities for discourse, we leave multitudes of things unexplained, we restrict ourselves to those matters which seem to us important, and we have rarely published any extended comment that was not more or less forced upon us by the necessity of explaining and presenting the text of the document.”³⁴ In short, Boyd feels that in specific instances the documentation demands the creation of descriptive context. However, there are limits to its application.

In Boyd’s discussion of context, the editor functions as an explanatory agent. This editor is compared with one that is more strictly concerned with dissemination of text. Described is a process that is equated to *delivering ice*, fulfilling the essential mechanical function, but nothing more. Instead, according to Boyd, the editor’s value comes from his or her ability to offer explanation, as it pertains to the documents, in addition to providing accurate transcriptions and contextual descriptions.

Boyd identifies two primary functions that the editor is concerned with: presentation and explanation. Presentation consists of the reproduction of the documentary material, taking into account issues of format, transcription, and arrangement. Though editors did maintain differing standards regarding how documents should be presented, there was agreement that this should be done so in a manner so that they could be used as reliable surrogates for original source. An example of differing conceptual approaches can be illustrated in comparing Carter and Boyd.

³³ Boyd, “Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning,” 55; Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xxxv-xxxvii.

³⁴ Boyd, “Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning,” 55.

These two editors possessed differing opinions regarding what threshold of fidelity to the original document was required, and in terms of document presentation, but both expressed the attitude that the document should operate as a reliable source.

However, Boyd's view on the *explanatory* function of the editor was unique in its orientation, although like the presentation function, his concern with the nature of the explanatory function of editing was shared by others. As the two other leading editorial critics of this period, Cappon and Carter were also concerned with the explanatory responsibility of the editor, but each described approaches, which differed from Boyd's.

Carter did not explicitly state that the editor fulfilled an explanatory function. The emphasis of his discussion was on the role of the editor in presenting texts through strict transcription and minimal disruption.³⁵ He stated that "Documents may be annotated briefly or abundantly, or they may be prepared for publication without footnotes," and that, "as a rule some editorial notes are deemed essential to a well-rounded edition of historical papers."³⁶ Though Carter gives the editor flexibility, he is explicit in stating what types of notes are acceptable.

The majority of the notes are descriptive in nature. This includes information relating to cross references, citations to other materials, and notes on abbreviations. Explanatory notes, as conceived by Carter, are to serve a contextual purpose. The type of information that would be included in these notes consists of name/place identifications, comments regarding authenticity, and essential historical background information.³⁷ However, the information the editor provides is conceived of as context in form of fact, not in the form interpretation.

³⁵ **Editorial disruption** can be defined as any intervention of the editor that negatively influences the representation's ability to convey the meaning of the original document.

³⁶ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 32.

³⁷ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 34-35.

In describing the function of annotation, beyond description, Cappon wrote that “the contribution of the editor as historian ranges from brief notes elucidating obscure points and personal names in the text to interpretation of historical problems and controversies in headnotes and introductory essays.”³⁸ Cappon addresses the varying nature of this practice through the use of Boyd and Carter as examples. Carter’s ideas are used to illustrate the perspective that the editorial purpose is primarily a descriptive function.

Boyd, however, is used to illustrate the perspective of what Cappon defined as the “scholar-editor.”³⁹ This editor is concerned with the interpretation of the materials contained within the edition, along with their interpretation. While Carter’s descriptive editor is concerned with the internal integrity of the edition, through a concern with establishing accuracy, providing accurate transcription, and providing a coherent set of documentary relationships, the interpretive editor, as described by Cappon, is concerned with external, as well as internal relationships. This editor provides comments on the documents themselves, but also on how the documents relate to the environment in which they originally operated.

Cappon uses Julian P. Boyd’s perspective to illustrate an example of this category of editor. While this editor shares the central concerns of the editor defined by Carter, the interpretive editor also looks outward to the context beyond the immediate body of documentation. In describing reactions to Boyd’s practices, Cappon writes that “If some critics would argue that by these criteria the line between historical editors and author becomes indistinguishable, they could not deny that this scholar-editor has raised editorship to new levels of attainment.”⁴⁰ In presenting these two views, Cappon’s central concern is with drawing attention to the central question of defining the appropriate function of the editor. As two

³⁸ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147-148.

³⁹ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 148-149.

⁴⁰ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 148.

prominent currents of editorial thought, the perspectives of Carter and Boyd also offer different perspectives on the scholarly function of the editor. Is the appropriate function interpretive or descriptive in nature?

Cappon's perspective on the explanatory function can be seen as falling between the poles of Carter and Boyd. The defining characteristic of Cappon's editorial philosophy is that an *application* of an editing methodology to a body of documentation, whether selective or comprehensive, should allow for the "wider accessibility and more intelligible use of historical documents."⁴¹ This is not a unique perspective in itself. Boyd and Carter were also similarly concerned with the transmission and dissemination of materials that could be used as original sources. However, also like Boyd and Carter, Cappon's view on how the editor should accomplish this task is unique in terms of its particular characteristics. While Cappon does not explicitly argue for an approach that is as strict as that of Clarence E. Carter, he does offer a view of annotation that is more restrained than that described by Julian P. Boyd.

Cappon divides the role of the editor into two primary functions. The first function is to transmit "authentic and accurate texts," within the editor's "frame of reference," while respecting "archival principles."⁴² This consists of adhering to a framework like that provided by Carter, which *prescribes* procedures for maintaining the integrity of the documents and their contents. However, Cappon goes beyond Carter and demonstrates a concern with interpretive context.

The secondary function of Cappon's editor is to make the texts "more intelligible," which aligns with Boyd's view of the role of the editor.⁴³ But, while Boyd describes the transmission/dissemination function and the explanatory function in terms of equal importance, Cappon places greater emphasis on the overarching function of producing "authentic and

⁴¹ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 147.

⁴² Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 147.

⁴³ Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 147.

accurate texts.”⁴⁴ This process does consist of developing context, but Cappon places greater emphasis on the function of transmission.

This concern with transmission can be traced to Cappon’s stated view that the editor’s work should be guided by archival principles. Because of this, his editorial philosophy is more sensitive to the issue of disruption. In the context of Cappon’s editorial thought, editorial disruption can be equated with the failure of the document to communicate adequately its meaning. He is unique in discussing the editor in this manner, as an intermediary with communicative power. The editorial function, as conceptualized by Cappon consists of extending the reach of the original sources, through the use of surrogates.

In describing the editor as a figure that “stands between the reader and the text,” Cappon also illustrates that through the editing process, the editor creates a dialogue between the reader and the document.⁴⁵ The reader, by necessity, reads through the editorial apparatus to move through the text. Extensive explanatory notes could disrupt or distract from the document’s meaning. In placing less emphasis on the explanatory function than Boyd, a position that recognizes that the editor will engage in explanatory practices is presented, but that these should not disrupt the primary practice of transmitting accurate and reliable documents.

Boyd’s editor does not appear to take this middle ground. Here, explanatory and descriptive function cannot be separated from one another. This view of the editor differs from that of Carter and Cappon, where there was a stated distinction between the processes of reproducing the document and that of providing context. Boyd’s editor reproduces documents and context.

⁴⁴ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 147.

⁴⁵ Cappon, “The Historian as Editor,” 138.

These varying attitudes regarding the nature of contextual and explanatory information illustrate how differing philosophies regarding the editor's role in narrating and interpreting records influences how this information would be constructed. The approach used would influence the narrative and explanatory properties of the documents and the degree of editorial intervention.

5. Lyman H. Butterfield and the Construction of Documentary Collections

Editors of the early modern period were well aware of their role in creating unique collections out of existing artifacts. One of the central actions of the documentary editor is the process of bringing together related documentation that shares an intellectual relationship. Because of this the edition is a constructed object. The editor's views regarding the type of collection that he or she would like to create will determine its final form.

Julian P. Boyd illustrates this point quite nicely. His idea regarding the comprehensive edition can be viewed as a redefinition of the documentary edition as a collection. First, Boyd's work served to correct the incompleteness and inaccuracies of past editions of Jefferson papers. As collections, these works failed in later scholarly evaluations. Here, Boyd's work operated as a re-evaluation of the documentary edition as a collection, based on the consideration of past editorial work. However, Boyd's work should also be viewed as a redefinition of the concept of the collection.

Boyd offered an approach that presented a unique view for containing and structuring documentary materials. First, within reason, Boyd was concerned with the editing and publishing of all related Jefferson documentation for which he had intellectual responsibility, including correspondence that he had sent and received. Jefferson is treated in an archival sense;

he is evaluated in terms of his documentary relationships. Additionally, Boyd presented the editor as an agent that was an active intermediary within the work. In addition to providing descriptive and contextual information as it related to the work's physical form, Boyd's editor narrated, or in a way curated the documentation, through offering interpretive and explanatory content as a means of increasing the accessibility and intelligibility of the documentation. These attitudes resulted in the construction of a particular type of collection.

In evaluating early modern editing as a collection generating process, and in considering documentary works as collections, it is important to distinguish between the concepts of scope and completeness. While one of the most notable characteristics of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was its scope, this is not the defining property of early modern documentary editions, when considered as collection. An editor's determination of scope is a critical decision. This defines the nature of the documentation and subjects that would be contained within the work. At the most basic level, scope determines what the edition will contain and this defines its potential use. In understanding the nature of scope as it relates to the editing process, it is helpful to evaluate the concept as a form of collection development or selection policy. Defining scope is the process of defining topical boundaries.

Editorial completeness is the concept that was most critical in editors' conceptualizations of their works as collections. Editorial completeness is concerned with the nature of document relationships. Scope and completeness are related concepts, but they are distinctly different from one another. A discussion of Boyd's work illustrates this concept. In determining the scope of the Jefferson papers, Boyd made decisions regarding the subject of the project (Thomas Jefferson, and more specifically, both his personal and professional existence), the time period to be covered (entire existence as a creator of documentation), and lastly, topical coverage (not

limitations in terms of documentation to be edited). These aspects sketch out the contours of the edition and define the parameters within which the documents will reside.

Defining the edition in terms of completeness is an entirely different exercise. Here Boyd's concern was with determining the characteristics of the documentation that would be included within the categories and contours identified in determining scope. Completeness is concerned with documentary relationships. In this regard, editors, as creators of a published documentary record, would ask themselves questions regarding the requirements of their work, and what it is to accomplish. In the Jefferson project, this concept influenced the specific selection of documentation for inclusion within the works. This influenced the editorial decisions to publish both outgoing and incoming correspondence, the publication of draft documents, and the formulation of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* as a comprehensive edition. In Boyd's view, these aspects were required of his work, in order for the project to have utility as a collection.

It is important to emphasize that completeness does not necessitate comprehensiveness. These editorial concepts are, to a degree, relative, and are related to the issue of editorial intention.⁴⁶ Early modern editors had varying attitudes regarding the concept of completeness. Often these can be seen as being related to the editor's overall scope of a given project.

A good counter example to Boyd, and an example of a different category of completeness and comprehensiveness, can be seen through considering Cappon's *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*. This edition focused on a set of communications that occurred between Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Abigail Adams. Here, the point of focus in creating the edition was the dialogue that occurred between these individuals through the use of correspondence. This work is also unique because of the focus placed on publishing a particular document type, the letter.

⁴⁶ Boyd, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, xiv-xvi; Butterfield, *Diary & Autobiography of John Adams*, xxxvii-xlii.

Though narrower in scope, this work can be viewed as complete and comprehensive. Cappon, in his introductory statement, describing the origins of the project, stated that the edition, “ought to be as complete as possible.”⁴⁷ In this regard, the inclusion of the Jefferson-Abigail Adams correspondence can be viewed as assisting in fulfilling this objective. The decision to include this strand of correspondence was that “since the letters between Abigail Adams and Jefferson complement perfectly the correspondence of the two statesmen, it seemed to me that they should be included for their personal charm and tang as well as for their subject matter,” and further, that “Mrs. Adams played an influential part in the delayed reconciliation between her husband and Jefferson during 1801-1812.”⁴⁸

Cappon’s comments on the policies for including documents within the edition demonstrate a similar concern with completeness. By including the correspondence of Abigail Adams, the edition would provide a more accurate representation of the documentary and personal relationships of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. Though the Cappon and Boyd editions differed in terms of editorial scope, and the characteristics of the documentation, each of these editors were similarly concerned with the issues related to completeness and comprehensiveness.

Any discussion of the role of the editor in constructing collections requires an examination of Lyman H. Butterfield’s work with the Adams Family papers. While the editors of the other founding era projects were working with projects that were unified and organized around one central figure, Butterfield found himself charged with editing and publishing papers related to a family. This presented a number of unique issues. First, a substantial number of individuals created, and were documented, by these papers. Secondly, this collection of papers

⁴⁷ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxviii.

⁴⁸ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxviii.

consisted of a complex set of documentation, containing multiple documentary forms. Examples of this documentation within the papers were state documents and official correspondence, personal correspondence, and diaries.⁴⁹

A defining characteristic of early modern editorial theory and discussion was the concern with developing usable collections. Developing editions with this property influenced the thought surrounding the elements that made up the edited documents. Editorial concern pertaining to the appropriate use of annotation, transcription, and contextualization, were related to what the editor felt was required of a usable edition. The idea of what was required in developing usable collections of published original sources, in terms of the treatment of documentation, can be viewed as being defined by the overall editorial approach of the editor, and the unique requirements posed by the specific documentation being published.

Butterfield's work and approach is representative of this concern. First, Butterfield's attitudes can be found in a succinct statement made in a 1966 piece appearing in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Regarding the editorial function, Butterfield wrote that "our purpose is not, by crowding our pages with footnotes, to display our learning, but by rendering as accurate a text as we can, and by informing the reader, when necessary, on how we arrived at it and when we ourselves have doubts about it, to convey a lost world as fully, and intelligibly as its surviving records will permit us to do."⁵⁰ In this statement, the central function of the editor in creating these works is to provide access to an accurate transcription.

A secondary aspect of this work is that it will provide a descriptive and explanatory context, whose central function is to evaluate and consider the documents as historical evidence. Editorial presence, here, is described in terms that are more closely associated with description,

⁴⁹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, xxiii-xxxvii.

⁵⁰ L.H. Butterfield, "Editing American Historical Documents," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d Ser., 78 (1966): 104.

rather than explanation and narration. Here, the explanatory and narrative function is described in restrained terms. But, the act of editing could also be viewed in terms of selecting and constructing, which is also interpretive in nature. The editor did develop the edition through the consideration and evaluation of the documentation included and excluded from the work. However, beyond issues of provenance and their validity and historical evidence, as demonstrated in Butterfield's theory of editing, the editor should not offer an interpretation of the documents in terms of their historical significance. This view operated within Butterfield's overall concern with the idea of editorial responsibility.⁵¹

In describing his generation's editorial practice within the larger scope of editorial practice, Butterfield wrote that "the advances made in scholarly editing are the result of editors' assuming increased responsibility toward their original materials, toward the writers whom they are editing, and toward those students and readers who they anticipate will use and read their book."⁵² Butterfield felt that the editorial functions concerned with the, searching and gathering, authentication and evaluation, transcription, and annotation, were influenced by this increased responsibility. This allowed for the production of works that could be used as primary sources.⁵³ The era's increased editorial responsibility can be viewed as being directly related to the shift in the editorial function, to one that was charged with producing collections of evidence.

Editorial responsibility also requires that editors recognized the limitations of their practices, both posed by their methods, but also the limits posed by the materials themselves. The manner in which original sources could be edited and made available was to a great extent influenced by the characteristics of the documentation. Butterfield's concept of editorial responsibility emphasized the production of works that were in essence *true* to the original

⁵¹ Butterfield, "Editing American Historical Documents," 98.

⁵² Butterfield, "Editing American Historical Documents," 98.

⁵³ Butterfield, "Editing American Historical Documents," 99.

documentation and its intent. It is important to note that the first element described in L.H. Butterfield's definition of editorial responsibility was the loyalty that the editor had to the original sources. Though the editor was concerned with the production of a work that would provide for the wider access to original sources, and that would serve scholarship and readers, the editor's primary loyalty resided with the original documentation and its accurate presentation.

This is evidenced by his treatment of the Adams Family Papers. Butterfield's approach recognized the uniqueness of the body of materials with which he was working, the challenges that this posed in their representation through publication, and the constructive function of editing. His work demonstrated a loyalty to the materials, which influenced how they were structured.

As noted, the Adams Family Papers consisted of a body of documentation that possessed many creators and took multiple forms. In a discussion of the project, the collection was described as containing 300,000 pages of documents spanning three generations of the Adams Family. This documentation existed as "diaries, letterbooks, incoming letters, political, diplomatic, and literary writings," as well as an assemblage of "account books, commonplace books, legal and business papers, genealogical and historical notes, commissions and diplomas, sketches and drawing, maps, pamphlets, broadsides, posters, passports, cipher keys, newspapers, and even check stubs."⁵⁴ This listing provides an idea of the complexity of the documentation with which Butterfield and his associates were concerned.

Additionally, the papers' unique provenance conditions also influenced how this collection of papers would be edited. Butterfield is careful to note a condition that distinguished these papers, from that of the other founding era papers, namely that the family had maintained

⁵⁴ L.H. Butterfield, "The Adams Papers," *Daedalus* 86 (May 1955): 64.

control over this documentation. Members of the Adams family had maintained the responsibility for the organization and description of the body of documentation. Because of this, the initial work of the Adams Project was to address issues related to the physical control of the documentation. As defined by Butterfield's editorial philosophy, a critical examination and understanding of the documentation was required in order to develop a proper plan for its dissemination. Here, editorial criticism is turned towards the documentation. Greater attention was required in establishing physical and intellectual control. Or, in Butterfield's words, a great deal of the initial work was concerned "with putting the papers into usable form."

These characteristics and activities are editor focused. In order for Butterfield to begin work on determining how to represent the materials through publication, it was essential to develop a workable model for evaluating and assessing the large body of documentation. Editorial work was dependent on this type of understanding.

What unique edition, or document, focused characteristics influenced the publication of this documentation? First, Butterfield expanded on the idea of the collection, as it related to the publication of documentary materials. While Boyd's edition created a collection through the surveying and selection of scattered documentation, Butterfield published from an existing collection. The emphasis was in publishing materials from the papers produced and maintained by the Adams Family. However, like Boyd's work, Butterfield's edition was also constructive in nature. Because of the size of the collection, Butterfield recognized that comprehensive editing, as illustrated by *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, could not be applied. Doing such would be impossible, but even if possible, would result in an unwieldy collection.⁵⁵ Creating a usable collection necessitated a selective approach in editing from within the body of material.

⁵⁵ Butterfield, "The Adams Papers," 67-68.

In addition, Butterfield recognized that within collection there existed multiple independent series, which could be structured into their own individual groupings, in terms of publication. Here, Butterfield's work can be conceptualized as organizing the mass of materials into a more manageable number of smaller published collections, or series. This redefinition of the documentary relationships, in the published forms, was necessary for constructing usable documentary editions. Butterfield conceptualized the development of four unique published collections within the overall Adams Papers project. The series was defined as consisting of the diaries of John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and Charles Francis Adams. A second series contained the Adams Family correspondence. A third category was defined as containing general and non-family correspondence. Lastly, the fourth category remained undefined in Butterfield's evaluation, and would be used as a means for the publication of critical materials in the remaining varied categories of documentation.⁵⁶

Butterfield's conception of editing, and his work in formulating *The Adams Family Papers* closely aligns with his editorial theory and philosophy. The two most critical aspects of Butterfield's underlying editorial approach were the centrality of editorial responsibility to the editing process and the function of editing in creating usable published collections. An important characteristic of Butterfield's role in the Adams project was how active he was in sculpting the identity of the project. Though the project strived for completeness and comprehensiveness, in terms of the documents, objects, and themes that would be presented and published, this could only be achieved within the specified categories defined by the editor.⁵⁷

This project illustrates an interesting tension that exists between the concepts of selectivity, completeness, and comprehensiveness, and serves as evidence for Boyd's remarks

⁵⁶ Butterfield, "The Adams Papers," 67-70.

⁵⁷ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, xxxvii-xli.

regarding the relative nature of these concepts. Though the papers of the Adams Family could only be edited and published selectively, specific aspects of the documentation could be edited and published in a comprehensive and complete manner. Here, there is distinction between the collection as an original body of documents, and the multiple *published collections* that were derived from this body of documentation. Butterfield's editor is an active agent in defining collections.

Editorial responsibility recognizes that the process of publishing original sources is defined by choices and editorial interventions. The editor is instrumental in making these choices and in determining the nature of the collection. What is the primary objective of this activity? What is the editor's responsibility? In terms of Butterfield's editorial theory, one response can sufficiently answer both of these questions. The central editorial objective and responsibility is that of producing usable collections. These are collections that contain accurate representations of original sources and that are overburdened by the effects of editorial intervention. Additionally, these representations are contained within a mechanism that allows for their access. Butterfield's editorial choices were made in reference to this objective. In order to create a usable published record of the Adams documentation, the editor found himself required to consider and conceptualize how to effectively represent the objects in a printed form.

Lyman H. Butterfield's editorial theory and thought differs from that of Julian P. Boyd, Lester J. Cappon, and Clarence E. Carter, in regard to his emphasis on the role of the editor in constructing evidence in the form of collections, and in defining editing as a collection generating process. While all four of these figures conceptualize the editor as a form of intermediary, each presented a consideration of this that contained a distinct nuance.

Julian P. Boyd's theory and thought emphasized the explanatory function of the editor and the documentary edition. The documentary edition allows for the understanding of individuals, events, and ideas through the presentation of documents. This function, in turn, in Boyd's view, is assisted by the editor's ability to explain and contextualize.

Lester J. Cappon's thought placed greater emphasis on issues related to the *transmission* of documentary materials as text and evidence. The editor, and the editorial function, carried out a communicative function. Cappon's editor was concerned with the relationship between the reader and the documentary materials as well as the role of the editor in establishing this relationship. Here, the editor is an active agent in creating a published form of documentary evidence, and the editing process is conceived of as an evidence generating activity. Cappon, like Boyd, was concerned with the nature of the editor's function in creating context, though he conceptualized the use of context, in more descriptive terms than Boyd.

