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The San Francisco of Alfred Pioche and Charles Meryon

BY O. J. ROTHROCK

We could well be mistaken to allow François Louis Alfred Pioche no vision of San Francisco more ideal than that suggested by one of its legend establishments, "El Dorado. The Temple of Chance." True, he was among the first to join the great Gold Rush, and one of the few Forty-Niners actually to become rich. Yet the record of his enterprises demonstrates, that for him the Golden Gate led not to the prospects of the mines beyond (however appropriate the English meaning of his name) but rather to the promise of the city itself. Symbolic of that record and of its nobler ambition, if you will, are the photographic panorama of San Francisco taken in 1855, the five panels of which are now in The Art Institute of Chicago (Figs. 2 and 4), and the oblong etching copied from it in France in 1856 at Pioche's command by the remarkable Parisian artist Charles Meryon. An impression of the latter is in the Graphic Arts Collection, Princeton University Library (Figs. 3 and 5).¹

¹ Our etching is No. 73, last state of 4, in the standard catalogue: Loys Delteil (with revisions by Harold J. L. Wright) *Catalogue Raisonné of The Etchings of Charles Meryon* (New York, 1924). Delteil's measurements should be 185 x 950 mm.

Thanks to Esther Sparks of the Art Institute for answering questions about the photographs and arranging for their publication. Also, to Gladys Hunsen of the San Francisco Public Library for kindly pointing out Lloyd LaPage Rollins, "Charles Meryon and His 'Vue De San Francisco.'" *Quarterly of The Society of California Pioneers*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (June, 1952) 97-107. My efforts may be considered in part an expansion of his article. Thanks also to Elizabeth Roth of the Spencer Collection, New York Public Library, Alfred Bush of the Library here, and David Coffin and Peter Bunnell of the Department of Art and Archaeology for their helpful suggestions and bibliographic pointers.
Ironically, for reasons conceivably traceable in part to Meryon's own contribution to the rise of the aesthetic of "art for art's sake," and so to the neglect by most historians until recently of photography's relation to art, we are able to publish the photographs and the etching together here for the first time. But this, as our by now wiser experience of the modern age will realize, is just one from an imbroglio of ironies behind the commission. Not only did it involve the confrontation of an especially sensitive artist with photography, the one with his profound, not to say immemorial attachment to the poetic validity of manually drawn realism—the other with its irreversible destiny of technologically achieved, startlingly total realism, but also of two men, banker and artist, both deeply but very differently engaged in interpreting the urban ideals of their time or, to borrow a phrase from an 1855 issue of Putnam's Weekly Magazine, in interpreting "The great phenomenon of the Age . . . the building of great cities."  

"Of all the marvellous phases of the history of the present," wrote Bayard Taylor in 1849, "the growth of San Francisco is the one which will most tax the belief of the Future . . . When I landed there, a little more than four months before, I found a scattering town of tents and canvas houses, with a show of frame buildings on one or two streets, and a population of six thousand. Now, on my last visit, I saw around me an actual metropolis, displaying street after street of well built edifices, filled with an active and enterprising people and exhibiting every mark of permanent commercial prosperity." Pioche apparently shared that prosperity and the vision of its permanence. Born to a wealthy family in St. Dizier, France, he had already established his double reputation as a daring investor and lover of the cultural refinements of urban life by running through his sizable legacy in Paris. Thereafter he had served briefly as chancellor in the French consulate in Chile, but when the news from California reached him, he had returned to finance. In fact, it was with a cargo of merchandise from Chile that he and his compatriot, the bookkeeper Jules B. Bayerque, arrived on February 20, 1849 to stake their claim among the tents and canvas houses of San Francisco by opening an import and retail firm on Clay Street.  

How quickly the firm prospered can perhaps be glimpsed from remarks about it by one Ernest de Massy, whose journal and letters offer a detailed chronicle of a typically nearly disastrous experience in the Gold Rush. A few days after anchoring in the Bay in December, 1849, he describes Pioche's firm with the misgivings of one fresh from the masonry of civilization: "They run a large and flourishing business, make everyone welcome, and look after all business carefully, but I am not sure how substantial they are. Most of their capital is tied up in a building site located in the heart of the city with a wooden house on it." Three months later, chastened by life in San Francisco, he was ready to imply that the firm had at least some substantiality. Provisioned at last for the trek westward to the mines, he writes: "I am leaving for an indefinite period in which many things may happen [and did] and as I may never return alive from this wild and savage country I thought it best to give you some addresses . . . to get some trace of me." Among them he lists the firm of Pioche and Bayerque. In any case, by 1851 Pioche felt substantial enough and above all confident in the city enough to take the decisive step that made him San Francisco's chief banker for French capital. He sailed for Paris to enlist investors. 

No doubt Pioche realized that fabulous tales of the Gold Rush and Napoleon III's consolidation of power combined to encourage speculation. Still, it was a creditable show of optimism. By European standards San Francisco was, after all, hardly more than a few wooden houses, many shipped "ready made" 'round the Horn, that seemed to suffer spectacular conflagrations with dismaying regularity. Further, government policy concentrated not on the city but on the mines, even to the extent of underwriting companies of laborers and soldiers, the Garde Mobiles, to work

---


---


French claims. But Pioche's optimism had to overcome, one imagines, the much greater obstacle of rampant gold fever. The propaganda of the Gold Rush made San Francisco more a gateway to romance than a reality in itself. The populace was showered with broadsides and manuals, complete with convenient maps, distributed by the numerous companies selling sea passages—La Maison d'Or, Le Nouveau Monde, L'El Dorado, and the inevitable company that raffled tickets, the Société de l'Ingot d'Or—with tremendous success. By 1853 some thirty thousand Frenchmen had gone. Many had the backing for which Pioche himself was vying, but most went, as de Massey describes them, with "... no supplies, capital, credit, or friends of influence."

Pioche, meanwhile, returned with six million francs. Initial investments were in lucrative rental properties, stores, wharves, and warehouses. Emphasis soon shifted, however, to the undeveloped hills rising above the harbor. This was to be Pioche's major contribution to the growth of San Francisco, and since it may well have had some bearing on the commissioning of Meryon, it seems important to reconstruct the chronology.

Pioche, Bayerque and Company purchased enormous tracts of real estate around Visitacion Valley, the Bernal and San Miguel Ranches, Mission Dolores, Hayes Valley, and the Western Addition during the period of land speculation that reached its peak in 1853. In 1853 Pioche again sailed for France and remained there until 1856. The news that reached him was alarming. The Gold Rush was over and the city was being abandoned by many empty-handed hundreds. By 1856 real estate values had plummeted. In the very months that the photographs were taken and the etching commissioned, then, Pioche was faced with huge investments in unmarketable land.

Pioche's solution was as confident and farsighted as his initial trip to France in 1851. He raised the necessary funds to open his land to development. On his return in 1856 he hired professional planners and two hundred French laborers to lay out Hayes Valley and the Western Addition. More boldly still, he built the first of San Francisco's great urban car lines, the Market Street Railroad, which ran by steam from Mission Dolores past Hayes Valley to the foot of Market. Thus he connected his developed real estate to the congested center of the city.

In later years Pioche extended the reach of the city by backing the San José Railroad, which joined to the Market Street line, and the Placerville and Sacramento, with its terminal at Folsom. He also backed the city's first gas works. Among his other interests were the Sierra Mining and Irrigation Flume, the Ely Mining District (vide the county seat of Pioche, Nevada), new kinds of hydraulic mining equipment and processes for treating ores, and, with an admirably Gallic twist, the bottling of New Almedan mineral water.

Pioche's enterprises, embracing banking, real estate, railroads and gas works made him a typically progressive mid-nineteenth century city builder. Yet it seems important to see his business undertakings within his whole way of life. For Pioche was one of San Francisco's first great collectors and patrons of the arts. He collected paintings, sculpture, bronzes, and porcelain. His houses, first on Mission Street and later on Stockton, were sumptuously furnished. He entertained lavishly. He is said to have had his artist-protégé Pietro Mezzara invent keepsake cameos and jewelry for his guests. He was a patron of the opera and a founding member of the Society of California Pioneers. And through it all he was an indefatigable *bon vivant*. At one time he is said to have imported forty chefs from Paris and a shipload of fine wines to enhance the city's French fare. Such extravagant gestures were perhaps the style, though a style not devoid of a certain utopian intoxication. He may even have gone too far, as he was accused of being generous to a fault to his court of hangers-on. In any case, there can be no doubt that Pioche sought to lead a cultivated life in the world's newest city. "... un homme qui joignant le goût des grandes entreprises à l'amour des beaux-arts et aux plus généreux sentiments du cœur," is how Daniel Lévy, who knew him, describes him. Indeed, it may be that the ultimate source of Pioche's faith in the city, beyond its promises of enterprise and culture, was a heart-felt wonder at its natural beauty. Perhaps the portrait most complete of him is neither at his banking house, nor among his collections, nor at the opera, but alone on the veranda of his private retreat, "The Hermitage," which he had constructed far up "at the feet," as he put it, of Mission Dolores. From there he could contemplate the majestic harmony of the city, the Bay, and the distant hills. As J. Wesley Jones lectured on the same
view, which he daguerreotyped in 1851, "... as from the loftiest seat in an amphitheatre, We look down upon the magnificent city of San Francisco ...".

In 1855 or early in 1856 Pioche, Bayerque and Company decided to commission a printed panoramic view of their beautiful city. The print, moreover, was to be copied from photographs or, technically speaking, from five daguerreotypes of which, in turn, five paper enlargements had been made. Who the daguerreotypist was we do not know. Nor do we know of any documents that clarify exactly the purpose of the project. Nor do we know how or why Charles Meryon, who had never before worked from photographs, was elected to carry the project out. We do know that Pioche was in France from 1854 until sometime in 1856, and the coincidence of his residence there with the commission would seem to clear up at least that mystery. Conceivably, having received the daguerreotypes from his partners in San Francisco or simply having come across them in Paris, Pioche himself handed them along with the enlargements and instructions to the artist.

From the photographs themselves we can deduce that the date—MDCCCLV—inscribed in the cartouche of the etching correctly gives the year the panorama was taken. The Gothic construction of Old St. Mary's, visible in the fourth panel, was not completed until December, 1854. Also, Meryon's own letters confirm the date—1856—in the etching's lower left margin. From them we learn that he had obtained the commission by March, 1856, pulled the first proofs by September, and finally, a full year after beginning, finished the edition in March, 1857. His letters otherwise remain stubbornly vague about his patrons and any instructions they might have given him. But even if we know little more than these few facts, some speculation about the commission, involving as it did a banker, an artist, and photography at mid-nineteenth century, seems worthwhile.

Let us begin by pointing out that the concept of the commission was not novel. There were plenty of precedents for the reproduction of daguerreotypes in all the manually-prepared mass printing media of the time, wood-engravings, lithographs and steel intaglios. A lithograph of Notre-Dame de Paris, claimed to have been copied from a daguerreotype, was published in 1859, the very year Daguerre announced his process.9 Thereafter, architectural and topographical views were often copied—sometimes freehand and sometimes traced from photographic models. If, for example, Pioche read Putnam's Monthly in January, 1853, he was treated to "... a rapid glance, at the progress of New York and its architecture" in a pictorial essay of wood-engravings copied from daguerreotypes.10 Much closer to home was Francis Michelin's 1852 oversized color lithographic panorama "City of San Francisco . . . from Daguerreotypes taken on the Spot." The spot was just down Nob Hill from that later occupied by Pioche's cameraman.11 Still closer to the spot, indeed, just a few yards north of it, was the vantage for the 1854 daguerreotype panorama that appeared a year later as a lithographic plate in the Annals of San Francisco (Fig. 6). Naturally, it shows many of the same buildings that Pioche's shows, except Old St. Mary's. As for metal plate media, the frontispiece of the same book is a brilliantly steel-engraved copy from a daguerreotype of California Street taken by J. M. Ford (Fig. 7).12

Even so, the patron's wish to have the artist work from photographs is less self-evident than it would seem. In spite of the amazing advances in photography over two decades, most printed pictures by far in 1856 were still copied from sketches or water-

11 The Old Print Shop Portfolio, XXXI, No. 4, p. 88. Numerous lithographic panoramas of early San Francisco are known, but which were based on sketches and which on daguerreotypes is not always clear. See Harry T. Peters, California On Stone (Garden City, New York, 1939) and Mel Sont, The San Francisco Bay Area (Berkeley, 1950), pp. 106 ff.
colors by artists "in the field." The weight and bulk of photographic equipment, complications of exposure time and sunlight, problems with chemicals and preservation on one hand and, on the other, the halting development of satisfactory photo-mechanical reproduction provided part of the inertia. The rest—difficult for us to recollect—was habit-of-mind, the not only traditional pictorial habits but the ages-old association of pictures, including printed pictures, with the hand of an artist. Thus, the first and most fundamental question to ask Pioche is why photographs were preferred. The answer seems to lie in the special identification of photography with the Gold Rush.

One supposes that the decisive difference from other distant places and events that early photography recorded with such exhilaration, whether Niagara Falls, the Colossus of Rameses II, Perry's expedition to Japan, or the great fire in Hamburg, was the fascination of gold. Furthermore, San Francisco was not only a distant place, situated literally on the edge of a wilderness, it was a city of astonishing growth. Far more dramatically than New York or Paris, it was a shining affirmation of civilization's amazing progress. Distant place, fascinating event, international creation: San Francisco combined all the romantic, journalistic and ideological elements that made a photograph a photograph and not just a picture. It was no mythical Eldorado, lost in the mists of the mountains. It was exotically, indisputably real. Photographs proved it.

Indeed, we may be inclined to underestimate the extent of photographic propaganda engendered by the Gold Rush. New Yorkers, for example, thronged in 1851 to a sensational exhibition of 300 whole-plate daguerreotypes taken in 1850 by Robert H. Vance and entitled Daguerreotype Panoramic View of California. "On looking upon these pictures," wrote one reviewer, "one can almost imagine himself among the hills and mines. . . ." Still more sensational was J. Wesley Jones's Pansoscope of California, a dionysiac newreel of the overland rush from the Mississippi. Its painted scenes were copied from no less than 1500 daguerreotypes. To Jones's stentorian commentary, from which we have already quoted vis-à-vis the view from Mission Dolores, the Panscope's several hundred yards of canvas first unrolled to Boston audiences in 1852. With his mind on less material ore, Henry Ward Beecher reportedly said of seeing it, that one experienced "... the various stages of civilization, from the newest most recent town, up to the metropolitan grandeur of San Francisco."14

San Francisco in the early fifties was perhaps the most daguerreotypet of all American cities, and for obvious topographical reasons, as well as ideological, the panorama was a favored form. Eight daguerreotype panoramas (or parts thereof) through 1855 have been located,15 which is an extremely high incidence of survival when, for instance, not one daguerreotype of New York City from before 1850 is known.16 The earliest of the eight dates from circa 1850 and was taken from the roof of the Union Hotel. From 1852 onward, the market moved progressively up Nob Hill.

And their truth remains. No matter how charming or intrinsically artistic the many sketches and water colors of Gold Rush San Francisco, they were and are not nearly so vivid documents as the daguerreotypes. There is no more memorable evocation of the Gold Rush than William Shew's 1852 panorama of the Bay from Rincon Point, in which appears in eerily minute and silent realism a veritable ghost fleet of anchored ships, their crews gone to the gold fields. In the catalogue to his exhibition, Vance took pains to stress photography's realism: "These views are no exaggerated and high-colored sketches, got up to produce effect, but are as every daguerreotype must be, the stereotyped impression of the real thing itself."17 As for panoramas of San Francisco specifically, here is one described in Alta California in 1851: "DAGUERREOTYPE OF SAN FRANCISCO.—Decidedly the finest thing in the fine arts pro-

16 Rudisill, op.cit., p. 145.
17 Catalogue of Daguerreotype Panoramic Views in California (New York, 1851), cited from Rudisill, op.cit., p. 139.
duced in this city . . . is a consecutive series of Daguerrean plates, five in number, arranged side by side so as to give a view of our entire city. . . . It is intended for the 'World's Industrial Convention' in London. We venture the assertion that nothing there will create greater interest than this specimen of Art among us, exhibiting a perfect idea of the city which all the world carries with its name abroad more of romance and wonder than any other. It is a picture, too, which cannot be disputed—it carries with it evidence which God himself gives through the unerring light of the world's great luminary."18

In the light of such enthusiasm we can better understand the inspirational source of Pioche's commission. It represented not merely another instance of photography used as the model for a printed picture. It represented the use of a special genre of photography, especially identified with San Francisco, and especially significatory of photography's power. The point, obviously, is important. It enables us to assume that the essential and underlying aim of the commission was to transcribe the photographs accurately.

