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The Forgotten Brother: 
Francis William Newman, 
Victorian Modernist

BY KATHLEEN MANWARING

. . . it is not enough to say with some writers that Francis Newman passed the whole of his life in the shadow of his famous brother. Nor is it enough to dwell on his oddities of dress and behaviour, his prosaic cast of mind, his lack of a sense of humour, and the faddishness which dissipated his powers, even to the exasperating extent of clothing one of his best essays, “Christianity in Its Cradle,” in the eccentric garb of a reformed spelling. All these factors must be taken into account. But a more fundamental reason for his obscurity is, paradoxically, the progressive direction of his mind. Far more than his brother he was a writer of tracts for the times (as Elizabeth Barrett Browning observed, John Henry Newman was a writer of tracts against the times) and made his contribution to the secular shape of things to come.¹

Subtitled “An essay in comparative intellectual biography”, William Robbins’ book, The Newman Brothers, draws attention to the long-neglected sibling of the flamboyant Catholic theologian, John Henry Newman; yet even the author speaks of the task as a difficult one: “To try placing the obscure Francis in any sort of relation to so impressive a reputation and achievement may well seem a wilful attempt to compare a fog-shrouded foothill with a majestic peak”.² While undeniably the famous cardinal left his mark on both the Anglican faith which he forsook and the Catholic Church which he embraced, no less an admirer than novelist George Eliot wrote of his

2. Ibid., x.

brother Francis: “How much work he has done in the world, which has left no deep, conspicuous mark but has probably entered beneficently into many lives’. As an abolitionist, women’s rights advocate, marriage law critic, land nationalization supporter, vegetarian and teetotaler, Francis William Newman advanced the cause of liberalism and gained for many progressive social movements “a hearing with many who would have been deaf to the appeals of other men’.

The Francis William Newman Papers in the George Arents Research Library comprise 76 letters to Moncure Daniel Conway, American author and preacher, and editor of *Commonwealth* (Boston), “an anti-slavery paper with more literary tendencies than Garrison’s *Liberator’*. The letters span the years 1864 to 1893 and con-

---


4
tain Newman’s thoughts and arguments, as well as elucidations of his published writings, on a wide variety of social, political, and religious subjects. The collection offers an insight into not only the mind of an original thinker, but also the Victorian conviction that rationalism, coupled with an enlightened morality, can and must lead to social progress.

Born in 1805, Francis was one of six children of John and Jemima Newman. The family was rescued from poverty by the small fortune of John’s Huguenot wife after his own calamitous forays into banking and the brewing industry. Later, it was the financial support of the eldest son, John Henry, that enabled Francis to study at Oxford, where his academic achievements outshone even those of his celebrated brother: “On his taking the degree, the whole assembly rose to welcome him, an honour paid previously only to Sir Robert Peel on taking his double first”.6 Elected to a Balliol fellowship in 1826, Francis was expected to follow his brother in taking orders: “Dear Frank, we both are summon’d now / As champions of the Lord”.7 However, a crisis of conscience, instigated by the conflict Francis Newman perceived between the documents and institutions of Christianity and his own reason and moral sensibilities, resulted in the resignation of his fellowship, followed by a sojourn first in Ireland, then in Baghdad, where he worked as an independent Christian missionary. Maisie Ward, author of Young Mr. Newman, reports that with this journey, Francis “crossed the Rubicon dividing the Christian faith of his youth from the Unitarianism of his later life”.8 Newman’s return to England was coldly received by his family, who found his nonconformist approach to religion an affront to his orthodox, Anglican upbringing, and it can be surmised that John Henry’s own simultaneous Romish leanings and subsequent conversion to Catholicism did little to soften that blow.

Teaching posts in Bristol and Manchester subsequently led to his appointment to the Chair of Latin in University College, London, a place he took in 1846 and held until 1863.9 As a professor of classical literature, he attempted to awaken an interest in Latin through

9. The Athenaeum, 9 October 1897, 490.
the use of his own translations of "Hiawatha" and Robinson Crusoe as classroom exercises. He also published English versions of Horace's odes and of Homer's Iliad; the latter, for which he was severely criticized by Matthew Arnold, was intended to make the classics accessible to the working class. (The argument between Newman and Arnold led to the coining of the term "Newmanise", used to refer to the method of strict translation by which the classics are trivialized.)

Newman's philological publications also included works on Arabic and African dialects.

Meanwhile, Newman published a number of books on religious subjects, including A History of the Hebrew Monarchy (1847), The Soul: Her Sorrows and Her Aspirations (1849), Phases of Faith (1850), an autobiographical account of his religious development, and Theism, Doctrinal and Practical (1858). If to the modern reader these volumes would appear as little more than exercises in theological pedantry, it is important to note that even his admiring contemporary George Eliot referred in 1874 to "poor Mr. Francis Newman". With "affectionate sadness" she recalled the interest which in far-off days she had found in his The Soul and Phases of Faith. Newman's Athenaeum obituary notes that while these books were sent to the then Roman Catholic Cardinal, Francis "bitterly declared that his brother said he had not time to read them". Thus, while both brothers continued to explore the boundaries of their Christian faith, their quests for personal truth led them on divergent paths.

Yet despite his preoccupation with religious beliefs, perhaps Francis Newman's most enduring contributions to society lie in his writings on social problems. His long train of publications includes: The Ethics of War (1860); The Permissive Bill (1865) about liquor laws; The Cure of the Great Social Evil (1869) about prostitution; Lecture on Women's Suffrage (1869); Essays on Diet (1883); The Land as National Property (1886); The Corruption Now Called Neo-Malthusianism (1889); and The Vaccination Question (1895).

Upon his death in 1897 the Athenaeum obituary praised the extensiveness of his enormous output. Yet even in this final tribute Francis failed to escape the shadow of his brother's reputation:

12. The Athenaeum, 9 October 1897, 490.
In the seventies it used to annoy Dr. [John Henry] Newman to be called “F.” (short for Father) Newman in the Dublin Review, “whereas,” he wrote to a friend, “my brother is commonly distinguished from me by this initial. I say this”—and the sentence is an illustration of the decorum of family feeling presented by the Cardinal when he wrote to outsiders—“because, much as we love each other, neither would like to be mistaken for the other.”

It was further noted that Francis had not attended his brother’s funeral and that following the Cardinal’s death in 1890, he had published The Early History of Cardinal Newman, “which betrays a theological unbrotherliness rarely met with in recent biography”. (This is a somewhat more charitable, if less colorful, evaluation than that made in Henry Tristram’s Newman and His Friends, in which Francis is referred to as “having dipped his pen in slime”). Thus, Francis Newman seemed doomed to be cast, even in death, as a “rebound” of his brother, never fully perceived as an independent freethinker whose increasingly progressive stance had heralded the twentieth century’s secular approach to social issues.

In his autobiography Conway wrote:

... the world does not know what a grand man he was. He was so unambitious, so conscientiously free from the rhetorical devices that catch the popular ear, that his reputation is less than that of many inferiors.

Francis’ personal letters to Moncure Daniel Conway reveal a humanitarian who was committed to advancing the morality, rather than the institutions, of religious belief in the interests of social reform:

I have never known a man more absorbed in moral and benevolent work than Professor Newman. The self-devotion that his brother gave to a church, Francis gave to humanity.

13. Ibid.
14. The Athenaeum, 9 October 1897, 490.
15. Henry Tristram, Newman and His Friends (London: John Lane, 1933), 46.
16. The Athenaeum, 9 October 1897, 490.
18. Ibid., 448.
Moncure Daniel Conway (1832–1907), preacher and author of more than seventy books, including works on slavery, oriental religions, and demonology; two novels; and biographies of Thomas Paine, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Thomas Carlyle.


Despite this lofty retrospective evaluation by Conway, the letters between the two men began with a rather banal appeal by Newman to secure financial advice:

I am counting, [that] they will for your sake, kindly invest in safe American funds, according to their discretion, for my
advantage. . . . I do not count anything safe which is too far West or South—I prefer New England, or the Federal Govt.19

Yet out of this somewhat mundane personal request evolved an exchange which encompassed the entire sweep of political and social issues that characterized the second half of the nineteenth century on both sides of the Atlantic. Significantly, many of these issues—civil rights, prison reform, prostitution, temperance, land nationalization, Irish independence, working conditions, and population control—remain unresolved even today. Thus, there is a special poignancy in Newman’s letters, which provide a window not only into the past but also into the future.

Initiated in 1864, while the Civil War was still raging, the Newman letters register the progress of the conflict and the uncertainty of its outcome. Apprehension concerning European intervention, together with Newman’s lack of confidence in Lincoln’s passive strategy of waiting for starvation to overtake the South, prompted:

I have lost expectation that Grant can succeed. . . . I cherish hope, that if that come about which may seem worst,—great ruin to Grant’s army, & an immediate determination of Napoleon to make alliance with the South,—your people will at length understand that half measures cannot succeed, & you must have a thoroughgoing President.20

A subscriber to Commonwealth, The Liberator, and National Anti-Slavery Standard, Newman kept abreast of the abolitionists’ cause: “No American could follow the vicissitudes of our struggle with more poignant anxiety”.21 Concerning the possibility of permanent secession of the slave states, Newman wrote:

Nothing can be more futile than yielding a foot of ground to independence, unless you are willing to yield the entire valley

19. Newman to Conway, 24 March 1864, Francis William Newman Papers, George Arents Research Library for Special Collections, Syracuse University. All subsequent references to Newman’s letters are from this collection.
of the Mississippi, & Pennsylvania. New England with New York might have peace, yet even so would be browbeaten by the mighty South, & your countrymen know it. You will but lose labour & reputation by seeking for anything but justice under the Union indivisible.\textsuperscript{22}

A critic of Lincoln himself, Newman chastised Conway for his continued opposition to the President following his reelection in 1864:

I should, if I had been an American, greatly have preferred General Benjamin F. Butler to Mr. Lincoln: but as a man and citizen of the world I am quite reconciled to Mr. Lincoln by his last message. The gentleness of his character which degenerated into weakness is of great value in his relations to England & France. With a Butler or a Jackson in his place, irritations might arise highly dangerous to the future. . . . There is no reason to suppose that he does not learn. If he does not go as fast as you wish, prick him on; and if others do the same, he will go faster.\textsuperscript{23}

As the South approached the final throes before its defeat, Newman reminded Conway that the effort to abolish slavery was but one of many causes for the war, and advised a moderate approach in victory:

In my deliberate judgment, even if no negroes had existed, the North could not have declined this war, without the certainty of national disintegration, & a miserable future of endless intestine war & military usurpers; and to talk of allowing a hostile power to establish itself on the mouths of your principal rivers as a measure of peace is a deplorable delusion.\textsuperscript{24}

Later, while still attempting to neutralize Conway's radicalism, Newman adopted a more philosophical approach:

\textsuperscript{22} Newman to Conway, 21 November 1864.  
\textsuperscript{23} Newman to Conway, 21 December 1864.  
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
It is a real inconvenience to virtuous men that they have fewer tools to work with than rogues use. In contrasting Caesar and Cato, I have often urged that the talents of the former are unfairly exaggerated, since he can be amiable, generous, just, fraudulent, cruel, violent, spiteful, according as one or other conduces to success; while Cato, being always like himself & anxiously scrupulous, fights as halfarmed against the whole armed. So your North does not dare to maltreat Southern prisoners, as Jeff. Davis maltreats Northern prisoners. . . . It is a serious difficulty, no doubt, to the more virtuous side; but they must bear it as they best can: for Satan is not cast out by Satan.

So too, in whatever degree the Abolitionists are more virtuous than Mr. Lincoln, in that degree they necessarily give him an advantage over them. With moderate shrewdness he is sure to know, that they will not, in mere spite to him, ruin their country; they will not put the negroes into the power of Jeff. Davis. . . . He can calculate exactly how they will act, if he knows them to be intelligent; and unless they will renounce either their intelligence or their virtue, they cannot deprive him of this certainty.25

In a statement that is as relevant today as it was in the midst of the emotional turmoil of Reconstruction, Newman provided a perspective on states' rights and the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches of government:

The President has evidently tried to leave to Congress nothing but the privilege of endorsing his measures, after he has made it as hard as he could to alter them. Many of you have understood (what I have all along believed) that the disease of the Union did not consist in slavery, but in the extravagant power of the local States to establish slavery, which ought to have been ruled down as against the force of Republicanism. But I am disposed to add, that the extravagant power of the President was a collateral part of the disease. The States could not have worked the Federal power for purposes utterly

unrepublican, but for the undue independence of the President. . . . I predict a future dangerous struggle between Presidents & Congress; so great power by intrigue & management has every President, unless the nation insist that his business is solely Executive.26

Convinced that Andrew Johnson’s Reconstruction policies would thwart progress in securing the newly freed slaves “those first rights,—pecuniary and personal justice,—and access to education”, 27 Newman advocated impeachment:

You will believe that I mourn over things in the U.S. Yet I think it clear that Andr. Johnson breaks down morally. Being neither dignified nor plausible, he does not give to any section of the Republ. Party decent pretext for adhering to him.28

Then, as if to close the chapter on his concern with the American politics of abolition, while indicating a growing interest in the European tensions generated by Napoleonic ambitions, Newman wrote:

During your war, English opinion was of great practical importance: now it is of none. To know the facts well, was then to me a duty, now it is a liberal curiosity, a pleasure or pain. I now find danger of giving too much time to it, so deep interest have the events. Yet to know them in the result is now enough for me, or nearly so—one weekly newspaper suffices.29

Since, like Newman, Conway was a minister as well as an abolitionist, it is not surprising that a number of letters involve theological discussions. Newman felt that without the doctrine of Free Will “there is no such thing as morality”.30 About the use of the term “Free Christian”, he wrote:

. . . if any one, entirely agreeing with me, adopts this name to express the fact that he holds in substance the *spiritual* doctrines of the first Christian, but *without* making himself a disciple of Jesus or of the apostles,—I see nothing to censure in it. 31

Again, on the belief in Immortality, he wrote:

"It seems to me more and more that the overwhelming idea of a future eternity so dwarfs the present world that the several and more devoted Christians do not and will not give their energies to improve the Transitory age." 32

and later:

I publicly avowed that I have no personal wish for it, and cannot imagine a world for which *this* one has fitted me. 33

And concerning the preaching of morality (as opposed to doctrine) from the pulpit:

If 52 times in the year a Morals Lecture or Address is to come forth . . . it even may claim as hearers persons who would not have listened if you advertised it as Religion. 34

and:

I think that we need, for plain teaching concerning sexual morality, separate church lectures to men and to women, with a woman as church minister to lecture to the women. Then each lecturer will speak with salutary plainness to his or her sex. 35

34. Newman to Conway, 12 October 1888.
35. Newman to Conway, 10 October 1869.
Thus for Newman, the usefulness of doctrine is relative to the degree to which it affects moral choice. For this unorthodox believer, the contribution of Christianity to humanity lay in providing the guidelines for social behavior rather than the elements of dogmatic belief.

But Francis Newman did not confine his interest to religious topics.