Carter's thought conceptualized the editor as a type of translator, and editing as a form of translation, while Boyd and Cappon described an editing that was concerned with the transmission of documents that contained and presented text and context. The ability of a document to be communicated or explained to the user required a presentation that made the source intelligible. In this regard Boyd and Cappon communicated text along with meaning. However, Carter argued for a stricter editing that was concerned with the presentation of accurate transcription. His editor translated between documentary forms. Editorial functions allowed for the presentation of original sources in a unified printed form. For Carter, the central tenet of editing was a strict loyalty to the documents and their creators. Providing accurate transcriptions was the most critical editorial function. While descriptive and textual notes could be provided to offer information required for evaluating the authenticity and reliability of the

documentation, Carter felt that the editor should not engage in acts of interpretation. Editorial value came through the presentation of accurate representations of original sources.

These four discussions illustrate that though editors were in agreement regarding the primary function of the editor and the editorial process, the creation of representations of original sources that can be used as evidence, there were differing views in considering how this could be achieved. Of critical importance was the presence of the editor within the edited document. In each of these discussions editors were essentially asking themselves questions regarding the requirements for producing documentary evidence and how this evidence should be communicated.

B. SYNTHESIZING EDITING PRACTICES

This discussion illustrates the presence of differing theoretical, conceptual, and practical approaches that were used in considering and developing documentary editions. Though there were critical differences between the varying threads of editorial thought, a synthesis of these findings demonstrates that editors, during the editing processes, were concerned with a series of primary editing processes. Here, a synthesis of the previous discussion of editorial thought and attitudes, drawing out and identifying the primary themes, practices, and functions that editors engaged in during editorial contemplation and practice, is provided.

1. Construction and Creation

Editors of the early modern period engaged in acts of construction. In writing about editorial practices, their works were described in these terms. In this regard, their works can be

viewed as crafted objects, or as assemblages.⁵⁸ The projects developed by editors began as sets of ideas. In considering use, form, and content, editors were developing blueprints for creating a particular category of historical evidence. Out of existing artifacts the editor would create a work, a collection. In this regard, editing is best viewed as a highly creative act, as a form of authorship.⁵⁹

The form of authorship that the editor engaged in was related to his or her intent for the evidence. Editors devised different editorial approaches in order to develop different constructions. Defining the early modern period was the comprehensive edition, an approach that was demonstrated by Julian P. Boyd to be a valid method for constructing published editions of original sources. In the case of Boyd's Jefferson project, and the other founding era projects that adopted this approach, the construction served multiple purposes. The function of this editing was to correct critical failures of editing through re-editing and publication, to re-establish intellectual documentary relationships, and to unify related but physically dispersed collections. This construction, defined by the comprehensive Founding-Era editions, was guided by an editorial concern with macro level relationships, the relationship between an individual and his or her documentation. Individuals and subjects served as the unifying and organizing elements.⁶⁰

Editors did engage in other types of construction. The editions developed by Lester J. Cappon (*The Adams-Jefferson Letters*) and Lyman H. Butterfield (*The Adams Papers*) are

⁵⁸ During the proposal defense for this dissertation (February 24, 2010) my committee offered valuable comment on the role of the editor as a craftsman. This has assisted me in refining my discussion of the relationship between editorial thought and the physical objects that it influenced. Along these lines, the documentary edition can also be described as an assemblage. For a discussion of the concept of the assemblage as it relates to information objects see Bernd Frohmann, *Deflating Information: From Science to Documentation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004): 264.

⁵⁹ Lester J. Cappon described the variations in past editorial endeavors as a result of this activity. He also described documentary editing as a specific category of historical writing. See Cappon, "A Rationale for Historical Editing," 158-159.

⁶⁰ These approaches are apparent in the descriptions of Boyd's, Butterfield's, and Cappon's projects.

examples of editions influenced by differing organizing devices, influenced by different editorial ideas and frameworks. Cappon's edition took as its organizing principle the relationships between John Adams, Abigail Adams, and Thomas Jefferson, as represented by documentary materials, in this specific case, correspondence. Here, the constructive aspect of the editing process is influenced by a concern with specificity. Cappon defined the particular relationships that were to be documented by the edition, and the specific category of original sources that it should contain.

Butterfield's work with *The Adams Papers* is a vivid example of editorial creativity. His work illustrates the importance of this type of creativity to the editing process. Butterfield published, primarily, from an existing collection. Butterfield recognized that it would not be possible to publish a comprehensive edition of 300,000 documents. Additionally, because of the diversity of the documentation, its generational coverage, and variety of topics, a strict chronological arrangement would not operate as an effective structuring scheme. In publishing *The Adams Papers*, Butterfield found that the Adams Papers (manuscript collection) as an object, could be translated into multiple, focused, published collections, which would make up *The Adams Papers* (the published surrogates). While Butterfield found it difficult to be comprehensive and complete at a macro level, similar to Boyd's *The Jefferson Papers*, he did find it possible to construct smaller more focused collections.⁶¹

Editorial construction and creation was driven by the procedures of definition of scope, selection, and organization. The early modern era produced different categories of editorial constructions; documentary editions took multiple forms. However, the unifying characteristic was the intent that they serve as surrogates for original sources and that they operate as evidence. Any variations in method or approach can best be viewed as variations on this theme.

⁶¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, xxxvii-xli.

2. Editorial Description

The early modern period of editing was defined by an increased concern with the process of editorial description. It is important to distinguish editorial description from editorial contextualization. Editorial description is concerned with providing information regarding the materiality of the document, and any factors that might have influenced its material aspects, such as custody of the original and the approach used in transcribing the printed representation. Editorial description is concerned with both the representation and the source for the representation. Editors provided this information in descriptive and textual notes.

Editorial contextualization, which is the third critical function that I will discuss, is concerned with intellectual content of the edited documents and their relationship to a larger historical context. This point will be discussed in further depth, but here, it is appropriate to state that this was one of the more contentious points of discussion during the early modern period and where there was the most variation in terms of statements on how this process should be carried out. Editorial contextualization was provided through the use of explanatory notes and editorial statements. In succinctly stating the distinction between these two functions, editorial description is concerned with the materiality of the object, while editorial contextualization is best described as being concerned with the intellectual content of the object.

In evaluating the editorial description function, it is important to state that like the aspects that defined the construction of editions during the early modern era, thought and procedures for describing edited documents was also influenced by editors' conceptualizations of edited and published original sources as a form of surrogate evidence. Descriptive information served both the editor and the user. Information regarding the provenance of the documentation, and the degree of editorial intervention in creating the edited object, left the work open to criticism of

users and other editors. Editors revealed the practices that influenced the editorial process, which allowed their works to be evaluated as evidence. The presence of descriptive information assisted editors in creating trustworthy evidence.

The foundations of modern editing's concern with descriptive information can be traced back to Jameson. In the examples cited in this study, Jameson drew attention to the need for editors to provide information that documented the provenance of the documents contained within their works, as well as the procedures used in preparing the documents for publication. These evaluations also demonstrated that documentary works should be open to evaluation, in reference to other categories of historical evidence. Jameson's assessment of editorial methods consisted of evaluating editions in comparison to original source documents and other existing editions of published papers. Because documentary works can be seen as both derivative and comparative, standards of completeness, comprehensiveness, reliability, and comprehensiveness operate in reference to their related objects. The importance of this point became apparent in the later writings of editors, where the editing process was discussed explicitly in constructive terms, and more importantly, editors identified the importance of providing information that documented this process.

The concern with description is also closely related to the idea of a usable collection. Because editions were constructed evidence, the primary question any reader would have to ask whether the edited documents could be used in the place of the original sources. In order to answer this question, readers would have to interrogate the edition and its documents. Information that documented the processes that led to their development, construction, and creation would allow this question to be answered. Usability, as the concept related to early modern editors' conception of their work, was primarily defined in terms of whether or not the

work could function as evidence, and whether the reader would trust the work to provide an accurate representation of the original source.

3. Editorial Context

As stated in the previous section, an evaluation of editorial thought reveals a concern with two primary categories of context. Descriptive context was concerned with issues of materiality, reliability, and authenticity. In constructing a descriptive context, the editor provided information that would allow the reader to evaluate the work as evidence, and decide whether or not a given document should be trusted. The importance of this context was not debated. Constructing descriptive context was directly related to the central mission of early modern editors, providing scholarly grade representations that could function as evidence.

Providing editorial context was also a critical function. Editorial context refers to information that is concerned with the intellectual content of the documentation, both as it relates internally within the edition, but also as the documents relate to a larger historical or documentary context. This type of information could consist of fact-based information, such as providing information regarding a place name, or providing a birth/death date for an individual identified within a letter. However, this information could also be quite extensive, bordering on interpretation. This information could consist of summaries/interpretations of the events documented within the works. As was shown in the discussion of editorial attitudes, the primary value assigned to this type of information was that it would aid the reader in better understanding the documentation. Editorial context can be distinguished from descriptive context by its interpretive and explanatory nature.

Editors did not reach a consensus when it came to evaluating the form, function, and utility of editorial context. While some strands of editorial thought placed primacy on the explanatory function of editing, arguing that one of the fundamental tasks of the editor was to make documents more intelligible through explanation, other strands cautioned against this exercise. The differences between these schools of thought can be traced to the degree to which editing is conceptualized as an interpretative exercise. Julian P. Boyd was a champion of context, arguing that the editor should do more than simply “deliver ice,” or in editing terms, provide access to transcriptions.⁶² For Boyd, a significant aspect of editorial work was in creating a contained documentary environment that would allow the user to better understand a set of ideas, events, and activities, as represented by published original sources. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was initially lauded for its explanatory characteristics, and this aspect of the work influenced editorial procedure of the other founding era projects.⁶³

A bookend to Julian P. Boyd is Clarence E. Carter. As stated in this dissertation’s discussion of Carter’s thought, he felt that the editor should reduce the influence of the editorial function on the document. For Carter, the editorial function did not consist of offering an interpretation or evaluation of the documentation itself. In his view, the editor had to be careful as to not be *too* present within the documentation. While Carter did approve of a form of passive editorial context, including information regarding obscure place names and similar types of information defined as acceptable, he felt that the editor should not offer interpretive comment. The primary function of Carter’s editor was to create accurate documentary texts, not

⁶² Boyd, “Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning,” 54-55.

⁶³ Brubaker, “The Publication of Historical Sources,” 216-218.

explanatory commentary. Again, the primary difference in these editorial approaches relates to differing attitudes regarding the interpretive function of editing.⁶⁴

Though not explicitly stated in editorial discussions, the editor carries out two distinct narrative functions which relate to this issue of editorial context. First, editors narrate through documents. In constructing an edition, the editor sculpts a narrative through documents. The choices an editor makes during the processes of defining scope, selection, editing, and presentation determine how an individual, event, or activity will be represented through documentation. This was an essential aspect of early modern editorial theory. Evidence for this view can be found by going back to Boyd. A fundamental aspect of his work was a concern with the idea of completeness. Previous editions, in Boyd's view incomplete and inaccurate, had failed to accurately convey Jefferson's essence through documentation.⁶⁵

Another excellent example that illustrates this point is Cappon's *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*. His work focuses on a specific narrative as provided through documentation. In addition, in the introduction to this work, Cappon explains his reason for including the Abigail Adams letters. This line of correspondence supplemented the Jefferson-Adams dialogue. The inclusion of these letters provided a different degree of understanding. Though mechanically, the primary function at play in these instances is of transmission, the objects joined together, also function as a narrative.

Both of these examples what can be described as implicit or silent narration. This action occurs as a consequence of the primary editorial activity. However, a second type of narration associated with editorial context is a highly conscious form of narration. In constructing editorial context, the issue is to what degree the editor feels he or she should offer an evaluation

⁶⁴ Carter, *Historical Editing*, 32-35.

⁶⁵ Boyd, *A Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, 11-13.

or explanation of the materials. Should the editorial context be restrained, as argued by Carter, placing greater emphasis on the text of the document, or in keeping with Boyd's view, is it the function of the editor to create a context that will allow the reader to understand the greater context of the documentation? Both of these approaches were put forth as valid philosophies.

The other prominent critical editors of this period, Butterfield and Cappon, can be viewed as falling within this spectrum. Both recognized that while the editor was concerned with dissemination, there was also a concern with intelligibility. Each of these editors put forth views that granted more latitude than described by Carter, but that were also not as explicitly interpretative as the view put forth by Boyd. These variants of editorial thought offer varying opinions on how to represent original sources effectively. But though there are differences, these variations come through a concern with evaluating the same concepts. Each of the approaches described can be viewed as variations on central themes. Editors were concerned with matters of description, context, and construction. Influencing editors' concern with these concepts was editorial intention.

C. EDITORIAL INTENTION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS

An important assumption of this study is that early modern editors were concerned with creating two objects. These were the theoretical edition and the actual work that was produced by the editing process. The relationship between these two objects can be described in terms of the relationship that exists between an idea and an object. The theoretical edition can be described as a set of ideas that define the form that an edition could potentially take, as described by editorial policy, procedure, and practice. Theoretical editions exist in terms of potential.

Editions produced by editors can be thought of as theoretical editions, or ideas of the work, made concrete.

The relationship between these two entities can be made concrete through an examination of editorial intention. Editorial intention affects both the theoretical and the actual edition. Editorial intention is related to the attitudes, views, goals, and objectives that define the editor's thought regarding the form an edition should take, the documents it would contain, and the types of use that it will allow. These elements lead to the creation of the theoretical edition, which can be viewed as a formalized plan for the production of a documentary edition. The best example of this type of document is Boyd's *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*. A more macro-level can be seen in the NHPC reports, which offer a theoretical template for producing documentary editions.

The editorial introductory statements provided by editors in their editions can be viewed as evidence of the theoretical edition. In these statements editors describe the scope of their projects, the mechanics of the editing process, and information regarding the nature of the editorial context provided within the editions. These statements can be viewed as articulations of editorial intention for the edited documents that followed them. The editorial statement describes the theorized edition in terms of a formalized method that was later applied to a set of documentation. The affects of this application came in the form of the edited documents contained within the works.

Viewed in another manner, the theoretical edition can be viewed as a synthesized and structured statement of an editorial philosophy, as applied to a specific set of documents. An editor's view regarding the appropriate strictness of transcription, or the proper amount of

editorial context, will be reflected in these methodological statements. Understanding these statements is crucial to understanding the editor's philosophy.

To what degree does the editorial philosophy affect the form editions take? Does anything become lost in translation from the theoretical conceptualized edition to the actual physical object? These are important questions in terms of understanding the relationship between editorial theory and method and the affects of their application through editing. This can be understood through a comparison of the theoretical and actual edition.

In the pages that follow a comparative analysis of editorial statements and edited documents is provided. Here, emphasis is placed on examining how the editorial framework influenced the form of the edited documents. This will allow for a more concrete understanding of the nature of editorial intention and the relationship between the physical edition and the theoretical edition. Because this study is concerned with editorial intention in the early modern period of editing, the editions discussed have been selected from the associated Founding-Era projects, which defined this era. Both comprehensive and selective editions are evaluated.

1. L.H. Butterfield's *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*

a. Theory and Method

In introducing the editing procedures of this work, Butterfield is careful to emphasize that the editorial procedures described in reference to the *Diary and Autobiography* are to apply to *The Adams Papers* and the edition "as a whole."⁶⁶ It is important to emphasize that this is in keeping with Butterfield's theoretical discussions regarding the nature of the edition as a collection. Though the collection was published in a series of more manageable focused parts,

⁶⁶ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, iv.

they were all derived from the same collection of original sources. Because of this, the documentation should be treated in the same manner.

Methodologically, the approach adopted by Butterfield was the one shared by *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* and *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. According to Butterfield, both of these projects adopted an approach that that was centered between “exact duplication” and “complete modernization.”⁶⁷ This demonstrates the recognition that while an important editorial concern is with reproducing an accurate representation of the objects, it is also important to create a representation that is intelligible. Butterfield goes on to state that the approach is also necessitated by what technology will allow, and in some cases facsimiles are included, rather than reproductions in typescript.⁶⁸ In summarizing the “principle rules for rendering text” in editing the *Diary and Autobiography*, Butterfield wrote that “they may be regarded as devices for maintaining the desired middle ground between pedantic fidelity and readability. The scholar concerned with the ultimate niceties of a critical passage in the text may always resort to the photographic facsimiles of the manuscripts available in the microfilm edition of the Adams Papers.”⁶⁹ Here, emphasis is placed on the ability of the edition to represent the text accurately and intelligibly. The microfilm will allow for an unedited view of the documentation, if necessary.

How did Butterfield achieve this middle ground in editing? Regarding spelling Butterfield wrote that “spelling is preserved as found in the manuscripts.”⁷⁰ However, he does note exceptions to this principle. He notes that “slips of the pen are silently corrected.”⁷¹ An

⁶⁷ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, iv.

⁶⁸ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁶⁹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷⁰ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

example of this practice cited is the correction of “Gentlement” to “Gentlemen.”⁷² However, if the editors determine that an error of this type is of any significance then it would be reproduced in the edited document. In regard to personal names, no matter what the form, the spelling is reproduced. If a name is determined to be unable to be understood then a corrected spelling would be included in brackets following the text.⁷³

The “grammar and syntax” of the documentation was preserved by the editors.⁷⁴ In cases where intelligibility might be disrupted, corrections are provided within brackets next to the text, and in cases where explanation is warranted an editorial note would be provided. Lastly repeated words are eliminated from the text. Related to this aspect of the documentation are procedures regarding capitalization and punctuation.⁷⁵

Regarding capitalization, it was editorial policy to preserve the capitalization found in manuscripts, with exceptions. Alterations were made to capitalization so that all sentences in the edited work would begin with a capital letter, all personal, honorific, and geographic names would be appropriately capitalized, and lastly, in cases where the appropriate capitalization cannot be determined, then it is modernized. On the methods for addressing issues of punctuation Butterfield wrote that “punctuation is normally preserved as found in the manuscripts, but a few rules of conventionalization have been systematically applied in preparing John Adams’ *Diary and Autobiography* for publication.”⁷⁶ It is further stated that this approach was developed in order to address issues related to the “peculiarities in the manuscripts

⁷² Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷³ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷⁴ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷⁵ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi.

⁷⁶ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi-lvii

themselves.”⁷⁷ These rules addressed issues where punctuation would disrupt the intelligibility of the documents.

Butterfield also presented concrete procedures for addressing issues posed by abbreviations and contractions, canceled matter, variant readings, and editorial insertions. The principle procedure for addressing abbreviations and contractions is that these “are preserved as found in names of persons and places; in the datelines, salutations, and leavetakings of letters; in endorsements and docket; in units of money and measurement; and in accounts and other tabular documents.”⁷⁸ In cases where these are missing or illegible, the document content, containing the editor’s interpretation, is provided in square brackets to indicate the nature of the editorial intervention. Here the concern is with accurately representing the text, while also allowing for its intelligibility.⁷⁹

Canceled matter, defined as text that has been “scored-out” or erased is not included in the document unless it is determined to be of “real stylistic, psychological, or historical interest.”⁸⁰ Here, the editor makes a choice regarding the intention of the author and the importance of the text. This instance is particularly interesting in illustrating the interpretive nature of editorial work. Variant readings, defined as “variations in text between two or more versions of the same letter or document,” were described as being noted if they were deemed to be significant.⁸¹ In cases where variant readings were deemed significant, these texts were included in footnotes. Lastly, regarding editorial insertions, Butterfield notes that these are to be

⁷⁷ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lvi-lviii.

⁷⁸ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lviii.

⁷⁹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lviii.

⁸⁰ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lviii.

⁸¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lviii-lix

“italicized and enclosed in square brackets.”⁸² This provides for editorial transparency, indicating the presence of editorial intervention.

Because of the unique challenges posed by the dating of documents, Butterfield provided a specific statement regarding the procedures of printing and assigning dates. Adams’ diary possessed a number of unique conditions related to this point. First, often the dates of the entries were “normally part of the entries themselves, being the first word or several words therein.”⁸³ This would make the location of this information problematic. In order to address this characteristic of the documentation, an editorial decision was made to “print the diarist’s dates as centered captions above the entries.”⁸⁴ This alteration would increase the navigation of the entries, and would reduce the complications posed by these *hidden* dates. Butterfield notes that there were also instances where entries were either “vaguely dated or wholly undated.”⁸⁵ In these cases the editors would make an evidenced based decision and assign a date in brackets.⁸⁶

On annotation, the work of Butterfield and his associates was influenced by a set of “general principles of annotation policy.”⁸⁷ These policies were divided into six categories. First, regarding “Persons, personal names,” Butterfield wrote that because of the thousands of names contained within the documents, it is not feasible to identify all of the individuals noted in the papers. However, Butterfield notes that “members of the immediate family and other relatives who played a significant part in the family’s history are to be identified.”⁸⁸ Regarding the form of these names, it is noted that “names seriously misspelled or represented in the manuscript by initials are clarified either by a corrected or full version inserted in the text within

⁸² Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lix.

⁸³ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lix.

⁸⁴ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lix.

⁸⁵ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lix-lx.

⁸⁶ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lix-lx.

⁸⁷ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lx.

⁸⁸ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lx-lxi.

brackets or by a footnote.”⁸⁹ Here the standard for annotation is usability and feasibility.

Because of the nature of editorial work, there were limits in terms of the labor that can be spent on the identification process. Usability is also a critical factor influencing the decisions described here. Individuals critical to the documentation are identified and names that cannot easily be interpreted are clarified.

Butterfield writes that “place names are to be corrected by bracketed insertions in the text or by footnotes when they are seriously misspelled or otherwise confusing.”⁹⁰ The objective of this action is to improve document clarity. Additionally, Butterfield also states that most of the geographic names will also be included in an index, in addition to the in-text devices.⁹¹ In addressing critical aspects of annotation, Butterfield devotes particular attention to annotation as it related “books and other publications.”⁹² This category consisted of references to writings by members of the Adams Family, books that were purchased, and books that were read. Butterfield goes on to describe that this information was also to be included within an index. In commenting further on this point, it is stated that the “bibliographic annotation and verification” processes had not been as successful as the editors would have liked, and that further bibliographic study is needed.⁹³

A separate category of annotation exists for providing information regarding textual problems. The policies regarding textual issues align with the overall textual policy, stating that the overall textual policy should be followed when addressing textual concerns.⁹⁴ Lastly, a category is assigned to address concerns related to “gaps in the diary record.”⁹⁵ Butterfield

⁸⁹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lx-lxi.