And yet, as we have just read in *Alta California*, photographic realism and fine art were not necessarily distinguished. At the same time we assume that accuracy of transcription was Pioche's essential instruction, we must also bear in mind that a work of art could well have been his expectation. Indeed, nowhere, and exactly in the mid-eighteen fifties, were photography, art, and realism more gloriously confounded than in *Paris*.19

To what degree the commission actually was motivated by pure aesthetics we cannot of course surmise. It would be nice to think that that was Pioche's primary motive, that, as a collector of art, he wanted the photographs transcribed by a recognized French artist, and that he chose Meryon because he had seen and admired the latter's extraordinary series of engravings depicting Paris. The fact is, however, that in 1855 and 1856 Meryon was hardly recognized. Ill, poor, emotionally disturbed by his illegitimate birth, and a recluse, he was hardly known. His artistic career had begun in earnest only six years earlier, when he made etching his sole mé-

tier. In 1851-52 his entry in the Salon passed unnoticed; his entry in 1853, the impressive *Galerie Notre-Dame*, was refused. Entries in 1854 and 1855 passed again unnoticed. His great *Eaux-fortes sur Paris*, placed on sale in 1854 at Vignère's at only thirty francs the set, was a commercial failure. And he received no significant attention from the prolix French press until 1859.20 Thus, if Pioche chose Meryon from purely aesthetic motives, he was exceedingly astute. Besides a more than casual familiarity with the Parisian art world, we would have to grant him the same more than ordinary appreciative insight, if not the same romantic and republican sympathies as the few who eventually did recognize Meryon's genius, among them Victor Hugo, Charles Baudelaire, and Philippe Burty.21

On the other hand, it may well be that Pioche's motives were only indirectly concerned with art and that the commission went to the obscure Meryon more by happenstance—and certain assurances on the artist's part—than by aesthetics. Uppermost in Pioche's mind at the time may have been not art but business. As we have seen, 1855 and 1856 were years of financial crisis. With the cessation of the Gold Rush and consequent drop in land values, Pioche's chief, if not urgent, aim may have been to restore confidence and to stimulate further French investment in San Francisco by circulating, if you will, an accurate advertisement of its growth.

That the etching was commissioned with an extra-aesthetic purpose seems to find further and firmer support in the etching's grand cartouche, which serves to connect, tastefully but unmistakably, the city with the bankers. Flanked by the allegorical figures of Abundance and Industry, it carries the medallion portraits of Pioche and Bayerque and their initials. We might even go so far as to accept the cartouche as certain evidence of specific instructions, were it not for its strange history of artistic license. For ex-


ample, while the first trial proof of the etching shows the profile portraits of both Pioche and Bayerque, the second shows only that of Pioche. In the third and fourth, final proof, both portraits re-appear. Still more strangely, in a letter written to Burty in 1861, Meryon claims that the cartouche was his idea, which he used to unite the composition and to hide the awkward convergence of perspective in the center foreground caused by photographing five contiguous views from the same position. "Je conçus également la pensée d'un titre mitoyen, d'essent grande dimension, qui pût masquer la partie centrale, en même temps qu'il servirait à relier . . . " But in his journal of 1869, Mes Observations, the artist goes even farther. He claims that at one time he intended to avoid the difficulties of the foreground by introducing there a column of flames and smoke rising to the sky with birds of prey circling around the top of it. Well, however true to the city's early history, we may take the liberty of imagining Pioche, hair standing on end, reacting to that idea, which surely tells us more about Meryon's imagination than about the banker's instructions or even the absence thereof.

The surviving preparatory drawings nonetheless indicate that Meryon did have some freedom in the cartouche's invention. In one, for instance, an ornamentally linked sequence of palm tree, garland, and medallion motifs appears. In another, the figure of Abundance holds a cornucopia rather than a wreath. Another, which we reproduce here (Fig. 8), not only reveals a variation in the shape and decoration of the cartouche but also just one profile, that of Pioche. Still and all, the highly conventional design of the cartouche, finally resembling nothing more imaginative than a bank note, together with the portraits and initials, makes it difficult to believe that the patrons did not have at least some part in its invention, if nothing more than the request to somehow connect the city with their firm. The initials, after all, were not fantasy, and it seems safe to assume that neither were the portraits.

There is yet more evidence that the patrons may have mixed enterprise with art—the size of the edition. We have noted earlier that photographs were customarily reproduced in one of the mass printing media. Thus, nothing would be unusual about the fact that the San Francisco was etched in steel, except that Meryon normally used copper. In one of his letters to his father in 1856 about the commission, he states that he was etching for the first time in steel and for the explicit purpose of increasing the yield of impressions: "Ajoutez à cela que dans le but de pouvoir obtenir un grand nombre d'épreuves . . . j'avais entrepris pour la première fois de graver sur de l'acier." As with the cartouche, the idea here was surely not entirely his own.

If both accuracy of transcription and size of edition were indeed factors in the commission, and had the commission taken place a few years or even months later, and had the photographs themselves been better, that is, not requiring the hand of an artist to smooth over the awkward joining of one panel to the next, to unify the perspective, and to naturally redo the unnatural variations and contradictions in their lights and shadows, the patrons might well have turned to photo-mechanical reproduction. Yet it is only fair to point out, that of the three manually prepared mass printing media commonly available, they chose the least popularizing. Employed mainly by publishers to reproduce works of art and to illustrate deluxe editions, steel intaglio was more closely identified with high art than either lithography or wood-engraving. Furthermore, most work in steel was engraved, not etched, and etching was at that very moment acquiring its mystique as an especially, not to say preciously artistic medium.

At this juncture of aesthetics and technology, however, our speculations require a closer look at the photographic panorama itself. Meryon's letters, with frequent references to "petites placques daguerreotypées" and complaints of the acute ocular fatigue and dizziness suffered from trying to discern their details, leave the impression that he copied the San Francisco from the daguerreo-

---

22 Delteil, loc.cit.
23 Burty, op.cit., p. 590.
24 Delteil, op.cit., No. 73. (Translation from Mes Observations by Wright.) Meryon may have known one of the many prints of San Francisco affine, e.g., Peters, op.cit., plates 52 and 57. Plate 57 (our Figure 6) was twice issued, in 1854 and 1855, with configurations blocked in.
26 National Gallery of Art Rosenwald Collection, Alverthorpe, which houses an additional drawing for the figure of Industry. The Art Institute of Chicago houses also a drawing for Industry.
27 Ducros, op.cit., Cat. No. 764.
types alone, an impression which the subsequent literature about the artist has tended to perpetuate. Thus, what one expects to find in The Art Institute of Chicago are the five daguerreotypes. What one actually finds, as several exhibitions and at least two authors ought to have sufficiently underscored, are the five photographic enlargements. The daguerreotypes, so far as we know, are lost.30

How do we know, then, that the daguerreotypes ever existed, that the Chicago photographs were not themselves original, and that, it being the era of the daguerreotype, Meryon was not simply using the term generically? Aside from a single passage in Meryon's correspondence, which we shall explore momentarily, we can readily detect in the enlargements the telltale signs of the daguerreotypes: above all, the memory, as it were, of the daguerreotype's originally brilliant detail; additionally, the characteristic surface markings and the darkening around the borders, and, finally, the white, toneless sky and the almost total absence of animate life due to the necessary length of daguerrean exposure. That two blurred human figures do appear (in the right most panel) probably indicates that Pioche's daguerreotypes were smaller than the largest standard size, since the smaller the plate the shorter the period of exposure. Of course, we can not determine just which plate size actually was used, whether ninth plate, sixth plate, quarter plate, and so on, although we can say that the size of the individual enlargements (whose widths vary due to trimming) is greater than the largest standard plate. In that respect, the dimensions of the largest photographic panel in Chicago, 151 by 199 mm., also provide evidence of the lost daguerreotypes. Their proportions, 151: 151/199, correspond neatly enough to the thumb-rule for the standard proportions of American-cut daguerrean plates, that is, 1: 1.3.30

30 The enlargements go back to Meryon's friend Commandant de Salis. They were subsequently exhibited in 1891: London, Christie, Manson, and Woods, Catalogue of The Collection of Etchings by Charles Meryon of M. de Salis, Cat. No. 28; in New York in 1897: The Grolier Club, A Catalogue of Etchings and Drawings by Charles Meryon, 1898, Cat. No. 107; in 1909 they were purchased from Howard Mansfield and exhibited in 1911 by The Institute of Chicago, Stichney Bequest, A Catalogue of Etchings and Drawings by Charles Meryon in The Howard Mansfield Collection, Cat. No. 121 (3). Mansfield's introduction to the catalogue (p. 13) points out that they are photographs, not daguerreotypes. Rollins, op.cit., p. 105 quotes in translation the passage we cite in note 31, below.

30 The standard dimensions and proportions of American daguerrean plates are listed by Beaumont Newhall, op.cit., p. 118.
Figure 4. Paper enlargements of 5 plate daguerreotype panorama of San Francisco, 1855. The Art Institute of Chicago. Stickney Bequest.

Figure 5. Charles Meryon. *San Francisco*. Etching and drypoint on steel, 1856. Graphic Arts Collection, Princeton University Library.
Figure 6. Lithograph after daguerreotype panorama from *Annals of San Francisco*, New York, 1855.
Philip Ashton Rollins Collection of Western Americana, Princeton University Library.

Figure 7. Steel engraving after daguerreotype of California Street by J. M. Ford. Frontispiece to *Annals of San Francisco*, New York, 1855.
Philip Ashton Rollins Collection of Western Americana, Princeton University Library.
How do we know, then, that the enlargements in Chicago were not made after 1856? For the answer to this, we must rely mainly on a passage in a letter which Meryon wrote to Burty about the San Francisco: “Les matériaux sur lesquels je devais opérer consistaient en un panorama Daguerre sur plaques, composé de cinq petites vues carrées... Cependant, pour m'éviter cette fatigue que résulte du miroitement de la plaque, on avait eu la complaisance de me livrer aussi chacune de ces vues partielles reportées sur papier.” Elsewhere, rather than “reportées sur papier,” he uses the phrase “l'épreuve daguerrienne” or “cinqu'épreuves juxtaposées de daguerréotype,” by which we now realize he meant exactly what an experienced printmaker would mean—impressions on paper.

Of course, more than one set of the enlargements may have been made. But the enlargements in Chicago are certainly the ones Meryon used. Not only does their provenance go back to the artist's friend and protector, de Salis, but they also bear what are surely Meryon’s own outlines in pencil of the hills beyond the Bay (Fig. 2).

Meryon, therefore, did have both the daguerréotypes and the enlargements. Unfortunately, his own explanation, that “on avait eu la complaisance” to deliver them to him to save him the fatigue that resulted from the glare of the daguerréotypes (caused by their glass protection against oxidation), is too politely indirect. We cannot surmise from it whether the enlargements were included at the initiation of the project or whether they were made later at his request. The very impersonality of his wording would suggest that his was the passive rôle.

Neither do we know how usual the enlargement of daguerréotypes as an aid to copyists was. Almost certainly painters like Charles Nègre in the early fifties used enlargements, perhaps projected directly onto their canvases, and it stands to reason that copyists in the graphic media used them, too. Yet, so far as we can determine, the Chicago panels used by Meryon are the only known documents of that procedure.

By far the most interesting technical aspect of the enlargements, however, is that they are on paper. More precisely, they seem to

---

31 Burty, Gazette des Beaux-Arts, XIV (1869), 539-40.
32 For the history of technology of photographic enlargements in this and the next two paragraphs my source is Helmut Gernsheim, op.cit., pp. 311-17 and passim.
have been made from wet collodion negatives (glass plates) contact printed on paper with an albumen coating. This process, as opposed to the enlargement of daguerreotypes on larger daguerrean plates, had been common practice since the forties among portrait photographers if not among graphic copyists, was most definitely advanced. It probably involved a device like the vertical enlarger with which Quinet had been experimenting in Paris since 1852 and Alphonse Liebert in the later fifties in Nevada and California, or else one like the “solar camera,” a horizontal enlarger patented by David Woodward of Baltimore in 1857. In either case, the process had not yet moved in 1856 from the experimental to the patent stage, and the Chicago panels seem to be the earliest enlargements of their kind yet identified.

Whoever had the enlargements made thus had to go out of his way to do it. And the apparent reasons for doing it were to get beyond the usual daguerrean scale on one hand and to unite the five panels into a single view on the other. To enlarge the scale of daguerreotypes up to the scale of art, so to speak, had been a goal of photography from the beginning, a goal already achieved by 1856 by the soon-to-be predominant positive-negative processes. In this respect, Pioche’s enlargements anticipate the mania for large photographic panoramas that developed around 1860, although the latter did not involve enlargements so much as the construction of large cameras. It is possible, in fact, that Pioche’s enlarged panorama was not initially made as an aid to Meryon at all but as a work of art in itself. We will recall that Meryon spoke of “cinq épreuves juxtaposées . . . ,” so that he may well have received the enlargements already mounted together, as they are today, on cloth. Further, the variations in the widths of the enlargements—199, 188, 190, 196, and 185 mm.—must mean that they were trimmed in order to get rid of overlapping in the daguerreotype plates and in order to fit the paper panels snugly into a single, comprehensive and grand view.

The emphasis in Meryon’s letters on the daguerreotypes no doubt expressed his recognition of both their technical and aesthetic priority. No doubt he was more fascinated by their silvery microscopic realism than by their comparatively dull paper enlargements. Yet it seems obvious that what Pioche really asked him to do was to copy the enlargements and that he did so with both scale and accuracy of transcription in mind. If the enlargements were initially made as a work of art, Pioche recognized its potential in a printed edition. If they were made specifically for the commission, then Pioche emerges as a patron memorable for his determination to get what he wanted.

The last question is the extent to which Meryon actually used the enlargements. Perhaps we need go no farther than to observe that the overall length of the panorama in Chicago is 950 mm., including around 3 mm. of space at the cloth joints of the panels, and that the etching is also 950 mm. in length. The height of the enlargements is 151 mm. and that of the etching 185 mm., but this difference of 34 mm. represents the sky added by Meryon. What is more, this conformity of outer dimensions between the etching and the Chicago enlargements applies with but occasional millimetric differences throughout. From apse to façade, Old St. Mary’s in the etching and in the enlargement is the same size.

The conclusion to be drawn from the conformity of dimensions above is hardly avoidable. Meryon did use the enlargements, and far more substantially than his statement about evading the mirroirment of the daguerreotypes would lead us to believe. In a word, he traced them.

How he traced them can be readily reconstructed from the surviving drawings, for all are on transparent India paper.30 We are not surprised that their architectural and topographical elements conform in size to the same elements in the enlargements and the etching. They show how Meryon used the transparencies to adjust the perspective and unify the composition. With respect to the elements added by Meryon, particularly the cartouche, the drawing in the Spencer Collection is highly instructive. It indicates how the artist used the transparent paper to arrange the cartouche to cover just the area he wished. Since it is a pastiche of five separate pieces, it also tells us how he proceeded from one drawing to the next by scissoring out and reusing details that satisfied him. Finally, The Art Institute of Chicago houses a drawing of the first panel in reverse; it of course tells us how the tracings were transferred to the steel plate. In sum, Meryon used transparent papers just as many printmakers did to transfer their preparatory drawings. The only difference in this case was that the key preparatory drawing was the photographic panorama.

30 Those listed earlier and two more in The Chicago Art Institute, a tracing of all five panels and of the first in reverse.
Such, then, was Pioche's side of the project—a marvellously un-sortable nineteenth-century mixture. Art, yes; but at the same time how better to demonstrate in a way that, let us say, "could almost not be disputed" how San Francisco had grown since he first appealed to French investors four years before. An etching, yes; but on steel. A remarkable artist, yes; but working from photographs. A work of art made by hand, yes; but based on enlargements made by the most advanced photographic technology.

And Pioche did get a work of art. If it was an advertisement, it was an extremely modest one. Certainly it was a far cry from the then proliferating genre of such urban advertisements, whose usually chromolithographic bird's-eye views of cities were surrounded and overlapped by typographic and sometimes by both typographic and pictorial directories to local churches, civic monuments, scenic sights, grand mansions, notable railway bridges, principal industries, substantial banks and busy emporia. Nor, apparently, did Pioche require "Copied from Daguerreotypes, taken on the spot."

Indeed, the etching has a dignity that transcends all our speculations. It does not ultimately allow us to overlook the possibility that Pioche meant above all to praise not just San Francisco but the idea of San Francisco, the ideal of the city, which had been revealed to him through the photographic panorama itself. It may even be that he discovered in the panorama some of that expansive self-confidence characteristic of American thought about cities in those days, of cities building in and with the grandeur of the land, free from the past, in "... the country of the Future... of beginnings, of projects, of designs, of expectations."

The imaginative, reclusive, and mentally unstable Meryon was, at least on one level, the right artist for Pioche's commission. He had an obsessive appetite for architectural forms. His Eaux-fortes sur Paris, among them the Galerie Notre-Dame with its warren of Gothic details and La Pomme Notre-Dame with its forest of scaffolding, reveal an incredible bending of the will to observation. The pencil drawings from which the etchings were made testify even more eloquently to his visual concentration as well as to his daily, almost tactile and psychic cohabitation with the buildings, streets, and stones of old Paris.

At every other level, however, the commission and the artist would seem to have been utterly mismatched. Meryon looked upon his city with a kind of Gothic mysticism. To him, buildings were anything but symbols of mankind's capacity for progress. They were rather expressions of ancient and mysterious passions, accretions of time and evil. Hardly panoramic, his perspectives were close, moody and unexpected. His belief in artistic license led him to combine two views into one or to alter the locations of buildings or the buildings themselves. Of lights and shadows he made disconcerting patterns. His skylines were definitely not troubled. They were haunted by Gothic towers and circling birds of prey. The grotesque in his etching Le Stryge he conceived as watching over Paris: "Insatiable Vampire l'éternelle Luxure..." (Fig. 1).

