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This talk was presented on May 22, 1983 at a dinner given by the Syracuse Friends of Chamber Music in celebration of Mr. Krasner’s eightieth birthday.

The events of Louis Krasner’s career are already history and have been recited many times in this community where he spent about thirty years, teaching, playing, and using his wisdom about music and the world of music to bring the level of concert life here to the high point we now enjoy. Perhaps you will forgive me if I don’t attempt to repeat all the details of Krasner’s legendary (and still ongoing) career, but talk about him in a way no one else could—that is, how, as a person fifteen years his junior, I have felt his orbit of influence intersect my own life.

I was first aware of Louis Krasner when his Columbia recording of the Berg concerto appeared on 78 rpm records around 1941. I was then twenty-three. I bought the records immediately and played them to extinction on the old, crank-type, parlor Victrola that we had in my home. It would be difficult to convey to you now how astonishing it was to hear such music and such playing. Having worked so hard myself to play an in-tune arpeggio in octaves, I was amazed that here was a man who could play one in major sevenths! The beauty of the final variations on Es ist genug was strange at that time, yet overwhelming in its effect. Although the musical idiom, known rightly or wrongly as “atonality”, had existed for twenty or thirty years by then, there had been no such major work for the violin at the time Krasner commissioned Berg to write his concerto. But Krasner, trained in the tradition of all the great violinists of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, had to enter a totally new world, both musically and violinistically. It took a remarkable combination of foresight and courage to do it. I think that there I have struck the key words which
Louis Krasner in Crouse College on his return to Syracuse University in October 1984 (Photo: Steve Sartori).
characterize everything Louis Krasner does, whether it concerns music or any of the many challenges one has to cope with in life.

Foresight of the kind possessed by Louis Krasner is one of those inexplicable gifts from God—like musical talent, unusual ability in mathematics, or the profound philosophical insights imparted to the biblical prophets. Courage is most often associated with the soldier or the athlete. But by no means do all conflicts occur on the battlefield or playing field. Only the naive are unaware that artistic life is itself a battleground and that the concert stage is as much a challenge to the performer as the playing field is to the athlete. Krasner has been a courageous soldier in the struggle for the acceptance of twentieth-century music. He has never lacked the courage to fight for the living composer, a fact that has made him dear to all the participants in that grand campaign. Among the many persons in this country who revered Krasner for his contributions are Gunther Schuller, Aaron Copland, Roger Sessions, Ernst Bacon, and Ernst Krenek.

Among thinking violinists in the world, Krasner has long held a special place. Not all fiddlers were like Ruggiero Ricci, who, upon being introduced to Louis after a concert in Buffalo, said: "Oh, you're the guy who played that goddamned concerto." I can bear witness to the deep respect of Yehudi Menuhin, who had a meeting with Louis on one of his visits to Syracuse to see the manuscript and discuss the Berg concerto, which he had just performed with Pierre Boulez; or the respect of Joseph Silverstein, who asked to consult Louis before he played the Schoenberg concerto with the Boston Symphony. In recognition of the courageous feats he performed on the concert stage, Krasner is held in high regard by many others among the world's best violinists, even though not all of them (but an increasing number every year) have dared to commit their careers to performances of the Berg or Schoenberg concertos. It has been only within the last ten or fifteen years that several recordings of the Berg have appeared and that this work (although not yet the Schoenberg) has become accepted not too unwillingly by planners of symphony programs. So it is only now, nearly fifty years later, that the violinist's world and the musical world in general are arriving at the same point that Krasner had arrived at when he was in his mid-thirties! In that respect he was a true pioneer. Whether it is staking out new land, new ideas,
or new art, such people have to have those two characteristics which Louis has in such strong measure, foresight and courage.

To return to my personal recollections, I first saw Louis Krasner and had a significant talk with him in 1944. I was teaching at the University of Texas in Austin when the Minneapolis Orchestra under Dimitri Mitropoulos gave a concert there. Krasner was the concertmaster. A friend of mine in the German department of the University had given me the score of a violin and piano sonata written in the twelve-tone technique by one of the good American students of Krenek, Russell Harris, then on the faculty at Hamline College in Minnesota. Thinking that Krasner might have known the composer or the piece and wanting to speak to the famous violinist whose playing I already knew so well, I approached him as he left the stage at the end of the concert. After I had described the piece—which he had not seen—he said something which surprised me. I had expected automatic interest from the proponent of Berg and Schoenberg because it was a twelve-tone work. But Krasner said: “It doesn’t matter whether it is twelve-tone or not; the point is whether or not it is a good piece.”

For me, this was an eye-opening remark. It showed me that the attitude of the Viennese School (at least, of Schoenberg and Berg) was not a faddish kind of modernism that placed all importance on its technical devices but one that stood first for basic musical values, for which their twelve-tone technique was only a new means of construction. I have seen this view confirmed many times since; but it was Louis who first gave me that insight, and at a time when he didn't know my name or that our paths would ever cross again.

The above incident reveals other notable traits of Louis: his interest in, his belief in, and his accessibility to young musicians. I have witnessed examples of these over and over again in his teaching at Syracuse University. In this segment of his professional life, he is as active as ever through his association with his alma mater, the New England Conservatory, and the Berkshire Music Center at Tanglewood. I have spoken of the regard in which Krasner is held by composers and violinists. I don’t dare try to count the numbers of the devoted students who have come under his influence or guess how many more there will be. The catholicity of Krasner's taste, as revealed in my earliest encounter with him, was one of the assets he brought to his musical directorship of the Syracuse Friends of Cham-
ber Music. Though he always insisted on quality, he by no means turned the organization into a special-plea platform for twelve-tone music, or any other kind. The result has been that the SFCM has given a hearing to many diverse trends in contemporary music and has provided a remarkable education to its members, as well as satisfied them with fine performances of traditional masterpieces.

The SFCM is only one of Louis Krasner's many legacies. As he reaches his eightieth year, he sets an example for all of us about how to live. With his gift of foresight, he has never lived only for the moment, but for the future as well, and with deep respect for that which has passed. Therefore, the importance of any one point in his life—an eightieth birthday, for example—means only as much as a sign passed on the highway indicating the distance to the next city. One sees it go by, but it is no stopping point. And so it is on this happy occasion: Louis sees it go by, but he is still on the move. All we need to say to him now is, "Glückliche Reise".
On October 28, 1984, Mr. Krasner came back to his old home, Syracuse University, in order to speak to the Library Associates at their annual meeting. After a warm introduction by Professor Frank Macomber of the Department of Fine Arts, Mr. Krasner gave his address on the subject of American composers whom he had known and worked with. The following is an abstract of his talk, in which particular emphasis has been given to Roger Sessions.

I have always been deeply interested in the affairs of the Syracuse University Library Associates and I feel honored by your invitation to speak at this luncheon. Only on an occasion such as this do I realize how long it has been and how very many are the years for which I have to account. I have reflected hard during recent days and I have attempted to bring some order to the thoughts that have accumulated during many decades and now crowd my mind. The passage of time seems only to add to the questions that possess us, or at least to change them as they stir the memory.

Do we truly get smart in later life? I am not sure. But whatever it is that matures our advanced years, I recognize that a thoughtful, deeper insight is not the usual characteristic of youth—which is an overloaded time when we must strive, when we must push, persevere, and hasten on towards the realization of our ambitions. Do we, as we grow older, become reflective, and a little more tolerant? Perhaps, but sometimes, also a little less tolerant. Not only do human values change—and always with increased acceleration—but, also our own individual outlooks undergo constant revision.

Rudolph Kolisch, the highly esteemed violinist and leader of the internationally known Kolisch Quartet of Vienna, which premiered the important new works of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern in the 1920s and 1930s, was teaching in Boston in his retirement when I
arrived there a few years ago. As old friends, we found much to talk about, and in our long discussions Kolisch boldly philosophized that he had arrived at the conclusion that the great music of the masters should not be performed at all, but should only be read and studied from the score. This, mind you, was Kolisch’s contention after a lifetime of highly successful concertizing in the United States and in Europe. It sounded like an outrageous idea. But it came from an authoritative musician who was already over eighty years old.

So, as I continue to work and fret with talented and accomplished student musicians, I arrive at a deeper understanding of Kolisch’s point of view. Let me explain. A great work of art, as, for example, a late Beethoven quartet adagio, is—in its vision, in its universality, in its
infinite measure of contemplation—so overwhelming and all-con-suming in its power that it appears impossible and beyond human ability to recreate and bring it to total and perfect realization, to achieve the oneness with it that existed in the mind of the creator at the moment of its inspired conception. Thus, it may be that, indeed, Kolisch’s view does merit serious consideration. To my stu-dents, however, I present Kolisch’s viewpoint in order to argue and perhaps even to support my conviction that struggle and striving are themselves actual, vital, and productive forces that are inherent in a true work of art. In interpretive performance also, the performer’s self-identification with the essence of the artwork, the striving, the persistent striving, and the total and complete dedication—these breathe life into the art experience and its uplifting sense of perfection. Émile Zola expressed it in words that are inspirational for the performer. “Art”, said Zola, “is a corner of the Universe, seen through a tem-perature.”

I have become an octogenarian—the word rings forbiddingly in my ear. But there are compensations too, for it is apparent that the status brings with it some distinction and, I hope as well, the privilege of indulging in reflection with one’s friends. And now, I shall turn to the subject of my many decades as an American musician.

I have a hazy memory of longing folk-songs that my mother sang beautifully in my infancy. But my first discovery of outside music occurred when, at the age of four, I heard the awesome ceremonial chants of orthodox Russian priests during a funeral procession on a dusty country road in a tiny village of the Ukraine. Then came my family’s emigration to the United States. About two or three years later, I began to spend hours lingering outside glass store fronts on the side-walks of Providence, Rhode Island, listening to the latest sentimental ballads and ragtime music that was played, sung, and sold by talented and very persuasive singers and pianists.

I remember at about that time being entranced as I stood by a small group of instrumentalists and singers at a lively, folksy Jewish wedding in a neighbor’s apartment. Soon, and despite a very scratchy voice, I coaxed my way to membership in a small synagogue choir. It was when I heard (and I can still relive the moment) the heart-rending, expressive beauty of a Psalm sung by my elder, twelve-year-old brother Jacob at the High Holiday services in a synagogue that I
Louis Krasner in his master class at Crouse College, Syracuse University, in October 1984 (Photos: Steve Sartori).
recognized the necessity of music for my life. My violin study began at this time, relatively late, at the age of nine. Four or five years later, by a stroke of good fortune and the generous, long-lasting sponsorship of a wonderful lady, I was taken to Boston to study at the New England Conservatory of Music.

In due course, I discovered the music of Charles Ives, Leo Ornstein, and George Antheil, who was then known as the “bad boy of music”. When I met Roy Harris, Henry Cowell, Walter Piston, and others, I never failed to urge each of them to write music for the violin. Roy Harris obliged me with a piece called Prelude, which was impassioned, impulsive, and characteristically expansive. Harris enjoyed considerable attention and prominence for a time as the typically American composer, whose music depicted our great, western-frontier landscape. Henry Cowell’s response to my urgings was the Suite for Violin and Piano, which, despite his close friendship with Charles Ives, was more suggestive of Far Eastern thought. Cowell’s music is contemplative, colorful, somewhat repetitious, and even introspectively shy.

My closer association with two of America’s most significant composers, Roger Sessions and Aaron Copland, came later. The music of each master is as unlike the other’s as could be expected from two so dissimilar natures and personalities. Nevertheless, they always enjoyed a warm, affectionate admiration for each other, and in the 1930s they organized jointly a Society for the Promotion of American Music. Copland’s music is loved for its open harmonies and jazzy American rhythms. Sessions’ expressivity is heavier, laden with darker harmonies and complex rhythms. And, it is not readily accessible. Copland’s music is closer to France than to Sessions, while Sessions relates to Central European influence more than to Copland or other Americans. You may be interested to know that Roger Sessions had ties to Syracuse through his sister Hannah, who was the wife of Paul Shipman Andrews, former dean of the Syracuse University College of Law.

Roger Sessions’ Violin Concerto is one of the most important concertos of our time. When I played it in 1947 with Dimitri Mitropoulos and the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, the composer wrote out extensive notes, which, I think, shed light on the mood of the times and lend insight also into the work process of a composer and the creative energies that propel his being. Sessions wrote:
My Violin Concerto was begun in Rome in 1931 and finished in San Francisco in 1935. I did not work on it continuously between these dates. At that time I was composing little, allowing my conceptions to take place slowly, and reflecting, and observing much; besides that, I was making and undergoing great changes, in a purely external sense. About the time the Concerto was begun, I left Italy, where I had lived for six years, and went to live in Germany for two years. The first movement was composed in the summer of 1931 in Eastern Holstein, on the shores of the Baltic Sea; the second was completed, and the third, in essentials, and the fourth were sketched, in Berlin, in the following months. I did not, however, bring it to completion till the summer of 1935, when, after having witnessed the Hitler revolution and having shortly thereafter returned to the United States, I visited California for the first time as a guest teacher at the University in Berkeley. The Concerto is associated in my mind with all of these events and with others of a more personal nature; but I have no reason to consider the music as connected with them in any more direct sense than that of having been composed with great intensity in a period of intense living and rapid change, both inward and outward. But for me the work is a very important one; not only do I feel that I have put a very large part of myself into it, but I still feel that it is the first of my works in which is clearly embodied what has come to be most characteristic of all my later music.

An internationally known violinist had asked me for the score even before its completion; he later announced his intention of performing it. The date was set for early December 1936, with one of the major Eastern orchestras, and had been extensively publicized both by the violinist and otherwise. Three weeks before the performance, however, the violinist asked for a postponement and requested me to change the work in certain respects—in particular, he asked me to compose a new Finale. Since I had written the Concerto as I wished it, and since I had also been in constant consultation with a first-class violinist during the composition of the violin part, this was clearly out of the question. I finally, however, felt obliged to release the violinist from his agreement.
to play the work, and did so on my own initiative. No doubt, it was this episode which has led to rumors that the violin part is "unplayable"; but it should be made clear that it was on my initiative, and not that of the violinist in question, that he was released from what he considered an obligation, and that I have no reason to believe that he is responsible for any rumors regarding the 'unplayability' of the work. The episode was, in my opinion, unavoidable, though there is no doubt that it constituted a serious setback—even though a temporary one—for the work itself. This is by no means the first time, moreover, that a new work has been declared unplayable, especially in the case of stringed instruments with their highly specialized technique.

I might tell you here of my own meeting with Mr. Sessions at the time the Concerto's performance was suddenly cancelled. I had travelled from New York City to Boston to hear the work. It was soon after the successful launching of the Alban Berg concerto and I was eager to hear and possibly add another new concerto to my repertoire. My disappointment was therefore keen when, upon arrival at Symphony Hall, I read the "cancelled" strip which had been pasted over the large display poster outside the hall. I took the next train back to New York City and, to my great delight, I met Roger Sessions on the train. He recounted the entire sad story of the Concerto and its unhappy cancellation. He then asked me whether, in view of my having had some performing experience with so-called problematic, 'unplayable' violin music, I would take time to examine his work and report to him as to the validity of the criticisms that had caused cancellation of this, for him, very important performance.

I received Sessions' manuscript shortly afterward and, following some study, I determined that there were indeed a few passages which I wished to recommend for change. However, before submitting my findings to the composer, I grew a little hesitant and turned to my friend Richard Burgin, the deeply admired concertmaster of the Boston Symphony Orchestra at that time, with the request that he also examine the score and let me have his judgment. After some time, Richard Burgin informed me that he, too, had found various passages which did not seem suitable to him and which he recommended should be altered. It then developed in our further discussions that the pas-
sages objected to by the original performer were different ones from those I had marked for elimination. Furthermore, the places that Mr. Burgin designated for change were different still from the parts that both the original soloist and I had criticized and wished altered or rewritten.

When I explained these discrepant findings to Roger Sessions, he was, of course, amused and we all agreed enthusiastically that the Concerto should certainly stand exactly as it was originally written. It has since been played by several artists and I do not think that I could now even locate the various, so-called 'unplayable' sections of the piece.

It is a matter of record that both the Brahms and Tchaikowsky violin concertos were, at first, rejected as unviolinistic. The concerto of Alban Berg, although warmly received by the general public in all its early performances, was often described by critics and musicians as cacophonous and written against the violin. The Berg is now admired everywhere, as one of the standard-repertoire violin concertos. The Arnold Schoenberg violin concerto is in my judgment a truly great and monumental work, which makes utmost demands on performer and listener alike. As yet, only a small number of violinists play it and its acceptance by the public has been slow and labored. Schoenberg always said: "I can wait."

The innovative new music of the 1930s and 1940s frequently excited audiences to much furor, opposition, demonstration, and rancor; whereas the contemporary music of more recent years is, I think, somewhat milder and more audience-conscious. Nevertheless, it should be noted that public acceptance has, in general, not been heightened measurably by this fact.

Now, I shall return very briefly to my earlier American years.