⁹⁰ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxi.

⁹¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxi.

⁹² Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxi-lxii.

⁹³ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxii.

⁹⁴ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxii.

⁹⁵ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxii.

describes that John Adams' habits as a diarist presented unique challenges. He is described as keeping his diary "only fitfully," and that because of this condition, the diary contains gaps of months and years.⁹⁶ In addressing this issue, the editors have filled in these gaps with summarizations, created by examining his corresponding correspondence. Offering further specificity, Butterfield states that these types of annotations are "usually attached to the first entry following a long break in diary; in a few special cases they are attached to the last entry preceding the break."⁹⁷ This is a very interesting discussion and procedure. Here the editor attempts to address the limitations posed by the documentation.

b. Examination of Documents

The preceding discussion offers a discussion of the editorial procedures and methods that were devised in formulating an editorial approach for editing the *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. Next the critical question to ask is how the application of these procedures and rules influenced the construction of the documentation. Here I offer an examination of the entries for January 27 and February 2, 1756.⁹⁸ In examining these I will focus on how the editorial approach influenced the form that the documents have taken.

John Adams' entry for Tuesday January 27, 1756 is fairly brief. This entry reads "Att my Uncles."⁹⁹ The text of this entry is presented here as it appears in the text of the Butterfield edition. Though this entry is brief it possible to obtain a great deal of understanding regarding the presentation of documentation. First, it is important to focus attention on the dating of this entry. The date "27 TUESDAY." appears as a caption centered above the entry, as described in

⁹⁶ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxii.

⁹⁷ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, lxii.

⁹⁸ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

⁹⁹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

the textual policy. Next it is important to give careful attention to the form of the text, primarily the issue of capitalization and spelling. Here, Adams' spelling of the word "Att" has been preserved. Carefully note how this word is not qualified in any way. Though this spelling is not modernized it can still be understood.¹⁰⁰

The word "Uncles" also offers a unique presentation, which correlates to the editorial philosophy.¹⁰¹ Here, both Adams' spelling and punctuation are preserved. Again, though not modernized, they do not hinder understanding the phrase, or its meaning. This entry also offers an illustration of the editorial principle regarding annotation. The word "Uncles" is associated with a footnote that identifies the individual's name, profession, educational background and marriage history. Because this individual is a family member, he has been the subject of an extensive note. When evaluating this entry, it is found to align with the policies put forth in the editorial statement.¹⁰²

The entry for "2 Monday" (February 2, 1756) is more substantial. This entry reads: "Wrote to John Wentworth by Coll. Josiah Willard. Spent the Eve, sup'd and lodg'd at Major Chandler's, with the universal Scholar, gay, Companion, and accomplish'd Gentleman Mr. Robert Treat Pain. Misty, thick Weather."¹⁰³ In this entry, "John Wentworth" and "Mr. Robert Treat Paine" are associated with footnotes.¹⁰⁴ An examination of this entry finds that it is presented in accordance with the policies put forth in the editorial policy. In this entry, Adams' uses of capitalizations and abbreviations have both been preserved by the editors. Likewise, in this example we see a different use of the footnote. While the two individuals noted are not

¹⁰⁰ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

¹⁰¹ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

¹⁰² Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

¹⁰³ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

¹⁰⁴ Butterfield, *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, 4.

family members of Adams, they are noted as important associates, and thus merited explanation through a footnote.

c. Summary

What does this illustration tell us about the relationship between the theoretical edition and the physical edition, or stated differently, the consideration and application of method? When evaluating the selected documentation edited by Butterfield and his associate editors, there is a well-defined relationship between the methods articulated in the editorial statement and text that appeared within the edition. A comparison of the edited documents and the methodology statement reveals that they were constructed in accordance with editorial procedures. More importantly, though, this example illustrates the nature of the influence of editorial intention on the construction of documentary editions. The editorial procedures described by Butterfield were defined by editorial values. Butterfield's edition was conceived as a work that would make texts accessible and intelligible.

This was made most clear in his decision to adopt the approach developed by Julian P. Boyd. The editing Butterfield articulated in this statement was of a variety that was concerned with providing accurate transcriptions, while also providing a degree of editorial context. Both of these characteristics are present in the entries provided in the *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*.

2. Lester J. Cappon's *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*

Next, as an example of a selective edition, I offer a comparison of the theoretical edition and its physical manifestation as presented by Lester J. Cappon. I offer Cappon in comparison to

Butterfield because both offer differing approaches in formulating a methodological approach to editing. Though both of these individuals developed projects of differing character, which accounts for some of these differences, they can also be seen as being related to differences in views regarding editorial intention.

The procedures put forth by Butterfield were expansive, strict, and regimented. This can partially be viewed as a consequence of his project. *The Adams Papers* was a massive undertaking. Butterfield was working from a body of 300,000 documents and edited and published multiple series' of collections. This would require a great deal of editorial control. However, Butterfield's theoretical approach can also be viewed as having influence on how the theoretical and physical editions were formulated. Butterfield's emphasis on the role of the editor in constructing collections can also be seen as exerting an influence on his approach in developing a method.

Lester J. Cappon's conception of the editor and the editorial process possessed a different orientation. While conscious of the editor as an intermediary, he was also wary of disruptive editorial influence. This was rooted in his emphasis on the editorial process as one of transmitting evidence. Cappon's selectivity in his editing projects might also be illustrative of this point. Archival knowledge is a central aspect to Cappon's editorial thought. This yields a finer appreciation of the nature of archival relationships, as they relate to editorial practice.

a. Theory and Method

In describing his approach in editing this correspondence and publishing the edition, Cappon wrote that "it seemed desirable also to simplify the editorial process by eliminating headnotes for individual documents, by reducing the annotation, by presenting the letters

chronologically in a series of chapters, each with an introductory essay, and by providing a general introduction on the historical background of the correspondence.”¹⁰⁵ This approach places primacy on the text. The editorial approach described here appears to be attempting to reduce itself to its most essential elements. Cappon is concerned that the edition provides the necessary context that will allow for the appropriate use of the papers; however, he is concerned with providing a context that will not be too disruptive to the documentation itself.

Cappon’s approach is also influenced by the characteristics of documentary relationships. The influence of Boyd’s work on his project is addressed in this editorial statement. First, in terms of constructing the project, Cappon wrote that “readers of the present edition will observe that it leans heavily on the *Papers* for basic documentation to 1789.”¹⁰⁶ From a methodological standpoint, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* also exerted an influence. This influence resulted from Cappon’s understanding of the documentary relationships that existed between Boyd’s edition and his own.

In describing the approach used in transcribing and presenting these materials, Cappon, described the adoption of methods used by Boyd. First, because selected descriptive information was provided in the Jefferson papers, Cappon did not include this information, in most cases, when formulating his edition. Additionally, in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, “decoded passages” were also “copied and rendered in the same manner.”¹⁰⁷ An example of this is the translation of the ampersand to the word “and,” except in cases where this element is essential to the meaning of a word or phrase.¹⁰⁸ In formulating his approach to publishing these letters, Cappon was conscious of the relationship that existed between his work and Boyd’s. Because both projects

¹⁰⁵ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹⁰⁶ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹⁰⁷ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹⁰⁸ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

were concerned with a shared category of documentation, there was a shared relationship between both works as collections. Both projects can be viewed as linked by archival and textual relationships.

During the process of transcription, several guidelines were followed. When transcribing the documents “obvious slips of the pen” were “corrected silently” by the editor.¹⁰⁹ In supporting this approach, Cappon wrote that because of physical limitations, John Adams dictated his letters during the “last eight years of his life,” because his eyesight did not allow him to correct the errors present in his writings.¹¹⁰ For this reason, the editor felt that “it would be misleading to retain” these errors; they were not true to the intent of the author or of the document.¹¹¹ Capitalization also was guided by rules and procedures. It was editorial policy to maintain the capitalization of the documentation with one exception. In the case of the Jefferson letters, often the author would begin his sentences with lowercase letters, rather than uppercase letters. For these instances, all of the words beginning sentences were capitalized by the editor during the transcription process. Here, there was not a concern with this decision altering the meaning, and carrying out this editorial intervention would improve the readability of the documents.¹¹²

Punctuation was also subject to editorial intervention. The guiding policy was that punctuation was to be maintained unless it was felt to obscure the meaning of the document. Additionally, what the editor defined as “excessive punctuation,” best illustrated by John Adams letters, was maintained “to convey the style of the original as much as possible.”¹¹³ In addressing abbreviated words, it was the policy of the editor to not expand abbreviations;

¹⁰⁹ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹¹⁰ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹¹¹ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹¹² Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹¹³ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

however, in cases where the abbreviation could lead to ambiguity or misunderstanding, in terms of meaning, the complete word was provided. Related to this point was the issue of spelling. “Erratic spelling, common in the eighteenth century,” was maintained unless issues of clarity and understandability necessitated its modernization.¹¹⁴ The last critical editorial policy related to the identification of personal names. Rather than being described in footnotes, personal names were identified in an index. In making this decision, Cappon’s concern was in reducing the number of annotations present within the documentation, which reduced the amount of visible editorial intervention on texts themselves.¹¹⁵ In evaluating these policies, Cappon was concerned with balancing a concern with the production of accurate transcriptions, maintaining the intent of the records’ creators, and lastly, creating a body of documentation that could function as evidence and communicate meaning.

A concern in editing and publishing *The Adams-Jefferson Letters* was with reducing the affects of editorial disruption on the publication of the documents. In commenting on this point, Cappon wrote that it was appropriate “to simplify the editorial process by eliminating headnotes for individual documents, by reducing the annotation, by presenting letters chronologically in a series of chapters, each with an introductory essay, and by providing a general introduction on the historical background of the correspondence.”¹¹⁶ In defending this approach Cappon went on to write that “to streamline the scholarly trappings of an edition designed primarily for the general reader is more compelling now than in 1948.”¹¹⁷ This description reveals the unique editorial intent of the work.

¹¹⁴ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

¹¹⁵ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix-xxx.

¹¹⁶ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxviii.

¹¹⁷ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxviii.

There are three critical aspects revealed in these statements. First, Cappon was concerned with the usability of the documents being affected by cluttering them with annotations and intrusive commentary. For this reason the primary means of providing contextual information was through edition and chapter level introductory essays, rather than through annotating the documents themselves. Secondly, a moderate approach to annotation was applied in this edition. Because a large quantity of descriptive information was provided through other editions, readers could be referred to this information and it was not necessary to reproduce it. Secondly, information that would have been included in explanatory footnotes could be provided through the use of the editor's introductory statements. As a result, the effects of editorial intervention would be less visible on the documents themselves. Lastly, it is important to comment on Cappon's editorial intention regarding use. Here, it is articulated that this work was anticipated to be used by a general audience, beyond research historians. This reality affected the approach taken in formulating this work.¹¹⁸

b. Examination of Documents

How did these procedures influence the final form of the documents contained within this edition? A critical examination reveals that there is a clear relationship between Cappon's editorial policies, the idealized edition, and the edited documents' ultimate physical form. This relationship will be illustrated by a critical examination and narration of two letters.

The first letter, written by Abigail Adams to Thomas Jefferson on "Decemr. 20th. 1785," bears evidence of the influence of the editorial device.¹¹⁹ First, a general review of this letter reveals the absence of annotation. The editor has not offered any explanatory content directly

¹¹⁸ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 108-109.

¹¹⁹ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix-xxx.

within the document. This is keeping with the policy of providing contextual information through the use of introductory and editorial essays. While context is provided, it does not disrupt the document's form.

Secondly, the editorial procedure to maintain spelling and abbreviation, when it does not affect the meaning of the document, is also apparent. The word "Decemr." was maintained by the editor; in this instance the meaning of the word can be understood.¹²⁰ Likewise, when referring to John Adams within this letter, Abigail Adams writes "Mr. A." Again, within the context of this body of letters, "Mr.A." can be understood to refer to John Adams.¹²¹ In this instance preserving the original form of the abbreviation did not disrupt meaning, nor was an expansion of the word required.

This letter also demonstrates the transcription procedure regarding capitalization. A review of the document shows that the capitalization of the original was preserved in the presentation of the document. Illustrating this point is one line of the Abigail Adams-Jefferson letter, which reads "The Dieties however shewed that they were subject to Humane frailty and got a few Limbs dislocated in their Tour."¹²² Here the original capitalization is preserved along with the 18th century spelling of the word "shewed," which when modernized would read "showed." However, none of these issues disrupt from the meaning of the text, and the editor's preservation of this capitalization and spelling keeps with the intent of the author and of the original document.¹²³

¹²⁰ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 108.

¹²¹ Cappon, *The Adams Jefferson Letters*, 108.

¹²² Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 108.

¹²³ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 108.

Another example, a letter from John Adams to Thomas Jefferson written on “Decr. 20. 1785,” also displays these characteristics.¹²⁴ First, it is important to note the abbreviation of the word “December” as “Decr.” is preserved.¹²⁵ The form of this word is easily understood; meaning is not disrupted. It is also important to note that the phrasing of December is different from the form used in the previous document. Both forms are presented; both intentions are respected.

This document demonstrates an example of Cappon’s use of annotation within documents. As stated in the editorial statement, the objective was to limit the use of annotation to cases where it was needed to provide for the intelligibility of the document. In this document, the word “Reverberes,” a type of reflecting lamp, is defined using a footnote.¹²⁶ This object is described in reference to the transport of oil. Understanding that this term refers to a lamp is necessary in understanding the meaning of the sentence; discussion related to the transport of a type of oil that could be used to light lamps.¹²⁷ Here the editorial decision was made to supply a note, because knowing the term is required for the document’s immediate intelligibility.

Another notable point illustrated by this document is the editor’s decision to preserve the punctuation of John Adams’ letters. In the introductory statement, Cappon explained the decision to preserve Adams’ somewhat unusual punctuation because it was critical in understanding the “character” of his documentation. This letter illustrates this documentary condition, and the editor’s decision to maintain its form.¹²⁸

One letter of Adams’ letter reads “If Boylstone would Act in concert with him, his Capital would be equal to every Thing which relates to the Business: But, he is a Singular

¹²⁴ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 109-110.

¹²⁵ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 109.

¹²⁶ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 109.

¹²⁷ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 109.

¹²⁸ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, xxix.

Character, irritable, fiery, avaricious, parcimonious, to a degree, that made me always doubtful whether he would succeed: besides his Age and Ignorance of the Language.”¹²⁹ Here, the uniqueness of Adams’ punctuation is kept. This does not disrupt the meaning of the document, and its presentation in this manner creates a more accurate representation of the original source. It is also important to note that his capitalization and spelling have also been preserved. In this letter Cappon successfully limits editorial intervention while providing a representation that is true to the original document and its creator.

3. Conclusions

These examples demonstrate the nature of the relationship between the theoretical edition (the edition as an idea) and the physical form the edition took through edited documents. In these examples the form of the printed documents possessed the characteristics described in the formal editorial statements. Both of these elements were influenced by the editor’s intent, and a particular view regarding the function of the editor. Butterfield and Cappon both possessed different ideas regarding readership and the nature of editorial intervention. These attitudes were visible in editorial statements, which described the forms their works were to take, and ultimately, their works’ finalized forms.

D. SUMMARY

This chapter provides an analysis of the different variants of editorial thought that were present during the early modern period of editing. It also offered commentary on the nature of editorial intention as a factor that influenced the development of editorial ideas, and the affects of

¹²⁹ Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 109.

both of these elements on the production of documentary editions. Though there were variations in terms of how editors conceptualized their roles, and their work, there was a shared concern with a set of primary elements. In this sense these variations can be viewed as variations on a set of themes. Editorial thought of the early modern period was defined by a concern with the replication of text, the offering of context, and the description of documents. The differing views on how to carry out these functions was related to the editor's view regarding how to make documents accessible, both physically and intellectually, and how present the editor should be within the work.

While these attitudes were critical in affecting the work of editors, contextual elements also influenced early modern editorial practice. In the next chapter, "Editorial Contexts," the primary external elements, which influenced editors, are identified, described, and evaluated.

VII. EDITORIAL CONTEXTS

Documentary editing, as a practice concerned with producing original sources, occurred within a larger scholarly context. This context can be divided into two primary categories, contexts of access and context of use. Documentary editors operated within both of these contexts. In constructing editions, editors, with a particular intent, developed a record rooted and influenced by their attitudes regarding original sources. This defined how a reader would make use of their works, and the character of use that the editions would allow. Editors set parameters, which defined use.

However, the editorial function can also be viewed as an access function. Through publication, the editors disseminated original sources of a particular type and that possessed specific characteristics, as a result of the editorial procedure. Because of these two conditions, the editor can be viewed as being closely aligned with communities of users and allied professional communities concerned with providing access to original sources. Editors and their works were uniquely positioned within these two communities. In this chapter a discussion of the relationship between early modern editing and these communities is presented. This discussion provides an evaluation of three contexts. These contexts can be defined as archival, historiographic, and governmental and correlate to communities concerned with access, use, and support.

A. INTRODUCTION

The practice of early modern documentary editing existed within an environment made up of allied communities, each of which exerted their own form of influence. These contexts can be described as contexts of access and contexts of use and correlate to the archival, historiographic, and governmental communities. Though these two aspects are closely related, there are subtle differences that can serve as distinguishing characteristics.

Access can be viewed in terms of structures, both human and technical, that would allow for the access of original sources and other categories of documentation. In the context of an archival repository or a special collections library, access is offered through the presence of intellectual and physical controls. Archivists and special collections librarians determine the nature of elements necessary for obtaining physical access to historical documentation. The context consists of elements and procedures that determine the degree to which a user may, or may not, engage with a resource. Examples of these elements are archival descriptions, reference services, and duplication services.

While the context of access can be defined by the structures that are required, developed, and applied, in order to provide access to documentation, the context of use is strongly defined by the attitudes and beliefs that influence the requirements of original sources. The context of use consists of the attitudes that define the requirements of original sources, both in terms of what sources are required for research, and also in regard to the requirements of sources used as evidence. During the study's period, this community consists primarily of academic historians, though attitudes regarding the requirements of a general readership can also be identified and evaluated.

Editors operated within both of these contexts. Like the archivist, the editor creates access structures. The documents contained in an edition are transcribed on to a particular medium and are supplemented by a system of notes that provide access to contextual information. Engagement with the materials is influenced by these elements, similar to the structures implemented in physical archives. In summary, the editor functions in a manner similar to that of the archivist. Though the specific mechanics, and the nature of the materials, differ, the overall intent is shared. In devising avenues for working with materials, the editor, like the archivist, applies a set of controls that determine how the sources will be used.

Use, as an activity, is better defined in terms of the attitudes and beliefs that influence the fundamental characteristics of a source and the user's attitudes towards the object. An original source has value because of its unique communicative power. The object has this power because of its ability to reliably convey facts. In addition to these conditions, which define if a source can even be used as an original source, value also defines whether a source, at a more macro level, is of use to a potential researcher or reader. This point is related to the idea of selection.

The editor is also positioned within this context of use. Editorial attitudes influence the selection of material for publication, the characteristics of the editing required for producing usable editions, and lastly, the requirements for ensuring the reliability and authenticity of the materials contained within the work. Though the editor begins with an original source, the object that is produced can only be described as a surrogate and as a representation. Because of this, careful attention is given to the preservation of the edited materials authenticity and reliability through a concern with accurate transcription and documentation associated with the materials context. Aspects that are unconscious to the original must be consciously re-created in the surrogate. Because of these characteristics, the editor operates, to some degree, as both an

archivist and historian. This attitude is present in the writings Julian P. Boyd and Lester J. Cappon.

In addition to operating on the boundaries of these contexts, editors were influenced by the activities of archivists, special collections librarians, and scholars. Editors' comments illustrated how the inferred needs of a potential user population influenced the selection of materials and the manner in which they would be presented, through the editing process.

Support for the Founding Fathers projects was motivated by the attitudes regarding what subject topics warranted research, and which areas would be best served through documentary publication. Within the confines of the papers, editors demonstrated a concern for the potentially diverse needs of scholars and readers. The underlying logic of comprehensive publication was that a diverse body of materials would serve a larger set of unique research needs. A researcher of Benjamin Franklin could study Franklin the political figure as well as Franklin the scientist.

In addition to the elements that influenced the selection and publication of documentary materials, the requirements of original sources, operating as evidence, also influenced editorial theory and the editing of documents. A principal concern of editors consisted of ensuring that the documents that they produced could function in lieu of the original source document. This necessitated applying an editorial apparatus that would provide for the reliability and authenticity of the document, through making the object available for evaluation. In working with original sources, historians heavily relied on archivists and archival institutions to provide and maintain these conditions. In a sense, the editor had to place the archivist within the text. Through transparency of method, documentation of a document's provenance, and textual clarifications, editors felt that the requirements of authenticity and reliability could be met.

These instances illustrate the characteristics of the external conditions that influenced editorial work. In producing works of a particular kind, published original sources, editors had to contend with the unique needs of their intended user population. This also required creating documents that would meet the expectancies and requirements of evidence. In succinctly describing the nature of this influence, it can be stated that editors contended with meeting the needs of their users through the fixing and replication of archival and documentary functions. The conditions of reliability and authenticity that historians and other readers required of the original source materials were provided for by the archivist and the archival institution. In the context of documentary editing it was the editor who created and maintained these conditions.

These influences operate mainly at the document level. However, at a more macro level the federal government, in particular the National Historical Publications Commission (NHPC), and later the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), influenced editorial practice. In setting an agenda for documentary publication in the United States, the agency defined what projects, figures, and topics were of critical importance. This influence cannot be underestimated. The work of the NHPC created a programmatic agenda for the American practice of documentary publication, but more importantly, the agency also advocated an approach that would influence the practices of editing projects. Influenced by Boyd's *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, the commission argued for the comprehensive treatment of figures of similar stature. With this, the building of collections became a stated objective of documentary editing practice.¹

These editorial contexts can be classified into two categories of material influence. The first category of influence can be described at the document level. Influence of this type consists

¹ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 17-19.

of the archival and user factors that affected how the documents themselves are constructed as evidence. Evidence of this influence can be seen in the editorial apparatus applied to the documents, the nature of annotations and explanatory notes used to clarify and narrate the text, and lastly, in editors' concern with documenting the provenance and context of the printed document. The standards of archivists and historians can be seen within this category of influence.²

The second category of influence is more macro in nature and functions at the object level, the documentary edition as a whole. Influence of this type reveals itself prominently in the subject of the edition and in its scope. Historians and the NHPC were most responsible for this category of influence. Editors constructed documentary works in reference to the perceived needs and interests of their anticipated scholarly and general readership. Evidence of this influence can be seen in the documentation produced by editors, the proposals produced by the NHPC, and historians' assessments of editorial projects.