Meryon saw Gothic buildings both visually and conceptually, not to say symbolistically, and such was his conceptual need that he often verbalized his architectural imagery. He wrote poems which he sometimes etched and ornamented as separate prints and sometimes inscribed within his architectural etchings. We find across the top of La Rue de Mauvais Garçons, for example: "Quel mortel habitat/ En ce gite si sombre?/ Que donc là se cachait/ Dans la nuit et dans l'ombre?..."

Meryon's then was an intensely imaginative yet ambivalent identification with a city of the past, the unique creation of centuries that made up the crowded, notoriously dirty, decayed, and crepuscular streets and habitations of medieval Paris. And it was this Paris, source of disease and republicanism, that Napoleon III and his "urbaniste-demolisseur" Baron Haussmann were in the process of levelling. "Thanks to the fruitful plan of the Emperor," went the official line, "architecture transforms our cities..."


26 Phillip Cate, Meryon's Paris/Piranesi's Rome, University Art Gallery, Rutgers University, 1971. This exhibition demonstrated the extent of such alterations by pairing the views in Meryon's etchings with modern photographs of the same views.
27 Delteil, Cat. No. 23.
28 Ibid., Cat. No. 57.
The imagination of Meryon and his austere and macabre morality, much as they portrayed old Paris as the capital of vice, were hardly attuned to so grand a plan of urban renewal. He was not the artist to be forced into the open and onto the spacious boulevards that were sweeping through the city with panoramic impersonality. He was bitterly aware that many of the buildings he lived with, drew and etched were scheduled for destruction, as was the house that inspired La Rue de Mauvais Garçons shortly after he made the print. The poems he addressed to these condemned buildings are whimsically ironic and sad. To the ancient pumping station adjacent to Notre-Dame: “C’en est fait, / O forfait! / Pauvre Pompe, / Sans pompe, / Il faut mourir; ...”  

For his etching of the Ancienne Porte du Palais de Justice: “La cas vraiment est grave/ Et tristement je grave / Que pour l’exorciser/ Il faudrait la ... raser ...”

Not surprisingly, Meryon’s art became in the later fifties a rallying point for the opponents of Hausmann and the Empire. Then as now much literary exercise was made against the deaf colossus of modernizing change, and the Eaux-fortes sur Paris were inevitably allied with the Empire’s most prestigious enemy, Victor Hugo. The great author knew the etchings. In 1859 he wrote to Baudelaire in response to the latter’s inspired page on Meryon in La Revue Française: “Puisque vous connaissez M. Meryon, dites-lui que ses splendides eaux-fortes m’ont ébloui ... Ses planches vivent, rayonnent et pensent.” Two years later Hugo also wrote to the critic Philippe Burty about Meryon: “Fortifiez-le par tous les encouragements possibles,” he again urged. “Le souffle de l’immensité traverse l’œuvre de M. Meryon et fuit de ses eaux-fortes plus que des tableaux—des visions ...”

But it was Burty himself in the Gazette des Beaux-Arts in 1863 who most explicitly opposed Hausmann’s unfeeling demolitions of the city’s antiquity with Meryon’s art: “... Il a exprimé avec une clarté toute française la poésie intime et suprême de ce vieux Paris qu’il réserve à notre génération de demolir et défigurer sans pitié.” Again: “Mais la Ville, Alma mater, ne devait-elle pas au moins conserver aux générations suivantes le souvenir de ce qui allait disparaître sous la pioche des démolisseurs? La photographie suffit-elle pour écrire l’histoire du passé? ... A-t-on donc songé à faire prendre à M. Meryon des croquis qu’il pût graver tour à tour, et que l’on aurait appelés l’Album historique de la ville de Paris?”

Burty’s disdainful dismissal of photography as being unable to penetrate and preserve the soul of old Paris, as Meryon’s etching did, brings us to the final ironies behind the commission. For to Burty, as to Baudelaire, Alfred Cadart, Théophile Gautier and other intellectuals of the day, there had taken place around 1855 a revival of the art of etching by Meryon, Seymour Haden, Jongsren, Millet, Bracquemond, Whistler and others which was revealing the new way of art in opposition to photography. To Baudelaire, it was the very restoration of creative imagination itself—that “Reine des Facultés”—which made art, art, and which was the implacable, irreconcilable, aristocratic opponent of photography and its unimaginative realism and vulgarly popular appeal. So it happened, in fact, that the first important notice of Meryon’s art, by Baudelaire, appeared among the same editorial letters by which the critic, in his reaction to the inclusion of photographs with the fine arts in the Salon of 1859, delivered the century’s most vitriolic and effective attack on photography and its public.

Amusing though it would be to quote from Baudelaire’s famously scathing letters here, his essential arguments against the camera and for the art of imagination were succinctly summed up three years later by Gautier in his introduction to the initial album of original etchings published by the revivalists, who had become formally organized as the Société des Aqua-Fortistes: “En ce temps où la Photographie charme le vulgaire par la fidélité mécanique des ses reproductions, il devait se déclarer dans l’art une tendance au libre caprice et à la fantaisie pittoresque. Le besoin de réagir contre le positivisme de l’instrument-miroir a fait prendre à plus d’un pientre la poite sur graveur à l’eau-forte, et de la réunion de ces talents, emuifs de voir les murs tapiés de monotones images d’où l’âme est absente, est née la Société des Aqua-Fortistes ...”

Ah, Baudelaire. In the same year he, too, wrote at length of the

40. Delteil, op.cit., Cat. no. 32.
41. Ibid., Cat. No. 20.
42. Ducros, op.cit., Cat. No. 449.
43. Ibid., Cat. No. 455.
etching revival in Le Boulevard, and in that article he again praised Meryon and pointed, yes, to none other than the San Francisco as Meryon's masterpiece. "Nous avons vu aussi chez le même éditeur [Cadart] le fameux perspective de San-Francisco, que M. Meryon peut, à bon droit, appeler son dessin de maîtrise. M. Niel, propriétaire de la planche, ferait vraiment acte de charité en faisant tirer de temps en temps quelques épreuves. Le placement en est sûr."47

Certain passages in Meryon's own correspondence suggest that he shared, though perhaps with less vehemence, the artistic resentment of photography. Writing to his father in 1853 of La Rue des Toiles à Bourges he says: "La composition de cette pièce m'a coûté beaucoup plus de peine qu'on ne saurait le croire: comme je ne me suis jamais aidé jusqu'ici de Daguerreotype (cela pour plusieurs raisons) ..."48 Unfortunately, we never learn what his reasons were. Elsewhere, concerning his etching of La Pompe Notre-Dame, he intimates that the uniqueness of his eye for picturesque subject matter was in competition with the facile ubiquity of cameras: "Je ne la verrai détruire qu'avec peine (quoique sa disparition ne puisse nuire à la valeur de ma gravure) car c'est au milieu de Paris une pièce rare et curieuse. Si le Daguerreotype n'était quand même pas là pour recevoir les images des choses, je serais peut-être le seul à avoir gravé ce sujet."49

Small wonder, then, that Meryon, as he labored over the San Francisco, found the commission, with its alien photographs, so perfectly like reality yet so tacitly abstract, and its strange city, so distantly seen and devoid of the past, torturous. Among his correspondence concerning the project are some anguished letters written to his father during the year he worked on it. We shall quote only two or three portions here. March, 1856: "Mon ouvrage sur Paris est, comme je vous l'ai dit, terminé; pour le moment je suis chargé d'un travail assez important qui va me donner de l'occupation pendant cinq ou six mois: c'est une planche d'assez belle dimension représentant le panorama de San Francisco. Le sujet est à la vérité assez peu pittoresque ..." September: "Il me faut un courage excessif pour toujours aller. Je viens d'obtenir de premières épreuves d'une grande planche à laquelle j'ai travaillé pendant tout le beau temps. Je vous en ai déjà parlé: c'est une grande vue de San Francisco, dont le dessin m'avait été donné en cinq épreuves juxtaposées de daguerréotype. Comme ces épreuves ne se raccordaient que difficilement tant à cause de la déviation des lignes que de la confusion qui existe toujours aux limites, il m'a fallu une peine inouïe pour en faire un seul dessin à peu près correct. L'innombrable quantité de maisons, d'édifices divers, l'extrême finesse de certains détails me faisaient concevoir, pendant toute la durée de l'exécution, des craintes bien sérieuses relativement à la réussite de mon ouvrage." Finally, March, 1857: "J'ai terminé ma vue de San Francisco à mon grand soulagement: je sais seul la peine que cette planque m'a donnée."50

The amazing thing is that he did finish it. He spent an entire year, as it were, near the intersection of California and Powell Streets. Nor, presumably, could he name what he was tracing, whether Old St. Mary's, City Hall, the Montgomery Block, the Telegraph Station, or even Telegraph Hill. Likewise, the rather unfamiliar architecture, the Quebec and Monterey style houses, the pipe-stem colonnettes, lancet windows, and barge boards must have caused him more than once to doubt his vision.

Nonetheless, the etching is infused with Meryon's poetry. The glowing contrast of light and shadow, the heightened sky, the little figures and grazing animals, and the effectively simple cartouche, wafted on ethers, make it, overall, a surreal San Francisco, a mysteriously quiet symbolist city. Could it be, that despite the ironies of the undertaking, Meryon sensed, as did Pioche, the photographic panorama's symbolic transcendence?

Perhaps, after all, the cartouche really was Meryon's idea, which he invented less for his stated reasons than for its power to secure the panorama to a symbolic plane. Self-contained yet quietly uniting the whole panorama, the cartouche seems to tell us that as much as we are viewing a particular city we are viewing in the panorama a form used by artists to signify the city as ancient as art itself.

Further, could it be that the San Francisco commission somehow freed Meryon from his dark passage through old Paris? Is it possible that he saw it, if not exactly as Pioche's vision of beauty, abundance, and industry, as a dreamed-of place of serenity and health? How, in fact, are we to explain the additions that Meryon made?

48 Ducros, Cat. No. 744.
49 Also to his father, 1853. Ducros, Cat. No. 644.
50 Ducros, Cat. No. 764.
What of the sky, massed over the panorama as a great volume of clouds and air? And what of the figures, the shepherd, the gardener, the laundresses, the little travellers in the uncrowded and sunny streets? And the grazing cattle and sheep? Could they have been Pioche's idea? Taking all the additions together, Meryon seems to have had his own ideal of progress, a kind of new harmony or peaceable kingdom.

If we look among the artist's poetry we do find a curious piece, etched in 1855, which we may well wish to apply to his vision of San Francisco. It is entitled the Loi Solaire: "If I were Emperor or King of some powerful State, (which I would not wish, nor be able, to be)—Considering that large cities are engendered solely by sloth, avarice, fear, lust and other bad passions; I would cause to be elaborated a law determining, in as precise a manner as possible, the area of ground, with or without cultivation, to be compulsorily adjoined to each habitation of desired capacity for a given number of human beings so that air and sunlight, those two elements essential to life, may ever be widely distributed. This law: source of all material, and consequently moral, well being will be called: Solar Law."

Whatever Meryon's interpretation, the San Francisco did not bring him fame and fortune, as Baudelaire was so sure it would. Whether it satisfied Pioche, or served his purpose, we do not know.

Meryon's aesthetic sensibilities apparently never recovered from his encounter with the new technology. Some months after he finished working over the photographs his mental instability became so severe that he had to be removed to Charenton. Following his release in 1859 under the protection of de Salolis, he never again was able to sustain the effort that produced his first installments of the Eaux-fortes sur Paris, and some have judged that the prints he made after the San Francisco are too topographical. In 1866 he was removed once more to Charenton and there he died of self-starvation in 1868.

Meanwhile, Pioche's fortunes were similarly sad. In 1862 an ecological disaster in the form of a flash flood of mud and water from Sans Souci Lake in the hills above his home on Mission Street ruined his house and property, which thereafter became known as Pioche's Pond. Ten years later, for reasons apparently related to over-confident investments and to the banking failures of 1870, he too committed suicide. He left no children to see the Burnham plan in 1906 for redoing San Francisco in the style of Haussmann. Nor did anyone see it done, since the plan was approved by the City Council on the eve of the Great Earthquake. Still, if you take your aesthetic sensibilities up California Street today to the spot where Pioche's daguerreotypist once stood, you can scarcely see the Bay, or the city, for the buildings.

---

51 Meryon did the sky in drypoint.
A Plan for *Vanity Fair*

BY JOHN SUTHERLAND

The student of Thackeray is well served by two fully annotated editions of *Vanity Fair* which have appeared in the last ten years: Geoffrey and Kathleen Tillotson's (1963) and J.I.M. Stewart's (1968). It is interesting to note, however, what contrary views of Thackeray's craft the different editors hold. The Tillotsons argue for a conscientious novelist, one who protects his novel against the disintegrating pressures of serialization by forethought: "only the careful laying of the ground in the early chapters," they tell us, "implying much premeditation of the subsequent course of the novel, could make possible such effective writing under such conditions." Stewart's Thackeray is quite different: "those critics of the book who would vindicate *Vanity Fair* as a carefully pre-structured whole are really working against the grain of Thackeray's genius... the predominant feel of the book is one of brilliantly resourceful improvisation." The difference of opinion is clearly an important one; a "careful" Thackeray may not necessarily deserve more admiration than a "brilliant improviser" but it will be a somewhat different admiration.

All commentators are handicapped by the lack of Thackeray's working materials for *Vanity Fair*. Apart from more or less casual remarks in letters, we know virtually nothing of the month-to-month writing of the novel. Hence on the purely subjective evidence of the novel's "feel" drastically opposite assessments are put forward. It is an unsatisfactory situation and one in which some useful light is thrown by a unique set of three fragments of pencil

---

3 Pp. xxi-xxiii.
4 P. 9.
5 The early chapters of the novel survive in manuscript and are held in the Pierpont Morgan Library. On their evidence a great deal has been deduced about Thackeray's work on the novel before he began to publish it in January 1847: see the Tillotsons' "Introduction" and Gordon N. Ray's essay "Vanity Fair: One Version of the Novelist's Responsibility," *Essays by Diverse Hands*, N.S. XXV (London, 1980). 87-101.
notes in the Robert H. Taylor Collection of Thackerayana now reposed in the University Library at Princeton:

The bugles sounded then without, and you heard the assembly beating in various quarters of the town. The Major took me home [written in faint pencil on a small piece of paper, marbled on the reverse side indicating that it was, presumably, the inside leaf of a pocket book].

in repairing to the alarm ground where he found men and officers hurrying from their billets [in faint pencil on another small piece of paper presumably cut from the same sheet of paper as the above].

Jos with his servant 6
The state of the town 2½
Rebecca sells him the horses, etc. 3½
His flight Mrs. O'D's anger 2½
Dobb's return 1½
makes love to Jos
who will take care of him
I said Amelia

Quatre Bras 2½
[In faint pencil on a small piece of, possibly, letter paper].

These scraps offer a brief but unique insight into Thackeray’s working methods. They refer, of course, to Numbers 8 and 9 of *Vanity Fair*, the famous and highly complicated Waterloo chapters. The first two items belong to the end of chapter 29, and the abrupt ending to the Duchess of Richmond’s ball. What Thackeray jotted down inside the cover of the unknown notebook was the idea, caught on the wing, that against the brilliant social occasion, the imminent battle and George’s infidelity Amelia should be thrown into Dobb’s arms. The subjective “The Major took me home” points to the way in which the critical episode was to be organized with Amelia as its sympathetic center, her mute pain suffusing the whole. This is how the scene forecast above eventually reached print:

*It was Thackeray’s habit to keep notes for his novels in leather-bound pocket books.*

*“Major” is slightly proleptic, Dobb gets his promotion to field rank after Waterloo but it is the kind of mistake Thackeray often made.*

His wife saw the one part at least of the bouquet-scene. It was quite natural that George should come at Rebecca’s request to get her her scarf and flowers; it was no more than he had done twenty times before in the course of the last few days; but now it was too much for her. “William,” she said, suddenly clinging to Dobb who was near her, “you’ve always been very kind to me—I’m—I’m not well. Take me home.” She did not know she called him by his Christian name, as George was accustomed to do. He went away with her quickly. Her lodgings were hard by; and they threaded through the crowd without, where everything seemed to be more as it than even in the ball-room within.

George had been angry twice or thrice at finding his wife up on his return from the parties which he frequented: so she went straight to bed now; but although she did not sleep, and although the din and clatter, and the galloping of horsemen was incessant, she never heard any of these noises, having quite other disturbances to keep her awake.

Osborne, meanwhile, wild with elation, went off to a play table, and began to bet frantically. He won repeatedly . . . Dobb went up and whispered something to him, at which George, giving a start and a wild hurray, tossed off his glass, clapped it on the table, and walked away speedily on his friend’s arm. “The enemy has passed the Sambre,” William said, “and our left is already engaged. Come away. We are to march in three hours.”

The second fragment describing the assembling of the troops is less significant and seems to refer to Dobb’s arrival at the muster parade on the morning of Waterloo, a description Thackeray did not, in the event, work up.

The third of these fragments shows Thackeray measuring out the proportions of an as yet unwritten part of his novel. Such calculations are to be found elsewhere in his manuscript notes and were particularly important for the serialist filling an exactly prescribed number of pages each month. Though neither his writing paper nor his handwriting were, until late in life, metrical consistent, Thackeray obviously kept a running account of his novel’s

---

*Vanity Fair*, p. 279.
quantities as he went along. Hence such computation as this in the
notebook for Denis Duval:9

my page holds 24 lines.
4 Ms lines = 5 of print.
24 lines = 30 of print.
30 Ms pages = 24 of print.
5 Ms pages = 4 of print.
1½ pages = 1 p of print.