The violin concerto by the high-ranking Italian composer, Alfredo Casella, had its first performance in 1929 in Boston when I played it from manuscript under the baton of the composer.

During that period I played and also recorded for Columbia Records a new Sonata for Violin and Piano by the American composer Walter Piston, who was at the piano for the performance and recording. By the way, Walter Piston was also the pianist when, as students, we played together in a trio which provided background music in a Boston downtown hotel lobby. Piston was of Italian parentage and his music bears some similarity in attitude to that of Casella.
Nevertheless, nothing in either composer's work can be identified as Italian or American, although both correspond in flow and style.

The Sonata for Violin and Piano by the gifted composer and pianist Easley Blackwood is an individualistic and effective work of considerable momentum. We played it at the University of Chicago, where the composer is based, and later in Syracuse, which has faithfully supported many first performances.

I must, at this point, take a moment to express my appreciation and gratitude to Syracuse University and the Syracuse community for the encouragement both have always given all local music organizations in their efforts to bring famous and also lesser-known composers to this area. This city and University may well be proud of the distinguished composers that have lived and taught here. Those that I have known and performed—Joseph McGrath, Ernst Bacon, Howard Boatwright, Earl George, and Franklin Morris—have always been of inspirational help to me, as well as stimulating for all artistic activity.

Syracuse has in its interest and support kept abreast very honorably with contemporary music. Not only the Syracuse Symphony, sustained in its infancy by the efforts of Chancellor William P. Tolley, but also the University Orchestra concerts, and the Art Festival events, together with the outstanding concerts sponsored by the Syracuse Friends of Chamber Music—these have all helped to bring Syracuse much national recognition as one of our country's respected cultural centers. The long list of composers who visited, played, lectured, and conducted at Crouse College reflects nobly on the Syracuse public. I am proud that Dimitri Mitropoulos and Aaron Copland have been recipients of honorary degrees from Syracuse University.

There is little time left for me on this occasion to talk at any length about my important years in Europe. I lived in Paris during the now famous 1920s and made my debut in Vienna in 1929. During the years that followed I lived and studied in Berlin in the pre-pogrom period and later in Vienna. That increasingly turbulent period was of enormous significance for me. My colleagues and friends were often deeply involved intellectually and emotionally in the political and social upheavals, and I myself witnessed strife and actual military battles fought between the Social-Democratic regime of Vienna and the Federal Fascist government of Austria. My concertizing in Europe continued, as did also the frenzied enterprise of the creative artists
and their loyal followers and supporters in Central Europe. Arnold Schoenberg, Alban Berg, and Anton Webern were the music heroes. My good fortune in having had the opportunity to live and function during those years in Vienna—"the proving ground for World destruction" in the words of Karl Kraus—was great beyond calculation. The arrival of Hitler in Vienna, of course, hastened my return to the United States.

Overall, I feel that my early American training, institutional and other, and the sense of courage and venture which it imbued in me, served me to great advantage as a young man associating with and finding acceptance among well-established, mature musicians, artists, and successful performers in Europe. Reviewing the advantages and the continued opportunities opened to me by the patronage of my generous private benefactor in the days before government and foundation grants, a friend dubbed me "one of the last examples of a kind of period piece of early Americana". It is interesting, perhaps even elucidating, to think of myself in terms of a Benjamin Franklin stove or a Duncan Phyfe chair.

I will leave you now. Thank you for your attention—and much more.
In 1982 Professor Emeritus Louis Krasner presented a large gift of musical scores to the Syracuse University Libraries from his personal collection. Among the early and rare editions from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries are a significant number of Beethoven items, including four valuable first editions. In this category the score of the Missa Solemnis is of special interest. On the title page is written the name Anton Schindler. Schindler was Beethoven's biographer as well as, to quote The New Grove Dictionary, his "secretary, errand boy and factotum". On the caption of the Benedictus (page 213), in what appears to be the same hand, is written the tempo indication Andante con moto, with the con moto crossed out and the Andante modified to molto cantabile e non troppo mosso, in which form it appears in subsequent editions of the work. This emendation may prove to be important, possibly reflecting a change of mind on the part of the composer. Schindler's signature will have to be verified and other research undertaken before its significance can be fully established.

Also included are first editions in score format of the Pastoral Symphony, five of the String Quartets of Op. 18, and the Triple Concerto. The instrumental layout of the Triple Concerto is unusual when compared to the standardized modern sequence. In the first edition the timpani are at the top, followed by brass, woodwinds, and strings, with the soloists at the bottom. In modern editions the order is: woodwinds, brass, timpani, soloists, and strings.

Professor Krasner has long been an ardent advocate and practitioner of the performance of chamber music, so it is not surprising to find many chamber works represented among his Beethoven holdings. What is surprising and of particular interest is the substantial number of contemporary arrangements.

During the Viennese classical period, the time of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert, there was a great vogue for the home per-
formance of works for small ensembles by dedicated and often quite skilled amateurs. String quartets and quintets seem to have been especially popular. Though original works for four or five stringed instruments were plentiful, nevertheless, piano sonatas, piano trios, and other works with piano were often arranged for strings.
Beethoven himself, opposed in general to this practice, declared in a letter of 13 July 1802 to the publishers Breitkopf and Härtel:

The unnatural rage now prevalent to transplant even pianoforte pieces to stringed instruments, instruments so utterly opposite to each other in all respects, ought to come to an end. I insist stoutly that only Mozart could arrange his pianoforte pieces for other instruments, and also Haydn—and, without wishing to put myself in the class of these great men, I assert the same touching my pianoforte sonatas also, since not only would whole passages have to be omitted and changed, but also—things would have to be added, and here lies the obstacle, to overcome which one must either be the master himself or at least have the same skill and inventive power.—I have transcribed only one of my sonatas for string quartet, yielding to great persuasion, and I certainly know that it would not be an easy matter for another to do as well.¹

The sonata to which he refers is Op. 14, no. 1, in E major, which he transcribed for string quartet in F, a half-tone higher.

Not much attention was paid to Beethoven's wishes by the printing trade, at least where money was to be made. A certain Austrian music publisher named Joseph Czerny (no relation to Beethoven's famous pupil Karl) even ventured to arrange the other sonata from Op. 14, the one in G major, for string quartet. This version, which was published in parts around 1815 (well within Beethoven's lifetime), is included in the Krasner collection, which also contains quartet arrangements of the Sonatas Op. 2, 22, 26, and 28, and a string quintet version of the Sonata Pathétique. The transcriber of the Sonata, Op. 2, no. 1, even went so far as to substitute a different slow movement, picking the Andante più tosto Allegretto from the Violin Sonata, Op. 12, no. 2, as being musically more appropriate or perhaps better suited to a string ensemble than the original.

On 20 October 1802 (the same year as the letter quoted above), Beethoven published a protest in the Wiener Zeitung relating to two string quintets which had recently appeared in print:

I believe that I owe it to the public and to myself to announce publicly that the two Quintets in C major and E-flat major, of which the first (taken from a symphony of mine [the First]) has been published by Mr. Mollo in Vienna, and the second (taken from my familiar Septet, op. 20), by Mr. Hoffmeister in Leipzig, are not original quintets but transcriptions prepared by the publishers. The making of transcription at the best is a matter against which (in this prolific day of such things) an author must protest in vain; but it is possible at least to demand of the publishers that they indicate the fact on the title page, so that the honor of the author may not be lessened and the public be not deceived. This much to hinder such things in the future. . . .

The First Symphony and the Septet had been extremely well received by the German public, with the Septet remaining by far Beethoven's most popular instrumental work during his lifetime, a fact which eventually became a source of annoyance to the composer. Of course, the temptation to issue lucrative transcriptions was more than the publishing trade could resist, and the Septet in particular appeared in many arrangements. The very string quintet version against which Beethoven protested is included in Krasner's gift, although in a later issue with the same plate number by C. F. Peters, Hoffmeister's successor. It is worth noting that Beethoven himself subsequently arranged this septet for piano, clarinet or violin, and cello, as his Op. 38, and suggested to Hoffmeister at one time the possibility of issuing the work in an arrangement for seven strings, and, at another, as a quintet for flute and strings. Regarding the flute quintet the composer wrote: "This would help the amateur flautists, who have already approached me on the subject, and they would swarm around and feed on it like hungry insects." 

The Krasner Collection also includes a string quintet arrangement of the First Symphony, although this seems to be a different version from the one which drew Beethoven's ire. Krasner's was published in a large collection of Beethoven chamber music for strings by Pacini

3. Ibid., 260.
4. Ibid., 273.

The gift comprises two other symphony arrangements: a string quintet version of the Fourth and a piano-trio version of the Seventh. It is interesting to learn that Beethoven himself once made a piano-trio transcription of his Second Symphony.

Professor Krasner has also given to Syracuse University four other arrangements for string quintet. There is the Piano Trio, Op. 1, no. 3, in C minor, arranged by Beethoven himself and issued as his Op. 104. And there are transcriptions by Charles Khym of Op. 1, no. 1, as well as Op. 11 and Op. 16.

Considerable curiosity and interest attach to these various arrangements for the Haus-Musik trade, made mostly during Beethoven's lifetime. It seems likely that none of them has been played since the early nineteenth century. Home music-making has largely vanished, having been replaced by the ubiquitous phonograph and radio. Nevertheless, it seems quite likely that these transcriptions are enjoyable to perform and pleasing to listen to. It would be wonderful to think of ensembles, whether professional or merely enthusiastic, seeking to play them again.

In the list below, an effort has been made to provide a fairly accurate “mirror” of the title pages in Krasner's Beethoven gift. Capitalization and punctuation follow those in the scores, and line endings are indicated with slashes. Data appearing out of sequence in the lower corners of title pages are preceded in the list by [l.:] for left or [r.:] for right. However, it has not been deemed necessary to reproduce such typographic niceties as italics and superscript letters.

Most of the supplied dates are from Georg Kinsky, Das Werk Beethovens: thematisch-bibliographisches Verzeichnis (Munich, 1955). Also used as dating tools were Otto Erich Deutsch, Musikverlags Nummern (Berlin, 1961); Cecil Hopkinson, A Dictionary of Parisian Music Publishers 1700-1950 (London, 1954); and three studies by Alexander

Opus 1
early edition

3 parts (51, 21, 17p.) 25x34cm.
1797

Opus 1,
No. 1
arr. string quintet

5 parts (9, 7, 4, 5, 5p.) 33cm.
1815 (Weinmann 1)

Opus 4
arr. piano trio

GRANDE SONATE / pour le Forte-Piano / avec Violon et Basse obligé / tirée [sic] du grand Quintetto op. 4. / composée / par / LOUIS van BEETHOVEN / à Vienna / chez Artaria et Comp. / [l.]: 1818.
3 parts (22, 8, 7p.) 26x34cm.
1806 (Weinmann 2)

Opus 11
arr. string quintet

QUINTETTO / pour / 2 Violons, 2 Altos et Violoncello / arrangé d'après un Trio / de / Louis van Beethoven / par / CHARLES KHYM. / À VIENNE et PEST / au Bureau d'Industrie. / [l.]: 672.
5 parts (8, [6], 5, 4, 5p.) 33cm.
1810 or 1811

Opus 13
early edition

Grande Sonate / PATHÉTIQUE / pour le / Clavecin ou Pianoforte / composée et dediée / À SON AL-
TESSE MONSr LE PRINCE / CHARLES DE LICH-
13. / Vienne / Au Magasin de l’imprimerie chimique
I. R. priv. sur le Graben. / No. 953. . .
15p. 26x36cm.
ca. 1810 (Deutsch)

Opus 13
arr. string quintet
QUINTETTO / pour / 2 Violons, 2 Altos, / et Vio-
loncelle / composé / par / LOUIS VAN BEE-
THOVEN / arrangé d’après [sic] la Sonate path: /
Oeuvre XIII. / à Vienne chez Hoffmeister. / [l.:] 340
5 parts (7, 4, 4, 4, 4p.) 33cm.
1805

Opus 14,
No. 2
arr. string quartet
QUATOUR / pour / Deux Violons, Alto & Violon-
celle / arrangé / d’après une SONATE de l’Oeuvre 14
/ de L. v. BEETHOVEN / et dédié / à Monsieur
Théodore Müller / par / Joseph Czerny / Vienne,
chez Jean Traeg. / [l.:] 574.
4 parts (5, 4, 4, 4p.) 34cm.
1813 (Weinmann 3)

Opus 16
arr. string quintet
Quintour / pour / 2. Violons 2. Altos & Violoncelle
/ arrangé d’après [sic] le Grande Quintour / pour le
Clavecin / & / quatre Instruments à Vent / de / Louis
van Beethoven / par / Charles Khym / à Vienne chez
Louis Maisch / [l.:] No. 416.
5 parts (7, 5, 5, 4, 5p.) 33cm.
1813

Opus 18
first edition in score format
PARTITIONS / des / 6 premiers Quatours / (Oeuvre
18.) / pour / deux Violons, / Alto et Violoncelle, /
composés par / L. VAN BEETHOVEN. / No 2.
[-No 6.] / [thematic incipit] / [l.:] No 5263. [-5267.]
[r.:] Prix f.1. / A Offenbach s/m, chez Jean André.
5 scores (26, 28, 27, 27, 27p.) 25cm.
1829
No. 1 is lacking.
Opus 20
arr. string quintet
2 sets of 5 parts (No. 1: 7, 4, 4, 4, 3p.; No. 2: 7, 4, 4, 3, 3p.) 34cm.
Pl. no. 110, 111. First issued in 1802 by Hoffmeister; this is a reissue by Hoffmeister's successor, dating from after 1814, with only the title page changed.

Opus 56
first edition in score format
Grand / Concerto / CONCERTANT / pour / Piano Violon et Violoncelle / avec accompagnement d'Orchestre / composé et dédié / A Son Altesse Sérénissime / le Prince de Lobkowitz / PAR / L. VAN BEETHOVEN / Oeuvre 56 / PARTITION / (ou Pianoforte Seul.) / [l.:] No 383 [r.:] Priz de Suscription fl: 3. / [r.:] ou 1 Th: 16ggr. / Francfort s/M / chez Fr: Ph: Dunst.
Score (123p.) 34cm.
Pl. no. 413. 1836
Cover title: Collection Complète / des / CONCERTES / L. v. Beethoven / Partitions / No 4. / Francfort s/m chez Fr: Ph: Dunst.

Opus 60
arr. string quintet
5 parts (12, 11, 11, 11, 11p.) 34 cm.
First issued in 1809 by Kunst- und Industriekontor (Kinsky); this is a reissue by Riedl, who continued the firm's publishing activities between 1814 and 1819. Most likely, only the title page is changed.

Opus 68
first edition in score format
Sixième / SINFONIE / PASTORALE / in fa majeur: / F DUR / de / Louis van Beethoven. / Oeuvre 68. / Partition. / Propriété des Editeurs / Prix 3 Thlr. / à _
Opus 92

arr.
piano trio

Opus 104

early issue from first edition plates

Opus 123

first edition

Leipsic, / Chez Breitkopf & Härtel.

score (188p.) 26cm.

Pl. no. 4311. 1826

Opus 92

Siebente / GROSSE SINFONIE / in A dur / von /
Ludwig van Beethoven / 92tes Werk. / Für das
Piano-Forte, Violine und Violonzello eingerichtet. / 
Eigenthum des Verlegers. / WIEN / im Verlag bei 
Tobias Haslunger. / so wie auch zu haben: / in Leipzig 
bei Breitkopf und Härtel___C. F. Peters___Fr. Hoff- 
meister, / . . . / [I.:] No 2565.

3 parts (piano: 36p. 25x34cm.; violin and cello: 
each 13p. 33cm.)

1817 (Deutsch)

Opus 104

QUINTET / für / 2 Violinen, 2 Bratschen / und 
Violonzell / von / Ludwig van Beethoven / nach 
einem seiner schönsten Trios fürs Piano-Forte / 
von ihm, selbst frey bearbeitet, und neu eingerich-
tet. / Eigenthum der Verleger. / Wien bey Artaria 
und Comp. / [I.:] No 2573

5 parts (11, 9, 7, 7, 7p.) 33cm.

First edition issued in 1819; this is a reissue from 
the following year with only the title page 
changed.

Opus 123

MISSA / composita, et / SERENISSIMO AC EMI-
NENTISSIMO / DOMINO DOMINO / RUDOL-
PHO JOANNI / Caesareo Principi et Archiduci Aust-
riea S.R.E. Tit. s. Petri in monte / aureo Cardinali 
et Archiepiscopo Olomucensi / [coat of arms] / pro-
fundissima cum veneratione / dedicata a / LUDOV-
ICO VAN BEETHOVEN. / OPUS 123. / Ex sumti-
bus vulgarium. / MOGUNTIAE / ex taberna 
musices B. SCHOTT filiorum. / PARIS / chez les fils 
de B. Schott, rue De Bourbon no. 17. / ANVERS 
chez A. Schott. / 1827.

score (299p.) 33cm.

