

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: REMAPPING DICKINSON AND PERIODICAL STUDIES

Ingrid Satelmajer, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004

Dissertation directed by: Professor Martha Nell Smith
Department of English

My dissertation addresses Emily Dickinson's neglected periodical poems of the 1890s. In examining these poems, it 1) updates and recasts the narrative of Dickinson's posthumous production and 2) challenges long-held assumptions about periodical culture that have contributed to that culture's neglect. Since circulation figures of the periodicals easily exceeded sales figures for Dickinson books in the 1890s and some poems remained uncollected until almost the mid-twentieth century, these poems are vital for understanding the reception and publishing history of Dickinson's poetry. Further, the movement beyond authorial intention in textual studies encourages us to look at "unsanctioned" texts like Dickinson's periodical poems. My project unseats the book-centered nature of production and reception narratives and challenges larger perceptions about the presentation and distribution of American poetry in the nineteenth century,

foregrounding the central role periodicals played in fostering and recording readers' desire for the genre.

This project initially examines how Dickinson's periodical texts worked in concert with the marketing of the four Dickinson books published in the 1890s: *POEMS* (1890), *POEMS* (1891), *LETTERS* (1894), and *POEMS* (1896). In such places as the children's magazine *ST. NICHOLAS*, the Dickinson editorial team of Thomas Wentworth Higginson and Mabel Loomis Todd sought out broader markets and worked to create an image of the poet that would increase the public's appetite for her. The periodicals, however, served as more than mere "handmaidens" to the books. My project employs archival research to examine how Higginson and Todd's editorial production of Dickinson after the author's death clashed with similar efforts in *SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE* and the *INDEPENDENT* by Susan Dickinson (Dickinson's sister-in-law), an editor whose work has been ignored in part because her successes were realized solely in periodicals. But Dickinson's publication record also reveals that periodicals were not a transparent medium for the expression of editorial intention. The reader-based rejection of Dickinson in the *CHRISTIAN REGISTER* reveals the active role readers played in periodical culture. And in the *YOUTH'S COMPANION*, an early media giant, the concerns of a sizable and powerful institution trumped those of any author or author-based editor.

REMAPPING DICKINSON AND PERIODICAL STUDIES

by

Ingrid Satelmajer

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2004

Advisory Committee:

Professor Martha Nell Smith, Chair
Professor Neil Fraistat
Professor Robert Levine
Professor William Sherman

©Copyright by
Ingrid Satelmajer
2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank, first of all, my dissertation committee: Robert Levine, who pushed me to refine arguments and challenge current critical conversations in ways that proved vital for this project's foundation; Bill Sherman, who encouraged me, always with enthusiasm and theoretical sophistication, to consider my work in a larger book history framework; Neil Fraistat, who proved time and again an admirable model in scholarship and pedagogy and who offered crucial guidance and training in textual studies; and Martha Nell Smith, my director, who offered vital support for my project from the start, shared my delight in details, and never let me forget my responsibility to my own voice.

I also have benefited from contact with a wider community of professors and scholars. I thank Mary Norcliffe, Ann Parrish, Otilie Stafford, and David Knott for their continued interest in my work, and I thank Roger Gilbert for the course ("Cultures of American Poetry") that ultimately led me to my topic. I appreciate conversations and/or correspondence with Paula Bernat Bennett, Ellen Gruber Garvey, Katherine King, Barton Levi St. Armand, Robert Scholnick, and the members of the Washington Area Group for Print Culture Studies. Detailed feedback from two anonymous readers at *Book History* helped tremendously; co-editor Ezra Greenspan's astute comments and careful editing pushed me to refine my analysis at a crucial time in the project. Among my many fellow graduate students at the University of Maryland, all part of a truly generative and collegial community, I thank in particular Kristin Bailey for her encouragement; Matthew Hill for his collaboration on an early, pre-dissertation website ("Emily Dickinson and *The Youth's Companion*") that led to my project; Liz Driver, my dissertation partner, for her

question, “When are you going to start writing?”; and Yung Min Kim for years of collegial support, advice, and critical feedback.

I appreciate funding received from the Mary Savage Snouffer Dissertation Fellowship, which supported my work for the 2003-2004 academic year, and from a QCB Research and Travel Grant, which supported a research trip to Yale University’s Manuscripts and Archives Division. The staff at the University of Maryland’s McKeldin Library were consistently helpful; I thank in particular the interlibrary loan department for their procurement of hard-to-obtain sources. I also appreciate the assistance I received from the staff at Princeton University’s Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, especially from Margaret Sherry Rich and AnnaLee Pauls, and from Yale University’s Manuscripts and Archives Division.

Significant portions of the Introduction and Chapter 1 appeared as “Dickinson as Child’s Fare: The Author Served up in *St. Nicholas*,” *Book History* 5 (2002): 105-142. That material appears here courtesy of Penn State University Press. Quotations from documents located in Princeton University’s Department of Rare Books and Special Collections are published with permission of Princeton University Library. Quotations from documents located in the *Dickinson Electronic Archives* are published with permission of the *Dickinson Electronic Archives*.

Many friends and my entire family deserve credit for their support. I thank all of them for their interest and faithful support—in particular, Nichole Bromme, Arthur and Lilo Fefferman, David Valdes Greenwood, Lester Pelley, Ruth Satelmajer, and Heidi and Dan Weber. I thank John and Elizabeth Satelmajer for well-appointed research

accommodations; Tom Wehtje for the companionship of a similarly obsessed researcher; Christa and Phillip Brusio, Roberta Spivak, and Nikole Satelmajer for sympathy, encouragement, and ever-ready ears and eyes as I worked through my arguments; Judy Pelley for her careful reading of the entire document; and Nikolaus Satelmajer for critical feedback, moral and technical support, and a lifelong example of enthusiasm for scholarship. Most of all, I thank my husband, Douglas Pelley, who ignored the silvered words of certain taxicab drivers, and who always made clear to me the value of my endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I: Dickinson as Child's Fare: The Author Served up in <i>St. Nicholas</i>	22
Chapter II: Fracturing a Master Narrative, Reconstructing "Sister Sue"	69
Chapter III: Not "For the <i>Christian Register</i> ": Readers Reject Dickinson	116
Chapter IV: Prizes for Poems: Dickinson and <i>The Youth's Companion</i>	181
Conclusion	240
Appendix 1	246
Bibliography	248

Introduction

Since Thomas Johnson's 1955 variorum *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*, scholars have had ready access to a list of Dickinson poems published in periodicals. Subsequent research has led to updated lists of Dickinson's periodical publications during her lifetime; poems in periodicals following Dickinson's 1886 death, however, have been all but ignored.¹ My dissertation addresses these neglected texts with two goals in mind: 1) to update and recast the narrative of Dickinson's posthumous production and 2) to challenge long-held assumptions about periodical culture that have contributed to that culture's neglect.

Dickinson scholarship has been concerned primarily with events, influences, and textual production and reception during the span of the poet's life. These concerns,

¹ Johnson records the initial publication of sixty-one Dickinson poems in periodicals during the 1890s, thirty of which were included within articles in the *Christian Union* and the *Atlantic Monthly*. The remaining thirty-one poems on his list appeared in *The Youth's Companion* (9), *Scribner's Magazine* (2), *The Independent* (12), *Life* (1), *Christian Register* (1), *St. Nicholas* (2), *Handbook of Amherst* (1), *Book Buyer* (1) (a publication repeated in *The Youth's Companion*), and *Outlook* (3). See Johnson, "Appendix 10: Chronological Listing of First Publication Elsewhere Than in Collections." For notation of two initial printings in a Todd article that Johnson does not record, see Willis Buckingham's *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*, 427. See, as an earlier notice of four periodical poems, George F. Whicher, "Notes and Queries: Some Uncollected Poems by Emily Dickinson." Whicher, who raises a number of questions about the poems' submission, is concerned "that they should not be left buried in the files of yesterday's periodicals" (440).

endemic to major author studies, hold a special appeal for an author who, from the first posthumous volume of *Poems* (1890), emerged as a mysterious recluse—socially and textually separate from her contemporaries. Key in Dickinson scholarship have been extensions of or challenges to the “recluse” image that explore notions of “private” and “public.” A notable corrective tradition in Dickinson scholarship, for instance, seeks to establish Dickinson’s broad participation in her contemporary culture and her specific participation as reader and published author in the day’s print culture.²

Attention to Dickinson’s 1890s production has centered on the volumes of Dickinson’s poems and letters that were published. That focus correspondingly has made central those books’ editors, Mabel Loomis Todd and Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and has presented a story that both condemns their “creative editing,” or normalization of the poems, and celebrates their triumph over purportedly adversarial publishing forces. Although the publication of Dickinson’s poetry after her 1886 death began with Dickinson’s sister-in-law Susan’s efforts, sister Lavinia’s reclamation of the project

² On the questions of contemporary culture and influence, see, for example, Jack Capps, *Emily Dickinson’s Reading 1836-1886* (1966), Barton Levi St. Armand, *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture: The Soul’s Society* (1984), Benjamin Lease, *Emily Dickinson’s Readings of Men and Books: Sacred Soundings* (1990), Judith Farr *The Passion of Emily Dickinson* (1992), and Elizabeth A. Petrino, *Emily Dickinson and Her Contemporaries* (1998). On the question of Dickinson’s participation in this culture by way of print publication, see Johnson’s “Appendix 9,” which lists “Poems Published in Emily Dickinson’s Lifetime.” For essays on Dickinson’s publication in periodicals during her lifetime, see Karen Dandurand, “Another Dickinson Poem Published in Her Lifetime”; “Publication of Dickinson’s Poems in Her Lifetime”; “New Dickinson Civil War Publications”; and “Why Dickinson Did Not Publish”; Robert J. Scholnick, “Don’t Tell! They’d Advertise!: Emily Dickinson in the *Round Table*”; and Barton Levi St. Armand, “Emily Dickinson and *The Indicator*: A Transcendental Frolic.” Dandurand’s work is especially important for its discovery of previously unknown publications during Dickinson’s life.

placed at its center the two people with whom it largely has been associated. First, Lavinia enlisted the assistance of Thomas Wentworth Higginson—prominent man of letters, frontline abolitionist, key woman’s rights advocate, and erstwhile correspondent of Dickinson’s. Higginson in fact had discouraged Susan’s earlier plans for a “rather more full, and varied” volume (qtd. in *AB* 86).³ Now he agreed to help if someone would put the manuscripts in order. Next, Lavinia recruited Mabel Loomis Todd—Amherst resident, possessor of her own literary aspirations, and (not least) the mistress of Austin Dickinson (Susan’s husband). Todd would undertake the efforts of copying the manuscripts and Todd and Higginson would undertake together the broader editorial tasks. Such tasks included selecting which poems to publish, choosing between variants, and, more controversially, adding titles and at times incorporating rather aggressive textual changes (normalizing punctuation, spelling, and grammar; altering rhyme schemes; and adding or deleting lines).⁴ In the end, four titles appeared, all published by

³ Susan writes this to Higginson in a December 1890 letter. On Susan’s plans toward a volume of Dickinson’s poetry (which Chapter 2 covers further), see S. Dickinson, “Notes Toward a Volume of Emily Dickinson’s Writings” in the *Writings by Susan Dickinson* link of the *Dickinson Electronic Archives*.

⁴ Higginson and Todd co-edited the 1890 and 1891 volumes of Dickinson’s poetry. Todd edited the 1894 *Letters of Emily Dickinson* and the 1896 volume of poetry by herself. Millicent Todd Bingham (Todd’s daughter) offers a sympathetic account of what she calls their “creative editing,” claiming that Todd and Higginson altered poems in anticipation of a resistant audience (*Ancestors’ Brocades: The Literary Debut of Emily Dickinson* 36-46 [hereafter cited as *AB*]). Further examination of Todd’s work since Bingham’s account has revealed that Bingham underplayed Todd’s changes; concurrent biographical work has suggested a dramatic background to the changes, revealing Todd’s affair with Austin Dickinson (Emily’s brother) and animus toward Susan Huntington Dickinson (Austin’s wife and Emily’s intimate friend and literary confidante). For more on Todd’s editorial work, see Caroline C. Maun, “Editorial Policy in the Poems of Emily Dickinson, Third Series”; Klaus Lubbers, *Emily Dickinson: The Critical Revolution*, 15-

the Boston-based Roberts Brothers: *Poems by Emily Dickinson* (1890); *Poems: Second Series* (1891); *Letters of Emily Dickinson*, 2 volumes (1894); and *Poems: Third Series* (1896). The first two were edited by Todd and Higginson, the second two by Todd alone.

Offering its own crush of details with which to contend, the record of the books' publication carries a dramatic subtext of tangled personal relationships; to add to that narrative the details of periodical-published poems (submitted by Susan as well as Todd and Higginson; appearing as reprints as well as initial printings) presents yet another layer of tangled personal and textual relationships. In addition, the kinds of Dickinson scholars who might have studied the periodical poems have had their own battles to fight. Scholars of Dickinson's reception have centered their efforts on correcting the impression that the poet did not find favor until the twentieth century; attention to periodicals of the 1890s thus has meant attention to reviews, notices, and essays surrounding the books.⁵

18, 46-47, 71-72; and R.W. Franklin, *The Editing of Emily Dickinson: A Reconsideration*. Anna Mary Wells raises the possibility that Todd forged some Dickinson texts in "ED Forgeries." For further admission by Bingham of her mother's editorial excisions, see "Poems of Emily Dickinson: Hitherto Published Only in Part." (Although see, on Bingham's misrepresentation of one poem in the article, Franklin, "The Manuscripts and Transcripts of 'Further in Summer than the Birds.'") For more on the editorial complications resulting from the tangled family relationships, see Elizabeth Horan, "Mabel Loomis Todd, Martha Dickinson Bianchi, and the Spoils of the Dickinson Legacy," and "To Market: The Dickinson Copyright Wars."

⁵ In perhaps the earliest balanced view of Dickinson's reception in the 1890s, Anna Mary Wells blames "the fifteen years of obscurity between 1900 and 1915" for "the popular misconception that no one before our own generation had appreciated Emily Dickinson" ("Early Criticism" 258). Klaus Lubbers supports this assessment in *Emily Dickinson: the Critical Revolution*, blaming in specific the decline in Dickinson-related editorial activity at the close of the nineteenth century. More recent misconceptions of Dickinson's negative nineteenth-century reception have been traced to the privileging of prominent critical voices, as is done in, for example, a selection of critical responses to Dickinson edited by Caesar R. Blake and Carlton F. Wells (*The Recognition of Emily*

And Dickinson textual scholars, who put manuscripts at center stage, have pushed to “unedit” the editorial bungling of Todd, Higginson, and others and thereby have elevated the manuscripts’ status and focused efforts on exploring their material facts.⁶ With the

Dickinson: Selected Criticism Since 1890). Blake and Wells emphasize, in their preface, the “mixed” reception Dickinson received in the 1890s and, through the selection of their essays and introduction notes to the essays, construct a narrative in which Dickinson’s critical reputation grows in fits and starts until it is firmly established by the 1960s. Furthermore, as Willis J. Buckingham notes, “by treating opposed views equally, this method overrepresented the handful of critics who clearly savaged Dickinson’s verse” (“Poetry Readers” 164-179). Key texts correcting such a perception are Virginia Rinaldy Terris’s 1967 dissertation, “Emily Dickinson and the Genteel Critics”; Lubbers’s *Emily Dickinson: The Critical Revolution*; and Buckingham’s own *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s*. Buckingham, who reprints all known reviews and notices of Dickinson’s writing during that period, is the single most important source for analysis of Dickinson’s reception in the 1890s. I am indebted to Terris’s and Lubbers’s work, but I especially am indebted to Buckingham’s collection and to his conception of an engaged and vibrant reading public in the 1890s in which periodicals played an integral role.

⁶ Marta Werner asserts that “[t]oday editing Emily Dickinson’s late writings paradoxically involves unediting them, constellating these works not as still points of meaning or as incorruptible texts but, rather, as *events* and phenomena of freedom” (5). Werner refers here to later compositions of Dickinson’s that were not included in the author’s self-made manuscript books; the act of “unediting,” however, is one that a number of Dickinson scholars have pushed for at large. Todd is not the only editor to have attracted heat from Dickinson scholars; but her excision and mutilation of manuscripts and tangled personal relationship with the family understandably have placed her work under considerable scrutiny. Further impetus for “unediting” Dickinson, however, arises from responses to twentieth-century editorial efforts. Ralph W. Franklin exposed many of the shortcomings of Thomas Johnson’s variorum (1955) and reader’s (1960) editions of Dickinson’s poetry in *The Editing of Emily Dickinson: A Reconsideration*; Franklin’s own 1980 *The Manuscript Books of Emily Dickinson* are a central “unediting” effort (Loeffelholz 1). Key responses to the Franklin-edited manuscript books and to further archival work with the manuscripts have revealed Dickinson’s careful crafting of her manuscript poems and include: Susan Howe’s 1991 opening call for preservation rather than correction (“These Flames and Generosities of the Heart: Emily Dickinson and the Illogic of Sumptuary Values”); Martha Nell Smith’s 1992 analysis of “Dickinson’s Poetry Workshop” that reevaluates Susan Dickinson’s part in the process (*Rowing in Eden: Rereading Emily Dickinson*); Jerome McGann’s 1993 call for more radical editing practices (“Emily Dickinson’s Visible Language”); and Werner’s 1995 argument for the consideration of Dickinson’s late fragments (*Emily*

publication of *The Manuscript Books of Emily Dickinson* in 1980 (ed. Ralph W. Franklin), scholars were permitted relatively easy access to reproductions that revealed a set of texts dramatically different from those they had read for so long in print. Confronted with the peculiarities of Dickinson's punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and lineation, scholars since have called for preservation rather than correction. Realizing the extent to which Dickinson indicated no clear preference for many of her variants, they have argued that the *reader* be allowed to choose.⁷ The existence within Dickinson's manuscripts of small drawings, cut-out pictures, and stamps, has also revealed an author highly aware of the physical properties of the page who, it has been argued, was consciously engaged in a type of domestic publication.⁸ And manuscript scholars have faced textual skepticism similar to that which periodical scholarship faces: questions of legitimacy, questions about the medium as a "final" textual form, as opposed to being

Dickinson's Open Folios). Editions that embody further manuscript research and have benefited from the body of scholarship on manuscripts since Franklin's *The Manuscript Books* include: Werner, *Emily Dickinson's Open Folios*; Ellen Louise Hart and Martha Nell Smith, eds., *Open Me Carefully: Emily Dickinson's Intimate Letters to Susan Huntington Dickinson* (1998); and R.W. Franklin, ed., *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition* (1998).

⁷ See Mary Carney, "Dickinson's Poetic Revelations: Variants as Process"; Marget Sands, "Re-reading the Poems: Editing Opportunities in Variant Versions"; Lionel Kelly, "Emily Dickinson: Imagining a Text"; and Sharon Cameron, *Choosing Not Choosing*.

⁸ On Dickinson's use of drawings, pictures, and stamps, see Martha Nell Smith, "The Poet as Cartoonist." On the distinction Dickinson and Susan made between "print" and "publish," a critical observation which enabled Dickinson scholars to conceive of Dickinson's manuscripts as self-published writings, see Smith, *Rowing in Eden* (15, 224 n12).

merely a pre-book state.⁹ The keen interest of this group in the multiple texts and the material facts of Dickinson's manuscript "publication" creates a climate conducive to examining Dickinson's periodical publication. But since the periodical poems represent yet another layer of editorial changes beyond the 1890s books (shocking themselves for the degree they depart from the manuscripts), we might ask: What could be the impetus for examining such texts?

Part of the reason for examining Dickinson's periodical poems lies with the need for plugging holes in a gap-filled record. The poems, when mentioned, have been cast as one link in the publication history of the books—placed there, the story goes, to prime the public for *Poems, First (or Second or Third) Series*.¹⁰ However, circulation figures of the

⁹ See Smith, who notes that "the impulse to 'complete' [Dickinson's] texts" is "a product of a critical blindness to the possibility that 'unfinished' manuscript works were Dickinson's call to participatory reading which also recognized the text constantly extending itself" (*Rowing* 54). The prejudice against non-book forms receives astute consideration in studies of manuscript/scrival culture in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. See, for example, Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, on the vibrant manuscript culture that remained in place even "during at least the first two centuries of print, when the two systems of literary transmission not only competed but also influenced each other and, to a great extent, coexisted by performing different cultural functions" (1); and, Harold Love, *Scrival Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*, who makes the case for a culture of scrival publication. For a study that pursues related concerns as played out in American culture, see Tamara Plakins Thornton's *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. Thornton's focus on "handwriting," which is something different than Marotti's and Love's interest in the scrival "publication" of texts, similarly asserts the coexistence of handwriting and print, "the use of pen and ink" "long after Gutenberg cast his movable type" (xii). The "distinct" "cultural purposes" and "cultural messages" that handwriting "serv[ed]" and conveyed, she argues further, were "maintained" "precisely because," not simply "even as," "print saturated American society and consciousness" (xii).

¹⁰ Buckingham, for example, writes: "Partly to promote the 'Second Series,' Higginson had published in the *Atlantic* some of Dickinson's letters . . ." (Introduction xiii). Terris cites the "simultaneous publication of Dickinson poems outside of the Series" as one of

periodicals easily exceeded sales figures for Dickinson books in the 1890s, and some of the poems were not collected in books until almost the mid-twentieth century, making the periodical poems necessary for understanding the larger reception and textual history of Dickinson in the 1890s.¹¹ In fact, the simple act of foregrounding these neglected texts correspondingly foregrounds archival resources formerly overlooked. Asking periodical-centered questions of these resources reveals errors not only in the present details about the periodical poems' publication history, but about long-held assumptions surrounding the books.

Moreover, dismissing the periodical poems too readily ignores an important cultural reality: like any American editors of their time, Todd, Higginson, and Susan Dickinson were acutely aware of the central role that periodicals assumed in the marketing of authors (a role still assumed, though to an arguably diminished degree, today). In his important examination of the increasing dominance of periodical literature throughout the nineteenth century, Ellery Sedgwick asserts that successive generations of successful monthly magazines "increased the number of literary professionals, the volume of literature produced, and the influence of magazine editors and readers on

many "activities to promote the Series" (335) and argues that the thirty-one poems published initially in periodicals were placed there "with a view on the part of those who submitted them to establishing Dickinson's reputation as a poet, and beyond that, to stimulating sales of the Series" (345).

¹¹ Periodicals were notorious for inflating circulation numbers before the 1914 founding of the Audit Bureau of Circulations (Mott III: 15-16). Still, the estimated circulation number for a magazine like *St. Nicholas* (70,000) far exceeds even the total sales of the three volumes of poetry and the letters of a popular author like Dickinson (under 20,000). For sales numbers of Dickinson's books, see Buckingham, "Appendix D: Sales of Dickinson Volumes in the Nineties."

writers and on literature itself” (“Magazines and the Profession of Authorship” 399). Sedgwick focuses especially on economic factors that made publishing in magazines increasingly attractive; important work by Richard Ohmann (on connections between mass culture and late nineteenth-century periodicals), Ellen Gruber Garvey (on consumer culture in Victorian periodicals), and Michael Lund (on nineteenth-century serials) collectively reinforces the idea that we eschew periodicals at our own risk.¹² To ignore the publication of Dickinson poems in periodicals thus ignores conceptions that her editors had about authorship, the creation of an audience, and the channels by which various audiences received their literary products.

But the neglect by literary studies of periodicals suggests not simply an information gap. Constructing an untold narrative often requires a theoretical shift, the availability of a previously unavailable framework. My own work draws from textual scholarship’s interest in the social theory of textuality, linguistic and bibliographic codes, and “texts” as opposed to “works.” Linking all three of these areas involves a questioning of traditional attitudes toward “authorial intention,” the recovery of which, G. Thomas Tanselle claims in a 1991 essay, was for “twenty-two and a half centuries the ultimate goal of textual criticism” (“Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology” 83).¹³

¹² See Richard Ohmann, Chs. 9 and 10, *Politics of Letters*; Ellen Gruber Garvey, *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s* (1996); and Michael Lund, *America’s Continuing Story: An Introduction to Serial Fiction, 1850-1900* (1993).

¹³ W.W. Greg marks the beginning of the recent period of significant shifts in textual theory and practice with his 1950-51 “The Rationale of Copy-Text.” Working to dispense with the idea that editing be governed by an unthinking adherence to rules, Greg argued that editors should have freedom to choose between texts in determining the text’s

Emphasis on authorial intention, to put it simply, makes central the writer's position; producing an eclectic text (the editorial act most often associated with this stance) aims to expunge outside matters of interference (compositors' errors, editorial pressuring and bungling) in hopes of giving us the text the writer most likely would have liked to see.

The social theory of textuality, perhaps the most serious assault on the "author's" central position and the dominance of eclectic texts, claims writers as but one part of a larger system that also features editors, printers, and book distributors.¹⁴ Highlighting rather than erasing the work of others in the system means that the "codes" often connected to them gain recognition as contributing to, rather than interfering with, the meanings of texts. Meaning resides also, that is, in what Gerard Genette calls "paratexts" (for example, prefaces and dedications) and in what Jerome McGann calls "bibliographic codes"—"typefaces, bindings, book prices, page format, and all those textual phenomena usually regarded as (at best) peripheral to 'poetry' or 'the text as such'" (*The Textual Condition* 13).¹⁵ With the author joined by a company of others, with the "author's words" simply one factor in the texts that literary scholars edit and analyze, it is no longer desirable to elide differences between discrete "texts" in the interest of some larger

"substantives" but should use the earliest extant copy-text to determine "accidentals" (qualities of the text like punctuation most likely to be affected by printer errors) as it was least likely to have been corrupted by the printers. Greg's method, along with Fredson Bowers's system of establishing an apparatus, would be widely adopted even while finer details might be debated (e.g., whether the first or final edition offers the best copy-text).

¹⁴ For two seminal texts on the social theory of textuality, see Jerome McGann's 1983 *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* and D.F. McKenzie's 1986 *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*.

¹⁵ I rely here on McGann's distinction between Genette's "paratexts" and his own "bibliographic codes."

“work.” Instead of simply arguing for the inherent superiority of one particular version or for a conflated creation by an editor, it becomes important to examine “multiple versions,” the social forces involved in their construction, and the various forms those versions take.¹⁶ As Tanselle rightly notes: “[I]f texts are social products, then texts will take different shapes as they pass from one social milieu to another; and if authors are not the only source of validity in the constitution of texts, then all these variant texts carry their own authority as products of history (“Textual Instability” 1).”¹⁷ Joseph Grigely pushes the point further: supposedly “damaged” goods are the inevitable product of human interaction with texts, he argues, and “reconfiguration” and “reterritorialization” are “germane to art and perhaps are reasons it is able to substantiate itself as art . . .” (1-2).¹⁸ Questioning a textual tradition that he casts as “eugenicist”—concerned always with purifying, removing error—Grigely proposes that “rather than disparaging such texts, we might consider their importance in the bibliographical chain of a work and how a stemma based on authority is not the only kind of stemma that can be written” (48). In the case of Dickinson’s periodical poems, we have nothing but “damaged goods”—

¹⁶ For proposed editorial responses to these ideas, see, for example, Donald H. Reiman, “‘Versioning’: The Presentation of Multiple Texts”; and John Bryant, *The Fluid Text*.

¹⁷ Tanselle, I should note, appropriately applies such reasoning to answer those who would dismiss eclectic editions altogether—such a position, he argues, is inconsistent with “[t]he view that all past editions are acceptable because they occurred” (“Textual Instability” 56).

