Documentary Reproduction: Letterpress Publication--Why? What? How?

By CHARLES E. LEE*

South Carolina Archives Department

WHEN I was asked last spring to give this paper I was told that I was to take part in a panel on documentary reproduction and that my particular topic would be "Letterpress Publication—Why? What? How?" My thinking in the ensuing months has thus been concerned with all of these questions, rather than with the more restricted subject as printed in your program. Not unnaturally, when I came to put my thoughts on paper, I turned to my own State and Archives for examples. So I should like to add to this paper a subtitle: A Reevaluation From South Carolina.

As I approach my subject, I am reminded of a story they tell about the late Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, president of the Anti-Saloon League in the 1920's and a figure of note to those of us who became conscious of public affairs during that decade. On his way to a convention of the league, Bishop Cannon was accosted by a heckler picketing the entrance to the hall and protesting the meeting by his condition as well as his words. "I don't know who you are. Who in hell are you?" asked the drunk. "I don't know who you are either," the Bishop replied. "What part of hell do you come from?"

What documents you should publish and how you should publish them depends, I think, on what part of the archival hell you come from. Thus I feel that the program committee has erred in its scheduling of events today. This morning's session should follow rather than precede this afternoon's meeting, at which, it is to be hoped, the symposium on archival standards—six Dantes guided by our own special Vergil, Ernst Posner—will show us the way out of

* The author is Director of the South Carolina Archives Department. This paper was read before the Society of American Archivists on Oct. 8, 1964, at Austin, Tex., as part of a session on the selection of source documents for publication. Oliver W. Holmes, Executive Director, National Historical Publications Commission, was session chairman.

our respective infernos, if not into paradise at least into bearable purgatory.[1]

For I am sure that Dr. Posner in his pluralistic approach to the establishment of archival standards is providing us with the means of beginning to answer the burning problems that torment us —problems of documentary publication as well as those of a more central nature. *Why*, *what*, and *how* thus imply also *where* and *who*, and those of us with a "hall of records" approach will naturally require answers different from those with the approach of a State library or a historical society.

Two preliminary remarks are necessary—one short and one extended. The word "letterpress" means printed or nonphotographic reproduction. "Letterpress" here includes reproduction of printer's type on paper by offset lithography as well as by linotype, monotype, or plates. It does not include, however, facsimile reproduction of documents on paper by lithography, collotype, or other methods—special types of reproduction that are needed only to meet special problems on special occasions.

My second preliminary remark is that, despite the emphasis of the South Carolina Archives during the past 10 years, documentary reproduction is not, I strongly believe, the first responsibility of an archives, hall of records, State library, or other depository. What do you do if—as is still the case with an uncalculated number of South Carolina public records because of the disaster of a hundred years ago and the succeeding decades of neglect—many of your documents have lost all semblance of the order in which they were kept by their office of origin and exist only in lunatic and tattered disarray? I believe that your most pressing responsibility is to restore usability and rationality to your collections by repair, inventory, and arrangement, and then—as the National Archives has taught us to do—to publish not the records but the resulting preliminary inventories and guides, for the benefit of yourself and your staff in conducting further work as much as for use by the public whom you serve.

Willy nilly, at the same time of course you will be answering historical and genealogical research questions, unveiling historical markers, cutting the grass at historic sites, verifying the facts of Revolutionary and Confederate service for dowagers bent on inherited military distinction, providing politicians with apt his-

[1] At the afternoon session to which Mr. Lee refers a panel of experts discussed the "Standards for State Archival Agencies" set forth in Ernst Posner's *American State Archives* (Chicago, 1964).—ED.

torical examples, transporting abandoned records from county courthouses and State warehouses, and doing all the other things that your legal mandate or instinct for self-preservation demands.

Then and then only—after you have accomplished the subterranean labors that only your professional peers and scholarly colleagues will appreciate and have fulfilled the services that your various publics demand of you—are you justified in turning your attention to documentary publication.

I thus place documentary publication rather low on the list of archival priorities. I have, however, no intention of deprecating the decision of my predecessor, J. Harold Easterby, to emphasize publication of documents or of abandoning continued publication of the major series that he initiated. I hope you will pardon my going rather fully into the South Carolina experience in an attempt to define the place of documentary publication in the archival program.