The multiplicity of crusades which enlisted Frank's moral fervour, like his versatile scholarship, and often esoteric linguistic studies, lessened the influence he might have had. Certainly they prevented a fruitful concentration of his talents and energy. He was anti-liquor, anti-tobacco, anti-vaccination, anti-vivisection. He seemed at times, as he ruefully admitted, to be anti-everything.36

In his autobiography Conway recalled reproaching Newman for his Spartan tastes and “for undervaluing the flowers and ornamental side of life”,37 to which accusation he responded:

I will remind you that you do not know me by sideview, and hence cannot see all of me. . . . Let me assure you, that there never was a boy or man with more equably elastic spirits. As a young man, & boy, I was full of antics when out of sight. I used to be scolded for all sorts of fancies, as standing on my head; and when quite alone, I used to run & jump with utmost fury, on occasion. Even now, at the age of 65, on a fine day I have to put constraint on myself, from knowing that all expenditure of force violently is imprudent to my heart. (The first warnings I felt in the heart, were from running with the horse on which my wife was riding, and again from drawing her in a Bath Chair.) What are bad spirits, I never know; & my hopefulness is generally thought extreme.—But what are called the “gaieties” of life have always oppressed me, because they are artificially got up. I like a romp with a dog (& with a cat, but that in play she forgets that my skin will not bear her claws as her kitten’s skin does) and

---

I enjoy exceedingly the unpremeditated merriment of children & gay people on fit occasions. But deliberately to manufacture merriment is to me quite lugubrious.\textsuperscript{38}

Considered an extremist by his contemporaries ("Nearly every thing that I write is too eccentric for booksellers to risk money on"),\textsuperscript{39} Newman "espoused the unpopular reforms of his time with an almost ascetic zeal".\textsuperscript{40} A teetotaler ("It avails little to say that you have not felt mischief from wine. . . . Strength bears many things that are not beneficial but even hurtful"),\textsuperscript{41} who opposed the use of tobacco ("Leeches, if put to the veins of great smokers, fall down dead as soon as they imbibe their blood"),\textsuperscript{42} Newman also eschewed the theatre and recommended only intermittent reading of novels:

\begin{quote}
I would not go to an opera, & never have gone, because of what I learn of it from those who go. As to "romances," no two are alike. . . . But to be a systematic novel reader is, I suppose, good for no man or woman.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

Perhaps no idea better illustrated Newman's whimsical faddishness than his vegetarianism,\textsuperscript{44} a practice he embraced "on public grounds entirely & with many misgivings".\textsuperscript{45} Years later Newman confessed that the illness from which he had been suffering for several months was not, as Conway had suggested, the result of an "overworked brain",\textsuperscript{46} but was caused by an unmonitored meatless diet:

\begin{quote}
It seems that I have suffered a slow poison from two perfectly healthy vegetables in excess,—celery & onions! A violent & dangerous attack of dysentery (I use the right word) from a dish apparently harmless, brought out the whole truth. . . .
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{38} Newman to Conway, 2 February 1871.
\textsuperscript{39} Newman to Conway, 29 March 1868.
\textsuperscript{40} Conway, \emph{Autobiography} 1:449.
\textsuperscript{41} Newman to Conway, 21 March 1867.
\textsuperscript{42} Newman to Conway, 26 July 1870.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Robbins, \emph{The Newman Brothers}, 151.
\textsuperscript{45} Newman to Conway, 28 March 1868.
\textsuperscript{46} Newman to Conway, 10 January 1872.
Perhaps I have to regain my normal state tediously; for the evil has been full 18 months sapping me.47

Yet to enumerate these puritanical habits is not to trivialize or diminish Newman's dedication to humanitarian causes:

I am sore under the enjoyment of luxuries, while others are wanting necessaries; & the closer I can come down to what you call "the baldest utility," the happier does it make me.48

For Newman's advocacy of a moderate lifestyle included a commitment to social reform regarding women's issues and to the temperance laws. His progressivism in these areas did not spring solely from an opposition on religious or moral grounds to "pleasures of the flesh", but also from an optimistic belief that a social movement—one which promoted a modification of the marriage laws, a realization of the underlying causes of prostitution, and an understanding of the price in human misery of drunkenness—would foster not only the welfare of individuals but of society as a whole.

Deeply interested in all questions related to women, Newman affirmed in an early letter to Conway his intention actively to support women's rights: "I want to subscribe a donation by way of testimony to Lucretia Mott's movement in New York".49 A believer in equal access to higher education, he helped to promote Bedford College for Women and is cited by the College historian, Margaret Tuke, as "the most important influence after the pioneer founder, Mrs. Elizabeth Reid".50 Although opposed to marriage laws which divested women of their legal status and property rights, Newman nonetheless criticized those who caused a public scandal by choosing to register their protest by elopement:

They ought to have called together a select body of approving friends, the more the better, to hear and witness their mutual solemn engagement, after reciting the reasons why they

47. Newman to Conway, 10 January 1872.
49. Newman to Conway, 8 December 1866.
Letter to Conway in which Newman criticizes George Eliot (Miss Evans) for her elopement with George Henry Lewes.
could not use the legal ceremony. . . . When a man & woman call their kinsfolk & the friends whose good opinion they most fear to lose, to witness their solemn & permanent contract, society at large understands that they really mean marriage; then society will never confound such conduct with the heartlessness of profligates. 51

Newman's opposition to the Contagious Diseases Act, a measure legislating medical supervision of prostitutes, may at first glance appear to be an expression of moral outrage for the disregard of the "values of purity and continence": 52

You speak with pity of a youth thrust upon London, ignorant of the laws of health; and evidently mean, "ignorant that he may catch disease from a diseased woman." Whether any are so ignorant as this, I somewhat doubt. But the ignorance which I see in youths of this class, is more reprehensible,—ignorance that Love is essential to make sexual union worth having, natural & fitting; ignorance that they degrade their own souls & aid to trample a woman into ruin. Nay, this is not ignorance; it is recklessness. 53

Yet a closer examination reveals that Newman's moral indignation was dwarfed by his wrath over the "callous and often brutal treatment of the women by the medical examiners, and the whole matter of sexual exploitation and degradation": 54

. . . the Acts subject to horrible forcible outrage women who have no disease, women who have committed no legal crime, women who are pregnant or recent mothers. Women are outraged every fortnight, not because they have disease, but in order to look in & see whether or not they have. And to many (those of small & delicate form) the instrument is torture, to nearly all it is odiously humiliating & depressing, it

51. Newman to Conway, 4 November 1876.
52. Robbins, The Newman Brothers, 150.
risks communicating infection, & the repetition of it must undermine health. So I believe, & so the women feel.\textsuperscript{55}

Newman further asserted that the Contagious Diseases Act ignores the immorality of prostitution while sanctioning its practice, provided certain hygienic standards are maintained:

Let Parlt. decree that for a woman to sell her person is a crime, & we shall know what we are at. But to make it an offence only when she is diseased, is a law which cannot be carried out, & is not the existing law. The only offence now is, not to become worse than slave to the surgeons, \textit{whether she is well or ill}. It is not merely that the CD Act \textit{sanctions} vice (which may be a phrase of uncertain meaning): but it gives a public \textit{warrant} that vice may be practised on a particular woman \textit{with impunity}.\textsuperscript{56}

When Conway defended the Contagious Diseases Act as necessary to protect young men from incorrigible prostitutes, Newman declared:

. . . you are pertinaciously blind to the fact that women become prostitutes \textit{by compulsion} \& \textit{against their will}. This is why I tax you with hardness towards them. You say, "if a woman \textit{will} pursue this trade," she must not complain at being treated as these Acts treat her. You refuse to look at the fact that a large mass of them are mere slave girls, \& another floating mass betake themselves temporarily to this hateful mode of eking out a livelihood,—and would never become systematic prostitutes, but for these Acts, which pounce upon, libel them \& label them, \& do the worst to harden \& ruin them.\textsuperscript{57}

Thus Newman's opposition to the Contagious Diseases Act was not merely an exercise in moral self-righteousness, or even a manifesta-

\textsuperscript{55} Newman to Conway, 26 July 1870.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Newman to Conway, 27 September 1870.
Letter to Conway in which Newman explains his reason for sending an unsolicited photograph of himself.
tion of his concern for the civil rights abuses to which those laws subjected women, but a recognition of the underlying causes of prostitution itself. For in his support of equal educational opportunities for women and modifications to the marriage laws (such as enabling women to retain their legal status and property rights and extending the grounds for divorce to include "habitual drunkenness, obstinate desertion, cruelty, and long imprisonment"),\textsuperscript{58} Newman demonstrated his understanding that economic dependence and sexual dis-

\textsuperscript{58} Robbins, \textit{The Newman Brothers}, 150.
crimination with respect to legal protection were the real causes of prostitution.

In his support of temperance legislation, Newman affirmed the link between the use of alcohol and the abuse of women:

Nay, our good rustic lad addressing a clergyman not long ago said: "Sir, put down the Drink Shops, and you will soon hear nothing of Street Harlots." Our medical men, even when themselves lovers of wine, avow that marriage is defiled by the beer or gin of husbands, wives are oppressed, and children are born idiots,—from the drink system! 59

Asserting that "drunkenness causes violent crime, insanity, pauperism, impurity", 60 Newman advocated the enactment of legislation by which the tavern keeper could be held legally responsible for damages caused by a frequenter of his establishment:

... there are many subsidiary measures used & useful in America, which we neglect, such as authorizing wives, husbands, parents to warn a publican that he has made such a one drunk, & after such a warning give a right of action & damages to the wife so if the evil be repeated. (Of course, when a man drinks one glass in each of a dozen shops, it is hard to say which publican is guilty; but all such laws have a moral effect, even if very seldom brought home to a conviction; & every trial of this nature awakens the public conscience.) 61

Newman, however, admitted that censure of tavern keepers would not eliminate the problem of alcohol abuse altogether:

I used to think, that the drinking on the premises was the great & almost the sole evil, & that if the liquor could only be bought to be carried home, 9/10ths of the evil wd. disappear. I do not know whether this was not true 30 years ago; but

60. Newman to Conway, 26 July 1870.
apparently it is false now. . . . I observe that quite of late certain town officers represent that early closing (early!!!) has led to the evil of men buying liquor, & taking it home, whereby the whole family is made drunken.62

Newman expressed outrage with the government's contention that the country's economy would suffer from a prohibition on alcohol:

. . . men called Economists are such idiots that they cannot learn Vice to be of all things least Economic; and that a man who does not keep his brain in a human state has no right to claim indulgence or privilege as a citizen.63

And he was further angered that the legislature's lack of commitment to ban liquor was based on political rather than moral considerations:

If Parlt. were sincere in desiring the public welfare as the paramount object, the case would be different: but what they desire is (1) not to offend, but to conciliate, powerful capitalists, which cannot be consistent with lessening the consumption of liquor; (2) not to have trouble from a deficit in the Exchequer, wch might happen from a great & sudden change even towards national sobriety; (3) not to have to give up drinking wine, or to retain the right as an invidious privilege; (4) they have no objection to promote the public welfare, if the other objects be first secured.64

Thus Newman's opposition to liquor was based on his belief that its use undermined family life, for which not only individuals, but also society at large, paid a great price in human misery and waste. Furthermore, for Newman it was unconscionable that the government, in sanctioning the use of alcohol through the granting of liquor licenses, failed to provide moral leadership by abdicating its responsibility to promote the public welfare.

Yet, while adopting a liberal stance toward most social reforms,

62. Ibid.
64. Newman to Conway, 23 March 1875.
Newman ran counter to the prevailing progressive attitudes of his contemporaries with regard to a number of issues, some of which are still debated today. On capital punishment, Newman wrote:

I maintain, against Wendell Phillips, that a murderer's life has no more sanctity than a wild beast's life, and we have as much a right to use it up as a cheap article for public good, as to confiscate his property. Mr. Phillips is indignant at our killing a murderer for public advantages. I say, we have as much right to do so, as to kill a bullock. To claim sacredness for human life as such, is an enormous & unjustifiable assumption. When it loses moral worth, it is depreciated: when it becomes vile & mischievous, it loses all sacredness.65

And when John Stuart Mill exhorted people to limit population, Newman claimed that the champion of modern Utilitarianism was distorting the teaching of T. R. Malthus, who “distinctly renounced as inhuman the idea of dishonoring fathers for having ‘too many’ children, and said, that when once marriage was entered, the public must have no opinion about limiting numbers”.66 Newman believed that population control was a matter of individual choice rather than a public policy issue, and that for “rich men to tell poor men not to increase, can only move contempt & enmity: for every poor man feels that the poor have before God & man a greater right to multiply, than any rich man can have to keep a piece of fertile ground idle for his own pleasure”.67 And furthermore:

The meanest intellect knows that on a limited surface there must at last be an end of unlimited increase; but to fill our heads with alarm about the distant future, while incalculable supplies are within sight, is certainly the way to paralyze us.68

On another occasion, in support of his belief that Sundays should be set aside for the “intellectual improvement of the working classes”,69

67. Ibid.
68. Ibid.
69. Newman to Conway, 10 February 1874.
Newman found himself at odds with the very individuals he attempted to aid by his advocacy of legislation providing for public access to museums on that traditional day of rest and worship:

I signed a petition to Parliament some 15 or more years ago for the opening—(it was signed almost solely by known scientific & literary men)—but I would not sign it now. As soon as I brought it to the notice of workingmen, I found, that those even of the Holyoake connection were either adverse or lukewarm; from a belief that it would introduce a principle which would enable employers to set their men to work on Sundays, multiply production, lower price, & thereby lower wages; so that they wd. at length get 6 days wages for 7 days work. Their object was the opposite; to limit the work time: this made them quite unwilling to stir, or perhaps even opposed to the opening of Museums on Sunday. Since I found this out, I have said: “It is in the working man’s interest that the opening is proposed: let him settle the question: the gentry & the literary men had better not meddle with it.”

Thus, while Newman supported most of the social reforms proposed by his progressive-minded contemporaries, he nonetheless remained an independent and practical freethinker.

A man of keen self-perception, Francis William Newman was aware of his ambiguous public image not only in relation to his brother John Henry, the Catholic cardinal who devoted a lifetime in opposition to the forces of liberalism, but also to many of his peers in those same progressive movements to which he devoted his energies:

Mr. Wilson Herbert in the Examiner speaks of me as keeping myself in the background for many years. It is the Editors who have not liked my freedom of thought, & refusal to go in the beaten track, who have kept me in the background.

Yet Newman felt compelled to publish his work, understanding that while he received scant recognition by his contemporaries, he might fare better with posterity:

70. Newman to Conway, 8 February 1874.
71. Newman to Conway, 10 February 1874.
I am publishing and republishing as only a man can to whom money is of no import; and aim to get my life work in a form accessible to all who wish for it. I know it has a better chance in the future than in the past; and now that I have managed to get enough funds at my disposal, I want to get matters through the press, before life or eyesight fails.\(^\text{72}\)

Whereas John Henry Newman was conscious of leaving behind his correspondence as a "document to my heirs",\(^\text{73}\) Francis was not. His biographer writes of him: "He had a theory that letters should not be kept, and many people have told me that he asked for his letters back in order to destroy them".\(^\text{74}\) Given Francis Newman's systematic attempt to eradicate his personal correspondence, the George Arents Research Library is indeed fortunate to have so rich a cache of documents to illuminate this extraordinary man. If Newman is not remembered as a leader of social reform in the areas of abolition, women's rights, temperance, or working conditions, it is not owing to his lack of commitment, but rather to his reluctance to focus on one issue. The diffusion of his efforts on so many fronts contributed to his obscurity. And although he is not associated with any particular reform movement, Newman's legacy rests in his advancement of the trend toward a secular approach to the solution of society's ills. For however Victorian his belief that the powers of reason and moral force could be yoked to solve human problems, Newman's conviction that morality could exist apart from religious authority places him at the forefront of the secular humanism of the twentieth century.

\[^{72}\text{Newman to Conway, 15 June 1889.}\]
\[^{73}\text{Robbins, The Newman Brothers, 16.}\]
The Joseph Conrad Collection at Syracuse University

BY J. H. STAPE

The collection and preservation of Joseph Conrad's work in America has a long history. John Quinn, a wealthy New York lawyer who began collecting Conrad manuscripts in 1911, was the first and exclusive purchaser of Conrad's original documents until 1918, when Conrad on the sly began to sell manuscripts to Thomas J. Wise, the famous bibliographer and—as later revealed—notorious forger. Quinn, who had undertaken to keep his collection intact, in turn broke his word, and the sale of his collection in New York brought prices unmatched even today. Conrad could quite rightly launch his ironic query: "Did any of the bidders faint? Did the auctioneer's head swell visibly?"1 Quinn's sale allowed A. S. W. Rosenbach, the renowned Philadelphia book dealer, and George T. Keating to form the nucleus of their important collections, the former still in Philadelphia at Rosenbach's home (now the Rosenbach Museum and Library) and the latter in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University. Diverse in origin, Syracuse University's collection of Conradiana, housed in the George Arents Research Library, has more printed than manuscript materials.