But we may make other than simply quantitative deductions
from the Vanity Fair schedule. What we have there are the propo-
sitions for two chapters of about 6 Ms pages each. These finally
appeared as chapters 31 and 32 but in their final form, though rec-
ognizable, they are significantly different. This can be best shown
if we convert the finished chapters back to the kind of synopsis
Thackeray originally used:

Chapter 31
Jos with his servant Isidor.

The state of the town
Rebecca makes love to Jos.
Rebecca visits Amelia.

Chapter 32
Jos's terror: he shaves his
whiskers.
Rebecca snubs Lady Bareacres.
Rebecca sells Jos the horses.
Stubble returns wounded: Mrs.
O'D will take care of him.
Jos's flight: Mrs. O'D's anger.
Quatre Bras.

A moment's comparison shows the discrepancies between plan
and execution. Jos's interview with Rebecca is broken into two, a
split anticipated in Thackeray's parenthetic "makes love to Jos."
Lavomaking becomes the business of their first meeting, horse-
trading of the second. The effect of the enlargement is to stress the
comedy of Jos's military bravado and ultimate ignominious flight
and to create an over-arching episode which contains the rest.
Towards the same end the deliciously funny "Coupez-moi!" scene
was introduced.

Surprisingly, perhaps, we see that at first Thackeray intended
to make much more of the "great battle" giving a climactic 2½ pages

9 This notebook is held in the British Museum. Thackeray makes the following
calculation because after years of writing monthly numbers of 32 pp. he was unused
to preparing novels for the magazine serialization which was intended for Duval.

(almost half a chapter) to Quatre Bras. In the event he declined
to play the "military novelist"10 and offered only half a page of
muted and general comment concentrating instead on its domestic
repercussions. The understatement was, it is generally acknowl-
edged, a master-stroke.11

Other re-balancings followed the novelist's non-combatant role.
Becky was promoted to having, with Jos, the dominant part in this
sequence. Thackeray added the hypocritical sisterly visit to Ame-
lia and the lighter business of Becky's mischievously tantalizing
the horseless Bareacres. But the most intriguing of the deviations
from the little plan is that concerning "Dobb's return" and "who
will take care of him I said Amelia." In accordance with the
decision to enclose the chapters in Jos's rise and fall as a military
man this scene (in altered form) was advanced to before the fat
hero's flight. It was also played down. No such heroic self-sacrifice
as that implied in "I said Amelia" is in fact portrayed. Indeed the
juvenile Ensign Stubble is looked after by the more motherly
Mrs. O'Dowd:

'And—and you won't leave me, will you, Mrs. O'Dowd?'
'No, my dear fellow,' said she, going up and kissing the boy.
'No harm shall come to you while I stand by.'12

We note, however, that originally Thackeray did not intend the
wounded man to be the boyish Ensign Stubble but "Dobb." "Dobb" or "Dob" is, of course, Dobbin's nickname. It seems that
a wounded Dobbin (deliriously raving his love) was to have been
nursed by a heroic Amelia who had given up her chance of safe
passage with Jos to do so. Meanwhile George was to fall at Quatre
Bras.

It would be out of place to ask whether the events Thackeray
eventually decided on for his novel are an improvement or not.
The original shape of things would have injected more life into
the subsequent longueurs of the Amelia-Dobbin relationship if,

10 Vanity Fair, p. 282.
11 See, for example, the praise of J. W. Dobbs in his Thackeray: a Critical Port-
trait (Oxford, 1941), p. 113: "These critics who complain that Thackeray mis-
uses the chance to capitalize on the Duchess of Richmond's ball and the affai-
are blind to the delicacy of an art which gives him superbly the effect he wanted,
and exactly the right effect."
12 Vanity Fair, p. 313.
13 See Vanity Fair, p. 279 where Osborne shouts to Dobbin: "Hullo, Dob! Come
and drink, old Dob!"
albeit unconsciously, he had declared his criminal affection for Mrs. Osborne while George was still alive; and it would have given more point to the years-long exile in India. But, demonstrably, Thackeray had decided to cool down his account of the Waterloo crisis and as part of this process Amelia and Dobbin were to be allowed no more contact than “The Major took me home.”

This set of thumbnail and probably incomplete notes for the Waterloo chapters is uniquely informative about Thackeray’s methods. Their uniqueness lies in that they show Thackeray inventing, outlining, measuring, altering, experimenting—going through all the functions we normally associate with “planning.” Admittedly the planning is of an extremely flexible and probationary kind, nonetheless it is more accurately described by the Tillotsons’ “premeditation” than Stewart’s “brilliantly resourceful improvisation.” And one senses that it was a habitual exercise. Thackeray was lamentably indifferent about his manuscript materials and so were his family executors. When most of the Vanity Fair manuscript is lost one appreciates that only a lucky fluke preserved these fragments. Bearing this in mind it is not unjustifiable to assume the kind of preparatory effort which improves the Waterloo chapters elsewhere in the novel.
Letters to Octavius Wilkinson: Tom Hughes’ Lost Uncle

By John R. DeBruyn

The following narrative is based on letters in the Morris L. Parrish Collection of the Princeton University Library written by the Victorian novelist and public figure Thomas Hughes (his father, John, and brother Hastings as well) to Octavius Wilkinson, giving incisive accounts of family affairs in England and America, including the establishment of the Utopian community of Rugby, Tennessee.

On October 5, 1880, in front of the still unfinished Tabard Inn, in the presence of the Episcopal Bishop of Tennessee, distinguished guests from North and South, and young colonists who formed a choir to provide antiphonal responses, Thomas Hughes, author of Tom Brown’s School Days, opened his colony at Rugby, Tennessee, with certain Appalachian natives as curious onlookers. This was an important destination on the idealistic road he had been traveling since his own schoolboy encounter with the great Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby School and father of Matthew Arnold. It was, as his less illusioned brother William Hastings Hughes put it, “the last of the many castles in Spain which he had, always with some high and unselfish object in view, helped to build during his life.” Letters to Octavius Wilkinson, Hughes’ uncle, now in the Morris L. Parrish Collection of the Princeton University Library, give significant glimpses of the Rugby venture and shed some new light on it.

Since Tom Hughes’ arrival in New York on August 21, 1880, as perhaps the most popular English author and lecturer to travel in America since Dickens, his colonization activities had been followed with intense interest on both sides of the Atlantic. His aim was to provide an opportunity for British younger sons, of the landed gentry and upper middle classes, not eligible to inherit the family fortune, to make an honest living in the New World, preferably by the sweat of their brows in agricultural pursuits.

Openings in the professions—law, army, and the clergy—in this “swarming time of the race,” were now lacking in England, he stated in his opening address at Rugby.² He had founded, he said, a community on Christian principles, “a community of gentlemen and ladies, not that artificial class which goes by those grand names, both in Europe and here, . . . but a society in which the humblest members, who live (as we hope most if not all of them will to some extent) by the labour of their own hands.”³

Hughes had long been interested in the United States, where he was ideologically perhaps more at home than in Britain. He saw it as a place of fulfillment for his Utopian ideals. Likewise an admiration for the works of James Russell Lowell, which developed into a warm personal friendship and a visit to America in 1870 to see him, greatly increased his enthusiasm for the New World. Having been strongly pro-Northern during the Civil War, Tom Hughes was now much interested in helping to bring about as rapid a recovery in the South as possible.

But why was the colony established in Tennessee? “About the end of the third quarter of the last century,” ³¹ Tom’s brother William Hastings wrote in 1907, “just after the very severe financial crisis caused mainly by the speculation and peculation of the recent Civil War, a Boston philanthropist [Franklin Webster Smith] . . . conceived the scheme of aiding the mechanics of New England, among whom there was much distress at the time, consequent on the crisis, to ‘return to the soil’” by establishing a colony in the South or West.⁴ Although Smith finally decided upon a site on the Cumberland Plateau of Tennessee, he now felt that the need for such a settlement had vanished in the face of improving economic conditions. Conveniently the Boston entrepreneurs found the enthusiastic Tom Hughes and his friends (such as Henry Kimber, British railway magnate, and John Boyle, London barrister) ready to take over the enterprise. Consequently, by the end of 1879 the British Board of Aid to Land Ownership, Limited, technically an amalgamation of old and new projects, had assumed major responsibility for the colony.

Properly established and dedicated, Rugby, Tennessee, seemed to thrive splendidly in the eyes of its founder, Hughes, who wrote articles for the London Spectator and other British periodicals describing its progress in glowing terms. He had, with characteristic optimism, invested heart and family fortune into his colony (including the considerable proceeds from Tom Brown’s School Days). His optimism was buoyed by signs of physical growth, such as public buildings and dwellings; but perhaps most of all he was heartened by the imminent establishment of a library in his name, sponsored by Dana Estes of Boston, to which leading American publishers were to contribute books. Tom Hughes hoped this might “prove the turning point in the fortunes of the settlement.”⁶

In May, 1881, several months after the colony’s opening, Mrs. John Hughes, his mother, arrived in Philadelphia on her way to Rugby, Tennessee. She was welcomed like a royal visitor and was accompanied by her books and pictures, her granddaughter, and the faithful Dyers (old family servants). The summer of 1881 brought calamity to the colony in the form of a severe drought and a typhoid epidemic in which several young men died. These tragedies were followed in early 1882 by financial crisis. Reorganization forestalled actual bankruptcy, but mortal blows had been struck. Hughes lost heavily financially, his state of despondency at the colony’s apparent failure heightened by poor health. From it he rallied, but “never perhaps fully realized that the dream as he had dreamed it was not to be realized.”⁷

On October 5, 1882, the Thomas Hughes Library, although he could not be present, was dedicated. Edward Berton—German scholar, novelist (he wrote a novel Das Sabirergut, 1896, based on his Rugby experiences), and a friend of George Gissing—was the first librarian. The library in the wilderness, with its extraordinary collection of more than 7000 volumes of Victoriana, still stands in silent testimony to the ideals of the Rugby founder. In the autumn of 1883 he made the first of five return visits from

³ Thomas Hughes to Dana Estes, 15 April 1882. This is one of five letters in the Morris L. Parish Collection, Princeton University Library, written by Hughes to Estes regarding the Rugby settlement.
⁴ “The True Story of Rugby.” In a letter to Dana Estes, 2 February 1882, Tom Hughes admitted that “the settlement has been in difficulties” that “will I trust be removed shortly.” However, he scoffs at the rumor that he has “served all connection with or interest in the settlement” and insists that he has never had greater interest in or worked harder for the success of the colony.

² Thomas Hughes, Rugby, Tennessee (New York: Macmillan, 1882), p. 95. This book was made up of articles previously published in The Spectator and other British periodicals.
³ Ibid., p. 106.
⁴ “The True Story of Rugby.”
England to see his mother in Tennessee. He was last in Rugby in 1887, shortly before her death on October 5, at which time he was already on his way across the Atlantic, never again to return to America. With the death of Mrs. Hughes any substantial hopes for the long-term survival of the colony vanished.

The failure of the Rugby colony, and that it was a failure one must agree, was due to a number of causes. That upper class youths could almost at once, without much previous experience with physical labor, succeed in agriculture was a fond idealistic dream. Like Tom Brown many of them preferred to play cricket or tennis or bathe in the clear pools of the Clear Fork or sit in the shade on the broad verandas of the Tabard and complain. Although some of these were eventually replaced by a more solid kind of settler, it was probably too late to assure success for the colony. Too much money had been spent for the land, not really suitable for extensive cultivation, and the titles were often unclear. Too many reports of its difficulties had appeared in British and American newspapers and magazines, thus making it even less likely to succeed.

These letters to Octavius Wilkinson make contributions not only to the already familiar but continuously unfolding story of Rugby, Tennessee, but also to that of a second American phase. This, essentially more heterogeneous than that of Rugby, centers in the Southwest. Much less well known and not mentioned as often in the Princeton letters, it is nevertheless of great interest and importance to them as it relates to this great Victorian figure. It includes activities of Tom Hughes' sons, cousins, and nephews (relations, as well, of Octavius Wilkinson), who engaged in agriculture, particularly the raising of sheep and cattle in Texas, and the driving of the cattle to market in Colorado and Kansas. With the arrival in Texas in 1874 of James (Jem), Tom Hughes' eldest son, substantially before the establishment of Rugby, Tennessee, this phase officially began. Tom Hughes' eventual editing of his nephews' letters in a book G.T.T. Gone to Texas (1884) was designed to attract young Englishmen disadvantaged because of the laws of primogeniture to the strenuous outdoor life on farms and ranches. It brought the reading public's particular attention to the

Boerne, Texas, sheep ranch of Willy, Gerard, and Harry Hughes, sons of William Hastings, Tom's brother.

Although the Hughes and Wilkinson activities in America are of special interest in these letters, one finds considerably more information of value. Much of this communication constitutes what might be called the enveloping action, centering on the parental background as well as the life and career of Tom Hughes and related family affairs. These are exclusive of the American ventures but sometimes overlapping with them. To this far-flung dynasty of Hughes and Wilkinson families, embracing three or more generations on two continents, Octavius Wilkinson is a focal character. The interest of all these letters is enhanced as they lead to the discovery of the presence and identity of Octavius Wilkinson, Tom Hughes' lost, or forgotten, uncle. Indeed "Octavius is [to us] just a figure in the family tree and a stone in the church yard of Eaton Socon. We did not even know that there were other lines descending from Octavius," so Mrs. Pauline Melvile of Cambridge, England, great-great-granddaughter of Octavius Wilkinson, recently wrote.

The 53 letters now in the Morris L. Parrish Collection of the Princeton University Library, written by John Hughes (the father), Thomas Hughes, and William Hastings Hughes (henceforth to be called Hastings) to Octavius Wilkinson from 1840 to 1889 have not yet received the attention they deserve since their acquisition by purchase in 1956. Several of these letters are fragmentary and there are certain lapses in continuity; thus they do not seem at first glance to be very promising. However, correlated with other Hughes manuscripts and published sources, notably the definitive biography of Tom Hughes by Mack and Armytage, they tell a story that is always absorbing and often poignant as family tragedies are touched upon. Here one finds a certain justification for N. G. Annan's assertion that "Family connexions

† Most of the basic editing was completed by William Hastings before the project was taken over by his brother Tom to broaden the book's popular appeal. The latter contributed a Preface.
are part of the poetry of history.”11 The exact quality of a collection of letters, one must add, depends on the nature of the person to whom they are written.

Octavius Robert Wilkinson was born on July 17, 1806, at Stokesley Manor, Yorkshire. Shortly after his birth his parents moved to Nether Hall, Suffolk. A brief family history written by Margaret Elizabeth Wilkinson Hughes, Octavius’ sister (also in the Morris L. Parrish Collection) tells us that Thomas Wilkinson, their father, was the son of a Stockton, Durham, merchant. After achieving success as a shipowner, Thomas Wilkinson retired with his Yorkshire-born wife, Jane Hutton, first to Stokesley Manor, and then, as we have seen, to Nether Hall, Suffolk, “to be within easy reach of the great coursing meetings at Newmarket,” so fond was he of hunting and racing.12 Tom Hughes reminisces in Early Memories for the Children about boyhood visits to Nether Hall, his mother’s girlhood home, with its intense coursing preoccupation, and makes the only printed Hughes reference to Uncle Oct (as he was called by Tom’s brother Hastings).13 Very possibly Margaret Wilkinson met her future husband, John Hughes, because of the shared fondness of these two families for hunting and hounds.14 It is interesting to recall that when well over eighty years of age, Mrs. Hughes rode her white horse down to the Meeting of the Waters, at Rugby, Tennessee.

Uncle Oct, the obituary in the Hunts County News, January 16, 1899, states, “was articled to a firm of solicitors and served his terms in the Temple and admitted a solicitor in 1830. In the same year Mr. Wilkinson came to St. Neots and entered into partnership with the late Mr. Peppercorn.” The newspaper account continues with the information that for many years Uncle Oct was clerk to the St. Neots Bench of Magistrates and a Commissioner for Oaths. An examination of the parish records of St. Mary’s, Eaton Socon (where he lived, across the Ouse from St. Neots) discloses, moreover, that he was a church warden, indeed an active one, until shortly before his death. In 1839, the year he came to St. Neots, Uncle Oct had married Mary White of Woodlands,

County Durham, who was closely related to Robert Surtees Smith, author of the Jorrocks novels.15 Eleven children, not all surviving in an age of high infant mortality, were born of this union.

In 1868, two years after Mary’s death, he married Elizabeth Hobson, who died in 1890, two years before Uncle Oct (January 9, 1892). Frequent references to the Wilkinson family, including Octavius’ descendants, are made in these letters.16 Octavius Wilkinson, family solicitor, apparently was a man one could trust and in whom one could confide. As solid as his firm of Wilkinson and Butler, Solicitors, surviving today, he must have been realistic and practical, not much interested in the ideological aspects of backwoods Utopias, but genuinely concerned for the welfare of his kinsmen.