Pl. no. 2346
Opus 125
early issue from first edition plates


score (226p.) 34cm.

Pl. no. 2322. First edition issued in August 1826; this is a later issue without the list of subscribers. The plate number assigned this work was originally 2321. Evidence of this may be noted at the foot of many pages, where the “1” has been engraved over with a “2”.

string trios, quartets, quintets, original and arr.


5 parts (247, 169, 209, 38, 196p.) 34cm.


In the quartet arrangement of the Piano Sonata, Op. 2, no. 1, the *Andante* has been replaced by the *Andante più tosto Allegretto* movement of the Sonata for Violin and Piano, Op. 12, no. 2.

A handwritten note attached to the verso of the title page in the first violin part states that the quartet arrangements of the piano sonatas and the quintet arrangement of the symphony are by A. Bloudeau.
Álvaro-Agustín de Liaño and His Books in Leopold von Ranke’s Library

BY GAIL P. HUETING *

One of the most intriguing aspects of working with rare books like those in the George Arents Research Library is their provenance, or former ownership. Often a distinguished former owner is the main reason for considering a particular book or group of books rare in the first place; in other cases provenance is incidental to the importance of the item. Except when a collection of books is known to have belonged to one person and is acquired for that reason (the books may or may not bear ownership marks), provenance is typically noted from evidence in the books themselves—from such marks as bookplates, stamps, owners’ signatures, and annotations. Provenance is especially important when the former owner is a famous person, for annotations by such a person may contribute to the body of knowledge about him or her. Ownership marks and annotations can also be a source of information about a less prominent person. Annotations in particular, especially if they are extensive, can reveal something about the personality of the former owner. Yet, apart from some specialized types of annotations (such as glosses in medieval manuscripts and a few cases involving well-known former owners), little attention has been paid to the analysis of annotations in books.¹

¹ Librarian in the Original Cataloguing Department in the library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ms. Hueting was von Ranke Project Librarian at Syracuse University from January 1982 to December 1983. She would like to express her appreciation to David Louis Jensen and Elizabeth A. Williams of the von Ranke Project staff for their assistance, especially since her return to Illinois.

This article is concerned only with one specific case of provenance, as traced from annotations in a group of books which are part of the Leopold von Ranke Library at Syracuse University, itself a special collection by virtue of its provenance. The von Ranke Library, which was purchased for the University after the historian's death in 1886, consists of approximately 6,500 titles, in addition to manuscripts, maps, and journals. The materials deal chiefly with European history and related fields. When the recataloguing of the book collection began in 1977, cards were made for various special files maintained by the Rare Book Division of the George Arents Research Library, in addition to the standard author, title, and subject entries. These files record place of publication, publisher and/or printer, date of publication, and associated names. If an owner other than von Ranke could be identified from marks in the books, an entry was made under that owner's name.

The Liaño books, which are the focus of this article, bear annotations, often lengthy ones, some of which are signed with a distinctive device or monogram. Such inscriptions are an unusual feature in von Ranke's library; most of the books there that are associated with other owners are identifiable by bookplate or signature alone. Relatively few are annotated. By June 1985, nineteen books believed to have belonged to Liaño had been discovered. They are mostly eighteenth-century books in the fields of church history, commerce, and law. The annotations in four of the books include the owner's full name in an ex-libris statement in Latin, thus—Alvar-Augustinus-Maria de Liágno—and hint at a very interesting personality in an unusual situation. They reveal that Liágno—or more correctly in his native Spanish, Liaño—was the son of a Spanish nobleman, had formerly been a Roman Catholic priest but had converted to Calvinism, and was living, at least for a time, in Berlin. Written in fluent French,


3. His full name in his native Spanish is Álvaro-Agustín de Liaño; when writing in French, he used the form Alvar-Augustin de Liágno.
Latin, and Italian, they demonstrate a considerable knowledge as well as decided opinions about theology and church history.

Who was this man, then, and what was he doing in Berlin? Intrigued, I began trying to find out.

Though not famous, Liaño was sufficiently well known to have left tantalizing traces of his scholarly presence in Europe during the early 1800s. The National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints and the General Catalogue of Printed Books of the British Museum have listed Liaño as the author of several books on Spanish history and literature, of which the second volume of his Répertoire portatif de l'histoire et de la littérature des nations espagnole et portugaise is to be found in von Ranke's library. Continuing my search, I discovered in a brief entry in Das gelehrte Teutschland that Liaño had been a royal librarian in Berlin. Historical accounts of the Royal Library in Berlin, now the German State Library in East Berlin, confirmed that he was one of several librarians there between 1811 and 1822. Curt Balcke's Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek listed the articles by F. Boll and A. Risop that make use of most of the available primary sources on Liaño. Their primary materials were the archives of the Library, the records of the French congregation in Berlin, and Liaño's own posthumous papers.

From the various secondary sources, especially from Boll's article, Liaño's life story can be sketched briefly. He was born in Menoba, Granada, on February 17, 1782, the son of a Spanish nobleman. At the age of eighteen he became a Carmelite monk and was sent to Africa as a missionary. Having become disaffected with the Catholic

Church for reasons we can only guess at, he went to Pistoia, Italy to join the famous bishop Scipione de Ricci, whose diocese was a center of reforms and new ideas, such as Jansenism. Later he fled to Paris, then to Holland, where he converted to the Reformed Church, then to Vienna. It is unclear what led him to these places. He came to Berlin in 1809, apparently with prestigious letters of introduction, because he was soon in the favor of the royal family. On June 25, 1810, King Frederick William III of Prussia instructed his minister of state to place Liaño in a suitable position. He was duly appointed to be a teacher of Spanish and French at the newly founded University of Berlin, but he refused this position on the grounds, apparently, that it was less prestigious than he was expecting. Following that, although he barely knew German, he was made a librarian at the Royal Library and became one of five members of the librarians' administrative council. He was at first assigned to supervising the copying of the new catalogue and, from 1812 on, to cataloguing manu-
scripts. The Library’s quarterly report of October 1813 lists Liaño as primarily responsible for the areas of Catholic theology, church history, the church councils, and history and literature of Italy, Spain, France, and England. Along with another librarian, he had regular public service hours on Tuesdays and Saturdays.

Historians of the German State Library tend to emphasize Liaño’s status as a court favorite and minimize his contributions to the library. According to them, his lack of fluency in German and his inconsistent working habits kept him from making much progress on the catalogue of manuscripts. On the other hand, Eugen Paunel in his Die Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin argues that Liaño’s knowledge of languages must have been an asset to the project. But whatever the case, his departure from Berlin in 1822 was clouded by ugly charges. K. A. Varnhagen von Ense in his Blätter aus der preussischen Geschichte noted that Liaño was said to have taken 1,800 books from the library home with him and to have lost or stolen many of them.

Liaño married, had a son, and became an elder of the French congregation in Berlin. Even though he was close to the royal family, especially to Prince Heinrich, he never really felt at home in Prussia. Proud, prickly, unable to write in German, he believed his intellectual gifts were not appreciated. Indeed, after the war against Napoleon, few Prussians were interested in foreign history and literature. However, it is known that in 1814 Liaño did give lectures on Spanish language and literature. Also, he published in 1818–1820 two volumes on the history of Spain and Portugal, Répertoire portatif de l’histoire et de la littérature des nations espagnole et portugaise, but the project was never completed in five volumes as planned. In 1817, hoping to have more influence on Prussian politics, he submitted a number of articles to Heinrich Luden for his periodical Nemesis, and three of them were published. They were “Brief eines Berliner Presbyterianer an eine edle preussische Frau über den heiligen Bund der europäischen Herrscher” (which was translated into German from

---

7. Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, 1: 143, 332.
10. Paunel, Die Staatsbibliothek, 142.
Liaño's French), "Factum contre l'esprit de la censure prussienne", and "Censure de Berlin". At the end of 1817 (and probably even before then), Liaño seriously sought to leave Berlin for a more congenial environment. Luden gave him a frank, gloomy impression of Jena (where Luden taught) and suggested that he look instead to Weimar, the intellectual center of German classicism. Liaño was not able to leave Berlin until 1822. Finally, at that time, he managed to settle as a private scholar in the small principality of Neuwied (in the Rhineland), where he enjoyed the confidence of the ruling princes and lived until his death in 1848.

It was during this last period, probably in the year 1828, that he returned to the Catholic Church. Also, in 1829 and 1830, he wrote two parts of another book, Noticias literarias y históricas, ostensibly a continuation of his earlier work but actually an extended advertisement for a series of Spanish classics edited by Joaquin Maria de Ferrar. The publisher, J. A. Meyer, was apparently trying to attract a market in Germany for these titles. After the publication of this book, Liaño became so obscure and forgotten that Nouvelle biographie universelle was to claim that he had died "about 1830".

It is clear that Liaño never achieved either the fame or the peace of mind he was looking for. He tended to attribute his problems, both in Spain and in Germany, to enmity and to intrigue against him rather than to any shortcomings of his own. Certainly, he had a great deal of knowledge, especially of languages and of church history; his interests extended in many directions, and he was very well-read. However, he appears to have been unable to finish anything (except his short articles), and he tended to embark on open-ended projects. Both Répertoire portatif and Noticias literarias y históricas suffer from an extremely rambling style, with digressions in footnotes equal in length to the text. Whatever insights into Spanish history and literature they offer are very hard to extract from the mass of words. The facts and ideas are also colored with suspicions of conspiracy against himself.

The books in Leopold von Ranke's library that formerly belonged to Liaño raise some interesting questions. How and when did von Ranke acquire them? Were the two men acquainted with each other? Von Ranke first became prominent as a historian about 1830, long

12. Information on Liaño's later life is primarily from Boll, "Briefe".
before Liano's death, but he did not go to Berlin until after Liano had left that city. Could any of these books have actually been the property of the Royal Library? What do Liano's annotations reveal about his life and his working methods? Most of these questions cannot be answered. There is no evidence that von Ranke and Liano knew each other. Unlike some of von Ranke's books, which were previously owned by men known to have been his friends and colleagues—for example, F. H. Rheinwald, Karl Friedrich von Savigny, and Christian Daniel Beck—these books do not contain anything that suggests a friendship between von Ranke and Liano. Also, Liano is not mentioned in von Ranke's letters nor in his few autobiographical writings. Von Ranke rarely wrote in his books and never indicated how he had acquired them. It seems clear that von Ranke took possession of the Liano books after 1832, because Liano dated one of his annotations in that year, and some of the notes refer to his reconversion to Catholicism. It is unlikely that the books originally belonged to the Royal Library. Von Ranke owned other books that bear the Library's crest on the bindings and have ownership stamps; indeed, some even indicate that they were sold as duplicates. The Liano books have no such markings.

Liano used various marks to identify the books he owned. The angular monogram or device mentioned above appears in eleven of the eighteen books, often more than once. Sometimes he signed his name in abbreviated form: A.-A.-M. de L?; or, just L?. Occasionally, he used the phrase: Ex βιβλιοφιλακιῳ Alvari-Augustini-Mariae de Líagno. Another kind of identifying mark appears in six of the books about religion; the fairly long annotations are prefaced with two religious symbols, the Tetragrammaton (the four Hebrew letters representing the name of God) and a combination of Greek letters, alpha, chi, rho, and omega (which joins together two symbols referring to Jesus Christ). Six books, chiefly in the fields of law and commerce, have notes stating when and where he acquired them. Sometimes this is the only annotation. Two examples are:

Work bought in Berlin at the palace bookstall 17 Oct. 1817.

L?14

14. I have translated all the annotations being quoted in the text of this article but retained Liano's capitalization and punctuation. The notes are presented in the original French, Latin, or Italian, with Liano's own underlinings, accents, spelling
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Half-title page, showing religious symbols, an ex-libris statement, and Liaño's monogram. From Abbé André, L'Esprit de Duguet (Paris, 1764).
I bought this book together with the Latin work of Emman Weber, entitled *Examen artis heraldicae* today, Berlin, 4 Sept. 1821. L.15

In addition to these ownership marks, Liaño used the end-papers, preliminary leaves, and sometimes the title pages of his books to record various kinds of factual and personal information. A frequent type of note is a brief description of the contents of the book, usually in the language of the book itself:

Third part of the Italian philosophy of the illustrious abbot Antonio Genovesi, or three volumes *Della diceosina*, which is to say—the art of the just and the honest; with a portrait of the author. [Annotation and book are in Italian.]16

(Calvinist) history of the Eucharist by Matthieu Larroque, Calvinist minister at Vitré. [Annotation and book are in French.]17

Liaño often added biographical information about the author of a book. Sometimes this consisted only of the author’s birth and death dates, as in Genovesi’s book:

Born in Castiglione on 1 Sept. 1712, died at the age of 57 years on 22 Sept. 1769.18

At other times the biographical notes continue at great length. The notes on Matthieu de Larroque, mentioned above, fill much of the

and abbreviations, and include a short citation of the book in which each annotation appears; for full citations see the list of Liaño’s books at the end of the article.


18. “Nato in Castiglione il 1 di 9bre 1712 morto nell’età di 57 anni il 22 7bre 1769.” In Genovesi, *Della diceosina*. 
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title page, and his son, Daniel de Larroque, is given another long paragraph which takes up a little more than one side of a leaf 10 x 15 1/2 cm. A shorter account of David-Renaud Boullier and his son gives an example of this type of annotation:

By David-Renaud Boullier, whose origins were in the Auvergne, born of Protestant parents in Utrecht 24 March 1699, zealous minister among his coreligionists in Amsterdam, an inaccurate, obscure, and diffuse writer but useful to readers who study conscientiously, a respectable man, died as minister of his church in London 23 Dec. 1759. His son, who was like him a preacher, moved from London to Amsterdam and from Amsterdam to The Hague, where he died in 1797. He is the author of a small volume on exterior eloquence and of some sermons.19

Much of the biographical information comes from the large French biographical dictionary Biographie universelle, compiled by the Michauds. The long biographical annotation on François Véron de Forbonnais is taken almost verbatim from this source, as an excerpt shows. Liaño’s annotation begins:

The author is the illustrious François Véron de Forbonnais, inspector-general of coinage and member of the institute, born in Mans in 1722, whose great-grandfather had founded in Mans a factory for strainers which in central Europe are called Vérones. After a good education and several trips to Italy and Spain in connection with his father’s business affairs, he was called to Nantes in 1743, at the age of 21, by one of his uncles, who was a rich armorer there. The opulence of Nantes

turned his attention to the study of political economy and for 5 years he collected the material to excel in that field . . . 20

The corresponding passage from *Biographie universelle* reads:

Forbonnais (François Véron de) inspector-general of coinage, member of the Institute, was born on 3 October 1722 at Mans, where his great-grandfather had founded a factory for strain- ers, known throughout central Europe by the name of Vé- rones. After finishing his studies in Paris, young Forbonnais traveled for two years in Italy and Spain on the business af- fairs of his father. One of his uncles, a rich armorer in Nantes, called him to join him in 1745. The extraordinary bustle of this opulent place, the richly-laden vessels received at the port there, astounded Forbonnais and turned his naturally reflect- ive mind to the study of political economy. During a stay of five years in that city, he collected a great number of impor- tant observations about the industries, commerce, the navy, colonies, the value of coins, etc. 21

In other cases, such as the information about the de Larroques and the Boulliers, *Biographie universelle* is clearly the source, but it is not followed so closely as in the case of de Forbonnais. However, Liaño does seem to have turned to *Biographie universelle* again and again, despite his expressed low opinion of it:

Salvi is the biographer of Genovesi in that miserable compi- lation of Michaud called *Biographie universelle*, v. 17, pp. 86–89. 22


22. “Salvi est le biographe de Genovesi dans la miserable compilation de Michaud dite *Biographie universelle*, tome 17 pp. 86–89.” In Genovesi, *Della diceosina.*
In his Répertoire portatif he called it “Biographie Universelle, which the cabal of obscurantist scholars in Paris is publishing with Michaud”.23

Liaño also used bibliographical reference works, and he was familiar with Barbier's Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes et pseudonymes. He often cited other editions of the work in hand, related works, or, in the case of anonymously published books, the author. It is clear that he exercised considerable skill in using reference books. However, he did not usually cite in his annotations the specific sources of bibliographical references. These are rarely as obvious as Biographie universelle is for biographical details; indeed, such information could have come from any of the catalogues or bibliographies that were available in the early nineteenth century.

In his copy of the 1723 edition of Mémoires chroniques et dogmatiques, written by Hyacinthe Robillard d'Avrigny but published anonymously, Liaño cites the author and the date of the first edition:

The 1st edition of this work is that of 1720, one year after the death of the author (d'Avrigny), published in Paris by Guérin. L° 24

In Exposition de la doctrine de l'Église Gallicane by César Chesneau Du Marsais, he refers to another book by the same author:

In 1719 there appeared, printed in Rome, a book by Du Marsais entitled Politique Charnelle de la Cour de Rome, taken from the History of the Council of Trent by Cardinal Pallavicini.25

Writing in a copy of the anonymous Essais sur les intérêts du commerce maritime, he gives the author's name:

Author: D'Héguerty, according to M. Barbier, Dict. des An. et Ps., but a man omitted in the Biogr. Univ. of Michaud.  