In summary, when evaluating context, it is important to recognize that in editing, editors engaged in two acts: the *collecting* and *construction* of evidence. Object level concerns influenced the collecting function of editors while document level concerns influenced the editorial function of constructing evidence. These factors influenced the form the editions took in their published presentations.

This description of contexts and factors provides an overview of the general environment within which editions were created and how this environment influenced the construction of documentary editions. In the remainder of this chapter, these contexts, and their influence on documentary editing, will be described, discussed, and evaluated in greater specificity.

² Brooks, *Research in Archives*, 27-31.

B. THE INFLUENCE OF ARCHIVAL FUNCTIONS ON DOCUMENTARY EDITING

The success of the editor's project would begin and end with the usability of his or her documents. For this reason, it is appropriate to begin with a discussion of the influence of the archival community and archival procedures on the construction of documentary editions. This discussion will consist of two parts. First, I will provide an overview of the relationship between the archival and editorial communities. Of particular emphasis in this discussion is the degree to which the archival community was concerned with the practice of documentary editing. Secondly, I will provide a discussion of the nature of the relationship between the editorial and archival functions

1. Archival Engagement and the Function of Documentary Editing

In order to understand the relationship between the archivist and the editor, it is first important to understand the role and function of collecting repositories. While the late 19th and early 20th centuries saw a great movement in the amount of material gathered, organized, and made accessible by collecting the institutions, the middle decades of the 20th century saw movement in the amount of material made available by these institutions. Institutions and archivists demonstrated a commitment to the dissemination of materials beyond their repository walls, through the form of reference services, print publication and through the use of photostat and microfilm.³

The archival profession has undergone a process of refinement, similar to that described of the editing function. In his 1939 presidential address to the Society of American Archivists,

³ Shelley, "The Publication Program of the Maryland Historical Society," 318-319; Weinberg, "Publication Program of the Philadelphia Archives," 196-197; Shelley, "The Choice of a Medium for Documentary Publication," 365-367.

Albert Ray Newsome gave a talk titled “The Archivist in American Scholarship.”⁴ In opening his talk Newsome stated that “The plain record of archival activity and development in the United States during the past few years indicates clearly that archival interests have been nationalized and professionalized,” and that because of this, “the professional role of the archivist in American culture merits careful examination and evaluation.”⁵

Archivists and editors can be seen as being influenced by similar motivations to collect, construct, and disseminate. The pages of the history journals and the American archival community’s primary journal, *The American Archivist*, provides a catalog of discussions regarding methods of determining what materials to select for dissemination, methods for doing so, and the use of technology in facilitating this process. Though methods for allowing for the wider accessibility of documentation differed between archivists and editors, both communities shared a concern with access, and both parties experimented with methods for doing so. Here, Newsome calls for a critical reflection of the nature of archival functions and societal function of the editor.

This is similar to the editorial discussions that occurred during the early decades of the early 20th century within the editing community. Though this discussion was narrower in scope, the primary issues were related to standards and definitions of use, there was a shared period of formalization and evaluation. The conversations initiated by Newsome in this dialogue were larger in scope. His concern was with the growth of the archival function into aspects of public life and what this required of the archivist. In summary, Newsome found that the function of the American archivist was to serve as “a scholar, an expert technician skilled in the arts of his

⁴ Albert Ray Newsome, “The Archivist in American Scholarship,” *The American Archivist* 2:4 (October 1939): 217-224.

⁵ Newsome, “The Archivist in American Scholarship,” 217.

profession, and a public administrator.”⁶ Here, the archivist is positioned as an expert of documentation, concerned with his or her institution, but in addition, the American archivist also serves a larger societal function that comes through making materials available to a wider public. At a macro level, the archivists and editors of the middle decades of 20th century are linked together through similar self-evaluative discussion.

Similarly, the editorial and archival functions can be viewed as sharing similar methodological functions, rooted in historical method. Susan Grigg notes that the “classical formulation of historical method in the United States” can be divided into three elements.⁷ These are research, which Grigg defines as “the identification and location of sources and the selection of evidence from them.”⁸ Though made in reference to the process of carrying out formal research, editors and archivists work can be viewed in these terms. Archivists and editors are both concerned with the location and description of items, as a means of creating usable collections. The second element described by Grigg is analysis, which is defined in terms of “external and internal criticism,” and is concerned with evaluating the reliability and authenticity of a source.⁹ Editors and archivists, too, carried out this function. In evaluating materials for publication and retention, editors and archivists critically reviewed materials that they were concerned with making accessible. The last element described by Grigg is synthesis, which she describes simply as “interpretation.”¹⁰ Archivists and editors made their work available through interpretation acts.

⁶ Newsome, “The Archivist in American Scholarship,” 222-223.

⁷ Susan Grigg, “Archival Practice and the Foundations of Historical Method,” *Journal of American History* 78:1 (June 1991): 228.

⁸ Grigg, “Archival Foundations,” 228.

⁹ Grigg, “Archival Foundations,” 228.

¹⁰ Grigg, “Archival Foundations,” 228. In addition to these shared relationships in terms of historical relationships, archivists and editors are also linked by a concern with specific categories of documentation. This study has illustrated the presence of editorial concern regarding the nature of documentary editions as a category of documentation. Archivists had a similar concern. Andre Hinding notes that during the 1960’s archivists began to

The decisions made in building collections, and the processes of making them physically and intellectually accessible, requires an evaluation of the sources and the nature of intended use. By necessity, this function is interpretive. Though Grigg notes that in the contemporary environment, this model has declined, it was influential during the early modern period of editing.¹¹

These previous aspects relate to larger theoretical concerns that link these two communities together. During the early modern period, evidence of a more direct relationship can be viewed, with archivists contributing to editorial discussions. First archivists contributed to this dialogue publishing case studies of institutional publication programs.¹² These consisted of evaluations of editorial projects and discussions of institutions own editorial activities. Like editorial case studies, these are primarily descriptive in nature.

Collecting institutions and archivists have been engaged in the publication of original sources. Original sources were published in letterpress, disseminated through microfilm, and issued through magazines and pamphlets. Just as the mechanisms for dissemination varied, so did the reasons for this publication. Materials were disseminated through a variety of *printed* forms in order to serve the needs of researchers and users, and in the case of primary sources, disseminated through institutional magazines and pamphlets, to increase the visibility of its collection. The distinction between this archival publishing and documentary editing was that

question the documentary materials that they had collected and maintained, and began to evaluate how to develop a more holistic documentary record. Editors and archivists are both similarly linked by this concern. For a discussion of this aspect, see Andrea Hinding, "Inventing a Concept of Documentation," *Journal of American History* 80:1 (June 1993): 169-170.

¹¹ Grigg, "Archival Foundations," 228.

¹² For examples of this work see: Memory F. Mitchell, "Editing the Papers of a Contemporary Governor," *American Archivist* 33:1 (January 1970): 11-18; Donald H. Mugridge, "The Adams Papers," *American Archivist* 25:4 (October 1962):449-554; and William H. Runge, "The Madison Papers," *American Archivist* 20:4 (October 1957): 313-317.

the publication programs developed by repositories supplemented their access agendas.

Publication was not the central dissemination function.

A common theme linking these discussions was a concern with format and form, in terms of the production of these surrogates. Archivists authored assessments of these practices as well as recommendations on procedure. An example of a discussion of policy and procedure is C.C. Crittenden's 1940 article "Publication Policies for Archival and Historical Agencies."¹³ Here Crittenden presents a report of the activities of the Society of American Archivists' Committee on the Publication of Archival Materials. This consists of a programmatic summary of the Committee's recommendations. Here, general procedures are laid out, for example, in terms of the types of publications that should be produced, and the infrastructure required for supporting the publication of documentary materials by collecting institutions.¹⁴ Guidelines are provided that the Committee felt would allow institutions to develop sustainable publishing programs.

In this next section, I will first discuss the relationship of the archival function of dissemination in reference to documentary editing, and will then discuss the dialogue of editing and dissemination that occurred between these two groups. This will provide an overview of the nature, character, and influence of these activities and discussions.

2. Disseminating Archival Evidence and Its Relationship to Editorial Knowledge

Historical editing can be described as partially operating within an archival frame of reference. In describing their work, early modern editors used two primary points of reference to discuss their craft and philosophy. These are the works and ideas of other editors and the formal

¹³ C.C. Crittenden, "Publication Policies for Archival and Historical Agencies," *American Archivist* 3:4 (October 1940): 245-250.

¹⁴ Crittenden, "Publication Policies," 248-249.

archive as a site for gathering, containing, disseminating and providing access to archival materials.

A repository could disseminate this evidence in a number of ways. Archival descriptions could be shared and would provide collection level information pertaining to original sources. Repositories also disseminated archival evidence through access to physical artifacts within the controlled setting of the archival repository. Though this dissemination is constrained, it occurs within the confines of the repository. Circulation occurs between the institution and the individual. The circulated item is the artifact itself. However, this can still be viewed as a form of dissemination, though narrower when compared to the nature of the dissemination with which editors were concerned.¹⁵

American archivists of this period were also concerned with the dissemination of archival evidence through the circulation of surrogates. Archivists engaged in discussions regarding how the use of duplication processes could affect their work, and leading repositories developed publishing programs, which resulted in the production of collections that could be shared and exchanged in multiple formats. More importantly, archivists enthusiastically presented discussions of these efforts to the larger scholarly community.¹⁶ These instances illustrate that American archivists of the middle 20th century were greatly concerned with the dissemination of archival evidence in a variety of forms. At its heart, a central function of the archival enterprise is the dissemination function, both of the artifacts themselves and surrogates.

Additionally, the archival function was also greatly concerned with description, though archivists used finding aids and file cards, rather than annotations. In description, archivists provided contextual information that was required to effectively engage with original sources,

¹⁵ Phillip C. Brooks, *Research in Archives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969): 19-24

¹⁶ See descriptive case studies.

and to evaluate their authenticity and reliability. In these descriptions, archivists conveyed information regarding the creator of archival materials, how they came to reside within a given archival repository, and their relationship to other objects and creators. All of this information provided a history or genealogy of the evidence with which the archivist was concerned. The objects archivists disseminated were made usable through description.¹⁷

Lastly, archivists were engaged in acts of construction, or building. The development of archival collections is directly linked to collecting activities. Archivists' decisions to collect, retain, and describe are highly conscious decisions and are linked to an institution's goals of access. In addition, archivists' collections, and information about them, were disseminated through systems that they themselves developed. Appraisal policies, finding aids, surrogates, and reference services are all mechanisms that define how a collection is developed, maintained, and disseminated. The archivist *builds* a collection in many ways.¹⁸

In terms of functional similarities, archivists and editors can be viewed as being engaged in similar activities. Both groups engaged in exercises that were heavily influenced by collecting activities and disseminating activities. Archivists and editors can both be described as experts of original sources, with their own unique orientations. Maintaining artifacts and producing surrogates are two distinct activities. Both are concerned with their own unique collection buildings activities.

However, there were distinct differences between the underlying philosophy that influenced editorial publishing and that of archival publishing. In a 1965 article Charles E. Lee, at that time serving as director of the South Carolina Archives department, described a set of "general axioms," in the form of six rules, regarding documentary publication within the context

¹⁷ Phillip C. Brooks, *Research in Archives*, 27-31.

¹⁸ Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice*, 25-30.

of the archival institution. First, Lee writes that “I think that you should choose to publish that unpublished documentary record which is most central to an understanding of your own archives.”¹⁹ Here, the archivist and editor are in agreement regarding the issue of duplicate publication. Like the editor, the archivist does not want to expend resources on publishing documents that already exist in an acceptable form. An aspect of this statement that is particularly interesting is how Lee positions documentary publication as an activity that should operate in service to the institutions primary objectives and collections. In this regard, dissemination through publication can be conceptualized as a form of advocacy and outreach.

Lee also illustrates that there are differences in terms of how editors and archivists viewed the function of documentary publishing, as it related to their specific work practices. Lee’s second rule is that “you do not publish for the sake of the historian and still less for the sake of the genealogist and organization joiner.”²⁰ For whose sake did the archivist publish? According to Lee, publication serves two primary functions. First, “because preservation of your archives and the interests of your parent institution necessitate it,” and secondly, “because you hope that you can seduce these customers [researchers] into research more central to your purpose.”²¹ Again, the act of publishing occurs in service to the collection. This point is related to his third rule. According to Lee, the archivist, and the archival institution, should “not publish simply because the record is interesting, curious, or fascinating,” that “in more technical terms, in publishing records, as in evaluating them for possible destruction, you think first of their evidential value and only secondly of their informational value.”²²

¹⁹ Lee, “Documentary Reproduction,” 359.

²⁰ Lee, “Documentary Reproduction,” 359.

²¹ Lee, “Documentary Reproduction,” 359.

²² Lee, “Documentary Reproduction,” 359.

This statement is particularly interesting and illustrates a uniquely archival view as it relates to documentary publication. First, Lee draws parallels between the practices of selecting materials for publication within an edition and selecting original artifacts for retention within an archival collection. In comparing a documentary edition and a body of archival materials as different categories of collections, the principles of editorial selection and archival appraisal can be seen as being closely related.

Two of Lee's recommendations are more immediately practical in scope. Rules number four and five are related to the financial realities of documentary publication. Lee writes that the archivist should only "publish what you have a reasonable demand for."²³ An edition size of 500 volumes is recommended. And secondly, the archivist "should undertake to publish only so much as your resources permit you to publish."²⁴ Here, Lee addresses the point that documentary publication is expensive in terms of the cost and labor required to produce an edition, and that these realities should influence the overall scope of any edition.

Lee's last comment is related to the principle of provenance. He writes that, regarding documentary publication that "generally speaking, you will publish your own records rather than someone else's."²⁵ In clarifying his use of the term, "generally speaking," Lee states that this term is included "because on occasion you will find that somebody else has a record that you are convinced ought to be yours."²⁶ This perspective, the archivist as editor, is quite different from that of the documentary editor.

The document editor, to a degree, exists independently of a collection. In formulating an edition, documentary editors devise the published collections that they are going to create.

²³ Lee, "Documentary Reproduction," 359.

²⁴ Lee, "Documentary Reproduction," 360.

²⁵ Lee, "Documentary Reproduction," 360.

²⁶ Lee, "Documentary Reproduction," 360.

Published collections are assembled from multiple collections residing in unique repositories. Provenance, as documentary editors are concerned with the concept, is concerned with the relationship between the editorial subject and his or her papers. This is quite different from sense in which Lee is concerned with provenance. For Lee, the collection with which the archivist is concerned is the one that resides within his or her own repository. Provenance, here, is defined by the relationship to the institution. This discussion illustrates the distinctions between how editors and archivists conceptualize the publication of original sources.

3. Using Archival Concepts

During the early modern period, how was the editorial community affected by the archival community? First, it is critical to consider the editor's concern with archival principles. As demonstrated in this dissertation, an emerging theme of editors during the early modern period was an increased concern with the idea of completeness in regards to publishing documentary materials. Editors, and sponsoring agencies, became increasingly concerned with the idea of publishing complete collections that contained materials that the subjects generated and received. Here, the concern was with the nature of documentary relationships. This practice is closely related to the archivists' concern with the fonds, or "the entire body of records of an organization, family, or individual that have been created and accumulated as the result of an organic process reflecting the functions of the creator."²⁷ Another term for this object was the record group.

The underlying principle of the fonds is that records are generated organically as a result of actions, activities, and events. Archivists are concerned with not only preserving records, but

²⁷ Defined in Pearce-Moses, "Fonds," *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists), accessed online at http://www.archivists.org/glossary/term_details.asp?DefinitionKey=756 (accessed June 15, 2010)

also with documenting record relationships, in terms of how they were arranged by the creator.

The term “*le respect pour les fonds* (respect the fonds),” is directly related to this concern.

Archivists are concerned with preserving original order as a means of providing for the reliability and authenticity of original sources.²⁸

Editors differed from archivists in regard to their concern with this principle. Editorial discussion of the middle 20th century demonstrated a concern with principles related to the unity of records and the organic nature of their creation and dispersal. However, editors were less concerned with the management of relationships than they were ordering relationships. Editors were concerned with the intellectual relationships, evidenced by a concern with bringing together related correspondence and in illustrating the genealogy of critical pieces of documentation. But, as an ordering device, the primary guiding principle was time. Chronological schemes were the primary mechanisms for displaying documents. In this approach editors demonstrate a concern with the idea of the record groups. This is best illustrated by the example presented by selective editions, where a particular category of a body of records is selected for publication.

But, this adherence to chronological order is also keeping with archival principles. In his work on the history of archival theory, Richard C. Berner quotes Robert M. Warner and Ruth B. Bordin, then affiliated with the University of Michigan, as stating that “no system of arranging personal papers other than the chronological one comes as close to life as it is experienced.”²⁹ This statement is made in regards to unorganized papers, which for the most part, the papers associated with editing projects would be considered. In working with bodies of records, in the form that they receive them, editors follow this archival principle.

²⁸ Defined in Pearce-Moses, “*le respect pour les fonds*,” *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists), accessed online at http://www.archivists.org/glossary/term_details.asp?DefinitionKey=756 (accessed June 15, 2010)

²⁹ Richard C. Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), 55-56.

Editors demonstrated similar eagerness to adopt other archival principles. As discussed in this study, J. Franklin Jameson assisted in ushering in a period of critical reassessment. His concerns regarding the absence of genealogical information associated with the document was closely related to the archivists' concern with provenance. In the archival sense, provenance is associated with the context of a record's creation, as well as with the context under which a record was received. Both of these aspects are important for understanding the nature of an object's reliability or authenticity.

Editors were concerned with multiple contexts of creation. During an editing project, the editor was charged with managing a complex body of documentation, both in printed and original forms. In the context of printed documents, the editor was tasked with evaluating the accuracy of a document through evaluating the contextual information provided by the originating editor. In the case of original documentation that the editor evaluated, the concern was with evaluating the contextual information captured by the individual or institution. In both of these instances, the editor is required to parse through context in order to determine a document's utility. Here, the editor is similar to the archivist in that both become experts in evaluating context. However, editors of scholarly grade editions are also responsible for the creation of contexts. In this regard the editors may possess a heightened sensitivity to the nature of context and provenance.

It can be demonstrated that early modern editors carried out their work in accordance to similar practices and procedures that were carried out by archivists. The critical question to ask is regarding the nature of this relationship. Were editors influenced by the archival community? Were archivists influenced by the editorial community?

One solution to this question might come through a careful consideration of J. Franklin Jameson, Julian P. Boyd, and Lyman H. Butterfield. These individuals are representative of a class of individuals that were critical in the development of structures for supporting documentary materials. Each of these individuals was also involved in editorial, archival, and historical contexts. For this reason they might have recognized shared concerns that were document focused, not strictly profession focused. It might be the case that the nature of editorial influence comes from larger macro concerns and practices. Examples of these being processes like collecting, selecting, and describing. A discussion of the processes carried out by archivists and editors reveal subtle differences, but not differences in terms of the general function of providing access to original sources.³⁰

C. DOCUMENTARY EDITIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

Documentary editions were largely conceived of by editors as tools for historical researchers. For this reason it is important to take into account the nature of the relationship between the editorial community and the community of researchers that would use these editions. In particular, I am concerned with the degree to which the research needs of potential user population influenced the development of these works. This can be accomplished through evaluating reviews of documentary editions, requirements of sources as evidenced by historical research methods manuals, and in considering the nature of editorial inference regarding its own potential user population.

³⁰ Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice*, 17-23.

1. The Requirements of Sources

A review of classic historical research methods manuals of the mid 20th century provides insights into the requirements of sources, based on what was methodologically acceptable. In regards to sources, a great amount of evidence was placed on matters related to internal and external criticism, determining if the document is accurate and if the document could be trusted. Gilbert J. Garraghan, in his work *A Guide to Historical Method*, devoted five chapters to topics related to evaluating credibility, integrity, and authenticity of historical sources.³¹ Schafer and Hockett each devoted two chapters in their classic works to this topic.³² In describing the requirements of the sources, the most pressing concern is in regards to issues related to trustworthiness.

Editors demonstrated a concern with these concepts and have created mechanisms that allow the reader to validate the authenticity and reliability of the work. It cannot be forgotten that editors themselves are historians. J. Franklin Jameson's assessment of faulty published editions was an editor's warning, but it was also a historian's complaint. He argued for the necessity to include information that would allow for the evaluation of published documents, and that would preserve their integrity. Secondly, the use of explanatory notes within the editions, which editors implemented to aid in clarifying the text, assists with internal criticism.

In evaluating influence, it can be stated that editors were influenced by the requirements of historical scholarship, including their intended users, in carrying out editorial activities. Editors have stated that their primary audience consisted of historians, both scholars and students. Documentary editors of this period were well aware of the requirements of a source.

³¹ Gilbert J. Garraghan, *A Guide to Historical Method* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1940).

³² Homer Carey Hockett, *The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing* (New York: Macmillan, 1961); Robert Jones Shafer, ed., *A Guide to Historical Method*, 3d ed. (Homewood, Il.: The Dorsey Press, 1980).

The movement towards a more rigorous form of editing can be viewed as a reconsideration of the documentary edition as a scholarly source. The increase in the editorial consciousness of the middle 20th century can also be viewed as a characteristic of this recognition. As shown in this study selected editors became increasingly aware of their role in constructing historical evidence. These dialogues consisted of phrases like “transmission,” “intermediary,” and “purity.”³³ Editors were well aware of their potential corrupting influence of the documentation. Their understanding of this possible influence can be seen as guiding editorial practices and procedures.