¹⁸ Hans Robert Jauss similarly rejects the “literary work” as “monologic” “monument” and compares it instead to “an orchestration that strikes ever new resonances among its readers . . .” (21). He sees “respon[se]” as essential to the continuing ability of “a literary event . . . to have an effect . . .” (Jauss 22).

poems altered beyond what they were in the books; poems crowded into small spaces; poems only a page away from ads for “Waterproof Outfits for Coachmen.”¹⁹ We also, however, have poems in places with much higher circulation numbers than had the books, poems that created and fed public hype and thus helped stimulate demand for additional books, poems that with all their textual impurities could be highly satisfying texts for readers.

These theoretical tenets, central for my own project, largely have been applied in a scholarly tradition historically dominated by book- and manuscript-centered concerns.²⁰ By examining *periodical* texts, a genre traditionally cast as a link in the bibliographic chain either leading to or descending from “the book,” even the most enthusiastic supporters of the above theories will be tested. Can and should “contexture” be discerned in a textual site that encourages scattered rather than linear paths of reading?²¹ Even if we agree with McGann’s assertion that we must find “Final authority’ . . . in the actual

¹⁹ The additional alterations of the poems ranged from changed punctuation to revised rhyme schemes and deleted lines. Many of the poems were printed in crowded formats; for the one that also stood only a page away from the “waterproof outfits” ad, see Emily Dickinson’s “Nobody” in the 5 March 1891 *Life*.

²⁰ As I allude to in note 7, however, manuscript studies also have had to articulate a position of distinct cultural function apart from print culture and “the book.”

²¹ As employed by Neil Fraistat, contexture is “Whenever discrete poetic ‘texts’—etymologically, something woven—are organized by their author (or coauthors) into a collection, they form what I shall call a ‘contexture,’ a larger whole fabricated from integral parts” (4). It was Fraistat’s thinking about poetry collections, in *The Poem and the Book*, that led me to consider poetry’s place in a medium like periodicals. If “a collection of diverse poems might itself aspire toward the complexity and variety of a long poem” (Fraistat 10), what does a collection of diverse genres—news articles, opinion pieces, cartoons, advertisements, serial novels, and poems—create when housed under one roof?

structure of the agreements" between "the author" and "the affiliated institution" (*A Critique* 54), what do we do in Dickinson's case? Other recent author studies that consider the "popular market" can take solace in a resulting reciprocity, so that "editorial adherence to policies and practices" (here, by Hawthorne and Poe) made "popular practices . . . central to their own compositional acts" (Post-Lauria 162); market conditions and influences gain interest, that is, because they are considered for the effects they have on the author.²² But with a posthumous Dickinson, there was no "agreement" and the facts surrounding her periodical publication prove disturbing for what we know about her intentions: *The Youth's Companion*, with its circulation of around 500,000, differs dramatically from Dickinson's domestic productions; the changing of lines in "The Sleeping Flowers," published in *St. Nicholas*, "put so in order to have the rhyme perfect, in a child's magazine" (*AB* 139), shows deliberate disregard for what she wrote. Dickinson's periodical texts will provide an arena to push the logic of many theories central to textual scholarship.

This theoretical grounding also puts pressure on the content and methodologies of periodical scholarship. First, the facts of Dickinson's periodical publication direct attention to less-than-central periodicals in the critical conversation. Late nineteenth-century periodical scholarship has been enamored especially with a body of periodicals with which Dickinson's editorial team essentially had no contact—the ten-cent monthlies

²² See, on Herman Melville, Sheila Post-Lauria, *Correspondent Colorings*; on Henry James, Michael Anesko, "Friction with the Market", and on Edgar Allan Poe, Meredith McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting 1834-1853*, "Unauthorized Poe" and "Poe, Literary Nationalism, and Authorial Identity." Periodical publication, while important for each of these books, does not provide the main focal point.

like *McClure's*, *Munsey's*, and *Cosmopolitan* that amassed phenomenal circulation numbers and now assume center stage in modern mass culture history. That this “magazine revolution” started in 1893 makes these magazines’ omission from the Dickinson narrative in part an issue of timing—Dickinson’s editors by then had submitted most of Dickinson’s periodical-published poems.²³ But neither does Dickinson’s periodical publication offer an extensive look at the earlier darlings of periodical historians—the “quality monthlies” of *Harper's*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Century*, and *Scribner's*. *Scribner's* alone in this group published Dickinson, and the *Atlantic Monthly* proved the only other major outlet for Dickinson’s editorial team. Instead, Dickinson’s editors largely pursued publication in the children’s arm of the *Century* (*St. Nicholas*) and a host of weeklies with concerns that included humor (*Life*), family entertainment (*The Youth's Companion*), and religion (*The Independent*, *The Christian Register*, and *Outlook*). These publications are not wholly uncharted by

²³ These phenomenally successful magazines have in part represented a long-developing shift in periodical publication whereby advertisements, rather than magazine sales, underwrite the magazine’s production (and thus change the very nature of the product and the production process). Ohmann, whose seminal work accords nineteenth-century magazines a key role in the development of modern mass culture, makes 1893 central to his critical history. He notes, however, a crucial point: that “the historians’ decision to fix 1893 as the critical moment is only a narrative convenience” and, as a result, unfairly dismisses “women’s magazines” (especially the *Ladies' Home Journal*) and “magazines called *The Youth's Companion*, the *People's Literary Companion*, and *Comfort . . .*” (*Politics of Letters* 140). Ohmann’s 1987 book and subsequent studies by others have paid further attention to women’s magazines. (See, for example, Helen Damon-Moore, *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the Ladies' Home Journal and the Saturday Evening Post, 1880-1910*). On the *Youth's Companion*, one in the second group, which Ohmann describes as “mail-order catalogs dressed up as magazines to meet postal regulations” (*Politics of Letters* 140), see my Chapter 4. When Todd submitted additional poems after 1893, she pursued already-established contacts.

historians. As most are weeklies, however, a class that has attracted considerably less critical attention than monthlies, my project often seeks to recover a sense of the significant role these publications played in late nineteenth-century American print culture and how periodicals less obviously part of a literary narrative concerned themselves with poetry.

My project also aligns with the growing body of scholarship pushing for a more theoretical examination of periodicals.²⁴ In this field, historically dominated by empirical concerns and methods, much effort has gone into documenting, describing, and recovering “lost” periodicals. Or, periodicals have served as archival repositories, rich sources for those recovering “lost” authors. As a result, nineteenth-century periodical culture has been, like other categories of “undiscovered public knowledge,” a subject often present but rarely discussed; one, as Harold Love says of seventeenth-century scribal culture, “which has been the subject of endless minutely detailed research, and

²⁴ As a small but useful (and growing) theoretical sub-field, the push for a more theoretical examination of periodicals found voice in a special issue of *Victorian Periodicals Review*. Laurel Brake and Anne Humphreys’s introductory essay, “Critical Theory and Periodical Research,” pushes for a shift in periodical scholarship from absorption with empirical research to a joining of that research with critical theory. For two especially germane essays that were reprinted and expanded the following year, see Margaret Beetham, “Open and Closed: the Periodical as a Publishing Genre” and Lyn Pykett, “Reading the Periodical Press: Text and Context.” Beetham’s essay explores what qualities are peculiar for periodicals as a genre and Pykett examines what might replace the former view of periodicals as solely a mirror for the surrounding culture. In the area of American literature, two useful contributions are the relatively young journal *American Periodicals* and the 1995 collection, *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*. See especially the collection’s introductory essay by Kenneth M. Price and Susan Belasco Smith (“Periodical Literature in Social and Historical Context”). See also Lawrence I. Berkove, “New Old Additions to the American Canon.” For a partial bibliography of recent periodical scholarship, see Kim Martin Long, “Selected Scholarship 1999-2003.”

which is everywhere apparent, and yet one which has never been addressed as an entity in its own right” (34).²⁵ Highly satisfying for such concerns has been the non-author-centered work by Ohmann, Garvey, Lund, and Sedgwick. But like scholarship by Sheila Post-Lauria (on Melville), Michael Anesko (on James), Meredith McGill (on Poe), and Kirsten Silva Gruesz (on some of the Fireside Poets), my own work on a canonically central author similarly allows me to focus on broad beliefs and assumptions about periodical culture—to recover a particular publishing “culture,” that is, rather than an author.²⁶

Finally, my dissertation has larger implications for conversations about nineteenth-century American poetry. Joseph Harrington charts twentieth-century scholarship’s neglect of American poetry, from F.O. Matthiessen’s almost poetry-free American renaissance in 1941 to 1990s critical studies that “present themselves as studies of American literature or culture per se” while making little or no mention of poetry (164).²⁷ Those recovering nineteenth-century poetry have tried to discern what value its contemporary readers drew from it, what demands they brought to it, and, as in Alan Golding’s notable *From Outlaw to Classic*, what happened to the fortunes of various

²⁵ Love uses Don R. Swanson’s term “undiscovered public knowledge” to describe the condition of scribal publication scholarship (9).

²⁶ It also allows me to benefit from the “bibliographic research” associated in literary studies with major authors’ “canonical status” (McGill 41).

²⁷ Harrington’s *Poetry and the Public*, from which I cite, continues Harrington’s exploration of issues that he voiced earlier in his excellent “Why American Poetry Is Not American Literature.”

American poets as those demands changed.²⁸ Projects on nineteenth-century women's poetry—including Paula Bennett's recent *Poets in the Public Sphere*—use such questions to challenge the neglect of, among others, Lydia Sigourney, the Cary sisters, and Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.²⁹ But American literary scholarship also has forgotten Bryant, Whittier, Longfellow, Lowell, and Holmes; the entire culture of nineteenth-century American poetry has suffered neglect.³⁰ Clearly, critical narratives of nineteenth-century poetry have not forgotten Dickinson and Whitman and, in fact, have remembered them at times at the expense of other poets. But my interest in poetry culture and performance

²⁸ Thus, one critic, in his examination of Longfellow's one-time "appeal" hones in on "his advocacy of a cross-gendered sensibility—and, crucially, of a 'sentimental' masculinity—that answered to the experiential trials and affective needs of his audience" (Haralson 329).

²⁹ See, for example, early histories by Emily Stipes Watts (*The Poetry of American Women: from 1632 to 1945* [1977]) and Cheryl Walker (*The Nightingale's Burden* [1982]) and, indicative of the recovery nature of this scholarship, anthologies by Walker (*American Women Poets of the Nineteenth Century: An Anthology* [1992]), Janet Gray (*She Wields a Pen: American Women Poets of the Nineteenth Century* [1997]), and Paula Bernat Bennett (*Nineteenth-Century American Women Poets: An Anthology* [1998]). Bennett's groundbreaking *Poets in the Public Sphere* (2003) challenges the predominant portrait of nineteenth-century women's poetry as domestic sentimentalism. She concerns herself with "[r]esituating nineteenth-century American women's newspaper and periodical poetry within the tradition of social dialogue and debate from which it sprang and to which it belongs" so as to make clear the genre's "function as a form of *public* speech" (Bennet, *Poets in the Public Sphere* 4- 5).

³⁰ Although her aims are not simply to recover this group, the most significant work on members in it is Kirsten Silva Gruesz's *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*. Gruesz is interested more broadly in lyric poetry's cultural work in a Romantic-era "transamerican culture" ("a bridgeable, thinkable communion between the Anglophone and Hispanophone worlds") (3). She brings "local periodical poets" from U.S.-published Spanish-language periodicals "into dialogue . . . with the better-known Men of Letters on various national scenes . . ." (Gruesz 20). As evidence of the assumed privileges of male poets, see Patricia Okker's remark that "[m]ale authors . . . were judged solely on the basis of their writings" (106).

challenges the genre's neglect by exploring more broadly how nineteenth-century poetry's *physical state* in particular might have hindered or enhanced the appreciation for these poets and how poems so far afield from authorial control were still vital for the distribution and reception of an author or text.³¹

The critical narrative I offer of Dickinson's 1890s periodical poems is one that might have been told chronologically. In fact, through careful notation of actions' dates I have unearthed portions of this tale that until now had been suppressed, ignored, or obfuscated. But chronology also fails us. The nature of this particular publishing enterprise—the fits and starts by which Dickinson's editors promoted her, the split effort between the books and the periodicals—does not lend itself especially well to a neat narrative, progressing from one event to the next and, ultimately, resting at a final conclusion. Such narratives are perhaps held together best by books, the print culture conclusion toward which literary history likes to move. Because I am concerned with periodicals, to proceed in a purely chronological fashion would have led me back and

³¹ This is not to suggest a total critical disregard of the question of nineteenth-century American poetry's performance and material manifestations. I mean only to suggest a difference in priorities. Gray, for instance, usefully touches on the changing "relationship between print and oral culture" in her anthology's introduction, arguing that print culture afforded women a "female public sphere" from which oral culture otherwise excluded them and touching on the oral public performance venues women's poetry did have (xxxii); her anthology, however, renders invisible key information about the poems' social contexts in that it fails to note the sources of the poems. Most useful from my perspective are Gruesz, who is highly interested in specific performances of poems and non-canonical "scenes of transmission" (5) and reception, and Bennett, who acknowledges periodicals as the starting point for her anthology project (*Nineteenth-century American Women Poets* xxxix) and, with her recorded impression that there were, among nineteenth-century women poets, major "poems" even where there were not major "poets" (*Nineteenth-century American Women Poets* xl), touches on the kinds of questions that have been key to my own reconsideration of nineteenth-century poetry's cultural role.

forth, never allowing for the sustained examination of a single periodical. Too, chronology necessarily privileges one group over another—editors take center stage with a tale that narrates by date of submission; publishers and “readers” dominate in a tale that narrates by publication date. I was interested in all of these groups—Dickinson’s editors, periodical editorial staffs, reviewers, and readers—and thus looked for a form that would allow me to examine the contributions of various communities. I also was interested in various shades of production and reception—magazine editors, for instance, “received” Dickinson as much as “produced” her, on a private level as they decided whether or not to publish her poetry, on a publicly visible level as they reviewed and published her poems, and on the level in which all editors are also readers and all readers also editors.

My dissertation thus uses specific episodes in Dickinson’s periodical publication to make the case for an independent and autonomous periodical culture. I focus first on how the periodical texts worked in concert with the marketing of the four Dickinson books published in the 1890s. Chapter one examines the publication of two Dickinson poems in *St. Nicholas*, a premiere children’s magazine. In such places, Dickinson’s editors sought out broader markets and worked to create an image of the poet that would increase the public’s appetite for her. The two *St. Nicholas* poems, whose very timing worked to the advantage of the marketing of *Poems* (1891), were part of a larger campaign to cast Dickinson as children’s friend and thus offer an alternate, albeit complementary, persona to the image of solitary woman pushed forward by the books.

The periodicals, however, served as more than mere “handmaidens” to the books. My second chapter draws on archival research at Princeton University to address how

Mabel Loomis Todd and Thomas Wentworth Higginson's editorial work on Dickinson after the author's death clashed with similar efforts by Susan Dickinson (Dickinson's sister-in-law). Although Susan regularly has been cast as indifferent to the effort to publish Dickinson posthumously, my research helps narrate more fully the tale of her early involvement. I trace how subsequent to her dismissal from the project, Susan used periodicals to stage an editorial protest. Because her editorial successes were realized solely in periodicals, I argue, Susan's case cautions that emphasizing books in reception histories creates incomplete and faulty narratives.

Chapters three and four look further at the kinds of disruptive acts that the nineteenth-century periodical world could foster. Chapter three examines the audience outcry over Dickinson's placement in a Unitarian weekly, the *Christian Register*. I examine the *Christian Register* poem in the context of the larger placement of Dickinson in religious periodicals and argue that, while her poem's theology might seem contentious, the poem to some degree fell victim to a periodical climate that thrived on debate and audience participation. Chapter four analyzes Dickinson's publication in *The Youth's Companion*, a media giant of the day. Publishing nine first printings and six reprints in six-plus years, the *Companion* repeatedly proved capable of vigilante acts, publishing as first printings poems that were not, delaying the publication of poems after their submission, and, through a longstanding practice of reprinting, lifting poems from other sources and appropriating them whenever and wherever they wanted. Its textual practices reveal the *Companion* as interested first in its own institutional needs and schedule and prove that it was anything but a malleable conduit. It offers a fitting case

study with which to close since, in the end, the challenge I offer to larger perceptions about the presentation and distribution of American poetry in the nineteenth century foregrounds the ability periodicals had outside of the book-publishing circuitry to foster and record readers' desire for the genre.

Chapter 1

Dickinson as Child's Fare: The Author Served up in *St. Nicholas*

Two Emily Dickinson poems published by *St. Nicholas*, a prestigious children's magazine, stand as centerpieces of a larger effort to market Dickinson posthumously as "children's friend" in the 1890s. Unsettling to look at, the poems clash with the still-popular conception of Dickinson as retiring spinster and with Dickinson's well-documented reticence toward print. Even accounting for the fact that the publication of these and other Dickinson periodical poems took place after Dickinson's death in 1886, the texts suggest a marketing ploy gone awry, the editorial push of the poet into an incongruous arena. Throughout the 1890s, Dickinson's editors added titles; normalized punctuation, spelling, and grammar; changed rhyme schemes; and added or deleted lines. Poems such as the *St. Nicholas* texts of "Morning" and "The Sleeping Flowers" seem to heap insult upon injury. The visual packaging of the former and the altering of the latter "in order to have the rhyme perfect, in a child's magazine" dare us not to take them seriously.³² By foregrounding the efforts to turn Dickinson into an easily consumable textual commodity, however, I suggest the benefits of her editors' project. As a

³² Millicent Todd Bingham quotes Mabel Loomis Todd on the alterations in *Ancestors' Brocades* (139).

magazine highly skilled at asserting the value of print publication, *St. Nicholas* could help legitimate the efforts of Dickinson's editors to introduce her into print culture. Further, I use the example of Dickinson's *St. Nicholas* texts to argue that nineteenth-century periodicals as a whole bear further consideration as sites where textual desire and appetite could be created—even if that appetite was for the sweetened products of a children's magazine such as *St. Nicholas*. For too long, textual scholarship has dismissed periodical texts as variant readings to books. As a result, scholars have turned a blind eye to such poems and the ways they functioned as texts in their own right and as legitimate players in the scene we have treated as if dominated by books.

I.

One standard narrative of Dickinson's 1890s publication focuses on how the poems were "rescued" from manuscript status by the book publication efforts of Thomas Wentworth Higginson and Mabel Loomis Todd. This narrative simplifies motivations behind the books' publication and caricatures the contributions by individuals (like Susan Dickinson) not involved with the books. It also obscures, by ignoring or mentioning only in passing Dickinson's periodical publication, the understanding Todd and Higginson had of the central role periodicals played in marketing authors in the 1890s. Higginson's own considerable reputation as activist and man of letters in fact was linked inextricably to periodicals, as Dickinson's relationship with him illustrates. The poet famously contacted him after reading his 1862 "Letter to a Young Contributor" in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and as Anna Mary Wells's biography of Higginson underscores, Dickinson's

longtime practice of tracking him through periodicals meant that “[i]f Emily Dickinson actually did, as she several times claimed, read every word he ever published, her contact with the outside world through periodical literature was substantial” (*Dear Preceptor* 267). As a writer, Higginson associated most closely with the *Atlantic Monthly*, the prestigious periodical dominant for decades as cultural arbiter. He appeared early in the magazine’s history, contributing twenty-one essays from 1858 through 1861 (Wells, *Dear Preceptor* 114), contracting with the magazine for ten articles in 1867 (Wells, *Dear Preceptor* 215), and—although taking a six-year break from it in the 1870s—maintaining a significant presence in it into the twentieth century. In addition, Higginson served as poetry reviewer for the *Nation* and contributed to a formidable list of other prominent titles, including *Putnam’s Monthly*, the *Christian Union*, the *Independent*, *Scribner’s Monthly* (later the *Century*), *Scribner’s Magazine*, and a representative sampling of the day’s children’s magazines. Higginson acknowledged his reputation’s debt to the periodical network—he recounts receiving credit for his controversial *Atlantic* essay “Woman and the Alphabet” as ““the seed of Smith College”” and ““one of the influences that opened Michigan University [sic] to women . . .””; his lectures out West in 1867, he notes, ““always”” brought ““readers of the “Atlantic” so glad to see me,”” including one who reports that ““He and his father always looked for my articles in the “Atlantic” and cut those leaves first . . .”” (M. Higginson 156-157; 265).³³ Moreover, periodicals further reinforced Higginson’s reputation as leading citizen, abolitionist, and woman’s rights

³³ “Woman and the Alphabet” was issued later as a tract; Mary Thacher Higginson’s 1914 biography of Thomas Wentworth Higginson suggests the credit he received for Smith College might have been due to the essay in that form.

advocate by reporting his lectures and by serving as conduit for the female writers whose careers he encouraged. By the time Higginson entered the posthumous Dickinson editorial project, his periodical contacts were extensive, giving him access to and knowledge of periodicals of the highest caliber.

Todd lacked Higginson's formidable credentials, but she was keenly attuned herself to the benefits conferred by the day's periodicals. In conjunction with her husband, David, an astronomy professor at Amherst College, Todd pursued publication with steady determination and political savvy. Both Todds were ambitious, and by 1888 David "actively promoted his own and Mabel's talents by calling on magazine and newspaper editors whenever he was in New York or Boston" (Longworth 312). Todd, an astute student of the day's literati, contributed equally to the team effort. Besides recording her own visits to editorial offices and contacts with connected individuals, Todd proved to be a careful watchdog: one 1883 diary entry cites her having read reviews in *Nature*, the *Academy*, and *Spectator* of a biography because "David's [review of the same book] is just about to be published in the *Nation*" (Todd diary, 27 May 1883). By the end of the 1880s, Todd gained access to a variety of magazines, including the *Nation*, *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly*, *St. Nicholas*, the *Century*, the *Christian Union*, and an editorial position in Mrs. Logan's *Home Magazine*. Here, as with her networking efforts, Todd's success often dovetailed with David's. In *Frank Leslie's* and the *Century*, Polly Longworth notes, David published articles before Todd's own pieces appeared (322); further, Todd's essays often capitalized on David's work when she offered astronomy-related and travel-style articles set in locations such as Japan, where David's

eclipse expeditions took place. Two separate diary entries reveal Todd's increasing success meeting David's in the *Nation*: in one 1882 entry she claims, "He [David] must have published hundreds of things in that paper" (Todd diary, 20 October 1882); in a later one, in 1889, she notes, "Read the *Nation* after [dinner]. David & I figure largely in this one" (Todd diary, 13 December 1889). It might be too much to see especial pride in her days of singular achievement ("In the evening read my article in *Christian Union* for Oct. 31. A notice of me in *Woman's Journal* for today") (Todd diary, 2 November 1889). Todd basked equally well in individual success, however, making her personal accomplishments central even in essays such as "Ten Weeks in Japan." Todd's ambitions later would make her editorial work suspect. Some have argued, however, that in the late 1880s they apparently only advanced her editorial qualifications: "She [Vinnie] knew Mabel had had some experience with publishing And while Sue had envisioned private printing, Mabel at once looked on the venture as a commercial one, which squared with Vinnie's desire for a wide audience" (Longworth 295).³⁴

From the beginning of their editorial involvement with Dickinson, both editors called on their experience in navigating the nation's periodical web. Higginson's 25 September 1890 essay in the *Christian Union* offered a public introduction of the poet before the first volume appeared—his decision to place it there capitalized on timing, for he pulled it from the *Century*'s potential lineup when the *Century* delayed publication for

³⁴ On problems with Todd's editorial work, see note 3 in my Introduction. Todd's publishing experience should be kept in context. As Elizabeth Horan notes, "Without Thomas Wentworth Higginson's name and connections Mabel Todd had but a slim chance of promoting the poet" ("To Market" 91). For more on Todd's approach to and experience with publishing and marketing, see Horan ("Mabel Loomis Todd" 71-77).

too long (AB 65). Other of their activities to promote the first volume drew on their respective editorial positions, Higginson taking responsibility for the *Nation* (“I do all the poetry for the *Nation* & will write to the *Critic*” [AB 65]) and Todd covering Mrs. Logan’s *Home Magazine* (“ . . . I put a short notice of the *Poems*, in my regular article on new books” [AB 85]). Others’ reviews and notices held their attention too. Telling is the fact that Todd’s scrapbooks of clipped reviews would serve as a key resource for Willis Buckingham’s extensive 1989 collection of reviews, notices, and commentary on Dickinson in the 1890s (Buckingham, Introduction xi). And Higginson, assuming the role of elder statesman, clued Todd in on the identities of anonymous and pseudonymous reviewers, noted the even distribution of poems quoted throughout reviews, and proved to be an especially careful reader in his notation of amusing typographical errors. (In one review, “bald” replaced “bold,” so that Dickinson’s hair was described as “bald, like the chestnut burr” [AB 316] and elsewhere, Higginson writes, a reviewer credits “the 1st preface to *Mrs. T.W.H.* I dined with him at Mrs. Howe’s & he probably took me for a disguised woman!” [AB 201]) By the time the peddling of individual texts to periodicals took place after *Poems* (1890) appeared, Todd’s and Higginson’s efforts come across as matter of course: Todd’s extra effort to deliver a new set of poems to the *Youth’s Companion* (ones earlier sent were to appear first in book form) rings true with visits she made to other editorial offices on her own behalf; Higginson’s refusal to submit a poem to the *Atlantic Monthly* forgoing his considerable connections to the magazine, suggests

a concern with the effect of substandard products on his own reputation's currency ("I don't think [editor Horace] Scudder would print this, for *I* should not") [AB 202].³⁵

The two editors were introducing the poet in what has been classed an undistinguished and inauspicious period for poetry.³⁶ Whereas nineteenth-century poetry on the whole has suffered recent critical neglect outside of Whitman and Dickinson, recovery efforts of an earlier generation of nineteenth-century American poetry can rest on the contemporary social and cultural centrality the "Fireside Poets" in particular held.³⁷ But in the latter part of the nineteenth century, concerns over the health of American poetry surfaced even in places like *The Independent*, a weekly that was a noted supporter of poetry, and which reported in 1898 on a *Current Literature* survey regarding "the statement that interest in poetry is declining in America" ([Untitled] 92). Less than a year later, M. S. Kinney lamented in a *Saturday Evening Post* article the state of contemporary poetry—the article's title, "In the Twilight of Poetry," sticking all too well

³⁵ On Todd and the *Companion*, see *Ancestors' Brocades*, 158-159.

³⁶ "Magazine poetry" arguably was derided especially. Statements on books surfaced, too, however: "All publishers are naturally shy of new Mss. of poetry . . . for they know by experience that the deadest of all books is a dead volume of verse. The sepulcher of deceased poetry in Mr. Burnham's churchyard of old books, in Cornhill, is the largest bin in his establishment" (qtd. in St. Armand, *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture* 30). Studies of periodicals consistently dismiss the poetry therein as "bloodless and derivative" (John 173), "not distinguished" (Mott IV: 490), and "now unreadable" (Filler, "The *Independent*" 121).