FIRST EDITIONS

Syracuse University holds all of Conrad's novels from Almayer's Folly (1895) to The Rover (1923) in either first English or first American editions and, similarly, complete collections of the six short-fiction titles and five non-fiction prose works. Among these are presentation copies of Youth (first English, 1902) inscribed for Sir Edmund Gosse and The Arrow of Gold (first American, 1919) presented

to a Mrs. Demerest. Conrad’s collaborations with Ford Madox Ford—
*The Inheritors* (1901), *Romance* (1903), and *The Nature of a Crime*
(1924)—are also represented by first editions.

**PRIVATELY PRINTED AND LIMITED EDITIONS**

Although Syracuse University holds only one pamphlet—*London’s River* (1919)—of the six privately printed by Clement K. Shorter and none of the twenty pamphlets privately printed in two series (1919 and 1919–20) by Thomas J. Wise, the collection is particularly strong in limited and privately printed editions issued after 1920. It contains copies of the dramatization of *The Secret Agent* (1921), *The Dover Patrol: A Tribute* (1922), and *John Galsworthy: An Appreciation* (1922) printed by H. J. Goulden. The dramatized version of *The Secret Agent* is also here in a private printing of 1923 by T. Werner Laurie. Strangeway & Sons private printings include *Geography and Some Explorers* (one of thirty signed copies) and Richard Curle’s edition of Conrad’s “Congo Diary” (1926). Also enriching the collection are the 1902 private issue of the preface to *The Nigger of the “Narcissus”* printed by J. Lovick, the private printing of Conrad’s preface to his wife’s *Simple Cooking Precepts for a Little House* (1921), the first separate printing of Conrad’s first story, “The Black Mate” (Edinburgh: The Dunedin Press, 1922), and Jerome Kern’s 1925 private printing of *The Admiralty Paper*.

Of particular interest are two copies of the “privately printed” issue of *Notes on Life and Letters* (London: Dent, 1921) distributed to reviewers and to friends of the publisher. This “private printing”—in fact identical with the trade issue aside from the certificate on the verso of the title page, its olive (rather than dark green) binding, and lighter paper—was unauthorized by Conrad, and his forcefully expressed displeasure led Dent to destroy a number of copies. Thus, it appears that of the thirty-six copies so issued only sixteen survive.

The collection also contains a signed copy of Conrad’s collected prefaces, *Notes on My Books* (1921), one of 250 copies issued under the Heinemann imprint. (Doubleday, Page of New York, which also issued 250 copies, in fact printed the whole run.) Two limited editions of *One Day More*, Conrad’s dramatized version of his 1902 short story “To-morrow”, are held: two copies printed in 1919 by the
Beaumont Press, London (an edition limited to 274 copies) and a signed copy of the first American edition (limited to 377 copies) issued in New York by Doubleday, Page in 1920. The posthumously published works, Suspense (1925) and The Sisters (1928), are at Syracuse in American limited editions. Conrad’s play Laughing Anne, based on his short story “Because of the Dollars”, is also held in a signed limited edition (London: Morland Press, 1923).

LETTERS

Among the more significant Conrad holdings in the Syracuse University collection are nine items, in holograph or typescript, of correspondence from Conrad to business connections, acquaintances,
and friends. The earliest letter, that of 14 January 1898, to T. Fisher Unwin, his first publisher, concerns a possible separate American publication of the short story “The Return”. A letter of 19 April 1898 addressed to the editor of The Academy (Charles Lewis Hind) evidently accompanied proofs of Conrad’s review of Hugh Clifford’s book of Malay tales Studies in Brown Humanity (published in The Academy on 23 April 1898). Letters to friends include that to R. B. Cunninghame Graham, addressed as “Très cher ami”, thanking him for books, and a letter of 18 December 1915 to Sydney Colvin, a friend who directed One Day More in 1905. There are also: a note of 6 May 1909 to an unidentified recipient to whom Conrad sent a holograph leaf of A Personal Record, and a letter of 12 April 1916 that pledges support to the poet Edward Thomas in his application for a Civil List pension. Two letters of 1918 are of particular interest—that of 11 June to Sir Edmund Gosse, the well-known man of letters, offering a defense of Nostromo, and that of 2 July to Mrs. [Elizabeth] Dummett, Cunninghame Graham’s companion, accompanying a signed presentation copy of the second English edition of Nostromo (London: Dent, 1918). The latest letter—6 October 1920—is to Captain J. G. Sutherland, commander of the HMS Ready, a Q-boat in which Conrad had made an expedition in 1916.

The collection also includes three letters from Mrs. Jessie Conrad: to [Christopher] Sandeman dated 13 August 1924; to Peter F. Somerville dated 16 July 1928; and to a Mr. Partridge dated 28 June 1936.


perhaps nor such an unconditional as all that. I will make bold to say
that neither at sea nor ashore
I have ever lost because of
responsibility. There is more
than one sort of intoxication. Even
before the most seductive reveries
I have been mindful of

soberly of inward life, that asceticism
of sentiment in which alone the
form of truth such as one conceives
it, such as one feels it can
be rendered without shame. It is
but a mandarin and inept
verify that comes our through
My strength of wine. I have
tried this poor worker all my
life - all my two lives. And did
do from taste, no doubt, having an
instinctive horror of
full self-possession, but also
from artistic conviction. Yet there
are so many pitfalls on each side
of the true path. That

MANUSCRIPT AND TYPESCRIPT MATERIALS

In addition to the letters mentioned above, the most important
items in the Syracuse University Conrad collection are a holograph
leaf of A Personal Record and a forty-five-page typescript of the essay
“Autocracy and War”, the latter the gift of William Pearson Tolley. The leaf from A Personal Record, an autobiographical work originally published in The English Review from December 1908 to July 1909 as “Some Reminiscences” and first issued in book form under that title, is the only known evidence of the existence of an original manuscript and as such provides essential information for the textual critic.

Similarly, the typescript of “Autocracy and War”, Conrad’s 1905 essay on the Russo-Japanese War written while he was on a working holiday in Capri, is all that survives of his original work on this piece. The Syracuse typescript appears to be the copy marked by an editor for the essay’s printing in The North American Review in July 1905. (The essay also appeared in London in The Fortnightly Review in the same month.) The typescript bears the epigraph “Sine ira et studio” (Without anger or partiality—Tacitus, Annals, 1.1), which appears only in the American serial printing and is corrected in pencil for a printer. The placement of the by-line “Joseph Conrad” is indicated on the first page, and an end-signature—in the same hand—is added on the last. While none of the changes or corrections are in Conrad’s hand, the typescript is nonetheless an important document in establishing the text’s transmission. It is preserved with a copy of the July 1905 number of The North American Review.

MISCELLANEA

The Conrad collection also contains a few photographs and first editions of various collections of letters as well as some related works. Among the more interesting items belonging to this group are: a presentation copy from Jessie Conrad to Richard Curle of Conrad’s and Ford’s The Nature of a Crime; an inscribed copy of Curle’s edition of Conrad’s letters, Conrad to a Friend: 150 Selected Letters (1928); and two copies of Curle’s Into the East, Notes on Burma and Malaya (1923), for which Conrad wrote a preface. Of the last, one copy is an inscribed presentation copy and the other bears a note in Curle’s hand. A rare item is a privately printed letter—Joseph Conrad on Stephen Crane (Yselta, Texas, 1932)—one of thirty copies, this with a manuscript note attached by Vincent Starrett, one of Crane’s early bibliographers.
Jean Cocteau (1889–1963) is reputed to have been the most ‘astonishing’ of French twentieth-century artists. In one of his many autobiographical works, La Difficulté d’être, he tells how, one day in 1909, he was walking on the Place de la Concorde with Sergei Diaghilev, who had captivated Paris the previous year with his Ballets Russes, and Vaslav Nijinsky, his greatest dancer. For nearly two years the young Cocteau had been seeking to win Diaghilev’s admiration. “Nijinsky”, he writes, “was brooding as usual. He walked ahead of us. Diaghilev was amused by my simperings: when I questioned him about his reserve (I was used to praise), he stopped, adjusted his monocle, and said, ‘Etonnez-moi’ [Astonish me]. The idea of surprising anyone had not occurred to me before.”

For the next fifty-four years, Cocteau set about attempting to astonish the art world. He wrote poetry, novels, plays, journals, autobiographical works, memoirs of his opium experiences, as well as hundreds of letters, prefaces, and tributes. Also, he drew and painted extensively; wrote opera oratorios in collaboration with Arthur Honegger and Igor Stravinsky (Antigone, Oedipus Rex); devised ballet scenarios with Erik Satie and Darius Milhaud (Parade, The Ox on the Roof), and made several memorable films (The Blood of the Poet, Orpheus, Beauty and the Beast). In 1955 Cocteau solicited a chair among the forty “immortals” in the French Academy and was duly elected. Thus, the enfant terrible of French letters, who had once written that true “audacity consists in knowing just how far one can go too far”, climaxed his career in the most conservative of French artistic establishments. In his acceptance speech, Cocteau said that he spoke in

the name of the great poètes maudits of France—Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Verlaine—who had never been elected to the French Academy. What he neglected to say was that none of what he called "François Villon’s progeny" had ever actively sought admission.

Between 1963 and 1971, the Syracuse University Library acquired more than two hundred fifty holograph manuscripts by Jean Cocteau. These are now to be found in the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections, where they enhance an already rich assortment of French manuscripts that have been thoroughly listed in a previous article in the Courier. An abridged history of their acquisition might be told here. The story is interesting, for it includes several of those ironical twists that made so much of Cocteau’s life seem like a chassé-croisé with Death, choreographed by the artist himself. On 17 July 1963, Martin H. Bush, Deputy Administrator of Manuscripts at the Syracuse University Library, wrote Cocteau a letter describing a “large undertaking” at Syracuse University “aimed at making the important source materials of the theater and the world of art and literature available to teachers, scholars, and practitioners of learned professions”. Moreover, he added, “many participants in the University’s graduate and undergraduate programs are genuinely devoted to art and literature”. The letter continued:

The type of material we are looking for includes: manuscripts of plays, articles, and books (whether published or unpublished), letters and general correspondence, and any records or files of a non-personal nature. Because of the impact you have had on society during your remarkable career, we hope to create a Jean Cocteau Manuscript Collection at Syracuse University in recognition of your past and future achievements. This material would be a boon to historians and students of the theater and the University and scholarly world as well. Scholars for generations to come will be able to gain a better understanding and fresh appreciation of the manifold aspects of your career.

On 11 August 1963, Cocteau, who usually responded generously to requests for manuscripts, prefaces, recommendations, and tributes,

replied that he would donate to Syracuse the bound manuscript of his film, "The Two-Headed Eagle". A month later, in a letter dated 11 September 1963, Cocteau wrote again from his country home at Milly-la-Forêt: "Mon cher Martin H. Busch [sic], Je vais voir si quelque manuscrit moins indirect qu'une œuvre de films se trouve à ma campagne et, malgré mon écriture illisible, serait, pour votre bibliothèque, un document plus humain et plus amical. Votre Jean Cocteau". To this second letter, Cocteau appended the postscript, "Beaucoup de mes manuscrits ont été volés et vendus".3

However much Cocteau enjoyed dramatization, the postscript does sound like that of a man being stalked by an avenging spirit. A month later, to the day, Cocteau was dead. The recurrence of the number eleven in these dates suggests a dice game with death, an idea that Cocteau would certainly have relished incorporating into one of his films. But there is a further irony: Cocteau died on 11 October 1963, within hours of hearing the news of the death of Edith Piaf, a close friend, whose vocal genius Cocteau appreciated and had written about extensively. In the New York Times obituary of 12 October 1963 (which spoke of both deaths in the same front-page article), Cocteau was reported as having almost predicted his own death after hearing the news of Piaf's: "Piaf is dead. The boat is sinking." I have been unable to verify that quotation among Cocteau authorities. What is certain is that at noon, 11 October 1963, one hour before Cocteau's own death, French radio listeners heard his recorded voice pay a moving tribute to Piaf's voice, "that great black-velvet voice magnifying whatever it sings".4

Cocteau's death dampened the hope raised by his two previous letters to Syracuse University that a substantial number of manuscripts would be donated. In response to the original offer of the manuscript of "The Two-Headed Eagle", Martin H. Bush had written: "We believe that any scrap of paper which would shed more light on the man Jean Cocteau would be worthy of preservation for scholars of future generations. This is especially true since we have

3. "My dear Martin H. Bush, I will see if some manuscript less indirect than a film work can be found in my country [home] and, in spite of my illegible handwriting, might be, for your library, a more human and friendly document. Your Jean Cocteau. P.S. Many of my manuscripts have been stolen and sold."

eight thousand people [sic] who either read or speak French at the University." However, Cocteau's "Two-Headed Eagle" seems never to have found its way to Syracuse University. A few days before his death, Cocteau did mail a folio volume of manuscript poems entitled *Poèmes 1957*, with a drawing on the cover and a dédicace, "à Syracuse University ces quelques calculs d'un mathématicien du verbe avec l'amitié de Jean Cocteau".\(^5\) In March 1964 J. Pierre Peyraud, the attorney in charge of Cocteau's estate, wrote to Syracuse University that in view of Jean Cocteau's "mort brutale", it would be impossible to fulfill the wishes he had formulated in his letters of August and September 1963. Presumably, Cocteau had left no written will.

With the exception of the *Poèmes 1957*, the present manuscript collection is the result of purchases made by the Syracuse University Library between 1967 and 1971. It consists of materials written over a fifty-year period: two hundred seventeen letters, manuscripts of dramatic works, essays, fiction, and poetry. Among the letters, perhaps two of the most moving were sent to Max Jacob (1876-1944), the French poet, after the death of Raymond Radiguet (1903-1923), Cocteau's youthful lover, a most promising writer who died of typhoid, having written two novels that Cocteau ranked with the best of Madame de Lafayette and Benjamin Constant. Jacob, a mystical Breton Jew, had converted to Catholicism in 1909. (His conversion, incidentally, did not prevent his arrest by the Gestapo in 1944 and his extermination at Drancy, a French death camp.) After Radiguet's death, Jacob presumably wrote Cocteau, whose Catholicism wavered throughout his life, advising him to practise his faith more fervently. One reads a serene letter to Max Jacob dated 29 December 1923, only seventeen days after Radiguet's death:

Mon Max, mon admirable et cher Max—Il faut que je t'explique pourquoi je semble de pas vouloir t'obéir. Je ne me contracte pas. Je ne me livre pas aux démons. Mais j'ai l'esprit trop religieux—un trop profond respect de l'église—pour user d'elle comme d'une drogue ou d'un fétiche. La communion ne peut se prendre à la manière d'un cachet pour calmer

---

5. "To Syracuse University, these few calculations by a mathematician of the word, with the friendship of Jean Cocteau."

As one might expect, Cocteau’s serenity was not fated to last. The very next letter to Max Jacob, dated 29 January 1924, records the beginning of the expected depression:


This letter coincides with the start of Cocteau’s first experimentation with opium, which he then took regularly during a four-year period of depression.

Besides the more than two hundred letters—the other principal correspondents are Violette Leduc, Maurice Sachs (see fig. 1), and

6. “My Max, my admirable and dear Max, I must explain to you why I seem not to want to obey you. I am not recoiling. I am not selling my soul to demons, but I have too religious a spirit—too deep a respect for the Church—to use her like a drug or a fetish. One cannot take communion as one would a tablet to soothe the soul. I must suffer. I do pray. I try to allow grace to take root in me. Now I know that one can feel divinity in oneself without straining, since Raymond lives in me and protects me. There was about him an angel who was ill at ease with his vices. This death has saved him and he wants me to take advantage of it. I’m certain of that. You would not be ashamed of my attitude. I talk about him, and I am correcting the proofs of the Ball [Radiguet’s posthumously published novel, Count d’Orgel’s Ball] without faltering. I have your poem on him in my pocket and I embrace you. Jean.”