In this regard, editors can be defined as possessing a theoretical understanding of their users’ needs and requirements. This understanding influenced their approach in editing. Early modern editing’s concern with provenance, description, reliability, and context was oriented towards meeting the requirements of a source. Conceptually, each of these elements aligns with the concept of editorial transparency. Through providing access to contextual, provenance, and descriptive information, the editor would leave the documents open to assessment and criticism by the reader. This is required for the document to be evaluated as a reliable and authentic source.

Because, as has been stated, documentary editions can be conceptualized as hybrid works, information of this type was considered to be quite important. Though the source materials for the edition are unconscious, and generated according to archival principles, documentary editions are highly conscious. Every aspect of the document, from transcription, to annotation, to presentation is defined by the editor. Early modern editors were cognizant of this reality. These editors were also aware that many editions of the 19th century were not transparent

³³ Cappon, “A Rationale for Historical Editing,” 137-139.

in terms of revealing their gaps, deletions, and alterations. This influenced early modern editors' approach to developing context.

Critical to early modern editing were the concepts of completeness and comprehensiveness, illustrated by the work of Julian P. Boyd. The development and implementation of these concepts within documentary works can also be seen to have its origins in editors' understanding of the nature of historical evidence and in the theorized understanding of their users. Boyd was concerned with incompleteness. Two primary reasons for editing *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* were first, the incompleteness of previous editions of Jefferson papers, and secondly, the large body of Jefferson documentation that remained unpublished.³⁴ In conceptualizing this work, Boyd was concerned with developing a usable collection that would provide a full topical and documentary record, making it accessible to a large number of users.³⁵

How well did early modern editors anticipate the needs of their users? Though the influence of the historiographic context can be viewed primarily in terms of editors' self-knowledge of the nature of historical evidence and in their theoretical understanding of users, this influence can still be evaluated. Did editors accurately envision their users? This can be understood by evaluating user attitudes.

Robert L. Brubaker's study of editing activity found that the reception of documentary editions was positive. The volumes themselves were seen as carrying out a critical scholarly function. However, he did identify points of disagreement among the reviewers. These related to the practices of annotation and selection.³⁶

Regarding annotation he found varying opinion regarding what was acceptable. The most critical aspect was the nature of editorial disruption. One reviewer lauded a volume of *The*

³⁴ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Commission*, 5-6.

³⁵ Boyd, *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Commission*, 13-16.

³⁶ Brubaker, "The Publication of Historical Sources," 216-218.

Papers of James Madison for its “meticulous, even exhaustive annotation;” however, another reviewer criticized Boyd’s annotations in Volume 1 of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*: “I think most scholars will agree that the documents can safely be left to speak for themselves in later volumes to a greater degree than they have in this one.”³⁷ This illustrates the challenges posed when creating a fixed collection.

These instances illustrate the difficulty of producing a fixed collection for a large body of users. This also illustrates the difficulty of theorizing a general user population. Early modern editing was based upon this type of theoretical user knowledge. Knowledge of this kind, together with the editor’s specific theoretical beliefs, influenced the form an edition took. Within a general frame, editors were influenced by their users’ requirements of historical evidence. However, there was variation within this frame.

D. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND DOCUMENTARY PUBLICATION

In evaluating the influence of the federal government on documentary editing during the early modern period, it is helpful to begin with commentary offered by E. Berkeley Tompkins about the foundations of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). During the early modern period, its predecessor body, the NHPC experienced two critical milestones that are noteworthy when viewed within the context of this study. These milestones can be viewed in terms of two primary categories: programmatic and supportive.³⁸

The most direct form of influence that can be detected is the NHPC’s role in establishing an agenda for documentary editing, both in terms of the categories of projects that should be

³⁷ Brubaker, “The Publication of Historical Sources,” 217-218.

³⁸ Tompkins, “The NHPRC in Perspective,” 89-92.

edited, but also, how they should be carried out. Boyd's presence was a factor in influencing the agenda that was presented in the NHPC's 1954 report.³⁹ In this sense, the NHPC can be viewed as extending Boyd's influence. Here, we have evidence of a reciprocal relationship. The approach taken in publishing *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was cited as a model example by the NHPC and was used as a model for encouraging other comprehensive editing projects, including the Founding Fathers papers.⁴⁰

What characteristics did the NHPC assign to editing projects? First, there was a concern with completeness. In providing a context for their publication agenda, the NHPC provided a historical survey of the editorial activity in the United States, with an emphasis placed on pre and post Boyd. During the discussion of past editorial projects, issues related to incompleteness were emphasized. Here, the concern was with topical and documentary completeness. The characteristics of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* are used to ground this discussion. Completeness came through the comprehensive selection for publication; this aspect emphasizes the relationship between the subject and the material, and in developing documentary collections based on shared documentary relationships. The best example of this approach is the editorial view regarding the relationships between related sets of correspondence. In this regard the NHPC can be seen as advocating a collection building approach.⁴¹

Another aspect of the NHPC's influence is the definition of documentary publication as a public good. In describing the need for a national program for documentary publication, it is stated that "the better they [United States citizens] understand historical background of our present-day-institutions—social and economic, as well as political—and the ideals, hopes,

³⁹ Tompkins, "The NHPRC in Perspective," 90-91.

⁴⁰ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 9-10.

⁴¹ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 17-19.

accomplishments, and even the failures of the men and women who have made the United States, the safer will be our democracy and the more secure our rights as free men.”⁴² Here, the function of producing documentary editions is described as an activity that will provide for stability and security. However, if we strip this rhetoric down to a more elementary level, the commission is arguing for the idea that there is a wide audience of readers. The vast majority of United States citizens were not historical scholars, but, these individuals would benefit from these works. Though this dialogue is nationalistic in nature, when reduced to its central theme, it is seen to be a statement on readership. A critical influence of the federal government on editing activity was in arguing for this expansion of audience.

This need is framed within the context of incompleteness. It is further stated that historical knowledge is incomplete because it is “hidden away in letters, diaries, journals, reports, and other papers that are not even known to exist or cannot be readily be examined,” and that “many of these papers ought to be published in order that they may be read by all persons who wish to know and understand the history of the United States.”⁴³ Here, documentary publication is conceptualized as an access function that will extend the reach of original sources. Documentary publications are conceived of as a unique form of evidence that can extend an artifact beyond its material boundaries.

In summary, the NHPC’s most critical editorial influence was in developing an argument for a specific editorial philosophy and approach. The NHPC adopted and operationalized the characteristics present with Boyd’s *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. The editorial function conceptualized by the federal government was of a particular character. First, the works that the commission would encourage were intended to be used for an audience beyond that of scholars.

⁴² National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 1.

⁴³ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 1-2.

Editing was conceptualized as a public good. Secondly, the NHPC was concerned with reducing the level of incompleteness in the *published* documentary record. It is important to note that the report articulates two types of documentary records. There is the record made out of original sources, which is hidden, and then there is the published documentary record, which is accessible. In this statement the federal government defines documentary editing as an access function. As a matter of influence, a critical consequence is that the NHPC encouraged extending the boundary of an editorial audience.⁴⁴

The primary function of the 1954 NHPRC report was to define the scope and function of a federal agenda for documentary publication. As the Commission noted, in describing the function of the Commission in 1954, “its chief purpose, so far as the present report is concerned, is to submit a suggested national program for the publication of historical documents.”⁴⁵ In 1954 the NHPC was concerned with established its philosophical and theoretical foundations, along with a preliminary list of subjects. This report addressed conceptual concerns.

In 1963, the Commission moved away from these conceptual concerns and addressed issues related to the resource requirements for maintaining a National Publications Program. The most critical aspect of this report was its statement regarding the financial requirements for producing documentary publications and a call for legislation that would provide funding for this activity.⁴⁶ In this report, the NHPC described its activities in terms of a maturing organization, but one whose activities were limited by the lack of financial resources. This aspect is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but it is important to address.

In describing the financial needs of the Commission, it was stated that in order “to plan a realistic 10-year program,” funds of \$1,000,000 per year would be needed to support proposed

⁴⁴ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 2-3.

⁴⁵ National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication*, 2.

⁴⁶ Tompkins, “The NHPRC in Perspective,” 91-92.

projects and those already in progress.⁴⁷ These funds would be used to support grant-in-aid programs and would be used with matching offers. In describing the sources for these funds, the Commission states that \$500,000 should come through private sources and the remaining \$500,000 should be provided by Congress.⁴⁸ This discussion emphasized the resource intensive nature of large scale editing projects. As a result of this report, legislation was signed into law during July of 1964. This authorized the NHPC to grant funds. However, though the Commission was “authorized an annual appropriation of \$500,000” up until 1971, the largest amount received was \$350,000.⁴⁹ An expansion of documentary editing activity made visible the required material resources. This issue of finance would be a point of debate, when evaluating the cost-benefit relationships of documentary editing.

E. SUMMARY

This chapter defined and described the context that documentary editing took place within, through examining practices, professions, and agencies that carried out activities related to the editorial function. These contexts reveal the varying degrees of influence from these elements on the development of editorial thought and the practice of documentary editing. Archivists and editors were linked together by their shared disciplinary foundations and a concern with providing access to specific categories of documentary materials. Though archivists and editors were concerned with different *physical* objects, both were concerned with providing access to a particular type of historical evidence. As a result, both groups worked with similar concepts, such as authenticity and context. If influence cannot be assumed, then it can be

⁴⁷ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President*, 1-2.

⁴⁸ National Historical Publications Commission, *A Report to the President*, 1-2.

⁴⁹ Tompkins, “The NHPRC in Perspective,” 91-92.

concretely stated that their activities occurred in parallel to one another in the development of particular access structures for providing access to historical evidence.

Editors and the larger historical community were closely linked together by use. Documentary editors constructed editions that they intended historians to use as evidence. As surrogates for original sources, these materials were required to fulfill the function of an original source. Because of this, editors were influenced by historians' requirements of evidence. In constructing evidence, editors created works that took into account the needs of this primary user base, while also remembering where previous editions had faltered as acceptable representations of original sources. Early modern editing, as an evidence generating enterprise was concerned with producing transparent documentation that revealed how it was selected, edited, and constructed. This evidence left itself open to criticism by its users.

Lastly, the federal government, best illustrated by the NHPC, exerted a unique form of influence. In its 1954 report, the NHPC created an identity for government sponsored and supported documentary editing. Editing was conceptualized as an access function, and its works were intended to be used by a wide audience of general users. In short, editing was described as a public good. Additionally, at the conceptual level, the NHPC articulated a methodological identity. Emphasis was placed on the ideals of comprehensiveness and completeness, as demonstrated by the work of Julian P. Boyd. The NHPC saw its mission to contribute to the development of the published documentary record through the building of published collections.

Together, each of these elements formed a unique editorial context, specific to the early modern period of editing. In addition to being defined by this context, early modern documentary editing was also defined by a specific category of editorial knowledge. The early modern period of editing developed through the creation of a particular type of editorial

knowledge, and its boundary point can also be viewed in similar terms, a reinvention of editorial knowledge. In chapter 8 a discussion of the characteristics of editorial knowledge and its relationship to the early modern period of editing is provided. Lastly, a synthesis of this dissertation's findings is presented.

VIII. A DOCUMENTARY UNIVERSE, 1943 – 1970

This chapter provides a synthesis and summary of the characteristics, ideas, practices, and relationships that defined the early modern era of documentary editing, as presented in this dissertation. In addition, a definition of the concluding characteristics and conditions of this period are described, defined, and evaluated. Principally, these concluding characteristics can be defined in terms of a shift in the nature of editorial knowledge and a reconsideration of the published documentary record. Lastly, this chapter presents the study's final conclusions and a discussion of future research.

A. REPRESENTATION OF ORIGINAL SOURCES DURING THE EARLY MODERN ERA

The principal issue that defined early modern documentary editing was a concern with the representation of original sources. This concern can be defined in terms of two questions. How should the edited documents appear in a printed form? What qualities must the edited documents possess so that they could, and would, be trusted by an audience of researchers and users?

Overarching macro concerns that engaged editors can be traced back to this issue of the relationship between the documentary edition and the original source documentation. These can

specifically be defined as audience, intention, and scope. In natural language, these translate to the issues of considering what individuals would make use of an edition, what would be the quality of this use (scholarly or general reading), and lastly, in providing access to documents, what body of records is required to render the edition useful. Acts of editorial definition and consideration occurred within the boundaries of these concerns. Developments in editorial theory, method, and philosophy can be seen as variations within these themes. The finer details associated with the nature of transcription, the use of annotation, and the role and function of the editor were influenced by these macro views.

The process of representation, the constructing and publishing of these surrogates, can be viewed as both an intellectual and physical exercise. An editorial apparatus is both a physical object and a set of ideas. Editing should be viewed as a very active and physical exercise. The editor has a direct action on the text, which determines its meaning and form. Editors quite literally built physical objects.

What was it that editors had to represent in these published surrogates? The analysis of the underlying concepts of editorial theory and methods illustrates a concern with three primary aspects in regards to the edited document as an original source. Editors were concerned with the replication of content, description and contextualization through the use of notes that would provide descriptive, summarization, and provenance information, and lastly, the presentation of relationships. Translating these concerns into issues of representation, editors demonstrated a concern with the document itself, determining what information would be required in allowing for an understanding of the document, and lastly, in creating collections, the editor was concerned with what documents needed to be included in order to provide a complete collection.

As this research has shown, there were varying philosophies regarding how to appropriately create this representation. There were differing ideas regarding the form an edited document would take in its printed version and what information would be required in order to allow it to be understood. This is an issue of sourcing. Editors can be viewed as theoreticians of original sources. These issues directly related to considerations regarding the requirements of sources. But though theoretical, these discussions were grounded in their relationship to concrete physical resources.

This reality is grounded by the macro level concerns: audience, intention, and scope. Audience, intention, and scope can be viewed as directly related to the issue of consideration of the needs of a user population, albeit an imagined and theorized audience. The editor can be conceived of as a form of author. Their writing of narrative is through documents. In writing these authoritative collections of documents, decisions regarding what documents to include within the edition, and the depth and type of annotation were influenced by this idea of what their users would require of the works.¹

It is critical to focus particular attention on, *the idea of*, in this last statement. Editors knew their users through knowing the history of editing and the nature of the historical discipline. The critical documentary editors I have examined in this study have defined themselves as historians and scholars. Editors that did not explicitly describe themselves in these terms and those that did not contribute to the critical literature, at the very least, likely had a background in history. Documentary editors understood their users through an expert knowledge of the historical discipline. Documentary editors, with their training in history and familiarity

¹ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 133-134.

with methods, understood what was required of a source in order for it to be used as valid historical evidence. Editors also understood the challenges of working with original sources.²

Much of early modern editorial theory and discussion was influenced by this type of knowledge, perceived editorial knowledge. Boyd's concern with the concept of editorial completeness was related to the challenges posed by the dispersal of original sources. Similarly, Boyd's and Cappon's concern with context was related to the idea that documents, in order to be understood, must also be intelligible, and this could be provided for through varying degrees of context. Carter's editorial philosophy, which differed from that of Boyd and Cappon, addressed similar concerns, but from a different orientation. Carter's concern with strict transcription and little editorial disruption was directly related to his concern that too much editorial intervention would make a document unintelligible. These three different perspectives are each grounded in an editorial knowledge, influenced by ideas regarding the requirements of an original source as they relate to the *perceived* needs of a user population. In this sense the documentary edition, and the idea of editorial use, are both actualized and theorized.

It is for this reason that an editorial apparatus, the mechanism that drives this representation process, in addition to being conceptualized as a physical object, should also be considered as a set of ideas. Though as I have just argued, the construction of these works was grounded by a physical reality of use and requirements, more specifically, this construction was driven by ideas *about* these conditions. These representations were built out of ideas influenced by attitudes and beliefs about the nature of historical evidence and their use. This is a particular type of editorial knowledge.

Here, I argue that this condition is the defining characteristic of American early modern documentary editing. This is the formalization of the Jameson project. Jameson, through

² Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 212-215.

demonstration, argued for a critical review of documentary editions, editing practice, and the editorial function. He accomplished this through critical reviews, examined in this study, which demonstrated that previous editorial methods were not formalized in a manner that would systematically provide scholarly grade editions. He discovered flaws related to issues of transparency, accuracy, and completeness.³

In arguing for a critical editorial criticism, Jameson was calling on editors to be careful in examining editorial approaches, methods, and their application. The early modern editors continued Jameson's project. Methodological statements issued by editors positioned their work, and their methods, in reference to those of the editors working during the 19th and early 20th century. Early modern editors examined and refined their own concepts through studying previous methods and editions.

As a point of example I will re-cite several instances of Boyd's, Carter's, and Cappon's thought. Boyd's concern with the concept of completeness in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was a result of what he perceived to be the absence of completeness in existing editions of Jefferson's papers. Carter's concern with the idea that producing accurate transcriptions should be the central guiding principle of the editor existed alongside examples of editors' that did take such luxuries, rendering, in his view, editions that contained multiple errors. The idea of the conscious editor was central to Cappon's thought. His theory and discussion placed greater emphasis on issues related to transmission rather than dissemination. Though these two actions are similar, transmission defines the editor as active, while dissemination defines the editor as passive. Cappon conceptualized the editor as an active agent in the construction of documentary evidence whom contributed to the form and identity. Editing was not a passive act.

³ Jameson, "Review: Madison," 559-561; Jameson, "Review: Monroe," 781-782.

Though this reevaluation took place in reference to use, it is important to recognize that this editorial knowledge was generated as a result of considering a theorized use, through being able to assume particular reading populations and their requirements. Editors constructed editions that would allow for readings of records, contexts, and interpretations. The emphasis an edition placed on these combinations of readings was related to considerations of the user population and their needs. Comparing Boyd and Carter illustrates this point. Carter argued for strict transcription and unobtrusive annotation that focused primarily on providing essential descriptive information. Boyd, however, felt that it was the editor's function to explain, not only the documents, but the actions documented by the artifacts. Existing alongside these different editorial philosophies were differing attitudes regarding use. Boyd assumed a diverse general and scholarly audience, while Carter cautioned against making any assumptions regarding users beyond historians. These ideas, views, and approaches came through a close examination of the role and function of the documentary edition. This was a particular category of knowledge. In this regard, a defining characteristic of the early modern period of editing was the increased understanding of the role of the editor, the editorial function, and the documentary edition, through a close examination of these elements. Jameson's project was formalized during this period.

However, there are limits to this knowledge. In formulating these ideas, editors made assumptions of their users that were not necessarily evidence based. Because of the background a documentary editor would possess, he or she would have an understanding of the requirements of historical sources as evidence, which would have been of great importance to the user of the edition. It is important to recognize that editors, though providing evidence, offered these documents through a particular form of access device.

Editors were not unique in this regard. An archival repository can be conceptualized as an access device. Within its walls, structures are present that allow for the containment and access of original sources. Like the archival repository, the documentary edition provides a specific kind of access. Within the edition documents are contained, ordered, and described in a fixed manner, which determines their use. This establishes a specific relationship between the documents and the readers and researchers. Beyond book reviews, editors did not have access to an extensive body of information that would allow them to understand the nature of the relationship between their works and their users. This would require an examination of users and the construction of outward editorial knowledge.

The beginning of modern documentary editing, and more specifically early modern editing, was defined by a shift in editorial knowledge. Production of scholarly grade documents that could be used as evidence could only occur through the reexamination and development of editorial works and practices, which the critical editors carried out. These inward evaluations of function, use, and intention allowed editors to formulate procedures for creating editions that could function as evidence.⁴ What were the consequences of these editorial practices? How did their editions aid users? Did the editions function as a useful tool for disseminating documentary evidence? These questions could not concretely be answered through a critical evaluation of the editions themselves or through self-reflections. Addressing these concerns would require a new type of editorial knowledge that would provide an understanding of editorial practices through understanding use.

⁴ Jameson's project was continued by Boyd, Butterfield, Cappon, and Labaree in their *re*-editing projects.

B. WALTER RUNDELL, JR., AND THE REINVENTION OF EDITORIAL KNOWLEDGE

In the context of the history of editing, 1970 represents a crucial boundary point. During this year, Walter Rundell, Jr., published his study, *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*. Rundell's study surveyed the use of original sources in the contexts of teaching and research within graduate history programs. A section of this study was devoted to evaluating the use and training in using documentary editions and the status of documentary editing within the history profession.⁵ This study will be presented in greater depth further in this chapter, but here, it is important to address why this work is of particular importance in the context of this study.

With the publication of *In Pursuit of American History*, a great deal of information regarding users' perceptions of, and attitudes toward, original sources came to be known. This was information that was previously unknown. In addition to information regarding use, Rundell documented attitudes that were held regarding these sources. This provided information regarding users' thoughts on the strengths and weaknesses of documentary editions, their usability, and their relationship to other historical sources.

Prior to Rundell's study, known information regarding the use of documentary editions came through inward critical analysis, which did not allow for a completely concrete understanding of use.⁶ In the period prior to *In Pursuit of American History*, editorial issues were considered in consultation with a theoretical, or ideal, user. This theorized user was trusting, felt that the editions possessed utility, and would receive great satisfaction in using the printed documents. Again, the primary concern that the editor felt needed to be addressed was

⁵ Rundell, "In Pursuit of American History," 159-201 and 260-283.

⁶ This is best illustrated by Carter's comment cautioning the editor against assuming knowledge about his or her users, beyond that of historians. See Carter, *Historical Editing*, 13.

the matter of clarity, which could be provided for through the use of accurate transcription and through providing descriptive and explanatory information.

Rundell's study addressed matters besides content, focusing additional attention on how the editions were engaged with by users, including historians, librarians, and students. Pedagogy was also a central aspect of this study, surveying the training available to students in learning how to use these editions, and other categories primary sources, properly. But, more importantly, Rundell also documented the academic culture in which these volumes were used.⁷ In addition to identifying how these editions were used, he also questioned the attitudes users had towards these objects, focusing on questions related to perceived utility, the relationship between original sources and their printed surrogates, as well as issues related to reliability, authenticity and trust. The end result is that the study offers a description of the practices of historians and graduate students in using primary sources, but more importantly, provides evidence of the attitudes that informed these practices, during the period studied.⁸

In the context of the history of editing, this study represents an outward turn. Consideration of the role and function of documentary editing, and the editions produce, came through engagement with users, not through the close examination of the objects themselves. This non-textual examination consisted of documenting and presenting reactions, attitudes, and perceptions. Offering this type of information provided insight into the conditions that influenced how the editions functioned. This was a study of reception.