The author of another anonymous work, *Voyages d'un philosophe*, is identified by referring to a book by Cornelius de Pauw:

Voyages of M. Le Poivre. (See Paw [sic], who gives his name and praises him in the Défense des Recherches philosophiq. sur les Américains contre Dom Pernety, p. 201, chap. 36).  

As the example citing de Pauw shows, Liaño was well-read and adept at finding information in sources other than what can be considered standard reference works. A particularly detailed use of other books appears in a long annotation in Matthieu de Larroque's *Histoire de l'Eucharistie*, in which Liaño quoted two Latin theological works by Jacques Boileau and one French work by Abbé Philippe-Louis Joly.

Annotations in which Liaño expresses his strong opinions are lively, even entertaining. Lamenting the "Jesuitization" of Robillard d'Avrigny's works after his death, he wrote:

D. Clemenset assures us, on the report of a Jesuit (preface to Lettres de Eus. Philalethe & Fr. Morenas, 3rd edition, p. iv), that d'Avrigny left these Memoires in the hands of his brother, from whom they were retrieved after the death of the author in order to accommodate them to the interests of the Pelagian and pharisaical Society of the Jesuits. L.  

Even when he has judged a book positively, he may add a negative remark about another person or group, as in this example:
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Letters against the impious nominal and outward Roman Catholics and Protestants of Europe in the 18th century, and defense of the Pensées of the great Pascal and 3 letters about the philosophy of Voltaire.29

Some of the bitterest comments, entirely negative, are directed against Jean Martin de Prades:

Impious summary of the history of the church of Jesus Christ written by the execrable apostate Jean Martin de Prades, who dared to profane the name of the venerable abbot Claude Fleury in order to attract public curiosity with this contemptible rhapsody.30

Another passage in the same annotation reads:

This book is an excellent introduction to the art of speaking with the same blame of the Jesuits as of the Jansenists and of preaching a profound indifference to the substance of Christianity by spreading, according to the needs of philosophism, calumnies and lies in a style suited to having them received as so many truths.31

The book by de Prades is one of several in which Liaño prefaced his annotation with a prayer, presumably to be repeated before reading the book. The prayer reads:

O my Savior! may this book and all those which resemble it not leave my Library except to support polemical studies by

30. "Abrégé impie de l'histoire de l'église de J. C. écrit par l'exécrable apostat Jean-Martin de Prades, qui a osé profaner le nom du vénérable abbé Claude Fleury pour exciter le curiosité publique avec cette méprisable rhapsodie." In Prades, Abrégé.
31. "Ce livre est une excellente introduction à l'art de parler avec le même mépris des Jésuites que des Jansénistes et de prêcher une profonde indifférence en matière de Christianisme en repandant d'après les besoins du philosophisme les calomnies et les mensonges dans un stile assorti au but de les faire recevoir comme autant de vérités." In Prades, Abrégé.
someone who, like me, does not want to live one moment except to adore you and to execrate the blasphemers who have wanted to destroy your church.\textsuperscript{32}

Liaño explains the purpose of such a prayer in another annotation:

This book is one of those which should not be read without praying to the Lord beforehand to preserve us from all complicity with the perverse men who wrote it. We should not look for anything in it except to prepare ourselves to combat their sophisms.\textsuperscript{33}

But in other cases a prayer might be thankful in spirit and not refer specifically to the book in which it is written:

Lord Jesus, my only master! may everything that is in the writings of your servants be in accord with your doctrine, may everything that they owe to the ineffable action of your spirit be engraved upon my heart and produce that faith, alive and full of good works which is the masterpiece of your power and of your grace, that faith which justifies, sanctifies, comforts, and saves, that faith without which we can only be lost. Those things which are in accord with your will, God, may you impress them on our hearts. Amen.\textsuperscript{34}

In addition to the prayers, the most emotional passages in Liaño’s annotations are his autobiographical reflections. These are invariably

\textsuperscript{32} “O mon Sauveur! que ce livre et tous ceux qui lui ressemblent ne sortent de ma Bibliothèque que pour seconder des études polémiques de qui, comme moi, ne veut vivre un moment que pour t’adorer, et execrare les blasphémateurs qui ont voulu anéantir ton église.” In Prades, \textit{Abrégé}.

\textsuperscript{33} “Ce livre est un de ceux qu’on ne doit lire sans prier auparavant le Seigneur de nous preserver de toute complicité avec les hommes pervers qui l’ont écrit. Nous ne devons y chercher qu’à nous préparer pour combattre leurs sophismes.” Tragopone, \textit{Sermons}.

\textsuperscript{34} “Seigneur Jesus, mon unique maître! que tout ce que dans les écrits de Vos serviteurs est d’accord avec votre doctrine, tout ce qu’ils ont dû à l’action ineffable de votre esprit soit gravé profondément dans mon cœur et y produise cette foi vive et féconde en bonnes œuvres qui est le chef-d’œuvre de votre pouvoir et de votre grace; cette foi qui justifie, sanctifie, console et sauve; cette foi sans laquelle nous ne pouvons que nous perdre. Quae dixere tuis consona sensibus, Nostris illa, Deus, cordibus imprimas. Amen.” In Nicole, \textit{L’Esprit de M. Nicole}.
written in Latin in the third person as a continuation of an ex-libris statement, as if the act of writing his name led him to ponder his life. One of the more concise statements reads:

From the library of Alvar-Augustin-Maria de Liágno, a most miserable man, a Spaniard, born of noble parents fervent in the Roman Catholic faith, in 1782, a Carmelite of St. Theresa, an unworthy priest of the Holy Roman Church, taught at a renowned Jansenist school but an apostate from papal tyranny, at last truly penitent from the heart.35

Another, more rambling autobiographical statement, which is too involved to quote in full, is couched in similar terms. It mentions the “horrible sin” of his leaving the Catholic Church and the period when “for the space of 20 years he lived as a Calvinist a most bitter life among schismatic deists” and “among the Prussians and the Germans”.36 Annotations of this type were obviously written after Liano’s reconversion to Catholicism. The first one quoted above is not dated, but the second has the date September 30, 1832.

The annotations in Liano’s books can be followed for almost twenty years—the earliest one dates from 1814 and the latest from 1832. Not enough are dated to make it clear how the activity of writing in his books developed, but it is interesting to speculate what doing so meant to him at various points in his life. What seems to have begun simply as a means of recording his ownership of his books perhaps grew into a way of keeping notes about his reading and his reactions to particular books. Possibly, he even used such annotations to prepare his published writing, which is often so rambling that it seems to have been assembled from scattered notes and anecdotes that caught his attention. After he returned to Catholicism and, growing older, perceived that he no longer had any audience or influence in Germany,


36. “... per spatium XX annos Calvinianus vitam inter schismaticos deistas amarissimam egerit ... inter borussos et germanos”. In Du Marsais, Exposition de la doctrine.
it seems probable that the blank leaves of his books became an important outlet for his opinions and emotions. It is this possibility that makes the later annotations so poignant.
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Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Grove Press Publication of the Unexpurgated Text

BY RAYMOND T. CAFFREY

Lady Chatterley's Lover was never an easy project. D. H. Lawrence took twenty-five months, from October 1926 till January 1928, and three complete versions to finish the novel to his satisfaction. When he first published his third version (the Orioli edition) in the spring of 1928 in Florence, he met difficulty and delay at every turn: his typists either rebelled against the text, took too long, or made too many errors; the printer had too little type to set more than half the novel at once and his typesetters knew no English; the paper manufacturers failed to deliver the special hand-made paper on time. All that while Lawrence's agent, Curtis Brown, and his publisher, Martin Seeker, opposed the private publication of the novel and worried Lawrence with the loss of his reputation. The book was pirated as soon as it reached America because Lawrence could not secure copyright. Finally, Lawrence came up against the censors, who banned the book from America first and later from England. It is not surprising that Barney Rosset, the president of Grove Press, began work on the 1959 Grove Press edition of Lady Chatterley's Lover in 1954, and that his trouble started where Lawrence's left off: with the censors.

Mark Schorer, Professor of Literature at Berkeley, had given Rosset the idea to publish the third version of Lady Chatterley's Lover for the first time in America. On 10 March 1954 Rosset wrote to Schorer to say that he and Ephraim London, the attorney, had reread the novel and agreed that "it seemed better from a literary standpoint and somewhat milder" than they remembered. London, who had lately distinguished himself by successfully defending the film The Miracle before the United States Supreme Court, felt, however, that "the chances are better than even that an attempt will be made to ban the book in New York, if you publish it". He recommended testing the censors with a strategy which relied upon the 1933 precedent that
Barney Rosset in the Grove Press offices, 64 University Place in Greenwich Village, New York City, ca. 1954.
lifted a Custom's ban against James Joyce's *Ulysses*. U.S. Customs enforces a law that prohibits the importation of obscene books, but the law "contains a provision permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to admit so-called classics or books of recognized and established literary merit when imported for non-commercial purposes".¹ London's idea was as follows: to import a number of copies, to inform Customs that they were coming and that they were intended for either resale or publication, and then, to force Customs to rule on the book's admissibility. If Customs confiscated the books, Grove Press would initiate a suit to defend the novel in federal court on the ground of its literary merit. Federal court action would carry no personal risk for Barney Rosset, but a favorable decision would not prevent his prosecution under state law where the penalty could be a fine, imprisonment, or both. A favorable decision in federal court, however, would create a precedent and strengthen Grove's argument of defense.

Rosset was eager to battle the censors. He set the plan in motion by writing on 31 March 1954 to Joan Landis, a friend who was living in Paris, to ask her to buy four copies of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Ephraim London called Customs and learned from a Miss Suske that the book was on the proscribed list. She suggested that if the package should slip through customs, Grove ought to return the books in their original wrapper. Landis wrote from Paris that she had found the books at Galignani's bookshop, where the Stockholm edition (Jan Forlag) sold for 1500 francs in hardcover and 1200 francs in paper.² Rosset asked her to mail the books and she sent them on 22 April 1954. On 28 April he wrote to Miss Suske to alert her that they were en

1. Ephraim S. London, Letter to Barney Rosset, 10 March 1954, Grove Press Records, George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University. Unless otherwise cited, all letters and documents used in the preparation of this article are in the Grove Press Records. I would like to thank Barney Rosset, who agreed to an interview and directed me to the records at Syracuse University; Ephraim S. London, who also took time to talk with me; and the able and cooperative staff of the George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University, especially Carolyn A. Davis and Edward Lyon.

route. Nearly a month passed without a reaction from Customs; so, on 19 May Rosset wrote again, and still he got no response. On 7 June Ephraim London wrote Rosset to report that he had spoken with people at the Customs Office, who said that a delay of thirty-four days was not unusual, and that Rosset would be “notified of their detention as soon as the books are received”. In his own hand, London added the postscript: “looks as if the issue has been prejudged”. Rosset, who was impatient for definitive action, telegraphed Joan Landis in Paris on 10 April to ask her to send a single copy of the book via air mail. “You sometimes have to argue with these people to make them take you seriously”, he wrote. By 22 June Rosset, with the fifth copy in hand, again wrote to Customs and delivered the book. This time he got an immediate response. On 22 June 1954 Irving Fishman, the Deputy Collector for the Restricted Merchandise Division, acknowledged Rosset’s three letters and advised him that they were in possession of all five books. “We have taken note of your statement that you object to the detention of this book, and the matter is being given careful consideration.” The New York Customs officers were unwilling to make the decision that would expose them to the Grove Press lawsuit. They sent the single copy to Washington, where the Collector of Restricted Merchandise judged the case. On 11 August, New York’s Irving Fishman reported the official position:

The book in question is obscene within the meaning of Section 305 of the Tariff Act of 1930. This book will therefore be seized and forfeited in due course as provided by law.³

Rosset was finally in trouble with the law: it had taken just under four months, but at last he had reason to bring suit against the federal government on behalf of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

In order to defend the novel against the charge of obscenity, Rosset had to build the case for “literary merit”. Mark Schorer’s role as initiator of the idea was a good start. His reputation as a distinguished scholar, literary critic, and teacher lent immediate prestige from the academic community, and his “Introduction” to the Grove edition still stands as a major scholarly and critical comment on the novel. Schorer had visited Frieda Lawrence Ravagli (Angelo Ravagli

was Frieda's third husband) in Taos, New Mexico and studied the three manuscript versions of the novel. His discussion of the evolution of the final version not only showed the censors how seriously Lawrence cultivated his art in this novel, but also opened the field for the many studies that have followed. Schorer's tone is neither defensive nor polemical: he applies established scholarly and critical methods to the novel, and the work sustains the serious inquiry. In addition to the "Introduction", Rosset asked Schorer in a letter of 24 April for a bibliographical note that would detail the publication history and appear at the end of the text in his edition. The scholarly apparatus makes a dignified frame for the novel and supports the contention that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* ranks as a modern classic.

Rosset next developed a list of persons to whom he wrote to solicit "written affidavits" that he could use in court to support the argument that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* "has literary value and that it is not obscene, immoral or indecent". Rosset's position throughout is clear: an edition of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* would be "a most worthwhile project, both in terms of literature and civil rights". He was as eager to break the stranglehold of the censors as he was to publish Lawrence's novel. The list of persons to whom he appealed reflects his dual purpose. Among them were: Karl Menninger, E. B. White, James Thurber, Archibald MacLeish, Edmund Wilson, F. R. Leavis, I. A. Richards, Jacques Barzun, Allen Tate, William York Tindall, Mark Howe, Edward R. Murrow, and Bennett Cerf. Not everyone responded; some declined to make a statement for the record but offered moral support and some simply objected to the project. F. R. Leavis (who had lately contracted with Knopf to publish *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist*, in which he places *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with the "lesser novels") declined in a letter of 17 September: "I don't like censorship, but then I think Lawrence made a mistake in writing that book". Henry Steele Commager, the noted historian, expressed a clear view of the censorship problem, but refused to become involved because he objected to the strategy of defending books one at a time:

4. Barney Rosset, Letter to Karl Menninger, 17 August 1954. This was a test letter that was eventually sent in two mailings, 23 June and 15 October 1954, to an increasing list of potential authorities.
as the law defines ‘obscene’ etc.—leading to indecent and lascivious thoughts—I think the Lawrence book—and many other books are clearly obscene. I think the real trouble is in the law itself. It seems to me sheer hypocrisy to have to argue that a book like this does not lead to lascivious thoughts. . . . I should like to see publishers and authors organize a really effective fight on the law and its definitions, not fight a piecemeal series of battles and skirmishes on every controversial book.6

Changes in a law of this sort rarely come about without the significant instance; individual cases create precedents that lead to other individual cases until the precedent has been extended and the law interpreted into obsolescence. Mark Howe, the renowned attorney whom Rosset had consulted, wrote in a letter of 24 June that he was sure “that the book should be allowed to see the light of day”, but he declined to write an affidavit for the court because of “his conviction that it will take a good deal of ingenious argument to persuade a court that the book is not ‘obscene, immoral or indecent’.” The attorneys, including Ephraim London, knew that Lady Chatterley's Lover was “obscene” under the prevailing interpretation of the law and that the Customs ban had created a persistent popular opinion that the book was clearly pornographic. Bennett Cerf’s reaction to Rosset’s letter states this view:

I can’t think of any good reason for bringing out an unpurged version of Lady Chatterley’s Lover at this late date. In my opinion the book was always a very silly story, far below Lawrence’s usual standard, and seemingly deliberately pornographic. . . . I can’t help feeling that anybody fighting to do a Lady Chatterley’s Lover in 1954 is placing more than a little of his bet on getting some sensational publicity from the sale of a dirty book.7

Cerf’s letter gave Rosset reason to organize a defense of the project. He had received positive statements from Edmund Wilson, Jacques

Barzun, and Archibald MacLeish. Wilson, who was on record in strong support of the novel since 1928, referred Rosset (letter, 28 June 1954) to *The Shores of Light*, which contained his original review. Jacques Barzun had written:

I have no hesitation in saying that I do not consider Lawrence's novel pornographic. Its aim is that of all his work: artistic, moral, and indeed inspired by a passion to reform our culture in ways that he thought would produce greater harmony, happiness, and decency.8

Archibald MacLeish wrote:

Only those to whom words can be impure per se or those to whom 'certain subjects' cannot be mentioned in print though they are constantly mentioned in life, or those to whom the fundamental and moving facts of human existence are 'nasty' could conclude on the evidence of the text itself that *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, as Lawrence wrote it, is obscene.9

Rosset defended his project to Bennett Cerf with the letters of his experts and with an offer to let him read Schorer's "Introduction". He mentioned in a letter of 1 July that he had reread the novel himself and "did not come to your conclusion that it was a dirty book—rather the reverse". It was Rosset's stand that he was undertaking to publish *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as any commercial publisher would, that he was investing time and money in anticipation of a return, a large return, if possible, such as "best sellers" bring. His motive as publisher, however, was complicated by his intention to strike a serious blow in the battle against the kind of censorship that was prevalent in the 1950s. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* had the potential both to generate profits and to embarrass the censors, whose standards and judgment had held it to be obscene for nearly thirty years. Cerf's letter gave Rosset the opportunity not only to answer the charge that he was exploiting the novel, but also to formulate a defense against the charge that it was an aberration in Lawrence's canon, a "dirty

book". By the time Rosset wrote to Cerf, in early July 1954, he had the defense of the novel squarely in place and had only to secure permission to publish—a more difficult project, as it turned out.