John Hughes, father of Tom and Hastings, was, like three of his sons, a graduate of Oriel College, Oxford. Born in 1799, he was the son of Rev. Thomas Hughes, vicar of Uffington, Berkshire, and Canon of St. Paul’s, London, and Mary Ann Watts (a strong contender for the original of Madam Brown in Tom Brown’s School Days), daughter of Rev. George Watts, one-time incumbent of Uffington. Possessed of mildly intellectual traits and being a moderately prolific author,17 he was also interested in wood-carving. Well on into maturity he was dominated by his strong-minded, firm-willed mother, friend of Sir Walter Scott and Harrison Ainsworth.18

John Hughes married Margaret Elizabeth Wilkinson, December 24, 1820. Until two years after his father’s death in 1833 they lived in a house adjoining the vicarage at Uffington, in the Vale of the White Horse. They then moved with their six children to Donnington Priory, in the Vale of the Kennet, also in Berkshire, near Newbury. Margaret Hughes, described as a “generous, high-principled, quick-tempered, warm-hearted woman,”19 could now

14 Ibid., p. 17.
15 According to a genealogical chart, in the possession of Mrs. Ross Clarke, of Topeka, Kansas, great-granddaughter of Uncle Oct, the latter’s wife, Mary White, was daughter of Thomas White and Elizabeth Surtees. This account is passed in a copy of Surtees’ Handley Cross or Mr. Jorrocks’ Hunt (1854).
16 In addition to his wife, Mary, and his son, Surtees, the “circle” at Eaton Socon included his daughters Anne Elizabeth and Eleanor, who married Uncle Oct’s law partner, Francis George Butler.
17 Among his published works were An Itinerary of Provence and the Rhone, with etchings by the author (1829); and an edition of The Boscofel Tracts (1890).
18 See Mack and Armitage, pp. 8, 14.
19 Dorothea M. Hughes, Memoir of Jane Nassau Senior (Boston: George H. Ellis, 1915), p. 3.
be the mistress of her own household. Painted by G. F. Watts and admired by Tennyson, she must have been an extraordinary woman.20

Two of the children of John and Margaret Wilkinson Hughes (Octavius’ sister) are especially important as writers of these letters. One of them, Tom Hughes, scarcely needs detailed mention. A typical Victorian-statesman-man-of-letters, his bibliography is considerably more extensive than just the Tom Brown books; and altogether he had a varied, if rather stormy career. After graduation from Rugby School, in England, he attended Oriel College, Oxford; and as his career advanced became a London barrister (shortly after his marriage to Frances [Fanny] Ford on August 17, 1847), won two terms in Parliament (for Lambeth and Frome), “took silk” (became Queen’s Counselor) in 1869, and was appointed County Court Judge at Chester in 1882. A disciple of F. D. Maurice and a friend of Charles Kingsley, he is noted for his dedication to Christian socialism as well as for the establishment of the Rugby, Tennessee, colony. The other letter writer, his brother Hastings, attended Harrow but no university. Most of his life, in England and America, he was a sherry merchant; but he did have newspaper experience. In 1858 he married Emily, the daughter of Archdeacon Clark of St. David’s, Pembrokeshire, and the niece of the famed political economist, Nassau William Senior (whose son, John, married Jane—“Jeannie”—Hughes). Along with his daughter, Emily, and three sons—William George, Gerard, and Henry—Hastings, now a widower, after financial setbacks in England came to America. They did not, however, all come at the same time. Hastings remained in the United States to the end of his life (1907).

The letters of John Hughes to Octavius Wilkinson, although the smallest in quantity in the Princeton collection, are perhaps closest to having a genuine literary flavor, thus providing an interesting background for the other letters. They possess a relaxed, easy quality, a tone in which he might write to a congenial brother-in-law, sharing interests in the duties of a county magistrate and various family concerns. He often mentions his children. For example, on December 23 (no year given), he writes, “I expect Tom & John home today; the latter has a wish to read for orders instead of following commerce, which, as I find it proceeds from sound & disinterested reasons, & not from mere idleness & an unsettled spirit, I have fully sanctioned.” Having been at the sea, the “younger children have derived much benefit . . . Jane [who became well-known as a social reformer] I really think, in particular, would throw most boys of her age in a trial of strength.” George and Tom “are reading together here, & helping the Craven cricket club to beat their neighbours.” (July 21, 1841) “Tom [John Hughes writes on January 17, 1851] does not seem to throw over his law for his Xtian-social-projects, though he devotes all his leisure to them, after all a better thing than gadding out; & really the success of the working men in question seems to have been hitherto pretty marked. At all events he & the promoters, (about one half clergy) seem to go about the thing in a Christian spirit, which will do themselves good in the next world, if not in this,” a remarkable statement from one of John Hughes’ conservative leanings.

The letters of Thomas Hughes to his Uncle Oct are those of a respectful nephew to an uncle, who is, also, a dependable and trustworthy solicitor. Although these letters, many written in the white heat of necessity, often refer to family business, one must not overlook their essential biographical importance. They are terse, to the point, in startling contrast with the often effusive letters he wrote to James Russell Lowell and Lord Ripon, with whom he shared basic literary and intellectual concerns. December 9, 1862 (the date the letter was received), for example, finds Tom and George having inherited the Spaldwick estate from their father, in the purchase of which the latter had spent incredibly large sums.21 The affairs of this property became increasingly troublesome so that it had to be sold some years later. In this communication he wants a small donation paid to the dunning Spaldwick parson and asks his uncle to help in the completion of executors’ accounts for his father, John, who died in late 1857.

Most affecting is the news of the death of Hastings’ wife (letter of January 15, 1864), in Port St. Mary’s, Spain, only a few days after the birth of her daughter, Emmy, on December 29, 1863. “Isn’t this a fearfully sad trial for poor Hastings? [Tom writes] Mother thinks of starting to join him in Spain—We have nothing

20 The painting by G. F. Watts (1858) is now in the possession of Mr. Oliver Nassau Senior of Poole, Dorset. Appreciation by Tennyson may be found in Charles Tennyson, Alfred Tennyson (New York: Macmillan, 1949), p. 387.

21 Spaldwick Manor Court Rolls, C-R-6, County Records Office, Huntington, England, indicate that one purchase by John Hughes amounted to £20,408.
yet beyond the telegram, so really do not know what she died of even—"  

On July 6, 1865, Tom is already launched on his first successful bid as a Liberal candidate for a seat in Parliament, from Lambeth. The getting of Spurgeon [C. H. Spurgeon, the great Baptist preacher, advocate of teetotalling and Sunday closings, also a Liberal] was a great point—Hastings [his participation is not elsewhere noted] & a number of helpers all Volunteers for the work are working splendidly, but whether we shall beat the old vestry & publican machinery which is mostly adverse I cannot yet guess—All looks well—" On October 5, 1868, Tom is again on the hustings, running successfully for a seat at Frome, Somerset. "It will be of course a far less onerous seat than Lambeth, [he writes] I think seems likely to be won & held easily—The offer was made in the most complimentary manner & my acceptance will make a Tory's chances in Lambeth hopeless—" He thanks his uncle for his "offer of help with Spurgeon," but his "former letter brought him [Spurgeon] on my committee & we have been great allies ever since—"  

The decade of the 1870's was a mixture of joys and sorrows, successes and failures for Tom Hughes. He was steadily losing the backing of the cooperative movement as well as that of the trade unions and with working men in general developed a mutual disenchantment. Likewise family tragedy frequently intervened. Tom's beloved brother George, whom he memorialized in Memoir of a Brother (1873), died on May 2, 1872. An undated letter written at Offley (George's Hertfordshire home) "3.30 p.m." suggests the poignancy of gathering up his brother's belongings after death. "I enclose the key to dear George's [sic] bureau, which stands in his room, on the left hand side of the window, under the picture of my father—In the right hand drawer at the bottom, you will find his account book referring to wages &c, showing the sums paid to the gardener." Tom is particularly concerned about not being able to find "accounts given in by the gardener or New." He apparently refers here to the fact that George had refused to pay his keeper, Henry New, an ex-prize-fighter and Tom's boyhood idol, because of his belief that he had cheated him. "Annie [George's widow, the former Anne Steward] seems very angry about New." Tom continues on October 7, 1872, "I have written to her strongly as to the duty of not turning him off without any thing—It seems that the least thing dear George wd have thought of doing wd have been to give him back his £120 (or whatever it was)—[in withheld wages]—If Annie won't do this I & Jeanie [Senior] will—"  

The latter, his only sister, died in 1877. Her death was a tremendous shock, perhaps greater than that suffered from the death of George, five years earlier. The distinguished company at Elm House, Lavender Hill, where Margaret Hughes for several years had lived with the Seniors, Hastings, and his family, had already broken up. Indeed by 1874 Mrs. Hughes had already taken Hastings' children to live in the Isle of Wight. The death of Thomas Wilkinson, Uncle Oct's brother, on February 2, 1878, placed on Tom the additional burden of administering a rather complex estate. Here Uncle Oct was undoubtedly of the utmost help. But Tom was moving steadily toward his greatest adventure: the establishment of Rugby, Tennessee.  

For some years Tom Hughes' thoughts had turned toward the New World as a means of fulfilling his dreams of establishing a Utopian colony. In 1870, as we have seen, he made a much publicized visit to America, ostensibly to meet his literary and ideological idol, James Russell Lowell. James (Jem), his eldest son, having emigrated to Canada, soon crossed the border in 1874, and went first to Colorado and then to Texas, where he became a rancher. Tom's letters to Uncle Oct quite frequently refer to his first son's American successes and later to those of his youngest, George, or "Plump," a student at Haileybury College in England, until 1881, who eventually settled in Kansas. Beloved parent though he was, Tom could not persuade either son to settle in Rugby.  

The letters of Tom and Hastings Hughes concerning the American exploits of their families are probably the most important in the collection. In contrast with published accounts, especially of Rugby, Tennessee, they give a truer sense of the quality of life with unvarnished candor. Beneath the laconic narratives sometimes smolders hidden drama.  

Mrs. Hughes, perhaps already considering a move to America,
had gone to her “little Chelsea home [21 Park Walk], where she will be I am sure much happier than in the Isle of Wight—She has her old servants with her [Elizabeth and Charles Dyer, who had promised Jane Senior on her deathbed that they would stay with Mrs. Hughes as long as she lived, and accompanied her to East Tennessee] & her favourite pictures & furniture & sees a number of friends who keep her cheerful—,” writes Tom Hughes on December 19, 1878.

News from America is good. Tom’s Jem and Hastings’ Willy are succeeding, and Uncle Oct’s grandsons, Edward and Robert Francis Hobson, “who seem fine active honest fellows will do well out there” when they arrive. The migration to America was on, and continued to the point that today the Hughes family and its Wilkinson and Hobson connections are almost exclusively American. Because of the heavy financial reverses sustained by their father, Hastings’ sons—Willy, Gerard, and Harry—were forced to leave their respective English public schools. Harry, the youngest, a Queen’s Scholar at Westminster until December, 1878, was the last of the brothers to terminate his formal education. Willy had departed for the New World on September 15, 1878. He was soon joined in Texas by Gerard, and then by Harry and by Hastings himself.

The early adventures in America of Tom’s Jem and Hastings’ three sons—all nephews of Octavius Wilkinson—as well as the latter’s two Hobson grandsons are related in lively detail in G.T.T. Gone to Texas (1884). This consists of letters written or about these young men, letters selected and edited first by Hastings and then by Tom. They were published to encourage the same type of Englishman for whom Rugby, Tennessee, was established to become sheep farmers and cattle ranchers in Texas. Tom Hughes’ enthusiastic interest in this competing, but completely contrasting enterprise, suggests his continuing concern for the dilemmas of the young.

No family happening fascinates more than does the arrival in Texas first of Edward (Ted) Hobson and then of his brother Robert Francis (Bob) Hobson (sons of Mary Octavia Wilkinson, Uncle Oct’s daughter, and James Hobson). The fascination is partly due to the satisfaction of discovering their identities from behind the aliases, Cousin Tim and Cousin Dick, that the editors of G.T.T. felt necessary to retain the desired anonymity. This discovery is doubly important because of the roles they play in the Princeton letters, which require some knowledge of the Texas background for understanding, although those surviving dwell for the most part on a later period, of which they are the sole and exclusive source of information. Quite significantly, these letters assist in the identification of Tim and Dick, a contribution to a complete Hughes biography.

Hastings’ eldest son, Willy, the editors of G.T.T. inform us, determined to import into Texas two Oxfordshire Down rams and four ewes, even before he had a ranch on which to keep them. These were brought from Liverpool by one Cousin Tom (Ted Hobson), “a year older than Willy, [this means that he was born in 1858] and a chum of his, who had been three years in a city office, [and] had determined to go to Texas too.”

On his arrival at Galveston in the summer of 1879, Hastings met Ted Hobson already “on his way back to Ireland to join another brother there and go with him to New Zealand.” Ted had served first as a ranch hand and then as a partner of Willy in a vegetable growing operation. Hastings had left Liverpool on July 4, accompanied by his son, Harry, and Bob, Ted Hobson’s brother—all seeking new fortunes in America. Fresh from three years’ service in the Royal Horse Guard Blues, Bob Hobson, like most Wilkinson descendants, was particularly gifted with horses. For some time he transported horses from Texas to New York, pasturing them, temporarily, on Willy’s Boerne ranch. Having become tired of this occupation, he was already (in late 1880), so Tom wrote his uncle, “in perfect get up as the fashionable riding master” in New York. (December 9, 1880)

By the end of October, 1879, Hastings had returned to New York, from Texas, to settle down in his accustomed role as a sherry importer. It is impossible to determine the exact date of his first arrival in the Rugby colony, but it could well have been in June, 1880. Even before he left England he was in correspondence with

27 G.T.T., p. 41. See also San Antonio Daily Herald, Sunday, February 2, 1879, Supplement, p. 5, col. 3.
29 Mrs. Henry Abel to the author, 26 September 1911.
30 A letter of Hastings Hughes to Robert Walton, Cincinnati, 9 June 1880, indicates that on that date he had already been to Rugby.
John Murray Forbes, Boston financier and member of Lowell's Saturday Club (who was to become his father-in-law in 1887), concerning the prospects of the colony. Hastings was never a deep believer in the venture. However, he was a reliable participant, who stayed at Rugby for much longer periods than did Tom, and could be credited with some of the early success that it enjoyed.

Much of the latter half of 1880 Hastings was in Tennessee preparing for the colony's official opening. His brother, who arrived in August, was traveling about the country lecturing, making friends, and in general seeking the sorely needed financial backing. Hastings' first letter to Uncle Oct (October 6, 1880), like many from his pen, is rich in Rugby lore. Telling of the success of the previous day's opening as well as the colony's hopeful prospects, he is most enthusiastic: "You will laugh I fancy [he declares] at my trying my hand at another trade! But really I think colonization suits me best and—you see I am not going to give up wine, though this is a teetotal settlement!" He continues, "I am going to stay here till Xmas at any rate (Tom having just left & Walter Senior [Jane's only son] following next Friday) in order to see to the English immigrants, church organization, cooperative store, &c —And if dear Mother comes—and she is talking of it seriously—I shall make it my permanent headquarters—I never was in quite so beautiful a country before." The prospects for grape culture roused him to considerable (professional!) enthusiasm.

In May, 1881, as earlier noted, there arrived in Rugby, Tennessee, Margaret Wilkinson Hughes, an authentic heroine, unswervingly true to her altruistic principles (on which she had likewise nourished her children). Transplanted at age 84 from her congenial salons of society, art, and literature in Chelsea and Mayfair, she had come to strengthen by the authority of her presence the prospects of this colony in the wilderness of the Appalachian plateau, where unfenced hogs rooted in the dooryards. In her retinue besides Emily, her granddaughter, and the faithful Dyers was Edward Wilkinson, Uncle Oct's own son, who for several years stayed in or near Rugby. (He needs to be carefully distinguished in these letters from Edward Hobson, his nephew.) Waiting for the comple-

tion of their house, they all lived briefly at the Tabard. Emmy, Hastings' daughter, was particularly delighted (at first) with Rugby, a community as compact and complicated as Jane Austen's Highbury. She wrote Lucy Taylor, her best English friend (daughter of the late Tom Taylor, playwright and editor of Punch), that she believed she would enjoy her new life more than that in London on Park Walk, Chelsea. Hastings writes, "No doubt Ted [Wilkinson] has told you of the very painful attack of gout from which dear Mother has been suffering. The Dr [probably Dr. Kemp, Harvard graduate, resident at Rugby] had no doubt of its nature, [the] drinking water rather than alcoholic indulgence the cause but I am inclined to think it took that form because there was a gouty tendency in the constitution." At the date of this letter (July 11, 1881) fortunately she is improving: "I hope to get her out of the hotel into the little frame house which is now being finished, in the course of next week. She will then decide on where she will have her own house built." Emmy "is anxious to have a little piece of ground of her own & to keep goats & poultry &c." Her little farm she eventually called Landscape after the estate of the Hobsons, her cousins in Ireland.