Rundell's study can be seen as illustrative of two conditions. First, the study can be seen as evidence of the increased formalization of the editing process, which occurred during the early modern period of editing. The study had its roots in a survey to study the use of documentary

⁷ Ralph E. Morrow, "Review: In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States," *The Journal of Southern History*, 36:4 (November 1970): 580-581.

⁸ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 183-188.

editions, as was stipulated by a Ford Foundation grant to the NHPC. This increased funding, while illustrative of a formalization of methods, also necessitated the need for additional evidence regarding how editions were used.⁹

Secondly, Rundell's approach was illustrative of an outward turn that demonstrated the need to look at the effects the documents created, in order to understand the consequence of editors' methods on the documents themselves. In short, this study was concerned with the relationship between the source material and researcher or reader. The act of transmission, which editors considered among their primary tasks, could not be understood through examining the documents isolated from the process of use, the consequence of transmission. This represented a shift in approach in terms of conceptualizing what could be learned from documentary editions. In addition, this also illustrated the importance of studying the mediating activity the edition carries out, in providing access to content. The intellectual environment post-Rundell was quite different than the decades which preceded his work. In the pages that follow I will provide an in-depth discussion of this study and its consequences.

1. Context

In Pursuit of American History resulted from the work Rundell performed in his capacity as director of the Survey on the Use of Original Sources in Graduate History (1965-1967). During 1965 Rundell was asked to direct this project by Wayne C. Grover, then serving as both Archivist of the United States and the chairman of the National Historical Publications Commission. Rundell was given full autonomy in directing this survey.¹⁰

⁹ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, ix-xiv.

¹⁰ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, ix-xiv. A more in-depth analysis of this initial project can be found in Walter Rundell, Jr., "Clio's Ways and Means: A Preliminary Report on the Survey," *The Historian* 30:1 (November

The Ford Foundation provided funding for the survey, as a provision of its two-million dollar grant to the NHPC for funding assistance to the Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Hamilton, and Franklin paper projects. In providing funds for the survey, it was felt that having information regarding the practices and needs of the profession would be beneficial. The study of documentary editing was an important aspect of this study (chapters six and nine), but the survey examined other aspects related to the use of original sources of American history and the instruction available to graduate students of history.

Rundell's primary data consisted of personal interviews and questionnaires. His subjects consisted of academic historians that actively supervised doctoral dissertations, history graduate students that were actively carrying out research, and librarians. One of the greatest strengths of the survey is the extensive number of interviews he carried out, and the variety of institutions that he visited. During the period of the survey, Rundell visited 70 of the 114 institutions that offered doctoral training in history. Additionally, he also visited forty other institutions that consisted of "private libraries, independent and state historical societies, state archives, a presidential library, and federal records centers."¹¹ In total, 557 individuals were interviewed, representing 112 unique institutions. Because of this, it was felt that the results of the study would ultimately "reflect an accurate picture of research training in United States history."¹²

Organizationally, the data is represented in two primary parts. The analysis of the findings is presented in narrative form. This section consists of eleven chapters: I. Historical Method; II. Social Science Tools; III. Collecting Original Sources; IV. Dissertation Topics; V. Local Sources; VI. Printed Sources; VII. Photocopy; VIII. Finding Aids; IX. Documentary

1967): 20-40; and in Walter Rundell, Jr., "Relations between Historical Researchers and Custodians of Source Material," *College & Research Libraries* (November 1968): 466-476.

¹¹ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, x.

¹² Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, xi.

Editing; X. Researcher-Custodian Relations; XI. Research Needs. Within each of these chapters an analysis and discussion of the primary findings is presented. In addition, Rundell also provides a set of recommendations derived both from his own analysis and from comments he received from the survey's subjects.¹³

The second representation of data is presented through a series of appendices. Appendix A provides a list of institutions visited during the course of the study. Appendix B consists of a copy of the questionnaire template provided to history departments, titled "Questionnaire for Departments of History offering the Ph.D." Appendix C consists of a list of all of the interview subjects. Included in this document are the names of each interviewee, their institutional affiliations, and the date of the interview. This directory is divided into three sections. The first section is titled "Professors" and the second section is divided into two sub-sections. 2a. is titled "Academic Libraries and Archivists," and 2b. is titled "Nonacademic Librarians, Archivists, and Directors of Historical Societies." Lastly, the third section of this appendix is titled "Graduate Students." Appendix D consists of a list of respondents to the questionnaire. The respondents are categorized according to institutional type. Categorically these are organized by Ph.D institutions, M.A. institutions, Historical Societies, Archives, and Libraries, and Academic Libraries.¹⁴

Appendices E-I contain summarizations and examples of certain findings. Appendix E contains a sample syllabus, illustrative of the material that was examined in studying the teaching of graduate students in seminars. Appendix F contains a "Selected List of Microfilm Finding Aids." Appendix G contains a directory of institutions that had carried out microfilming projects with the assistance of the NHPC grants. Appendix H contains a detailed summarization

¹³Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, xv.

¹⁴Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, xi-xiii.

regarding the travel of graduate students in carrying out research. Summarized is data regarding funding available, the nature of the institutions visited when carrying out research, and information regarding the frequency of student travel.¹⁵

Appendix I includes information regarding the spending priorities and preferences of professors and librarians in making original sources available for access. This information was arranged into three tables, which consisted of “Professors’ Priorities,” “Librarians Priorities,” and “Graduate Students’ Preferences.” In relation to funding, three categories of primary sources were evaluated. These categories consisted of photocopy, letterpress, and manuscripts. Secondly, this was further sub-divided into the purchasing of original sources as it pertained to research related to doctoral dissertations, and research related to master’s theses.¹⁶

I have provided this outline of the work to illustrate the uniqueness of Rundell’s evaluation. In describing these aspects, two primary points should be addressed. First, the use of data derived from interviews and surveys allowed for the documentation of the attitudes and beliefs that influenced the relationships that existed between the multiple user populations evaluated and the original sources. Understanding these attitudes is helpful in evaluating the educational practices, described by the academics, and the ways in which the sources studied were used. Because of this, in addition to providing valuable descriptive information, *In Pursuit of American History* also offers valuable contextual information that is helpful in interpreting the study’s findings.

Secondly, from a historiographic standpoint, *In Pursuit of American History* freezes a moment in time. Initially, the work’s purpose was primarily utilitarian in nature. The project fulfilled a stipulation of the Ford Foundation grant and provided valuable information regarding

¹⁵Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 379-380.

¹⁶Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 399-403.

the educational and research practices of faculty and graduate students in American history.

Though this study is in need of replication, it still carries out this primary function, serving as the most comprehensive study of American historians' use of original sources, and of the nature and quality of educating graduate students in using these sources.¹⁷

However, the study also possesses secondary values. Treated as a historical document, *In Pursuit of History* functions as a valuable source for archival history and historiography.

Cataloged within this work are stories of use, researchers' thoughts regarding primary sources, methods that the surveyed historians used in educating future researchers on how to properly use original sources, and the practices and mechanisms that supported the objective of providing access to original sources. Because of this, Rundell's study, in addition to serving as a source document for data regarding use, documents a period of historical thought and the politics of access.

This commentary offers a general overview of Rundell's study, including his general aims in carrying out this project, as well as its contours. The remainder of my discussion will focus on his treatment of documentary editing. In doing so, I will present his findings regarding the use of documentary editions, the instruction graduate students received in using these volumes, and lastly, the attitudes of historians, graduate students, librarians, and archivists held regarding this category of original sources. More importantly, I will offer an argument for the placement of *In Pursuit of History* within the context of the history of editing, offering the idea that this study can be seen to represent a new period of editorial knowing, best conceptualized as an outward turn that sought to document the relationship between documentary editions and their users.

¹⁷A discussion of the greater impact of this study and the affect of his work on the archival, historical, and editing communities can be found in William M. Nolte, "Walter Rundell, Jr.: The Archival Interests of a Historian," *The American Archivist* 48:4 (Fall 1985): 377-387.

2. Understanding Documentary Editions

a. Introduction

Two chapters of *In Pursuit of American History* are devoted to Rundell's findings regarding documentary editing. These are presented in chapters six (Printed Sources) and nine (Documentary Editing). The category of sources discussed in chapter six consists of "government publications, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and printed editions of the papers of notable individuals."¹⁸ A great deal of attention is given to documentary publications. Included in this analysis are the attitudes held by graduate students and faculty regarding documentary editions, examples of use, and the nature of the instruction that students received in using printed original sources.

Chapter nine focuses on documentary editing specifically. Emphasis is placed on the practice of documentary editing, the training available to students interested in instruction within this area, and the status of documentary editing within the historical community. Secondly, a discussion of the role of the NHPC in supporting training in documentary editing, and the nature of the relationship between the NHPC and the historical community, as well as future needs regarding documentary editing, is provided.¹⁹

This treatment offers a view of documentary editing at both a micro and macro level, offering discussion of the objects, practices, and processes that created the objects. In both sections, examples of use are provided along with a discussion of the attitudes that influenced the instances of education and use. This serves to provide insight into the factors that influenced the conditions that he found.

¹⁸Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 160-161.

¹⁹Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 260-283.

b. Findings

Rundell's discussion and findings pertaining to "Printed Sources" can be divided into three primary categories. These are use, education, and a discussion of specific categories of documentary publications. Within these, multiple themes can be identified. Of the issues addressed by the surveyed subjects are issues of reliability, accuracy, suitability, and the scholarly function of documentary editions. Because of this array of themes, Rundell provides a thick description of the environment surrounding documentary editions, focusing on attitudes and perceptions.

This accomplishes two tasks. First, in studying attitudes and perceptions, it is possible to obtain an understanding of the nature of documentary editions, through determining how the works were perceived. And secondly, it is possible to evaluate how attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions influenced use.

Rundell found diverging opinions regarding the use of printed sources, stating that "although most historians agree that printed sources, if used with the necessary scholarly precautions, offer advantages, they disagree on the nature of these precautions."²⁰ These opinions varied amongst faculty and graduate students. The primary advantage of printed sources, as noted by the surveyed subjects, was increased access to research materials. This was found to be particularly true for individuals affiliated with institutions that did not possess extensive collections of manuscripts, with one respondent stating that "well-edited printed sources are 'more useful than the manuscripts themselves.'"²¹

²⁰ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 161.

²¹ Interview with Bernard Mayo quoted in Rundell, Jr., *In Pursuit of American History*, 162.

A similar perspective was described by the historian, Merrill D. Peterson, in commenting on Boyd's edition of the *Jefferson Papers*. Peterson stated that "the whole point of Julian P. Boyd's edition of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* would be missed if students had to go behind Boyd's work to the original documents."²² Peterson further stated that a user working on topics documented by Jefferson's papers "would have to go no further than the Boyd edition."²³ Similarly, in describing the *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Arthur S. Link, editor of the Wilson Papers, commented that "only rarely would a student need to go behind the printed documents to check the originals."²⁴ The primary value assigned to the editions in these two comments is the works' ability to serve as an accurate surrogate for the object.

The responses above, offered by both a historian and a historian/documentary editor, reflect a view of the edited documents as a clean surrogate for the original source. These views align with that of the editors working within this period, in terms of their editions. However, not all users of documentary editions expressed this degree of confidence in the ability of the published surrogates to perfectly represent the original documents. One graduate student responded that, "he believed that the research scholar should not rely exclusively on the printed versions of the documents," describing that, in his view, printed resources, were useful in establishing a scholarly framework before proceeding to using scholarly resources for more specialized questions.²⁵

Respondents also brought up the issue that not all editions are of equal quality. A graduate student consulting J.S. Basset's edition of the Andrew Jackson papers found that Basset excluded important documents, and because of this "relied more on the microfilm copies of the

²² Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 184.

²³ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 184.

²⁴ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 187.

²⁵ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 186.

original letters.”²⁶ However, this same individual spoke highly of Reginald McGrane’s edition of the correspondence of Nicholas Biddle.²⁷ Here, the respondent illustrates the important reality that the relationship between the original sources and the researcher is defined by the editor and that this relationship can be quite varied.

In these instances a primary concern is related to the confidence the user has in the editor as an intermediary, and recognizing that the editorial process may result in the production of inaccurate or incomplete sources. On this matter Rundell writes that “the mechanics of transforming a manuscript into type often pose scholarly problems.”²⁸ This remark is well supported by the respondents’ comments. A graduate student responded that he “was particularly sensitive to the mistakes possible with printed sources, since he was once a typesetter.”²⁹ Again, the user is cognizant that the edited document is constructed from existing evidence. The source is filtered through the editor. Here, the respondent implies that there is an inherent concern related to the reliability of the surrogate source that must always be considered.

This finding is of great consequence to early modern editing practice. First, this demonstrates that students of history, trained to be critical of original sources, will not necessarily believe the edited document to be accurate. Secondly, this point addresses the issue that there may be a limit to the utility of editorial context. An editor can include information regarding editorial choices, genealogy of the documentation, and relationships to other documents, but this information does not reduce the influence of the editor as intermediary between the document and the user. Though editors could provide information that would

²⁶ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 186-187.

²⁷ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 187.

²⁸ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 168-169.

²⁹ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 168.

inform the user of the processes that led to an edition's creation, Rundell found that the users of these sources were very aware of the role of the editor in creating this form of evidence.

He also found varied opinion regarding the ability of documentary editions to function as tools for providing wider access to original sources. One respondent noted that documentary editions are invaluable to students that do not have access to extensive original sources. In this view, the editions fulfill the editorial objective of extending the reach of the original source. However, another respondent noted the timely process involved in publishing documentary editions posed an access constraint. According to a number of the respondents, it was "feared that major editorial projects have moved too slowly," and that because of this "these resources remain limited for researchers actively working in the field."³⁰ In this instance, the process that produces the documentary edition creates an access constraint.

These points illustrate important conditions that defined the nature of the use of documentary editions during this period. First, use is complex. While there was generally agreement that documentary editions possessed *a utility*, respondents disagreed on the specific nature of this utility. Varying degrees of strengths, weaknesses, and limitations were assigned by the respondents. Second, varying opinion was present regarding the role and function of the editors. Respondents noted that the work of the editors created a source of greater utility, through the use of descriptive and explanatory notes. Others felt that the editions needed to be approached with caution, illustrating Cappon's observation that "the editor stands between the reader and the text."³¹ From these findings, it becomes apparent that it is difficult to consider the user population generally. This sample reveals a divergence in opinion regarding the use of documentary editions and their characteristics

³⁰ Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History*, 188-189.

³¹ Cappon, "The Historian as Editor," 138.

3. A New Category of Editorial Knowledge

Through this study, Walter Rundell, Jr., developed a new category of editorial knowledge. This is user-derived knowledge, rather than edition or practice derived knowledge. The primary difference is that what is obtained is information regarding the relationship between the edition and the user, as evidenced through attitudes, perceptions, and instances of use, as well as the relationship of documentary editions with other categories of original sources, as conceptualized by the user. A critical aspect of this study is that it demonstrates a methodology for obtaining this type of information, and of the benefits of obtaining editorial knowledge through direct engagement with the users.

The value of this editorial knowledge was not immediately recognized by the historical or editing communities. Reception to this study was mixed and its importance was not universally recognized. *In Pursuit of American History* was the subject of a substantial number of book reviews, which demonstrate this mixed reception.³² The reviews of this work can be grouped into three primary categories. Rundell's study was described as being descriptive and analytical, descriptive and slightly analytical, and lastly, descriptive in nature. A majority of the reviews fell within the latter two categories. Only a small number of reviewers recognized that this study was capturing a snapshot of a historiographic moment. In specific reference to documentary editing and documentary editions, the study offered the richest available data regarding the attitudes and practices of users, as they related to these elements. The remainder of the reviews either recognized the descriptive value of the study, but felt it offered little in terms of analytical

³² Morrow, "Review: *In Pursuit of American History*," 580-581; Dwight W. Hoover, "Review: *In Pursuit of American History*," *American Quarterly* 23:3 (August 1971): 333-334; H.G. Nicholas, "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*" *The English Historical Review* 87:343 (April 1972): 458-459; John A. Garraty, "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*," 40:2 (May 1971): 232-233; and Michael Kraus, "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*," *American Historical Review* 76:3 (June 1971): 825-826.

value, or criticized the study for being simply descriptive in nature.³³ These reviewers did not identify the uniqueness of the information that Walter Rundell, Jr., was able to obtain.

This work is an important accomplishment when considered in the context of the history of documentary editing. *In Pursuit of American History* can be viewed as redefining the nature of what was known about editorial practice and the relationship between documentary editions and users. Here we have an instance of consideration that is not theorized. Though Rundell provides his own analysis and assessment, enough of the raw data, through the form of comment, is provided that the editor could use this information either to consider editorial practice or to consider additional questions that could be asked of users in understanding how these works function as original sources.

Additionally, this study serves as an important boundary point in this history. This study of modern documentary editing has illustrated that the practice of producing printed versions of original sources is defined by particular categories of editorial thought, attitudes, intention, and knowledge. A defining characteristic of the beginning point of modern editing was development of an editorial criticism that allowed editors to develop an understanding of documentary editions as objects and collections, and the nature of their influence. This critical evaluation was

³³ The reviews cited in note 497 fit within these three categories. The review by John A. Garraty is an example of a highly critical review of this work. His primary criticism was that the work was “impressionistic,” and that Rundell did not offer a sufficient analysis of his findings. The author also felt that aspects of the work’s discussion were generalized. In his view “the book has major flaws that gravely reduce its value as a summary of the current state of academic historical work.” See Garraty, “Review: *In Pursuit of American History*,” 232-232. Ralph E. Morrow offered a different assessment. According to Morrow, *In Pursuit of American History* is a “significant book,” and “can be read as a report on the state of research training, an extended essay on the conditions of research, a brief on improvements needed to facilitate research, and an introduction to research practice.” The strength of this work, as conceptualized in this review, is its presentation of a snapshot of historical activity, offering a view of the different sources, intermediaries, and practices with which historians and students engaged. See Morrow, “Review: *In Pursuit of American History*,” 580-581. Hoover offered a more neutral review. In assessing the work, the author writes that “the book is a necessary one for those interested in what is being done in research in graduate history education;” however, he balances this response with the statement that “while it does contain recommendations about research, its main thrust is reportorial and not analytical.” While this is not explicitly identified as a weakness, the author emphasizes that in his view, the value of the work comes from the description Rundell offers, not in the analysis. See Hoover, “Review: *In Pursuit of American History*,” 333-334. The comments of these reviewers are representative of the categorical assessments of this work. There was not agreement in terms of what the study offered, or the type of knowledge that was created.

essential to the development of Julian P. Boyd's *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission*, which can be viewed as a foundational document of modern editing practice.

Rundell's evaluation of the use of original sources serves as a similar transitional point. Though partially necessitated by the Ford Foundation grant, the desire for such a study can be viewed as recognition of the limitations of the editorial knowledge generated during the early modern period of editing. The knowledge generated by editorial criticism places emphasis on the relationship between the edition and the editor. Here, the concern is with the nature of construction and what is required in creating a usable edition. However, this type of knowledge does not provide for a concrete understanding of the nature of the relationship that exists between published collections of original sources and users. Rundell's study illustrates that this can best come through an analysis of the user, and his or her thoughts, attitudes, and ideas regarding these works. From 1970 on the potential existed for the creation of new forms of editorial knowledge, a richer understanding of the nature of editorial relationships, and a more refined modern editing practice. This shift away from the early modern is made possible through this redefinition of editorial knowledge. From this point on, the editor can be viewed as having the capacity to develop new categories of editorial knowledge, and as a result, develop new approaches to editorial practice.

C. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study evaluated a specific period of editorial practice, the critical ideas that developed within it, and lastly, the affect of these ideas on the production of documentary edition. During this research, it was discovered that the actions of early modern editors could be

conceptualized in three primary ways. First, editors were actively engaged in the construction of unique categories of historical evidence and unique collections. Secondly, editors engaged in multiple acts of description. Editors provided information regarding the provenance of their printed documents, the contexts of their creation, and explanations, or narrations, of the events documented by the materials. Lastly editors managed a complex set of relationships. Among these were the relationships between documents and the relationships between readers/researchers and original sources. These three themes defined early modern editing practice and each of these elements could be the subject of individualized studies. Through examining the ideas that defined these activities this study provides an examination of the contours of these processes, but each could benefit from more focused study.

As a study of ideas, this work identified the editors that contributed to the era's critical editorial discussion. While this study presented a framework for examining this figures and identified and evaluated the central aspects of these individuals editorial thought, each figure merits an in-depth analysis. The editorial thought developed by Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, Clarence E. Carter, and Lester J. Cappon is complex and offers interesting commentary regarding the nature of historical evidence, documentary publications as a class of evidence, and issues in the description of information. As authors of unique statements on editing practice, each of these figures could benefit from a closer evaluation of their work. In addition, though not an editor, Walter Rundell, Jr., was instrumental in the development of a unique category of editorial knowledge. This aspect of his work has been addressed in this study, but again, his ideas warrant further analysis.

Related to this point is the need for additional work examining editorial concepts. This study identified the existence of editorial concepts, which influenced how early modern editors

approached their work. Examples of these include *editorial presence*, *editorial criticism*, *editorial intention*, and the idea of the *theoretical edition*. This study identified the points of reference that editors used in defining and conceptualizing work. A better understanding of these editorial concepts would come through a close examination of each of them on an individual basis.

This study identified a number of editorial objects. First at the most macro level is the documentary edition. Documentary editions exist as ideas and as physical objects. These two entities may take multiple forms. The edition may be conceptualized as comprehensive or selective. An edition's physical form is defined by its intellectual framework. This is a work level concern. Editorial objects exist at the document level. In editing documents, editors linked together multiple entities to form a unified whole. An edited original source document will contain a transcription, along with a set of notes that may provide contextual information, provenance information, and serve to narrate the document. These different aspects illustrate the unique material characteristics of documentary editions and the edited documents contained within the larger work. The material aspects of early modern documentary editions have been identified and evaluated within this study. However, materiality is a complex subject, and a more focused study of the material aspects of documentary editions would provide additional understanding of editorial characteristics.