7. “My Max, Excuse my silence. I am in an atrocious state. Worse than that of the first days [after Radiguet’s death]. I was then drunk like somebody who has been hit on the head. Drunken sorrow. Imagine me now sobered up, face to face with this formless thing. I want to die.”
Fig. 1. Cocteau's letter to Maurice Sachs, September 1927. Jean Cocteau Collection, Syracuse University Library.

Marcel Raval—the manuscript collection includes twenty-eight essays alphabetically arranged by title or first line. The essays cover a wide range of subjects: from biographical sketches of contemporaries (Christian Bérard, Coco Chanel, Diaghilev, Max Jacob, Raymond Radiguet, Erik Satie) to critical pieces ("Procès de l'inspiration");
"Quelques notes autour de 16 millimètres"; "Romantisme") and historical backgrounds to his life and works ("La Légende du boeuf sur le toit"; "La Machine infernale"; "Notes sur la crucifixion"; "Sources des films").

The poetry of the collection is of two kinds: bound or collected manuscripts and single poems. The largest of the bound volumes of poetry is the collection of Poèmes 1957 donated by the author before his death. Though the inscribed and illustrated cover is in itself a flattering donation to Syracuse University, the poems themselves read like five-finger exercises by means of which Cocteau kept himself poetically in trim. Using inks with different colors, he set up the rhyme scheme first, then progressively filled in the verses. Most of the poems in this book are undistinguished in content.

Among the loose manuscripts, there are four drafts of a long and fascinating thirty-quatraine poem, "Un Ami dort", which is a loving, deeply moving meditation about the poet's feelings as he watches the man he loves sleeping:

Tes mains, jonchant les draps étaient mes feuilles mortes.
Mon automne aimait ton été.
Le vent du souvenir faisait claquer les portes
Des lieux où nous avons été. 8

Perhaps the most striking of the long poems among the Cocteau manuscripts is Crucifixion, a twenty-five-stanza poem in free verse, published in 1946. "The poem is sodensely written", writes Margaret Crosland, "so dramatic in treatment, that the impact made by a first reading is often unforgettable. Its compression, its use of dynamic rhythm, internal and half-rhymes are reminiscent of Gerard Manley Hopkins." Though it contains allusions to the crucifixion of Christ—the "racks" and "ladders" leaning upon the "new dead tree" of the first stanza evoking many a pictorial crucifixion—the poem's real subject is the experience of pain as felt by the suffering person:

8. "Your hands astride the sheets were my dead leaves.
   My autumn loved your summer.
The wind of memory banged shut the doors
   Of places where we have been."

Il y avait les coups. Les coups
du fer sur le fer. La vieille rose
des vents. Les coups. La rouille
des coups sur l'éventail en os
des pieds. Sur la natte
en orteils. Sur les planches. Sur
l'exquise enluminure du missel
des nerfs où la douleur court
plus vite que la douleur
dans le corail des tortures.
L'écho des coups. Les médailles
des coups. Les oreilles
des coups. L'âme du bois. L'âme
des coups sans âme.
Les coups du tonnellier. Les coups
du charpentier. Les crateres
de viande bleue. Les poteaux
indicateurs des lignes
de la main. Le cou
du cygne.10

Among the other major writings in the Syracuse University collection ought to be mentioned four dramatic works and one work of fiction. There is a six-page holograph scenario of the film La Belle et la bête; a twenty-four-page typescript of Oedipe-Roi, annotated and with illustrations including set and costume designs; a ninety-two-page holograph of Paul et Virginie, Opéra-Comique en 3 actes, by Cocteau, Erik Satie, and Raymond Radiguet, including holograph title and half-title pages; an eight-page divertissement written on music sheets about the “retour d'Ulysse à Ithaque, et accueil de Pénélope et ses


This free translation is adapted from Mary Hoeck’s original version, which Cocteau authorized (Crosland, Cocteau's World, 205, 211).
prétendants"; a one-act play in verse; and, finally, a sixty-four-page oversized holograph, *La Fin du Potomak*, including a four-page manuscript entitled "La Clef de l’oeuvre de Jean Cocteau".

*Paul et Virginie*, *Opéra-Comique en 3 actes* is totally unrelated to the famous novel written by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre in 1784, save that the young hero and heroine are also Rousseauistic innocents in the wily, wicked upper-class Paris of the 1920s. This charming comic operetta libretto, dated 16 September 1920, was written by Cocteau and Radiguet at the Bassin d’Arcachon (near Bordeaux), where they spent their summers in the early twenties. The operetta was never performed, for Erik Satie died (in 1925) before completing the score. In a separate manuscript letter, Cocteau describes the ill-fated collaboration between Radiguet, Satie, and himself:

*Paul et Virginie* a été composé par Raymond Radiguet et moi, en marge de notre travail et comme on se délasse, à Pigney, au bord du Bassin d’Arcachon. C’est dans le petit hôtel en planches de Pigney, que Radiguet écrivit le *Bal du Comte d’Orgel*. Erik Satie nous demandait un prétexte à musique. Jusqu’à sa mort nos crûmes qu’il avait presque terminé l’œuvre. Il n’en avait pas écrit une note mais nous le faisait croire par crainte que le texte ne le quittât et ne passât en d’autres mains.¹¹

A letter such as this one could provide an interesting footnote for Cocteau specialists, who have previously assumed that Satie “never completed” the score to *Paul et Virginie*.¹² Cocteau’s checkered relationship with Erik Satie did not prevent him from paying the French musician a moving tribute, the manuscript of which is at Syracuse. It reads, in part:

Mon honneur sera de l’avoir vénéré, d’avoir accepté les sautes de son caractère mystérieux, de lui avoir, dès que je l’ai connu,

¹¹. “*Paul et Virginie* was composed by Raymond Radiguet and me, in the margin of our work and as a relaxation, at Pigney, near the Bassin d’Arcachon. It’s in the small, wood-plank hotel of Pigney where Radiguet wrote his *Count d’Orgel’s Ball*. Erik Satie had been asking us for a pretext for his music. Up to the time of his death, we thought he had almost finished the work. He had not written a note but led us to believe that he had, fearing that the text would be given to someone else.”

assigné sa vraie place. Lorsqu'on demandait à Rossini qui était le plus grand musicien, il répondait: "Beethoven". Et lorsqu'on lui disait: "Et Mozart?" il répondait: "Vous m'avez demandé qui était le plus grand. Vous ne m'avez pas demandé qui était l'unique." Si l'on m'interrogeait sur notre époque, je répondrais sans doute que les plus grands sont Debussy et Stravinsky. Et j'ajouterais: "Mais Satie est l'unique".13

From the Cocteau scholar's viewpoint the two most important prose manuscripts are no doubt the Oedipe-Roi, pieds gonflés, a free adaptation of Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannos, and La Fin du Potomak, a novel published in 1939. The Oedipe-Roi, a twenty-one-page typescript with heavy revisions in Cocteau's handwriting, is strikingly illustrated in pencil by the artist. On the cardboard cover of the typescript is a drawing of Jocasta, with a monumental, partly shaded face that reminds one of some of Picasso's "classical" faces of the same period (1923). Jocasta is naked, her breasts and pubic hair are prominently displayed. In her right hand she holds what seems a snake-like umbilical cord. Her left arm resembles a truncated artery, on which her crown (or shield?) is suspended. Her legs, covered with fish scales, seem those of a large frog with web-like feet (fig. 2). On the bottom half of the last page (21) of the typescript, Cocteau has drawn a blinded Oedipus screaming in agony. There is a hole in the center of his outstretched left hand, suggesting a crucifixion. In the space to the upper right hangs a left foot, with a hole through the center, badly swollen and reminding the reader of the root meaning of "Oedipus", and of the subtitle of the play: "pieds-gonflés" (fig. 3). On a separate page at the end of the text is a full-page drawing of the blinded Oedipus, looking skyward, his sex prominently displayed in spite of his toga, standing alone outside a broken wall (fig. 4).

Cocteau wrote this adaptation of Sophocles' play in 1923. An un-

13. "It will be to my honor that I venerated him, accepted the ups and downs of his mysterious character, and, as soon as I knew him, assigned him to his true place. When people asked Rossini who was the greatest composer, he would reply: 'Beethoven'. And when they said: 'What about Mozart?' he would reply: 'You asked me who was the greatest. You did not ask me which one was unique.' If people were to ask me about our age, I would no doubt reply that the greatest are Debussy and Stravinsky. And I would add: 'But Satie is unique'." Crosland, Cocteau's World, 220.
dated cover letter to "Monsieur l'Administrateur" of the Comédie Française shows that Cocteau attempted to have his play performed by France's most illustrious classical troupe. Why it was not performed by the Comédie Française in the early twenties is a mystery,
but one can surmise that Cocteau's was one of several translations or adaptations to appear during those years. (André Gide is reported to have exclaimed: "C'est une véritable Oedipémie!") In 1926 Cocteau showed the text of his Oedipe-Roi to Igor Stravinsky, who wanted to collaborate with Cocteau on an Oedipus-Rex opera-oratorio (Cocteau
had earlier collaborated successfully with Arthur Honegger on an adaptation of *Antigone*). Stravinsky found the prose of Cocteau’s text “horribly meretricious” and decided that the opera-oratorio should be sung in Latin, “a medium not dead, but turned to stone, and so monumentalized as to be immune from vulgarization”.

14 The Latin text was provided by the eminent Jesuit scholar Jean (later Cardinal) Daniélou and is a free adaptation of Cocteau’s French. The Stravin-

sky-Cocteau opera-oratorio was performed for the first time on 30
May 1927. Daniélou's church Latin gives the piece a medieval rather
than classical flavor which, combined with the clean dissonances and
the dramatic percussions of Stravinsky's score, reminds the hearer of
Carl Orff's *Carmina Burana*, with which it is sometimes performed.
Cocteau did manage to salvage some part for himself, convincing
Stravinsky that he should play the part of the Narrator and that the
Narrator should speak in French. The Daniélou Latin text, incident-
ally, contains a literal rendition of three of the most striking lines
in Cocteau's earlier French version. When he learns the full truth
about his origins, Oedipus exclaims: "Je suis né de ceux dont il ne
fallait pas. J'ai fécondé celle qu'il ne fallait pas. J'ai tué celui qu'il ne
fallait pas. Lumière est faite." 15 In the Daniélou-Cocteau-Stravinsky
production, Oedipus, whose role is sung by a tenor, expresses this
shock of self-revelation by singing *a capella*: "Natus sum quo nefas-
tum est, concubui cui nefastum est, cecidi quem nefastum est. Lux
facta est."

*La Fin du Potomak* is a fifty-eight-page autograph manuscript, folio
size, dated "1er mai–5 mai 1939". It is a sequel to a curious book
entitled *Le Potomak*, written by Cocteau in 1913–14, "après s'être
endormi". The message of both *Le Potomak* and its sequel is not
clear. Both proceed from a state Cocteau described as "dans une
sorte d'hypnose et au bord du vide". *Le Potomak*, dedicated to Stra-
vinsky, is a piece of reverie to be read as one listens to the half-
coherent utterances of someone dreaming. Margaret Crosland ex-
plains: "Its characters were named after strange words read on old
jars in a chemist's shop. These characters hold discussions and write
letters to each other on a variety of topics, while the narrator event-
ually takes his friend Argémone to see the Potomak, a strange mon-
ster." 16 *La Fin du Potomak* has the same obsessive themes as the origi-
nal work: invisibility, sleep writing, obsession with self. The same
horrible, greedy, petits-bourgeois characters of the earlier work, the
Eugènes [ironically, the "well-born"] continue to devour the helpless
Mortimers and have by now begun to pervade the entire universe:

15. "I was born of those I should not. I have fertilized the woman I should not. I
have killed the man I should not. Light is made." Cocteau kept these lines verbatim
in his text of *La Machine infernale*, his successful adaptation of the Oedipus myth
produced in 1933, directed by Louis Jouvet at the Théâtre des Champs-Elysées.
Peu à peu, ils s'étaient glissés comme des larves et incorporés à l'univers. Ils s'étaient introduits dans les âmes grandes et petites. Le malaise que j'enregistrais, que j'annonçais seul en 1913 était devenu chose commune et en quelque sorte un malaise à prix unico. . . . Les Eugènes, dénouant leurs lignes maléfiques, s'étaient glissés sous la boucle des moindres noeuds des moindres machines à coudre. Un mécanisme aussi génial que celui qu'inventa le vieux Singer en entendant son voisin se plaindre que sa femme “lui mettait la tête à l'envers”, ce qui lui valut la trouvaille de renverser l'aiguille, les avait glissés sous la trame du monde et nul ne leur échapperait plus. L'Europe subissait leurs caprices. Elle se sentait écoeurée. Le dictateur Adolphe, en trenchcoat jouait aux échecs à sa table de Berchtesgaden. Il poussait les pièces d'une main molle et, sous sa petite moustache, souriait de la faiblesse de ses adversaires. Comme ses adversaires perdaient ils l'accusaient de tricherie et demandaient qu'on respectât les règles. Ils brandissaient des parapluies et des colombes. Ils se laissaient prendre leurs rois, leurs reines, leurs cavaliers et leurs tours. 17

When *La Fin du Potomak* was published in October 1939, Cocteau wrote a short preface making it sound more enigmatic and prescient a work than it really was. In fact, like most of Cocteau's prophetic works, *La Fin du Potomak* is “heedless of all but his own upheavals”. 18

17. “Little by little they had slipped in like larvae and had incorporated themselves into the universe. They had ingratiated themselves into great and small souls. The malaise that I was alone in recording, in announcing in 1913, had become a common thing, a five-and-ten-cent sort of malaise. . . . The Eugènes, untying their maleficient lines, had slipped under the bow of the slightest knots of the slightest sewing machines. A mechanism as ingenious as that invented by old Singer when he heard his neighbor complain that his wife ‘turned his head upside down’ (which led to the great discovery of his turning the needle upside down), had slipped them under the fabric of the world, and nobody could avoid them. Europe suffered their caprices. She felt nauseous. The dictator Adolph, in a gabardine trenchcoat, was playing chess at his table at Berchtesgaden. He was pushing his pieces with a soft hand and, under his little moustache, smiling at his adversaries' fear. His adversaries accused him of cheating and asked that the rules be respected. They brandished their umbrellas and their doves, while allowing their kings, their queens, their knights and their rooks to be taken.”

Whatever other talents he may have had, Cocteau was no historical prophet.

---

In perusing the Cocteau collection one is inclined to reconsider the artist's true talents. Was he ever as 'astonishing' as Diaghilev, that great judge of talent, suggested he try to be? In acquiring this manuscript collection, was the Syracuse University Library reasonable in its hope that "scholars for generations to come will be able to gain a better understanding and fresh appreciation of the manifold aspects of [Cocteau's] career"?

As an amateur (in the literal sense) of Cocteau, I am confirmed in my long-held belief that he was an artist of varied and uneven talent who did not excel at everything he practised. I have the highest regard for Cocteau as a filmmaker; but the collection sheds little light, and nothing new, on that side of Cocteau's oeuvre. Many of Cocteau's drawings (like those in the Oedipe-Roi manuscript) are very powerful. As to Cocteau the poet, playwright, essayist, and novelist, the collection bears out my impression that he ventured into these genres with imagination, but not with genius. In spite of the high regard in which Cocteau (and his translator) held the poem Crucifixion, it ranks neither with the work of Gerard Manley Hopkins nor with the best works of Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Apollinaire, or Valéry. I would, however, never go so far as André Breton, the 'pope' of French surrealism, who called Cocteau "the anti-poet . . . the arch impostor, the born con man".