Rosset asked Mark Schorer (letter, 24 March 1954) to approach Frieda Lawrence Ravagli as the person most likely to know what entanglements were attached to the rights of the novel. He asked that Grove Press remain anonymous for the moment and that Frieda say nothing about the proposed project. Though he was certain that the novel was out of copyright, he offered to pay a royalty to her if he could publish the book. Schorer wrote back on 2 April to say that Frieda “was very excited by the prospect of seeing the real Lady Chatterley in print”, but she had reservations about the rights: “I have the copyright but Knopf has the publishing right. . . .” Frieda did not understand the legal complexities, but she did acknowledge Rosset’s plea for quiet: “I think it very nice of the publisher to lie low as long as it is possible. I won’t say a word.” That was on 2 April 1954; on 5 April, nevertheless, she wrote to Richard Aldington to say, “some bold publisher is trying over here to publish an unexpurgated Lady Chatterley”.

So much for silence.

Shortly, Rosset wrote to Frieda to identify himself. He repeated his position that the novel was out of copyright and “in the public domain, available to anyone who might wish to publish it. However before going ahead, I would much prefer to have your agreement and enthusiastic support.” Ephraim London advised Rosset to stress the fact that he was under no legal obligation, but that he intended “to pay a royalty of 10% on all copies sold by us and paid for”. Frieda wrote to Rosset on 13 April that she was “very glad” that he was planning to publish, but she repeated her hesitancy about the copyright: “Alfred Knopf did copyright the expurgated Lady Chatterley. I don’t know, but I think you will have to have his permission which again will complicate things.” Frieda closed her letter: “I wish you all good luck with this problem child”.

In America Frieda was represented by Alan Collins of the Curtis Brown Agency. She had helped persuade Lawrence to allow Curtis Lawrence and Her Circle: Letters From, To, and About Frieda Lawrence, eds. Harry T. Moore and Dale B. Montague (Hamden, Ct.: Archon Books, 1981), 104.
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Brown's New York office to handle his American interests in the fall of 1923, when Lawrence was having trouble collecting royalties from Thomas Seltzer, his American publisher. Curtis Brown's first effort was to place *The Plumed Serpent* with Knopf, and from that point onward, Knopf considered himself the sole American publisher of Lawrence's work. In England, Frieda was represented by Laurence Pollinger of Pearn, Pollinger and Higham, Ltd. Pearn and Pollinger had been Lawrence's chief correspondents in the London office of Curtis Brown, and when Pearn and Pollinger formed their own literary agency, the Lawrence business went with them. Pollinger had been a staunch supporter of Lawrence in 1928, when Lawrence first published *Lady Chatterley's Lover* against the advice of Curtis Brown. He had also helped Lawrence to sell and distribute the novel and he was one to whom the officials from Scotland Yard came when they began to confiscate copies of the novel in January 1929. Pollinger had a major influence upon Frieda: he controlled the Lawrence "property" and her income from it. Pollinger had lately sold the film rights to *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and was probably listening to A. S. Frère of Heinemann, who had it in mind to publish the three versions of the novel on the ground that scholars would benefit enormously. Frieda brought Pollinger into the picture under the guise of being helpful to Mark Schorer. Apparently, she knew that Pollinger would have to decide upon the permission to publish, but she approached him incidentally: Schorer needed the second version of the novel to write his "Introduction". Frieda knew that Pollinger had a typescript and simply wrote to him to ask for a copy, saying "by the way" that the novel was to be published. Pollinger wrote back asking Frieda to "do nothing" without first consulting him. 12 Frieda had been "silent" once more.

When Schorer visited Taos in late May 1954, it fell to him to sort out Frieda's confusion and to settle her anxiety. Schorer examined the three manuscript versions of the novel, then looked through the "piles of ancient contracts" 13 only to find that the contracts with Knopf for the expurgated edition and with Dial for *The First Lady Chatterley* were missing. Frieda was so certain that those contracts had secured the copyright for someone, possibly for herself, that Schorer was un-

13. Ibid.
able to persuade her that the book was actually in the public domain. He finally caught her attention by telling her that anyone who wanted to publish the book could do so without paying her and that Rosset's offer of a ten-percent royalty was the gesture of a gentleman. At this point Frieda became concerned enough to ask Schorer to write both to Pollinger to satisfy him that she was not intending anything underhanded and to Rosset to ask him to announce his project to Pollinger and to A. S. Frère of Heinemann, a man who had worked with Schorer in the past and whom Frieda trusted. Frère had lately written to Schorer to mention his idea that the three versions of the novel ought to be made available, but that England was not ripe: "Perhaps in the freer intellectual atmosphere of the U.S.A. it can be done". Schorer questioned Frère's view of the "intellectual atmosphere of the U.S.A." Frère seemed likely to support an American edition, for he had nothing to lose and something to gain.

Before he wrote, Rosset again consulted Ephraim London, who restated his position in a letter of 3 June: "My very smallest concern—and yours—in connection with the publication of the book is the copyright question". Since Knopf had never registered a copyright for the 1932 expurgated edition, there was no copyright to expire. William Koshland of Knopf confirmed that fact when he wrote to Frieda on 11 June 1954. He reminded her that Lawrence had not secured copyright for his original edition and that when he published the novel in 1928, it had immediately become property of the public domain. Koshland's letter to Frieda made it clear that Alfred Knopf knew he had no right to the book and no legal grounds for opposing Grove Press. But Knopf, not pleased to think that Grove might actually clear the book for publication and then publish it, did oppose it. Koshland wrote to Alan Collins, who reported by telephone to Grove Press that Knopf took himself to be "the only authorized publisher of the U.S. version of Lady Chatterley's Lover—that version now under license to the New American Library of World Literature, Inc." Further, if Grove Press should succeed in winning a positive court decision, Knopf "would expect to be the publisher". Knopf gave his ultimatum to Collins: let "Grove Press be warned off the premises".

15. This letter came to Rosset as a copy in Frieda's hand.
Knopf used a literary agent to let his position be known. Ephraim London's assessment of that position was:

(1) He [Knopf] doesn't think the unexpurgated version can be published here;
(2) If it can, he intends to do it—for he considers his firm to be Lawrence's official publisher.
(3) I believe he realizes he can't prevent you from publishing it.17

Knopf was a problem. His threat to enter competition with Grove Press after Grove Press had fought a court action and paid for the legal fees presented a serious financial difficulty for Barney Rosset. Of the two, Knopf could better afford a price war. By taking the profit out of the project, he hoped to deter Rosset entirely. With Knopf it was not so much a matter of money as prestige. With Rosset it was a matter of breaking the censors and surviving financially, for Grove Press was a young company in 1954. Since Alfred Knopf had not made his threat to Rosset himself, Rosset decided to confront him for a direct statement. On 30 August 1954 Rosset wrote to ask if the threat were true and to offer details of the project to date. He also proffered ideas to effect a compromise that would not kill the new edition:

Although we have already encountered certain expenses and a good deal of work in connection with this project, we are willing to turn the entire matter over to you . . . if you will continue the case and get a court decision. Alternatively, if you would like to work with us we would be happy to share costs with you and, in the event that we obtain a positive decision, to publish the book with your imprint or ours and share in some manner any profits which accrue.18

Rosset sent copies of this letter to Alan Collins and to Frieda. She was enthusiastic and thought Rosset's offer "was very fair". "So you are already on in the fight. It is very exciting, I think it is an impor-
tant fight not only for this book, but others in the future, I shall be most interested what Knopf answers.”

This letter of 14 September 1954 is the only letter to Barney Rosset that she signed “Frieda Lawrence”; on all other correspondence she signed herself “Frieda Lawrence Ravagli”. She had warmed to the battle and shared in Rosset’s view that the publication of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* would open the door for future works that were not at that time respectable. One suspects that she felt in the present struggle the same tension and excited hope she shared with Lawrence in the fight they put up for the novel in 1928; it was a fight for a future that, in 1954, had not yet come.

By dealing with Alan Collins, Frieda Lawrence Ravagli, and Alfred Knopf, Rosset tried to keep the issue in America. But Pollinger would not be put aside. Pollinger wrote to Rosset on 23 July to argue against a Grove Press edition on the grounds of international copyright: “Of one thing I am absolutely certain, and that is *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is copyright [sic] in all the countries that signed the Berne Convention”. He said that Knopf, Collins, and Frieda opposed the project and that he would have more to say after he’d written to them. Pollinger’s letter to Knopf came to Rosset through William Koshland:

I am definitely against the Grove Press, provided they can go ahead under your Federal anti-pornography restrictions bringing out an edition at this time of the unexpurgated (Orioli) version. Is there no chance of your establishing exclusivity?

Like Knopf, Pollinger knew there was no copyright to deter Grove Press. He did not know, however, that Knopf had seriously slowed Rosset down with his threat of competition and that, as the threat was not made directly, Knopf had rather pointed a finger at him, Pollinger. Koshland wrote to Rosset on 1 October: “It would seem to us in light of what you write that it is time for us to bow out of the picture and leave the matter for resolution between you and Laurence Pollinger”. It was a clever ploy to keep Rosset at bay and simultaneously shift the responsibility.

Rosset went back to Ephraim London, who reaffirmed for the third time in as many months that it did not matter who opposed Grove Press on the grounds of the copyright:

The fact that Pollinger, Collins and Frère are opposed to a Grove Press edition is immaterial, for none has any right in the U.S. to the 3rd version of the work; in fact no one has, for the book is in the public domain.\(^{21}\)

Reassured, Rosset continued his strategy of ignoring the London interests and once more confronted Knopf, to whom he rehearsed his understanding that whatever Pollinger thought on the matter, Alan Collins, Frieda Lawrence Ravagli, and even A. S. Frère favored the project. In America, Knopf was the only objector. Rosset repeated his offer of a compromise and asked for an answer to his letter of 30 August.\(^{22}\) That was on 8 October. By 24 November, Knopf had not answered. Once again, Rosset wrote to Knopf and this time he requested a meeting to find common ground upon which to proceed. He reiterated his compromise: he would turn the matter over to Knopf if Knopf would see the case through court; he would share costs and profits in a joint venture; or he would accept a statement that Knopf would not compete and proceed himself.\(^{23}\) Rosset wrote to Frieda to ask for her support and he asked Schorer to persuade Frieda to write to Knopf. Schorer wrote back: “I don’t know if she will, now that Pollinger has put his foot into the pie”.\(^{24}\) In his letter of 26 November 1954 to Rosset, Knopf again deferred to Pollinger. Refusing to meet with Rosset, he continued his vague threat:

Once you arrive at an understanding with Mr. Pollinger, you will have no further difficulty with us, we will be prepared at that time to stand aside and let you proceed on your own with Lady Chatterley’s Lover as you please.

\(^{22}\) Barney Rosset, Letter to William A. Koshland, 8 October 1954.  
\(^{24}\) Mark Schorer, Letter to Barney Rosset, 27 November 1954.
"No further difficulty" was as near as Rosset would get to a frank admission that Knopf had contemplated publishing a competing edition.

The correspondence to clear the rights to Lady Chatterley's Lover was eight-and-a-half months old with no end in sight when Rosset decided to write, on 1 December 1954, to Laurence Pollinger to re-hearse the matter once more. He stated the facts: the book was out of copyright, as Knopf knew; Frieda Lawrence Ravagli, Alan Collins, and even Frère favored the project; Knopf had “implied that if we go ahead with the court action and win it then they, Knopf, will proceed with the publication of the book”. Since Rosset had been unable to persuade Knopf to clarify his intention, he asked Pollinger for “a definitive statement. . . . At least if we do not go ahead with the book I would like to be able to definitely point to the final and decisive thing which stopped us. Mr. Knopf is not willing to make that statement and now I am afraid the burden is upon you.”

While Rosset waited for Pollinger to respond, Frieda wrote first to Schorer, then to Rosset, and then to Knopf. On 3 December 1954 she wrote to Schorer:

I can't see why Pollinger objects. I can only think that he wants Heinemann to have the prestige of doing an unexpurgated Lady C first, but I am not sure of this. Anyhow I feel it would only help if there is an American edition.

Frieda understood, as did Rosset, that an edition of Lady Chatterley's Lover which had been cleared by the courts would create confusion among the censors, who had for twenty-six years held the book to be obscene. A reversal of that ruling would bring the censors' judgment not only into question but into the limelight, for Lady Chatterley's Lover was the work of an author whose reputation as a major writer was beginning to swell. The book would stand on "literary merit". Lawrence had been certain of that when he wrote it, and certain, too, that the censors would be threatened by it. Lawrence had been as eager to oppose the censors in 1928 as Barney Rosset was in 1954. Angelo Ravagli added a postscript to Frieda's letter. He wanted Schorer to understand that he and Frieda favored the project: "Pollinger is
against but we are for it”.

Pollinger’s opposition remained a mystery.

There is irony in the fact that Knopf, who claimed to be Lawrence’s only authorized American publisher, was effectively blocking Rosset’s edition of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. In 1929 Lawrence had decided that he would have no more to do with Knopf. He wrote to a friend to say: “... I’m going to leave him as soon as I have fulfilled my contract with him”.

When Frieda wrote to Rosset to suggest that she might mediate with Knopf, she acted on two impulses: first, she was eager for an edition of the novel and perhaps for the revenue it would bring and, second, she knew Knopf, who, as Lawrence said, “likes to be important”. Frieda’s proposed solution was a compromise that would both allow Rosset to publish the book, and appeal to Knopf’s interest in prestige. She suggested to Rosset (letter, 4 December) that Knopf publish “an edition de luxe for all time of Lady C. and you [Grove Press] a cheaper one with an introduction of all the Lady C. story”, that is, the Schorer “Introduction”. Frieda sent the same suggestion to Knopf, thus presenting a fourth alternative to his opposition, but the silence continued. On 22 December 1954, Rosset wrote to Frieda to thank her for her suggestion and her efforts. He said he had not heard from Knopf or Pollinger and found their “refusal to take a clear-cut stand very incomprehensible and not terribly admirable”. Still, it was effective. On 28 March 1955 Rosset wrote to Archibald MacLeish to say that Ephraim London had advised him to “shelve the project for the time being”. Fiscal wisdom was on the side of avoiding the double jeopardy of uncertain court action and certain publishing competition.

Rosset had wrestled with the project for a year before he set it aside. *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* sat idle for three-and-a-half years. In the meantime, Frieda Lawrence Ravagli died and Angelo Ravagli sold the

manuscripts of the novel. In 1956 Heinemann published the unexpurgated *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the Netherlands for distribution except in the British Empire or the U.S.A. Grove Press introduced its *Evergreen Review* in 1957 and published Schorer's "Introduction" in the first issue. The French film version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, released in 1957, was promptly banned in New York. Ephraim London took up the case and made his way through the courts until in December 1958 he told Rosset that the Supreme Court would hear the case in January 1959 and that he was confident he would win. A precedent in favor of the title would lift one element of risk from the project. Encouraged, Rosset wrote Schorer on 2 December 1958: "We can proceed with publication, although the situation is still certainly neither settled nor completely clear". The timing, at least, was good: a concentrated effort would have *Lady Chatterley's Lover* on the summer lists for 1959.

Rosset assembled the scholarly edition he had intended to publish in 1954. He added to his testimonials statements from Harry T. Moore, Lawrence's biographer, and Witter Bynner, the poet. Following Ephraim London's suggestion (letter, 29 December 1958) that the MacLeish letter would be "of great help to us", Rosset arranged with MacLeish to use his letter as a preface. MacLeish rewrote it and agreed to change its date from 1954 to 1959. On the jacket, Rosset quoted Edmund Wilson and Jacques Barzun, and he framed the text with Schorer's "Introduction" and "Bibliographical Note". Schorer took responsibility for the text. Again his work uncovered new problems for the scholars, for he tripped on the fact that there was extensive corruption of Lawrence's text in the editions of the novel already in circulation. He sent a Paris edition to New York for the typesetters, and his assistant corrected the galleys against a more recent Stockholm edition in California. When Schorer saw the number of "stets" on the galleys, he consulted Lawrence's original edition, the Orioli edition, and found that both the Paris and Stockholm editions had

strayed from Lawrence's original text. Schorer recorrected the galleys, and when he was through, felt that he had achieved "an accurate verbal text as Lawrence himself sanctioned it". By 31 August 1959, however, a proofreader at Pocket Books, Inc. who was preparing an edition for paperback reprint had discovered omissions in the Grove Press edition. Schorer had corrected the galleys made from the Paris edition against the Orioli edition in those places where there were discrepancies between the Paris and the Stockholm editions. As he did not compare the galleys line by line against the Orioli edition, he left out the lines that were omitted from the Paris and Stockholm editions. Although the text was not "letter perfect", as Schorer had hoped it would be, it reflected Lawrence's text to a greater extent than the editions of that time. Schorer's work also turned up differences between Lawrence's manuscript and his first (Orioli) edition. In the first chapter of the Orioli text, Lawrence describes Constance Chatterley as having a good deal of "unusual" energy, but in the manuscript he had written "unused" energy. Schorer, who had forgotten that note when the text was being prepared, asked Rosset to make the change when the book went into a second edition, but he had touched upon only the tip of the iceberg, so many were the discrepancies between manuscript, typescript, and first edition. Even now, nearly thirty years later, scholars have not settled the question of Lawrence's artistic intentions.