Lastly, it is important to recognize that his research is limited by the narrowness of its context. Here, attention is focused a specific period of editing and practice. In order to provide a better understanding of the American documentary editing, an exploration of additional periods of editing is required. In this study, attention was given to the intermediary period between Jameson and Boyd, or the period between 1900 and 1943. While this period was used as a

reference point for examining the early modern period editing, as a critical transitional period, it and the work that occurred within it warrants further attention.

Additionally, post 1970 documentary editing is a period that warrants additional attention. The period between the mid 1970's and the late 1990's consisted of debates regarding diversity as it related to the published documentary record, the funding of documentary editions, and the nature of publication mediums. These debates focused on the utility of editions and came from outside the immediate editing community. This makes this period of editing a particular valuable site for evaluation. Understanding this era of modern editing practice will provide for a more concrete understanding of the period as a whole.

The agenda presented in this discussion offers a strategy for moving beyond the early modern period of editing and studying the transitional period between Jameson and Boyd and modern editorial practice post-Rundell. An understanding of the foundations of modern editing is useful in approaching these differing eras.

This agenda also offers a program for a more in-depth exploration of the ideas, objects, and practices of the early modern period of editing. This dissertation is foundational in nature. The primary defining characteristics, both in terms of ideas and practices, have been identified and evaluated. This will provide a foundation for exploring the individuals, practices, and objects analyzed here, in far greater individualized specificity.

D. CONCLUSIONS AND SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

The underlying assumption of this dissertation is that the period of 1943-1970 can be viewed as unique within the context of the history of documentary editing, and that this period

can be defined in terms of the attitudes, ideas, and approaches developed and maintained by editors. Additionally, it is the author's view that these elements led to the development of documentary editions distinct in character and that functioned as a specific type of historical evidence. This analysis has demonstrated that editors working within this era did hold particular, although often differing, views, regarding the role of the editor and the function of published surrogates for original sources. These elements influenced the objects that they produced. In concluding this study, the research questions, which framed this study, will be revisited and responded to, providing a succinct summarization of the primary findings.

Question #1

What are the primary characteristics of the editorial methods developed and implemented during the period 1943-1970? What are the general characteristics of this period? To what degree does this period differ from previous periods of editing, in terms of methods, practices, attitudes, and external factors?

An examination of this period revealed that an essential defining characteristic of the early modern editing era was the nature of the editorial knowledge that was used to contemplate and develop editorial methods. It is within this frame that editors worked. The development of the early modern period of editing can be seen as resulting from engaging in a type of editorial criticism, demonstrated by Jameson. Editorial knowledge, and editors' reflections regarding editorial methods, occurred in reference to previous projects and practices. Though editors did put forth unique ideas, and were influenced by their own views regarding intention, these were developed in research to their editorial past.

A secondary overarching characteristic of this developing modern editing was that the examinations provided by critical editors demonstrated that this was an increasingly conscious

editing. Editors offered examinations of foundational issues related to the nature of editorial intention (to what ends should the edition be used?), description (what degree of contextualization and explanation is required?), and presentation (how should artifactual informational content be represented in transcription?). The varying approaches, best illustrated by Cappon, Carter, and Boyd, demonstrated a careful consideration of these concerns.

The editorial methods developed during this period were created within these two frames. They were developed through a careful consideration of the editorial process, through an inward examination of objects and practices. In evaluating the specific methods that were generated, they can be viewed as correlating to three unique aspects of the original source, and serve to illustrate the character of editorial concern during this period. First, the orientation of the methods developed demonstrated a concern with producing works that could operate as historical evidence and serve as seamless surrogates for original sources. Because of this, editors were concerned with developing a highly structured mechanism, in the form of an editorial apparatus, for reproducing source content.

Though attitudes regarding loyalty to the original document, in terms of its reproduction, varied, there was agreement amongst editors that the editor's actions should not disrupt meaning. This relates to another critical characteristic of this editing. Early modern editing was greatly concerned with transparency. Through extensive editorial statements included within the published editions, and the use of descriptive and explanatory notes, the editor could reveal the nature of his or her actions in producing a documentary edition. It was recognized that the editor was an intermediary in process of providing access to published documentary evidence.

Secondly, this concern with transparency was an aspect of editors' greater concerns with providing access to contextual information. Early modern editors performed two distinct, but

related tasks. Documentation was reproduced and context was described and created. A defining characteristic of these methods was the increased emphasis on developing procedures for the creation of context. This is illustrative of editors' reconsideration of the nature of access. While editors had long provided physical access through publication, early modern editors exhibited a greater concern with issues related to intellectual access. Again, attitudes varied on the nature of access that editors should provide, considering the approaches offered by Boyd and Carter, but there was a recognition of the view that the editor is engaged in a process that extends beyond physical production. Early modern editors were concerned with the description of original sources, in addition to their reproduction. This was accomplished through the application of a structure of descriptive, explanatory, and textual notes, in addition to intellectual frameworks that defined how they should be used.

Lastly, early modern editorial methods evidenced a greater concern with the consideration of relationships. Editorial theory can be viewed as being increasingly concerned with the idea that the documentary edition, while providing access to individual documents, was also concerned with the dissemination of collections. The nature of the relationships that existed between original sources was a central concern of this editorial thought. Two instances that illustrate this point are Julian P. Boyd's overall conceptualization of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* and the editors' concern with describing the nature of the relationship between original sources and their published surrogates.

An important characteristic of this editing was a concern with completeness as it related to the publishing of original sources. Boyd's edition was described as particularly innovative because of this concern. This is most visibly illustrated by his treatment of correspondence. Both the letters that Jefferson sent, as well as those that he received, were included within the

edition. Underlying this approach was the idea that in order to understand the activities documented by the records, both aspects of the correspondence had to be edited and published. This instance illustrates a concern with completeness at the document level.

However, this concern with relationships also occurred at the edition, or collection, level. This is best illustrated, again by Boyd, but also by the editorial work of Lyman H. Butterfield. Both Boyd and Butterfield were concerned with the relationships that existed between bodies of records as they related to their projects as a whole. Boyd popularized the concept of the comprehensive edition, which considered the publication of original sources in terms of publishing collections. Boyd's stated goal was to publish a complete record of Jefferson's documentary output. Here, the idea is that producing a complete documentary edition requires publishing all of the related bodies of documentation. The primary relationship that is emphasized here is the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and the original sources that he produced.

Butterfield had a different concern regarding documentary relationships. Butterfield, as editor of the Adams Family Papers had the unique task of editing an entire family's papers. As stated, an edition structure along the lines of *The Jefferson Papers* was appropriate for his project. There was not one central unifying figure. Because of this, Butterfield created a structure that allowed for the orderly publication of the Adams Family documentation in a manner that organized the materials in terms of logical groups. Here, Butterfield is similarly concerned with principles of completeness, and with describing the nature of documentary relationships, however, this demonstrates an instance where the editor had to exert a more assertive type of editorial control. Butterfield demonstrated the complexity of managing multiple documentary relationships.

In summary, the early modern period of editing can be distinguished by its increased consideration of the nature of the editorial functions. The themes, questions, and elements that editors examined came through a consideration of their own unique brand of intention. But, this consideration can be viewed as having its roots in editorial criticism. This led to careful consideration of the documentary edition as a category of evidence and its requirements, in terms of presentation, description, and documentary relationships.

Question #2

To what extent did underlying attitudes regarding the function of historical sources, editorial theory, and conceptualizations of editorial practice influence the development and application of editorial theory and methods?

Editorial practice in the early modern era can be described in terms of two conditions. First, editors were explicit in their view that the essential function of published collections of original sources was to serve as a surrogate for original sources. The editions that editors produced were conceptualized as a form of historical evidence and were to function as such. Additionally, there were varying opinions regarding non-scholarly uses, but primarily, the purpose of this category of works was to provide for the wider access of original sources. The second condition is directly related to this point. Because the edition was conceptualized as historical evidence, and editors intended their works to be used as original sources, the development of editorial theory, method, and practice occurred in reference to this objective. Editors developed conceptualizations, theories, methods, and procedures, which would allow them to construct evidence.

Because editors were active in the process of constructing original sources, this process reveals a great deal regarding the nature of editorial attitudes regarding the requirements of these

objects. First, editors like Boyd, Butterfield, Cappon, and Carter were strongly influenced by principles of reliability and authenticity as it related to the evaluation and use of historical evidence. This is illustrated by the emphasis that was placed on issues related to the creation of contextual and descriptive information. In order for a user to evaluate the integrity of a source, it must be open to evaluation. Editors, in supplementing their transcriptions with information regarding the origins of the documents, provided an avenue for this type of evaluation. Additionally, the concern with editorial transparency was also influenced by the requirements of sources. Editors were engaged in a specific type of construction, and these works were created out of a particular type of context. In providing statements that described the editorial device used in developing the edition, the evidence became open to further evaluation by the user. This was of particular importance, given Jameson's illustration of the difficulties posed by the absence of editorial transparency.

Editors' belief in the complexity of original sources also exerted an influence on the editorial theory and methods that developed as well as the editing process. This point is related to the descriptive function of the editor in providing intellectual access to documents. In providing access to physical sources there was a strand of editorial thought that emphasized the idea that providing simply physical access to sources, through transcription and publication, was insufficient. The editor also had an explanatory function to carry out. Selected editors, most notably Julian P. Boyd, felt that, because of the complexity of original sources, it was the function of the editor to increase the intelligibility of materials through explanation.

This can be viewed as a distinguishing characteristic of early modern documentary editing. Editors gave greater consideration to their roles as narrators and describers of documentation. Because original sources were subject to interpretation, or misinterpretation, it

was believed that the critical editorial function was to provide for a condition that would allow for the accurate consumption of historical evidence.

Issues related to the initiation of an editing project, the determination of a project's scope, and the process of document selection were also influenced by issues related to editorial attitudes regarding the function of original sources. Editors were aware that certain characteristics of original sources, both in their existing artifactual forms and those that existed in previously published documentary editions, could detract from their usability and ease of use. These relate primarily to the scattered nature of original sources, the existence of inaccurate or incomplete documentary editions, and the access issues posed by the material characteristics of original sources, such as illegible handwriting. These issues relate primarily to access concerns.

The underlying philosophy of Boyd's edition, as well as those of the other founding era papers, was that the comprehensive publishing could address the challenges posed by a physically separated, though intellectually related, documentary record. Editors felt that they were reestablishing these relationships. This aspect also relates to the issue regarding the material aspects of original sources. Through transcription, and presentation, editors could increase the legibility of materials that were difficult to use.

Lastly, as noted, editors' consideration of the characteristics of original sources took into account existing documentary editions. A number of the editions produced during the late 19th century did not meet the requirements of historical evidence. Some of these editions were found to be incomplete or inaccurate and could not function as usable surrogates for original sources. In this regard, a substantial amount of the work carried out by editors was corrective in nature and functioned as a correction of the published documentary record.

In summary, the requirements of evidence can be viewed as having a significant influence on the creation documentary editions. This came from editors' understanding of how original sources operated as evidence. Editors' concern with context, and with issues of reliability, was directly related to the overall objective of constructing published versions of original sources that could function as evidence.

Question #3:

As defined, articulated, and illustrated by editorial methodology, what is the relationship between the edited documents and the originating source materials, in terms of their function as historical evidence? How did the nature of this relationship determine the form the edited documents, and documentary editions, took in their final published forms?

In evaluating the relationship between original sources and the printed surrogates that were produced, editors can be viewed as being concerned with two primary tasks, both which were influenced in some manner by the intended function of the edition. First, it is important to recognize that editors were not concerned with publishing perfect surrogates of the original sources. Editors did not reproduce the artifact. Nor did editors reproduce the content exactly as it appeared in the original document. This form of replication could be accomplished through microfilm, but editors sought to address inherent access constraints that were present within the original sources.

More accurately, editors created representations of original sources. Early modern editors did not want to reproduce content exactly. Editors reproduced documentation in typescript, applied descriptive, explanatory, and textual notes, and presented the documents in a specific form of arrangement. These actions, in the editor's view, would create a more usable document. The meaning and interpretation that would be derived from the original document

and its printed representation would be the same. It was the intent of the editor to not alter meaning. However, the form and the presentation of the source in a printed form were quite distinct from that of the original artifact. These objects could function in the place of the originals, but they were, in their own right, unique objects. This was a reality that editors were quite conscious of.

Editors were well aware that they were attempting to create surrogates for original sources, in terms of the meaning that the document would convey. It was the intent to replicate the intellectual essence precisely. However, as objects, the works produced by editors were quite distinct in terms of their physical form. This was by necessity of the editorial function. Early modern editors' primary objectives were to reduce the effects of physical and intellectual access constraints. This required a shifting and alteration of form, through presentation.

Original sources were transcribed, annotated, and ordered. Tools for providing transparency, evidenced by the structures implemented by editors, addressed these points. Documentary editions, as evidence, were created in a unique context, by specific actions and activities. Meaning could be transferred relatively seamlessly, but form had to be translated. For this reason, editors provided information regarding this context of creation, so that the researcher or reader would trust the meaning contained within the printed document. These practices demonstrated that while the works produced by early modern editors could function in the place of original documentation, they were still viewed as unique objects that possessed their own unique characteristics.

This example refers to the relationship between the original and the edited document, as it relates to the degree of meaning that the source could convey. In addition to communicative power, a secondary aspect that concerned editors was the ability of their works to capture the

relationships that existed between original sources. Boyd, Butterfield, Cappon, Carter placed great emphasis on issues related to selection and definition of scope. The documents that editors decided to include and exclude was related to the nature of the documentary relationships that they wanted to represent. For example, Boyd's comprehensive edition places the emphasis on documents that had as their defining characteristic, a primary relationship to Thomas Jefferson. However, Cappon's selective edition of the correspondence between John Adams, Abigail Adams, and Thomas Jefferson placed emphasis on a more precise documentary relationship, that of materials that documented communications between three individuals. Each of these examples illustrates differences of intent, in terms of the relationships that Boyd, Butterfield, and Cappon sought to capture.

This aspect of editorial work is restorative in nature. Early modern editors' concern with completeness was a concern with bringing together physically dispersed, but intellectually related, objects. When editors viewed groupings of related, but separated documents, they saw sets of documentary relationships. Early modern editors felt that their works should capture these relationships. Treatment of correspondence is the most visible example of this type of work, but the editors' treatments of documents that existed in multiple draft forms, is another critical example. A draft of a speech would be included alongside available drafts. This editorial concern with documentary relationships occurred at both the document and collection level. Editors saw that their works could make explicit, implicit documentary relationships.

Question #4:

What was the affect of external factors, including allied professions, governmental institutions, and research standards, on the development of editorial methods? What was the extent of their influence?

This study demonstrated that the work of editors did not occur within a vacuum. Editorial work was affected by the influence of allied communities that both engaged in practices associated with documentary editing and made use of these resources. The factors/communities that had the greatest influence on the effect of editing practice can be defined in terms of archival, historiographic, and governmental.

The work of editors and that of archivists can be viewed as occurring in parallel to one another. Both groups were concerned with the creation of usable collections, editors through the construction of documentary editions, and archivists through the selection, organization, and description of original sources. Editors provided access to surrogates, while archivists provided access to the original artifacts. While the critical writings of editors do not exhibit explicit statements regarding any archival influence, there are similarities in the nature of the discussions that both groups engaged in, and the general functions that both professions carried out, although the specific orientation is unique.

Archivists and editors were both concerned with creating a usable historical record. This record would be usable in the sense that it would be reliable and authentic. Editors provided for this condition through a careful examination of the documents that they selected, a structured editorial apparatus, and in providing contextual and descriptive information along with the text of the documents. Editors were greatly concerned with providing provenance information. Offering descriptive notes and explanatory statements functioned as a form of contextualization.

This would allow the researcher or reader to evaluate the reliability and authenticity of the edited document. A concern with provenance was a central aspect of the archival functions. Archivists documented this information through gathering and organizing information regarding the context of a record's creation, information regarding its creator, and lastly, information regarding the chain of custody of a source. Conditions of reliability and authenticity are provided for through documenting the context of an object's creation, and a history of its custody.

Additionally, archivists and editors were similarly concerned with the description of documentation. Editors described printed documents through the use of descriptive and explanatory notes, while archivists described original sources through the use of descriptive tools called finding aids and through catalog cards. During the mid 20th century, archivists had similar concerns regarding the nature of what level of description is sufficient or necessary. Both groups conceptualized description as a form of intellectual and physical control.

Lastly, the archival and editorial communities were engaged in similar access practices during this period. In terms of editorial discussion and practice, discussion regarding the role of the documentary edition as an access tool centered mainly in relation to the concept of the comprehensive edition. The primary question was related to the degree of publishing that would be sufficient to create a usable collection. This is primarily a concern with the nature of physical access, though this also relates to the idea of editorial relationships. In terms of intellectual access, and operating more at the document level, was the editors' concern with explanatory notes as an access device. How present should the editor be within the text?

Archivists of this period were also concerned with access issues. Archival repositories provided different categories of access. Primarily, these institutions provided access to original sources in their artifactual state. However, archival institutions also provided access through

publication, primarily through the use of microfilm. The scholarly dialogue reveals that archivists, too, were concerned with issues of scope, timeliness of production, and issues related to publication medium, as it related to instances of access.

In terms of a genealogy of ideas, it is difficult to concretely articulate a statement on the nature of archival influence. However, it can be stated that the two communities did engage with one another. Editors were frequently published in the *American Archivist*. Additionally, documentary editors often found themselves moving in editing, historical, and archival circles. This is best illustrated by the examples of Lyman H. Butterfield, Lester J. Cappon, and J. Franklin Jameson. Both professions were not far removed from their professional roots within the historical community, and having a concern with historical evidence, archivists and documentary editors worked with similar concepts. While it may not be possible to make an explicit statement regarding influence, it can be stated that these groups were aware of one another and they engaged in similar, though distinct, documentary practices.

The nature of the influence of the historical community on the production of documentary editions relates to the requirements of an original source. Because early modern editors were concerned with constructing editions that could function as evidence, for historical research, their works had to be open to evaluation by users and they had to maintain standards of reliability and authenticity. In terms of influence on the construction of documentary editions, the critical influence can be viewed as methodological in scope.

Additionally, early modern editors were aware of the challenges that original resources posed for researchers and readers. First, a source in its original form may be difficult to read, depending on how it was *written*. Secondly, the scattered nature of original sources could present challenges to the researcher if he or she is unable to travel to locate materials and a

microfilm version is not available. Editors took these conditions into account when formulating their projects. The concept of the comprehensive edition, introduced by Boyd, would serve to address the challenges posed by the scattered nature of original sources. Secondly, the transcription process eliminates challenges that might have been present in regards to the legibility of documents.

The expectations of their primary users influenced editors in their work. In theorizing their user, and in understanding the characteristics of historical evidence, editors were able to make choices that would allow them to produce editions that could satisfy historians' requirements. Again, it is important to emphasize that this is a theorized understanding of the user; however, this view still exerted influence on the editor.

Lastly, the federal government influenced editorial practice during the early modern period. In particular, this influence came through the National Historical Publications Commission (NHPC), and later, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). Beginning with the publication of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* the federal government took an increased role in encouraging and coordinating documentary publication efforts within the United States. Both the NHPC, and later the NHPRC, laid out agendas which emphasized the types of projects that were of the most critical importance and the nature of the editorial approach that should be used.

The most prominent example of this is the influence of Julian P. Boyd's work on the government policy. During the early modern era, the projects given the highest priority were the Founding Fathers projects. These projects were carried out in the same manner as Boyd's *Jefferson*. Each of these projects was conceptualized as a comprehensive edition. During the early modern period of editing, the federal government's influence can be seen as arguing for,

and encouraging, a form of systematic editing, best illustrated by Boyd. It was at this time that the federal government emphasized the role of documentary heritage as a public good. Here, the federal government can also be seen as an instrumental element in encouraging a wider idea of readership, beyond that of scholars.

This discussion of external elements demonstrates that editors carried out their activities in relation to a number of allied groups. The nature of the influence of these groups on the practice of editing, and on the development of editorial thought, was varied. However, each of these contexts illustrate that editing occurred within a larger context of documentary activity. This was context defined by users, custodians, and organizations.

E. SUMMARY

These responses to the frames of this study describe the early modern period of documentary editing (1943-1970) as a period defined by particular sets of attitudes, practices, and projects. The editorial thought that developed during this period was partially a reaction to previous practices and ideas, but this period was also defined by a reconsideration of the editorial function, and the characteristics of the objects that the practice should produce.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Monographs and Articles

American Historical Review. "John Franklin Jameson," *The American Historical Review* 43:2 (January 1938): 243-252.

Baumann, Roland M. "Samuel Hazard: Editor and Archivist for the Keystone State," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107, no.2 (April 1983): 195-215.

Beale, Howard K. "Is the Printed Diary of Gideon Welles Reliable?," *The American Historical Review* 30:3 (April 1925): 547-552.

Berner, Richard C. *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983.

Bestor, Jr., Arthur E. "The Transformation of American Scholarship, 1875-1917." *The Library Quarterly* 23, no.3 (July 1953): 164-179.

Bickford, Charlene B. "Documentary Editing: Its History and Meaning." *Prologue* 18, no.3 (Fall 1986): 147-151.

Boyd, Julian P. "'These Precious Monuments of...Our History'." *American Archivist* 22, no.2 (1959): 147-180.

Broeker, Galen. "Jared Sparks, Robert Peel and the State Paper Office." *American Quarterly* 13, no.2 (Summer 1961): 140-152.

Brooks, Philip C. *Research in Archives: The Use of Unpublished Primary Sources*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Brubaker, Robert L. "The Publication of Historical Sources: Recent Projects in the United States," *Library Quarterly* 37: 2 (April 1967) 193-225.

Buck, Solon J. "Walworth Alvord, Historian." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 15, no.3 (December 1928): 309-320.

Burnette, Jr., O. Lawrence. *Beneath the Footnote: A Guide to the Use and Preservation of American Historical Sources*. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1969.