³⁷ As Joseph Harrington asserts, apparently about antebellum America, "poetry sold well": "it is hard to believe that 'Benito Cereno was more widely read and quoted than Longfellow's *Evangeline* . . ." (*Poetry and the Public* 165). Unfortunately, this popularity has been held against poetry too. While postbellum poetry measures poorly next to fiction's popularity, poetry in its early century esteem and cultural propriety is deemed less interesting than the novel's character of renegade and subversive form.

for twentieth-century critics who wanted to dismiss the period's product. This "twilight" did not, as some critics have stated, signal a decline in quantity.³⁸ Regular complaints surfaced over the floods of submissions and some editors published essays and stories openly discouraging poetizers. Suggestive of a government report on manufacturing statistics, William H. Hills tallies "The Poetry Product" in 1893, giving these examples: the monthly *Ladies Home Journal's* receipt of 5,000 poems per year (when it contained five or six poems at most per issue) and the annual use by a Boston daily of 1,000 poems gleaned from the 10,000 that it read (221-222).³⁹

It bears noting something rarely acknowledged, however. Poetry's health was a *debated* issue that emphasized the many participants in it as a cultural institution—writers, critics, and readers. Writers, or the lack of poets of the first order, drew blame in such commentary; but so did critics for receiving the genre with a "tone of contempt" and thus "discourag[ing] . . . poets and publishers of poetry . . ." ("A Plea" 316); *and* readers,

³⁸ Characterizations of the product's quality have morphed at times into statements on quantity, leading, for example, to characterizations of "magazine pages" as containing "a smattering of poetry" (Tebbel and Zuckerman 65) and claims that the "quantity and quality of magazine verse was said to be in decline" (Weber 134). In fact, Carlin Kindilien, citing a 1900 *Dial* survey on "literary currents in America and Europe," notes an actual increase in the number of poetry books published the last twenty years of the nineteenth century (5). And tables in David Reed's *The Popular Magazine in Britain and the United States: 1880-1960*, while confirming the dominance of fiction and non-fiction, suggest no discernible drop-off in percentage of space dedicated to poetry in 1890s magazine (236-262).

³⁹ See also "A Poet's Pathetic Plea" from the February 1890 *Writer*, which reproduces a purportedly author-prepared "lithographed circular" in which the author begs aspiring poets to leave him be (33). The message, from one who had received so much correspondence that it "forced [him] to abandon [his] professional work, and added to a burden of ill-health under which [he has] been struggling" (33), clearly seeks to teach hordes of aspiring young poets some manners.

who in the harshest estimates, were deemed downright inadequate, ignorant of “masterpieces,” which, such arguments went, demanded sustained attention even when the current product was lacking.⁴⁰ A 1900 *Century* editorial shames Americans for their ignorance, derisively recounting the source inquiries prompted by an exhibited painting titled “The Eve of St. Agnes” (“On the Reading of Poetry” 960). And most notably, because its title has stood in so widely for criticism of the era’s product, the *Post*’s editorial “In the Twilight of Poetry” in fact catalogs the sins of the reading public. Certainly, “the elder generation of American poets” had passed; but “even [‘the old standard poets’] lie in neglect” and people say things (of Nathaniel Parker Willis!) like, “‘Oh, yes; he was a stuffy old poet, wasn’t he?’” (McKinney 426) An editorial climate that declared, “[t]he taste for poetry is becoming a lost accomplishment” (McKinney 426) thus placed plenty of blame on readers too.

In articulating reception as well as production problems—a perceived gap between “poetry” and audience—the debate over poetry’s health made vacant a position in sales. “[I]f an author kept a shop and stood behind his own counter,” one piece jested, “wrapped up his poems in brown paper and took cash for them, he might make a considerable addition to his income” (“A Suggestion for Authors” 538). In fact, periodical editors stepped forward—editors who not only brought poetry into their ad-filled, commercialized worlds of mass culture, but who also used those very tactics to

⁴⁰ The 1896 *Century* article “A Plea for the Poets” admits “there is hardly a great living English-speaking poet,” but complains that “we are taking our revenge for this spiritual orphanage by abusing the fledglings and young birds of song . . .” (316). Just think of what you are doing, the author admonishes critics, for “discouraging the production of poetry” “is not only like opposing the cultivation of flowers; it is like trampling down wheat, for poetry is the bread of intellectual and spiritual life” (“A Plea” 316).

convince readers to consume poetry. One editor, noting the comforting familiarity of the many advertisements in horse-cars for “soap, ink, baking-powder, and patent medicine,” half-seriously wondered

Whether, in the interest of public education, some of our Browning or Shakspeare societies, or art associations, might not hire a few panels in the horse-cars in which a verse from Browning or Shakspeare might be exposed until they had become sufficiently familiar, or in which a good engraving or heliotype might be exhibited for the public eye, while in still another panel a phonograph . . . might play a Beethoven symphony.

([Barrows], “Musings,” 13 November 1890, 732, my ellipses)⁴¹

Periodicals *were* those horse-cars. They were venues filled with similar “soap, ink, baking-powder, and patent medicine” panels, venues highly effective in reaching people. But more than that, they often had individuals highly involved in similarly pushing poetry to an audience. In making use of their periodical connections, Higginson and Todd thus were allying themselves with a group of cultural salespeople well equipped to help their project.

⁴¹ For another connection established between poetry and advertisements, see one advertising specialist’s description of women using hairpins after reading the advertisements to “mutilate the pages [of a magazine] in a languid quest for the month’s poetry” (qtd. in Garvey 173).

II.

Historians and chroniclers of the eminent *St. Nicholas* exhibit little awareness of or pride in the two Dickinson poems first printed therein in 1891. Dickinson's name seldom appears among the notable contributors regularly listed to prove the magazine's prestige, and the occasional mention of her can display a misunderstanding of the facts.⁴² Yet Dickinson's publication in *St. Nicholas* was the highlight of the larger campaign to market her as children's friend. The effort, spearheaded by Todd, began after the November 1890 *Poems by Emily Dickinson* already had captured the public's imagination. Higginson's introduction, partly responsible for stoking public fascination, had cast Dickinson as "[a] recluse by temperament and habit" and likened her circumstances to those of one who "dwelt in a nunnery" (Preface iii, v).⁴³ Now, in lectures she gave as early as April 1891, Todd purportedly "corrected the popular

⁴² See, for example, May Lamberton Becker's 1934 foreword to *Poems for Youth* (edited by Alfred Leete Hampson, a Dickinson co-editor in the early twentieth century). Becker, a twentieth-century *St. Nicholas* editor, makes no mention of Dickinson's appearance in the magazine in this collection of Dickinson's poetry. Hampson includes "The Sleeping Flowers" (he titles it "The Bed-time of the Flowers") but does not include "Morning." See also Mary June Roggenbuck's otherwise very useful study of the magazine, where she apparently assumes that the poet was still alive when her poems were published. Roggenbuck questions editor Mary Mapes Dodge for highlighting the discovery of Helen Thayer Hutcheson during the same period while withholding "editorial tribute" for Dickinson: "Dodge may have recognized the potential renown of this shy and retiring poet but if so she gave her thoughts no editorial display" (240).

⁴³ Reviewers initially treated Dickinson's solitude sympathetically; later, however, they wrote of the poet's "morbid sensitiveness," "shunn[ing]" of "society," and general status as "strange, shy, solitary creature." See: the c. October 1891 "Emily Dickinson" in *Readers Union Journal* (198); [Andrew Lang]'s 3 October 1891 "An American Sappho" in *London Daily News* (202); and Mary Abbott's 6 October 1891 "Emily Dickenson's [sic] Rare Genius" in the *Chicago Post* (207).

impression that she [Dickinson] was always a recluse . . .” in part by telling how “to children . . . she was always accessible” (“Reminiscences of Emily Dickinson” 141).⁴⁴ Todd’s “correction” to Higginson’s “recluse” preface never was so much the necessary action of a crusader as it was of a savvy marketer, however. Higginson might have written the preface to *Poems*; Todd, as Ellen Louise Hart and Martha Nell Smith point out, both approved it and rejected Higginson’s suggestion that they use for a preface Susan Dickinson’s obituary of Dickinson (xv).⁴⁵ That obituary, which was in Higginson’s words a “good sketch of E.D.” (qtd. in *AB* 61), “emphasized that while she kept her own company she was ‘not disappointed with the world’” (Hart and Smith xv).

The “correction” of the Dickinson “recluse” image she helped create remained a lasting concern of Todd’s: beyond her early April lectures, similar efforts surfaced regularly in later lectures and in the 1894 *Letters of Emily Dickinson*. The most famous piece from the campaign (ironically not by Todd) reveals the appeal of a child-friendly Dickinson. In MacGregor Jenkins’s 24 October 1891 *Christian Union*–published recollection, Dickinson memorably lowers “dainties dear to our hearts” by way of a basket and sends notes with such openings as “Please never grow up . . .” (“A Child’s

⁴⁴ Other reviewers of Todd’s lecture picked up on this image—eight of the eleven additional pieces covering this talk repeated the item on Dickinson and children.

⁴⁵ For that obituary, which was published in the 18 May 1886 *Springfield Republican*, see S. Dickinson, “Obituary for Emily Dickinson,” in the *Writings by Susan Dickinson* link of the *Dickinson Electronic Archives*. The link also usefully contains drafts of the obituary that Susan crafted (<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson>).

Recollections of Emily Dickinson” 216, 217).⁴⁶ The erstwhile “nun” turns child’s playmate, a beneficent auntie-type proffering “gingerbread,” “cookies,” and “cake” from above (Jenkins, “A Child’s Recollections” 216).

In the “audience development” for the books that Elizabeth Horan argues Todd “mapped” in the 1890s, Todd “urged the publishers to target the ladies’ market . . .”—a market with notably close ties to publishing outlets associated with children and religion (Horan, “Mabel Loomis Todd” 67, 73-74).⁴⁷ Indeed, the *St. Nicholas*-created child that Dickinson becomes coheres with a larger infantilization of nineteenth-century women poets that feminists have detected. Barbara Antonina Clarke Mossberg’s examination of the child pose Dickinson often adopted notes the “equat[ion]” by “society” (and Dickinson’s “sense” of it) of “an accomplished female poet with an unruly little girl . . .” (48). Higginson’s resistance to ushering Dickinson into the *Atlantic Monthly*—and his complete lack of objections about her appearance in *St. Nicholas*—thus reveals also which markets were deemed acceptable for a woman poet and which “corrective” personae might be pursued.

⁴⁶ Buckingham identifies Jenkins as eventual publisher of the *Atlantic Monthly* (*Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 580); Garvey calls him that same periodical’s ad manager (54).

⁴⁷ Horan claims that children were not “Todd’s first choice” for an audience (she notes one of the poems Todd sent to *St. Nicholas* and mentions that “some other poems went to be published in *The Youth’s Companion* [“Mabel Loomis Todd” 90 n19]). She states that “[e]arlier, Dickinson’s work was rejected when she sent it to *The Century*” (“Mabel Loomis Todd” 90 n19). In fact, Susan Dickinson is the only person we have on record as having submitted Dickinson’s poetry to *The Century*, although Higginson had tried to publish his introductory article of the poet in that journal.

Publication of “Morning” and “The Sleeping Flowers” in *St. Nicholas* offered a number of readily apparent advantages to Dickinson’s editorial team as they sought to prove also the poet’s *textual* accessibility. The child publication of the *Century*, formerly *Scribner’s Monthly*, *St. Nicholas* had been flourishing under the “conductorship” of its celebrity-status editor, Mary Mapes Dodge, since its 1873 founding.⁴⁸ Dodge, often cited as central to the magazine’s success, had assumed editorship at a time when she was already famous for her classic 1865 children’s novel, *Hans Brinker; or, The Silver Skates*; other credentials included various periodical publications and editorial positions on periodicals such as *Working Farmer* and *Hearth and Home*. With her unsigned article in the July 1873 *Scribner’s Monthly*, Dodge provided a convenient expression of her philosophy about what a “good” children’s magazine should be. Such a magazine, which “was never so much needed,” needed to be distinctly for *children*—not “a milk-and-water-variety of the periodical for adults”—and needed to be a “pleasure-ground,” although one where children also might be instructed, or as Dodge puts it, “pick up odd bits and treasures” (“Children’s Magazines” 352, 353). Dodge’s statement reflects what R. Gordon Kelly describes as the dominant post-Civil War project of children’s

⁴⁸ In 1881, *Scribner’s Monthly* and Scribner & Company parted ways. *Scribner’s Monthly* became *Century Magazine* and maintained ownership of *St. Nicholas*; Scribner & Company exercised an option in 1887 to use the name “Scribner” again and began publishing *Scribner’s Magazine*, a direct competitor of the *Century*. For a useful overview of the juvenile magazine, see Mott, “St. Nicholas.” Other sources include: Fred Erisman, “St. Nicholas”; Roggenbuck, “*St. Nicholas Magazine*”; R. Gordon Kelly, *Mother Was a Lady: Self and Society in Selected American Children’s Periodicals, 1865-1890*; and Gannon and Thompson, *Mary Mapes Dodge*, Chs. 7 and 8. Garvey’s excellent study of the interplay between fiction and advertising in late nineteenth-century periodicals also is very useful (*The Adman in the Parlor*, esp. chapter 2).

magazines: “to provide wholesome entertainment for the children of democracy” (4). And although not the only one of its kind, *St. Nicholas*, “that voracious devourer of smaller fish” (Mott, *History*III: 176), quickly came to stand for its genre on its merits and because of its absorption of other children’s magazines (*Riverside Magazine*, *Our Young Folks*, *Children’s Hour*, *Schoolday Magazine*, *Little Corporal*, *Wide Awake*).

Operating under a parent company such as Scribner’s (later, the Century Company) afforded Dodge unusual accessibility to financial resources and top-notch contributors (including illustrators), but Dodge’s own editorial talents deserve considerable credit for *St. Nicholas*’s success. Drawing on a network of friends in the publishing world, Dodge attracted the most vaunted writers from the beginning, publishing the likes of William Cullen Bryant, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Greenleaf Whittier, Louisa May Alcott, Mark Twain, Rudyard Kipling, and Frances Hodgson Burnett. Always alert to potential talent and pieces of light energy, she also featured individuals who as authors are now primarily associated with the magazine or juvenile literature, including Frank R. Stockton, John T. Trowbridge, Laura E. Richards, Noah Brooks, Tudor Jenks, and Palmer Cox. Dodge placed such writers among the best illustrations of the day and, through the magazine’s use of Theodore Low De Vinne as printer, fused artistic with technological achievement. De Vinne, his reputation unequalled in his day, received credit for new printing standards, especially through his association with the *Century* (although *St. Nicholas* used him first). An entry in the *Dictionary of American Biography* catalogues printing advances achieved through this pairing of publisher and printer: “through cooperation of the publishers with De Vinne,

and the latter's installation of heavier presses, the use of hard packing, and the invention of coated paper (by S.D. Warren & Company of Boston, largely at De Vinne's instigation), fine-line wood-engravings and later half-tone plates were printed with a brilliance never before achieved" (R[ollins] 263).⁴⁹ The magazine thus offered writers the best clothes and the best company possible as they traveled en route to the privileged households of America and of the world. Wrapped up with those advantages, however, were less apparent benefits: this was a magazine that excelled at glorifying print publication and creating an atmosphere of textual desire and appetite. For Todd and Higginson, editors interested in making Dickinson textually palatable, *St. Nicholas* offered an ideal venue for affirming their own program of print publication in the most attractive way possible.

In its creation of textual desire, *St. Nicholas* marketed its own form as a superior manifestation of print publication. Vesting its periodical self with booklike elements, it sold itself on the basis of separate issues, each title page sporting Dodge's authorial-like presence.⁵⁰ Serials might span volumes, teasing readers into subscribing the following year; the popular act of binding the magazine, however, meant that readers would

⁴⁹ For more on De Vinne, see Megan L. Benton's "Typography and Gender: Remasculating the Modern Book." Benton analyzes De Vinne's call for masculine printing at the end of the nineteenth century; Dickinson's publication in *St. Nicholas* took place before the use of his new "Century" font.

⁵⁰ Garvey distinguishes between the practice of selling separate issues and that of selling subscriptions when she writes of the "three new ten-cent middle-class monthlies of the 1890s . . ." (9): "The new magazines also followed the elite magazines in their sale and promotion of single issues of the magazine, rather than inviting readers to join a community of readers as the mail-order monthlies did through their emphasis on subscriptions and subscription clubs" (188 n9).

associate the magazine with “book” covers, filling eulogies with their ubiquitous crimson and gold.⁵¹ Contributors thus enjoyed the permanence of being book-published even as they appeared in the monthly, but *St. Nicholas* made clear that its superiority rested in its hybridity. In a poem that echoes ad campaigns teaching consumers to demand brand-name products of grocers, “[a] little maid” who wants “something jolly to read” chooses *St. Nicholas* over a list of canonical authors (Moses 67). ““I can’t get all of those names in my head,”” she informs the store clerk and thus suggests a clear recipe for posterity (Moses 67). Appear in books if you must, but if you want to be read, get your work in *St. Nicholas*.⁵² As Dodge herself outlines in her introduction to the short-lived “Treasure-Box of Literature,” the magazine’s format makes all the difference. Although “well-packed schoolreaders, ‘compilations,’ and encyclopedias” make Literature available for young readers, the first demands less comfortable reading practices and the other two

⁵¹ Roggenbuck notes that “serials often bridged bound volumes” after the magazine changed ownership in 1881 (183). “[W]hen there were enough for a volume our parents would send them off somewhere and back they would come in a Bound Volume, splendid in crimson covers stamped in gold,” writes Becker, one twentieth-century editor of the magazine (Introduction xv). Stories by Becker and others make clear the magnetic charm of those covers: “I never saw a piece of furniture so hard for people to pass,” is the way Becker describes the office bookcases that housed her complete collection (Introduction xvi). See Garvey on how scrapbooks were promoted at large as a way to preserve periodicals (27, 48) and how advertisements could interfere with the perception of periodicals as “books” (167).

⁵² Apparently, getting published in *St. Nicholas* also could help an author get read later in book form. Roggenbuck writes that “[w]hen its serials were published as books or when its poems and sketches were collected into books, critics often felt it necessary only to say that their content had been published originally in *St. Nicholas* magazine” (34). Roberts Brothers, Dickinson’s publishers, did not need to invoke *St. Nicholas*’s name in the advertisements for the ensuing volume, however, presumably in part because the 1891 *Poems* was the second volume.

promote dangerous ideas about how one should process literature (“The St. Nicholas Treasure-Box of Literature” 139).⁵³ In *St. Nicholas*, readers could find a feast spread out by none other than Dodge, and parents could gain comfort knowing who presided over it all.

If publishing was the feast, young readers proved only too eager to jump in and set the table. The magazine celebrated print culture in part by encouraging from readers an intense level of participation. Departments such as “The Riddle-Box,” “The Letter-Box,” the “Young Contributors’ Department,” and the highly successful “St. Nicholas League” provided continuity between separate issues and suggest Dodge’s open ear toward readers.⁵⁴ Most impressive, though, was the overwhelming number of readers who flocked to the departments, conjuring up ways to see their names—or better yet,

⁵³ The sometimes danger, Dodge explains, with the last two is “they give an idea that a certain amount of good literature must be acquired, and that here is the cream of it, skimmed and ready, and the sooner you begin swallowing it the better, especially if you are not in the least hungry for it—most especially, then, for it shows how much your mental system needs it” (“The St. Nicholas Treasure-Box of Literature. Introduction: By the Editor” 139). Becker repeats Dodge’s claim of the magazine’s superior format when she argues that while many *St. Nicholas* items appeared eventually in book form, “they couldn’t have the special charm of our magazine, which was that it had something about everything, all together in one delicious assortment for us to choose what—and when—we pleased” (Introduction, xvi).

⁵⁴ For the former claim, see Erisman, “St. Nicholas,” 380. Roggenbuck does not directly state the latter, but suggests as much in her analysis of the changes that took place in the magazine after it changed ownership. Roggenbuck tells how Dodge appealed to readers for input: “[I]n September, 1881, the editor explained her plan for taking readers into ‘a sort of editorial partnership’ in order that they might have a voice in the general content of the magazine” (180). Roggenbuck continues to chart the birth and death of multiple departments during what she defines as the second of three periods during Dodge’s editorship (1881-1893), examining the period with the assumption that Dodge made changes in response to her readers.

work—in the magazine. Mary June Roggenbuck sets as a high-water mark one 1889 “Riddle-Box” contest that attracted 6,072 entries (308), and at least as noteworthy was the regularity of readers’ high participation—two contests in 1875 and 1876, Roggenbuck claims, attracted “more than two thousand” submissions (142, 144), and other activities led the magazine to publish multiple pages listing the names of reader participants (Roggenbuck 308, 142, 144).⁵⁵ Scholarship on the magazine repeatedly boasts that *St. Nicholas* served as nursery for later renowned authors.⁵⁶ Greta Little argues further that the magazine’s many interactive sections were where “the publishers and editors” “undertook to encourage and to educate future generations of writers” (20).⁵⁷ Primers as much as conduits, these departments taught what impeded publication and what encouraged it. Clearly, plagiarism was out. What got a prospective author in might be more difficult to define and depended on the department; entries in “The Letter-Box” suggested, however, that an exotic locale or royal parentage did not hurt.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Roggenbuck’s description of departments during the years 1873-1881 relates the magazine’s practice of printing contributors’ names (141-155).

⁵⁶ See, for example, Paul Rosta, “The Magazine that Taught Faulkner, Fitzgerald, and Millay How to Write.”

⁵⁷ Little mentions that Todd in fact was one of the young contributors to *Our Young Folks* (20).

⁵⁸ The two issues in which Dickinson’s poems appeared exemplify this principle. The May issue’s “The Letter-Box” features one letter from the rural United States; the remainder of the letters hail from Holland, England (two), and Canada. June features a similar array, including letters from Italy (two) and Austria, and a jingle set in the Nile. The letter from Canada appeals for publication with a standard tactic—that none has been published before from the writer’s specific location. At least as common, however, are other letters’ casual appeals to class consciousness—one from England comes from a young Californian already a seasoned world traveler; others refer to “Papas” of

Beyond such lessons, however, the magazine preached most eloquently a message about the desirability of print publication—a message that could legitimate Higginson and Todd’s Dickinson-related efforts. In clamoring for editorial attention, young readers learned that their efforts need not ape their preferences. While some precocious writers sought attention for fiction—the more popular genre for reading—many looked for success through their poetry.⁵⁹ Examining their efforts in this genre is useful both because Dickinson’s own contributions were poems and because Dodge, a poet of sorts herself, exhibited serious editorial commitment toward the genre.⁶⁰ In an era when poetry increasingly was seen as unremarkable, Dodge’s commitment deserves attention; as a program of cultural salesmanship, it could aid Higginson and Todd’s own project. Ellery Sedgwick notes that, by 1900, “[f]or poets, making a living by writing was probably harder than in the previous generation of Longfellow, Whittier, and Lowell. While many magazines carried poetry, they didn’t make it pay” (“Magazines and the Profession of Authorship in the United States” 422). While Dodge did not necessarily

distinction, one in the New York State Legislature and another a “U.S. official abroad.” See the May 1891 “The Letter-Box” and the June 1891 “The Letter-Box.”

⁵⁹ Fiction’s high ranking in magazines of this period has become a given. As Garvey writes, “The editors of the advertising trade journal *Profitable Advertising* concurred [with Frank Munsey’s opinion of the centrality of fiction]: ‘Magazines are undoubtedly read chiefly for the stories, and it is therefore evident that the storywriter is one of the advertiser’s most valuable assistants’” (4). For an acknowledgment within *St. Nicholas* of fiction’s status, see Sarah S. Pratt’s May 1891 “A Diet of Candy.”

⁶⁰ Dodge’s adult poetry appears along Dickinson’s at least twice—in the 1878 *Masque of Poets* and in the 1891 *Out of the Heart: Poems for Lovers Young and Old*. In *Out of the Heart*, published the same year Dickinson’s poems appeared in *St. Nicholas*, Dodge was represented by one poem (“Umpires”), Dickinson by five. For the latter anthology, see John White Chadwick and Annie Hathaway Chadwick, eds.

break that mold, she did work to sell poetry to readers, placing it regularly in the preferential lead-piece spot, meticulously categorizing any verse texts in the table of contents, and according precious space to articles about poets and poetry.⁶¹

Richard Ohmann, summarizing changes that took place in advertising after the Civil War, has written how ad agents “learned to reduce the ratio of prose to picture, of information to aura, creating the iconic links that most strikingly characterize advertising today” (*Politics of Letters* 146).⁶² Dodge, it seems, created similar “visual displays” (to use Ohmann’s words about advertising [*Politics of Letters* 146]) as she sold poetry to young readers.⁶³ Often paired with fetching illustrations, poetry acted as part of the

⁶¹ According to Roggenbuck, poetry led the magazine one third of the time during the period of 1881-1892 (230). Roggenbuck notes the distinction made in the table of contents, which designated verse texts as poetry, jingles, verses, and ballads (86). Dickinson’s own poems were “verses.” The articles Dodge featured included an early series by Lucy Larcom introducing readers to the poetry of winter, spring, and autumn. The elaborately illustrated essay on winter took up ten pages (including illustrations) of the issue and was rather heavy reading. (See Lucy Larcom’s December 1876 “Poems and Carols of Winter.”) For a summary of Dodge’s tactful direction that Larcom lighten her style, see Gannon and Thompson (135).

⁶² Although see, on the antebellum use of illustration, Meredith McGill, who argues that “[t]he culture of reprinting conferred a new kind of value on illustration” (28). While Ohmann’s argument suggests the value of illustration in repetition, McGill’s draws on Hugh Amory’s concept of “proprietary illustration,” whereby “engravings help to mark a text’s identity, to ward off wholesale reprinting, and to create a stable sense of value . . .” (28).

⁶³ *St. Nicholas*, with its quality printing technology and institutional investment in illustration, did an especially fine job with the poetry-illustration association, but it was not alone in the practice. A turn-of-the-century series in the *Saturday Evening Post*, “The Best Poems in the World,” hawks the series in part on the basis of the illustrations. The series was to feature the “Pocket-Book School of Poetry”—those poems that one cuts from a newspaper and carries in the pocket-book till they are worn through at the creases” (“The Best Poems” 8); clearly, however, the *Post* hoped the illustrations meant readers would never clean out those pocket-books: “When this series has been completed

magazine's visual package so that even space fillers had a surprising advantage: their appearing at the end of popular stories placed them before an especially captive audience, often with their own illustrations and at times set in distinctly different font. Poets also occupied a special place in the combined author-illustrator category. Stories about Palmer Cox's overwhelmingly popular Brownies series emphasize the illustrations the poet created to accompany his verses. And while prose writer-illustrators existed as well, poetry's shorter length afforded a closer marriage of the text with the illustration(s), an extreme case residing in Oliver Herford's poem in which an illustrated writer displays a poem on a page he holds up:

A poet named
Christopher Crumb,
When it chanced that a
rhyme wouldn't come
Would explain with a
smile—
“What matters it! I'll
Just end it with
Tum-ti-ti
Tum (384)

the readers of the POST will possess a valuable and artistically illustrated collection of the world's best poems.” At worst, this association could suggest a reversal of priorities—stories about a poem being created for the sake of an illustration (Towne 162) and reports about extravagant illustration prices paid (reportedly \$2500 for the illustration of an Edna dean Proctor poem [“News and Notes” 64]).

Within the illustration, the poem both ends and does not: the curling up of the page on which it is displayed helps “Christopher Crumb” achieve his arbitrary ending even as it cuts off the necessary final punctuation of the poem. Papers scattered on the floor reveal supposed evidence of “Crumb’s” creative struggles—by including these, Herford simultaneously expands how we “get” the poem (revealing other supposed courses the poem might have taken) and how we get his larger cleverness here, where the poem is not *illustrated* but is *illustration*.