Between July and the next letter (September 6, 1881) the previously noted drought and typhoid epidemic hit the Rugby colony. Several deaths resulted and Emmy was seriously ill, but now "thank God is quite convalescent." These summer calamities struck a heavy, perhaps mortal, blow to the prospects of the colony, surely to its public reputation. Hastings has taken over the correspondence of one of the victims, Osmond Dakeyne, who was secretary of the Board. Favorable reports concerning Granny (as Mrs. Hughes will hereafter be called) and Emmy are noted. (September 14, 1881) Ted Wilkinson is on the farm of J. Rylands Haigh, current Tabard manager; but Hastings hopes that Uncle Oct will buy for him the property of the late Dakeyne, which "has a nice little frame house & stable & is part cleared—"

When he wrote on March 17, 1882, from Cincinnati, Hastings had taken Emmy to Texas to visit her brothers on the Boerne

---

31 Mack and Armytage, pp. 295-290.
33 A reply, Octavius Wilkinson to Hastings Hughes (in Tennessee State Library, Nashville), St. Nevis, 12 November 1881, is the only extant letter of Uncle Oct.
34 Emily Hughes to Lucy Taylor, 5 July, 1881. The 35 letters written by Emmy Hughes to Lucy Taylor, from 1881 to 1887, in the possession of the author, are the best and most complete account of the Rugby colony by any member of the Hughes family.
35 "Granny," as Emmy calls Mrs. Hughes in her letters, is used for convenience.
ranch while he went "drumming." In January, Hastings must have learned that the colony had become virtually bankrupt. This event probably occurred during his absence although no direct mention is made in the letters. News must also have reached him of the dismissal of Haigh, hotel manager, who had violated his contract (executed by Hastings himself) by touching a drop of intoxicating liquor. Refusing to vacate the hotel premises, the unfortunate manager was sued by the Board of Aid, which won its case, although Judge Young, presiding, called the whole affair "a frivolous thing." Ted Wilkinson, still living on the Haigh farm, was a material witness at the trial.

The day after the return of Hastings and his daughter from Texas "Gerard turned up ... & after staying a week went on to join his brothers in the sheep business." Gerard had apparently not enjoyed his artist's life, having studied under G. F. Watts while living at his grandmother's old quarters on Park Walk after his brief visit to Texas. Ted Wilkinson, Hastings joyfully reports, left "looking very well & jolly ... Bob was getting on capitalily & saving money when I was last in New York." Granny has taken up gardening and was "busy planting & laying out her garden." She has "got in some of your vines, which struck well in the Board's garden last year," although there is fear that they will be attacked by phylloxera. By November 28, 1882, she had moved to Uffington Cottage (House), at Rugby, and had "just finished putting in the greater part of 100 peach & 100 apple trees here ... the rest are to be put in on one of Tom's lots at the other end of the village where the Dyers live, & where we planted last year 250 mulberry trees, so that Emmy may go in for "silk culture" later on ... [which she did, with the exasperating results that the silkworms spun everywhere, "behind doors, on the underside of tables, on the edge of pictures," except where they were intended] Also we have tried putting Indian corn into silage this autumn there, with what result we shall see in March, when the pit is opened—"

Many of the too often raffish early settlers (unprepared by training for the rigors of an agricultural life in the Appalachian wilderness) had left by their own choice, if granted such a prerogative.

"We have pretty well got rid of the loafers & incompetents who were such a plague here, & have altogether I think got through the worst of our 'diseases of infancy' as a New York friend of the settlement called them—" Bob Hobson thrives in New York, having "worked like a horse these two years past & already saved a good sum, & will I trust be able in about a year from this to settle in Virginia—He is so much liked in NY, & has made so good a connection there, that he will have no difficulty in finding a market for any horses he may rear or collect, whenever the time may come—" When last in New York, Hastings had "sent Aunt Betsy [second wife of Uncle Oct] a paper with a paragraph in it about Bob & his British accent w I thought w'd amuse her—" Ted Wilkinson, "looking very well & hearty," finally free from his agreement with the unfortunate Haigh, is waiting for the appropriate opportunity. His experiences have made "Ted cautious about committing himself to any particular line here, but I think he likes the country."

Walter Senior (Jeanie's son) had just passed through New York on his way back to England, Hastings writes (from 49 Beaver Street, April 23, 1883), regretful that he was unable to greet him in Tennessee because of too great responsibilities in preparation for a "prospective rise in the wine duties." Ted Wilkinson has gone to Chicago to seek a berth on the lakes (his having been a sailor's background), but apparently was unsuccessful; for, according to newspaper reports, he returned in June, 1883. Later (October 4, 1883) he seems about to join Charles Dyer's son, Arthur, "who is a very steady fellow & can already do almost man's work," in the operation of a saw and grist mill, likely to be a profitable venture now that the Arnold School, "on the English lines," has been proposed. Bob had made a prospecting trip to Texas, hopeful of acquiring a cattle ranch, but could find none suitable and believed the ranch business greatly to have changed.

Hastings reports in the same letter the departure for England of his brother Tom aboard the Servia, having made his first visit to Rugby and America since November, 1880. When in Tennessee he had given a supper at the Tabard for all his neighbors and

---

26 The Rugbeian, February 19, 1882, p. 2, col. 3.
27 Uffington House had been the name of Granny's Isle of Wight house as it was later to be of Tom Hughes' house in Chester, built about 1885.
28 Emily Hughes to Lucy Taylor, 15 June 1883.
30 Walter Senior, London barrister, son of Jeanie Hughes, accompanied Tom on his 1880 journey to America. He was a Rugby shareholder and owned property in the colony.
the next night was feasted by the Rugby “firsts” of three years before at the Dyers' Newbury House, reputed to have much better food than the hotel. Hastings also writes that his brother is much improved in health. His recurring indisposition, coupled with his financial reverses and general exasperation at the failure of his American enterprise, were responsible for his long absence: “He weighed just before leaving & shewed 13 1/2 lbs over his usual weight so I reckon that he will have got to Chester [where he is Circuit Judge] all the better for his American trip.” Granny Hughes was naturally delighted with his visit, which lasted slightly more than a fortnight. While in Rugby he had advanced Emmy two dividends from Uncle Tom Wilkinson's estate, “to enable her to buy a lot with a shanty on it adjoining Mother's lot.” (This was one of Emmy's several purchases, but decidedly the most interesting since it involved her uncle's loan.)

Bob, who had gone back to school to raise more money (October 29, 1883), has bought Dakeyne's farm, where Hastings hopes he will "be able to settle . . . before long—We are as you know close to the Kentucky bluegrass country where all the finest carriage horses in the US are reared & he will be able to buy these & pair them, & with his good connection[s] in NY make a paying business of it—It will be less risky than ranch business too—"

When he wrote on December 26, 1883, Hastings had made an earlier than scheduled visit to Rugby because of “a severe attack of suppressed gout” of his mother, but she was “already mending” when he arrived. For two days now “she has been downstairs nearly all day, & has not been over-fatigued.” He reports that he left “Bob & Ted [Edward Hobson] very flourishing in NY & hope to find on my return next week that Ted has got the berth in the pursers' department on one of the good lines of steamers.” The other Ted (Wilkinson) is in financial straits, “owing the Dyers $59 for board & cash.” Hastings had suggested his drawing on Uncle Oct in “Louisa Dyer's Charles Dyer's sister favor for 11.8/—"

Tom Hughes had just returned from his second of five return visits to Rugby, on October 24, 1884, when he reported joyfully to Uncle Oct, “I can't tell you how well I found them [the family in Tennessee] or what a pretty place they have made it with old Dyers help—Dear Mother rode down to the Meeting of the Waters a long 2 miles through the woods & up & down steep paths, & actually got a bad blow from a bough on the neck but was no worse for it.” On February 4, 1885, he wrote from Chester asking a favor for Arthur (or Pip, the son next older than George, or Plump). Having gone to Oxford from the sixth form at Haileybury, he "seemed likely to do well there being a studious & steady fellow.” Unhappily, “last summer in the long vacation he broke down, nearly had brain fever, & has only just recovered so as to be fit for work, if he is fit even now—” Tom hopes that “in a year or so he may be able to go back to Oxford.” The fact is that “from being a very religious boy allowed to read what he wanted, he got meddling his head with that pompous bag of wind Herbert Spencers prose & Shelleys poetry, which was I think the cause of the mischief.” His doctor thinks that regular work will effect a cure. "I can think of nothing so good as a lawyers office, & of course that being so would sooner have him at Eaton Socon than anywhere—"

Good news has been received from Rugby, Tennessee: “We have gone through all the bad times out there & spite of the fever & grip in the early days, & the land sharks with whom we have had about 20 suits (I have won all as yet) shall I think have a very flourishing settlement in another year or two—"

Hastings' next letter (New York, March 30, 1885) relates that because of his promotion to junior partner in his sherry importing firm (Purdy and Nicholas), he has less time to write than before, "especially as I go to Rugby for three days every two months, the journey to & fro occupying three or four days as the case may be." Reports from all family members in America are "excellent," including the Hobsons: "Bob is hard at work getting his Virginia farm, Pokahontas, said to be the birthplace of that interesting Indian from whom all FFV* trace their origin—into order." Bob's good sense and good fortune continue to impress Hastings. His brother, Ted Hobson, "was here last week, & left on Sat' on his usual voyage to the Habana—He is a great favorite on his line—Ward's—& I have little doubt of his being a full purser within a reasonable time." An allusion to Pip suggests that he is still in his uncle's law office. It appears, too, that thirty-five years earlier Hastings himself was under Uncle Oct's protection: "It seems but yesterday that Frank [Butler, his son-in-law] was laughing at me for

---

*FFV- This was located at Rock Castle, Virginia, 40 miles up the James River from Richmond. His daughter (Mrs. Henry Abel) has written me (30 September 1971) that because the soil was clay, not limestone, it was not a good place for the breeding of horses.
F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Contributions to
The American Credo

By James L. W. West III


Fitzgerald’s copy of the first edition, first printing, of The American Credo is among the rare books collections at Princeton (catalogue number Ex 1098.6695.11, copy 2).1 Nathan gave this particular copy to Fitzgerald: on the recto of the front free endpaper is Nathan’s inscription “To my good friends | Zelda + Scott | From their’s | George Jean Nathan—.”

The American Credo was a two-part effort. Mencken wrote the 96-page preface, and Nathan put together the actual “Credo”—a numbered collection of 488 quips, sayings, and witticisms, all of which poke fun at the cherished beliefs of the American mind.2 Fitzgerald, it appears, contributed twelve items to Nathan’s Credo section, and on the basis of these contributions, considered himself as part-author of the book. On the title page of his copy, he has in fact penciled his name in as one of the authors. (See Figure 1.) And in the text of the book, Fitzgerald has checked and initialed

1 I am grateful to Princeton University Library, as owners of Fitzgerald’s copy of The American Credo, for permission to publish these findings. I also thank Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University for a research grant which enabled me to visit the Fitzgerald Archive at Princeton.

2 Published with the permission of Julie Haydon Nathan (Mrs. George Jean Nathan). There is, in addition, a letter from Mencken to Fitzgerald attached to the front pastedown endpaper of the book. Mencken’s letter apparently concerns a manuscript written by an unidentified author. Fitzgerald sent the manuscript to Mencken in hopes that Mencken could interest his own publisher, Knopf, in accepting it.


---

mistaking a nursery field of ‘quick’ for asparagus!!” Like Pip, Hastings must have served a St. Neots apprenticeship.

To the last Tom Hughes retained, in his letters to Uncle Oct, his characteristic optimism in the face sometimes of contrary evidence. On March 10, 1885, “Times are very bad in these parts & the general outlook is by no means cheerful but the old country has pulled through worse & I doubt not will come through this right side up in spite of Bismark [sic] Russia & the Soudan—” A reading of letters up to 1889, three years before Uncle Oct’s death,42 from both Tom and Hastings, telling of Pip’s continued success as a solicitor; the sickness that soon led to the death of Jack, Tom’s soldier son; and the American exploits of Jem, Plump, and Emmy, sometimes colorful and always enthusiastic, should confirm, as would indeed an examination of all other letters, that they are very interesting indeed.

The final imperative question concerning the Princeton letters to Uncle Oct is “Are these letters important and, if so, how important?” Without making exaggerated claims, because the letters are somewhat incomplete and fragmentary and intended exclusively to be read by Uncle Oct, we can affirm their significance for a further study of Thomas Hughes and his milieu. These letters were written to an indispensable uncle (except those written by his brother-in-law) by nephews not inclined to unlock their hearts nor to display their intellectual, literary, or spiritual concerns to a man not deeply interested in such matters. All of them help to complete, adding color and perspective, the existing portraits of John, Tom, and Hastings Hughes. Most important, perhaps, they convey the irrepressible enthusiasm and untarnished idealism of Tom Hughes. He often tasted but never for long admitted defeat, and his nature is seen in clear, though sometimes subdued, detail. The depiction of close family ties from Donnington Priory, to Texas, and to Tennessee, suggests, as well, new chapters in a biography, which like that of any other great man, will never be complete.

---

42 No mention is made in these letters of Granny Hughes’ death on October 5, 1887, although in a Princeton letter, Thomas Hughes to Dana Estes, 30 September 1887, one finds mention of “bad news having detained me in Tennessee,” to suggest that Hughes before he left the United States was aware of the closeness of her death.
the items he contributed. (See Figure 1.) These are Fitzgerald's contributions:

22
That all male negroes can sing.
51
That George Bernard Shaw doesn't really believe anything he writes.

193
That whenever a vaudeville comedian quotes a familiar commercial slogan, such as "His Master's Voice," or "Eventually, why not now?", he is paid $50 a performance for doing so.

199
That all men named Clarence, Claude or Percy are sissies.

248
That a man of fifty-five is always more experienced than a man of thirty-five.

262
That John D. Rockefeller would give his whole fortune for a digestion good enough to digest a cruller.

429
That all the schoolboys in Boston have bulged brows, wear large spectacles and can read Greek.

433
That all the cheaper brands of cigarettes are sophisticated with drugs, and in time cause those who smoke them to get softening of the brain.

442
That lighting three cigarettes with one match will bring some terrible calamity upon one or other of the three smokers.

449
That all the great writers of the world now use typewriters.


That all Presidents of the United States get many hot tips on the stock-market, but that they are too honourable to play them, and so turn them over to their wives, who make fortunes out of them.

That Elihu Root is an intellectual giant, and that it is a pity the suspicion of him among farmers makes it impossible to elect him President.

That no man not a sissy can ever learn to thread a needle or darn a sock.

That all glass blowers soon or late die of consumption.

That all women who go in bathing at the French seaside resorts affect very naughty one-piece bathing suits.

That George M. Cohan and Irving Berlin can only play the piano with one finger.

Fitzgerald was apparently not the only outside contributor to The American Credo. On 25 November 1919, Mencken wrote to Louis Untermeyer: “Your contributions to the main Credo reach me just too late, dammit. I passed the page proofs a week ago.” It is likely, then, that other members of the Smart Set circle besides Fitzgerald were contributors to the book.

Fitzgerald’s twelve contributions have an interesting subsequent textual history. In 1921, Mencken and Nathan issued a “Revised and Enlarged Edition” of The American Credo. For the new “Edition,” 981 freshly typeset items were added to the end of the Credo section on new pages 191-266, but the first 190 pages of the book were merely reprinted, with some revisions, from the original 1920 plates. Spot collation of the first 190 pages on the Lindstrand Comparator reveals plate variants both in Mencken’s preface (at 73.14-19, 83.6, and 91.1-2) and in Nathan’s Credo (at 155.10, 169.6, and 173.2-4). No plate variants, however, affect Fitzgerald’s contributions to the Credo. Six years later, Nathan published The New American Credo (New York: Knopf, 1927). For this volume, Nathan dropped Mencken’s preface and published—in a true new typesetting—a revised and enlarged edition of the Credo section. All twelve of Fitzgerald’s contributions were retained in the 1927

4 Letters of H. L. Mencken, ed. Guy J. Forgue (New York: Knopf, 1961), p. 211. Forgue misdates the letter as “November 25th [1920].” (Mencken often omitted the year from dates on his letters.) Forgue apparently dates the letter 1920 on the basis of Mencken’s mention in the letter of two books—Untermeyer’s The New Adam and Floyd Dell’s Moon-Calf—both released in 1920. But Mencken, as a critic and reviewer, most likely read these two books late in 1919 in some pre-publication form. In any case, Mencken’s statement “I passed the page proofs [of The American Credo] a week ago” clearly belongs in November 1919, four months before official publication of The American Credo, and not in November 1920 when the book had already been on the market for eight months. The American Credo was officially published in mid-March 1920. See Publishers’ Weekly, XCVII (13 March 1920), 817.
volume, but with some textual alterations. The twelve items were re-numbered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor accidental changes appear in items 319 and 678 of the 1927 edition. As for substantives, the word “other” in 1920 item 442 is changed to “another” in 1927 item 669. And 1920 item 262—which read “That John D. Rockefeller would give his whole fortune for a digestion good enough to digest a cruller.”—was altered to item 45 of the 1927 edition: “That John D. Rockefeller would gladly give his entire fortune to be able to eat an eskimo pie.”

---

**Library Notes**

THEATRE COLLECTION

A recent addition to the Theatre Collection has been made in memory of the late Paul R. Wagner, Curator of Special Collections from 1966 until his premature death in 1970. The memorial takes the form of the recently published ten-volume set of *The New York Times Theatre Reviews 1920/1970*. Mr. Wagner was intensely interested in the theatre, as a playwright and as a member of the audience with an astutely critical sense as well as considerable knowledge of the history of the New York stage. This useful collection of reviews therefore seems a fitting memorial to the young man who served the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections well for much too short a time.—MARY ANN JENSEN, Curator of the Theatre Collection

JERSEYMEN GO WEST

“The headlong rush to California precipitated by James W. Marshall’s find in the tail race of Sutter’s mill at Coloma in January, 1848, affords one of the most compelling spectacles of modern history. It explosively peopled the Pacific West, forever changed the face of America and the character of the American people, and altered the course of history in so many ways that scholars will never trace them all.” The words are those of a Californian, Dale Morgan, but the precipitator of the Gold Rush is New Jersey’s own. Marshall is but one of the many Jerseymen whose westering held significance beyond their own lives. A selective gathering of such men formed the exhibition “Jerseymen Go West,” in the exhibition gallery of the library from October 10th through December of 1973.