- Burke, Frank G. "Automation and Documentary Editing," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 20:1 (January 1987): 73-79.
- _____. "The Beginnings of the NHPRC Records Program," *The American Archivist* 63 (Spring/Summer 2000): 18-42
- _____. "The Historian as Editor: Progress and Problems," *The Public Historian* 4:2 (Spring 1982): 4-19
- _____. *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*.
Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 1997.
- Butterfield, L.H. "Worthington Chauncey Ford, Editor." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series, 83 (1971): 46-82.
- Butterfield, L.H., and Julian P. Boyd. *Historical Editing in the United States: Papers Read at the 150th Annual Meeting of the American Antiquarian Society*.
Worcester, Mass: The American Antiquarian Society, 1963.
- Cappon, Lester J. "American Historical Editors Before Jared Sparks: "they will plant a forest..."", *William and Mary Quarterly*. 3rd series: 30. July 1973.
- _____. "Two Decades of Historical Activity in Virginia," *The Journal of Southern History* 6:2 (May 1940): 189-200.
- _____. "Walter R. Benjamin and the Autograph Trade at the Turn of the Century." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 78 (1966): 20-37.
- Callcott, George H. "Antiquarianism and Documents in the Age of Literary History," *The American Archivist* 21:1 (January 1958): 17-29.
- Carter, Clarence E. "The United States and Documentary Historical Publication." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25, no.1 (June 1938): 3-24.
- Chesnutt, David. "The Model Editions Partnership: Historical Editions in the Digital Age," *D-Lib Magazine* (November 1995), available online at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november95/11chesnutt.html> (accessed April 20, 2010)
- Cook, Terry. "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape," *The Canadian Historical Review* 90:3 (September 2009): 497-534.
- _____. "What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift," *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997): 17-63

- Cox, Richard J. *American Archival Analysis: The Recent Development of the Archival Profession in the United States*. Metuchen, N.J. & London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1990.
- _____. *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives & Records Management*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000.
- _____. *Managing Records as Evidence and Information*. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 2000.
- _____. "Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates: Quarrelling about the Preservation of the Documentary Heritage of the United States." *First Monday* 2:8 (August 1997), available at http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue2_8/cox/index.html (accessed March 9, 2006).
- _____. "Yours Ever (Well, Maybe): Studies and Signposts in Letter Writing," *Archival Science* 10:4 (December 2010): 373-388.
- Crittenden, C.C. "Publication Policies for Archival and Historical Agencies," *The American Archivist* 3:4 (October 1940): 245-250.
- Cullen, Charles T. "Casual Observer Beware: The Need for Using Scholarly Editions," *Prologue* 21:1 (Fall 1989): 68-74.
- Cunningham, Jr., Nobel E. "The Legacy of Julian Boyd," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 83 (1984): 340-344.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990.
- Donnan, Elizabeth, and Leo F. Stock, eds. *An Historian's World: Selections from the Correspondence of John Franklin Jameson*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956.
- Donohue, Keith. "Documenting Democracy," *Prologue* 36, no.3 (Fall 2004): 30-33.
- Dunlap, Leslie W. *American Historical Societies*. Madison, Wisconsin: Cantwell Printing Company, 1944.
- Dunlap, Leslie W., and Fred Shelley, eds. *The Publication of American Historical Manuscripts*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa Libraries, 1976.
- Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery, eds. *The Book History Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006.

- Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery. *An Introduction to Book History*. New York and London: Routledge, 2005.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncey. "The Editorial Function in the United States." *The American Historical Review* 23, no.2 (January 1918): 273-286.
- Frohmann, Bernd. *Deflating Information: From Science to Documentation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Garraghan, Gilbert J. *A Guide to Historical Method*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1940.
- Giunta, Mary A. "Assisting Documentary Publishing," *Scholarly Publishing* 21:1 (October 1989): 33-39
- Giunta, Mary A. "The NHPRC: Its Influence on Documentary Editing, 1964-1984," *The American Archivist* 49:2 (Spring 1986): 134-141.
- Gondos, Jr., Victor. *J. Franklin Jameson and the Birth of the National Archives 1906-1926*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.
- Grigg, Susan. "Archival Practice and the Foundations of Historical Method." *The Journal of American History* 78, no.1 (June 1991): 228-239.
- Hamer, Philip M. "'...authentic Documents tending to elucidate our History'." *American Archivist* 25 (January 1962): 3-13.
- Hesseltine, William B., and Donald R. McNeil, eds. *In Support of Clio: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1958.
- Hindle, Brooke. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol I (1760-1766) by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Isis* 43:3 (September 1952): 281-282.
- Hockett, Homer Carey. *The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.
- Howell, Martha and Walter Prevenier. *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Howsam, Leslie. *Old Books & New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Jameson, J. Franklin. "Gaps in the Published Documentary Record," *The American Historical Review* 11:4 (July 1906): 817-831.

- _____. *The History of Historical Writing in America*.
Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, 1891.
- Jones, H.G. *For History's Sake: The Preservation and Publication of North Carolina History 1663-1903*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966.
- _____. *The Records of a Nation: Their Management, Preservation, and Use*.
New York: Athenaeum, 1969.
- Kegan, Elizabeth Hamer. "A Becoming Regard to Posterity." *American Archivist* 40,
no.1 (January 1977): 5-15.
- Kline, Mary-Jo, and Susan Holbrook Perdue. *A Guide to Documentary Editing*.
Third Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.
- Kohn, Richard H., and George M. Curtis III. "The Government, the Historical
Profession, and Historical Editing: A Review." *Reviews in American History*
9, no. 2 (June 1981): 145-155.
- Lanier, Clinton R. "Electronic Editing and the Author," *Technical Communication* 51:4
(November 2004): 526-536.
- Lee, Charles E. "Documentary Reproduction: Letterpress Publication—Why? What? How?,"
The American Archivist 28:3 (July 1965): 351-365.
- Leland, Waldo Gifford. "The Prehistory and Origins of the National Historical
Publications Commission." *American Archivist* 27 (April 1964): 187-194.
- Lemisch, Jesse. "The American Revolution Bicentennial and the Papers of Great White Men: A
Preliminary Critique of Current Documentary Publication Programs and Some Alternative
Proposals." *AHA Newsletter* 9 (November 1971): 7-21.
- _____. "The Papers of A Few Great Black Men and a Few Great White Women," *The
Maryland Historian* 6 (1975): 60-66.
- _____. "The Papers of Great White Men," *The Maryland Historian* 6 (1975): 43-50.
- Leopold, Richard W. "The Historian and the Federal Government." *The Journal of American
History* 64, no.1 (June 1977): 5-23.
- McCarthy, Paul. "Insights from the Outside: The NHPRC Records Program at Twenty-Five,"
The American Archivist 63 (Spring/Summer 2000): 90-96.
- McCoy, Donald R. *The National Archives: America's Ministry of Documents 1934-1968*.
Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978.

- McKenzie, D.F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- National Historical Publications and Records Commission. "Forty Years of Publishing" *Prologue* 32:3 (Fall 2004): 4-6.
- Newsome, Albert Ray. "The Archivist in American Scholarship," *The American Archivist* 2:4 (October 1939): 217-224.
- Nolte, William M. "Walter Rundell, Jr.: The Archival Interests of a Historian." *American Archivist* 48, no.4 (Fall 1985): 377-387.
- Pearce-Moses, Richard. *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005. available online at <http://www.archivists.org/glossary/index.asp> (accessed August 3, 2010).
- Pilcher, George. "Ebenezer Hazard and the Promotion of Historical Scholarship in the Early Republic." *Pennsylvania History* 56, no. 1 (January 1989): 3-14.
- Reingold, Nathan. "Reflections of an Unrepentant Editor," *The American Archivist* 46:1 (Winter 1983):14-21.
- Rothberg, Morey D. "John Franklin Jameson and the International Community," *The History Teacher* 26, no.4 (August 1993): 449-457
- _____. "The Brahmin as Bureaucrat: J. Franklin Jameson at the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1905-1928." *The Public Historian* 8, no.4 (Fall 1986): 47-60.
- _____. "'To Set a Standard of Workmanship and Compel Men to Conform To It': John Franklin Jameson as Editor of the *American Historical Review*." *American Historical Review* 89 (1984): 957-975.
- Rothberg, Morey D., and Jacqueline Goggin, eds. *John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic Scholarship in America*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993
- Rundell, Jr., Walter. "Clio's Ways and Means: A Preliminary Report on the Survey," *The Historian* 30:1 (November 1967): 20-40.
- _____. *In Pursuit of History: Research and Training in the United States*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970.
- _____. "Relations between Historical Researchers and Custodians of Source Material," *College & Research Libraries* (November 1968): 466-476.

- Rutland, Robert A. "Recycling Early National History Through the Papers of the Founding Fathers." *American Quarterly* 28, no.2 (Summer 1976): 250 – 261.
- Shafer, Robert Jones, ed. *A Guide to Historical Method*, 3rd Edition. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1980.
- Shelly, Fred. "The Choice of Medium for Documentary Publication," *The American Archivist* 32:4 (October 1969): 363-368.
- Silver, Henry M. "The Publication of Original Research Materials," *American Documentation* 1:1 (January 1950): 182-183
- Simon, John Y. "Editorial Projects as Derivative Archives," *College & Research Libraries* 35 (July 1974): 291-294.
- Sung, Carolyn Hoover. "Peter Force: Washington Printer and Creator of the American Archives." PhD diss., George Washington University, 1985.
- Sweeney, Shelly. "The Ambiguous Origins of the Archival Principle of "Provenance"," *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 43:2 (2008): 193-213.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. "The Editing of Historical Documents," *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 1-56.
- _____. *Selected Studies in Bibliography*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1979.
- _____. Thomas. *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing*. Charlottesville: The Bibliographic Society of the University of Virginia, 1990.
- Tarter, Brent. "Long Before the NHPRC: Documentary Editing in Nineteenth-Century Virginia." *Documentary Editing* 30, no 1 & 2 (2008): un-numbered
- Teute, Fredrika J. "Views in Review: A Historiographical Perspective on Historical Editing." *American Archivist* 43:1 (Winter 1980): 43-56.
- Van Tassel, David D. *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America 1607-1884*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Vogt, George L., and John Bush Jones, eds. *Literary & Historical Editing*. Library Series, 46. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Libraries, 1981.
- Whitehill, Walter Muir. *Independent Historical Societies*. Boston: The Boston Athenaeum distributed by Harvard University Press, 1962.

Book Reviews

- Abbot, W.W. “*The Papers of James Madison*, Volume I, 16 March 1751-16 December 1779; Volume II, 20 March 1780-23 February 1781, edited by William T. Hutchinson and William M.E. Rachal,” *The American Historical Review* 68:2 (January 1963): 476-478.
- Adair, Douglass. “Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I: 1760-1776 by Thomas Jefferson; Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 74:3 (July 1950), 407-408.
- Bailyn, Bernard. “Essay Review: Boyd’s Jefferson: Notes for a Sketch,” *The New England Quarterly* 33:3 (September 1960): 380-400.
- Bemis, Samuel Flagg. “Review: *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 331 (September 1960): 174.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1760-1776*. Julian P. Boyd, Editor; Lyman H. Butterfield and Mina R. Bryan, Associate Editors,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 7:4 (October 1950): 596-609.
- Cappon, Lester J. “*The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Volume I, January 6, 1706 through December 31, 1734*. Leonard W. Labaree, Editor; Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., Associate Editor; Helen C. Boatfield and Helene H. Fineman, Assistant Editors,” *The New England Quarterly* 33:2 (June 1960): 246-248.
- Cappon, Lester J. “*The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1760-1776*. Edited by Julian P. Boyd, Lyman H. Butterfield, and Mina R. Bryan,” *Southern Historical Association* 16:4 (November 1950): 532-534.
- Chandler, Jr., Alfred D. “*The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume I, 1856-1880, Volume 2, 1881-1884*,” *The New England Quarterly* 40:4 (December 1967): 592-597.
- Cox, LaWanda. “Review: From the Great White Men to Blacks Emerging from Bondage, with Innovations in Documentary Editing.” *Reviews in American History* 12, no.1 (March 1984): 31-39.
- Davis, Richard Beale. “Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Volume 1, 1760-1776: by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan and The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Volume 2, January 1777 to June 1779. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan,” *Modern Language Notes* 66:6 (June 1951): 412-414.
- Farber, W.O. “Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I, 1760-1776,” *The Western Political Quarterly* 3:4 (December 1950): 640-641.

- Farnsley, Charles. "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *The Journal of Politics* 12:4 (November 1950): 714-715
- Ferguson, E James. "The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. Vol. III, 1782-1786 and Vol. IV January 1787-May 1788," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49:3 (December 1962): 506-508.
- Garraty, John A. "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*," 40:2 (May 1971): 232-233.
- Hindle, Brooke. "Review: Thomas Jefferson: Scientist by Edwin T. Martin and The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I (1760-1776) by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *Isis* 43:3 (September 1952): 281-282.
- Hofstadter, Richard. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I: 1760-1776. Vol. II: 1777 to 18 June 1779, Including the Revisal of the Laws, 1776-1786. By Julian P. Boyd," *Political Science Quarterly* 66:1 (March 1951): 152-154.
- Hornberger, Theodore. "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. by Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *American Quarterly* 3:1 (Spring 1951): 87-90.
- Hoover, Dwight W. "Review: *In Pursuit of American History*," *American Quarterly* 23:3 (August 1971): 333-334
- Jameson, J. Franklin. "Review: *The Writings of James Madison*," *The American Historical Review* 8:3 (April 1903), 559-661.
- _____. "Review: *The Writings of James Monroe*. Edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton. Volume VI. 1817-1823.," *The American Historical Review* 8:4 (July 1903), 781-782.
- Jennings, John Mellville. "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I, 1776 by Thomas Jefferson ; Julian P. Boyd," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 58:4 (October 1950): 529-530
- Jones, Howard Mumford. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. I. 1760-1776. By Julian P. Boyd; Lyman H. Butterfield; Mina R. Bryan," *American Literature* 22:4 (January 1951): 540-543.
- Kraus, Michael. "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*," *The American Historical Review* 76:3 (June 1971): 825-826.
- Morgan, Edmund S. "John Adams and the Puritan Tradition," *The New England Quarterly* 34:4 (December 1961): 518-529.
- Morrow, Ralph E. "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*," *The Journal of Southern History*, 36:4 (November 1970): 580-581.

Nicholas, H.G. "Review: *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States*" *The English Historical Review* 87:343 (April 1972): 458-459.

Petersen, Merrill D. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volumes I-III," *The New England Quarterly* 24:4 (December 1951): 533-536.

Potter, David M. "Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. I, 1760-1776 by Julian P. Boyd," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37:2 (September 1950): 312-314.

Schulz, Constance B. "Essay Review: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 109:1 (January 1985): 69-79.

_____. "“From Generation Unto Generation”: Transitions in Modern Documentary Historical Editing." *Reviews in American History* 16, no. 3 (September 1988): 337-350.

Shera, Jesse H. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume I," *Minnesota History* 31:3 (September 1950): 179-180.

Case Studies

Blessing, Matt. "Reuben Gold Thwaites and the Historical Resurrection of Lewis and Clark," 88, no.2 (Winter, 2004-2005): 42-49.

Blum, John M. "Editors' Camera: The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt," *American Documentation* 1:4 (October 1950): 13-23.

Cullen, Charles T. "20th-Century Technology and the Jefferson Papers," *Scholarly Publishing* 13 (October 1981): 45-53.

Butterfield, L.H. "The Adams Papers," *Daedalus* 86 (May 1955): 62-71.

_____. *Butterfield in Holland: A Record of L.H. Butterfield's Pursuit of the Adamses Abroad in 1959*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

_____. "The Papers of the Adams Family: Some Account of their History." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3rd Series, 71 (October 1959): 328-356.

_____. "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Progress and Procedures in the Enterprise at Princeton," *The American Archivist* 12:2 (April 1949): 131-145.

- Carter, Clarence E. "The Territorial Papers of the United States: A Review and a Commentary." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 42, no.3 (December 1955): 510-524.
- Eckles, Robert B. "The Organization and Publication of the Frank B. Gilbreth Papers," *The American Archivist* 29:1 (January 1966): 83-85.
- Hopkins, John F. "Publishing the Henry Clay Papers," *The American Archivist* 20:3 (July 1957): 231-233.
- Lees, Lorraine M., and Sandra Gioia Treadway. "Review: A Future for Our Diplomatic Past? A Critical Appraisal of the Foreign Relations Series," *The Journal of American History* 70, no.3 (December 1983): 621-629.
- Leopold, Richard W. "The Foreign Relations Series Revisited: One Hundred Plus Ten," *The Journal of American History* 59, no.4 (March 1973): 935-957.
- Lingelbach, William E. "Benjamin Franklin's papers and the American Philosophical Society." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 99, no.6 (December 15, 1955): 359-380.
- Massey, Gregory D. "The Papers of Henry Laurens and Modern Historical Documentary Editing." *The Public Historian* 27, no.1 (Winter 2005): 39-60.
- Mitchell, Memory F. "Publishing the Papers of a Contemporary Governor," *The American Archivist* 33:1 (January 1970): 11-18.
- Mugridge, Donald F. "The Adams Papers," *The American Archivist* 25:4 (October 1962): 449-454.
- Noggle, Burl. "A Note on Historical Editing: The Wilson "Papers" in Perspective." *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Society* 8, no.3 (Summer 1967): 281-297.
- _____. "Predilections to Politics and the Lures of Love: The Further Education of Young Woodrow Wilson," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 9:4 (Autumn 1968): 373-387.
- Runge, William F. "The Madison Papers," *The American Archivist* 20:4 (October 1957): 313-317.
- Sheldon, Richard N. "Editing a Historical Manuscript: Jared Sparks, Douglas Southall Freeman, and the Battle of Brandywine," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 36:2 (April 1979): 255-263

Shelley, Fred. "The Publication of the Maryland Historical Society," *The American Archivist* 15:4 (October 1952): 309-320.

Stertz, Jennifer E. "Yet Another George Washington Website: The Digital Edition and the Future of Documentary Editing," *Documentary Editing* 30:1 & 2 (Spring and Summer 2008): unnumbered.

Weinberg, Allen. "Publication Program of the Philadelphia Archives," *The American Archivist* 25:2 (April 1962): 193-197.

Critical Editing Texts

Bell, Jr., Whitfield J. "Editing a Scientist's Papers," *Isis* 53:1 (March 1962): 14-20.

_____. "Franklin's Papers and *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*," 22:1 (January 1955): 1-17.

Bergeron, Paul H. "True Value Seen: Historical Editing," *The American Archivist* 34:3 (July 1971): 259-264.

Boyd, Julian P. "God's Altar Needs Not Our Polishings." *New York History: Quarterly Journal of New York State Historical Society* 39, no.1 (January 1958): 3-21.

_____. "Some Animadversions on Being Struck by Lightning," *Daedalus* 86:1 (May 1955), 49-56

Butterfield, L.H. "Archival and Editorial Enterprise in 1850 and in 1950: Some Comparisons and Contrasts." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 98, no.3 (June 1954): 159-170.

_____. "Editing American Historical Documents," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 78 (1966): 81-104.

Carter, Clarence E. *Historical Editing*. Bulletins of the National Archives Number 7. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

Cappon, Lester J. "The Historian as Editor," in *In Support of Clio: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*, ed. William B. Hesseltine and Donald R. McNeil. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1958: 173-194.

_____. "A Rationale for Historical Editing: Past and Present." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd Series 23, no.1 (January 1966): 56-75.

Cox, Richard J. *Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004.

Labaree, Leonard W. "In Search of "B. Franklin"." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series, 16, no.2 (April 1959): 188-197.

Labaree, Leonard W. "Scholarly Editing in Our Times," *Ventures* 3 (Winter 1964): 28-31.

Documentary Works

Boyd, Julian P., ed. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Volume 1, 1760-1776*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Butterfield, L.H., ed. *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Butterfield, L.H., ed. *The Earliest Diary of John Adams*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966.

Butterfield, L.H., ed. *Adams Family Correspondence, Vols 1-2*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.

Cappon, Lester J. ed., *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*. Chapel Hill: Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia by the University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

The Selected Papers of Frank B. Gilbreth: The Gilbreth Records, N File, 4 reels.
The Micro Photo Division of Bell and Howell Co., 1700 Shaw Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 44112.

Hopkins, James F., ed. *The Papers of Henry Clay, Volume 1: The Rising Statesman 1797-1814*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1959.

Labaree, Leonard W., ed. *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 1. January 6, 1706-December 31, 1734*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Government and Commission Reports

Boyd, Julian P. *Report to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission on the need, scope, proposed method of preparation, probable cost, and possible means of publishing a comprehensive edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Washington: General Services Administration, 1943.

National Archives and Records Administration. "The Founder's Online: Open Access to the Papers of America's Founding Era: A Report to Congress," Washington, DC, National Archives and Records Administration, 2008. Available online at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/publications/founders-report.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2010)

National Historical Publications Commission. *The National Historical Publications Commission, 1934-1950, A Report to the Commission*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

_____. *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents, A Report to the President by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.

_____. *A Report to the President Containing a Proposal by the National Historical Publications Commission to Meet Existing and Anticipated Needs Over the Next Ten Years Under a National Program for the Collection, Preservation, and Publication, or Dissemination by Other Means, of the Documentary Sources of American History*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

National Historical Publications and Records Commission. *A Report to the President by the National Historical Publications and Records Administration*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Web Based Resources

Association for Documentary Editing. "What do Editing Projects Do?," The Association for Documentary Editing. http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/about/projects_do.html (accessed April 20, 2010).

Association for Documentary Editing. "A Brief History of Documentary Editing," Association for Documentary Editing. <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/about/history.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).

Committee On Electronic Standards. "Minimum Standards for Electronic Editions," Association for Documentary Editing. <http://www.documentaryediting.org/resources/> (accessed on April 20, 2010).

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. "Searching," The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. http://franklinpapers.org/franklin/info_search.jsp (accessed April 20, 2010).

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. "Volumes," The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. <http://www.princeton.edu/~tjpapers/volumes.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).