Like Oscar Wilde, Cocteau perhaps put talent into his work and genius into his life. What emerges from this collection is the outstanding personality of a remarkable man, whose generosity was not limited to himself. Of Raymond Radiguet he wrote that, "à quatorze ans, Raymond Radiguet nous battait tous aux échecs de la poésie"; and he ended a generous tribute to Erik Satie, who spurned him on several occasions, by writing that "Satie est l'unique". Perhaps his greatest gift lay in his capacity for admiring artists less liberal and more talented than himself.

19. As Margaret Crosland has claimed, Cocteau's World, 205.
A Book from the Library of Christoph Scheurl (1481–1542)

BY GAIL P. HUETING

Among the historical works in the Leopold von Ranke Library at Syracuse University is a thick volume containing nine titles printed in 1530. It is bound in half-tooled leather on thick boards of beech wood that have been left uncovered. Two metal clasps secure the fore edge. Because the cords that held the spine and front cover together are frayed, the book is now kept in a protective case that has been made to measure. There is no title stamped on the spine, but the bottom edge and fore edge bear the handwritten overall title derived from three of the works in the volume: Bellum hispa. neap. obsidio Viennae Austriae duces. The lettering on the edges indicates that the book was kept flat on a shelf. The collection to which it belonged was rearranged as it grew larger; the number 424 on the fore edge has become 443 on the bottom edge.

Neither the style of binding nor the fact that the volume contains multiple works is remarkable. Bindings with bare wood boards are not rare, and the Ranke library has many books that contain three or more titles. Their original owners had them bound together because the contents were related or because they were acquired in the usual unbound state (common in books until the nineteenth century) at about the same time. What sets this book apart is that its first owner can be identified. He not only pasted a large bookplate inside the front cover but also wrote his name on the first title page and made annotations throughout the book. He was Christoph Scheurl of Nuremberg.1

Scheurl was a jurist and a writer on historical and legal topics.1

* I would like to thank Paul Schrodt for his extensive help in describing the contents of the works contained within this volume from Scheurl’s library.

1. Wilhelm Graf, Doktor Christoph Scheurl von Nürnberg, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, Bd. 43 (Leipzig, Berlin: Teubner, 1930), is the longest biography of Scheurl. Maria Grossmann, “Bibliographie der
He lived during Nuremberg’s most influential period as a Free Imperial City. In accordance with his parents' wishes, he prepared himself for a scholarly career. After beginning his studies in Heidelberg, he spent the years 1498 to 1507 in Bologna, then a center for the study of law that attracted many German students. During these years he traveled extensively in Italy and began to buy books. He also had printed some of the speeches he had given on academic occasions at the University of Bologna. From 1507 to 1512 Scheurl was a professor of law at the University of Wittenberg (founded in 1502) and performed various legal and diplomatic services for Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony. In 1512 the Nuremberg City Council named

Werke Christoph Scheurls”, Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens 10 (1969), col. 371–96 is a complete list of his writings, whether printed in his lifetime or rediscovered centuries later.
him legal advisor (*Ratskonsulent*), the post he held for thirty years. This position entailed much diplomatic activity and travel in the interests of the city, including trips to the imperial court in Spain in 1519–20 and 1523. A copper engraving published by the Nuremberg City Library shows Scheurl as a thin-faced, serious man in a rich-looking, fur-trimmed coat.²

Like his better-known contemporary Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530), Scheurl carried on a voluminous correspondence and collected a substantial library. His correspondents included many humanists and figures involved on both sides in the Protestant Reformation.³ At first Scheurl was supportive of Martin Luther and his reforms. For a time in 1519, he attempted to mediate between Luther and one of his most eloquent critics, Johann Eck. However, as the break with the Catholic Church became irreconcilable, Scheurl remained loyal to the Catholic side and steadfastly defended Eck.

In contrast to the more open and outgoing Pirckheimer, Scheurl was characterized by the historian Ernst Mummenhoff as “pliant, courtierlike, indecisive in his whole manner, reserved and cool, and not a little vain”.⁴ Dietmar Pfister, on the other hand, described him as follows:

One can count among the main character traits of this man: modesty, unpretentiousness, religious feeling free of superstition, gratefulness, a temperament inclined to reconciliation, a sense of charity, and wise moderation coupled with caution.⁵

Scheurl’s library grew over many years. He bought large numbers of books in Italy, both during his student days and on an extended trip


there in 1510. He continued to acquire books throughout his life, and he must have received many from his correspondents, perhaps in exchange for books he sent them. Wilhelm Graf, Scheurl's biographer, wrote:

He negotiates with Spalatin the purchase of Regiomontanus' library. In general Scheurl knew the new books of his time and developments in the book market quite well because he had a lot to do with booksellers, of whom Johannes Koberger was the most famous.

According to Friedrich Warnecke, Scheurl had a number of bookplates designed with his family coat of arms. The woodcut design he used the most and had printed in various sizes was drawn by Albrecht Dürer or by an artist in Dürer's studio. Bookplates are known almost from the earliest days of printing, and German heraldic bookplates, those displaying the owner's coat of arms, reached a high point in the early sixteenth century, when some of the most notable artists (Dürer, Lukas Cranach, Jost Amann) designed them. The bookplates of this period are wood engravings. The coats of arms themselves are traditional and relatively simple, but the crests and border decorations provided many opportunities for flourishes. Scheurl's coat of arms, as depicted on his bookplate, has a crest with a helmet, many feathers (including peacock feathers at the top), a crown, horns, and a gryphon. The circular border consists of a wreath of leaves and berries, and there is a ribbon with tassels in each of the four corners.

The bookplate in Ranke's library is of this design, but at 19.5 by

7. Graf, 69. Author's translation. Georg Spalatin was the chaplain and private secretary of Elector Frederick of Saxony; Regiomontanus was a fifteenth-century German astronomer and mathematician.
8. Friedrich Warnecke, Die Deutschen Bücherzeichen (Ex-libris) von ihrem Ursprunge bis zur Gegenwart (Berlin: Stargardt, 1890), 181–82. Scheurl's descendants were still using a similar design about one hundred years later; it is shown in Karl Emich, German Book-Plates: An Illustrated Handbook of German & Austrian Exlibris, trans. G. Ravenscroft Dennis (London: George Bell & Sons, 1901), 183.
14.7 centimeters it is larger than the ones Warnecke lists. Often a design cut for another use had an appropriate printed line about the owner added to it to make it usable as a bookplate. Thus at the bottom of this plate is the legend in Latin, “A book of Christoph Scheurl J.U.D., who was born 11 November 1481”. (Juris Utriusque
Doctor means “doctor of both laws”; that is, both civil and canon law.) Another line mentions Scheurl's two sons and their birth dates. Although the design may have been printed earlier, the dates allow the bookplate to be pinned down rather precisely—between 1535, when the younger son was born, and 1542, when Scheurl himself died. Around the coat of arms are printed nine Biblical verses (from Genesis, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and Luke).

What were the books that Scheurl collected and had bound together during the 1530s? They are a strange combination—titles on history, theology, and even medicine—and yet each work reflects something of what is known of Scheurl's interests and activities. All but one are in Latin. Those books that are dated were printed in 1530, and probably only one was printed several years earlier. The first is a congratulatory piece, fourteen pages long, addressed by the author, Ioannes Stratius, to Eleanor on the occasion of her marriage to Francis I of France. Scheurl had a great respect for royalty (especially for Emperor Charles V, brother of Eleanor) and for court ceremony. Next comes a copy of two historical works printed together, both dealing with the war between Aragon and the Kingdom of Naples from 1459 to 1464; the first is by Jacopo Bracelli and the second by Giovanni Pontano. Scheurl evidently retained an interest in the history of Spain after his trips there. The third work, also a substantial one, is by Hieronymus Gebwiler. *Epitome Regii... Ferdinandi...* is a genealogical narration on the origins of the Hapsburg monarchs, ending with Ferdinand and Charles V. The work is highly laudatory; it compares the Hapsburg lineage favorably to such prominent figures of the past as Alexander the Great and Charlemagne. The fourth work, which consists of only fourteen leaves, is a chronology of the principal events in the world from the birth of Christ to the siege of Vienna by the Turks in 1529. No author is named, but it bears the title *Annotatio seu Breviarum Rerum Memorable...* Scheurl seems to have appreciated the chronology form; he himself wrote, but did not have printed, a listing of events from 1511 to 1528. The fifth work, also anonymous, is a vivid description of Sultan Suleyman's unsuccessful battle at Vienna in 1529.

---

10. This was Christoph Scheurl, “Geschichtbuch der Christenheit von der Jährzahl 1511 bis auf dies gegenwurtig achtundzwantzig Jähr”, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches und der deutschen Kirche im Zeitalter der Reformation* (1872): 5–19; cited in Grossmann, col. 385–86.
The sixth work is perhaps the oddest in the volume, for it is in Spanish rather than Latin and deals with a medical subject rather than with history. It has the title *Regimiento Preservativo C6puesto por el Doctor Luis Nunez de Anila* and is undated, though the colophon states that it was printed at Worms, Germany by Hans von Erfurt. As records give evidence of this printer having worked in Worms only during 1521–22, one may reasonably conjecture that the date
of this title is considerably earlier than 1530.11 Its six leaves outline rules for the preservation of bodily health. It is similar to a better-known work of the period, Regimen Sanitatis, which was printed in many editions. Both works give dietetic advice for a long life.

The last three works represent the Catholic side of the theological disputes of the Reformation period. The seventh, Repulsio Articulorum Zwinglii, was written by Johann Eck, the eminent German theologian and friend of Scheurl, and confutes the doctrine of the Swiss reformer Ulrich Zwingli. The eighth work is the Antilogiarum Martini Lutheri Babylonia, by Johann Faber, bishop of Vienna. The title of this piece is a play on words—the “Babylon of Illogicalities of Martin Luther”. Was Faber perhaps alluding to the Tower of Babel as well as to Luther’s work on the “Babylonian captivity” of the church—De Captivitate Babylonia Ecclesiae (1520)? Whatever his intention, in the substance of his work he merely draws fifty-two propositions from Luther’s writings and systematically refutes each of them. The ninth work, again by Johann Eck, is entitled Articulos 404 . . . and consists of that many propositions which Eck is prepared to defend publicly at any suitable time. The title page includes blank spaces for writing in the date and time of the next debate.

Viewed as a whole, this book reflects a breadth of intellectual interests not unusual for those times. Why would Scheurl have works on such diverse subjects as royal weddings, wars, genealogy, health, and theology bound together in one volume? The evidence suggests that convenience played a part. As described above, all but one of the nine titles were dated works printed in 1530. The bookplate dates from sometime between 1535 and 1542. It is probable that, at some date soon after 1530, Scheurl arranged to have bound together these newly printed works, along with the older Regimiento, which he had possibly only recently acquired, and afterwards inserted the new bookplate.

Not only did Scheurl write on the title page of the first work, he also underlined and annotated passages in several of the works, especially Bracelli’s and Gebwiler’s. Usually his annotations were brief and written in Latin, but together with the underlinings and pointers to highlight certain passages, they leave an impression of the personal stamp of the owner.

James Fenimore Cooper: Young Man to Author

BY CONSTANTINE EVANS

The distinctive event that marks the beginning of Cooper's progress towards a career as an author took place in 1805, when at age sixteen he left Yale College in disgrace. uninspired by his studies, Cooper had devoted his collegiate life to solitary walks, a series of pranks, and at least one brawl. When in his junior year he ignited a gunpowder charge in the keyhole of a fellow student's door, he had his academic career concluded by the college authorities.¹

For what future career Yale was to be a preparation is not known. One critic, however, suggests that it "was entirely in keeping with William Cooper's [Cooper's father] view of life that his son should profit by the family increases in fortune and social position". We should note here that the youthful rise of William Cooper during the Revolutionary War was an American success story, with perhaps a smudge on it. One commentator remarks that he was "possibly, at worst, a war-time profiteer . . . at best, little more than an adventurous capitalist who took care to form the right connexions". In any event, he had in 1786, at age 31, sufficient wealth to acquire 40,000 acres in the Cooperstown area of upstate New York. These he promptly sold, greatly increasing his fortune. An active state politician and local judge, he gained power as well as wealth; but clearly he looked to each of his four sons to become the gentleman, educated and cultured, that he never was. Thus, after the debacle at Yale, William Cooper took direct charge of his son's education and Cooper was made to resume his studies for a year under a tutor at Cooperstown. He again remained indifferent to study, and Judge Cooper, thinking

Otsego Hall, Cooperstown, New York, from Pages and Pictures from the Writings of James Fenimore Cooper, with Notes by Susan Fenimore Cooper (New York, 1865). The small sketches that accompany this article are by F. O. C. Darley as engraved by P. F. Annin for Pages and Pictures.
a disciplined life in order, decided that his son should have a career in the United States Navy.2

To qualify for entry into the Navy, Cooper sailed before the mast on the merchant ship Stirling, the absence of a naval academy making the merchant service a common training ground for naval candidates. Stirling sailed from New York on 15 October 1806, bound for London, and completed its voyage on 18 September 1807. With a facility that became characteristic of him once his interests were engaged, Cooper mastered a formidable range of seamanship and developed a passion for the sea. Significantly, Cooper was also exposed to the underside of life. According to another critic, the crew of Stirling was probably composed of "the flotsam and jetsam of society, derelicts, and drunkards, Ishmaels, . . . some of them in delirium tremens, whom the young Cooper, just barely seventeen, joined for his first voyage".3 All this—combined with a stormy crossing, pursuit by a pirate ship, and the boarding by a British press gang—must have made the bowers of Yale and the relative comforts of home seem very remote to Cooper. But his experience did not defeat him.

William Cooper, former Congressman and still-prominent Federalist, then used his political influence to get his son an appointment in the United States Navy.4 His influence must have been, and indeed needed to be, considerable, for as one naval historian writes of Robert Smith, Secretary of the Navy: "Smith insisted that all application [for appointment to midshipman] should be accompanied with recommendations from men of worth and note who were personally acquainted with the young man".5

A midshipman's warrant, dated 1 January 1808 and signed by Thomas Jefferson, together with a blank oath of allegiance was sent

to Cooper. On 20 February Cooper, who had been absent from Cooperstown, returned the oath, duly notarized, and four days later was ordered to report to the commanding naval officer at New York City.\(^6\)

Cooper's choice of careers, although dictated by his father, seemed a happy one. The preparatory voyage on Stirling proved congenial to his adventurous temperament and provided an outlet for his extravagant energies; it also allowed Cooper to be on his own while at the same time obeying his father. The Navy offered a continuation of this independent/dependent relationship with his father. As events turned out, however, Cooper could not have entered the Navy at a worse time. A context to make fully intelligible Cooper's dissatisfaction with a naval career and his subsequent resignation from the service is established by consulting naval history.

The Constitution, which came into effect in 1789, empowered Congress to "provide and maintain a Navy" and named the President as "commander in chief of the Navy". By congressional act, control of naval affairs was invested in the Department of War.\(^7\) The physical growth of the Navy, however, was neither rapid nor extensive. Equally slow was its removal from the jurisdiction of the War Department to an independent cabinet rank nine years after the Constitution had created it. The tardiness in each case can be explained by the fact that the very existence of a navy was strongly contested from the start.

Opposition to a navy was based on two broad positions, each reflecting Republican or anti-Federalist policy. The Republicans considered a navy a useless expense, especially in the face of an enormous national debt. Further, the fact that there was no pressing need

7. Quotations from the Constitution taken from synopsis in Paullin's *History*, 89–90.
for a naval force after the Revolution was a strong card in Republican hands. Objection to a navy was also founded on philosophic issues raised by the Revolution: "Permanent armies and navies", naval historians tell us, "were, in the popular view, the plaything of tyrants, the ornaments of that very system which America had just so violently repudiated". What finally removed opposition to a navy and initiated its subsequent growth in size and status was the sudden necessity to have one as a weapon to protect American commerce.