On 19 March 1959 Rosset announced in *The New York Times* his plan to publish *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

There is no reason, literary or legal, that this modern masterpiece should be withheld from the American Public any longer. The book is a beautiful and tender love story with a prominent place in modern English literature.

The announcement set the serious tone for the advertising and legal campaigns that Rosset would make on behalf of the novel and disregarded the view that Lady Chatterley's Lover was a "dirty book". Rosset not only published the novel, he used the power of the media to sell the idea that it was a major work of a major author. While Susman and Sugar, the respected advertising agency, handled the advertising, Rosset contracted with Readers' Subscription, a book club that catered to an educated audience, for distribution. He also distributed the novel through normal channels and reassured nervous booksellers that Grove Press would pay legal fees in the event of local prosecutions.37 By 25 March Rosset was able to report a seven-thousand-copy advance sale.38 The first books came off the press on 27 March, and by 31 March the "Chatterley" jinx had struck again: the first twenty-five thousand jackets had to be scrapped because Schorer's name was misspelled. Rosset said it was one of "the most drastic errors of our entire career".39 The book was given a publication date of 4 May 1959. It went through fourteen printings, one hundred sixty-one thousand copies, between the first order on 17 March and the last on 22 July 1959,40 the day after Judge Bryan cleared the book of obscenity charges. Lady Chatterley's Lover appeared on The New York Times best sellers list from 17 May till 6 September 1959. Rosset had captured the summer market, but Lawrence could not oust Leon Uris (Exodus) from the number one spot.

In spite of, or perhaps because of, the almost certain ban on Lady Chatterley's Lover, the media were eager to notice the Grove Press edition. Most magazines accepted advertising; Newsweek and Time ran stories in their issues of 4 May; The New York Times published Harry T. Moore's review on 3 May. On radio Ben Grauer interviewed Archibald MacLeish about the book and Mike Wallace interviewed Ephraim London about the film litigation.41 There was a general sense of excitement in the media, a sense that the strictures were undergoing a severe test. The legal battle opened in late April when the Deputy

40. Grove Press Lady Chatterley's Lover Production Schedule.
41. Grove Press diary, Items 3 and 5, 30 April 1959. Grove Press kept a diary during the Lady Chatterley's Lover project; the diary records important dates and events in the trial and publication of the novel.
Police Chief of Washington, D.C. inquired about *Lady Chatterley's Lover* at Brentano's bookstore. He asked an attendant to read a passage from the novel over the telephone, and probably compared it
with a copy of the novel that had been confiscated earlier to determine whether Grove Press had actually published the unexpurgated edition. Charles Rembar, who actually handled the Lady Chatterley’s Lover litigation for Grove Press, instructed a Washington law firm, Yohalem and Timberg, to file suit in the District Court to prevent the police from confiscating the novel. This initial action hung fire while the Post Office, on 30 April 1959, took official steps to ban the novel from the mail. Robert K. Christenberry, Postmaster of New York City, ordered twenty-four cartons (one hundred sixty-four copies) of the novel to be detained at the Post Office and on 6 May sent official notice that the book was “nonmailable matter under 18 U.S. Code 1461 . . . in that it is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, and filthy in content and character. The dominant effect of the book appeals to prurient interest.” The notice, which was signed by Herbert B. Warburton, General Counsel to the Post Office, stated the legal precedent the Post Office intended to uphold. Censorship was an emotionally charged issue: both sides of the question were defended with intensity. The censors saw the eroding obscenity laws as necessary protection against corrupting influences; the opponents saw the law as a repressive and unhealthy limitation of the freedom of expression guaranteed by the Constitution.

Rosset complied with the Post Office request that Grove not mail more books until the issue had been settled, and he agreed to a 14 May hearing date, originally scheduled for Washington, but actually held in New York. The Post Office ban was more the statement of a censor than the action of the police, but if it withstood legal argument against it, the ban would suppress the edition. The ban itself did not seriously interrupt the Grove Press distribution. It had already mailed about thirty thousand copies and continued to ship books by truck and to work through wholesalers. For small orders, Grove

45. Fred Jordan, Memo to All Salesmen, 7 May 1959. Dating is suspect; there is no date typed on the memo, but the cited date appears in handwriting as perhaps someone’s guess. Internal evidence suggests a later date.
shipped by railway express and shared the cost with the bookstores.\footnote{46} Rosset spent the money necessary to advertise, distribute, and defend the book, and he kept the issue before the public by cultivating the press. Grove constantly kept fourteen media centers informed about the progress of the case. Stories were carried regularly by the United Press, the Associated Press, The New York Times, Time, Newsweek, and Publishers' Weekly, to name a few.\footnote{47} The press was an eager ally. Their cooperation not only provided one sort of testimony for the court but also kept pressure on the Post Office.

The Post Office is part of the executive branch, but it has legislative and judicial powers: their “legislative powers are exercised when they issue regulations, their judicial powers when they decide how regulations apply to disputed situations”\footnote{48}. A Post Office hearing is conducted in the manner of a trial, and the judicial officer, who presides, acts like a judge. Charles D. Ablard was the judicial officer for the hearing in which Grove Press and Readers' Subscription, whose circulars were confiscated with Grove's books, were asked to present evidence that Lady Chatterley's Lover was not obscene. Saul J. Mindel and J. Carroll Scheuler represented the Post Office; Jay Topkis and Arthur B. Frommer represented Readers' Subscription; and Charles Rembar represented Grove Press. Arthur B. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, who had instigated the proceedings and appointed the judicial officer and the prosecutors, held a “theoretically judicial posture”\footnote{49}, an enviable position.

Simply stated, the Post Office, with due respect for the Ulysses precedent, found that the literary merit of Lady Chatterley's Lover was “outweighed by the obscenity; that the dominant effect of the book, taken as a whole, is one which appeals to prurient interests”\footnote{50}. They objected to Lawrence's use of four-letter words, his realistic portrayal of sexual intercourse, and his choice of sex as a main theme. The Post Office upheld the law according to its reading of the Supreme Court's ruling in the Roth case of 1957, in which the anti-obscenity statutes of New York and California were upheld. The Roth prece-

\footnotesize{46. Grove Press diary, Item 5.  
47. Grove Press diary, Item 2, 6 May 1959.  
49. Ibid., 63.  
50. Ibid., 65.}
dent provided a formula against which the Post Office measured *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and found that "to the average person, applying contemporary community standards", the book was obscene. The book itself was offered as evidence of its own obscenity. Because censorship had become an unpopular label, the Post Office declared that it was not acting as censor, but merely as executor of the standing law, for it had awaited the publication date before taking action and had exercised no prior restraint.

Rosset had chosen to publish *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in order to have a sound whack at the censors. He and Rembar agreed that they did not want simply "to beat the Post Office" by having the book removed from the proscribed list. By establishing its right to publish the book, Grove Press strove to "shrink the scope of anti-obscenity laws". It argued that the book resided within the guarantees of the First Amendment. Rembar opened his argument with a reminder that, in spite of its rhetoric to the contrary, the Post Office was acting as censor. Knowing well that there would be little chance of winning while the matter remained within the jurisdiction of the Post Office, he developed his argument for the record. He offered the testimony of Barney Rosset, Malcolm Cowley, the literary critic and historian, and Alfred Kazin, the distinguished literary historian, critic, and editor. Rembar established that Grove Press was a legitimate publisher who had offered a literary masterpiece to the public in appropriately dignified terms. He produced advertisements to support the contention that Grove was not pandering to an underground market for "dirty books". To demonstrate the reaction of the community, he introduced reviews, editorials, and news stories that hailed the publication of the novel as a major literary event, and he called upon scholars to establish its artistic integrity. Cowley spoke to the "literary and hortative ends toward which Lawrence aimed his novel, and the increasing frankness of current literature". Kazin addressed what Rembar called "a change in the range of tolerance in the general reading public over the past thirty years". Rembar argued that current literature

51. Rembar, 52.
52. Ibid., 64.
53. Ibid., 64.
54. Ibid., 79.
55. Ibid., 96.
dealt more frankly with sex and that readers had grown more tolerant of the subject since the Customs officials had banned the novel in 1928. The reading public had learned to distinguish between the literary treatment of sex and an appeal to prurience. Rosset's concluding testimony suggested that the public had become more discriminating than the laws which govern them:

It occurred to me, and I am sure it occurred to many other publishers, that since the book was written in 1928 the emotional maturity of the American people has undergone a great change. . . . It occurred to me that it would be incomprehensible if this book were published today that the public would be shocked, offended or would raise any outcry against it; but rather they would welcome it as the republishing, the bringing back to life of one of our great masterpieces, and therefore I went ahead and published it. Thus far, all of my anticipated feelings have been rewarded with what I expected to happen as having happened, with the exception of this hearing.56

The hearing took a single day. Ablard refused Rembar's request that the ban be lifted till a decision could be announced. Finally, on 28 May 1959 he announced his decision "that he was not going to make a decision",57 but would refer the case to the Postmaster General. His conviction was apparently on the side of the book, for he cited the longstanding ban as his reason for not wanting to overturn it. He knew the stakes. If he overturned the ban, he would "cast a doubt on the rulings of a coordinate executive department".58 The credibility of the Post Office was in jeopardy. If Summerfield wanted the fort held, he would have to step forward and hold it himself.

To his credit, Summerfield took under two weeks to write his decision. In the meantime, Rosset continued to urge the Post Office to lift the ban till the decision was announced.59 Twice he asked, and when he got no response, he initiated a suit against the Postmaster

56. Rembar, 111.
57. Ibid., 114.
58. Ibid., 114.
59. Ibid., 114.
of New York City, who was holding the books. The suit was filed on 11 June 1959 and the Postmaster General released his decision on the next day. Ignoring Grove's testimony, he found *Lady Chatterley's Lover* obscene according to the standing law:

The book is replete with descriptions in minute detail of sexual acts engaged in or discussed by the book's principal characters. These descriptions utilize filthy, offensive and degrading words and terms. Any literary merit the book may have is far outweighed by the pornographic and smutty passages and words, so that the book, taken as a whole, is an obscene and filthy work.\(^{60}\)

Ablard had refused to say that.

As the suit against the Post Office was already in place, Rosset went back to the press with aggressive and inflammatory rhetoric to condemn the ruling as a most dangerous expression of censorship in that it disregarded professional literary opinion, the opinion of the press, and the guarantees of the First Amendment.\(^{61}\) The press responded in kind, and its editorials and stories provided further testimony of the community standards for Rembar to use in court. The trial was held on 30 June 1959 before Frederick vanPelt Bryan, "a judge who combined intellect with a hard courtroom sense".\(^{62}\) The Post Office was represented by S. Hazard Gillespie, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York. Topkis represented Readers' Subscription, and Rembar as plaintiff argued first. There were no witnesses because the court read the record of the Post Office hearing. Grove Press argued that the novel was not obscene within the statute, and that if it were found to be obscene within the statute, then the statute itself would be invalid because the publication of the book was protected by the Constitution.\(^{63}\) It was a severe leap from censorship to the protection of the First Amendment, but Rembar's brief

\(^{60}\) Rembar, 117.

\(^{61}\) Grove Press, Press Release, 11 June 1959. This release was accompanied by four pages of quotations from articles in the press.

\(^{62}\) Rembar, 117.

had mapped out the footwork: for “no matter what Congress or the State Legislatures had meant to do, the First Amendment necessarily confined their enactments in narrow straits”.64

The Post Office lawyers persisted in their argument that they were not censors, but interpreters and enforcers of a standing obscenity law. Since they were outside their own territory this time, they reminded the court as well that the Post Office had the power to ban books from the mail; for if the publisher could not recognize obscenity, they could. Gillespie read descriptive passages from the novel into the record and insisted that “the excellence of Lawrence’s descriptions make it all the more necessary to ban the book”.65 The theory was that excellent obscenity is the worst kind. Gillespie also tried to chain the court to the Summerfield ruling: “the determination by the Postmaster General is conclusive upon the court unless it is found to be unsupported by substantial evidence and is clearly wrong”.66 He offered the book as sufficiently substantial evidence of obscenity, staking a good deal of his case upon the judicial powers of the Post Office.

From Bryan’s point of view the Post Office was laying claim to territory outside its jurisdiction. His decision redefined Post Office powers, which did not include “discretion” in obscenity cases.67 The Post Office had the power to enforce a ban judicated by the court, but it did not have the autonomy to set up as a national censor: “The Postmaster General has no special competence or technical knowledge on this subject which qualifies him to render an informed judgment entitled to special weight in the courts”.68 Bryan dismissed the Post Office ruling and said he would consider the question “whether Lady Chatterley’s Lover is obscene within the meaning of the statute and thus excludable from constitutional protection”.69

64. Rembar, 118.
65. Rembar, 139. Prior rulings (the Ulysses decision, for instance) enjoined the court to read a work in its entirety and not to be influenced by passages taken out of context; Gillespie must have known that he was violating that precedent when he read individual passages from the novel into the record, but it was one sort of legal tactic that did not slip past Bryan as it might have slipped past and influenced a jury. Bryan reprimanded the tactic in his decision and restated the ruling, p. 123.
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Bryan decided the case on the merit of the evidence. He cited the dignified marketing procedures, the scholarly text, and the reaction of the press. The critics disagreed about the book's excellence, but Bryan found that they all agreed it was a major work of a major author. The editorials in the press were unanimous in "approving publication and viewing with alarm possible attempts to ban the book".70 Bryan considered the question of obscenity in light of the Roth and Ulysses precedents. The Roth case spoke to general concerns and the Ulysses case to a single work. The Roth decision enjoined that a work is obscene if "to the average person applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest".71 The Ulysses case established that a work of literature is not obscene simply because "it contains passages and language dealing with sex in a most candid and realistic fashion with honesty and seriousness of purpose".72 Judge Bryan concluded that a literary treatment of sex is not in itself obscene and that pornography, which is only one sort of sexual writing, does not determine the genre. He also made an impact upon the language of the Roth case by revising the interpretation of "average person" and "community standards". The average person, he said, was one who would not distort the impact of sexual writing:

It is not the effect upon the irresponsible, the immature, or the sensually minded which is controlling. The material must be judged in terms of its effect on those it is likely to reach who are conceived of as the average man of normal sensual impulses.73

Bryan further loosened the ties of the obscenity law by giving credence to the attitudes of the press, which had reflected those changes in the reading public described by Kazin and Cowley. "The material", he said, "must also exceed the limits of tolerance imposed by current standards of the community with respect to freedom of

70. Bryan, 121.
71. Ibid., 122.
72. Ibid., 122.
73. Ibid., 123.
expression on matters concerning sex and sex relations.”74 This was an early statement that linked the idea of “freedom of expression” with the subject of “sex and sex relations”. Bryan’s reading of the precedents led him to conclude that Lady Chatterley’s Lover was not an obscene work and was therefore protected by the First Amendment. The Post Office had to deliver the books.

Rosset hailed the decision as “an overwhelming victory”.75 Grove got all it asked for from the court. They had taken a good deal of power from the censors and established the right of “serious publishers to issue books without threats of confiscation and prosecution”.76 The Post Office had lost too much. They took its case to the Court of Appeals on 2 December 1959 and lost again on 25 March 1960. The Bryan decision stood and became a landmark precedent that put freedom of expression under the First Amendment into the process of deciding future obscenity cases.