The first of this grouping of figures from the Westward movement was a personage from the 18th century Princeton campus: Colonel George Morgan, the Indian agent who lived in the original *Prospect* and there spun his ambitious design for New Madrid, the vast colony West of the Mississippi that he founded in 1789.
It was a short-lived dream, but far less inchoate than the designs of Western empire of Aaron Burr and Jonathan Dayton, who followed Morgan West and in the exhibition. A more solid footing for westering Jerseymen was that set out by Zebulon Montgomery Pike, whose exploration of the headwaters of the Arkansas in 1806 led to the discovery of the peak that still bears his name. Pike was followed in the exhibition by such distinguished figures as David Gouverneur Burnet, who sought health among the Comanche of Texas in 1817 and stayed to become the first president of the Republic; James Abert whose careful eye and skillful hand put the Southwest to paper on expeditions with the topographical engineers in the 1840's; Princeton's own Commodore Robert Field Stockton, who "conquered" California from the Mexicans in 1846 and proclaimed himself its first governor; the Kearneys: Stephen, whose Western ventures began as part of an expedition to the mouth of the Yellowstone in 1825 and culminated in the expedition that occupied New Mexico at the same time Stockton was taking California, and who also became its first governor; Lawrence, who, watching over U.S. interests in the Pacific, officially protected the sovereignty of Hawaii for America in 1843; and Philip who supported Scott in the Mexican War and was later to lead an expedition to California against the Rogue River Indians.

George McClellan, before his Civil War distinctions and his governorship of New Jersey, accompanied Marcy in explorations for the source of the Red River in 1852 and later directed railroad surveys which started in the Cascades and extended throughout the West; John Insley Blair, was not only the donor of Princeton's Blair Hall, but also a principal promoter of Western railroads; William W. Newell followed his governorship of New Jersey with an appointment as governor of Washington Territory in 1880.

Important Western careers by Princetonians in the present century were represented by Daniel Moreau Barringer, whose explorations as a mining engineer resulted in the discovery of the origin of Meteor Crater in northern Arizona; Howard Russell Butler, who painted the deserts of California and the Southwest and eclipses from Naval observatories in Oregon; and Dr. J. Monroe Thorington who shortly after the First World War began the systematic exploration of the watershed of large portions of the Canadian Rockies and the Purcell Range, where he mapped, charted the retreat of glaciers, painted and produced a distin-

guished literature on the history of mountaineering in the Canadian West.

At the center of the exhibition were materials representing the scientific expeditions Princeton University sent West in the 19th century. Beginning with the first journey of 1877 each benefited from the special contributions of William Berryman Scott who was given a special place in the exhibition. The last expedition represented in the show, that of 1895, was embellished with telegrams exploring the news that the Princeton party had been massacred by Shoshones in Wyoming—a rumor happily scotched by the father of John Hinadale Scheide, whose son, even then a book collector, was a member of the expedition.
MENDELSSOHN'S MOZART: A NEW ACQUISITION

No recent acquisition of printed music by Firestone Library's Special Collections is of rarer historical value than the set of volumes to be briefly described in this note. It is a matched set of bound volumes of the works of W. A. Mozart, including the first large portion of the Mozart edition that was brought out in the first years of the 19th century by the famous publishing house of Breitkopf and Härtel in Leipzig under the title *Oeuvres Complètes*. Valuable as this set is in its own right as a monument of early Mozart publication, it is vastly more important by virtue of its later ownership. Six of the seven volumes of this set bear the autograph signature “Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy” on their fly-leafs, in Mendelssohn's characteristically beautiful hand. They contain no other marks of ownership or later possession, and several of the volumes contain extensive pencilled fingerings and markings. The volumes have been generously given to the permanent collection of Firestone Library by a descendant of Mendelssohn.

Among early Mozart editions the *Oeuvres Complètes* is a well-known landmark. It actually represents the first attempt by a major publishing firm to bring together a collected edition of the works of Mozart, and was begun within ten years after his death in 1791. Breitkopf and Härtel undertook this task in the late 1790's with the help of Constanze Mozart, the composer's widow, and by 1800 they had announced to the public that the edition was planned to be divided into three major divisions: (I) the works for pianoforte alone and for pianoforte with other instruments (the "Klaviersachen"); (II) full scores of larger works, including Mozart's operas, cantatas, and church music; (III) performing parts for the orchestral and chamber works (the symphonies, concertos, quintets, quartets, etc.), so far as they were then known and authenticated.

The present group consists of an entire set of Part I, containing all the "Klaviersachen" as they were then identified from extant prints and manuscripts, in 17 *Heft*. They include the Piano Sonatas and other shorter works for pianoforte; all the Sonatas for Violin and Pianoforte; the Trios for Pianoforte, Violin and Violoncello; and other chamber works including the Pianoforte. To this unified set is added a seventh item, not immediately part of the original *Oeuvres Complètes* but a supplement to it and also published by Breitkopf and Härtel in the same format and binding: Mozart's Concert Arias, in one volume. All seven volumes fit the description given in Alfred Einstein's monumental revised edition of the Köchel catalogue of Mozart's works:

This edition [the *Oeuvres Complètes*] appeared in print in oblong format and in green covers with Greek corners; the first item to appear was the 'Musique pour le Pianoforte, Cahiers I-XVII'. These were frequently reprinted later on, showing a variety of printing processes that included musical typography, copper-plate engraving, and lithography. Plate numbers and publication numbers were used only in the reprints.

With the help of the last observation and additional information on music publisher's numbers (a vital aid in the dating of music prints of the 18th and 19th centuries) we can attempt to date the various fascicles making up these volumes, and thus arrive at tentative conclusions as to when Felix Mendelssohn could have acquired them. This is bound to be a crucial point in any assessment of the biographical significance of the annotations found in many of the volumes. Indeed, we find that many of the fascicles in these volumes (excluding the Concert Arias volume) do have plate numbers, and they are the following (in the right-hand column is the year assigned to numbers on the fascicles by Otto Erich Deutsch in his *Musik Verlags Nummern*, 1961):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of publication (after O. E. Deutsch, <em>Musik Verlags Nummern</em> [Berlin, 1961])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Heft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Einstein is correct in claiming that plate numbers were added only in the reprints and if Deutsch is correct in his assignments of these numbers to these years, then all too obviously Mendelssohn could not have obtained these volumes earlier than the dates shown. Indeed it is at least as likely that he obtained them as a unit from the publisher sometime in the 1840's, allowing for the publication of fascicle 7 with the plate number 6707 in 1842. This removes any imagined possibility that this Mozart set could be connected with Mendelssohn's early and formative years, or that the fingerings in it might have represented his own early performance of Mozart piano sonatas and piano chamber music. If he obtained them in the 1840's, this would mesh with other evidence of Mendelssohn's receiving music from Breitkopf and Härtel at that time, including new works by younger composers (for example Chopin and Thalberg) and newly published works by Handel and Bach. Mendelssohn had been in close touch with the firm of Breitkopf for years, maintained cordial relations with them, and indeed was himself mainly published by them.

As for the pencilled markings in these volumes, while it now seems wholly unlikely that they could have been made before the 1840's, it does not follow inevitably that they are not autograph markings made by Mendelssohn himself in his last years. On the other hand, a comparison of some of the numerals and other markings with published samples of Mendelssohn's music handwriting in finished works leaves me as yet unconvinced that these markings are to be taken as his own. I prefer to leave the question open to further study by Mendelssohn specialists.

For purposes of clarification, however, it may be useful to close with a brief tabulation of the fascicles of the Oeuvres Complètes volumes preserved here which do contain hand-written performance markings.

**Heft I: VII Sonates pour le Pianoforte**

- **Sonata I (K. 330)**, pp. 2-14.
  - Page 3/4/5 (i.e., page 3, staff 4, measure 5) has pencil fingerings in right hand (hereafter "r.h.")
  - 5/2/1: pencil fingerings in r.h.
  - 6/1/7: pencil fingerings in r.h.

remaining sonatas of this Heft: no markings.

**Heft II: Douze Thèmes variés pour le Pianoforte: No markings.**

**Heft III: (VII Sonates pour le Pianoforte) (lacks title page)**

- **Sonata I (K. 309)**: No markings
- **Sonata II (K. 281)**: ""
- **Sonata III (K. 279)**
  - P. 24/1/1, r.h.: pencil fingerings
    - 24/3/3, l.h.: ""
    - 24/3/4, l.h.: ""
    - 25/3/1, r.h.: ""
    - 25/3/2, r.h.: ""
  - 26/2/3, r.h.: note changed from a" to f"

**Sonata IV (K. 280)**

- Allegro assai, first movement, pp. 32-34: has many fingerings throughout
- Adagio, second movement, pp. 34-36: has sparse fingerings, in second section only
- Presto, finale: no markings

**Sonatas V, VI, VII: no markings**

**Heft IV: VI Sonates... pour Pianoforte et Violon**

- **Sonata I (K. 376)**: first two movements, no markings

- **Pře: Finale, p. 9**
  - P. 9/1/6: "p" inserted in pencil
  - 9/2/2: tie inserted in pencil
  - 9/5/1: wrongly printed flat corrected in pencil; no further markings
Violin part: at top quarter note = "90" (metronome marking) frequent fingerings in part

**Sonata II** (K. 296)

*Piano*: First movement
- P. 14/5/4: misprint corrected
- 16/2/3: trill added

*Piano*: Second movement
- P. 19/4/4: "p" added in ink
- 23/3/1/8: "for" added (= forte)
- 23/3/4/7: adds "p"
- 23/4/8: adds "f"

Violin part: fingerings, dynamics and other annotations added in all movements

**Sonata III** (K. 377)

Piano part: additions only in Finale, adds dynamics at end of movement

Violin part: numerous fingerings, dynamics, etc.

**Sonata IV** (K. 378)

First movement, none

Second movement:
- P. 42/2/1: change of note in r.h.
- 42/4/5: change of note in l.h.
- 43/2/1: adds "p"

Violin part: has fingerings in pencil.

**Sonata V** (K. 379)

Piano part: none

Violin part: has fingerings and other markings

**Sonata VI** (K. 580)

Piano part: First movement:
- P. 63/3/5: adds "f"
- 63/5/1: adds natural sign to a
- 63/5/4: corrects d to e-flat (written "es")
- 64/1/3: adds "p"
- 64/4/3/4: adds "cres . . . for"

Second movement: adds some dynamics at end of movement

Finale: none

Violin part: has fingerings and other markings

**Heft V**: XXX Gesänge . . .

No markings.

**Heft VI**: 14 Differentes Pièces pour le Pianoforte

Fantasia in C Minor (K. 475): p. 7: natural added to high e

Sonata: none

Rondo I (F Major): none

Rondo II (D Major): many fingerings throughout

Rondo III (A Minor): none

Gigue (G Major): none

Adagio (B Minor): none

Marcia (C Major): none

Tema & Var. (A Major): fingerings throughout first three variations

Theme & Variations: on *Mio caro Adone*: none

Theme & Variations: none

Sonata (F Major): fingerings in first movement

Overture . . .: none

**Heft VII**: IV Sonates pour le Pianoforte à 4 mains

Sonata I, II, III, IV: none

**Heft VIII**: VI Pièces pour le Pianoforte à 2 et à 4 mains

First two pieces: none

Andante con Var. (4 hands): markings in first three variations

Sonata, C Major (4 hands): in 1st movement numerous markings in both hands; in second and third, in Primo only.

G Minor Fugue (4 hands): has some corrections in *Secondo*

No markings in remaining pieces in Heft.

**Heft IX**: 5 Sonates pour Violon et Pianoforte

Sonata I (K. 402): Allegro: some fingerings in *Pfte*

Sonata II (K. 526): none

Sonata III (K. 494): Some fingerings in 1st movement only

Sonata IV (K. 481) and V (K. 570): none

**Heft X**: IV Sonates . . . Pianoforte avec de Violon et Violoncelle 

[= Trios]

*Piano*: Trio I (K. 502): some dynamics in finale; nothing further

Trio II (K. 548): none

Trio III (K. 542): none

Trio IV (K. 564): none

Violin part to these four trios: has a few markings in each work

Vcl part to same four Trios: no markings whatever
RECENT ACQUISITIONS—MANUSCRIPTS

During the period from July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, the following manuscripts, representing comprehensive collections or integrated groups of papers, were added to the Library’s holdings:

BREWSTER, BENJAMIN HARRIS (1816-1888). A collection of the papers of Benjamin Harris Brewster of the Princeton Class of 1854, a large portion of which document his work as Attorney General of the United States, 1881-1885. Given in memory of Benjamin Harris Brewster III ‘21 by Mrs. Brewster.

BRINCKERHOFF, ABRAHAM JR. A collection of the business papers of Abraham Brinckerhoff, Jr., and his partner, James L. Brinckerhoff, merchants, of New York, 1811 to 1843. The gift of the Reverend Samuel R. Knight and Miss Elizabeth Knight.

STEVENS, ALDEN (1907-1971). The papers of Alden Stevens concerning the Association on American Indian Affairs. The gift of Mrs. Alden Stevens.

TATE, CAROLINE GORDON. A collection of the personal papers of Caroline Gordon Tate was acquired with the assistance of Mrs. Gerard B. Lambert.

The Library has received the following single manuscripts, or groups, which supplement existing, established collections:

ADLER, ELMER (1884-1962). Three autograph letters to Miss Katharine Pearce. The gift of Miss Pearce.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION. Additions to the Archives of the American Civil Liberties Union, for the year 1967. The gift of the American Civil Liberties Union.

BARNES, JAMES ‘91. Additions to his papers. The gift of Mrs. Barnes and Miss Emily W. Browne.

BATAK MANUSCRIPTS. Five Batak manuscripts, translated into Bahasa by a native of North Sumatra, and by his son from Bahasa into English. The gift of John F. Mason.


FITZGERALD, F. SCOTT '17. A letter to Thomas Boyd was the gift of Mrs. Gregory Mason. A letter to Chester B. Skilling, 7 April 1922, with a military pass signed for him by Fitzgerald was purchased on the Friends of the Library Fund.

FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC. Additions to the papers of the Fund for the Republic were given by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

HARD, WILLIAM (1878-1962). Additions to the papers of William Hard were made by his daughter, Mrs. Gerard K. Lake.

HARPER AND ROW, PUBLISHERS. Additional selected papers from the firm’s author files have been given by Harper and Row.

HORAE. A book of hours written in France during the XVth century has been added to the Library’s collection of Medieval and Renaissance manuscripts. The manuscript is on vellum, with twelve large and four small miniatures. The gift of Mrs. Charles Denby.

KROCK, ARTHUR '08. Additions to his papers. The gift of Arthur Krock.

LEE, IVY LEDBETTER '98. Additions to his papers. The gift of his son, Ivy Ledbetter Lee, Jr. '31.


MACHEN, ARTHUR (1863-1947). Photographs of houses in which Machen lived were purchased on the Robert K. Root Fund. A letter to Horace B. Liveright, 19 December 1922, was acquired on the Friends of the Library Fund.

MEDINA, HAROLD '09. Additions to his papers. The gift of the Honorable Harold Medina.

PARRISH COLLECTION. More than two hundred seventy manuscript items (mostly letters) were acquired for the Morris L. Par-
ROSSETTI, DANTE GABRIEL (1828-1882). A manuscript in Rossetti's hand, headed "Box No. 4," was the gift of Robert H. Taylor '30. A self-portrait was the gift of Lady Mander.


SOUTHERN, SAMUEL LEWIS (1787-1842). Four letters to J. D. Barnard, Levi Lincoln, Williams Ten Eyck and R. S. Coxe, 1827-1832, were purchased on the Friends of the Library Fund.

STEIN, AARON MARC '27. Additions to his papers. The gift of Aaron Marc Stein.

STEVENSON, ADLAI EWING '22. Additions to the papers of Adlai E. Stevenson were made by his son, Adlai E. Stevenson III, Cass Canfield, John Bartlow Martin and Harry S. May.


TARKINGTON, BOOTH '33. The addition of correspondence, manuscripts, photographs and materials relating to his papers was the gift of John T. Jameson, Jr. '30. Four letters to the Silbermans and the autograph manuscript of a speech, "Salutatory," given at the thirty-fifth reunion of the Class of 1893, were acquired on the Friends of the Library Fund.

THEATER. Manuscripts and letters of persons prominent in the American and English Theater—William Seymour, Mrs. E. L. Davenport, Fanny Davenport, Edwin Booth, Dion Bouicaut, Wilkie Collins, Augustin Daly, Henry Irving, Charles Reade, and Ellen Terry, among others—were included among additions to the Davenport-Seymour family collection in the Library's William Seymour Theatre Collection. The gift of Miss Anne Seymour.

ULLMAN, JAMES RAMSEY '29. Additions to his papers. The bequest of James Ramsey Ullman. A letter to Dr. Robert E. Kaufman was the gift of Dr. Kaufman.

VAN DYKE, HENRY (1852-1933). A letter to Samuel Semple '91, 28 December 1899, was the gift of Mrs. Sam M. Semple. A letter to Lane Taneyhill with a verse to be added to the song. "America," 26 March 1906, was the gift of Jean Cranston Taneyhill.