The capture of American ships and the ransom extorted by the Barbary States for captured American seamen became the strongest card the Federalists had to urge a naval program. National honor was the hue and cry. The result was the Naval Armament bill. It was, however, the so-called 'quasi-war' with France (1797–1800) that elevated the Navy to a cabinet status and gave it the prestige of an independent institution.

But while the Navy continued to be the object of political wrangling, it was developing a life of its own in terms of martial honor, heroism, and glory. The high point of the Navy's self-consciousness was the Tripolitan War (1801–1805). The war made heroes, and the heroes made a compelling tradition of naval daring and courage. Ironically, this blossoming of esprit de corps took place during the administration of the Navy's greatest adversary, Thomas Jefferson. According to one naval history source:

The triumph of the Jeffersonian Republican Party, in the presidential and congressional elections of 1800, foreshadowed radical changes in naval policy. The Federalist defeat meant a shift of political power from the seaboard to the interior, and from commerce and finance to agriculture. . . . And it was not beyond the realm of possibility that the new regime might abolish the sea-going Navy altogether.9

Jefferson, of course, could not get rid of the Navy, but he could and did reduce its size and transform it. His "dry dock" plan, which in-

volved laying up the American fleet in a Washington shipyard, pro-
duced a tremendous uproar, for the officer corps was to be deacti-
vated, as the absence of ships obviated the need for crews. Jefferson's
“dry dock” scheme, however, failed to receive congressional ap-
proval. But a measure that did gain legislative approval was his con-
troversial “gun boat” policy—“another of his naval inventions”, and
“his most useless”.10

A gun boat was a small tactical vessel designed to be used in shal-
low water and was nearly useless for deep sea navigation. Referred to
as “Jiffs” by naval wags, these vessels were unpopular since they did
not train personnel for sea duty.11 Cooper, speaking from direct per-
sonal experience, writes, in his own History of the Navy, that Jeffer-
son's plan “for a short time, threatened destruction to the pride,
discipline, tone, and even morals, of the service”:

There can be no question, that, in certain circumstances
vessels of this sort may be particularly useful; but these cir-
cumstances are rare occurrences, as they are almost always
connected with attacks on towns and harbours. . . . The
American coast has an extent of nearly two thousand miles,
and to protect it by means of gun-boats, even admitting the
practicability of the method, would involve an expenditure
sufficient to create a movable force of ships, that would not
only answer all the same purposes of defense, but which would
possess the additional advantage of acting, at need, offen-
sively. In other words, it was entailing on the country the
cost of an efficient marine, without enjoying its advantages.12

In 1807, the year before Cooper entered the Navy, Congress autho-
rized the construction of 188 gun boats, more than tripling a like
authorization in 1806.13

10. Paullin, Naval Administration, 128; 133.
11. Paullin, Naval Administration, 135; Guttridge and Smith, Commodores, 172;
Sprout, American Naval Power, 58–60.
12. J. Fenimore Cooper, The History of the Navy of the United States of America,
also: Henry Walcott Boynton, James Fenimore Cooper (New York: Century Co.,
1931), 44–45.
13. Paullin, Naval Administration, 134.
The young Cooper, of course, having no idea that "the pride, discipline, tone, and even morals" of the Navy were being menaced, entered at the height of Jefferson's policy of pacifism. At this time the Navy had only twelve sea-going vessels, and there was little enough employment for naval officers, let alone for midshipmen just entering the Navy.\textsuperscript{14} Cooper's first duty was attached to the bomb ketch \textit{Vesuvius}, in New York for repairs.

A respite from idleness came on 5 July 1808, when Cooper was transferred to Lake Ontario to serve under the command of Lt. M. T. Woolsey. There were war winds in the atmosphere, and Cooper's transfer was part of an executive decision to fortify both Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, where the British had ships. Woolsey's instructions included the construction of a 16-gun brig of war. The British were busy building a brig of their own across the lake, an activity which caused some tension; however, in a letter to his oldest brother, Richard, Cooper remarked that although he had purchased a pair of pistols he would not need them.\textsuperscript{15} The duty was in fact peaceful, and Cooper apparently had a merry winter with his comrades.

By the spring of 1809 Cooper was becoming bored—but he was showing, by his subsequent actions, an initiative with regard to the management of his destiny previously absent from his conduct. On 8 April he wrote to Paul Hamilton, now Secretary of the Navy in James Madison's new administration, for a transfer to a station of

\textsuperscript{14} Bolander, "Naval Career", 543.
\textsuperscript{15} Letters and Journals, 1:10.
Also in the mails was Woolsey's recommendation for Cooper's promotion. Cooper's request and Woolsey's recommendation were ignored. On 13 September Cooper wrote to Hamilton requesting a year's furlough to make a European voyage. The object of the voyage was to accumulate more knowledge of seamanship—not at the time an unusual request. The Navy Department granted this request, but Cooper wrote Hamilton from New York that he could not find a ship for Europe. He wished permission, therefore, to cancel his furlough and to be transferred to Wasp 18, under the command of Lt. James Lawrence.

Lawrence, having distinguished himself in the Tripolitan War and being destined in four years to trade his life for naval glory, was a formidable and persuasive figure. Interestingly, he was in fact born, eight years earlier, next door to Cooper's own birthplace in Burlington, New Jersey. Whether Cooper appealed to this neighborly connection is not known, but he, as one commentator notes, "succeeded in wangling a berth aboard the Wasp".

Cooper developed a fast friendship with Lawrence, "the perfect man of war man", as he later recalled him in his own history of the Navy, and in the words of a later naval historian "one of the most gallant and attractive personalities in the annals of the United States Navy". But much as Cooper may have enjoyed the society of the charismatic Lawrence, he again found himself landlocked. If Cooper had any sea duty at all during this period, it lasted only four days—a voyage from New York to Boston. To make matters worse, he was assigned tedious recruiting duties in New York. Cooper's naval career was running into the sands.

Then, on 22 December 1809, Cooper's father died, the victim of apparent manslaughter; he had been struck from behind by a political enemy after leaving a political meeting in Albany. Cooper, as

17. Ibid., 15.
18. Ibid.
20. Quoted by Beard (Letters and Journals, 1:16n), whose citation reads, "History of the Navy, II, 105–106".
did each of his four brothers, inherited $50,000 and twenty-three specified farms. Although now in a financial position to leave the service, Cooper wrote to Hamilton on 3 May 1810, requesting a year's furlough "owing to the recent death of my Father" and the necessity of immediately attending "to my private affairs". Cooper further explained that the furlough was the alternative to resignation. It is important to notice that Cooper is stretching a point by saying his father's death was "recent". The full ambiguity of the letter—and, indeed, of Cooper's conduct—is readily apparent when the Hamilton letter is compared to Cooper's letter to his brother Richard, dated 18 May 1810, six days after receiving his one-year furlough. In the first portion of his letter, Cooper told Richard how on a previous visit to New York he had mentioned his intent to resign from the Navy: "... my only reason at that time was the blasted prospects of the service". Cooper then mentioned that he had written his resignation and submitted it to Lawrence, who "very warmly" recommended that he give the service another year or two; nevertheless, Lawrence would use his influence to procure Cooper a year's furlough. Cooper noted that he had accepted this arrangement, adding that it was in his power to resign at the end of the year "should the situation of the Country warrant it".

The first portion of the letter to Richard provided a background to the Hamilton letter, but the second portion, frequently cited by Cooper scholars, presented a new reason for resigning from the service—a reason presumably concealed from Lawrence and certainly from Hamilton. In a rapid shift in tone the younger brother confronted the present head of the family with the news that he was planning to be married to "the daughter of a man of very respectable connections and a handsome fortune". After assuring Richard of the high social rank of Susan Augusta De Lancey's family, he instructed him to "take your Hat and go to mother, the boys, girls" to ask if there is any objection to the marriage; Cooper averred that there had better not be. Richard was then to "take your pen in hand" and write Susan's father of the "happiness and pleasure" the Cooper family would experience upon the marriage. The concluding passage of the letter, "I wish not to interrupt you in your attempt to clear the

23. Letters and Journals, 1:16; 17n3.
24. Ibid., 17–18.
estate", indicated that Cooper's furlough request had less to do with his father's death than with his having met Susan De Lancey.

As noted, Judge Cooper had left a substantial estate. What concerns us here, however, is what has been seen as another part of Cooper's inheritance: an "intense devotion to the ideal of the function of the gentleman". It is in Cooper that "the agrarian dream of a thriving country-side dotted with splendid yet democratic gentry to lead and serve the people had its most energetic, and sincere, spokesman".25

Dates are now especially important. Since Cooper had only met Susan sometime in that spring of 1810,26 his 18 May letter to his brother suggests both ardor and a strong resolve.

Cooper's proposal of marriage has been called his first decision as a man.27 In other words, it was a life-decision made independently of his father and yet made possible by his father's death. Cooper was now, at the appropriate age of twenty-one, psychologically as well as financially prepared to step into his father's shoes. The two halves of his letter to Richard make manifest Cooper's transition from immaturity to maturity. Completing the picture is a much later letter to the Navy Department, written to clear up a snag attending his actual resignation on 28 April 1811; here Cooper reveals in effect that Susan's acceptance of Cooper's proposal was contingent on his resignation from the service.28

28. Letters and Journals, 1:25; 25n; 26n3; 27–28; 29n3; 71–74; 76–78; 89–91; 92–93; 105–8. The Secretary's letter (dated 6 May 1811) accepting Cooper's resignation
“I loved her like a man and told her of it like a sailor”, Cooper wrote to Richard. Thus, half-in and half-out of the service, Cooper took his first tentative steps towards his new identity.

No one doubts that Cooper also loved the Navy—not the duties, which were tedious or nonexistent, but the camaraderie, which the passing years changed into a proud nostalgia. Cooper’s own history of the Navy attests his lifelong concern for the service. Another dramatic career change lay ahead; but for now Cooper was not only leaving the Navy, he was leaving his boyhood.

Cooper’s transformation, begun at age thirty, from gentleman farmer of Scarsdale, Westchester County, to author seems to come out of nowhere. According to family legend, he began his first novel, Precaution (1820), after an abrupt remark to his wife that he could write a better book than the one he was reading aloud to her. This sudden impulse to write a novel, however, signaled a family adventure, not a celestial visitation of the Muse, for Cooper was leading a busy and full life during the spring of 1820. A quaint but graphic rendering of Cooper’s enthusiasm for his life as a gentleman farmer was recalled by his daughter:

While Precaution was being written, the author was engaged in work decidedly more to his taste, the improvement of the grounds about the cottage of Angevine [the name of the Cooper farm]. Landscape gardening was a new art in America at that date. . . . But the cottage at Angevine was built at the precise moment when new ideas of these subjects were opening before the minds of the country gentry. Mr. Cooper became deeply interested in the subject of planning a lawn, building a ha-ha fence, and setting out trees. He was very daring in transplanting; the size of some of the elms caused neighbors to generally shake their heads. Always active in

was misdirected; Cooper was in the dark as to his status until the Secretary (now William Jones) finally confirmed his resignation (27 January 1813); the later letter referred to above was written 8 January 1823 to question what Cooper thought were monies erroneously charged to him while performing recruiting duties, and to claim pay he thought still due him dating to the time he received official confirmation of his resignation.


30. Boynton, James Fenimore Cooper, 80. See also: Letters and Journals, 1:41–42.
his habits, he was generally in the fields while this ditching, and fencing, and transplanting was going on, often taking part in the work himself.\textsuperscript{31}

Indeed, looking at Cooper at this point in his life, one is surprised by a somewhat obscure item in his subsequent biography: a dying Franz Schubert calling for Cooper’s novels to console his last hours.\textsuperscript{32}

But, in fact, Cooper’s career as an author did not come out of nowhere; it emerged from a series of painful circumstances that began just as he was making the transformation from naval officer to gentleman farmer.

Cooper’s year furlough was granted 10 May 1810; he was married 1 January 1811 at his wife’s home in Mamaroneck. He immediately made plans for a civilian and domestic life; on 28 April 1811 he honored his pledge to Susan to resign from the Navy, apparently timing his resignation to coincide with the expiration of his furlough. During this interval he rented a small farm, appropriately named Closet Hall, in New Rochelle, about five miles from Susan’s family home. The residence was to be temporary, for Cooper concluded his resignation letter to the Secretary of the Navy, “I shall await your orders at Cooperstown where any orders from the Navy Department will find me”.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Letters and Journals}, 1:25.
But Cooper’s plans to return to Cooperstown were thwarted by the misdirection of the Navy’s acceptance letter. The confusion that followed pinned Cooper to New Rochelle and at the same time cooperated with his wife’s persistent desire to live near her family. Not until 27 January 1813 did Cooper, after a complicated correspondence, receive official confirmation of his resignation. He was then free to move to Cooperstown. Finally, in July, four months after the birth of their second child, the Coopers left New Rochelle.

The move to Cooperstown was inaugurated by tragedy: the Coopers’ first child, Elizabeth, died within a month. This event, tragic in itself, no doubt further alienated Susan from her provincial surroundings and augmented her need to be in a familiar setting. Susan returned for a visit home less than a year later.

The situation—Susan’s desire to be near her family, her dislike of Cooperstown—was complicated by Cooper apparently caring little for his wife’s Mamaroneck circle. The resulting awkwardness is revealed by the following passage from a letter Cooper wrote to Susan on 30 June 1814, during her projected six-week visit to her family. It is a long gossipy letter, the recital of local news broken by expressions of painful loneliness: “I received no letter from you last night although I certainly expected one. I suppose you so much engaged by your Friends that they give you, [sic] little time to yourself. Of this I cannot complain after having had you entirely my own for the preceding year—We have had no rain for two weeks. Every thing is suffering greatly—I am fearful our crop of hay will be but small. Corn looks well other crops tolerable.”

While observing the texture of Cooper’s private life, we should also notice that Cooper’s public life accorded well with his father’s views. In other words, Cooper was fulfilling his role as a public-spirited landowner by founding Bible and agricultural societies and being active in the state militia. But what he seemed to lack—both he and his brothers—was his father’s ability to make and manage money successfully. In brief, Susan’s desire to live near her family was satisfied in the autumn of 1817. By that time Cooper had gone through his cash inheritance; and largely because of the prodigality of his brothers, much of his father’s estate was vanishing under previous debts and claims. A new, large stone house, named Fenimore, was finished but unoccupied (and would remain unoccupied, for it

34. Ibid., 31.
burned down in 1823). While Cooper and his wife were paying an extended visit to Susan's parents, his mother died. Cooperstown now must have represented only the shell of a life, and so, when in January 1818 the De Lanceys provided him with a farm in Scarsdale, Cooper, deeply in debt, must have seen the chance for a new start. He had nothing to lose.

In Scarsdale, at Angevine, Cooper vigorously duplicated his life in Cooperstown, participating in Bible and agricultural societies, the state militia, and extending the range of his public activities to include Clintonian Republican politics. He ensured his social standing by forming close ties with the prominent John Jay family. The biographical portrait of Cooper that we have seen in his daughter's description bears witness to the energy that he expended in making a life for himself and his family. But the portrait is incomplete.

Leaving Cooperstown was a severe blow to Cooper for reasons linked to his ambiguous relationship with the De Lancey family. First of all, Cooper was genuinely proud of his connection with the De Lanceys; he even worked on compiling a De Lancey genealogy. Judge Cooper would have approved of such a connection. But the De Lancey family was also intimidating. As one critic notes, the Coopers were social upstarts, whereas the De Lanceys had been one of the great Tory families of New York, and "in a state which had changed its politics but not its social structure, the De Lancey name was still a great one".35 What in effect reenforced his sense of De Lancey superiority

35. Dekker, Cooper: The Novelist, 16.
was the fact that Angevine had been conveyed in trust to him, with Susan's two brothers—Thomas James and Edward Floyd De Lancey—acting as trustees. Under the terms of the conveyance, the property was not liable to Cooper's personal debts. The De Lanceys obviously had their doubts about Cooper's ability to become solvent. This could not have been lost upon Cooper.