However, most congenial for Higginson and Todd’s interest in proving Dickinson’s textual accessibility was the magazine’s consistent program to define poetry as effortless—a kind of natural singing in which craft was covered by ease. Lucy Larcom characteristically speculates in “Songs of Spring: Part I” that “the birds were the very first poets” (365); an illustration in “Songs of Spring: Part II” drives home her point. Titled “The Singing-Lesson,” the drawing features a young girl, book open on lap, surrounded by a variety of songbirds. That book (of poetry, presumably) rests unattended, the child’s sly, sidewise peek directed instead at the natural “poets” that surround her (“Songs of Spring: Part II” 461). But Dodge herself served as the greatest exemplar of the natural poet. Composer of many *St. Nicholas* space-fillers, Dodge had a reputation of being an effortless versifier, able to create forty-eight-line birthday poems while her sons waited outside her door (Runkle 283).⁶⁴

⁶⁴ This popular image of Dodge as facile composer persisted in the twentieth century with the publication of Miriam E. Mason’s 1949 juvenile biography of Dodge, *Mary Mapes Dodge, Jolly Girl*. For an example of a Dodge poem that highlights composition as a casual effort, see, in the May 1875 “Jack-in-the-Pulpit” department, [Mary Mapes Dodge], “The Sad Story of Little Jane,” written “just to amuse the children, as they sat

That Dickinson, while not promoted as such in *St. Nicholas*'s pages, was treated in the press at large as a new "discovery" at the time means her own writing becomes resonant with images prevalent throughout the magazine of young "found" poets who display a Dodge-like facility. In "Eddie and His Twirl Poetry," a six-year-old boy commands his mother to record his impromptu poems: "'Write, mother—write just what I tell you. I'm going to make some Twirl poetry!'"⁶⁵ And Walter Learned's November 1886 "Molly's Poetry" features his daughter's estimate of "Thanatopsis" as "'rather sad'" and her casual determination to write "'a cheerful "Thanatopsis"'" (Learned 58). Both young authors prove fit to navigate the trade. Eddie tells his mother to "'[s]ign it "BY THE GREAT ARTIST, EDDIE, ESQ., Nov. 27, 1874"'" ("Eddie and His Twirl Poetry" 451), and Molly—called an heiress throughout—asks publishing-connected Papa if her poem can be published (Learned 58). "'I usually leave that question to an editor,'" Papa replies; his telling the story, of course, accomplishes Molly's aim. Molly's poem concludes the story; the *St. Nicholas* illustrator decorates the story's margins with the snowdrops of which she writes (Learned 58).⁶⁶

with her [the school-mistress, one Dodge persona] upon the willow-stumps in my [Jack's] meadow." Although Dodge did not sign such compositions and presented the entire "Jack-in-the-Pulpit" column through the persona of Jack, it would not have been surprising for readers to assume her authorship of the column. For one thing, as Gannon and Thompson assert, "'Jack,' though a male figure, looks suspiciously like an affectionate caricature of Dodge" (114).

⁶⁵ Dodge prints two of Eddie's twirl poems and one very short story in the May 1875 "Jack-in-the-Pulpit."

⁶⁶ Molly's poem bears repeating: "Dear little snowdrops, deep under the snow, / You must be weary of winter, I know. / Sweet little snowdrops, far down in the ground, / You will be kissed and caressed when you 're found" (Learned 58). In "Effie's Realistic

Young writers needed not be savvy negotiators of the publishing world to gain the magazine's attention, however. Child poets Elaine and Dora Read Goodale were featured among regular contributors without the adult mediation of a story. Simply titled "Poems by Two Little American Girls," a brief introduction prefaces the six poems.⁶⁷ Here, the girls are described as model *St. Nicholas* children—"Living largely out-of-doors, vigorous and healthful in body as in mind, they draw pleasure and instruction from all about them" ("Poems by Two Little American Girls" 109). They "learn the secrets of nature, and these they pour forth in song as simply and as naturally as the birds sing" ("Poems by Two Little American Girls" 109). From the magazine's first issue, Dodge had admonished girls in particular to "[s]tudy your lessons if you must, . . . but remember that there are out-of-door lessons to learn—music lessons to take from the birds in summer and the winds in winter, picture lessons from Master Nature, health lessons from Dr. Oxygen, and love lessons from the bright blue sky" ("Jack-in-the Pulpit" 100).⁶⁸ As representatives of the magazine's push for outdoor living, the Goodale sisters are shown

Novel," the message about fiction was quite different. Here, young Effie glibly sets out to write a realistic novel, facilely espousing "Howellisms" until Papa sets her straight on the difficulties of the genre. In the end, she turns to writing fairy tales, declaring "'Papa says that I may write very good fairy-tales, but that I have n't imagination enough to be a realistic writer'" (Rollins 262).

⁶⁷ This introduction affords them more mediation than Dodge's introduction of another young poet, however. Four poems in "Poems by a Little Girl" appear with only the author's name (Libbie Hawes) and age (ten). See Libbie Hawes, "Poems by a Little Girl."

⁶⁸ My attention was alerted to this passage by Kenneth Klassen, in his introduction to *The School of Nature: An Annotated Index of Writings on Nature in "St. Nicholas Magazine" During the Editorship of Mary Mapes Dodge, 1873-1905*.

to exemplify also the magazine's view of poetry as intuitive: ". . . they began, almost as soon as they began to talk, to express in verse what they saw and felt, rhyme and rhythm seeming to come by instinct" ("Poems by Two Little American Girls" 109).⁶⁹

Dickinson, Barton Levi St. Armand reminds us, was once a "vigorous 'out-door girl'" herself who, accompanied by her dog Carlo, "roam[ed] the Amherst hills in search of the rare, the hidden, or the precious botanical specimen" (*Emily Dickinson and Her Culture* 188). Dickinson "reacted most intensely" to Higginson's "early nature essays," St. Armand argues, and "[i]t was precisely Higginson's nearness to nature and his high exaltation that prompted Dickinson to choose him as confidant" (*Emily Dickinson* 198). The poet sounds here very much like a model *St. Nicholas* girl and her poetry now entered a world that would have approved of her early natural environment.⁷⁰ For *St. Nicholas*, of course, an accompanying "natural" talent was to be captured and celebrated—to find a poet was to publish one. And for Dodge, no qualms arose over the publication of a recluse-poet's work. She formally introduces readers in January 1890 to poems by the deceased Helen Thayer Hutcheson. Hutcheson—like Dickinson, in her popular image—had led a "most uneventful" life, her "experiences were bounded by the small circle of a quiet home" ("Helen Thayer Hutcheson" 231). Although "it seems never to have occurred to her [Hutcheson] to print her poems," Dodge shows no

⁶⁹ For a later contribution by Dora, see Dora Read Goodale, "Christina Churning," in the December 1883 *St. Nicholas*. Dora's poem was part of a contest in which possible publication yet again was held out as an incentive. In an invitation for readers to submit illustrations for one of three poems, Dodge as "Silas Green" identifies Goodale as a previous "child author" ("Work and Play for Young Folk," 182-183).

⁷⁰ I thank Barton St. Armand for drawing my attention to this similarity.

reservations, ultimately giving readers sixteen of the young poet's verses ("Helen Thayer Hutcheson" 231).⁷¹ Higginson himself was only too aware of this attitude. Literary mentor that he was, he had served as adviser to the young Goodale sisters' parents, wanting "to prevent their being brought prematurely before the public . . ." (Letter to Dodge, *St. Nicholas* Correspondence). A notice of the sisters' forthcoming *St. Nicholas* publication had elicited a "frank" letter from Higginson to Todd, where he expresses disappointment that the girls were to be featured rather than discreetly included in the "Young Contributors" department.⁷² Now, of course, the magazine drew on another

⁷¹ Roggenbuck finds "curious" Dodge's enthusiasm for Hutcheson, whom Dodge introduces with much more "fanfare" than she does Dickinson (239, 240). Beyond the pride associated with the "exclusive" discovery of Hutcheson, however, Hutcheson's biography afforded Dodge the kind of example she liked to provide young readers. Hutcheson's death at age twenty-six allowed the magazine to cast the poems as "written by a young girl" who even in "only the light singing of a happy heart" engaged in "singing in perfect harmony with the tune set by the winds and waters, and the trill of birds" ("Helen Thayer Hutcheson" 231). Like the Goodale sisters, the biographical sketch suggests Hutcheson's oneness with the natural world and early proclivity: she "composed verses almost from her babyhood, 'making them up,' indeed, before her small hands had learned how to write down the pleasant fancies that came into the little curly head" ("Helen Thayer Hutcheson" 232).

⁷² The unpublished 11 November 1877 letter reads:

Dear Mrs. Dodge

I saw the above with regret amounting to pain. I have taken the greatest interest in these children (the Goodales) having been [consulted?] by the parents as to the best course to be pursued, in training them. My [one effort?] (& my wife's) was to prevent their being brought prematurely before the public, which the father evidently wishes, while the wiser mother expressed entire agreement with me. I had heard that some of their verses were to appear in *St. N.* but earnestly hoped it might be only as [----] Howells' sonnet appeared among the Young Contributors, & without [strike out] special notice. To announce them at fourteen & twelve as Davidsons, is the one sure way to make their genius as valueless as that of the Davidsons, in the end.

Excuse my frankness.

Ever yours,

writer he once had advised against publication. Higginson's preface had cast Dickinson's poetry as fresh and untrammelled ("poetry torn up by the roots, with rain and dew and earth still clinging to them . . ."). However, such images were to apologize for its formal roughness—the "indifferen[ce] to all conventional rules," the "uneven vigor" of the poems—qualities of Dickinson's poetry, in other words, that suggest her ill-suitedness for a *St. Nicholas* world, where "rhyme and rhythm" were to come by instinct (Higginson, Preface v-vi, iv, vi). Once Dodge accepted the two poems for publication, however, the question would not be whether Dickinson had been placed appropriately; for Dodge, with all authors, the question was only how to make that placement appropriate.

III.

Todd submitted the poems on 28 January 1891, the date on which she recorded in her diary the sending of an unspecified number of poems to *Life* and *St. Nicholas* (AB 106 n5). Higginson, author of children's material throughout the whole of his career, had contributed to *St. Nicholas*'s very first volume, but Todd too was no stranger to the magazine both as mother and as author. As mother, she had engaged with daughter Millicent in one of the magazine's time-honored acts: immersion in *Little Lord Fauntleroy*, Frances Hodgson Burnett's highly popular novel that appeared originally in *St. Nicholas* in 1886. Todd writes that on 29 January 1889, she "[b]egan Little Lord Fauntleroy to Millicent" (likely in book form) and on 3 April 1889 that she "[w]ent to

T.W. Higginson (Letter to Dodge, *St. Nicholas* correspondence)
On the sisters' later careers, see Paula Bennett (*Poets in the Public Sphere* 213 -215).

New York with Millicent” and saw “Tommy Russel in Little Lord Fauntleroy” at Broadway Theatre on Forty-first Street (Todd diary). Daughter Millicent even engaged (successfully) in the time-honored custom in which *St. Nicholas* readers wrote letters for publication. Todd records Millicent’s success in a 26 February 1889 entry (Todd diary); the letter appears in the March issue, detailing her trip to New York’s seashore. Adding further to this catalogue were Todd’s authorial activities. The December 1888 issue featured her “Ten Weeks in Japan,” a lengthy account of her experiences when she accompanied husband David on a solar eclipse expedition that he led, and the January 1890 issue included Todd’s “A Well-Filled Chimney,” an account of the more than eight hundred swallows that regularly filled her neighbor’s chimney.

The magazine now acceded readily to Todd’s peddling of Dickinson, notifying Todd that it was “accepting with delight two poems of Emily’s” in a letter Todd received on 3 February (*AB* 106 n5).⁷³ Clearly the banner publication of the two, “Morning” acts as lead piece for the May 1891 issue and for the second half of volume 18. The poem was everything Dickinson’s editorial team could have wanted. Willis Buckingham in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* records that advance notices appeared for the poem in as many as nine different periodicals; such recognition no doubt came because of its position as lead piece.⁷⁴ Clearly in a position of honor, it placed Dickinson in the

⁷³ At this point, Todd began work also on an article about Dickinson for *St. Nicholas* (*AB* 107 n5). The magazine never published Todd’s article, nor does Bingham record in *Ancestors’ Brocades* its fate.

⁷⁴ Five notices were unlocated. In addition to the *Century*, papers from New York, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Ohio, Texas, and Illinois printed some notice of the May *St.*

ranks of such contributors as Richard Watson Gilder, editor of the *Century*, and banner writers for *St. Nicholas* such as John T. Trowbridge, Helen Gray Cone, Tudor Jenks, and C. P. Cranch. The failure of Dickinson's editors to interest the *Century* in the poet likely was ameliorated somewhat by *St. Nicholas*'s enthusiastic acceptance of "Morning" and "The Sleeping Flowers"; the treatment by *St. Nicholas* of "Morning" as on par with that which *Century*-editor Gilder's own poem received several months earlier resonates now with a pleasant irony.⁷⁵

The attention to surrounding visual details affirmed the position that "Morning" held. The poem's situation across the page from George Wharton Edwards's "Spring Blossoms" placed it next to work by an illustrator who was by then a bit of a marquee name: Dodge uses Edwards for three of volume 18's twelve frontispieces—more than for any other illustrator in that volume—as well as for a number of other texts, including

Nicholas, including Dickinson's poem in their notice (Buckingham, *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s*).

⁷⁵ Buckingham notes that "the journal had conspicuously little place in its pages for notice of the Amherst poet . . ." (*Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s* 571) and that its published notice of the forthcoming appearance of "Morning" in *St. Nicholas* was "[its] only notice of Dickinson" (*Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s* 136). Bingham catalogues the journal's regular rejection of Dickinson-related items—from a poem that Susan Dickinson submitted on 31 December 1886 (*AB* 88 n16) to its indecisive attitude toward Higginson's inaugural article that ultimately appeared in the *Christian Union* (*AB* 65) to its rejection of an essay by Todd on Dickinson's handwriting (*AB* 279-280) and a Dickinson poem submitted, but not published, in December 1895 (*AB* 333 n1). The poems' publication no doubt signaled another sort of victory for Todd as well. Every periodical poem printed from her efforts solidified further her own role as Dickinson's editor; she had received evidence only in March that Susan Huntington Dickinson, on her own, had been sending Dickinson poems to the *Independent*.

her own “The Land of Pluck.”⁷⁶ The poem’s boxed-in sunrise above its title makes it one of only four lead pieces in volume 18 with decoration on the text’s page. And, while “Morning” lacks its own full-page illustration, Edwards’s “Spring Blossoms” does not belong to another text in the issue. Lacking the “see page –” otherwise connected illustrations always had, the child therein functions in effect as the speaker’s visual representation.

Read as a *St. Nicholas* poem, “Morning” gives readers the poet as child:

Will there really be a morning?

Is there such a thing as day?

Could I see it from the mountains

If I were as tall as they?

Has it feet like water-lilies?

Has it feathers like a bird?

Is it brought from famous countries

Of which I have never heard?

⁷⁶ The Europe-trained thirty-two year-old artist, illustrator, and writer was just seven years from becoming the art director of *Collier’s Weekly* (*The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* 414-415). Although Edwards is little remembered now, a profile would say in 1893: “[I]t is quite exceptional if one can pick up an important illustrated magazine at random and fail to find between its covers at least one picture done in line or ‘wash,’ and signed by George Wharton Edwards” (P. Maxwell 86). John MacKay Shaw cites Edwards’s first appearance in *St. Nicholas* as being just over two years earlier in volume 16, number 2.

Oh, some scholar! Oh, some sailor!

Oh, some wise man from the skies!

Please to tell a little pilgrim

Where the place called morning lies! (“Morning” 491)⁷⁷

The poem disrupts its own place in the magazine. Although it all but asks, Are we there yet? the first-line questioning of something supposedly very certain—“Will there really be a morning?”—makes uncertain the speaker’s circumstances. In other Dickinson poems where the sunrise’s appearance is questioned, such reasoning is explained more directly. One speaker says of “those who suffer now - ”: “They shall survive - / There is a sun - / They don’t believe it now -” (FP 1338).⁷⁸ And another recognizes:

The Doomed - regard the Sunrise

With different Delight -

Because - when next it burns abroad

They doubt to witness it - (FP 298)⁷⁹

Seeing the speaker of “Morning” as one who, like these subjects, questions morning’s appearance because she is “doomed” or is one “who suffer[s] now” makes the voice one of desperation rather than fancy.

⁷⁷ See also Dickinson, “[Will there really be a ‘morning’?]” (FP 148). References to Dickinson’s poems from Ralph W. Franklin’s *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition* will use the initials FP and the number he assigns. I also offer citations in footnotes that give the first lines of the quoted poems.

⁷⁸ See Dickinson, “[Time does go on -]” (FP 1338). The poem’s first two lines are: “Time does go on - / I tell it gay to those who suffer now - /.”

⁷⁹ See Dickinson, “[The Doomed - regard the Sunrise]” (FP 298).

Alternately, the “little pilgrim” questioning “where the place called morning lies” collapses time/event (“morning”) and geography (“the place”) in a way that potentially undercuts notions of an afterlife. Dickinson elsewhere calls heaven “The House of Supposition - / The Glimmering Frontier that / skirts the Acres of Perhaps - ” (FP 725), capturing in abstraction the questioning of “Morning”’s existence and the posturing of its fantastic qualities (“feet like water-lilies,” “feathers like a bird,” origin from unknown “famous countries”).⁸⁰ Another poem suggests a connection too when it begins with much the same tone as “Morning,” but poses its mischievous questions more directly:

What is - “Paradise” -

Who lives there -

Are they “Farmers”

Do they “hoe” - (FP 241)⁸¹

Here, adopting a “child’s innocence allows” Dickinson to “indulge in various heresies with impunity”; the child’s pose becomes an especially useful avenue by which Dickinson “confronts and attacks institutional religion” (Mossberg 48).

One month earlier, the *Christian Register* had published Dickinson’s “God is a distant - stately Lover -” in which Dickinson uses Longfellow’s characters from *The Courtship of Miles Standish* to question the theological soundness of a god who, as

⁸⁰ See Dickinson, “[Their Hight in Heaven comforts not -],” (FP 725). Farr connects the imagery of “[Will there really be a ‘morning’?]” to Thomas Cole’s *The Voyage of Life* and argues that the poem, with its “Bunyanesque Voyager,” “may easily be read as questioning both the possibility of eternal life and that of her own success as a poet” (81, 60).

⁸¹ See Dickinson, “[What is - ‘Paradise’ -]” (FP 241).

Standish, “[w]ooes” [sic] people “by his Son” (John Alden), only to claim that “Miles, and John Alden are synonyme!” (“A Poem” 212).⁸² Letters about that poem prompted the *Register* to print an apology; *St. Nicholas*, however, takes no risks with “Morning.”⁸³ Far from suggesting “doomed” speakers or theological archness, the poem’s position next to Edwards’s “Spring Blossoms” gives the speaker the decided lisp of a precocious child. The child in Edwards’s illustration—hands clasping a flowering branch—exemplifies the magazine’s ideals. She might as well be Elaine or Dora Read Goodale “living largely out-of-doors.” In concert with Dickinson’s poem, she “learn[s] the secrets of nature, and . . . pour[s] [them] forth in song as simply and as naturally as the birds sing.” Or, we might say, the poem does. The child of Edwards’s illustration does not sing; she provides, though, an appropriately realized speaker for readers of “Morning” in the magazine, thus allowing the poem to trill out a respectable if winsome child’s song.

The publication the following month of “The Sleeping Flowers” lacked the fanfare of “Morning.” Tucked into a middle section in the magazine, it is flanked on either side by two unremarkable pieces—Frank M. Chapman’s “A City Playground” and an installment from J. O. Davidson’s serialized *Chan Ok; A Romance of the Eastern Seas*. Sporting no illustration other than a respectably decorative opening letter, the poem nonetheless is visually attractive—printed in clear type and cushioned by plenty of white space. Rather lengthy as Dickinson’s poems go, the poem’s seven four-line stanzas

⁸² See Dickinson’s “A Poem” in the 2 April 1891 *Christian Register*. For more on the poem, see my Chapter 3. See also, Dickinson “[God is a distant - stately Lover -]” (FP 615).

⁸³ For an account of the controversy surrounding this poem, see Bingham (*AB* 124-125).

are deceptively conventional. In this dialogue about the contents of several flower beds, Dickinson, from the poem's beginning, also uses "bed" to mean a place to sleep in:

"Whose are the little beds," I asked,
"Which in the valleys lie?"
Some shook their heads, and others smiled,
And no one made reply. ("The Sleeping Flowers" 616)⁸⁴

The speaker persists in questioning:

Perhaps they did not hear, I said,
I will inquire again.
"Whose are the beds—the tiny beds
So thick upon the plain?" (Dickinson, "The Sleeping Flowers" 616)

The speaker meets with success this time; another character responds with a catalogue of flowers. All seems fairly unremarkable, until it becomes clear that gendered roles are at work here—the "I" who begins the poem is a "sir"; the character who responds is "she." "She," one stanza spells out, treats the flowers like so many infants:

Meanwhile, at many cradles,
She rocked and gently smiled,
Humming the quaintest lullaby
That ever soothed a child. (Dickinson, "The Sleeping Flowers" 616)⁸⁵

⁸⁴ See also Dickinson, "[Whose are the little beds - I asked]" (FP 85).

⁸⁵ Buckingham does not record advance notices for this poem as he does for "Morning." He notes, however, the reprinting of the poem by the *Christian Advocate* in its July 16

As such, the presence of “sir” becomes an intrusion. The opening repetition of his question becomes boorish in the assumption that no “reply” was made from lack of hearing; he is slow to realize that he has stumbled on a nursery scene where attendees are busy humming lullabies until the appropriate time arrives for the flowers to awake.

Even allowing for the gendered roles, the poem’s use of deferential language combines with conventional formal elements to make it a lullaby itself—stylistically smooth, soothing with its safe meter and rhyme. The linguistic changes “The Sleeping Flowers” required, however, covered potentially troubling stylistic undercurrents in much the way that the editorial packaging of “Morning” covered that poem’s own potentially troubling undercurrents. As Todd later would tell Higginson, line 18 was changed from “Her busy foot she plied” to “She rocked and gently smiled”; “soothed” then was substituted for “rocked” in line 20 apparently to avoid repetition of “rocked” (AB 139). The change downplays the extent to which the presence of “sir” is an intrusion; the gentle rocking that “she” engages in suggests the continuation of a calm scene rather than the interruption of one. Todd claims that the substitution of line 18 in *St. Nicholas* was made “in order to have the rhyme perfect, in a child’s magazine” (AB 139). Todd’s language does not make clear who bears responsibility for the substitution—both Todd and Dodge were fully capable of exercising such editorial freedom.⁸⁶

“Home and Young Folks” column (Buckingham, *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 106).

⁸⁶ When “The Sleeping Flowers” appeared in *Poems* (1891), these *St. Nicholas* alterations had been undone. On Todd’s involvement with altering Dickinson’s poems, see my note 3 in my Introduction. And on her similar alterations of rhyme schemes in *Poems* (1890), see Lubbers (16-17). Dodge, like many editors of the day, also was fully

The timing of the poems' publication clearly was a coup for Dickinson's editorial team. The poems followed directly on the heels of the *Christian Register's* publication of "God is a distant - stately Lover - ," offering the innocent shrug of child's friend to charges of questionable religious respect. Further, their May and June printings released them as the marketing hype for Dickinson's 1891 *Poems* was picking up: in May, firmer announcements started appearing about the forthcoming second volume, as did Higginson's and Todd's appearances as lecturers; in her lectures, Todd repeatedly asserted Dickinson's accessibility to children.⁸⁷ Todd later would cite "Morning" and "The Sleeping Flowers" as proof that "[m]any of Emily Dickinson's daintiest verses are for children" (Editorial comment 347); *St. Nicholas* had delivered the two poems to that

capable of such changes, as Todd herself had witnessed: Todd's 10 July 1889, diary entry records, "Proof from *St. Nicholas* of my 'Well-filled Bedroom' [later, "Well-filled Chimney"]. They have slightly changed the wording in two or three places" (Todd diary). For an analysis of revisions to *Tom Sawyer Abroad* that Dodge superintended, see O. M. Brack, Jr., "Mark Twain in Knee Pants: The Expurgation of *Tom Sawyer Abroad*." For an account of Dodge as astute editorial coach and negotiator, see Catharine Morris Wright, "How 'St. Nicholas' Got Rudyard Kipling: And What Happened Then."

⁸⁷ Rumors about the possibility of a second volume had begun as early as January of that year, but cast the second volume as a possibility rather than a positive event. See the 1 January 1891 "Literary Notes" in the *Independent*. The lectures had begun in March and April when Higginson read to "a group of friends" (Bingham, *AB* 122) from Dickinson's letters (March 22) and when Todd lectured to the Springfield Woman's Club (April 1). But most notable was a joint Higginson-Todd lecture before the Boston College Club. Garnering at least two periodical announcements prior to its being delivered, the May 2 lecture was reviewed widely. Bingham prefaces her material about the lectures with her mother's statement: "'The curiosity of the public with regard to Emily's life was insatiable,' my mother said, 'and both Colonel Higginson and myself were swamped with requests to write articles about her and to talk about her'" (*AB* 122). Although lecture invitations might have been extended on the basis of interest from the first volume, it would be a mistake to separate the *deliverance* of such lectures from the marketing of the second volume.

claim. These poems—with their more conservative rhyme schemes and meters, brought into the *St. Nicholas* fold by virtue of visual layout or textual doctoring—could appear as the kind of natural, intuitive composition liked by *St. Nicholas*, a place where “rhyme and rhythm” seem to come by “instinct,” where poetry is one of the “dainties dear to our hearts.”

IV.

In the periodicals of the 1890s, everyone was an editor: readers scissored favorite selections for scrapbooks; reviewers created their own editions of the books simply by responding, by reprinting the poems they deemed highlights. In such a world, the editorial impulse that ran large can shock us with the freedoms it took. Thomas Bailey Aldrich, just coming off his editorship of the *Atlantic Monthly* (1881–1890), seems ridiculous now with his 1892 *Atlantic* review in which he proposes an alternate rhyme scheme for Dickinson’s “I taste a liquor never brewed.” Aldrich, a decades-long fixture in the American periodical scene for his poetry, prose, and editorial work, seems to embody the sins of elite periodicals when he “venture[s] to desecrate this [the first] stanza by tossing a rhyme into it . . .” (283).⁸⁸ His meddlesome tinkering seems laughable because of the care that Dickinson, like all serious writers, invested in the composition

⁸⁸ Aldrich’s alternate version of the poem appears in his January 1892 *Atlantic Monthly* article “*In Re Emily Dickinson*” (283). Buckingham says the review “became the best-known—and perhaps most influential—rejection of Dickinson’s poetry to appear in the 1890s” (*Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 282).

process. But it also disturbs because his editing presumes an authority over the poet that contradicts the institutional respect we now grant Dickinson (and no longer grant him).

That institutional weight can leave us with conflicting concerns over Dickinson's periodical texts. As much as they shock from editorial altering, from hyped-up marketing, they shock too from apparent editorial neglect. The 5 March 1891 publication of Dickinson's "Nobody" in the comic weekly *Life*, for example, lacks severe editorial alterations on the order of the "The Sleeping Flowers" or the editorial provision of illustrated speaker ala "Morning." Still, tucked as it is in a corner, surrounded by cartoons and jokes, all but *adjacent* to advertisements but hardly advertised itself, the poem's publication speaks of laughable priorities. Current scholarship can "get" what the best joke on this page was—that while the periodical poem warns "Don't tell, / They'd banish us, you know," the manuscript suggests a variant: "they'd advertise." The manuscript, that is, warns us of the periodical poem, a text that illustrates the pitfalls of "telling," of speaking up, of being published. If they didn't "advertise" you, they might put you all too close to advertisements for beef extract, fresh fruit jams, complexion powders, and "Waterproof Outfits for Coachmen." In the end, we like to keep our texts closer to the author than the "corrupting" world of periodicals allows us.