The topography and climate of the particular half-acre of hell that Dr. Easterby inherited in 1948 almost necessitated the type of program he conceived. The staff of the South Carolina Archives along with its records was crammed into the bottom story of a shrine erected to the memory of the soldiers of World War I—the records largely stuffed into cardboard boxes stacked one on top the other, the staff working at tables and desks wherever space between the piles of boxes could be found. Under such conditions inventorying was impossible and, as Dr. Easterby further knew, even if inventorying had been possible, it would have been inadequate, for less than a third of the extant noncurrent records of the State—not simply of recent years but dating back to South Carolina's beginnings almost 300 years ago—had been turned over to the department. The land records—two separate series supposedly, but actually duplicates, which had originated in the State's dual capital cities of Charleston and Columbia—were in the possession of the secretary of state. Only a scattering of volumes had been transferred by the state treasurer. Just enough of the records of the colonial secretary of the province had strayed into the hands of the Archives to give the impression that the rest of his records were lost, although these had actually survived and were masquerading as estate papers in the office of the Charleston County judge of probate. Some early court records were with the Supreme Court in Columbia, but others, notably several hundred bundles of judgment rolls of the colonial Court of Common Pleas, moldered in the grave-like vaults of the Charleston County clerk of court. Two other court records, a journal of the Court of Common Pleas and a

journal of the Court of General Sessions, having been "captured" by courageous Yankee tourists in 1865, still languished as prisoners of war in Northern libraries. The journals of the South Carolina Vice-Admiralty Courts had been kidnapped or rescued, depending upon your point of view, by my friend A. K. Johnson from the U. S. Courthouse in Charleston and transported in part to the National Archives and in part to the Federal Records Center at East Point, Ga. Examples of records lost, stolen, strayed, or scattered could be multiplied.

Nevertheless, several important, reasonably complete, and recognizable series were already and had been for some time in the Archives: the early engrossed acts of the General Assembly; the journals of the Commons House of Assembly, the lower house of the provincial legislative body; the journals of the Upper House, not quite so clearly defined since they were intermixed with the journals of His Majesty's Council, composed of the same men (not always careful to distinguish which body they considered themselves to be at any one moment); the "audited accounts" (financial claims) of the American Revolution; and the "Indian Books"—an almost legendary series in which historians of the colonial period as late as Herbert L. Osgood refused to believe and which few, even recently, have examined with any care. Supplementing these archives of South Carolina were 36 volumes of transcripts of records in the British Public Record Office relating to South Carolina.

During his long tenure in office, Dr. Easterby's predecessor, A. S. Salley, had published documents from all these series in over 80 volumes, most of them small; but this earlier publication amounted to a spotty selection of records rather than a systematic presentation. Dr. Easterby boldly announced not the completion of these uncompleted series but the substitution of two completely redesigned series of "Colonial Records" and "State Records" of "uniform size," which would not only print the records heretofore unpublished but also reprint the documents inadequately published. All the record groups that I have just mentioned were to be published or republished. But that was not all. Three other series—"Bulletins and Studies," "Bibliographies," and "Readings in South Carolina History and Historical Outline Maps"—were also announced.

There is no reason to suppose that Harold Easterby—whose character combined modesty, sincerity, and industry in equally tremendous proportions—thought of this ambitious publication program as anything other than proper. Certainly he believed

initially that in time the Archives staff under his leadership could accomplish it.

Overambitious though it was, the publication program, as Dr. Posner says in his report, was justified by its results. I take it that Dr. Posner does not mean by this the results in published volumes of documentary material, which were certainly notable even though they fell short of Harold Easterby's goals. Dr. Easterby's vision of a South Carolina restored to "its rightful place in the history of the United States" by publication of its "remarkably full and rich collection" of public records appealed strongly both to his governing board, which was composed largely of professional historians, and to the two most influential political figures in the State government at the time—who, although political opponents, happened to be equally appreciative of South Carolina history. Dr. Easterby, somewhat to his own surprise I think, found himself given a $20,000 annual appropriation—enough to publish three or more major volumes a year—and permission to retain all funds resulting from booksales.