Thus, once the De Lancey family is seen as a psychological burden to Cooper, his daughter's description of his domestic activities takes on a new light. A touch of frenzy becomes evident—even in his landscape gardening. Beyond his genteel pursuits, we find a man investing in a frontier store in DeKalb, New York, and later in a whaler in Sag Harbor, a man speculating and mortgaging property to preserve the social status he saw as his own heritage as well as that of his wife: "... because he loved and admired [Susan] and because she was a De Lancey, he had to maintain and even improve his social and economic position".

A fleeting acquaintance with Cooper's immense pride and bristling temperament, his strange penchant to sense a wrong, real or imaginary, makes predictable the break between Cooper and the De Lanceys.

All of Cooper's biographers agree that Cooper's marriage was the one unclouded, sustaining feature of his life. A part of Cooper's sunny domestic life was reading novels aloud to his wife. The novels were often the popular British fare of the day that Susan enjoyed. When, as we have seen, in the spring of 1820, he read one he didn't like, he produced one of his own—produced, that is, a tale set in England, a pastiche of the British novel of manners.

Although the writing of Precaution began as a novelty, Cooper

37. Dekker, Cooper: The Novelist, 17.
took enough interest in it to show it around. Encouraged by family and friends, he sought a publisher, in this case a bookseller who would have the book printed, bound, and distributed at the author's expense. The publisher he wrote to in New York on 31 May 1820 was Andrew Goodrich, who was the only publisher Cooper knew well enough to approach confidentially. Goodrich took the job of publishing *Precaution*, while Cooper, in turn, viewed the operation more and more as a taxing emotional investment.

To make what follows fully intelligible, we have to appreciate that Cooper, at age thirty, was in many ways a failure. In spite of his energy and genuine ability, he could not gain economic freedom. By 1819 all his brothers had died, leaving Cooper responsible for the surviving families as well as a family of his own saddled with debt. It was debt that had forced him to abandon Cooperstown, the symbolic locus of his independence and identity. His wife's brothers were the trustees of the house he lived in, making him answerable to men of his own age. Furthermore, not having his father's speculative skills, Cooper was rapidly overreaching himself to salvage his father's estate. Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that he looked at times upon *Precaution* as a possible cause of further failure and expense.

Cooper's first letter to Goodrich has the superscripture "Most strictly confidential", which established the tone of anxiety characterizing the entire enterprise. Part of Cooper's desire for secrecy, reiterated in the letter, was related both to his fear of public humiliation and to his intention of passing off *Precaution*, which would be published anonymously, as an English novel. The ploy would automatically make the novel acceptable to the Anglophile literary public and thus increase the chance of profit.

Additional trials were made on Cooper's spirits as Goodrich's compositors blundered *Precaution* through the press. Harried by farm labors and trips to Sag Harbor, Cooper could not get to New York City to see his book printed. Correcting the proof sheets mailed to him was sometimes left to Susan. In an extended correspondence,

39. Ibid.
Cooper cajoled, insisted, and finally threatened a lawsuit to have Goodrich do the thing right—and quickly. *Precaution*, wretchedly printed, was issued 10 November 1820.

Writing a novel—learning how to manage a dramatic narrative, move characters about and have them function in a concrete setting, as well as mastering the technicalities of manuscript preparation—was not to be an empty experience. The habitual energy Cooper brought to whatever interested him, his great pride, and his competitive nature all demanded continuing effort. If he could write a better book than the one he had read to his wife, so could he write a better book than the one he had just written for her. On 28 June 1820, while seeing *Precaution* through the press, Cooper wrote to Goodrich: “... by the persuasion of Mrs. Cooper I have commenced another tale to be called the ‘Spy[,] scene in West-Chester, and time of the revolutionary war”. The situation in this case, however, differed significantly from the one producing *Precaution*, for from this date Cooper, slowly and haltingly, gravitated towards his new vocation. Although referring only to *The Spy*, he intuited the terms of his future career: “The task”, he wrote Goodrich, “of making American Manners and American scenes interesting to American readers is an arduous one—I am unable to say whether I shall succeed or not”.41

Fear of failure, now seemingly habitual with Cooper, doubtlessly played a major role in delaying the composition of *The Spy*. The first volume was actually written and printed before Cooper could bring himself to write the final volume. To reassure his publisher—and perhaps himself—Cooper wrote the book’s last chapter, which was set in type and paged, before composing the rest of the volume. A confident Cooper, writing in the preface of the third edition of *The Spy* (1822), recalled those days of trepidation: “While the book was in the press, we consulted with a few friends on the subject of abandoning its publication. We were persuaded to persevere, as it was urged that ‘Precaution’ had received a respectful notice from a few English periodicals and newspapers, and it was thought its author would be secure from loss.”42 *The Spy* was issued on 22 December 1821. It was a spectacular financial and critical success.

41. *Letters and Journals*, 1:44.
42. Quoted by Boynton, *James Fenimore Cooper*, 91–92.
Cooper's life as a gentleman farmer came to an abrupt end in the autumn of 1822. A quarrel with the De Lancey family over the way Cooper managed both his own money and his wife's property not under De Lancey control led Cooper to abandon Angevine and take his family to live in New York City. But Cooper went to New York a newly emerged author, and not for reasons exclusively connected with the success of The Spy.

Cooper's transformation from gentleman farmer to author had been slowly unfolding between 1820 and 1822. During this interval Cooper had enlarged his acquaintance with some of the New York intellectual world and had become involved in tangential literary concerns. In June 1820, about the time Cooper wrote Goodrich that he was starting The Spy, Charles Kitchell, an old Navy messmate, started a patriotic quarterly, The Literary and Scientific Repository. By 1821, Cooper had begun to contribute reviews to this journal. The Repository was published by Wiley and Halsted, who would in turn publish The Spy. Charles Wiley soon became Cooper's trusted friend and business associate, while Goodrich faded completely from sight. Prestigious publishers would follow: in a tribute to Cooper's literary business acumen, one critic notes that it "could not have been mere luck that [Cooper] gravitated towards the best literary publishers of his day". What marked, however, the most overt shift in Cooper's new

44. A facsimile reproduction of Cooper's contributions to The Repository, together with an introduction and notes by James Franklin Beard, is found in James Fenimore Cooper: Early Critical Essays (1820–1822) (Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimile & Reprints, 1977).
sense of identity were his social activities. His desire to lead and dominate soon had him holding forth in the back room of Wiley’s bookstore—the “Den” as he called it. And by the same impulse which had caused him to organize Bible and agricultural societies, he founded (before 1822) his Bread and Cheese Lunch. This group, social and convivial in purpose, was composed of New York writers and artists, prominent doctors, lawyers, and merchants. It rivaled in popularity similar gatherings in New York City, and Cooper was its leading member.46

One further point needs to be made about Cooper’s transformation from gentleman farmer to author. Cooper was working on a third book—The Pioneers, first of the Leatherstocking Tales—even before he had heard of the stunning success of The Spy.47 When Cooper moved to New York The Pioneers was ready for the printer. This book and not The Spy completed Cooper’s transformation from gentleman farmer to author. Cooper’s relationship with the De Lancey family had by now reached a crisis point. The dramatic success of The Spy may have done wonders for Cooper’s fragile confidence, but his victory had a marring irony attached to it: The Spy is set in Westchester, and Westchester meant the De Lanceys. Indeed, the De Lanceys’ Tory ancestors even figure in chapter ten of the novel. The Pioneers, on the other hand, is set in the thinly disguised Cooperstown of Cooper’s boyhood. Thus, in writing The Pioneers Cooper escaped Westchester and returned to Cooperstown in the only way he could, imaginatively. More importantly, the very act of writing The Pioneers freed Cooper psychologically from De Lancey domination and established his independence and new identity on his home ground. On the literal level, Cooper took his family to New York to be near his publisher and to establish himself in the city’s congenial cultural milieu.

Forming an interesting aside to these events is a minor drama unfolding in the real Cooperstown. The following is an extract from a letter written on 11 February 1822 by a Cooperstown resident:

47. Letters and Journals, 1:25.
In the polite circles of the village there are now very much in vogue the publications of a former citizen, James Cooper Esq. These are two novels, two volumes each, the size of the most approved English works of this description. I have not yet perused either of them; I speak from their general reputation only. The first is called "Precaution". . . . It is said to have been in good demand even at London, and at least
the British Reviews have spoken favorably of it, considering that it emitted from this country. The other is "The Spy: a Tale of the Neutral Ground". . . . "The Spy" has been pronounced the best novel which has ever been written in this country. It has met with a sale unprecedented in our literature. The first edition, which came out last fall, has been taken up and a second one called for, which will immediately issue. The author is engaged in composing another for the press—"The Pioneers, or the Sources of the Susquehanna". Whenever this shall appear I shall not omit reading it, should my opportunity be as great as my inclination. . . .

Some persons pretending that James Cooper has more vanity to father than wit to write a novel (perhaps, from the prejudice which is always felt against those seemingly superior,) have ascribed these publications to his wife or Mr. Atcherson [sic], his intimate friend. It is probable they are the joint efforts of the three who are individually more than respectable in literary acquirements. The last work has been dedicated to Mr. Atcherson; who can not consequently be supposed the author of it.48

About a year after the publication of The Pioneers (1823), Judge Cooper's house, Otsego Hall, was sold to satisfy debts against the estate. Two years later, Cooper, now the famous and undisputed author of The Last of the Mohicans, took his family to Europe for seven years. He returned to Cooperstown in 1834 and repurchased his father's house. In time, Cooper was reconciled with the De Lancey family, but his home was in Cooperstown for the rest of his life.

48. Letter from Renssalaer W. Russell to Lt. J. W. Webb, 11 February 1822, James Watson Webb Collection, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University. Cooper's daughter relates a similar episode: "Quite as a matter of course, [Precaution] was supposed, at first, to have been written in England, and by a woman. The publisher, however, declared that it was an American work, and written by a gentleman of New York. . . . when, at last, the name of Mr. Cooper began to be whispered in connection with the tale, incredulity rather increased—the very suggestion was considered a piece of pleasantry. . . . For a long time it was attributed to an English lady, a near connection of Mr. Cooper." (James Fenimore Cooper, Pages and Pictures from the Writings of James Fenimore Cooper, with Notes by Susan Fenimore Cooper [New York: James Miller, 1865], 20).
REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN

As I write in early March 1988, it is exactly two years since I assumed the position of University Librarian at Syracuse University and an opportune time to report formally to the Library Associates on these eventful years in the life of the Library. It has been an exciting period of change and innovation, as this University strives to achieve new levels of excellence in its academic and research programs. We see the Library as an integral part of those efforts.

In broad outline, the library staff devoted the academic year of 1986–87 to the assessment of and planning for the entire library system; in the following year, now drawing to a close, we began the initial stages of implementation of many of the recommendations resulting from the planning process. We have been profoundly encouraged by the support of the University administration and faculty, by the participation of library personnel at all levels, and by the profusion of good ideas that have come forth from many segments of the community. We have made a good start toward realizing the potential of this Library to serve its community. Much remains to be done.

One major achievement of the past year has been the development in the Bird Library of a new, unified information center on the first floor. This was hardly a new idea, but a need recognized almost from the opening of our doors in 1972, when it soon became clear that staffing was insufficient for the multiplicity of service points in the original design. Until this fall, Bird Library has had "subject floors" that functioned quite like separate branch libraries, each with its own specialized staff. In order to provide a more centralized and interdisciplinary approach to reference and information services, we have merged service points on the Area Studies, Social Sciences,
and Humanities floors with the first-floor General Reference Department, to form a considerably larger Information Services Department. Subject specialists in the various disciplines remain available for reference, collection development consultation, and bibliographic instruction. More staff are available at any given time to assist library users. Reference tools have also been brought together in a single, more usable collection. A larger and more highly visible information/reference desk makes it easier to approach staff for information, and for staff to assist users with indexes, reference tools, or the online catalog. Interdisciplinary work is greatly enhanced in this new setting.

Such specialized automated reference tools as Infotrac and Compact Disclosure, invaluable sources of bibliographic and other information on a wide variety of subjects, are being far more heavily utilized in this new first-floor location. Library staff in the Information Services Department are able to introduce these newer technologies to a wide variety of library users.

The issue of reference services was but one of many addressed during the planning year. Two staff retreats, held at Minnowbrook Conference Center at Blue Mountain Lake during 1986, helped librarians focus their thinking about possible elements of change and the mechanisms to make it happen. Subsequently, seven task forces were established to examine virtually all aspects of the Library, including such areas as organization and staffing, physical arrangement, user behavior, and future directions in automation. Each task force was charged with making both short- and long-term recommendations for change. Virtually all librarians on the staff contributed to this effort.

Concurrently, the Library was named as one of five units of the University selected for in-depth study as part of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation visit in March 1988. The report the Library prepared for that visit drew heavily on recommendations and observations made by the Library's task forces. In addition, Professor Michael S. Nilan of the School of Information Studies planned and conducted a series of surveys designed to give the Library information about its users' needs. The task force and Middle States reports as well as user surveys have all helped the Library to develop specific short- and long-term goals and have contributed to the Library's ongoing planning process.

All of this has been achieved with virtually no disruption in ser-
vice, at minimal capital cost, while giving us valuable experience towards planning more permanent quarters for information services, a crucial part of longer-term (and more expensive) plans for the reconfiguration of the entire Library. These plans include, at Bird Library, changing the present two-entrance layout to a single entrance/exit, reorganization of the general collection into a single, unified, rational, and understandable A–Z shelving sequence, and creating stairwell access to all floors. Other major projects in the planning stage include technological and automation improvements, and the locating of funds for preservation and collection development activities as well as for space and other critical needs in the Science and Technology Library.

Access Services and Security have also been major preoccupations of our planning during the past two years. Access Services responsibilities include circulation, interlibrary loan, reserves, and maintenance of our large collection of current periodicals. This year the department has assumed responsibility for reshelving all general stack materials used in the Library or borrowed and returned by readers. In the past, books located on each of the subject floors were reshelved by staff on those floors. Between September and December 1987, Access Services staff reshelved 90,000 borrowed books. Perhaps four to five times that number, used in-house but not borrowed, were also returned to their proper places on the shelves. Regular reshelving of library materials is perhaps the single most essential but unsung and unheroic task the Library performs.

Security issues have also been under discussion much of the year. The campus and Library are accessibly "downtown". Our collections of some 2.5 million books and journals draw, in a typical week, approximately 32,000 users. As can be imagined, overcrowding occurs, especially at certain times of the day and the academic year. There is also relatively heavy use of library resources by those with no current affiliation to the University. These conditions, as well as the occasional theft of personal property, have led the Library to reexamine some current access and security policies. A first step has been to establish a new Security/Facilities office with responsibility for building access, maintenance, and security. New staff and some revised policies will soon be in place to provide an improved atmosphere in the Library for study and research. An integral part of this process has been to ask everyone currently affiliated with the Uni-
versity to provide identification on entering the Library. Those not affiliated with the University have been asked to complete a short registration slip, in order to enable the Library to learn more about this group of users. So generous has the University been in sharing its library resources with the larger community, that this procedure, common to almost all urban libraries, has been regarded by some with dismay. While Syracuse University Library materials should always be available to scholars and others needing them, no university library can any longer afford to be the first resource for members of the broader community who can easily obtain identical or similar materials in school, county, corporate, or public libraries nearby.

Two other issues related to library atmosphere should be briefly noted: noise and the consumption of food and drink. Although the Library has in the past been misused as a social center, students and other users are beginning to indicate (if letters to the editor and articles in the Daily Orange are any indication) a willingness to cooperate in making behavioral changes.