Caroline Healey Dall's less-known review of the 1890 *Poems*, however, offers us an early suggestion of a much different view: "I am strongly impressed with the idea that a far finer volume will be compiled some day of this author's poems," she writes. "Since it [the first volume] was printed, I have seen some lovely things in newspaper columns. I supposed they belonged to the volume, but searching I do not find them" ("Three Books"

121).⁸⁹ Dall's essay stands out as an expression of an appetite for more, a combination of textual dissatisfaction and longing. In her statement, on some level innocuous, about the existence of uncollected poems, Dall hints that periodicals might drive the desire for and suggest a better book. Realizing that periodicals are in such a position—active, exerting pressure on settled forms—leads to how we might begin rethinking the marketing of such authors as Dickinson without thinking only and always of “the book.”

To conceive of periodicals as a dynamic force, we might recognize first some autonomy on the part of periodical poems. As I discuss in later chapters, consideration of poems published outside Todd's and Higginson's book-editing authority readily suggests that periodical texts functioned as more than “handmaidens” to the books. The periodical culture, I argue, could offer a route around the book industry and could even, in the case of media giant *The Youth's Companion*, prove a force semi-independent of the book-publishing circuit. But as a common periodical practice like reprinting suggests, decentering “the book” asks not for its dismissal in consideration of nineteenth-century American print culture; rather, it asks that we examine tensions between books and periodicals.

Indeed, in periodical reviews—an area that demands further thinking—such tension is almost palpable. On the one hand, reviewers reinforced books as the dominant unit. Standard notations of a book's binding and general appearance articulated it as

⁸⁹ It is not exactly clear to what poems Dall was referring. We know of no newspaper printings of poems; there were, however, poems printed in periodicals with newspaper-like formats (e.g., the *Independent*) and it is likely that there were reprints of magazine-published poems in newspapers.

material object; further, “the book” at times lent itself as measure for highest praise (“It [the book] is one to be owned, studied, and loved”) or most severe condemnation (“many of Miss Dickinson’s poems must be considered unworthy of the honour of book-covering”).⁹⁰ Even the act of criticizing the contents of a volume could recall a book’s layout (“ . . . on this page, an exquisite lyric—a fine thought in appropriate setting; on that, three or four limping, staggering stanzas, without rhythm or cadence. Think of the contrast between the two pieces subjoined . . .”) (“Current Literature” 169). On the other hand, as they passed out their judgments—a favor that books were not equipped to reciprocate—periodical reviewers at times could sidestep this act of reinforcing the dominance of the item even as they criticized it. “The book” as object and industry could turn fodder for criticism, for instance, as when one critic speculated that poorer verses had to be included in *Poems* (1891) “in order to bring the book up to the required size” (“Emily Dickinson’s Second Volume” 248). Most notably, however, periodical reviews reinforced periodicals themselves. Writers regularly called attention to notable pieces in competing publications, as was the case with Dickinson’s “Morning” in *St. Nicholas*. Even the common practice of quoting large portions of text that others had written relied on periodicals as well as on books: reviewers might include verbatim large portions of books’ prefaces; they also, however, extended the practice to fellow periodicals, using essays and other reviews as “sources” too.

⁹⁰ See the February 1891 “Talk About Books” (113) and the September 1891 “Poetry of the Month” (169).

The dominant practice of quoting freely from books that were reviewed, however, is where tensions between books and periodicals were perhaps most apparent. This act, in which every reviewer in effect created his or her own anthology, could place reviewers in a curious position, one vacillating between the dual functions of judgment and representation. Louise Chandler Moulton punctuates her quotation of Dickinson poems with an act of book reading (“I turn back a page”), only to culminate near the end with a full collision of the conflicts her position embodies: “I turn on and on—I see poems by the score that I want to quote, and must not. What shall I do? I can only say to all of you who love these specimens that I have given you, read the whole book, for you cannot afford to miss any of it. And yet I will cull for you this one more” (“With the Poets” 246). Moulton seeks to represent the book, but claims that she cannot. She defers to it—pressing on readers the book—yet stubbornly perseveres after deferring. Still another reviewer casts reading the book (the 1890 *Poems*) as an act of violation (“To turn over the pages of the small volume . . . is to feel as if committing an intrusion, so direct and so forcible are many of its utterances, so very evidently not meant for the prying public eye”), only to proceed to quote several poems (“Scraps of Verse” 67). Reviewers in such cases are relying on “the book” as a rhetorical tool—Moulton’s “one more” poem offers a suitable exit for her essay, and the second reviewer’s “intrusion” serves as dramatic opening for a positive review of the volume. Still, the conflicts here between rhetoric and practice suggest a relationship based not on mere deference. Finally, in moments of self importance especially, periodicals made clear their essential function in acts of writing, reading, and publishing. One early review of the 1890 *Poems* claims, “We have quoted

thus largely because of the charm of this work for us, and because, the poems *having never been published before*, are sure to be fresh to the reader [my emphasis]” ([Bates] 32-33).⁹¹ Since the review appears eleven days after the 12 November publication date of the book, the statement is not true, but it does represent a truth of sorts: for followers of that particular column, the poems were essentially previously unpublished—publication here is not author centered (especially in this posthumous case) and not book centered, but is defined by periodical appearance and reader experience. Publication, in this particular culture of reading, becomes many layered and even incomplete until it has been noted by the day’s periodical network.

“Marketing” too will need to be approached in a more nuanced way. The idea that periodicals merely served as a first stopping point for some poems as they ascended to book-published status falls short when we further consider publication details. Seven of the nine Dickinson poems that the *Companion* initially published, for example, did not appear again until the twentieth century—six of them not until the 1940s. Separated so completely from the volumes of the 1890s, these poems hardly stand representative of the handmaiden function so commonly assumed for periodical poems. Further, Todd and Higginson did not “place” poems in periodicals before the first volume of *Poems* appeared in 1890, relying only on Higginson’s *Christian Union* essay and periodical notices to introduce Dickinson to the public. Instead, Todd’s initial flurry of placing poems happened between *Poems* (1890) and *Poems* (1891)—volumes separated by only a year during which Dickinson’s poetry arguably needed little stimulus.

⁹¹ Bates served as a reviewer of the book for Roberts Brothers. For that report, see Bingham (*AB* 52-53).

We will need to keep in mind what periodicals themselves stood to gain from such texts. Whereas according to L. Frank Tooker, a *Century* magazine series on Victorian poets was one of “those desert regions in the magazine,” a later one on American poets, “was a far more attractive feature, for by that time the illustrations of the magazine had vastly improved, and the many fine engravings of the homes and haunts of the poets in question not only added to the sumptuous appearance of the magazine, but delighted those readers who like their information sugar-coated” (37). “Marketing” thus was a process of mutual benefit to the magazines. If this seems clear in cases like Dodge’s packaging of Dickinson’s “Morning,” it becomes all the more apparent in elaborate, editor-engineered productions like the 1908 sixtieth anniversary issue of *The Independent*.⁹² Embedded among the magazine’s own self-congratulations, the *Independent* elaborately celebrates its poetry patronage, most significantly in a thickly illustrated section featuring seven poets.⁹³ This collection truly is that—editorial notes proudly claim the “possession” of six of the reproduced manuscripts, sharing with readers a standard photograph of each poet and a wealth of archival material. Readers are offered poetry in dramatic terms—on a Tennyson poem: “the publication of this poem in THE INDEPENDENT of March 2, 1882, excited wide comment, for it was the first time in

⁹² The anniversary issue, I would suggest, is more nineteenth than twentieth century, coming as it does four years before the 1912 founding of *Poetry* and concerned as it is with poetic treasures of the nineteenth century.

⁹³ It reprints past “greats” from its pages (e.g., Dickinson, Robert Louis Stevenson, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Sidney Lanier) and features the following seven poets: Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Greenleaf Whittier, Bayard Taylor, Edmund Clarence Stedman, Richard Henry Stoddard, William Cullen Bryant, and Oliver Wendell Holmes (Sixtieth Anniversary Issue 1384-1398).

America that a poem was ever sent to the United States by cable” (Sixtieth Anniversary Issue 1414). The editorial excitement the poem prompts reflects the significance of this technology. It also reflects the *Independent*’s own gains (numerous “dailies” and “newspapers” copied the poem and gave the *Independent* credit). And it reveals a periodical’s ability to turn its own receipt, publication, and distribution of a poem into a newsworthy event that it then could use to hype its own standing. Poetry, while not a commodity of the most apparent value, could add much to these publications.⁹⁴

It might be useful, then, to view periodicals less as stopping points than as sites where textual appetite could be created and charted, perhaps a literary parallel to the consumer desire that periodical advertisements were creating. Ohmann, writing about the growth of name-brand advertising that started in the 1880s, notes that “food products” in particular “led the surge of national brand advertising throughout this period” (*Selling Culture* 88). “Appetite,” then, was being sold to many and on various fronts. Rudyard Kipling, another *St. Nicholas*–published author, would meet Dodge’s efforts to change the title of his “The Potted Princess” by observing of readerly hunger: “[L]et her Pottedness remain for the very reason that you say. It is suggestive of canned meat. Children are pigs (little ones) in their insides. The title will stick in their tum—I mean their minds” (qtd. in Wright 276). Dodge, no doubt accustomed to such metaphoric

⁹⁴ As Lawrence Buell notes in his analysis of “American Civil War Poetry and the Meaning of Literary Commodification,” “[t]he otherwise marginal value of Civil War poetry as saleable commodity” helps “apply pressure to the notion of ‘commodity’ itself . . . by prying it loose from the image of cash value per se . . . [and] by prying it loose from the image of sheer entrepreneurial self-interest” (124-5).

conceptions of her readers' appetites, seemingly concurred.⁹⁵ In the same issue that Dickinson's "Morning" appeared, Sarah S. Pratt's "A Diet of Candy" casts the magazine in gustatory terms. In Pratt's story, "Arthur's" mother admonishes him when he inhales the serials in a recent issue of *St. Nicholas*, skipping over history, transportation, and natural science articles. The mother of this subtitle-labeled "devouring" reader equates short fiction and serials to sweets—"desirable and necessary"—but insists too on the necessity of the "bread and butter and meat" non-fiction articles (Pratt 559). With Dickinson's *St. Nicholas* poems—in a situation where the periodical cooperated beautifully with the editors and the poems appeared in the book immediately following their initial publication—we must always bear in mind, therefore, the magazine's own agenda and skill in preparing authors for literary consumption when we think about Todd and Higginson's intersecting project of commodifying Dickinson.

We have no evidence that the marketing of Dickinson as children's friend had any real staying power: no children's book or even clear submarket for later 1890s volumes resulted directly from Todd's efforts.⁹⁶ Certifying on the one hand the book-

⁹⁵ Dodge's familiarity with such a metaphor is not surprising, considering the pervasive nature of the equation whereby "books" are "food" and "reading" (as Janice Radway has noted) is "eating" (more precisely, she titles one essay "Reading Is Not Eating"). For an early nineteenth-century example (1828), see Patricia Okker, who writes that "In a letter to the editor signed 'H***' in the first issue of the *Ladies' Magazine* (and thus presumably written by Hale), editing duties are compared to making 'a feast'" (74).

⁹⁶ Although Dickinson appeared in at least one anthology in the decade for children (the 1896 *Nature in Verse: A Poetry Reader for Children*), the anthologized poem ("A drop fell on the apple tree") was not from *St. Nicholas* (Lubbers 273). This is not to say that a children's Dickinson did not come into being, however. Barbara Antonina Clarke Mossberg notes that "In spite of its difficulty, her poetry does appear in commercially successful editions for children, often illustrated, and is routinely included in anthologies

clad Dickinson while on the other encouraging alternate personae through periodicals made sense, though. In addition to the cultural collateral that a magazine such as *St. Nicholas* offered, the cacophony of various periodical “Dickinsons” could keep readers guessing, waiting with Dall for that “far superior” volume. Todd’s later reference to one volume’s binding would rejoice: “‘That shade of green strikes everybody as so dainty, that they buy it all at once, almost without looking inside’” (qtd. in Horan, “Mabel Loomis Todd” 73).⁹⁷ Surely the transformation of some of Dickinson’s “daintiest” verses into “dainties dear to our hearts” further whetted the public’s appetite.

of children’s literature” (64). In addition, Jenkins’ story of Dickinson lowering goodies from her window is known widely.

⁹⁷ Horan uses the quote in her discussion of Todd’s marketing “genius”; such language, Horan argues, shows the editor’s efforts to cast herself as representative of the “ladies’ market” she wanted the publishers “to target” (“Mabel Loomis Todd” 73).

Chapter 2

Fracturing a Master Narrative, Reconstructing “Sister Sue”

Susan Huntington Gilbert Dickinson’s supposed failure to spearhead the Emily Dickinson publication effort after the poet’s death remains a sticking point in Dickinson scholarship, the tangled puzzle of a disappointing editor-author relationship. Those rectifying the vilification and erasure of Susan have highlighted her position as the poet’s literary confidante and primary correspondent. Still, the question persists: why did Dickinson’s “Sister Sue,” who professed such admiration for the poet, fail so miserably in the effort to make public Dickinson’s poetry?⁹⁸ That Susan shepherded into *Scribner’s Magazine* and *The Independent* three Dickinson poems, while long acknowledged, has received scant consideration. When compared to the four books, numerous periodical poems, and multiple articles resulting from Mabel Loomis Todd’s and Thomas

⁹⁸ As a title, “Sister Sue” often is used to signal the affection between Dickinson and her sister-in-law; Dickinson often referred to her in poems and letters as “sister.” As Lillian Faderman explains, however, Martha Dickinson Bianchi, Susan’s daughter, “tried to insure this impression [of a sisterly bond] by *consistently* referring to Sue Gilbert as ‘Sister Sue,’ as though that were Emily’s affectionate name for her throughout a very sisterly friendship, while in reality Emily almost never addressed Sue in that manner until several years after Sue’s marriage to Austin” (216). The false title, as Faderman suggests, has helped obscure the homoerotic nature of Susan and Emily’s relationship (216).

Wentworth Higginson's efforts in the 1890s, Susan's three poems seem negligible. Further, any perceived success on Susan's part has been diminished by the standard narratives told to account for it, which portray her as an ineffective renegade with scant success and little respect for the literary product she pushed.⁹⁹ My archival research on the role *Scribner's Magazine* played in the publication and reception of Dickinson in the late nineteenth century, however, sheds new light on Susan's success with that magazine and offers a new context for her negotiations with *The Independent*. Susan, this new information reveals, actively engaged in efforts to publish Dickinson's poetry for several years after the poet's death. Her pursuit was marked, if anything, by finesse and a persistent belief in the poems she marketed. And her failures, I argue, tell us less about her supposed character deficits than about the workings of the late nineteenth-century print publication industry.

Reconstructing "Sister Sue's" editorial work disrupts not only a dominant biographical portrait but a dominant bibliographic narrative. Recognizing Susan's successes fractures both the previously smooth tale of Higginson and Todd's editorial work and a standard narrative of print culture—that periodical poems later appearing in books are merely a lower rung on the ladder that leads to books, often appearing there in

⁹⁹ Dorothy Huff Oberhaus recognizes that "many contemporary critical and biographical works begin by acknowledging a debt to one or both women [Todd and Bingham]" (5). For example, Lubbers, in his groundbreaking book on Dickinson's reception, acknowledges Susan's submission of "several poems to Boston and New York magazines," but ultimately follows Bingham's lead, referring to Susan's "hoarded treasure" and claiming she "flinched from the dedication [the project] required," "instinctively shrank from the idea of seeing her next-door sister-in-law famous," and was more interested in "mak[ing] [her daughter] a poetic star in her own right" (15).

“service” to the book’s promotion. Although periodical poems like those in *St. Nicholas* often could whet the public’s appetite for the author and her literary product, the three poems Susan successfully placed signal a distinctly separate effort that later was absorbed into the books. With *Scribner’s*, we see how publication in a magazine could be pursued for its own sake, apart from and in lieu of any book. With *The Independent*, we see Susan using a periodical to protest the dominant publishing effort of Higginson and Todd. All together, Susan’s case offers a cautionary tale: emphasizing books in reception histories creates falsely seamless narratives. Reconfiguring “Sister Sue” as a print editor draws our attention to non-book-bound editorial efforts and allows us to appreciate them for the significant impact they could have on readers and on other editorial projects.

I.

The dominant narrative of Dickinson’s posthumous publication highlights the efforts of Lavinia Dickinson (Dickinson’s sister) and two Dickinson editors: Thomas Wentworth Higginson and Mabel Loomis Todd. When Susan registers in this narrative of posthumous publication, she fares poorly. Millicent Todd Bingham, Todd’s daughter, writes in *Ancestors’ Brocades*: “. . . Miss Vinnie [Lavinia] had first taken the box of poems to Mrs. Austin Dickinson [Susan] who professed great admiration of Emily’s work. Miss Vinnie asked her to do the necessary copying and editing. That she refused we know from Miss Vinnie herself . . .” (18). In Bingham’s account, Susan not only refuses to edit the poems; her subsequent intrusion after rejecting the task shows her to be the worst kind of editor. Susan, Bingham claims, acted outside Lavinia’s authority with

the publication of “Renunciation” in *Scribner’s*, a text Bingham spurns as textually spurious (she deems Susan guilty for the misreading of “soul” as “sail” and for the omission of a stanza). And in Bingham’s account of how Susan worked secretly to publish some of Dickinson’s poetry in *The Independent*—with Todd and Higginson’s official work underway and Todd having placed several Dickinson poems herself in the same periodical—Susan appears conniving and more interested in her daughter’s literary career than in the publication of Dickinson’s poetry. Susan’s successes with *Scribner’s* and *The Independent* become not publishing triumphs, but the self-serving actions of a loose cannon and less-than-reliable editor.

But Bingham’s narrative notably contradicts itself. While Bingham supports Susan’s reputed “refusal” with excerpts from Lavinia’s 23 December 1890 letter to Higginson, that letter suggests a different scenario when Bingham later gives it in full.¹⁰⁰ Worse yet, Bingham’s account of the *Scribner’s* publication directly contradicts the primary evidence that follows. Although she asserts, using Todd’s words, that Lavinia was “enfuriated” with the publication of the *Scribner’s* poem and enumerates Susan’s supposed offenses with the text’s publication, an often overlooked letter from Lavinia to Higginson (that Bingham reprints only one page later) states differently. “The poem so

¹⁰⁰ In Lavinia’s account, Susan lost steam on the project (she “was enthusiastic for a while, then indifferent & later utterly discouraging”) and handled the poems in a way in which Lavinia disapproved (“She wished the box of poems *there* constantly & was unwilling for me to borrow them for a day, as she was fond of reading them [the verses] to passing friends.”) (qtd. in *AB* 87). Susan, Lavinia charges, “lacks mental energy to complete” despite her “fine ability” (*AB* 87), but Lavinia never claims that Susan “refused” the project.

long watched for in the ‘Scribner,’” Lavinia writes with anticipation on 14 July 1890, “will appear in [sic] August number” (qtd. in *AB* 60).

Scholars have been aware for decades of the bias in Bingham’s account of “The Literary Debut of Emily Dickinson,” noting that *Ancestors’ Brocades* was written by a daughter to protect her mother.¹⁰¹ But while scholarship to a degree has ameliorated, for example, Bingham’s partial and flawed portrait of Susan, the book’s very usefulness as a source means misunderstandings about the sequence and nature of events like the above persist.¹⁰² Bingham publishes generously from Todd’s and others’ correspondence, quotes from Todd’s diary, and prints interviews she had with Todd, thus providing a valuable resource on the publication of Dickinson in the 1890s. But because Bingham skillfully weaves the story by threading diary entries and interviews with her own opinion and interpretation, her reading of events can be construed too easily as a direct account of what happened. Differing accounts—the one provided by Bingham, the other by the primary sources she reprints—are too easily conflated, their contradictions rarely teased out. And wide reliance on *Ancestors’ Brocades* in Dickinson scholarship, at times in place of original research, has meant the Todd-Bingham influence pervades the seminal

¹⁰¹ See note 99.

¹⁰² Bingham makes Todd the story’s heroine and Susan a major villain. Pictures published as front matter, for example, flatter Todd; the single picture of Susan presents her as the “‘great big, black Mogul’” (to use Todd’s words [*AB* 133]), as she is all but obscured by a tent of dark mourning clothes. For alternate accounts of Susan that recognize, for instance, her tremendous intelligence, literary acumen, and close friendship with Dickinson, see, for example, MacGregor Jenkins, *Emily Dickinson: Friend and Neighbor* (76-80, 97) and John Erskine, “The Dickinson Feud.”

biography, textual editions, and reception histories, thus perpetuating narrative biases and outright errors.

Overlapping fronts of biography and textual studies have led to enormous shifts in attitude toward “Sister Sue,” showing Susan to have been central in Dickinson’s emotional *and* writerly life.¹⁰³ Moreover, Susan-related scholarship, which dovetailed in the late 1980s with the rising tide of Dickinson manuscript studies, has carved out an especially intimate role for Susan in its understanding of Dickinson’s own textual practices.¹⁰⁴ Susan’s champions, working against the grain of “the collected and classified past” (Jauss 21), have celebrated the poet’s sister-in-law as Dickinson’s

¹⁰³ See especially Martha Nell Smith, *Rowing in Eden: Rereading Emily Dickinson* (155); Ellen Louise Hart and Smith, eds., *Open Me Carefully: Emily Dickinson’s Intimate Letters to Susan Huntington Dickinson* (64); and Jean McClure Mudge, “Emily Dickinson and ‘Sister Sue’” (98). A feminist and lesbian critical tradition has exposed the slurs against Susan’s character and given proper due to her intense and longlasting relationship with Dickinson. Rebecca Patterson’s early *The Riddle of Emily Dickinson* (1951) presaged this critical tradition. See, in addition to the above, Faderman’s “Emily Dickinson’s Letters to Sue Gilbert” (1977), Dorothy Huff Oberhaus’s “In Defense of Sue” (1983), Adelaide Morris’s “‘The Love of Thee—a Prism Be’” (1983), Hart’s “The Encoding of Homoerotic Desire” (1990), Judith Farr’s *The Passion of Emily Dickinson* (1992), Smith’s “Susan and Emily Dickinson: their lives, in letters” (2002), and Smith with MacDonald’s “Mutilations: What Has Been Erased, Inked Over, and Cut Away?” Further evidence of the critical shift lies with the fact that Smith is working on a biography of Susan.

¹⁰⁴ Smith’s *Rowing in Eden* best represents a strong crossover of Susan- and manuscript-related interests, but Susan-related scholarship from the beginning has had a strong footing in archival (manuscript) research. While this is in part because, as Mary Loeffelholz acknowledges, “manuscript studies” has “focus[ed] critical attention on the people in Dickinson’s life to whom we know she actually *wrote* in interesting and extensive ways . . .” (18), some early scholarship connecting Susan scholarship and manuscript work predates Ralph W. Franklin’s 1980 *The Manuscript Books of Emily Dickinson* and the subsequent flood of manuscript-related scholarship it engendered that focuses on Dickinson’s lineation, capitalization, and punctuation. See especially Faderman, “Sue Gilbert,” and Mudge, “‘Sister Sue.’”

primary correspondent and for her privileged access to Dickinson's "domestic workshop"—the author's system of "private publication" that shunned traditional print publication routes in favor of an alternative "publication" through letters and in the manuscript books that she carefully constructed.¹⁰⁵

Scholarship on Susan's efforts after Dickinson's death remains far less developed and largely centers on Susan's plans to edit a volume of Dickinson's poetry. Elizabeth Horan, for instance, offers details about the preparation by the Susan Dickinson household of a volume that was submitted to Charles Scribner's, Sons ("To Market" 91). And Smith persistently draws attention to criticisms Susan later voiced about the Higginson- and Todd-edited *Poems*, in which she details her own plans for a volume, and articulates Susan's role as a hidden influence on several volumes edited by others ("Susan and Emily Dickinson" 56, 69-70; 61). Archival resources made widely available to scholars on the *Dickinson Electronic Archives* have been crucial for the refutation of Klaus Lubbers's claim that "[a]fter the publication of *Poems* (1890), [Susan] reacted with hurt pride and alleged, not very convincingly, that she had planned an edition herself" (15). As Susan's "Notes toward a Volume of Emily Dickinson's Writings" and her son Ned's notebook reveal, the family engaged in activities geared toward the production of a volume like the one that Susan described to Higginson and, later, to *Independent* editor

¹⁰⁵ See Smith, who analyzes at length their famous exchange over Dickinson's "Safe in their Alabaster Chambers" (*Rowing* 180-197) and who first noted the distinction the two made between "print" and "publish" (*Rowing* 15, 224n12), thus enabling Dickinson scholars to conceive of her manuscripts as self-published writings.

William Hayes Ward.¹⁰⁶ Unusual, though, is Marget Sands's attention to Susan's periodical successes. Sands sees the alternate *Scribner's* text as reflecting active editing choices by Susan, casts Susan's efforts in *The Independent* as "a parallel editing project," and affirms Susan's role "as Dickinson's first editor" (143, 147).¹⁰⁷

Sands bases her argument on her discovery of an overlooked manuscript version of "Renunciation" in the Amherst College collection and most strongly makes the case for it as Susan's copy, the idea being that Susan "was doing editorial work just like Loomis Todd and Higginson, not misreading" (143). Franklin's variorum edition

¹⁰⁶ See S. Dickinson, "Notes toward a Volume of Emily Dickinson's Writings," and N. Dickinson, "Ned's Notebook." The introduction to "Ned's Notebook" notes, "It is not known whether the notebook represents merely a commonplace book of Ned's favorites of his family's writings or the beginnings of a more formal volume of Dickinson poetry; however, someone else (possibly Susan) has corrected mistranscriptions in Susan's "Hyssop" and "Crushed Before the Moth", and in Emily's "The Brig," which suggests that someone else may have read it or been involved in its composition" (Smith and Vetter).

¹⁰⁷ Sands identifies a previously overlooked version of "Renunciation" in the Amherst College collection. In his 1955 variorum, *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*, Johnson records four variant versions of the poem, including two lost copies—one submitted by Todd to *Scribner's*, the other reproduced by Todd in *Poems* (1891). Sands argues most strongly that the Amherst copy was Susan's. Franklin, however, identifies in his 1998 variorum the Amherst text as the "lost" Todd version reproduced in *Poems* (1891) (*The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition*)—a credible conclusion, since Sands herself says the poem "is strikingly like the facsimile copy printed in *Poems 1891*" (141). Sands does note "slightly more ink on some pen strokes and degrees of difference so slight as to suggest that size-for-size comparison is not possible" (141), but identifying the poem as the lost *Poems* (1891) copy hardly seems more conjectural than identifying it as Susan's. Franklin judges Susan as guilty of misreading twice, counting her penciled annotation to *Poems* (1890) (changing Todd's "soul" to "sail") as her second error. I would suggest instead that Susan's penciled-in correction signals her possession of an alternate version (she did, after all, *erase* the incorrect penciled correction of a misguided Amherst citizen, as she once told Higginson) and that she possibly sent her own original to *Scribner's* as she did later with the *Independent*.

indirectly refutes Sands's claim, but even without his refutation, the scattered facts of Susan's course of action after Dickinson's death leave us with an incomplete narrative. As Smith rightly points out, for Susan, "one shock had followed another in the decade preceding the discovery and printing of [Dickinson's] poems . . ." (*Rowing* 214), including Austin's commencement of an affair with Todd only weeks after son Gib's death and the deaths of many close to Susan, including Dickinson herself. Susan, Smith adds further, "may have been transfixed or distressed or otherwise awed and immobilized by [the manuscript books'] contents" (*Rowing* 214). Still, Smith admits Susan's inaction to be "somewhat perplexing" (*Rowing* 214) and Ellen Louise Hart calls it "puzzling" (257). Without the dates, challenges, and triumphs of Susan's actual course of action, we are left, moreover, with a skewed perception of what we know Susan *did* do. Susan becomes inactive even when acting, as when Hart writes that "[d]uring the 1890s Susan *allowed* several poems Dickinson had sent her to be published in periodicals . . ." (257, my emphasis). Susan becomes perceived as somehow ideologically resistant to print publication, fearful about the resulting publicity or, as Horan claims, "ambivalent about bringing them into the public forum of the market" ("Mabel Loomis Todd" 70). A kind of cyclical damage thus occurs where the belief that Susan did nothing after Dickinson's death diminishes our perception of what we know she did; the diminished perception then returns to support in our minds the characterization of Susan as inactive editor.