While the hoped-for goal was never reached, the handsome format and superb editing of the volumes, which began to make their annual appearance in 1951, brought national acclaim to the Archives and a responding resurgence of local pride. Pride in the publication program undoubtedly played its part in bringing funds for a Barrow laminator in 1952, a new statute more clearly defining the department's mandate and giving it its present name in 1954, acceptance of the project for publishing the papers of John C. Calhoun by the General Assembly in the same year, and appropriation for a specially designed Archives Building in 1958. These are the results that I think Dr. Posner had in mind in making his remark, rather than the 13 large volumes of documentary material published by Dr. Easterby during his 12-year tenure of office.

(I hope that my friends in the neighboring States of Georgia and North Carolina will not mind my believing that our success in getting our new building was not without its influence in stimulating in our sister States a healthy determination that anything South Carolina could do they could do better. I know that Dr. Easterby would rejoice in, rather than envy, the new buildings that Georgia and North Carolina will soon enjoy.)

Thus Harold Easterby, largely by means of his publication program, gave us that most valuable of archival possessions—*space;* and I wonder whether, if he had lived, he would not have basked in it and used it with joy as I have done and with similar decision: to

slow down on the publication program and to inventory while we may, realizing that "old Time is still a-Flying," that the records we have will never be any younger, that our holdings will rapidly become more voluminous, and that our wide-open spaces will quickly vanish.

Space, in the last 4 years, has enabled us to bring together under one roof, for the first time, virtually all of the "ancient archives of South Carolina"—meaning by that term the records dated earlier than 1900. Now that we have brought the records together, we find that the British during their 2-year occupation of Charleston carried off, and the Yankees during their 2-day destruction of Columbia burned, far less than we had previously believed. We have been able to reconstitute, for instance, the main trunk of the records of the Secretary of the Province and of the State—a series that started off simply as the "Records of the Secretary" and then became known as "Miscellaneous Records." This series, which is the parent series of all the administrative and probate records of both State and counties, now occupies two long rows of our first stack area. It extends without a break from 1671 to 1903, and the succeeding volumes are intact in the offices of the present secretary. Our twin but unidentical series of land grants and plats are now distinct from each other rather than intermingled, and we know how to use their appropriate indexes. During the past year and a half some 100,000 papers belonging to the Governors of the Reconstruction era have been isolated from the records of other departments in which they had been intermixed. Fifty-seven years of judgment rolls of the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, extending from 1703 through 1761, with 20 more years to come, have been taken from their bundles, unfolded, laminated, indexed, and filed flat.

Of more immediate purport in our decelerated publication program is our work with the legislative journals of the colonial period, the most clearly defined of all the series that Dr. Easterby undertook to publish. Harold Easterby began his publication of the new series of journals of the Commons House of Assembly with the year 1736 for two reasons: (1) that was the date reached by his predecessor in the rather eclectic series of journals published previously; and (2) no known gap in the journals appeared until the eve of the Revolution, whereas some gaps were known and others suspected in the period after that date. Ruth S. Green, the assistant editor of the Commons House series, and I, becoming uneasy in our lack of sureness in working with the Commons House, Upper

House, and Council journals, decided to make a step-by-step guide, for ourselves and potentially for others, through the best extant copies of the journals of successive sessions. Our resources were numerous and confusing: foul or rough manuscript journals; fair manuscript copies; transcripts of foul and fair journals whose originals are now lost; photostats of British Public Record Office copies; Library of Congress (W. S. Jenkins) microfilm; and Library of Congress (British Manuscripts Project) microfilm. When we were through, we found that in order to cover the known sessions of the three bodies we had to consult successively 29 distinct sources for the Upper House journals from 1721 to 1773; 47 different sources in succession to cover the Council journals from 1671 to 1775; and no less than 83 distinctly different records for the journals of the Commons House of Assembly. These summary guides to our legislative journals of the colonial period will soon be made available—at least in processed form. I believe that both Dr. Easterby and the scholars whom he pleased by his beautifully printed journals would approve our giving priority to publishing of this sort.