WHITE, JAMES AND MARY. Miniatures of Mr. and Mrs. James White were added to the James and Mary White Collection. The gift of Lady Berwick.

WILSON, WOODROW '79. Correspondence between Woodrow Wilson and his family with the artist Frederic Yates and his family, of Rydal, Westmorland, England, 1906-1929, was the gift of Miss Mary Yates. Two letters from Wilson to William Bayard Hale, 30 April and 6 June 1912, were the gift of Kenneth Rendell.

Other additions of manuscripts and related materials:

ALFONSO XIII, King of Spain (1886-1941). Letter to the President of Costa Rica, 3 June 1918, was acquired on the Friends of the Library Fund.


AZTEC. Two manuscript codices in the Nahuatl language have been acquired on the Friends of the Library Fund.


BRITISH STAMP ACT OF 1765. Two original stamps issued for use in America, bearing the serial numbers 169 and 307. Given in honor of the sixtieth reunion of the Class of 1912 by Arthur Cort Holden '12.


CROCKETT, SAMUEL RUTHERFORD (1860-1914). Four letters to Ashcroft Noble and Mr. Greig, 1891-1900. Purchased on the Friends of the Library Fund.


EINSTEIN, ALBERT (1879-1955). A letter to William M. Whitney, '12, written from Watch Hill, Rhode Island, 9 June 1934, was given by Mr. Whitney in honor of the sixtieth reunion of the Class of 1912.

GAMBLE, SIDNEY D. '12. Nine albums of photographs relating to his life in China; with two albums of pictures concerning his years at Princeton. The gift of Mrs. Gamble.

GARRETT, GEORGE '52. A letter to George Gillespie, Jr., 24 September 1971. The gift of George Gillespie, Jr. '52.

HALL, DOUGLAS KENT. On the Way to the Sky, the printers typescript, galley proofs and page proofs of the novel. The gift of the author.


KAHLER, HUGH MAGNIR '04. Selected correspondence and related papers. The gift of Mrs. Frank W. Hubby, 3rd.

KENNEDY, CHARLES WILLIAM '09. Three notebooks of Professor Kennedy’s lectures on the Victorian Age, and eighteen letters written to him by George Edward Woodberry. The gift of Mrs. Charles W. Kennedy.

LAWRENCE, DAVID HERBERT (1885-1930). Corrected page proof from Tortoises. The gift of Nathaniel Burt '36.

LESLIE, CHARLES ROBERT (1794-1859). Letter to Edwin Bullock, 18 October 1852, was purchased on the Friends of the Library Fund.

MCCLURE FAMILY. The diary of Malvina McClure, 1850-1860; correspondence and related papers of Grace L. J. McClure concerning the editing of the diary; and a journal of Mary McClure, 1855-1861. The gift of Professor E. D. H. Johnson.

MACKENZIE, SIR COMPTON. A letter to Miss H. C. Escreet, Christmas 1914, was given by Frederick L. Arnold. Four letters to Martin Secker were purchased on the Robert K. Root Fund.


NEW JERSEY DEEDS. Seven early deeds from the Princeton area were given by Mrs. Lewis H. Hitzroth. Five deeds were the gift of Robert S. Corbin.


PEREZ, ANTONIO (1539-1611). Norte de Principes. Two manuscripts written in Spanish during the XVIIth century. The gift of the late Albert J. Pareño '41.

PHLEGER, HERMAN. Material relating to the Bricker Amendment. The gift of Herman Phleger.

QUILLER-COUCH, SIR ARTHUR THOMAS (1869-1944). Two letters to Mrs. Coventry Patmore, 1912, were purchased on the Robert K. Root Fund. Seven letters were acquired on the Friends of the Library Fund.

ROOSEVELT, ELEANOR (1884-1962). A letter to John E. Weaver, 9 April 1948. The gift of Frederick L. Arnold.


UTAH. Manuscripts and photographs of territorial Utah were purchased on the Thornton Fund.


VREDENBURGH, PETER '92. Papers and photographs concerning his Princeton years and service in the United States Army in the Philippines. The gift of Miss Elizabeth Knight.


WHARTON, EDITH (1862-1937). Corrected typescripts and an autograph manuscript of her writings. The gift of William R. Tyler.

*The Library has also acquired single manuscripts and letters, or small groups of papers of the following:*


—ALEXANDER P. CLARK AND WANDA M. RANDALL

RECENT ACQUISITIONS—BOOKS

The following is a listing of significant additions to the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections between July 1, 1971 and June 30, 1972.

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND AMERICANA


EMERSON, RALPH WALDO. Eight first editions, each inscribed to Samuel G. Ward and one periodical appearance. Also two items connected with Emerson's brother, Charles, 1820-76. The gift of William Elfers '41.

GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS. Thirty-two books and pamphlets and twenty-four periodical articles by the former Princeton fellow. Also received were seven works by his wife, Helen Davenport Gibbons. The gift of Miss Mila Gibbons, Mrs. Alpheus T. Mason and Miss Hope Gibbons.

GAUSS, CHRISTIAN FREDERICK. *Through College on Nothing a Year. Literally Recorded from a Student's Story.* New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1915. The dedication copy inscribed by Gauss to
the dedicatee, George McFarlane Galt '90, with a letter of presentation tipped in. The gift of Matthew J. Brucoli.


RIBERO Y USTÁRIZ, MARIANO EDUARDO DE. Antigüedades Peruanas, por Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Juan Diego de Tschudi. Viena: Imprenta Imperial, 1851. James Bacon Ford Foundation Fund.


STEINBECK, JOHN. Twenty-nine first editions, twenty-six of which have been inscribed to Mr. Edwin Herzog. The gift of Edwin H. Herzog '21.

ULLMAN, JAMES RAMSEY. One hundred forty-six titles of the author’s copies of his own works. Several are foreign language translations or paperback editions. The bequest of the author, '29.

WHITMAN, WALT. Three books of extraordinary association interest: Leaves of Grass (Philadelphia: D. McKay, 1891-92) presented to William Sloane Kennedy, one of Whitman’s closest friends, by Horace Traubel, one of the poet’s literary executors. This copy is heavily annotated by Kennedy and contains several clippings and photographs. Also tipped in is a letter from W. H. Raymenton to Whitman, the poet’s reply, and Raymenton’s responding note. Complete Prose Works (Philadelphia: D. McKay, 1892) from the library of Thomas B. Harned, the author’s surviving literary executor, with Harned’s presentation to Miss Rene Stillman. Leaves of Grass (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1917) presented by the publisher to T. B. Harned with the note: “This book is issued for the purpose of driving the McKay (incomplete) Edition off the market. . . .” The gift of Mrs. James H. Beal.

CONTINENTAL BOOKS


GOGOL, NIKOLAI VASILEVICH. Pokhozdeniia Chichikova ili Mertvyia dushi; Poema. Moscow: 1842-46. From the estate of Frank W. Rounds, Jr.

LEVIS-MANO, GUY. Eleven books and two musical scores printed by him in Paris during the 1930's. The gift of Miss Mila Gibbons.

MANN, THOMAS. Twenty-two titles inscribed to the author's close friend, the late Erich Kahler. Several of the volumes bear heavy annotations by Kahler. Friends of the Library Fund.


PROBA. Centones . . . de vtriusque Testamenti Hystoriis ex Carminibus Virgili Aut Selecti. [Oppenheim: J. Koebel, 1514?]. The title page woodcut is a portrait of Proba Falconia. Rudolph N. Schullinger '17 Fund.

SPANISH LITERATURE AND HISTORY. Thirty-six works from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. Gift of the late Albert J. Parrefo '41, and purchase by the Friends of the Library Fund.


EARLY ENGLISH BOOKS


[LUCY FAMILY]. Seven funeral sermons bound in the following order: Wing titles H3741, C4501, P792, H869, S592 and D2463 and STC 25094. Robert K. Root Fund.


ENGLISH LITERATURE—EIGHTEENTH CENTURY


ENGLISH LITERATURE—NINETEENTH CENTURY


FLAXMAN, JOHN. Plates to illustrate works by Homer, Aeschylus and Hesiod. Four titles in all, two of which have engravings by William Blake. London: 1795-1817. Gift of Donald N. Wilber ’29.


[LAMB, CHARLES]. Prince Dorus; or, Flattery put out of Countenance. London: M. J. Goodwin, 1811. The nine plates, all hand-colored, have been variously attributed to Miss Flaxman, sister of the sculptor, and William Blake. This copy bears the bookplate of Jerome Kern. The gift of Mrs. Frank W. Hubby III.


PRIVATE PRESS BOOKS


SCIENCE


SINCLAIR HAMILTON '06 COLLECTION OF EARLY AMERICAN ILLUSTRATED BOOKS

One hundred thirty-five additions to the Collection. Among the eighteenth-century imprints are: The Holy Bible in Verse [by Benjamin Harris] ([Boston: J. Allen] 1717) from the collections of Elizabeth Ball and the late d'Alte Welch; Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners [by] John Bunyan (Boston: J. Allen for N. Boone, 1717) with a woodcut portrait of the author; The Pilgrim's Progress, by John Bunyan (Boston: G. Rogers and D. Fowle, for T. Fleet, J. Edwards and H. Foster, 1740) with several crude but spirited woodcuts; The Hermit of the Forest, by Richard Johnson (Philadelphia: B. Johnson, 1798) from the Welsh collection; A Bag of Nuts Ready Cracked (Worcester: I. Thomas, 1786), the Welch copy, which is one of two recorded; and The Remarkable History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, by Henry Fielding (Worcester: I. Thomas, 1799), edited from the first edition of six volumes to a mere 28p. A sampling of Mr. Hamilton's recent acquisitions of nineteenth-century books demonstrates the wide range of subjects represented in the Collection. A View of South-Carolina, by John Drayton (Charleston: W. P. Young, 1802) with folding plates and maps; A Memoir of Thomas Hamilitah Patoo (Andover, Mass.: American Tract Society [1825]) with cuts and a frontispiece portrait of the noble black; Corrected Proofs, by H. Hastings Weld (Boston: Russell, Shattuck & Co., 1836) has nothing to do with printing but does contain a title page vignette of a man correcting proofs in a form of type; Rural Residences, by Alexander Jackson Davis (New York: 1837) contains plans and color representations of four types of buildings with construction costs—a villa for $2,500, a rather elegant farmer's house for $1,500, a stone estate for $12,000 and a village church of stone for $9,000.; New York in Slices, by [George G. Foster] (New York: W. H. Graham, 1849) praises the convenience and low price of the omnibus among other

wonders in the City; The Night Side of New York, by Members of the New York Press (New York: J. C. Haney & Co., 1866) has an equal number of chapters on respectable social life and crime; An Account of Chang and Eng, the World Renowned Siamese Twins (New York: T. W. Strong, 1853) is illustrated with cuts of the connected pair killing a snake, shooting a wolf, marrying sisters and pitching hay; The Comical Medicine Man [by George G. Small] (New York: Collin & Small [1872]) is a spirited story of outdoor life opening with a Frank Beard illustration of that favorite outdoor friend, the Jersey mosquito; and That Convention; or, Five Days a Politician, by F. G. W[elch] et al. (New York and Chicago: F. G. Welch & Co., 1878) with numerous Beard cuts of political life in saloons and banquet halls. The gift of Sinclair Hamilton '06.

—ROBERT S. FRASER, Curator of Rare Books

MORRIS L. PARRISH COLLECTION OF VICTORIAN NOVELISTS

Through the generosity of Robert H. Taylor '30 and Mrs. Donald F. Hyde the Library was able to acquire for the Parrish Collection a number of items from the Charles Dickens collection assembled by the late Comte Alain de Suzannet. Foremost among them is a copy of Dickens' printed circular letter on "the wholesale piracy of British works" in the United States, 1, Devonshire Terrace, York Gate, Regent's Park, Seventh July, 1842, addressed in the author's hand to C. Cowden Clarke. Also of interest are a copy of Songs, Choruses, and Concerted Pieces, in The Operatic Burletta of The Village Coquettes ([London]: Bradbury and Evans, 1837), in which the names of the singers are written in the margin next to their songs; and the Cheap Edition of The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club (London: Chapman and Hall, 1847), in the eight monthly parts. The other items acquired from the Suzannet collection are the following translations: Die Pickwickier (Leipzig, 1837-38), five volumes in three; Oliver Twist (Brunswick, 1838-39), in German, three volumes in one; Barnaby Rudge (Leipzig, 1841), in German, eight volumes in two; La Pléiade (Paris, 1842), containing "Le Baron de Grogzwig" from Nicholas Nickleby; Les Chefs-d'Oeuvre de Ch. Dickens (Paris, 1847); Les Contes de Ch. Dickens (Paris, 1847-53), in three volumes; Vie et Aventures de Martin Chuzzlewit (Paris, 1858), in two volumes;
Aventures de Monsieur Pickwick (Paris, 1859), in two volumes; Le Neveu de ma Tante; Histoire Personelle de David Copperfield (Paris, 1859), in two volumes; Souvenirs de David Copperfield (Brussels [no date]); six volumes in two; Les Temps Difficiles (Paris [no date]); and Le Magasin d'Antiquités (Paris, 1865), two volumes in one. Three additional translations of Dickens were obtained from another source: Nicholas Nickleby’s Leifnad och Afventyr (Stockholm, 1842), in three volumes; De Firma Dombey en Zoon (The Hague, 1847-48), two volumes in one; and David Copperfield den Yngres (Stockholm [1852]), in three volumes.

The Library has long been interested in adding to the Collection translations, whether authorized or not, published during or shortly after the lifetime of the authors. Of the twenty-four other translations of various authors acquired during the year 1971-72 the following three are perhaps the most interesting: Charlotte Brontë, Jane Eyre, Mémoires d’une Gouvernante (Brussels, 1849), two volumes in one; Wilkie Collins, Armadale (Stockholm, 1865-66), one volume in two, a translation into Swedish which precedes the first English edition (1866); and Mrs. Trollope, Zedena, Gewoonen en Huiselijk Leven der Noord-Amerikanen (Haarlem, 1833), in two volumes. Other additions to the Collection include Mrs. Trollope, The Mother’s Manual (London, 1833), from the library of Princess Elizabeth, Landgravine of Hesse-Homburg, with an inscription in her hand stating that the book had been given to her by the authoress on July 24, 1833, bound in alligator; Anthony Trollope’s copy of Charles Lamb’s Poetical Works (London, 1836); and a copy of the revised edition of Bulwer-Lytton, King Arthur (Toronto, 1871), with a presentation inscription from Charles Reade to James Graham dated December 24, 1880.

—ALEXANDER D. WAINWRIGHT

ALBERT J. PARREÑO

Albert J. Parreño ’41, a member of the Council since 1960, died in Westerly, Rhode Island, on June 11, 1972. Earlier in the year Mr. Parreño had presented to the Library nineteen important books in the fields of Spanish and Portuguese history and literature, including Fernando de Rojas, Celestina (Venice, 1541) and two seventeenth-century manuscript copies of Antonio Perez, Norte de Principes.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The summary of financial transactions on the Operating Account for the year 1971-72:

**RECEIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance July 1, 1971</td>
<td>$5,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues for 1971-72</td>
<td>26,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle subscriptions and sales</td>
<td>3,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual dinner, May 5, 1972</td>
<td>2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Chronicle, Vol. XXXII, No. 3</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Chronicle, Vol. XXXIII, Nos. 1 and 2</td>
<td>4,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and printing</td>
<td>2,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership drive</td>
<td>2,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual dinner, May 5, 1972</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor’s salary</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Acquisitions Committee Fund</td>
<td>17,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,055</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash balance June 30, 1972

Contributions received from Friends during the year 1971-72 for current acquisitions totaled $32,512.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance July 1, 1971</td>
<td>$4,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,658</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$187</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance June 30, 1972</td>
<td>$4,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRIENDS OF THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The Friends of the Princeton University Library, founded in 1906, is an association of individuals interested in book collecting and the graphic arts and in increasing and making better known the resources of the Princeton University Library. It has secured gifts and bequests and has provided funds for the purchase of rare books, manuscripts, and other material which could not otherwise have been acquired by the Library.

Membership is open to those subscribing annually ten dollars or more. Students may join for three dollars and seventy-five cents. Checks payable to Princeton University Library should be addressed to the Treasurer.

Members receive The Princeton University Library Chronicle and occasional publications issued by the Friends, and are invited to participate in meetings and to attend special lectures and exhibitions.
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HAMILTON COTTIER
WILLIAM ELFEN
HENRY E. GREGORY
ARTHUR C. KELLEY
GUSTAVO D. MATOSO
CHARLES RYAN
REINHARD K. SCHAEFER
WILLIAM H. SCHRIEDE
FRANK E. TAYLOR

Executive and Finance Committee

ROBERT H. TAYLOR, Chairman

WILLIAM S. DIX
EARLE E. COLEMAN
SINEIHA LAMBERT
EDWARD NAUMBURG, Jr.
ALEXANDER D. WAIRWRIGHT

Chairmen of Other Committees

LIBRARY SERVICES: WILLIAM S. DIX
MEMBERSHIP: RICHARD M. HURER
PRINCETON ALUMNI: M. HALEY TAYLOR
PUBLICATIONS: GERALD EADES BENTLEY

Chairmen will welcome inquiries and suggestions.