Smith notes of "the story about Susan's role in Emily Dickinson's writing life" that it "has only been relayed in partial and competing versions, with many key facts hidden or trivialized" and, that lack of access to particular sources means "key" "facts

have been privatized, reserved for editors and scholars engaged in manuscript study” (“Susan and Emily Dickinson” 53). Likewise, the narrative I offer of Susan’s editorial course of action makes its case in part simply by collecting and reinterpreting already existing information—some widely known, much all but ignored. Too, as highlighted by both Smith’s narrative and the resources made available on the *Dickinson Electronic Archives*, public narratives based on archival research are key to any new account of Susan’s actions. My own critical narrative of her publishing successes draws most significantly on my study of correspondence and records in the Scribner’s archives at Princeton University. These archives reveal the full text of correspondence that rarely has been reprinted (and never in full), the poem’s acceptance date for *Scribner’s* (versus its publication date), and the surprising identity of the author of a damaging *Scribner’s* review of *Poems* (1890). I use this information, first, to narrate Susan’s negotiations with the publisher; second, to explore how *Scribner’s Magazine* treated the one accepted poem; and third, to inform our understanding of what Susan next did with *The Independent*. The evidence I offer makes it impossible to ignore any longer that the posthumous production and editing of Dickinson’s poetry took place on multiple editorial fronts (of which Susan was one) and that periodicals were a significant and autonomous force in the realization of some of those editorial goals.

II.

Two major obstacles have impeded a full appreciation of Susan’s placement of a Dickinson poem in the August 1890 *Scribner’s Magazine*. First, the dominant account

by Bingham-Todd claims “several things” about the published poem “enfuriated Vinnie”:
1) “. . . Susan had no right to send the poem to a magazine” because “Lavinia regarded herself as the sole proprietor of Emily’s poems . . .”, 2) “Susan kept the money she received for the poem instead of turning it over to Lavinia,” and 3) (Todd quotes from her diary) ““There was a ridiculous mistake, printing sail for soul”” (qtd. in *AB* 59).¹⁰⁸ The often overlooked letter from Lavinia to Higginson, published one page later, betrays the fact that Susan submitted the poem directly under the umbrella of Lavinia’s encouragement.¹⁰⁹ Still, Bingham further demonizes Susan’s efforts later, repeating that Susan sent the poem ““without authorization”” and enumerating textual problems like the sail/soul error and a missing stanza (*AB* 149 n11).¹¹⁰ In the context of Bingham’s narrative, Susan’s act, the first successful attempt to publish a Dickinson poem after the author’s death, appears coldly calculated to upstage Todd and Higginson’s own editing and marketing of *Poems* (1890). As it beat by several months the November 1890 publication date of the first book, in which it was slated for inclusion, Higginson had to request from Edward L. Burlingame, editor of *Scribner’s*, permission for the poem’s publication.¹¹¹ Burlingame readily granted permission, the poem appeared in the book,

¹⁰⁸ I refer to Bingham-Todd as the author of *Ancestors’ Brocades* when I want to emphasize certain collective messages that mother and daughter convey together.

¹⁰⁹ Bingham so effectively buries this fact that even Susan’s defenders have considered Lavinia to be upset with Susan’s effort. See Sands (141).

¹¹⁰ The account also blurs the true source of the complaints. While Bingham-Todd begins the list reporting on “Several things” that “enfuriated Vinnie,” the list ultimately slides to Todd’s own complaint about the sail/soul error.

¹¹¹ For the permission letter, see Bingham (*AB* 59 n11).

but in the rush of details involved in preparing for the book's publication, Susan's "unauthorized" act and the faulty text, as depicted in the standard narrative, seem designed to upset rather than assist in any publication effort.¹¹²

But appreciation of Susan's effort also suffers from incomplete and scattered knowledge we have about the poem's submission and the path it took to reach publication. Existing details, if gathered together, begin to counter the dominant portrait of Susan as inactive and ineffective editor. Bingham reprints a 31 December 1886 letter Susan sent only seven months after Dickinson's death offering a Dickinson poem to *The Century*, which shows Susan's early resolve and her smart use of Dickinson's connections with the publishing world (AB 88). And scattered scholarship notes something about subsequent negotiations with Charles Scribner's publishing. Lubbers recognizes the *Scribner's* poem to be the result of "repeated requests" on Susan's part and quotes letters printed in Roger Burlingame's account of the Scribner's enterprise that show the efforts made "on Emily Dickinson's behalf" in November 1887 by William Crary Brownell, Austin Dickinson's friend and soon-to-be-editor at the Scribner's house (21).¹¹³ And Horan, who explains that Susan worked with Brownell on an edition of

¹¹² Judith Farr, for example, writes of the *Scribner's* poem: ". . . Sue did not need the occasional fifteen dollars paid her by magazines like the *Century* [sic] for a Dickinson poem. But she did need to lay claim to the poet . . ." (322).

¹¹³ I retain the first initials of Edward L. Burlingame (first editor of *Scribner's*) and Roger Burlingame (his son and author of the 1946 *Of Making Many Books: A Hundred Years of Reading, Writing and Publishing*) when writing of them. Reliance on *Ancestors' Brocades* helps explain the regular neglect of E. L. Burlingame and Brownell; Bingham includes only E. L. Burlingame's permission letter.

Dickinson poems after the author's death, uses an account by Martha Dickinson Bianchi (Susan's daughter) to tell how Brownell "traveled to Amherst to examine for publication the manuscripts and to consult with Susan," the idea being "that a hundred or more should be put together for publication . . ." (qtd. in Horan, "To Market" 91).¹¹⁴ Bianchi describes how Lavinia's retrieval of the poems interrupted her and Ned's typing of them and explains that Lavinia "found Susan's method too slow" and "disagreed with Mr. Brownell's conservative attitude" (qtd. in Horan, "To Market" 91). Finally, resources now widely available to scholars through the *Dickinson Electronic Archives* complement Bianchi's description of this editing project with Susan's notes and Ned's notebook.

These sources, along with the overlooked letter of eager anticipation from Lavinia, clearly disprove the claim that Susan worked surreptitiously to bring about the poem's publication. Susan, moreover, began the aboveboard effort just over half a year after the poet's death when she submitted a Dickinson poem to *The Century*. But if these facts fail to stick from an infrequent recognition of these sources, they suffer too from failings of the sources themselves. In addition to Bingham's skewed narrative, which all but obscures any sources that make contrary points, Lubbers quotes only in part from the letters published by R. Burlingame, who himself excises some seemingly irrelevant passages. Examination of the Scribner's archives at Princeton University, however, solidifies the impression that Susan was involved actively in publication efforts after Dickinson's death. With this information, we can begin to characterize the way in which

¹¹⁴ Horan identifies Brownell as an editor at Scribner's, but he did not begin work at the publishing house until January 1888 (E.S.B., "William Crary Brownell," *Dictionary of American Biography*).

she pursued that publication, the negotiations foregrounding that publication, and the kind of project(s) that she and others pursued. In particular, the archives suggest that Susan and Brownell pursued and *Scribner's* considered a project that was neither book nor single poem publication but the multi-page introduction of the author via the periodical.¹¹⁵

The first communication the archives offer regarding the potential publication of Dickinson's poetry is Brownell's 9 November 1887 letter to E. L. Burlingame (first editor of the recently started *Scribner's*). The letter is remarkable in part for Susan's use of an envoy. She, whose earlier letter to *The Century* showcases Dickinson's connections in the publishing world, finds in Brownell a highly effective inroad to *Scribner's*. Brownell, though not yet an editor at the Scribner company, already had begun his extensive authorial relationship with the magazine and later was to be touted as a significant contributor.¹¹⁶ By the time he wrote his November 1887 letter to E. L. Burlingame regarding Dickinson, Brownell had published the first two articles in a six-part series on French culture, which commenced with the July 1887 *Scribner's* and concluded in February 1889. The level of E. L. Burlingame's own regard for Brownell became clear when *Scribner's* kicked off in January 1890 its "Point of View" department,

¹¹⁵ Lubbers partially quotes one letter when writing that Brownell was an unrecognized early advocate of Dickinson's poetry, but his (and R. Burlingame's) pairing of the letter with the idea that a book was not published by Scribner's conflates what I believe were two separate publishing projects.

¹¹⁶ For items praising Brownell's contribution, see "[Untitled]" in the 2 February 1889 *Current Literature*; "A Magazine Anniversary" in the 13 January 1912 *Outlook*; and Edith Wharton, "William C. Brownell" in the November 1928 *Scribner's Magazine*.

comprised each month of several unsigned pieces. E. L. Burlingame led with a Brownell essay and used Brownell when he could, publishing fifteen of his articles in the first year and five months of the department's existence.¹¹⁷

Although Susan uses Brownell as a contact, his letter clearly follows a foreground of discussion in which Susan, called here "Miss Dickinson," played a key part.¹¹⁸ The paragraph regarding Dickinson reads as follows (passages excised by R. Burlingame and thus unavailable to Lubbers in bold):

Doubtless ere this you have heard from Miss Dickinson **to whom I sent your letter, without comment. She writes me that she has readily acceded to your proposal. Thank you on my own vicarious part for your interest in the matter.** To my newspaper trained sense the notion of a broadside of Miss D's things—3 or 4 pages say—such as could, I feel confident, be selected from the many she wrote, and printed, not as a literary discovery **or in any other sensational way, with illuminative comments by a discoverer, or anything of that kind**—but merely as literature—which I think many of them are—seems rather a good notion. I contribute it for what it is forth [sic], quite aware that you are probably

¹¹⁷ See "'Point of View': 1890-1923 Contributors," *Scribner's Magazine* Records: 1886-1941, Charles Scribner's Sons Archives, Princeton University.

¹¹⁸ R. Burlingame also concludes that "Miss Dickinson" was Susan (and transcribes "Miss" as "Mrs.") (272); too, a later letter (in which E.L. Burlingame rejects all but one poem) reveals Susan as Burlingame's contact. "Miss D" is Emily Dickinson. Susan maintained contact with Brownell years later. Smith notes that Susan's "scrapbooks show that in March 1902 she sent W. C. Brownell a favorable review of his *Victorian Prose Masters* and received a most warm reply" ("Susan and Emily Dickinson" 67).

endeavoring to steel yourself to suggestions from people who know nothing about magazine editing. (Letter to E. L. Burlingame, Scribner's Archives)¹¹⁹

Letters of sponsorship were not unusual in nineteenth-century periodical (and book) publishing circles. Higginson wrote letters on behalf of his wife, asking magazine editors to consider her poetry, and the Scribner's archives holds such letters by others, where the correspondent's good name attempts to vouch for the submission's quality. But Brownell's letter engages in an unusual level of negotiations—a discussion of future publication details that goes far beyond customary statements of sponsorship or introduction.

The extent to which Brownell focuses on publication details strongly suggests that the *way* in which the poems would be published was to be unusual. Clearly the proposed publication was not to be in a book. But while Brownell refers to a potential “broadside,” the letter supports less the idea of a broadside in any traditional sense and points instead to a magazine-connected project.¹²⁰ First, Brownell approaches E. L. Burlingame as someone who hails himself from the periodical world, calling on his “newspaper trained sense.” Second, the fact that Brownell had established a relationship with the magazine as a contributor (and not yet with the publisher as an editor) suggests he was approaching

¹¹⁹ The letter also differs some from the R. Burlingame text in punctuation and typography.

¹²⁰ Burlingame's reference to a “broadside” confuses matters because a broadside is “where one sheet contains only one page of matter, with no folding required” (Greetham 119)—he goes on to describe it, however, as “3 or 4 pages.”

E. L. Burlingame as editor. Third, Brownell's final sentence self-consciously recognizes the likelihood that E. L. Burlingame, as newly appointed magazine editor, probably was receiving advice from many quarters. Fourth, E. L. Burlingame's log of items accepted for publication in *Scribner's Magazine* records that Dickinson's "Renunciation" apparently was accepted one month later ("Record of Matter Accepted: 1886 to 1900," Scribner's Archives).¹²¹ That acceptance, and the substance of later correspondence from Susan to E. L. Burlingame, suggest that E. L. Burlingame's "proposal" was for Susan to submit several samples of Dickinson's poems so he could consider a multi-page or supplemental presentation of her writing ("Renunciation" being one of the samples Susan submitted).¹²²

To argue that Brownell supports here a magazine-related project might seem to make false the claim that he advised Susan on the preparation of a small volume of poems for publication consideration by Scribner's. But another letter suggests there might have been two separate rejection letters from Scribner's—one for a book and another for a magazine-related project. Dating from 17 December 1888, the letter was sent by Brownell himself (since employed by Scribner's) to a Mr. Dickinson. The letter retains some mystery. In the letterbook's index, which lists alphabetically every recipient, the name "Dickinson" appears to have been added after the index originally was compiled and the entire entry of name, corresponding letterbook page (290), and date

¹²¹ The log does not state the exact month and day. Surrounding entries place it at around December of that year.

¹²² I thank Martha Nell Smith for suggesting that the "broadside" might have been a supplement.

(12/17/88) appears with a line through it and a circle and question mark around the page number (Brownell letterbook). The letter's contents conform to Bianchi's description of the project as a small, approximately 100-poem volume, and with knowledge of Brownell's support and his friendship with Austin. Brownell describes them as "your little volume of poems"; refers to "[t]heir many evident merits"; deems them as "falling into a very difficult category, commercially speaking"; and seems unusually apologetic and cordial about the rejection, writing, "We need not add that we have been greatly interested in the book . . ." (Letter to Mr. Dickinson, Scribner's Archives).¹²³ The possibility that the family was submitting a Dickinson book to the publishing house during 1888 also helps explain Susan's silence during this year when she otherwise maintained contact with E. L. Burlingame in the preceding and following years.

¹²³ There were other "Mr. Dickinsons" in contact with the publishing house—Charles M. Dickinson (editor of *Daily Republican* in Binghamton, NY), for example, submitted "The Children and Other Poems," which the publisher received on December 9, 1887, and rejected on January 5 ("Rejection Files. Record of Manuscripts Received and Rejected: 1873-1888," Scribner's Archives.). Still, Brownell's letter suggests a personal acquaintance with its recipient (as he had with Austin) and a personal interest in the project. The December 17, 1888, letter reads in its entirety:

Dear Sir,

We find ourselves unable to undertake the publication of your little volume of poems. Their many evident merits do not of course save them from falling into a very difficult category, commercially speaking, and [illegible] judgment that we should be unwise to charge ourselves with the enterprise of bringing them before the public is based on an inference that hardly permits us to doubt the unsatisfactoriness of the result. We need not add that we have been greatly interested in the book and that we are greatly obliged to you for permitting us to examine it; and it is with great regret that we have to inform you that, as you requested, we hold the "copy" at your disposition instead of being able to serve you in this matter. (Brownell, Letter to Mr. Dickinson, Scribner's Archives)

Further suggesting that two separate projects were being considered is the fact that additional correspondence between Susan and E. L. Burlingame clearly pertains to the magazine publication of Dickinson's poetry. In a 15 July 1889 letter, Susan would prod gently at E. L. Burlingame, who was still sitting on Dickinson's poetry after having accepted "Renunciation" in December 1887. Susan writes:

I fear that you have been importuned in the matter of Miss Dickinson's verses through her sister's instigation, up to the point of positive annoyance. Pray do not mind her. I understand that Renunciation was accepted for Scribner['s?], **and rest on that, unless I hear to the contrary from you, or some representative of the magazine.** The two or three others which I sent as illustrations of her versatility, if not too much trouble I will ask you to return. **I mean to arrange all I personally own, in some attractive souvenir form in the Fall for my children.**

(Letter to E. L. Burlingame, Scribner's Archives)

Susan's letter further reveals Lavinia's connection with the project Susan pursued. It also makes unclear whether the "mistakes" Susan eventually was charged with resulted from her copying of the poem or from the *Scribner's* editors themselves. Was Susan asking that Burlingame return copies of the poems, that is, or had she sent out her own originals (as she later did with the *Independent*)? Her stated plan to publish a volume of the poems falls immediately after she requests their return—as if the volume could not be published otherwise.

E. L. Burlingame did not finally reject the other poems Susan had sent until 3 February 1890. Burlingame, writing in his capacity as editor of *Scribner's*, claims, "It was my hope, as you know, that we might sometime manage to present a group of them; but this was not practicable" (Letter to Susan Dickinson, Scribner's Archives). Payment of \$15 would follow on June 16 of that same year (Payment logs, Scribner's Archives). And the poem itself appeared two months later in the magazine's August issue. The poem's late appearance means Susan's first visible sign of success came at a date approaching three years after original contact with the publishing house. It also was success that followed a substantial amount of contact even if we exclude the possibility that the family submitted a volume that was rejected by Brownell on 17 December 1888: an early proposal sent from E. L. Burlingame to Susan via Brownell; a 9 November 1887 letter from Brownell to E. L. Burlingame voicing Susan's interest in that proposal; the submission by Susan of several Dickinson poems within a month after that; likely communication from *Scribner's* ca. December 1887 accepting "Renunciation"; a 15 July 1889 letter from Susan to E. L. Burlingame; and payment on 16 June 1890 for "Renunciation." Put in this context, it is clear that Susan maintained an active and longstanding interest in the project. And if we believe Susan moved away from "enthusiasm," we might also sympathize, considering the lengths she went to for the sake of a single poem.

III.

Scribner's publication of "Renunciation" in its August 1890 issue might seem an anticlimactic result considering the amount of communication between Susan and the publisher. It gains stature, however, when we consider that the later editorial placement of multiple Dickinson poems in periodicals did not begin until the highly successful first volume of *Poems* had appeared and created eager customers for the poems. Susan's achievement, moreover, represented an unusual success in the field of "quality monthlies" that Todd and Higginson later would find so cold to the publication of Dickinson poems. Although *Harper's* and the *Atlantic* published reviews of and articles about Dickinson's poetry, the *Century* was highly inhospitable and *Scribner's* was the only one of the four that published any of Dickinson's poems outside of articles.¹²⁴ Susan's success speaks of the seriousness with which she took Dickinson's poetry. While Higginson refused to submit a Dickinson poem to the *Atlantic* and joined Todd in the act of infantilizing Dickinson in *St. Nicholas*, Susan comes across as uncompromising in her own editorial promotion of the poet.

Of the four American magazines regularly classed as "quality monthlies," *Scribner's Magazine* was by far the youngest.¹²⁵ It often is confused with *Scribner's*

¹²⁴ *Harper's* published a high-profile review by W.D. Howells (January 1891); the *Atlantic Monthly* published Higginson's widely-noted article on Dickinson's letters (October 1891).

¹²⁵ It also is the least chronicled; the *Century* and *The Atlantic Monthly* in particular have excellent book-length histories in Arthur John's *The Best Years of the Century* and Ellery Sedgwick's *The Atlantic Monthly, 1875-1909*. For information on *Scribner's Magazine*, see Frank Luther Mott, "*Scribner's Magazine*"; R. Burlingame, *Of Making*

Monthly, an earlier magazine established in 1870 and known as *The Century* by the time of *Scribner Magazine*'s inception. Although the Scribner company agreed not to start for five years any competing publication after it split with the later-named *Century*, after those five years, it launched in 1887 a direct competitor, *Scribner's Magazine*. The magazine, by all accounts, was immediately successful, taking an assured place as one of the four "quality" monthlies as it published its share of notable names and projects, including the 1889 publication of Jacob Riis's "How the Other Half Lives." *Scribner's*, Frank Luther Mott qualifies, "gave less attention to public affairs and social causes than the *Century*"; "it was not always as successful as the *Atlantic* [in the area of "'pure literary work'"]"; and it did not reach the level of the *Century* in illustrations for a number of years ("*Scribner's*" 718-719). Still, it soon rivaled the circulation numbers of the *Century* and *Harper's*, passing both of them by the turn of the century.¹²⁶ In taking for the magazine's first editor E. L. Burlingame, the publishing house selected one of its own, making, Mott declares, "an excellent choice" ("*Scribner's*" 717).

Although each quality monthly sought publishing coups that would set itself apart from its competitors, Brownell's November 1887 letter to the *Scribner's* editor about Dickinson proposed a bold undertaking for the magazine. A three- to four-page "broadside" is substantial and would have been daring for the new magazine, started only

Many Books; and Robert Gene Barrier, "A Critical History of *Scribner's Magazine*, 1887-1914."

¹²⁶ The *Atlantic* had significantly lower numbers, though considerable prestige. See, for example, Ellery Sedgwick (*The Atlantic Monthly, 1857-1909: Yankee Humanism at High Tide and Ebb* 242). Mott attributes *Scribner's* success in part to the fact that it sold smaller (though still substantial) issues for a lower price ("*Scribner's*" 718).

in January of that year. And Brownell's suggestion that the poems be "printed not as a literary discovery . . . but merely as literature" adds to the novelty of the project.¹²⁷ A magazine's devotion of that much space to a collection of one author's writing demanded an exigence beyond the simple declaration of it as "literature"—presentation of something as "a literary discovery" was a standard fallback for such ventures. In fact, Brownell's November 1887 letter directly followed *Scribner's* October 1887 conclusion of its most famous "literary discovery": a series of Thackeray's unpublished letters that had appeared in every issue since April 1887, spanning a total of 98 pages.¹²⁸ The introductory material sets up the letters' publication. On one level, it seeks to explain away Thackeray's injunction to his daughter "to publish no memoir of him" (and includes a letter from Thackeray's daughter, stamping the project with her delighted approval) (Brookfield 387, 388). It also suggests, however, how unlikely the magazine was to present a group of texts by an almost unknown like Dickinson without mediation.¹²⁹ Presenting such things "in a sensational way," to quote Brownell, not only offered a context for readers to receive the texts. It also served as self-advertisement for the magazine and educated readers as to the role they were expected to play.

¹²⁷ *Scribner's* "became noted for its literary discoveries" ("End of *Scribner's*" 60).

¹²⁸ On the series' success, see Mott ("*Scribner's*" 720); and "[Untitled]," *Current Literature* (93).

¹²⁹ Karen Dandurand, who identified in the 1980s additional publications during Dickinson's life, examines how systems of distribution beyond print publication further expanded Dickinson's contemporary audience in "Dickinson and the Public."

Scribner's did allow, however, for the direct presentation of a single poem by a relative unknown. Although Burlingame's 3 February 1890 rejection letter to Susan expresses his regret that he was unable "to present a group of [Dickinson poems]," "Renunciation" finally appeared in *Scribner's* August 1890 issue, more than two-and-a-half years after its December 1887 acceptance. As such, "Renunciation" contrasts greatly with the Dickinson poems that Todd ushered into magazine pages. Many of the Todd-sponsored Dickinson poems are light, either because they *become* so by virtue of the magazines she placed them in (ala "Morning" in *St. Nicholas*), because of the topic (many are descriptive nature poems), or because of the way they treat their topics—many are epigrammatic or focus a complicated idea through an accessible metaphor. "Parting," for example, the one poem Todd saw into *Scribner's* pages (in June 1896), deals with a weighty topic in an easy manner:

My life closed twice before its close;

It yet remains to see

If Immortality unveil

A third event to me,

So huge, so hopeless to conceive

As this that twice befell.

Parting is all we know of heaven,

And all we need of hell. (Dickinson 780)¹³⁰

¹³⁰ See also Dickinson, "[My life closed twice before it's close;]" (FP 1773).

The poem, despite shifting and multiple metaphors, fits comfortably in the reader's mind—in part because of its length (eight lines) and the simplicity of its language.

Like the other periodical poems that Susan successfully placed, “Renunciation” stands in contrast to Todd-sponsored periodical poems as more daring, a fact that supports the claim that Susan, in her original plans for a Dickinson volume, “was determined to depict Dickinson in her complexity, making a collection that was ‘rather more full, and varied’ than the conventional presentation in *Poems by Emily Dickinson* (1890)” (Horan and Smith xvi).¹³¹ “Renunciation” is long for Dickinson—six four-line stanzas—and explores an unclear sequence of events with a full retinue of religious metaphors and language.¹³²

There came a day at Summer's full
Entirely for me;
I thought that such was for the saints
Where Revelations be.

¹³¹ Horan and Smith quote here from a December 1890 letter that Susan wrote to Higginson about *Poems* (1890). Smith, working from Susan's critique of the Higginson and Todd volume and Susan's “Notes” further elaborates: “Hers [Susan's volume of Dickinson's writing] would have been filled with drawings and jokes as well as profound lyrics, and her outline for production shows that rather than divide the poems into conventional categories Susan would have emphasized poetry's integration with quotidian experience, Emily's intellectual prowess, and her philosophical interrogations of the spiritual, corporeal, emotional, and mental realms” (“Susan and Emily Dickinson” 68-69).

¹³² On this poem's complicated textual history, see note 107.

The Sun as common went abroad,
The flowers accustomed blew,
As if no sail the solstice passed
That maketh all things new.

The time was scarce profaned by speech;
The symbol of a word
Was needless as at Sacrament
The wardrobe of our Lord.

The hours slid past, as hours will,
Clutched tight by greedy hands;
So faces on two Decks look back
Bound to opposing Lands.

And so, when all the time had failed
Without external sound,
Each bound the other's crucifix—
We gave no other bond.

Sufficient troth that we should rise,
Deposed at length the grave,

To that new marriage justified

Through Calvaries of Love! (Dickinson, "Renunciation" 240)¹³³

The poem's opening sets the speaker in circumstances where, because of an impending separation, the time spent with a beloved takes on the solemnity of religious ceremony. Judith Farr, who considers the poem one of "Dickinson's [two] greatest poems of sublimated or renunciatory love," writes of it that "landscape or external reality is implied but superseded and then displaced by an austere landscape of the mind" (304). But the poem also contains a "displacement" of real event, where the speaker and the beloved engage solely in metaphoric acts—"clutch[ing] tight" the passing hours, "b[i]nd[ing] [each] other's crucifix." "Renunciation" takes place with the promise of future "marriage," a reunion to take place after a Christ-like resurrection from "the grave." The "new marriage" is "justified / through Calvaries of Love!"—a settled state becomes dependent on love's tortures.