We shall resume as soon as possible, however, our letterpress publication of the legislative journals of South Carolina in the format and editorial style initiated by Dr. Easterby. Even before construction of the new building began to consume most of his energies, some publications he planned had begun to fall by the wayside. The new "Bulletins and Studies" series produced a Civil War chronology. "Basic Documents" resulted in annotated editions of four (but not all six) of the State's constitutions. "Illustrated Topics" covered only one topic—ante bellum transportation. "Historical Outline Maps" never got beyond the beginning stages of research. But despite all the burgeoning problems of building construction (which led, I feel sure, to his death, as similar problems led to Mary Bryan's death), the transcribing, printing, and indexing of the Commons House journals continued, not so swiftly as he had hoped but always moving steadily ahead. Amid the piled boxes of the South Carolina World War Memorial Building, documentary publication was the only possible archival activity; in his adoption of an ambitious publication program as means of escaping the archival cubbyhole in which he found himself, Dr. Easterby's instincts were sure. In his continued emphasis upon publication of the Commons House journals, as the old trap was escaped and other publishing efforts were discarded, his instincts were equally sure, I believe, and in an archival sense more firmly grounded.

Why, when all is said and done, does an archives exist? Almost, like Emerson's Beauty, an archives "is its own excuse for being," but not quite. An archives' excuse for being is the State, the Nation, the university or college, the business, the church, or other institution to which it belongs. The archivist, like the historian, believes that the human institution in its present existence has a dimension of meaning that extends backwards in time to its origins. When fully conscious of this time dimension, the institution is strong because it knows itself, its strength and weaknesses, its mode of being and action. "In South Carolina," Governor Glen complained in the 1730's, "they put everything in commission." And, in order to avoid precipitate action and to build unanimity of opinion, so do they still in South Carolina today. From beginning to end, however, the key to South Carolina government has been the jealousy with which the power of decision has been guarded by the lower house of its legislative assembly and the amazing detail with which it has dealt with the minutest affairs of its citizens all the way down to the local level.

Thus the central records of the South Carolina Archives, the ones which most clearly uncover the character of the government whose records they are, are the laws and legislative journals. South Carolina existed for its first 60 years without a printing press; for 30 of those years a £1,000 bounty offered for a printer who would come and print the laws went unclaimed. The very first broadside, published in 1731, concerned legislative action on the granting of land. The first substantial volume to be printed and published was a legislative code. The first series to be started was the series of session laws. Men so powerful would wish to make their decisions readily known so that they could be made effective. They might not be equally eager to let the record of their deliberations—the mode by which they reached decision—be disseminated. The legislative journals of South Carolina were kept only in manuscript until 1831; almost 80 years of them remain unpublished, except on microfilm, even today.

Because these journals—of the Commons House of Assembly and the House of Representatives, of the Upper House of Assembly and the Senate—provide the master keys for unlocking the remaining records in the South Carolina Archives, they are crucial for an understanding of the State and its government. The dignity of the State demands a suitably dignified publication of series of records so central. In a very real sense, I believe, the continued existence of the State government depends upon it.

But let me move away from the South Carolina example toward what I hope can be more general axioms. What documentary material you choose to publish (after you have accomplished the more pressing tasks we have talked about) depends upon who you are and the circumstances in which you find yourself.

Rule 1. I think that you should choose to publish that unpublished documentary record which is most central to an understanding of your own archives—that is, to the parent institution whose creature and servant you are. In some States this crucial record might be the executive papers of successive governors; for a university, the journal of its faculty council or board of trustees; for a business corporation, perhaps its annual financial statement. You make your most central record or series of records as usable as possible—which means that you publish it by letterpress if you can.

Rule 2. You do not publish primarily for the sake of the historian and still less for the sake of the genealogist and organization joiner. You will, of course, find yourself publishing guides, indexes, and documents that interest these three groups, but you are not to be confused by their demands or their praise, their complaints or their thanks, into thinking that you are doing this *for* them. You are doing it (a) because preservation of your archives and the interests of your parent institution necessitate it and (b) because you hope that you can seduce these customers into research more central to your purpose. For example, you might entice the talented historian from the neighboring university into your court records to see what kind of tavern bill an 18th-century rake would leave unpaid, in the hope that he will go on to write a four-volume institutional-developmental study of your State's court system.