Press coverage of the obscenity proceedings, combined with Grove’s advertising campaign, created a brisk demand for the book. Rosset had succeeded in removing the legal risk from the project, but his own legal hold on the rights was tenuous. Though he had the permission of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli and the support of Alan Collins, he did not have a copyright and he did not have a contract with the Lawrence estate. In short, his edition lacked “authorization”. In early April 1959 Rosset reopened negotiations with Alan Collins. He sent him a contract, dated 17 April 1959, which Collins forwarded to Pollinger. Pollinger turned it down and sent his own impossible contract for Rosser’s signature. In the meantime, and at the suggestion of Collins, Rosset sent to Curtis Brown Agency a first royalty check, which Collins held as a token of good faith.77 Nevertheless, Pollinger continued to oppose Grove Press. He charged Harry T. Moore with disloyalty for having reviewed the Grove Press edition in the Times,78 but remained reluctant to deal directly with Rosset. Why Pollinger objected to Grove Press remains a mystery. His terms were very steep, and he did not seem to care that the longer he waited to come to

74. Bryan, 123.
reasonable terms with Rosset, the less Rosset needed his authorization. When it became apparent to Rosset that Pollinger was intractable, he wrote directly to Lawrence's heirs, C. M. Weekley, Barbara Barr, and Angelo Ravagli. They responded by unifying behind Pollinger. However, Rosset had made enough trouble that Pollinger agreed to a meeting in exchange for Rosset's agreement not to write to the heirs again. The meeting was held in early October 1959 in London. On 7 October Pollinger wrote a confirming letter, outlining terms that were still unacceptable to Rosset. By that time, though, Pollinger's authorization was no longer worth the trouble it was taking to get: the book had been cleared of obscenity charges and the competition was in the market. Rosset wrote to the heirs again and outlined his own terms. He showed where the royalties would suffer from the legal expenses and arrived at a payment of $47,200, which Pollinger refused to accept. Rosset withdrew the offer. In February 1961 Collins advised Rosset that Pollinger had asked for the royalty check which he had been holding since June 1959. Pollinger instructed Collins to say that "the processing of this check is in no way to be taken by you as a full payment of the royalties due the Lawrence estate on the publication of this title". In light of the treatment he had received, Rosset wrote Collins on 7 July, "I don't see that we have any further obligation". Collins had the best line in the scenario when he said early on: "What a sad business".

Until Bryan's decision was released on 21 July 1959, Grove Press had enjoyed an exclusive position in the market. They had sold 110,000 copies of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and the book was holding second place on the *Times* best sellers list. It held that position until 6 September and then began a steady decline, appearing for the last time in the last position on 15 November. The sale of the book had not slowed by that time, but competition from pirate paperback editions took the market from the hardcover. The first difficulty came from the New American Library, which had been licensed in 1946

---

by Knopf to publish his expurgated edition in paperback. NAL began an advertising campaign that claimed legitimacy for its edition through its contract with Pollinger and Knopf. They sold the expurgated edition on the coattails of the Grove edition and captured some part of the market Grove had created. It was then that Knopf’s sense of fair play came to the fore. He clarified the ambiguous claims NAL was making with a statement that he had licensed only the expurgated edition and had no claim to the unexpurgated edition.84 Pollinger, in the meantime, had made a separate agreement with NAL for the paperback rights to the unexpurgated edition.85 When Bryan’s decision cleared the book, NAL had an edition ready for the market; but Knopf was not a party to that negotiation. He withdrew his support from Pollinger and NAL.

The second competitor was Pocket Books, Inc. Rosset had begun negotiations for reprint rights with representatives of Pocket Books in May 1959, but the discussion had lapsed until July, when the tide was running toward a favorable legal decision. Pocket Books again opened the question of reprint rights and offered a contract that appeared to be agreeable to both parties. The written contract, however, differed substantially from the oral agreement, with the result that Rosset did not sign. He terminated negotiations with Pocket Books, Inc. and signed an agreement with Dell Publishing for a paperback reprint. Pocket Books, which had been developing its own edition, simply entered the paperback market without a royalty agreement with Grove Press.86

Grove’s edition of Lady Chatterley’s Lover brought out both the worst and the best in the publishing business. There were companies like Dell, Random House, and Knopf, which respected Rosset’s efforts and felt that Grove Press had earned the rights to the book. Dell distributed the paperback and Random House contracted for an edition in the Modern Library series. Alfred Knopf, who had originally opposed the Grove Press edition, claimed no right beyond the expurgated edition that he had published in 1932.87 There were those, however,

87. See Note 84.
who would not miss an opportunity. *Publishers' Weekly* (17 August 1959, p.28) lamented that “the public image of the whole book trade has been cheapened by the ‘Chatterley’ sweepstakes”. By 10 September 1959 Fred Jordan of Grove Press counted five paperback editions in the market,88 while Grove had a royalty agreement with only one, Dell. By the end of the year, there were 1,750,000 copies of the Grove paperback in print and 161,000 copies of the hardcover.89 To dispose of the unsold hardcovers, Grove ran a Christmas special: one free with ten.90 Rosset had cleared the book with the censors, but he could not contain the pirates any better than Lawrence had.

The Grove Press edition of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is one of the major publishing events of the century: it is as important to Lawrence’s canon and reputation as it is to the publishing industry and society. In 1926, when Adele Seltzer, wife of the publisher, asked Lawrence for a bestseller, he had winced at her unrealistic demand: “Why does anybody look to me for a best seller? I’m not that sort of bird.”91 Ironically, he was writing *Lady Chatterley's Lover* at the time. The Grove Press edition fulfilled Lawrence’s potential to be a popular author, and it opened floodgates that put the book into the hands “of the masses”, an ambition Lawrence had confided to Rhys Davies in 1929.92 Rosset, London, and Schorer were confident that the book would sell. Pollinger was probably a difficult negotiator because he felt that it was a very valuable property, although in the 1950s no one suspected that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* would support the many editions that appeared in the 1960s and after.93 The scholarly aspect of the Grove edition gave direction to students of Lawrence, who have reassessed the value of the novel, studied the three versions, and begun to study the corruptions in the text. Rosset’s defense of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* successfully concluded the battle with the

censors that Lawrence originally inspired—in a sense, the last major work of his life. Judge Bryan's decision that the novel is not obscene made a change in the way that society and the courts came to view sexually explicit writing and sexual writing in general. It led to more natural attitudes about matters which had previously inspired anxiety in readers, authors, and publishers alike. Finally, the Grove Press edition of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* had the important effect of forcing the censors to honor the First Amendment, and thus, of clearing the way for works like *The Tropic of Cancer*, which Rosset published next.
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Benson Lossing:
His Life and Work, 1830-1860

BY DIANE M. CASEY

Benson J. Lossing's interest in reaching a popular rather than an elite audience, his journalistic style, and the changing methods of historical research, which began to develop at the end of the nineteenth century, have all led to the current opinion of him—that he was a popularizer of history, and not a historian. However, an examination of his long and varied career suggests that his work deserves consideration in the study of antebellum American life.

Lossing was born on February 12, 1813, in Beekman, New York. His father, John, who died while Lossing was still an infant, was a farmer. Lossing's mother, Miriam, died when he was twelve. Not much is known of these difficult early years except that Lossing received very little formal education. At the age of fourteen, he was apprenticed to a watchmaker in Poughkeepsie, New York, where he spent the next seven years learning his trade by day and studying independently at night.

In 1833 Lossing married Alice Barritt. Two years later, at the age of twenty-two, he abandoned watchmaking to become the editor and joint proprietor of the Poughkeepsie Telegraph. In 1836 he became involved with the Poughkeepsie Casket, a literary journal. It was while serving as editor of this journal that Lossing learned wood engraving, an art form which he would master and use extensively during his early career.

During the 1840s illustrations became increasingly important in

1. Dictionary of American Biography. Alice Lossing died in 1855. In a letter to a friend who had just lost a relative, Lossing confided that his wife was dying of uterine cancer: Lossing to Dr. Francis, Poughkeepsie, New York, February 2, 1855, Benson Lossing Collection, George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University. Lossing was married for the second time on November 18, 1856 to Helen Sweet. By 1872, he had two sons and two daughters. See John T. Cunningham, "Historians on the Double", American Heritage, 19 (June 1968): 80.
periodicals. The customary method of production for these 'embellishments' was engraving, usually on steel and copper, although wood was also being used. Lossing, with his newly acquired skill, was taken on by the Family Magazine, the first fully illustrated periodical in the United States. He worked there, both as editor and illustrator, from 1839 to 1841. From his active involvement during this early period of experimentation, Lossing learned the effectiveness of illustrations in conveying and reinforcing ideas, the possibilities of wide, inexpensive distribution of knowledge, and the need for educating the general public. He described the importance of engraving in his Outline History of the Fine Arts:

The value of engraving as it at present exists, and especially that department which is so intimately connected with printing, cannot be appreciated. It may justly be called the great disseminator of information, for it impresses facts upon the memory in a manner more lasting than can possibly be done by letter press description. The record of the historian and the song of the poet, the theory and truth of the philosopher, and the delineations of the biographer, may all be laid before the child or the adult; but without the engraver's art, his notions of all that they have severally described, are vague and inconclusive. It is to the graphic art that the poor man owes his knowledge of the form of things abroad, whither his circumstances will not permit him to go; and it operates as a mighty lever in raising the mass to an elevated standard of general knowledge, unattainable, by any other power.2

In the early years of the nineteenth century, magazines and newspapers proliferated in response to the market, and Lossing took full advantage of the opportunities the situation offered. As a result of his growing reputation through his work with the Family Magazine,

2. Benson Lossing, Outline History of the Fine Arts (New York: Harper, 1843; first published 1840), 302-3. In addition to this book and the others by Lossing cited in this article, the George Arents Research Library holds a Benson Lossing collection that includes incoming and outgoing letters, legal documents, several sketches and manuscripts, and copies of material held by Vassar College. The George W. Childs collection in the Arents Library also contains letters concerning Lossing's work. The major collection of Lossing materials is held by the Henry E. Huntington Library.
Lossing was able to start his own business in 1843. He joined in partnership with William Barritt (probably a relative by marriage) to form the firm of Lossing and Barritt, which would become the largest wood-engraving establishment in New York City. By the age of thirty, with little formal education and limited financial resources, Lossing had become a successful businessman. He now turned his attention to gaining recognition, not only as an artist, but even more importantly in view of his overall career, as a writer of history.

One should examine Lossing’s success bearing two things in mind: first, the status of art in early nineteenth-century society; and second, Lossing’s own approach to the use of illustration. The antebellum period was a period of transition for artists in America. At the beginning of the century resistance to the fine arts had been very strong and so deep-rooted that it would continue to be an important element of American thinking throughout the period. Neil Harris explains in *The Artist in American Society* that “as luxury was the deadly corruption which could poison national virtue, and as the fine arts—foreign, expensive, aristocratic, superfluous—epitomized such luxury, many patriot hearts were sealed against their American existence”.3

But there were those who saw value in the fine arts and contended that they could be useful in creating a national image. This utilitarian approach suited the mood of the period. Gradually, the arts began to gain a measure of acceptance, as the government employed architects to design national buildings, sculptors to create statues of national figures, and painters to produce portraits and scenes of America. Lossing, an early supporter of the use of art in creating a national identity, argued that to create a ‘popular taste’ favorable to the arts, it was “necessary by facts to produce a conviction that to the Fine Arts all civilized nations are greatly indebted for their advancement in political and social greatness”.4

Lossing was also a firm believer and active participant in the use of art to instruct and control. As early as 1840 he had observed:

> The cultivation of the Fine Arts, and a general dissemination of a taste for such liberal pursuits, are of the highest im-

portance in a national point of view, for they have a pow-

erful tendency to elevate the standard of intellect, and

consequently morals, and form one of those mighty levers

which raise nations as well as individuals to the highest point

in the scale of civilization. 5

An examination of Lossing's early work as an engraver
demonstrates his use of art not only to project generally held nationalistic

ideals but also to propagandize. In 1845 Lossing was hired by Edward

Walker, a New York publisher, to provide the engravings for the

Reverend John Dowling's The History of Romanism, an example of

the anti-Catholic literature that was prevalent in the nativist move-

ment of the 1840s and 1850s. Nativism, which was an expression of

the anxiety Americans suffered as they sought to identify their diverse

origins with a single national image, had intensified during the large

flux of Catholic immigration (beginning around 1820) with its en-
suing economic problems. As emotions ran high, the traditional dis-

trust of Catholicism was exacerbated. Catholics were seen as a threat
to American security, not only as foreigners but as people owing al-

legiance to a foreign ruler, the Pope.

Book publishers naturally sought works to appeal to the public's
interest in and fears about Catholicism. The History of Romanism was
one such book. In his preface, Dowling stated that the work was an
attempt to present a comprehensive view "on the subjects of contro-

versy between protestants and papists". Also, he noted that the en-

gravings "are not mere fancy sketches for the sake of embellishment,

but are illustrative of unquestionable facts, and intended to impress

those facts more vividly upon the memory". 6 They were, indeed, to

be considered an integral part of the book. Lossing, working in New

York City where nativist sentiment was extremely strong, must have

realized the potential popularity of such a book. Whether he agreed

with the sentiments of the book is not known; certainly he must have

recognized the opportunity to further his career.

The added engraved title page is a vivid example of art as propa-
ganda (fig.1). The images are not original and the symbolism would

5. Lossing, Outline History, Preface.

Fig. 1. Added engraved title page, John Dowling’s *The History of Romanism*. 
have been clear to most nineteenth-century readers; nevertheless, a detailed description was provided for this 'emblematical title page'. The purpose of the engraving was to lend force to Dowling's exposition of the "true" nature of Popery. Two 'enlightened' monks "are lifting up the curtain to exhibit to the world a genuine picture of the Romish Anti-Christ". The Pope is shown "trampling under foot the Bible". "Thus has Popery ever set her own decrees above the inspired word of God, and enforced obedience to those decrees, wherever she possessed the power, at the point of the sword." The threat of Catholicism was made clear from the outset by the effective use of both images and text.

The publication of *The History of Romanism* had two important results for Benson Lossing's career. First, his use of illustrations correlated to the text became a technique that he would continue to employ very effectively. Secondly, the success of this book prompted Edward Walker to publish Lossing's first book on American history. Walker noted that:

> Having experienced the skill of Mr. Lossing . . . in the illustration of Dowling's *History of Romanism* . . . and having full confidence in his ability as a writer, I have entrusted to him both the authorship of this volume and its pictorial embellishment.\(^8\)

With the publication of *Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, or the War of Independence*, Lossing became a writer of history as well as an engraver and businessman.

However, illustrations would remain an integral part of Lossing's work. He wanted to impress "facts upon the memory". Therefore, most of his engravings were of a realistic rather than symbolic nature. In his own books, he made use of illustrations to interpret historical events and to reinforce patriotic ideals. For example, in *Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six*, Lossing described the capture of Major John André, the Adjutant-General of the British Army during the

---

8. Benson Lossing, *Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, or the War of Independence; A History of the Anglo-Americans* (New York: Edward Walker, 1848), "Publisher's Notice".
Revolution. André had conspired with Benedict Arnold in a plot which would have allowed the British to seize the patriots' fort at West Point. Lossing wrote:

André was paralyzed for a moment with astonishment, and offered them his horse, his purse, his watch, and large rewards from the British government, if they would let him go. But their stern patriotism was inflexible, and he was carried before Colonel Jameison.9

To illustrate his text Lossing executed an engraving entitled “Capture of André” (fig.2), in which André is shown offering his watch to a patriot, who has just discovered, concealed in André's boot, papers which disclose the conspiracy. André's dismay is made obvious. Lossing's illustration emphasizes the grandeur of the landscape and at the same time suggests how isolated the area was where the incident occurred. In this way, he underlined the loyalty and incorruptibility of the patriots, who could have easily succumbed to bribery and treachery. The engraving not only depicts a historic event but instructs the reader in how patriotic Americans were not corrupted by freedom.

Another important aspect of Lossing's work as an engraver was his desire to record scenes and objects of the past which he felt were disappearing and would, therefore, be lost to future generations of Americans. While recording the past, he also frequently provided a picture of his own time; for, in the interest of presenting accurately what he observed, he often included information about himself and conditions in his own day. This feature of his work is evident in his best-known book, The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution, where, for example, in illustrating Milford Hill, site of a skirmish between the colonists and British soldiers in Connecticut, he shows the reader how it appeared on the day he was there (fig.3). Rain is falling and the artist is shown working diligently under an umbrella. This engraving reveals more about Lossing and his work methods in the nineteenth century than about the Revolution.

In The Pictorial Field-Book Lossing also included two engravings of “the old Raleigh tavern at Williamsburg”, where in the Apollo Room

9. Lossing, Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, 320.
Fig. 2. The capture of Major John André, the Adjutant-General of the British Army during the American Revolution, by a group of patriots.
“the leading patriots of Virginia, including Washington, held many secret caucuses and planned many schemes for the overthrow of royal rule in the colonies” (figs. 4 and 5). When Lossing arrived at the tavern, workmen were preparing to remodel the Apollo Room. He noted: “Had my visit been deferred a day longer, the style of the room could never have been portrayed”. For Lossing that would have been a tragedy. “The sound of the hammer and saw engaged in the work of change seemed to me like actual desecration.” He recorded the room as he found it but also included the workmen’s tools which were soon to destroy it.