Years later, when R. Burlingame expressed regret about the Scribner company missing out on Dickinson, he led into his account with a somewhat defensive explanation of poetry's place in the magazine: "The acceptance of a poem—unless it was 'occasional' . . .—usually added a complication to an editor's already harassed life. Poems accumulated and it sometimes took years to find places for them in the Magazine" (271). One poem, he continues, appeared ten years after its acceptance in the magazine. Although he does not directly connect the unnamed poet's plight to Dickinson's, her poem likely did add "a complication" to E. L. Burlingame's life. Telling is the rapidity

¹³³ See also Dickinson, "There came a day at summer's full" (FP 325).

by which E. L. Burlingame published the issue's three other poets in relation to Dickinson. The editor sat on Dickinson's poem the longest, accepting it in December 1887, but accepting George Melville Upton's sonnet on 9 March 1888, Andrew Lang's "A Dialogue" on 14 February 1890, and Thomas Bailey Aldrich's "The Sister's Tragedy" on 20 February 1890 ("Record of Matter Accepted: 1886 to 1900," Scribner's Archives).¹³⁴ Aldrich and Lang, marquee names of the day, later were famously critical of Dickinson's poetry (Lubbers 36-40, 57-58). Both also, however, were this issue's primary poets, Aldrich commanding an especially prominent place with "The Sisters' Tragedy" stretching across three pages and sporting two illustrations.

Scribner's ambivalence toward Dickinson did not show only in its delayed publication of "Renunciation," however. In March 1891, an unsigned piece in "The Point of View" department coolly weighed in on the poet. Willis Buckingham makes special note of its influence, writing: "*Scribner's* literary authority, and its reviewer's careful judiciousness of tone, combined to made [sic] this one of the most admired—and damaging—of Dickinson's early notices. Even the *Nation*, whose own poetry critic was Higginson, recommended it . . ." (*Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s* 119). Identifying the anonymous review's author adds further to a sense of the damage. As a log in the Scribner's archives reveals, the reviewer was none other than W. C. Brownell—the same Brownell who aided Susan's efforts, the same Brownell who would lament to Charles Scribner: "Burlingame told me Roberts were to bring out a collection

¹³⁴ Dickinson's "Parting" was accepted 6 January 1896, a date much closer to its publication (June 1896) ("Record of Matter Accepted: 1886 to 1900," Scribner's Archives).

of Miss Dickinson's poetry—a scheme I should have liked for us rather” (“‘Point of View’: 1890-1923 contributors,” *Scribner's Archives*; Burlingame 274).

Identifying Brownell as the author of the unsigned *Scribner's* review leaves us to ask why the author, long viewed as trying to help engender the posthumous publication of Dickinson, offered such a tepid response to the poems. Perhaps the most compelling explanation emphasizes Brownell's role as reviewer and suggests he was responding as much to competing critics as he was to the book itself. Lubbers, for example, convincingly postulates that a positive review of Dickinson's poetry by William Dean Howells likely prompted the one in *Scribner's* (28). Brownell's review, moreover, directly takes on Higginson, opening by quoting a prominent passage from Higginson's preface and closing with a final parting shot at the colonel. Brownell removes his quarrel from a direct criticism of the poems—not quoting a single line in the whole article—making this a discussion among gentlemen, and steers clear of the personal attacks on Dickinson that characterized some of the other negative reviews. More than personal shots at Higginson and Howells, I would add, Brownell's response also appears to be part of a relatively new department's efforts to distinguish itself from its older competitors. *Scribner's* was in March 1891 a four-year-old magazine in a field of competitors established in 1850 (*Harper's*), 1857 (*The Atlantic Monthly*), 1865 (*The Nation*), and 1870 (*The Century*); its “The Point of View” department, in which the Dickinson review appeared, had started only in January 1890.¹³⁵ Other journals' competing departments

¹³⁵ On the significant critical reputation of *The Nation*, see Sedgwick (*Atlantic Monthly* 76).

had been around significantly longer—*Harper's* “Editor’s Study,” for example, began in January 1886—and their associated critical voices offered stiff competition. *Harper's* had Howells, the *Nation* had Higginson, and the *Atlantic Monthly* shored up its own reputation with both authors—Howells because of his past editorship and Higginson because of his long-standing connection with the monthly.

Still, it becomes impossible not to recall that Lavinia Dickinson reportedly “disagreed with Mr. Brownell’s conservative attitude” regarding Dickinson’s poems (Horan, “To Market” 91). Brownell, it seems, might be due a reevaluation—from an early champion of Dickinson to a supporter with conflicted opinions on the poems and conflicting responsibilities within the Scribner’s publishing enterprise (interested both in marketable books and his own critical contribution). That reevaluation also contributes to our rethinking of Susan. If not necessarily betrayed by Brownell, Susan lacked awareness of the degree to which his support was conflicted and thus compromised.

IV.

Susan’s dealings with *Scribner's* reveal as untrue the claim that she did not “take any step to bring the poems to print until Lavinia—and Austin, helped by Mabel Todd—had done so” (Farr 322). Clearly, the late publication date of “Renunciation” says nothing about the long foreground of negotiations that preceded its publication. But also important is Susan’s later publication of two Dickinson poems in *The Independent*—an action that did take place after Higginson and Todd’s editorial work (supported by Lavinia) was underway. Negative interpretations of Susan’s *Independent* submissions

have drawn on Bingham's scurrilous chapter ("Flying Sparks") in *Ancestors' Brocades*, which devotes itself entirely to Susan's "'unauthorized' attempts at publication" (AB 120), printing multiple letters interspersed with Todd's explanatory comments and referring the reader at the chapter's opening to Susan's glowering "black mogul" photograph.

Rather than disprove the secretive or inflammatory nature of Susan's February 1891 submission of two poems for publication in the *Independent*, I offer a corrective narrative of her actions based on the context of her negotiations with *Scribner's*. Without that context, Susan's contact with the *Independent* does arguably signal late regret on her part. But with *Scribner's* in the foreground, we find a measured response to the abrupt usurpation of her editorial role. Only two months after the August 1890 appearance of "Renunciation" in *Scribner's*, Roberts Brothers released *Poems by Emily Dickinson*. While Higginson's status meant his name attracted the lion's share of the public's notice, the editorial credits listed first Mabel Loomis Todd, Austin Dickinson's mistress. Susan, fresh from her successful placement of "Renunciation" in *Scribner's* (and thus fully aware of the time involved in publishing), surely would have realized that Lavinia turned to Higginson and Todd to edit the poems while Susan was still negotiating the poem's publication. The *Scribner's* negotiations thus allow us to see Susan as an editor dethroned. Her subsequent protest thus takes place on editorial grounds and reveals the expression of legitimate and deep-seated editorial differences.

When Susan submitted poems to the *Independent*, she claimed, "'Magazines and newspapers are now eager for anything of Emily's, but I should prefer the Independent to

them all as I rate it's [sic] literary merit most highly" (February 8, *WSD*).¹³⁶ Questions follow immediately—if Susan really preferred the *Independent*, why did she first pursue quality monthlies like *Century* and *Scribner's*? As a weekly, the *Independent's* format meant it looked more like a newspaper than it did the lush, picture-filled monthlies. Did Susan really rate the “literary merit most highly” of a paper built on the foundation of Congregational church concerns and “until 1867, a *religious* newspaper and the organ of a sect . . . ”? (Filler, “Liberalism” 293)¹³⁷

As I consider further in Chapter 3, religious weeklies as a category in fact proved to be a highly effective publishing venue for Susan Dickinson, Higginson, and Todd. Susan smartly turned in fact to a publication that offered her unusual access in part on the basis of the connections that the periodical had in her prominent Congregationalist community. But beyond that, *The Independent*, which commenced publication on 7 December 1848 and lasted until 13 October 1928, underwent through its lifespan a broadening of content typical of many nineteenth-century religious-rooted magazines. When editor William Hayes Ward joined the paper, it already had started widening its scope. Ward himself moved beyond his original responsibilities to the paper's religious

¹³⁶ I take my text, where possible, from “Correspondence with William Hayes Ward,” *Writings by Susan Dickinson*, ed. Smith, Laura Elyn Lauth, and Lara Vetter, *Dickinson Electronic Archives* <<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson/susan/ward.html>>, which updates Bingham's reprinting of the correspondence and offers it without her surrounding commentary. In-text citations from *WSD* include the month and day of the letter (all cited correspondence took place in 1891).

¹³⁷ On the *Independent*, see Mott “*The Independent*”; *The Independent*, Sixtieth Anniversary Issue (December 10, 1908); Louis Filler, “Liberalism, Anti-Slavery, and the Founders of the *Independent*” and “*The Independent*: Indispensable Conservative in the Antislavery Crusade.”

department and “added departments of foreign mission news, scientific discoveries, and biblical and archeological [sic] investigations . . .” (Ward 1348). By the time Susan (and Todd) submitted Dickinson’s poems to the periodical, it was rewriting its own history in order to emphasize its antislavery campaign.¹³⁸

Later, Mott would claim that *The Independent* “was more hospitable to good poetry than any other of its class [the general weeklies]” (*History*IV: 59); indeed, the sheer bulk of poems it printed was impressive (241 in 1885 and 226 in 1886) (Mott, “*Independent*” 377). Certainly, its hospitality toward Dickinson provided more instances of initial publication for her poetry (12) than any other periodical in the 1890s.¹³⁹ After Ward exhibited great enthusiasm over Dickinson’s *Poems* (1890) in the editorial offices (Carman 504), the *Independent* printed several reviews and notices of *Poems* (1890) and Ward immediately accepted three of four Todd-submitted Dickinson poems. Ward, who asked that Todd send additional verses, printed the three accepted poems in the February 5 issue and supported the poems’ lead spot presence with two items: a notice in “Editorial Notes” of the poems published therein and a report in “Literary Notes” on the success of Dickinson’s *Poems* (1890).

After this dramatic show of support for Dickinson’s poetry, a show clearly orchestrated by Todd, Susan stepped in. Sending an unspecified number of Dickinson poems to the journal on February 8, Susan accompanied her submission with the first of

¹³⁸ See Filler (“Liberalism” 293-294).

¹³⁹ Thus calling into question Lubbers’s characterization of it as one of three “denominational journal[s]” that “remained skeptical” toward Dickinson’s poetry (201).

several letters that reveal her to be Todd's equal in working the literary machine of the day.¹⁴⁰ As with the *Century* and *Scribner's*, Susan uses personal connections to make contact with the periodical, establishing in her first letter's opening her personal ties to Ward (Austin apparently knew him through Amherst College). She also establishes her personal ties to Dickinson (of "early girl-hood intimacy" [February 8, *WSD*]) and Dickinson's writing, later describing the poems she repeatedly calls "mine" as "yellow and faded with time – (many too personal and adulatory ever to be printed) . . ." (March 14, *WSD*).¹⁴¹

Susan's established intimacy with "yellow and faded" poems served most obviously as bulwark after Todd and Lavinia discovered Susan's poetry submissions and Lavinia sharply staked claims of legal ownership. But Susan also uses her intimacy as a smart bargaining tool, a stamp of legitimacy on her editorial protest. Susan's letters walk a fine line when they represent her situation—her first letter to Ward mixes a misleading statement on her own (nonexistent) authority (her claim of preference for the *Independent*) with undoubted proof that hers was an act outside the dominant Dickinson publication effort.¹⁴² Susan criticizes *Poems* (1890), states plans to publish her own

¹⁴⁰ For more on Susan's savvy dealings with the day's publishing industry, see also Smith (*Rowing* 214-218).

¹⁴¹ Susan, of course, had a notable right to call them "mine," as Dickinson had sent her the poems. Todd, on the other hand, publicly asserted an intimacy with Dickinson that she never had.

¹⁴² Although correct that periodicals were "eager" customers and truthful that she had some preference for the *Independent*, Susan neglects to mention the by-then irrelevancy of her own preferences.

collection, and awkwardly requests that the transaction be “confidential”—all in a letter that signals Ward’s establishment of a new contact (Susan) when he had been using another (Todd) (February 8, *WSD*). But even as Susan’s second letter warns (Austin thinks it “not best, or fair” to Higginson/Niles “to print many” poems), she balances caution with temptation. No doubt aware of the appeal that original texts had in an autograph-crazed culture, Susan “enclos[es] a poem in [Dickinson’s] own hand” and promises “in a few days . . . several little poems . . .” (February 18, *WSD*).¹⁴³

Susan backs any access to physical manuscripts with a powerful command of their workings. Her second letter to Ward launches a remarkable defense of Dickinson’s poetics and makes clear that she would not see those poetics compromised for the sake of a poem’s being printed. She responds especially to Ward’s criticisms of “The Martyrs,” which Susan had called “clean and crisp as rock crystal to me” when she submitted the poem (February 8, *WSD*) and which one reviewer later said “has a firm and strong touch” (“New Holiday Books” 269). Susan’s obituary of Dickinson had echoed the poem in her

¹⁴³ That autograph craze led Ward to give the poem to his sister as a souvenir, prompting an exchange between Susan and him where she promised additional pieces for his sister to keep. Todd and Higginson similarly sent souvenir Dickinson pieces to people (Smith, *Rowing* 244 n34; Leyda 2: 214). *The Independent’s* own fascination with autographs and manuscripts shows in its sixtieth anniversary issue. But the best known periodical feature attached to this cultural interest surely is Edgar Allan Poe’s antebellum articles in the *Southern Literary Messenger* and *Graham’s Magazine* on autographs. On Poe’s articles, see Tamara Plankins Thornton (77-81) and, especially, Meredith McGill (177, 181-183). Thornton’s study of *Handwriting in America* offers helpful insight into this phenomenon. She finds “a critical moment of definition for the script medium” in “the ‘triumph of print’”; namely, that “[a]s men and women exploited the impersonality of print to its fullest, they came to understand handwriting in contradistinction to print and to make handwriting function in contradistinction to the press, as the medium of the self” (30).

description of Dickinson's religious beliefs: "With no creed, no formulated faith, hardly knowing the names of dogmas, she walked this life with the gentleness and reverence of old saints, with the firm step of martyrs who sing while they suffer" ("Obituary for Emily Dickinson," *WSD*). The poem, its subject especially appropriate for a magazine with religious roots (and doubly appropriate for its remove, like Dickinson, from "creed" and "dogma"), marches forward with the rhythm of the feet of "martyrs":

Through the strait pass of suffering,
The martyrs even trod,
Their feet upon temptation,
Their foreheads upon God;

A stately, shriven company—
Convulsion playing round,
Harmless as streaks of meteor
Upon a planet's bound;

Their faith, the everlasting troth,
Their expectation sure;
The needle to the North degree,

Wades so, through Polar air. (Dickinson, "The Martyrs" 1)¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ See also Dickinson, "[Through the strait pass of suffering]" (FP 187). See also Ned Dickinson's transcription of the poem in his notebook ("Ned's Notebook").

When Ward objected to the final two stanzas of an earlier Todd submission, “Of tribulation these are they,” he had rejected the poem outright (*AB* 113). With Susan, however, he apparently proposed printing the poem’s first two stanzas only to have Susan say she would “rather the three verses . . . if any” (February 18, *WSD*).

Susan’s defense of “The Martyrs” backs her earlier criticism to Ward of Higginson and Todd’s editorial work (their “silly fear of the public or lack of ability to recognize the power of many” poems the volume excluded [February 8, *WSD*]). Her editorial role, she makes clear, will be champion rather than apologist. The March 12 publication of “Called Back” in tandem with “The Martyrs,” moreover, hints at just how much she would push her readers. Unlike the relatively formally regular “The Martyrs,” the nineteen-line “Called Back” features three stanzas of varying lengths (6, 5, 8), with lines of varying lengths and meters. If “The Martyrs,” “one of Susan Dickinson’s favorites,” was “proof, she declared, of Emily’s godliness” (Farr 181), “Called Back” offered readers a different pose: an impishly playful subversion of death’s solemnity.

Just lost, when I was saved!

Just heard the world go by!

Just girt me for the onset with eternity,

When breath drew back,

And on the other side

I heard recede the disappointed tide.

Therefore, as one returned, I feel,

Odd secrets of “the Line” to tell!
Some sailor skirting novel shores!
Some pale “reporter” from the awful doors
Before the Seal!

Next time to stay!
Next time the things to see
By ear unheard,
Unscrutinized by eye!
Next time to tarry
While the ages steal,
Tramp the slow centuries
And the cycles wheel! (1)¹⁴⁵

The poem’s title recalls that of *Called Back*, a popular novel by “Hugh Conway” (Frederick John Fargus) in the 1880s that made its rounds in Amherst.¹⁴⁶ In Conway’s eerie romance, the chapter titled “Called Back” features a couple revisiting the scene of and reliving a murder, and the novel makes central to its title an act of transport, a moment and experience “called back”—not an individual “called back” postmortem to another realm. Dickinson’s oddly morbid poem treats the speaker’s near-death experience as adventure, a spiritual transport—she is a “sailor” in a foreign country, a

¹⁴⁵ See also Dickinson, “[Just lost, when I was saved!]” (FP 132).

¹⁴⁶ On Dickinson’s response to the novel, see Jack Capps (100, 174) and Farr (6-7).

“reporter.” But the final stanza’s anticipation of the speaker’s future crossing over treats death itself as a portal through which one assumes a spectator’s position and engages in the ultimate act of voyeurism. By assigning or approving the poem’s title, Susan overlaid the poem with the novel’s eerie story for readers—an editorial act that, unlike the Latin titles Higginson wanted for many poems, made the poem accessible to a popular consciousness without truncating the poem’s impact.¹⁴⁷

Sands calls Susan’s work a “parallel editing project” to Todd and Higginson’s (142). I think it more likely that Susan knew they were set to collide. On March 11, the day before the *Independent* published both the “The Martyrs” and “Called Back,” somebody at the journal erroneously sent the poems’ proofs to Todd and unleashed Todd’s and Lavinia’s fury. Although Susan continues to assume a confident and casual pose (promising to send Ward more poems when she has “a little leisure”), the “injunction” by Lavinia to which Susan refers ultimately stopped Ward’s consideration of Susan-submitted poems.¹⁴⁸ Ward’s letter to Austin Dickinson that followed supports Susan’s position, but states that he will publish no more Dickinson poems without Lavinia’s consent.

¹⁴⁷ Although I arrived independently at the connection between the book and the poem’s title, see also on this connection Benjamin Lease (156 n87).

¹⁴⁸ Lavinia claims, disingenuously, her own wish to withhold the poems from publication until the second volume appears (*AB* 117). Todd (with Lavinia’s knowledge) pursued the poems’ publication in periodicals between the first two volumes. In addition to the poems that already had appeared in *Life* and *The Independent*, poems would appear between the two volumes in *The Christian Register* and *St. Nicholas*.

Susan's reply to Ward has fared poorly in the judgment of many, largely because two sentences have seemed evidence of Susan's selfish interest in peddling daughter Martha's writing. The first closes the letter's body ("I wish I could persuade my daughter to send you an Easter poem she has just written – but she is immovable, having a most feminine horror of print."); the second is part of a postscript ("My daughter wrote a sketch – "My Surviving Aunt" a couple of years ago which I would like to send to you sometime.") (March 23, *WSD*).¹⁴⁹ But it is specifically as an *Ancestors' Brocades* text that the letter proves Susan's misdeeds. Bingham's footnote to the letter highlights those two sentences ("I have been told by several persons that at this time Susan was more interested in her daughter's literary career than in Emily's poetry" [*AB* 118 n4]). And the omission of Ward's preceding letter from the book (perhaps not available to Bingham) makes Susan appear much more forward in what was her *response* to a letter sympathetic to her.

Remembering Ward's letter for its fear of Lavinia's injunction, for its support of Susan's position, highlights a different set of statements than does Bingham's footnote—those where Susan characterizes Lavinia as having "foolish fits of temper," as "baffled by [Susan's] possession of so many mss. of Emily's," as "very foolish in her talk of law, &tc.," as one whose "vagaries" Susan is "quite used to," as one whom Susan "pit[ies]" (March 23, *WSD*). Susan emphasizes Ward's position as coconspirator in her own project, soothes the editor's ego ("It is an advantage to have them printed in the *Independent* as she well knows."), and draws him further into her own circle—although

¹⁴⁹ I follow the *DEA* in transcribing "send" instead of "read."

Susan “shall never yield a line in [her] possession to [Lavinia],” she “happ[ily]” lets Ward’s sister have the poem he passed on to her and promises another (March 23, *WSD*). Her postscript’s reference to “a sketch” about Lavinia (the “Surviving Aunt”) thus is far less the act of literary pimp than it is a confiding wink about its subject. But perhaps the single best response to charges of Susan’s misdeeds is that Todd’s and Higginson’s own careers reveal how editors regularly peddled multiple literary products. Higginson used his own literary connections to push his wife’s writing, Todd energetically pursued her own writing career even as she edited and marketed Dickinson’s poetry, and both editors used any connections they had in the publishing world to push forward the poet—making Dickinson at times the “side product” each editor sold, just as Martha may have been while Susan marketed Dickinson. If we can applaud cautiously the marketing savvy Higginson and Todd exhibited, as I believe we should, we can do the same for Susan—recognizing all three for their editorial work in introducing Dickinson to the public in the 1890s.¹⁵⁰

V.

Todd and Higginson edited into the books all three of the poems that Susan saw into the periodicals of the 1890s—“Renunciation” (*Scribner’s*) appeared in *Poems* (1890), “Called Back” and “The Martyrs” (*The Independent*) in *Poems* (1891). To some extent, the books’ enlistment of the poems signaled the dominant flow of the industry so that, for instance, the *Scribner’s* poem became part of the book’s advanced billing in the

¹⁵⁰ On this editorial savvy, see Horan, “Mabel Loomis Todd,” esp. 71-77.

Critic.¹⁵¹ But Todd's book editing of "Renunciation" became an act of revenge, recompense for Susan's supposed daring and violation. Todd's diary-recorded response to the poem's *Scribner's* publication initially sounds nonchalant. The Saturday, 26 July 1890 entry reads: "Read and loafed a little, and went to Vinnie's for the original of the poem published in the August *Scribner*. There was a ridiculous mistake, printing *sail* for *soul*, and I wanted to verify my memory, which was right—as usual. Call, early [followed by mark]" (Todd diary). Todd here makes her trip to Vinnie's never so much a crusade as the third in a list of activities that includes reading and loafing. (Although "Call, early [followed by mark]" likely means Todd's textual triumph prefaced a sexual one, a meeting with Austin that evening.)

The still tangled textual history of "Renunciation" makes it uncertain whether Susan owned an alternate version (with differences reflected in the *Scribner's* printing) or if Susan purposefully or erroneously altered her copy of the poem.¹⁵² One thing is certain, though: that while Todd recognized elsewhere the validity of Susan's alternate versions, Todd's casual notation of Susan's "mistake" in "Renunciation" contrasts sharply with Bingham's later explanation of the motive behind the facsimile reproduction of the text in *Poems* (1891).¹⁵³ Bingham claims: "Emily's manuscript was reproduced in

¹⁵¹ See Alexander Young's 2 August 1890 "Boston Letter."

¹⁵² See note 107.

¹⁵³ For Todd's recognition of Susan's alternate versions, see her 24 July 1891 letter to Higginson (qtd. in Bingham, *AB* 145-146). Bingham undermines the validity of Susan's possession of Dickinson poems, claiming: "[Todd] said that Lavinia was always convinced that the poems in question had been wrongfully kept by Sue, that she had

facsimile as the frontispiece *solely in order to dispel doubt on this one point*. Had it not been Susan who was guilty of misreading the word, the point might not have been made an issue” (AB 149). Todd’s reputed vindication says nothing about the supposed missing stanza from the *Scribner’s* poem—the publication of the four-page facsimile is to take place for the sake of a single word that Todd viewed Susan as guilty of misreading.

The shift in Todd’s attitude toward the “error” makes sense in the context of preceding events. By then, Susan had followed “Renunciation” with the subversive publication of “The Martyrs” and “Called Back” in *The Independent*. Susan also had pointed out an error of Todd’s when weighing in on the book in a letter to Higginson (AB 92). And, if Susan had decided to leave out a stanza in “Renunciation,” her editing had received the unwitting approval of critic Maurice Thompson, who, in an 8 January 1891 article, declared the stanza (included in *Poems* 1890) “has nothing in it to make it worthy of print” (96). But Todd’s attempt to discredit Susan’s editing fell on a local audience, her aim apparently singular among those producing *Poems* (1891).¹⁵⁴ For reviewers, while the facsimile drew attention, it prompted comments about the book as material object: “The publishers have given the volume the same beautiful form of publication as the former,” writes the reviewer for the *Boston Budget*, “and its fine, heavy paper, generous margins, and cover of palest green with the fleur-de-lis in gold, and a frontispiece giving the fac-simile of Miss Dickinson’s manuscript of her famous poem,

failed to return them with the box of poems which Lavinia had left with her soon after Emily’s death” (AB 112).

¹⁵⁴ See Thomas Niles’s letter to Todd and Todd’s to Higginson (Bingham, AB 150, 165).

‘Renunciation,’ make it all in all, a most attractive as well as a most fascinating volume” (241-242).¹⁵⁵ In her effort to corral Susan’s editing into her own book-centered authority, Todd thus produces a text that “the book” in effect consumes. “Renunciation” becomes emptied for readers of the textual differences Todd so desperately wanted highlighted and pregnant instead with material significance alone. The culture’s greed for authors’ handwriting means the poem never could have gone unnoticed, but it also means Todd’s quest to show her editorial authority through the author’s handwriting was misplaced in a culture where handwriting could be seen as remarkable in itself.

Still, Todd in some sense did triumph. In her and daughter Bingham’s representations of Todd’s efforts, she became—even more so than Higginson—the perceived controlling editor of “Emily Dickinson’s Literary Debut.” But Todd’s narrative also dominates in part because it is a book-centered narrative and thus is one that literary scholarship supports and retells. As fracturing the dominant bibliographic narrative makes clear, though, constructing an author’s reception through her books falsely glosses over the fault lines that lie beneath the surface. To examine those lines in this case reveals something striking: that while *we* press the Susan-edited poems into the service of the books—failing to examine them for the ruptures they signify in the book-dominated narrative—*she* did not. Why we do this lies in part with our conception of periodicals as handmaidens to books; how we might challenge such a notion lies with the model that Susan’s actions provide us. In Susan’s case, we see an editor pursuing

¹⁵⁵ See also, Unlocated clipping (ca. 15 November 1891); “Emily Dickinson’s Second Volume” in *1890s Reception* (24 November 1891); and “New Publications” (23 November 1891).

publication of the poet in *Scribner's Magazine* with no clear book project in sight and later using *The Independent* to subvert the dominant book publishing effort. In neither case do the periodicals work in service of “the book.” Instead, “the magazine” surfaces as entrepreneur and as an experimental form both for its restrictions and flexibility and for the idealism that often fueled it.

Susan's negotiations with *Scribner's* call to mind how magazines often floated authors before the public. George Washington Cable, for example—rejected first by the Scribner publishing house, brought out and promoted next by *Scribner's Monthly* (*Century*), and *then* published by the house (John 64-65)—suggests not the case of a magazine serving a book but instead the reason the magazine broke with Scribner's publishing in the 1880s. Unwilling to serve the parent company, as did *Harper's*, in a feeder relationship, *Scribner's Monthly* had proven too autonomous, interested in publishing its own books rather than passing them on to the publisher.¹⁵⁶

As entrepreneurs, magazines assumed various risks—the long-term commitment to large and expensive serials or the financing of extensive trips in pursuit of on-location articles.¹⁵⁷ Further, even though *Scribner's* ultimately balked at the prospect, that the magazine might have been the first place to introduce any bulk of Dickinson's poetry calls to mind the way spatial and temporal experimentation was always also a business risk. The line between financial risk-taking and spatial/temporal experimentation blurs when we consider other projects: Dr. Josiah Gilbert Holland's (*Scribner's Monthly*)

¹⁵⁶ On *Harper's* and *Scribner's Monthly*, see Arthur John (98, 103-108).