Rule 3. This follows closely on the last: You do not publish simply because the record is interesting, curious, or fascinating. You discard the temptation to transcribe and publish the Governor and Council's 100-page investigation of the bogus slave revolt of 1749 and go back to your work of transcribing and publishing the rather dull procedural record of the Commons House. In more technical terms, in publishing records, as in evaluating them for possible destruction, you think first of their evidential value and only secondly of their informational value.

Rule 4. Nevertheless, you publish (at least by letterpress) only what you have a reasonable demand for. Somewhere around 500 copies is the smallest edition economically feasible, I believe. Even if you sell at a calculated loss, as I think you should, your per-unit

cost in editions of less than 500 will result either in a fantastic volume price or in an outrageous subsidy of the purchaser. There is an upper limit, too, in the size of your editions; but I shall discuss this under the *how's* of letterpress publishing.

Rule 5. You undertake to publish only so much as your resources permit you to publish. Obviously, unless you have money to pay the printer you won't engage his services. But are you equally sure you have adequate editorial workers, typists, proofreaders, and indexers on your staff? Will they have the time from other labors, will *you* have the time, to meet the printer's deadlines and publication dates?

Rule 6. Generally speaking, you will publish your own records rather than someone else's. I say "generally speaking," because upon occasion you will find that somebody else has a record that you are convinced ought to be yours. We intend to publish the texts of Commons House journals that we have lost but that the British Public Record Office has preserved, considering these copies tantamount to modern security copies although, of course, they were not made for this purpose. We have not asked the William L. Clements Library, however, nor shall we ask, to let us publish from their William Henry Lyttleton collection the pertinent Indian records that would undoubtedly have been copied into the last of our "Indian Books" had not Lyttleton carried them off with him in 1760, when he left South Carolina to become Governor of Jamaica. For us, Governor Lyttleton's papers, like those of all of South Carolina's colonial Governors, were never part of the South Carolina public records; they are Lyttleton papers, not South Carolina executive papers or records of South Carolina Indian affairs. We are glad that the Clements Library has them, and we realize that they were never destined for us. Their absence from our published records will tell more about the real character of South Carolina government in the 18th century than an artificial inclusion of them would.

Neither shall we join our sister State of North Carolina in a joint publication of the minutes of the board of the Lords Proprietors of Carolina. Strictly speaking, while these minutes are of extreme interest to the histories of both States, they are part of the archives of neither. Publication of them by both of us together, or either of us separately, would be continuation of a century-old effort which, I believe, is no longer in order. The many projects initiated at the beginning of the 19th century to transcribe in England and publish in America all the records relating to the original North American colonies were from the beginning of

ambiguous value. The story of South Carolina's activities in this area goes back to the 1830's: on the one hand, they led both to the formation of the South Carolina Historical Society in the 1850's and to the Public Record Commission, the ancestor of the South Carolina Archives, in the 1890's; on the other hand, the energies spent in gathering, transcribing, and publishing these British materials on the colonies might well have been spent in uncovering and preserving equally important—and, ironically enough, often identical—manuscript records on this side of the ocean. Certainly today, microfilm and the slow but sure publication of successive volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial* relieve us from further attempts at letterpress publication of British materials.

What I am saying, of course, is that the principle of provenance, rather than pertinence of subject matter, should govern archival publication of documentary materials as well as archival arrangement. And here I seem to run counter to the major documentary publication endeavors in progress in the United States today and to deny the validity of one in which the South Carolina Archives and I myself are deeply involved. I allude of course to the various "Papers of" projects, which the National Historical Publications Commission, first under Philip Hamer and then under Oliver Holmes, have fostered and sponsored. Neither Dr. Holmes nor Dr. Hamer nor my friend and colleague Ed Hemphill, editor of the Papers of John C. Calhoun, will be surprised to find me expressing not so much my doubts of the value as my perplexity at the sudden popularity of these documentary projects, particularly of the "great man" variety. Hoping to provoke rejoinder, I shall only remark that these great publication efforts, which bring together with much toil and tribulation a multitude of documents from an almost equal multitude of depositories, seem to result from a fundamental questioning of the ancient institutions that I and other conservatives like me are so eager to maintain. Almost it seems that we in the latter days of the 20th century, while we lose respect for our basic institutions, still cling desperately to our continuing reverence for the "fathers" who "founded" them. In our efforts to find our way into every possible moment of their conscious thoughts that can be revived, are we attempting to free ourselves from the crippling influence of national "father figures," or are we, by attempting to relive in their minds the early days of the Republic, seeking a resurgence of national patriotic faith? Of one thing I am sure: despite the proud involvement of the South Carolina Archives Department with publication of *The Papers of John C.*