Benson Lossing’s work as an engraver is significant for several reasons. First, as an early proponent and practitioner of the use of the fine arts to foster American nationalism, Lossing exemplifies the role of the artist in antebellum America. Second, the fact that he was interested in reaching and educating the general population provides a significant insight into the popular culture of the period. Third, his method of going out into the country and sketching the scenes of American history as they appeared in the nineteenth century makes his work as an engraver and artist particularly valuable. And finally, it is instructive to take notice of what he considered important enough to portray for posterity, for a study of his selected subject matter reveals much about the values that were considered important in the nineteenth century and that have since become closely associated with the American identity.

As important as Lossing’s talent as an engraver was to his initial success, his own ambition was to be a writer, not just an illustrator, of historical works. In the Preface to Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, Lossing clearly stated his purpose in writing yet another book about the Revolution. His explanation is interesting for what it reveals about his confidence in his ability as a historian and his attitude about the writing of history. It also suggests that a certain elitism was growing in the field of historical research.

We feel conscious of the apparent presumption for one “unknown to fame” to enter the lists with those historians of the Revolution . . . but none can be so great that “one cubit to his stature” may not be added.10

10. Lossing, Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, Preface.
Fig. 3. Lossing at work sketching Milford Hill, the site of a skirmish during the American Revolution.

Lossing felt, even after studying these other works, that he still had something valuable to contribute.

The desire, stated emphatically in 1848, to create a useful work and one that would be of interest to the general public and especially

Fig. 4. Exterior view of the Raleigh Tavern at Williamsburg.
to the youth continued to guide Lossing throughout his career. In both his art and his writing, Lossing sought to convey the lessons, as well as the events, of history and in doing so to excite patriotic sentiments in his readers. Essentially a self-educated man, he saw education as a crucial tool in developing national pride, and historians as 'national teachers'. His deep concern that the lessons of the Revolution not be forgotten was vividly revealed when he wrote:

Shall this rich inheritance be long perpetuated, and how? The answer is at hand. *Educate every child—educate every emigrant,* for 'education is the cheap defense of nations.' Educate all, physically, intellectually and morally. Instruct, not only the *head*, but the *heart*; enlighten the mind, and, by cultivation, enlarge and multiply the affections. Above all, let our youth be instructed in all that appertains to the vital principles of our Republic.\(^{11}\)

Until his death in 1891 Lossing worked untiringly to educate the common man through his books and articles. His days were spent, not in political activities or reform movements, but in spreading his view of what it meant to be an American. Throughout his long ca-

---

reer, in which he published more than forty books and hundreds of articles, the Revolution would remain in his view the central event in America's history.

In 1848 Lossing conceived the idea for what was to be perhaps his best and most popular work, The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution. His idea for this volume was triggered by a chance meeting with General Ebenezer Mead in Connecticut. Reminded, as they spoke, that Mead had been an eye-witness to the events of the Revolution, Lossing reasoned that other participants must also be alive. Here, then, was a way to make history more interesting and instructive: he would gather his materials by traveling to all the important sites of the Revolution, sketching, collecting information, and talking to eye-witnesses. He did this, and the result was a great success. Lossing's technique of presenting history "as a record of the pilgrimage" he had made among "scenes and things hallowed to the feelings of every American", rather than a chronological account, appealed to the public. His more than one thousand engravings based on sketches done in the field heightened interest in the book. Although Lossing's work was warmly welcomed by the public and amateur historians, it was criticized by the small, emerging group of professional historians. These academic historians found Lossing's journalistic method too personal and informal to be appropriate for serious historical research.

Lossing's books were meant to be didactic as well as informative. Like other men of the period, he assumed there was a basic set of values that were American. As the historian, Rush Welter, points out, "Americans typically believed that the lessons of their nation's history might be summed up in 'Americanism'.'

While the ideas of liberty, progress, mission, and virtue were all a part of this Americanism, writers like Lossing were actually creating, not describing, the image of a national American identity. Hence, there is a subtle paradox in the work of Lossing and others like him, who believed they were describing a discernible national character. In the new, expanding nation, made up of diverse peoples with different and often contradictory interests, values, and goals, such a national identity did not in fact exist. But through the work of Lossing and others the

image of a national identity, as they believed it should be, began to emerge. In describing ‘American’ values and goals, they put before the general public a set of concepts which eventually did contribute to a sense of national unity.

This transition was going on at two levels in this period, as an ‘elitist’ and a ‘popular’ culture both began to be evident. The ‘elitist’ cultural group identified with Europe and European values and sought to modify European institutions to American needs. The ‘popular’ cultural group was identified with the common man who sought through politics, and economic and social mobility, to create a new democratic society that would be distinctly American. Lossing’s work served to bridge these differences, because, while aimed at the general populace and stressing democratic goals, his use of art and history, even as vehicles of his message, was highly acceptable to ‘elite’ cultural attitudes. Lossing’s books had a large readership—a fact that assisted him in spreading his message of national unity. His main objective, however, was always in reaching two specific groups which cut across these cultural differences: youths and immigrants.

Lossing’s concern with both groups was that they be educated, especially educated to be good American citizens. Generally, interest in education was widespread in the antebellum period, as evidenced in the public school movement and the popularity of the lyceum associations. Perhaps because he was himself self-educated, Lossing was particularly concerned with the type and quality of material available to young people. He shared a common anxiety that the younger generation, removed from the experience of the struggle for independence, would misuse its freedom. Lossing’s outlook reflected a prevalent belief that freedom without restraints was potentially dangerous to the individual and, ultimately, to the country.

The proliferation, in this period, of inexpensive reading materials, especially of novels, appeared to Lossing to be corrupting the minds of the young and turning them away from serious pursuits. Lossing addressed these issues in his Preface to The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution. Hoping his work would help counteract these negative influences, he wrote:

The exciting literature of the day, ranging in its intoxicating character from the gross pictures of sensual life drawn by the French writers of fiction, to the more refined, but not less
intoxicating works of popular and esteemed novelists, so cheaply published and so widely diffused, has produced a degree of mental dissipation throughout our land, destructive, in its tendency, to sober and rational desires for imbibing useful knowledge. Among the young, where this dissipation is most rife, and deleterious in its effects, it seemed most desirable to have the story of our Revolution known and its salutary teachings pondered and improved, for they will be the custodians of our free institutions when the active men of the present generations shall step aside into the quiet shadows of old age. 13

Lossing also sought to reach the ‘humble’—the ‘humble’ being the common man in general, but in particular the newcomer to this country. In his first historical work, Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, Lossing explained that he desired to present “a volume of intrinsic value at a cost so moderate, that the head of every family in the land may afford to spread its contents before his children”. 14

By 1850 the great influx of immigrants was generating a major political issue. It was clear that they might, as voters, exert tremendous power. To many Americans, including Lossing, this possibility added an urgency to the need to educate these newcomers in American values. Lossing’s awareness of this need was clear when he wrote:

It is the mission of true patriotism to scatter the seeds of knowledge broad-cast amid those in the humbler walks of society . . . for these humbler ones are equal inheritors of the throne of the people’s sovereignty, and no less powerful than others at the ballot-box where the nation decides who its rulers shall be. 15

Lossing, both as historian and artist, sought to have his work serve a useful purpose. To him the reading of history was not a luxury but

14. Lossing, Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Six, x.
a necessity. It was not a subject only for the educated elite, but one of which every man, however humble, must be aware if he was to become a good citizen and true patriot. With this egalitarian approach, Lossing reached a wide audience in the nineteenth century.

Carl Becker, the historian, wrote: "Whether arguments command assent or not depends less upon the logic that conveys them than upon the climate of opinion in which they are sustained." When the climate of opinion changed in the twentieth century, Benson Lossing's patriotic, didactic approach to history no longer seemed relevant. Discounted by professional historians from the outset, and now out-of-style and antiquated, Lossing's monumental achievements have been allowed to slip into obscurity. But it is interesting to note that in the late 1960s and early 1970s, with the Bicentennial approaching, a number of Lossing's works, including *The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution*, were reprinted. Suddenly, his themes and ideas seemed appropriate and useful again. His engravings provided detailed, precise visual records of hundreds of events, places, people, and things connected with the struggle for independence. Lossing's willingness to travel thousands of miles in order to record all that he could of a fading past resulted in an important and valuable record of the early years of the American Republic.

As in his own day, Lossing found a twentieth-century following among those who sought a utilitarian application of historical knowledge. Perhaps, however, it is time to reconsider the work of Benson Lossing not as a historical study of the Revolutionary period but as a means of understanding the antebellum period and the development of American nationalism in that period. For, ironically, the lasting value of Lossing's work may well lie in the image he presented of his own life and times.

RECENT ACQUISITIONS

The George Arents Research Library has recently received two collections of note: the Jackie Martin Papers and the Dewitt I. Mackenzie Papers. Both Miss Martin and Mr. Mackenzie were former Syracuse University students.

Cecilia B. ("Jackie") Martin, who died in 1969, was the first woman photographic and art director of a United States metropolitan newspaper, the Times-Herald in Washington, D.C., where she was employed before World War II. She was also the first woman member of the White House News Photographers Association. In 1936, Miss Martin was elected to the Royal Photographic Society of England. During the war she was a correspondent in France and Italy. She received the War Department Certificate of Merit and Theater Ribbon in 1946, and numerous professional awards and medals from foreign governments throughout her career. She was chief of the nineteen-country photo operation of the Marshall Plan in Europe and planned and organized for the United States Information Agency the worldwide distribution of Edward Steichen's "Family of Man" photographic exhibit. Perhaps best known among the books for which she provided illustrations is Washington, City of Destiny, with its photographs of the White House interior and household scenes of the Roosevelt and Truman families. The collection of her papers, donated by her sister, Lillian Clements, includes photographic prints and negatives, correspondence, scrapbooks, clippings, and other materials documenting her life and work.

DeWitt I. Mackenzie (S.U. Class of 1907) was not only an author of several publications dealing with the politics of war, but also one-time chief of the London Bureau of the Associated Press and later, during World War I, chief of foreign service, war analyst, and correspondent in Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America. Attached
to British General Headquarters, Mackenzie was the first foreign war correspondent to be allowed into Egypt. He was present at the peace conference and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. His papers, donated to the library by his daughter, Marjorie Mackenzie Heimer, include correspondence, photographs, World War I dispatches from the front lines, telegrams and columns from 1930-51, unpublished memoirs, manuscripts, and memorabilia.

Amy S. Doherty
University Archivist

POST-STANDARD AWARD CITATION, 1985,
FOR ANTJE LEMKE

Antje Bultmann Lemke, we salute you. You are a scholar of wide-ranging interests, who is on intimate terms with people like the Brothers Grimm, Aldus Manutius, Albert Schweitzer, William Caxton, Francis Bacon, and other immortals of the ages.

Your lectures on creativity, teaching in a high-tech world, ethics in decision making, and the role of the Church in Nazi Germany demonstrate your ability to integrate scientific knowledge with a humanist's concern for every man. Your writings are internationally known. You are sought as a speaker, scholar, and consultant around the world.

As a teacher you are one of the truly great. You have a special talent for inspiring students, strengthening their self-confidence, encouraging them to accept responsibility and to achieve at new levels of excellence. Alumni are loud in their testimony to the lasting effects of your teaching on their lives.

You have enriched the Syracuse community through your support of the arts and of libraries. A fine musician yourself, once active in the Syracuse Symphony Orchestra, you have nurtured its growth and that of the Syracuse Friends of Chamber Music through your personal contributions. During your tenure as Fine Arts Librarian you enhanced and refined the Syracuse University music holdings to preeminent standards. You have served unstintingly on the boards of the Onondaga County Public Library, the Everson Museum of Art, and the Syracuse University Library Associates, where your energy and foresight as chairman of the Publications Committee conjured into being a remodeled and more substantive journal, the Syracuse
University Library Associates Courier. Your good offices in behalf of the University have brought to Syracuse such outstanding acquisitions as a major group of the Albert Schweitzer papers, the Clara Sipprell collection, and the Rudolf Bultmann papers.

Perhaps some of your best efforts have gone unrewarded and unsung. You seem to view your life as an instrument for causing good things to happen. The late Julian Friedman’s important international human rights bibliography is one of many projects where you played a catalytic and important role.

It is right and fitting that the 1985 Post-Standard Award for Distinguished Service to the Syracuse University Libraries should be conferred upon you, Antje Lemke, who speaks to us as one of the wise women of the world.

PRESERVATION AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

The New York State Department of Education has awarded Syracuse University Libraries a substantial grant ($450,000 extending over five years) with which to develop a preservation program for the maintenance and preservation of our collections—not only our rare and unique materials, but our large general collection as well.

The problems which will be addressed by the Preservation Grant funds are varied and numerous. Environmental conditions offer perhaps the major challenge, for the humidity and temperature levels within all of the Libraries must be monitored with great care, since books, microfilm, and other library materials respond to fluctuations of only five to ten percent in temperature and humidity by cracking, flaking, and crumbling. Equipment has been purchased to monitor the internal environment of the Libraries. We now have two recording hygrothermographs which record humidity and temperature levels on a weekly basis. We have also acquired a number of sling psychrometers for measuring relative humidity, as well as some maximum/minimum thermometers. The findings resulting from these instruments will help identify specific problem areas within the Libraries.

Equipment has now been purchased to remedy various other preservation problems. Microfilm stored in wooden library cases presents an immediate problem, as acid from wood migrates into stored ma-
material with deleterious effects. For this reason metal microfilm cases have been ordered. To relieve the overcrowding of the map cases, which currently hold our very valuable collection of maps, we are purchasing more map and plan file cases. We have, in addition, acquired two record-cleaning machines for the Belfer Audio Archive’s collection of unique and valuable recordings. Our extensive microfilm collection will be refurbished by a newly purchased microfilm-cleaning machine.

Besides cleaning and adequately housing our collections, the Preservation Program will fund microfilming projects that will provide a safe and usable alternative medium for a number of research collections. Collections currently scheduled for preservation microfilming include all manuscripts from the von Ranke Library, the Daily Orange beginning with the 1926 edition, the Syracuse University Board of Trustees’ minutes beginning in 1870, and The Bugle, a local Depression-era newspaper. The importance of preservation microfilming has been recognized by Library Associates, and as a result of their special funding the manuscripts of the Oneida Community have already been microfilmed. By providing a microfilm edition of a valuable collection, original material can both be preserved and made available to scholars outside the Syracuse area.

On a more mundane level, the Preservation Program will oversee and fund a massive cleaning program throughout the general library collections. As shelves are cleaned, books which need repair, rebinding, or reconsideration for rare book status can be culled and taken care of.

The Preservation Program will also begin a patron education program intended to ‘raise the consciousness’ of library users. Posters, bookbags, and acid-free book marks will be used to convey the message that books are objects needing special care and handling if they are to survive for future generations to enjoy.

The Preservation Program is off to a hopeful beginning. We look forward to having an impact that will last beyond the grant period and become an essential part of the Syracuse University Libraries’ daily work.

Suzanne Etherington
Preservation Coordinator
IN MEMORIAM

MRS. RAMONA B. BOWDEN, a long-standing and enthusiastic member of Library Associates, died on December 30, 1984. Former actress, teacher, and feminist, she was religion editor of the Syracuse Post-Standard for the last thirty years. In 1968 she received the Post-Standard Woman of Achievement Award for fostering "community understanding in the true ecumenical spirit", and for her outstanding teaching. In her last years it gave her special pleasure that she was the only American reporter who had reviewed the Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Ontario from its modest beginning in a tent in 1955 to its current standing as a prominent international theatre. Her knowledge of the theatre and her love of language permeated her life and were enjoyed by friends and readers.

Contributions in her memory may be made to Syracuse University Library Associates.

As she did with a host of worthwhile activities MRS. RHEA ECKEL CLARK gave her loyalty, ideas, and support to Syracuse University Library Associates. Rhea was a wonderful member of the Associates, for she was a lover of books, knew the community as perhaps no one else could, and thought that intractable problems can be resolved if only people work together for a common goal. She had charm and intellect, the first stunning and the second formidable, and she exemplified the best of America—a mix of idealism, practicality, and concern for the public good.
THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ASSOCIATES, founded in 1953, is a society whose efforts are devoted to the enrichment of the special collections of the Syracuse University Libraries. The Associates' interests lie in strengthening these collections through the acquisition of unusual books and manuscripts, items which are rare and often of such value that the Libraries would not otherwise be able to acquire them.

The Associates welcome anyone to join whose interests incline in the direction of book collecting or the graphic arts. The perquisites of membership include the use of the Syracuse University Libraries' facilities and resources, as well as invitations to exhibitions, Associates-sponsored lectures, and special events of the University Libraries. In addition, members will receive not only copies of all our incidental publications, historical tape recordings, and typographic keepsakes, but also, semiannually, a copy of the *Syracuse University Library Associates Courier*, which contains articles related to unusual and interesting aspects of the Libraries' holdings, and in particular, to the holdings of the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections.

SUGGESTED MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS are as follows: full membership, $30; introductory membership, $20; student and senior citizen membership, $10. Checks made payable to Syracuse University Library Associates should be sent to the Secretary, 600 Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210. Telephone (315) 423-2585.
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