One crisis we have shared with virtually all university libraries since 1985 is the rapid escalation of prices of periodicals, journals, and other serials. Because of the increased volume of published scientific work, inflation, and the weakened dollar abroad, costs in this period have far exceeded rises in our budgets. Funds for books and other materials are correspondingly less available. In the fall of 1987 Vice-Chancellor Gershon Vincow proposed a significant increase in acquisition funds, contingent upon simultaneous efforts by the Library and faculty to reduce on-going journal costs by judicious cancellation of peripheral journals considered less essential to our current research priorities. The program has involved much negotiation and many difficult decisions but has successfully improved our financial ability to support better the monograph-based disciplines in the social sciences and humanities.

In the area of technology and library automation several major decisions loom ahead. Syracuse University Library was one of the first in the country to develop and implement an online public access catalog as the primary tool for access to collections. The system, known as SULIRS, though much used and liked by our users, is, unfortunately, the victim of a technological obsolescence that requires major changes, replacement, or enhancement over the next few years. Planning continues in this crucial area of library service.
The special collections of the George Arents Research Library—of particular interest to many of our Associates—have also received a good deal of planning attention in the past year. Despite extensive collections of rare books, manuscripts, and archives, chronic understaffing since the early 1970s has left large cataloging and processing backlogs which we must deal with in a systematic way. Four planning groups addressed this and other needs of the Arents Library; their recommendations will be considered later this spring.

In addition to the active program of events of bibliographic and library interest, and the publication of the semiannual Courier (in which we take great pride), a major Library Associates concern is to support the growth of the collections with funds for special acquisitions. With the Associates' help we have made significant additions during the past few years, including major manuscript collections of Stephen Crane, Rudyard Kipling, Albert Schweitzer, and Robert Phillips (S.U. class of 1960). We are very pleased to be able to say that during this last year we have added more than a hundred new members to our roster. We thank all our members for their support.

The Library is looking forward to being a part of the University's "Campaign for Syracuse", through which we hope to realize many of the plans outlined here. It will require energy and foresight to carry out these plans effectively and in ways that enhance our service to the University and the scholarly community. The Library stands ready to meet that challenge.

David H. Stam
University Librarian

RECENT ACQUISITIONS

In late 1987 the George Arents Research Library purchased four Benson J. Lossing letters for its collection of Lossing (1813–1891), a historian and artist who popularized United States history with his pictorial field books. The new materials, which span the period of July 1869 to September 1874, are addressed to Archibald Wilson, a bookshop owner in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., and concern the publication of a book of poems written by Wilson's father, William, and edited by Lossing.
With the letters are several newsclippings pertaining to the publication that give us a picture of William (1801–1860). He was an immigrant from Scotland in the 1830s, a frequent contributor to newspapers both in his homeland and in the United States, and a poet—all in all, a man of sufficient standing to be included in the Dictionary of American Biography.

On the whole, William Wilson’s Poems, the topic of this group of letters and clippings, was well received on both sides of the Atlantic and went to three editions (1869, 1875, 1881), all published in Poughkeepsie by Archibald Wilson. In contrast to the popular acclaim is an unsigned, lengthy review in the New York Daily Tribune of 12 July 1881. It reads: “The poet is neither a Burns nor a Motherwell, but walks quite in the beaten path, and gathers of the wild grasses that grow beside it”. The critic goes on to remark that the “zest of character to Wilson’s book is its Scotch enthusiasm and felicitous use of the Scotch dialect”.

Sad to say, the Syracuse University collection of Benson J. Lossing materials is to date lacking a copy of this book, which is needed to round off an interesting vignette in Lossing’s life.

Carolyn A. Davis
Manuscripts Librarian

Syracuse University Library recently acquired the literary papers of poet and editor Robert Phillips, a distinguished alumnus of the University (B.A. 1960 and M.A. 1962) and long-standing member of Library Associates. Mr. Phillips is the author of a number of volumes of poetry, fiction, and critical works as well as the editor of numerous literary anthologies. His poetry and other writings have appeared in the major literary periodicals over the past twenty-five years. His critically acclaimed editions of the letters, poems, and stories of Delmore Schwartz have done much to revive interest in Schwartz’s work.

Since leaving Syracuse University in 1962, Mr. Phillips has succeeded in balancing a full and productive literary life with responsibilities as the creative director in several of New York City’s major advertising firms. Last year, Mr. Phillips received the Award in Literature given by the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters; also, he was one of the poets invited to participate when Robert Penn Warren was installed as Poet Laureate. Syracuse Uni-
University recently honored Mr. Phillips by presenting him with the George Arents Pioneer Medal awarded to alumni who have achieved excellence in their fields of endeavor. In recognition of his gift to the University of a considerable portion of this collection, Mr. Phillips has been named a life member of Library Associates.
In addition to all of his own published and unpublished writings, his papers include extensive correspondence files with some of the major literary figures of the past three decades including Horace Gregory, Marya Zaturenska, Robert Francis, William Heyen, Philip Larkin, Karl Shapiro, Erica Jong, and Elizabeth Spencer. Mr. Phillips' extensive interviews with Shapiro, Larkin, Spencer, and others, undertaken for and published by *The Paris Review*, are included together with hundreds of incoming letters from dozens of writers, early drafts of the work of these writers, and other related material. Of special interest is an extensive file of more than three hundred letters from Joyce Carol Oates, a classmate of Robert Phillips at Syracuse. This file documents a friendship that has extended for nearly thirty years and will be of considerable interest to future scholars studying the life and work of both Oates and Phillips. The acquisition of the Robert Phillips Papers, made possible, in part, by generous support from members of Library Associates and through Mr. Phillips' own gift, complements the Gregory, Zaturenska, Francis, and Granville Hicks collections in the George Arents Research Library and strengthens considerably the Library's holdings of original research materials of twentieth-century writers.

Mark F. Weimer
Rare Book Librarian

The Slide Collection for Fine Arts and Architecture at Bird Library has received a donation of ca. 2000 slides from Winston Weisman, Professor Emeritus at Pennsylvania State University. In his long and distinguished career as an art historian Professor Weisman published many articles on architectural history, in particular on the history of the skyscraper. As a result of this interest, the donated collection of slides represents a splendid record of the development of commercial architecture in the United States and in Europe. It includes engraved views of New York around 1850 by Henry Hoff that illustrate not only early technological developments such as the passenger elevator and skeleton construction, but also the implications of the zoning laws that shaped the environment around the high-rise buildings.

It is through the dedicated effort of Dr. Richard Porter, former Director of the Lowe Art Gallery and a former student of Professor
Weisman, that Syracuse University Library is the recipient of this important collection of architectural slides. A checklist of the holdings has been prepared.

Johanna Winterwerp Prins
Slide Curator

POST-STANDARD AWARD CITATION, 1988,
FOR JOSEPH AND ELAINE SPECTOR

For more than half a century the Spector family has vigorously supported Syracuse University. Joseph and Elaine Spector have continued that family tradition with distinction, from their student days at the University to the present time. An honorary trustee of the University and a Varsity Club member, Joseph Spector has also been cited as a University Letterman of Distinction. In addition, he has been prominently active in community affairs. His services include membership in both the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce and the Metropolitan Development Association.

Joseph and Elaine Spector, recipients of the Post-Standard Award for 1988
(Photo: Bill Gandino).
Over many decades the Spector family’s particular center of interest has been the Syracuse University Library. The seminar room named for Sol Spector, Joseph’s father, is the most visible evidence of the family’s generosity toward the Library. Their enthusiasm for special projects such as the acquisition of the Albert Schweitzer and Stephen Crane collections has been noteworthy. But most importantly, Joseph and Elaine Spector have given the Library marvelous books over the years. In 1967 they donated a collection of important Greek, German, and Dutch Bibles from the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. In that same year, they presented as well a copy of Marc Chagall’s *Cirque*, one of the most prized and beautiful books of this century. To honor them on the occasion of Joseph Spector’s fiftieth reunion year, an exhibition of their selected gifts has been mounted in the Spector Room of Bird Library.

For their continuing support and commitment to scholarship and to all that a university stands for, it is highly appropriate that the 1988 Post-Standard Award for Distinguished Service to the Syracuse University Library be presented jointly to Joseph and Elaine Spector.

**ANNUAL MEETING**

At the annual meeting on 22 April 1988, presided over by Vice-Chairman Arpena S. Mesrobian, the Board of Trustees accepted with regret the resignation of Chester Soling. Mr. Soling has been Chairman of the Library Associates since 1983 and has adeptly guided the organization through a period of considerable growth and change. With unanimous acclaim the Board thanked him for his dedication and energetic leadership. The meeting preceded the spring luncheon, at which the Post-Standard Award was presented to Elaine and Joseph Spector, and David H. Stam, University Librarian, spoke on “Why Libraries Matter”.

During the morning’s business, the Board of Trustees approved the amended bylaws, which are presented beneath, and elected the following officers: Antje B. Lemke, President; David H. Stam, Executive Director; and Mark F. Weimer, Secretary. Also, the following members were elected to the Board of Trustees: Sarah K. Auchincloss, Henry S. Bannister, Antje B. Lemke, Arpena S. Mesrobian, Vernon F. Snow, Eileen Snyder, Walter E. Sutton, and Dorothy
Wertheimer. Chancellor Emeritus William P. Tolley and Professor Emeritus Mary H. Marshall, charter members of this association, were named Honorary Trustees in recognition of their years of support and service to the Library Associates.

BYLAWS OF THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATES

(Adopted on April 22, 1988)

ARTICLE I: Membership

Section 1. Membership is open to any individual interested in the Syracuse University Library. Categories of membership shall be established by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the Executive Committee.

Section 2. Any person who contributes in one year at least $5,000 in cash or $15,000 in property acceptable to the Syracuse University Library shall be enrolled as a life member.

ARTICLE II: Officers

Section 1. The officers of this association shall be a President, Executive Director, Secretary, and Treasurer. All officers shall be elected by the Board of Trustees from its own membership or from the membership at large.

Section 2. The terms of all officers shall commence at the adjournment of the annual meeting.

Section 3. The terms of office of the President, Executive Director, Secretary, and Treasurer shall be for three years.

ARTICLE III: Duties of Officers

Section 1. The officers of this association shall perform the usual duties of such officers, together with such duties as shall be prescribed by the Board of Trustees.

Section 2. The President shall preside over meetings of the Board of Trustees and provide community leadership in developing support for this association.
Section 3. The Executive Director shall have overall responsibility for directing the activities of this association and for the functioning of its board and committees.

Section 4. The President and Executive Director are ex officio members of all committees.

Section 5. In the absence of the President, the Executive Director shall assume the duties of the President. In the event of a vacancy occurring in the office of the President, the Executive Director shall serve as President until the next meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Section 6. The Secretary shall record and distribute the minutes of all meetings of the association and the Board of Trustees and maintain the membership and other records of this association. In addition, the Secretary shall carry on all correspondence of the association and Board and perform such other duties as the Board of Trustees shall determine.

Section 7. The Treasurer shall be responsible for overseeing the financial affairs of the association and for reporting on these matters to the trustees.

ARTICLE IV: Board of Trustees

Section 1. There shall be a Board of Trustees of this association consisting of up to thirty-three elected members. The Board shall elect a President, Executive Director, Secretary, and Treasurer for terms of three years. No more than eleven trustees shall be elected each year for a three-year term.

Section 2. The Chancellor and vice-chancellors of Syracuse University, the University Librarian, the Associate University Librarian for Collections, and officers of the association shall serve as ex officio members of the Board of Trustees. All ex officio members shall be voting trustees.

Section 3. The Board may elect to the Board of Trustees honorary members, by a unanimous vote, upon nomination by the President. Honorary members shall have all the privileges of the elected trustees and shall serve for an unlimited term.

Section 4. Between regular meetings of the association, the Board of Trustees shall act for the association.
ARTICLE V: Duties of the Board of Trustees

Section 1. The direction of the association and its affairs shall be vested in the Board of Trustees.

Section 2. The Board of Trustees may establish and dissolve committees. The President, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, shall appoint members to committees and designate the chairs thereof. The President may also establish additional ad hoc and standing committees with the Board's approval.

Section 3. The Board of Trustees shall have the power to fill any vacancies in its membership between annual meetings.

ARTICLE VI: Committees

Section 1. The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers and ex officio members of the Board, the immediate past President, and such other members as the President shall appoint for a term of one year. The Executive Committee shall have all the powers of the Board of Trustees between its meetings except to amend the bylaws.

ARTICLE VII: Nominations

Section 1. At least thirty days prior to the annual meeting, the President shall, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, appoint a nominations committee of at least three members to nominate candidates for those vacancies to be balloted upon at the next annual meeting.

ARTICLE VIII: Meetings

Section 1. This association shall hold its annual meeting in the month of April or May each year for the election of trustees and the transaction of other business. The date of this meeting shall be determined by the President, and written notice shall be given to the membership at least ten days prior to the determined date.

Section 2. Other meetings of this association may be scheduled by the President or the Executive Director.

Section 3. The Board of Trustees may hold regular meetings at
such place and at such time and upon such notice as it may determine.

Section 4. Special meetings of the Board of Trustees may be called at any time by the President or the Executive Director by giving notice to each trustee.

Section 5. After proper notification, members present shall constitute a quorum at any meeting.

ARTICLE IX: Special Rules

Section 1. The President and the Executive Director shall officially represent this association.

Section 2. No member shall receive directly or indirectly compensation from this association. This association may, however, reimburse any member who has incurred approved expenses in the affairs of the association.

Section 3. With respect to all questions of construction of the constitution or bylaws, the decision of the Board of Trustees shall be final.

Section 4. All matters that may affect, or be affected by, Syracuse University policy shall be cleared with appropriate Syracuse University officials.

ARTICLE X: Amendments

Section 1. These bylaws may be amended by the Board of Trustees at any meeting of the same provided that a ten-day notice of the proposed amendment is given.
IN MEMORIAM

MARIE LITTLE BIRD, widow of Ernest Stevenson Bird for whom Syracuse University's Bird Library was named, died on February 29, 1988 in Granby, Connecticut. Both she and her husband were vigorous supporters of this library. Her surviving son, the Reverend Paul Lachlan Peck, has requested that those who wish to make memorial contributions address the Marie L. Bird Rare Book Endowment Fund at the Ernest Stevenson Bird Library, Syracuse University.

RUTH CANFIELD TOLLEY, wife of Chancellor Emeritus William Pearson Tolley, died at their home on January 12, 1988. She was a graduate of Syracuse University and a member of Alpha Phi Sorority. Ruth Canfield and William Pearson Tolley were classmates at Binghamton Central High School and prominent together in student leadership, and literary and scholarly activities. Upon graduation in 1918, they both continued these interests with high success at Syracuse University.

In 1925 Ruth Canfield and William P. Tolley were married. During the twenty-seven years (commencing in 1943) that Dr. Tolley was chancellor of Syracuse University, Mrs. Tolley devoted special attention to and showed warm concern for faculty wives and children. She was a warm, steadfast, and forthright supporter of her husband in all his work for Syracuse University. In particular, she joined him as an active partner in his appreciation of the library and the development of our special collections. She was a sure and honored friend of the Library Associates.
THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ASSOCIATES, founded in 1953, is a society whose efforts are devoted to the enrichment of the Syracuse University Library and especially the rare book and manuscript collections. The Associates' interests lie in strengthening these collections through the acquisition of unusual books, manuscripts, and other research materials which are rare and often of such value that the Library 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 borrowing privileges and general use of the Syracuse University Library's facilities and resources, as well as invitations to exhibitions, Associates-sponsored lectures, and special events of the University Library. In addition, members will receive our incidental publications, typographic keepsakes, and the Syracuse University Library Associates Courier, a semiannual publication which contains articles related to unusual and interesting aspects of the Library's holdings and, in particular, to the holdings of the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections.

SUGGESTED MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS are as follows: Benefactor, $500; Sustaining member, $200; Individual member, $50; Faculty and staff of Syracuse University, $30; Senior citizen and student, $20. Checks, made payable to Syracuse University Library Associates, should be sent to the Secretary, 100 E. S. Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-2010. For further information about the programs and activities of the Library Associates, telephone (315) 423-2585.
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