Calhoun, these great projects, ranging far beyond the resources, documentary and monetary, of single archives are not, except for special circumstances like our own, archival responsibilities. For this reason I have supported the National Historical Publications Commission in its attempts to gain congressional support, and I rejoice in its success.

In talking about what you should publish, I have implied much about why you should publish—saying fundamentally that you should publish to strengthen your own archives and its parent institution. This does not say, however, why you have to publish by letterpress rather than microfilm, or for that matter why you publish at all. First of all, you will publish the central records and do it by letterpress because in that way you will get the most people, scholars and nonscholars, to use and study those records.

The professional historian and the graduate students working under him should not have to be told about the archival treasures that await their discovery; but they *do* have to be told. When I received the most recent list of research projects in progress in early American history from the Institute in Williamsburg, I was shocked to see how many scholars and their students had failed even to ask us about studies to which we could have contributed. Even more shocking is the scholar of reputation who breezes in for an afternoon to pick up a few apt quotations that will permit him to document a prejudice and to cite one of your manuscript groups in his footnotes. At the other extreme, less blameworthy but more naive, is the scholar who asks by mail that you do voluminous and minutely documented research for him. I am sure that many of you received along with me a few weeks ago a form letter, printed on the official letterhead of a college department of history, requesting any biographical details that might be uncovered on several hundred Confederate newspaper editors and reporters! Few and far between are the persons—and the knowledgeable genealogists outnumber the historians—who realize the nature of archival collections, have the skills to search them, and the energy to do so. Here we archivists ourselves must accept much of the blame; the graduate schools of history are, however, equally responsible.

The expense of research in distant cities deters many from using archives that could help them, and microfilm ought to be the answer. It *is* the answer in part, but that "most wonderfully useful and irritating invention," while it does much that print cannot do, does not answer the same purposes or meet with the same acceptance. The scanning of microfilm, even with the assistance of electric-

powered devices to relieve handcranking, remains slow and difficult; the use of microfilmed indexes to microfilmed documents, exasperating. Copies of all the known journals of the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly are easily available to scholars in one or more of three forms: in the Easterby-Green expertly indexed and edited new printed series; in the not so expertly indexed and edited old printed series; and on microfilm. Frequency of citation to them in published monographs is in the order listed. Until scholars are more accustomed to searching the manuscripts in archives and to using published microfilm, if you want to make sure that they pay attention to your most important documents, you will publish them by letterpress.

On the *how* of letterpress publication, I have a cautionary note and several bits of advice on editorial practice. The cautionary note is that even though you may publish documentary materials you are not primarily a publisher. Indeed, if you can find a bona fide publisher who will do your publishing for you in the format and editorial style that you want, you will be wise to pay him well for his services. He is equipped to deal with problems of warehousing, packing, shipping, invoicing, and bill collecting—you are not.

Also remember, when you come to set the size of your editions, that you are not a publisher. If you are convinced that your volume of documents has a potential sale of 2 or 3 thousand, by all means turn it over to a university press; if the sale may run to 5 thousand, call upon a commercial house. In all likelihood your sales will be somewhere between 500 and 1,500, and you will have to publish the work yourself. If you gain the library and scholarly distribution that the sale of all these copies represents, consider yourself lucky and your responsibilities met. Contemplate no reprints; don't think of manufacturing plates or storing type. When your printing is exhausted (more likely it won't be), turn your customers over to University Microfilms or a similar house specializing in Xeroxed editions. Apply your publishing energies and money to other documents.

In setting your format and editorial practice, remember that your basic reason for letterpress publication is to provide easy access to the information contained in the documents you have selected. Having puzzled out the words of the original manuscripts and realized that you cannot actually "reproduce" them (microfilm will come much nearer to doing this than your letterpress editions), you will use an "expanded" rather than literal mode of transcription, avoiding ampersands, thorns, and abbreviated words ending in

raised superior letters—all the paraphernalia of "Ye Olde Coffee Shoppe" sort of transcription. You will, of course, describe your method of transcription as clearly as possible in an introductory editorial note.

Dr. Easterby's standard of printing in a manner contemporaneous with the document is like putting the ostrich egg in the hen-house—as a master model to keep in view while depositing a more modest and more usable product in the nest. An 18th-century model for an 18th-century document might be followed for legibility of type and durability of paper, but who would wish the same volume to carry an 18th-century-style index? Similarly, instead of following the conventions of an earlier day by using title of book and title of chapter for your running heads, put them to work by making them carry useful information: the date of the document printed below, its writer, its recipient. If you must change footnotes to back notes printed in the last pages of the book, use your running heads to show what pages of text they illuminate.

In general, format should grow out of content. The volume designs itself if editor and designer both know their craft and can communicate to each other their respective languages. Book design is not imposed by a designer; still less is it successfully imitated from a successful model. P. J. Conkwright's design of *The Jefferson Papers* fits the Jefferson Papers. Willis Shell's design of the *Journals of the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly* suits them. These designs can be worn by similar series about as successfully as borrowed clothes can be worn.

The index to your volume of documents is, of course, your main reason for publication by letterpress—indeed, unless a competent index is included, I for one would prefer my documents published on microfilm. You will, therefore, make your index as good as you possibly can. Since one of the points of indexing is to save time, you will try to make it save rather than waste time. You will include "mentions" if they have any conceivable usefulness, exclude them if you can't imagine how they might be useful, and segregate them from more substantial references. You will break down entries into subentries, lest the researcher be dismayed at the number of pages he has to consult; my own patience wears thin after three unproductive references and is completely exhausted after five. You will be generous with *see also* references and sparing with *see* references. Not many indexes give the run-around of one in my family library, where "Hannah" invites you to see "Anna" and "Anna" tells you to see "Hannah"; but many an index

will show a "Steers. *See* Cattle" only to show, when you turn back, a brief "Cattle, 37." "Steers, 37" and "Cattle, 37" would save initial typesetting as well as future page-turning. A set of master index cards, listing your topical choices and your manner of presenting them, is essential if you are embarking on a series. It took me some time to realize that I was missing half of the "South Carolina" references in the *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial* because in some of those volumes the indexer had chosen to use "Carolina, South."

Mention of that great series, begun more than a hundred years ago by Noel Sainsbury, one of the greatest transcribers and publishers of documents, gives me as good a note to end on as any. Almost daily at the South Carolina Archives I use the early volumes of the *Calendar* in a way that Sainsbury could not have anticipated. Entering by volume index, I move to the abbreviated texts of the printed calendar and from there to the full texts on the appropriate microfilm of Colonial Office records furnished by the joint efforts of the British Public Record Office, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Library of Congress. Mixed modes of documentary publication—like this one (and the similar Carleton Papers) fortuitously arrived at—present, I believe, the most fruitful possibilities of future documentary publication.

The First Fountain Pen?

231. SCHWENTER, DANIEL. Deliciae Physico-Mathematicae. Oder Mathemat: und Philosophische Erquickstunden. Figures, diagrams, and music; 1 volvelle, another present in sheet form but not cut for use. 2 vols. in one, small 4to, old vellum with letters in ink. 2 leaves badly dust-soiled, some browning. (*N.Y. Times*) Nuremberg, 1651

A fascinating compilation of invention, theories, and mathematical problems. The making of a fountain pen from quills is described at pp. 519-20 of Vol. I, with a diagram (these are the soiled sheets, having been open for display for many years.) Some devices, such as the combination lock and its permutations, are reported from other sources; the work sometimes descends to common tricks and the solution of riddles. Smith, *Hist. of Mathematics* I, p. 420.

—PARKE-BERNET GALLERIES, INC., sale catalog, *The History of the Recorded Word in Manuscript & Print . . . Selections From The New York Times Museum of The Recorded Word . . . and From Other Sources*, p. 41 (New York, 1965).