¹⁵⁷ On *The Century's* financing of such trips, see John (131, 171).

conception of a number of the magazine comprised solely of Helen Hunt Jackson's work (never executed) and *Lippincott's* response to the ubiquitous serial form by publishing one novel per issue in the late 1880s.¹⁵⁸ Cases in which poetry, denigrated even then as "space filler," could be backed by a commitment of significant space further the point. The *Century* began its first-ever issue (as *Scribner's Monthly*) with a sixteen-page narrative poem, and *Scribner's Magazine*, in its first year of publication, featured a six-page Robert Louis Stevenson poem (R. Burlingame 251).¹⁵⁹ With serialized poems, the magazine's investment in the genre could be spread out over a longer period. Nonetheless, it represented a substantial commitment; for example, Longfellow's massive *Michael Angelo* appeared in three 20-35 page parts (January to March 1883) in the *Atlantic Monthly*.¹⁶⁰

But in Susan's dealings with *The Independent*, the periodical becomes an effective entrepreneur because it makes a limited investment in the author. With one Todd and Higginson-edited collection already out and another on its way, Susan was unlikely to find any editorial recourse with a more substantial project through a book-publishing enterprise. Any privately published volume, however, would lack teeth. Her issuance of a volume that adhered to her own editorial ideals, her own desired

¹⁵⁸ On H.H., see William W. Ellsworth, *A Golden Age of Authors: A Publisher's Recollection* (36); on *Lippincott's*, see Michael Lund's excellent *America's Continuing Story: An Introduction to Serial Fiction, 1850-1900* (117).

¹⁵⁹ Although Stevenson himself would claim: "I never . . . could fathom why verse was put in magazines: it has something to do with the making up, has it not?" (R. Burlingame 260)

¹⁶⁰ On that example and others, see Lund (39).

presentation of Dickinson's poems, would have signaled less of a threat to Todd and thus would have been less successful. Publication in a periodical—especially one already engaged in Todd and Higginson's editorial project—could bring to a public venue the threat she signified for Todd and she could, at least temporarily, enlist the editor's support, appealing to an enterprising desire to set the record straight. Even though Ward expressed disapproval regarding the Susan-Todd-Lavinia conflict over Dickinson's poetry, we must remember that Susan represented her project to him from the beginning as one of literary reform, a critique of the book-bound Dickinson. A self-serving periodical editor at the least could take advantage of such an offer to bag some desirable literary goods; an idealistic one could conceive of such a venture as a small piece of a cultural mission.

When we allow books to dominate our conceptions of literary production and reception, we caricature or ignore figures like Susan Dickinson and trivialize the role played by media like periodicals. Susan's case reminds us that the master narrative we prefer—where poems like Dickinson's ascend from manuscript to book—seduces with its tidy progression but subordinates or ignores competing narratives for the sake of that progression. When we admit those competing narratives, we might discover that dominant and subordinate editorial figures can occupy a variety of positions, that textual narratives are more staggered than linear.

Chapter 3

Not “For the *Christian Register*”: Readers Reject Dickinson

Susan Dickinson’s editorial work reveals the life periodical poems could have outside of books and the subversive role periodical publication could assume. Even so, the critical narrative I offer of her successes (and of Todd and Higginson’s in *St. Nicholas*) relays only a limited portrait of 1890s periodical culture. With all three editors thus far, I have highlighted a degree of editorial control and arguably have reconstructed expressions of editorial intention. As a result, periodicals have figured in this critical narrative as accessories to author-based editorial programs, with periodical poems creating an image of the poet or periodical publication circumventing “the book.” No periodical, however, was a transparent medium through which these editors’ goals might be expressed. When success ensued, it often represented a degree of professionalism on the magazine’s part and the author-based editor’s own connections and place in the publishing world’s network. It also often revealed a degree of luck. After all, there were competing editorial demands, templates, schedules, and needs; poems were altered, delayed, and rejected. Much could, and often did, go awry.

This chapter focuses on a famous Dickinson production failure and a rupture in the poet's reception: the *Christian Register* publication of "[God is a distant, stately lover,—]," which elicited complaints from readers. While to our contemporary sensibilities (replete with constructions of Dickinson as an asexual or sexual creature) the configuration of God as "lover" immediately comes to mind as the likely source of that controversy, the complaints brought against the poem were theological as well. Still, since the theology of Dickinson's scandalous poem was not wholly at odds with the Unitarian orientation of the *Christian Register*, the furor it aroused seems surprising. I examine the poem in the context of the larger effort to place Dickinson in religious periodicals and reveal the category as a whole as a major element of the posthumous publication of Dickinson. The controversy reveals much about the weekly's concurrent facilitation of dissent and debate and its adherence to notions of propriety about what was proper or improper to share with "the world." Its audience's rejection of a marketed Dickinson highlights the lively exchange the periodical fostered within its own pages, its self-perceived power as a communication tool. In the end, that is, the rejection of Dickinson's poem rested on a model of readership and dialogue that the *Christian Register* promoted. And, moreover, our ability to chart the presence of that dialogue contributes to our tenuous ability to catalog, describe, and track both the general act of reading and the specific act of reading poetry.

I.

Narratives of Dickinson's 1890s production and reception generally have emphasized the poet's formal and stylistic differences from her contemporaries. Susan's uncompromising negotiations with *Independent* editor William Hayes Ward, for instance, prove her a champion of Dickinson's poetics. And how Dickinson wrote is central in Bingham's apologetics for her mother's "creative editing." Bingham asks, "Just how much shock, of form or of content, could the reader absorb?" (AB 46), but her own focus on form—Dickinson's rhyme, punctuation, verse form, spelling, grammar—notably fails to consider how content was modified.¹⁶¹ The residual stylistic idiosyncrasies left after the "creative editing" become important in reception narratives too—Lubbers cites "style" and "form" as central in critical debate over and rejection of the poet (24, 29) and even Buckingham, who steers our attention elsewhere, admits that "when Dickinson is faulted, it is almost always for her technical irregularities" ("Poetry Readers" 166).¹⁶² Certainly, despite Todd and Higginson's editing, reviews still abounded with complaints over Dickinson's formal roughness, most famously perhaps in Thomas Bailey Aldrich's rewriting of "I taste a liquor never brewed." But amid this set of concerns, the single periodical-published Dickinson poem of which we have recorded complaints and

¹⁶¹ For example, while Bingham quotes a deleted stanza of "Arcturus," she presents it in the context of copyediting-type changes (AB 39).

¹⁶² Buckingham, who overturns previous narratives that established Dickinson as rejected in the 1890s, tends to emphasize the qualities for which she was admired and accepted. Even on the issue of technique, he further notes, "[a] surprising number of nineties reviewers, admitting the absence of conventional metrics in Dickinson, nevertheless rejoiced in her 'wilding' music . . ." ("Poetry Readers" 177 n10).

controversy is one where “content” very much comes at the center of controversy, namely Dickinson’s “God is a distant, stately lover.”

Years later, Bingham-Todd would represent the incident lightly in *Ancestors’ Brocades*. As opposed to the Susan-related quarrels Bingham fervently dramatizes, this poem’s history represents, in Todd’s words, “an amusing incident” (AB 124) and she claims elsewhere that “Vinnie and I had considered it together for a considerable time before I sent it away, and she was mischievously happy to have it published” (Sewall 290). In fact, though, Todd expressed considerable anxiety over the topic of Dickinson’s “irreverence,” claiming questions on the topic “came to me in hundreds of letters, and verbal questions as well which assailed me after every one of the hundreds of talks which I gave for eight or ten years after the poems and letters were issued” (qtd. in Sewall 289-290). And no matter how “amusing” she purportedly found the incident, her public response assumed a defensive posture, most notably in her later introduction to *Letters* (1894).

Todd submitted the poem as part of the flurry of promotional activity that took place after the publication of *Poems* (1890). The period represented Todd’s greatest success in seeing Dickinson’s poems into periodical publication. Todd-submitted articles had fared poorly—her own article being rejected by three different places and one by her father meeting with rejection by *Frank Leslie’s Monthly* (Todd, “List of Articles”). But her submission of Dickinson poems met with tremendous success: *The Independent*, *St. Nicholas*, and *Life* all together accepted six Dickinson poems in Todd’s first round of submissions. Todd later would experience wholesale rejection from *St. Nicholas* and

Harper's Bazar, and her efforts after *Poems* (1891) largely were characterized by a series of rejections. By the time she submitted the *Register* poem, however, that rejection was yet to come (Todd, "List of Articles").

In fact, Todd, Higginson, and Susan all had experienced considerable success thus far in the broader category of religious periodicals. Higginson's landmark article introducing Dickinson to the public had appeared in the *Christian Union*, after all. And that periodical, which boasted about "lead[ing]" in the area of Dickinson ("Inquiring Friends" 88), continued its coverage with various notices and articles. The Congregationalist *Independent* also had expressed its interest early on, offering one of the first notices of *Poems* (1890), publishing an extensive and influential 11 December 1890 review by William Hayes Ward and Dr. Twining, and relaying an enthusiasm for the poems through personal connections. The magazine was the first place to which we have record of Todd submitting poems, and, starting with the poems submitted by Todd and by Susan, it soon became the periodical with more instances of originally published Dickinson poems than any other. The *Christian Register* in particular seemed an amenable outlet for Dickinson's poetry because of the strong interest it expressed in Dickinson's poetry. An unsigned 18 December 1890 review by Higginson's friend John White Chadwick, Todd later recalled, contained sentences that "so delighted Lavinia that I tried to discover the author" (AB 93). In fact, Higginson already had been corresponding with Chadwick—a figure of prominence in the *Christian Register* because of his high-profile position as minister of the Second Unitarian Church of Brooklyn, NY, an appointment he held from 1864 until his death in 1904 (B[acon], "Chadwick," DAB

588-9), and his literary credentials. These factors, combined with Higginson's own high standing in the Unitarian church, suggest the weekly was highly open to a Dickinson submission.

Todd records having sent the poem on 23 March 1891, and editor Samuel J. Barrows's prompt March 26 letter responds as if to a gift: "Many thanks for your kindness in sending me the poem of Emily Dickinson. What a genius she was!" (*AB* 124). The remainder of his short letter treats the poem—or, perhaps more importantly, its author's perceived character—with confidence: "Her resurrection surely came. Would that we might always think that genius had its Easter and was not buried in the tomb" (*AB* 124-5). Barrows, just having published the periodical's Easter issue, which celebrated the occasion with an above-average amount of poetry, configures Dickinson here as a Christian author, even as he laments more largely the absence of a link between "genius" and salvation. His chosen metaphor conveys this idea by boldly equating Dickinson with Christ and suggests too an affinity between Christ's resurrection and the public expression of latent genius ("genius ha[ving] its Easter").

Published immediately thereafter on 2 April 1891, Dickinson's "A Poem" employed its own Christ-centered metaphors to portray a divine-human relationship:

God is a distant, stately lover,—
Wooes, as he tells us, by his Son;
Verily, a vicarious courtship.
Miles and Priscilla were such an one.

But, lest the soul, like fair Priscilla,
Choose the envoy and spurn the groom,
Vouches, with hyperbolic archness,
Miles and John Alden are synonyme! (212)¹⁶³

Objections followed quickly. Barrows writes Todd twenty days later of “two letters from readers who have been greatly shocked by the poem” and of the comment by “Rev. Brooke Herford who forwarded one of them . . .”: “‘It is one of the most offensive bits of contemptuous Unitarianism that I have met with’” (AB 125).¹⁶⁴ Barrows himself claims not to find the poem “any more irreverent or daring than the metaphors used in the Song of Solomon . . . nor any worse than the metaphors representing the Church as the Bride of Christ in the Apocalypse” (AB 125). Speculating that the problem might lie in whether or not “such a poem has the stamp of traditional authority upon it,” Barrows asks whether Todd might write a “brief article . . . which might vindicate [Dickinson] against the charge of irreverence” (AB 125). In fact, Barrows himself authored the article for the 30 April 1891 issue.

The journal later would publish additional reviews of Dickinson’s poetry, but the publishing connection and the poem were damaged. We have no record of Todd’s

¹⁶³ See also Dickinson, “[God is a distant - stately Lover -]” (FP 615).

¹⁶⁴ Elsewhere, Todd describes Herford’s disapproval as follows: “But alas, my good friend the Reverend Brooke Herford, then pastor of the Arlington Street Church, spoke most slightly of that poem, calling it ‘One of the offensive pieces of insistent Unitarianism ever published.’ [sic]

‘Why, Mrs. Todd,’ he asked me in real friendliness, ‘Oh, *why* did you give that to any magazine to publish?’” (App. II, vol. 1, 290, Sewall).

further submitting any poems to the periodical for publication, nor would the public see the poem again until Martha Dickinson Bianchi's publication of it in 1929. But what about the poem so gravely offended? Barrows's letter to Todd suggests one avenue of likely offense. His claim, that is, about the harmless nature of the poem's metaphors intimates that offense lies in the sexual and romantic undertones of the metaphor. Dickinson already had been criticized for her elevation of human love. When treating the subject, one critic had charged, "she becomes absurdly, if not blasphemously intemperate . . ." ("Grim Slumber Songs" 85), making God, Christ, and heaven, another claimed, "accessories, necessary indeed, but ancillary, to merely human love . . ." ("Talk About New Books" 73). The *Christian Register* poem, of course, offers instead an analogy whereby a human love story makes clearer the properties of divine love. Indeed, the real insult, although not stated as such by Herford or Barrows, is that it is a love story of diminished proportions. If we consider the poem for its simple equation of "God" and "lover," then, Barrows is right that the poem is no more "irreverent or daring" than what readers could find in the heated passion of the Song of Solomon or in the cited Apocalypse analogy. In the poem, God remains far removed from the objects of his affection and appears a suitor of the most cold and distant sort. In the challenges to Calvinism that came throughout the nineteenth century, Ann Douglas explains of the doctrine of Atonement, "God is no longer expressing hatred of sin in his sacrifice of his son but love of man . . ." (124). God, in nineteenth-century Protestant theology, truly had become a "lover," Christ's crucifixion becoming a "courtship" rite. In a cultural context in which a devout woman might "refer[] to Christ as 'The Great Lover'" (Douglas 242),

Dickinson's poem seems more troubling for its charges of coldness, remove, and even disinterest on God's part than for its characterization of salvation and atonement as courtship.

But the more often-repeated complaint by Herford suggests a different avenue of offense. Puzzling as the claim is, Herford's characterization of the poem as "one of the most offensive bits of contemptuous Unitarianism" faults the poem's embodiment (or, as I will argue, vocalization) of theology. That the poem was published in a Unitarian weekly and Herford himself was a prominent Unitarian minister baffles in this respect.¹⁶⁵ His description of the poem as an expression of Unitarianism (though "contemptuous") hardly seems grounds for complaint. Indeed, the poem's arch questioning of the trinity's verity (God "Vouches, with hyperbolic archness, / Miles and John Alden are synonyme!"), which questions how there could be separate gods and only one, appears wholly in keeping with the Unitarian (as opposed to Trinitarian) theology the weekly represented and promoted. Although the editorial efforts of Todd (or the *Christian Register* editors) did make more impertinent the poem's tone, the poem hardly seems

¹⁶⁵ A British minister who was prominent on the American Unitarian scene from 1875 to 1893, Herford (father of author-illustrator Oliver Herford) served as minister of the Arlington Street Church in Boston and "a preacher at Harvard" from 1883 ("Herford, Oliver," *The National Cyclopaedia*). B. Herford figures prominently in the pages of the *Christian Register*. "The great work which Dr. Herford has done in his nine years in Boston, for his own church and for the Unitarian cause, demands a continuance," one piece extols about six months after Dickinson's *Register* publication. Responding to a rumor that Herford was considering a call to London, the *Register* claims "[t]he city could not part with a citizen so eminent in good works and sound counsel without pain, and the college near by would lose a preacher of the liberal gospel strong in influence over its hundreds of young men." ("A Unitarian Duty," 581). When Herford moved to England, he was retained as an editorial contributor for the *Register* ("Brevities," 21 January 1892, 39).

shocking when considered in the context of other statements the magazine published.¹⁶⁶

C. P. Cranch, for instance, had declared recently that

I think there are hosts of good people who get tired, as I do sometimes, of hearing about Christ. There is no irreverence that I am conscious of in this confession. It is only because of my reverence for the Great Teacher and Saviour that I would rather not hear his name continually introduced in prayers and sermons and religious papers” (“Christ in the Pulpits” 803).¹⁶⁷

The periodical, that is, was replete with discussion over the role that Christ should assume in religious theology and ceremony. And surely the Unitarian belief in Christ’s humanity made the equation of Christ playing out “The Courtship of Miles Standish” less difficult to swallow.

What the *Christian Register* also was filled with, however—and where a “bit” of “contemptuous Unitarianism” could get one in trouble—was extensive discussion of how one shared one’s beliefs and in what forum. A letter in the 19 February 1891 issue, for example, relates the correspondent’s non-belief in the trinity, but concludes that he will not “publicize” his beliefs. To lack discretion in such matters was to invite criticism. A *Christian Register* editorial reports: “The Springfield *Republican* treats the recent article of Mr. George P. Lathrop in the *Christian Register* somewhat cynically, and declares that

¹⁶⁶ Where Dickinson’s manuscript copy ends the poem with a thoughtful and thought-provoking dash—suggesting the final statement as possibility rather than conclusion—the *Christian Register* text instead punctuates tritely, with a final exclamation point, making the poem convey shock or trivialize its theology.

¹⁶⁷ The *Christian Register* used both a continuous and a separate issue page numbering system. My in-text citations follow the continuous paging; my bibliography gives both.

‘the reasonable and proper thing for a man to do when he changes his religious faith is to be quiet about it’ (“Editorial,” 2 July 1891, 421). When not silent, members were warned, a certain caution was required. A piece co-signed by Herford in the 21 May 1891 issue says about “Christianity, But With the Door Open”:

It is entirely consistent with this that Unitarians shrink from making the name “Christian” or that of “Jesus Christ” a creed or test or shibboleth. But, all the more because they leave the door wide open for all to enter who feel in general sympathy with them, they want it to be known without any evasion or mistake that it is a Christian Church which is so left open, and that it is essentially Christian worship and work which is going on in it. (323)

This statement expresses not only an ambivalence inherent in Unitarianism but recommends, as a result, the adoption of a defensive posture. To communicate the church’s theology in these writers’ view, that is, requires vigorous counterweight communication. To speak was to mask essential beliefs for fear of misunderstanding and for the sake of proper appearance and conformity.

Such statements, of course, reflect on a particular moment in American Unitarianism and Protestantism. They also, however, were predicated on characteristics of the media. Indeed, while periodical scholarship customarily overlooks religious periodicals as effective media, scholarship by David Paul Nord and others posits a significant confluence of religious evangelical purpose and technology and argues for the recognition of the religious roots of modern mass media. Religious periodical editors were acutely aware of possible damage by an “ill-chosen” “single word” distributed in

“‘thousands of copies’” (Brown 158). And it is precisely, I will argue, the *Register*’s perception of its own power as part of the print media that made Dickinson’s poem in Herford’s, and likely others’, eyes a dangerous ally better kept silent.

II.

Concern about the ill effects of “ill-chosen” words in the 1890s religious periodicals might seem misplaced in the larger context of nineteenth-century American Protestant history. Dominant narratives of American religious history, like Ann Douglas’s *The Feminization of American Culture*, characterize the century as one of decline in theological rigor and church-based power. Compelling accounts of the reach and power of nineteenth-century religious activity, like Nathan O. Hatch’s *The Democratization of American Christianity*, place at center the antebellum and Civil War periods, not the late nineteenth century.¹⁶⁸ Dickinson’s own life tells something of mid-century religious activity: “No fewer than eight revivals swept Amherst, college and town, during her formative years,” Richard Sewall notes, “roughly between 1840 and 1862” (24). Religious historians note the post-Revolutionary era’s abandonment of state-sponsored religion and the subsequent enthusiasm by which religion worked “to sell itself not only in the competitive church market but also in a general market of other cultural commodities that were trying in many cases to break free of religious disapproval rooted mainly in Protestant animosities” (Moore 11). Treatment of the era says much about the Protestant movement’s methods; characterizations focus on the period’s intense activity:

¹⁶⁸ Hatch’s history also resonates because he casts the activities of the period as a compelling reflection of American history and an American ideology.

revivals, conversion efforts by magnetic figures of upstart groups, the production and distribution of print matter by the American Tract Society and the American Bible Society, the proliferation of denominational colleges and universities, the genial Protestant support of public education, and the missionary movement in America.¹⁶⁹ As Sidney E. Ahlstrom describes it, “the antebellum period was the great time of evangelical triumph. These were the days above all when the ‘Evangelical United Front’ took up the manifold causes of moral renewal, missionary advance, and humanitarian reform—with revival preaching almost always leading the way. Its aim was to bring the gospel to all America and to heathen lands abroad, but primarily it hoped to make America the world’s great example of a truly Protestant republic” (387).

These efforts took place under the guise of varying degrees of cooperation and competition—“mainstream” groups “believed themselves to be especially charged with making America a Christian nation” (Handy vii), upstart groups fought back against the perceived dominance of established ones, and established ones countered revival with revival.¹⁷⁰ And as numbers became a significant focus of Protestant groups, churches

¹⁶⁹ For special consideration of revivals, see Moore (esp. 41-56); on “magnetic figures of upstart groups,” see Hatch; and on the American Tract Society, see Amy M. Thomas, “Reading the Silences: Documenting the History of American Tract Society Readers in the Antebellum South” and David Paul Nord, *The Evangelical Origins of Mass Media in America, 1815-1835*, “Religious Reading and Readers in Antebellum America,” and “Systematic Benevolence: Religious Publishing and the Marketplace in Early Nineteenth-Century America.”

¹⁷⁰ Hatch notes that populist groups “perceived tyrannical intent in the coordinated Calvinist schemes and launched a ferocious crusade against every facet of Calvinist orthodoxy” (170). These groups found in “the energetic advance of Calvinist seminaries, missionary societies, and benevolent organizations . . . a self-appointed aristocracy trying to control the soul of the nation and to crush simple congregational freedom”

slackened their grip on previously forbidding doctrinal tenets: “The deliberate adoption of revivalistic methods by many Congregational clergymen . . .,” for example, “led them to modify certain of the tenets of Calvinism in a way which caused others to fear they were abandoning a sound position” (Smith, Handy, and Loetscher 28). Dickinson herself often is portrayed as laboring under the weight of a Puritan ancestry and nurtured on all sides by stern religious figures, but “. . . it is crucial to note that by the time she was born in 1830, the transformation from the austere Calvinism of Jonathan Edwards to a more genteel Christian profession was well under way in the Amherst area” (Lundin 11).¹⁷¹ That transformation played out on a national scale. The “disruptively hard edges of the gospel” were “softened” “for the sake of social cohesion” (Noll 272), and the interest in a progressive social policy meant “. . . a relaxation [by Congregationalists and Presbyterians] of such views of man’s total depravity as minimized human effort for self-improvement” (Smith, Handy, Loetscher 10-11).

Still, this transformation generally is not seen as especially aggressive or pervasive until post-Civil War America when, as historians note, religion faced not just social and tactical pressures but ideological challenges, “most notably historical criticism of the Bible and Darwinian evolutionary theory” (Ahlstrom 733). Ahlstrom describes, on

(Hatch 174). But counter-efforts hardly were one-sided: “The impetus for establishing many new religious periodicals after 1800 came, paradoxically, from Congregational and Presbyterian clergymen . . . who searched for ways to counter popular radical appeals (Hatch 143).

¹⁷¹ Eberwein, like Lundin, seeks to normalize Dickinson’s religious experience. She dates later the area’s relaxation of standards but also suggests that Dickinson far from suffered in such an environment: “Dickinson family members entered the church gradually during the poet’s lifetime, so that she surely never grew up with the assumption that every respectable and God-fearing person must necessarily belong” (98).

the one hand, a schism within churches between liberal and conservative factions (733), but on the other hand the ability of the liberalizing faction to “transform[] Christianity into a benign and genteel form of religious humanism” (740). Dwight L. Moody, for example, exhorted that people “‘Join some church at once.’ Which church did not matter” (Ahlstrom 745). And the message by which one evangelist converted people “was so generalized that Christian Scientists, Unitarians, and Roman Catholics saw no incongruity in signing his cards” (Ahlstrom 747). Thus, while estimates might show an increase in church membership during this period,¹⁷² the adaptation of liberal thinking to “the spirit of the age” meant “that its effects were ambiguous” (Ahlstrom 763).

That ambiguity showed in the periodical culture of postbellum America too. Antebellum print arms of religious groups had flourished in and contributed to the era’s intense level of activity. Organizations like the American Tract Society and the American Bible Society “helped to lay the foundation for mass media in America through their pioneering work in mass printing and mass distribution of the written word,” argues Nord, who adds “evangelical” to the standard list of technological, economic, and political reasons usually cited behind changes in reading (“Evangelical Origins” 2). Organizations that sought “to deliver the same printed message to *everyone* in America” both “dreamed the dream of a genuinely mass medium” (Nord, “Evangelical Origins” 2)

¹⁷² That increase can be tracked through the whole of the nineteenth century. Douglas writes of the first half of the century: “In 1800 only one of fifteen Americans belonged to a religious society. By 1850 one of every seven Americans was a church member” (22). And Robert T. Handy reports of the century’s latter half: “One estimate of the size of nine Protestant denominational families found that the increase in church membership went from about four and a half million in 1860 to about twelve and a half million in 1890” (79).

and went outside of the standard means employed by that medium. In particular, argues Nord, religious publishers adopted different distribution methods, “resist[ing] what they took to be its fundamental corrupting principle: the adjustment of supply to popular demand. The religious publishers, especially the union societies, had a purer and grander vision for mass media in America: They proposed to supply reading material to *everyone*, regardless of demand, regardless of location, regardless of ability to pay” (“Systematic” 242).

Periodicals as a category played an important role too in the self-styled missions of antebellum religious groups. Although the first religious periodical was a magazine, weeklies, or “the ‘religious newspaper,’” in particular became “a phenomenon” in the first third of the century (Mott, *American Journalism* 206). Periodicals were established, as cataloged in Henry Smith Stroupe’s engaging study of *The Religious Press in the South Atlantic States, 1802-1865*: to “‘contribut[e] towards the maturity of both literature and piety’” (4); to “‘commence a crusade against pride, profligacy, lukewarmness and ignorance’” (5); “to communicate . . . ‘accounts of Revivals of Religion; the proceedings of Bible and Missionary Societies; the labors of missionaries; and, allowing a little latitude to the expression, remarkable occurrences in the life and death of Christians’” (6); “to print the news of the progress of benevolent enterprises” (16); and to exert positive influence within church organizations (“piety and morality among Methodists”) (28). The assessment, moreover, by the Presbyterian Synod of Virginia that “a vehicle of communication [was] essential to the prosperity of the church” (Stroupe 5) and which saw “a newspaper as indispensable for the communication of information to the people”

(Stroupe 8) asserts the priority that religious organizations placed on developing such publications. Many of these mission statements reflect rather insular purposes, goals concerned with denominational instruction or internal communication. But religious publications soon achieved an impressive level of saturation. The period from 1800 through 1830 saw an increase from 5,000 to 400,000 “subscribers to religious journals” (Moore 19) and Stroupe estimates that there was “one subscriber to a religious periodical in every ninety-six persons” in 1850 (27), “an average year for the period 1830-1865” (26).

Later estimates suggest a continued strong showing by the genre. By 1870, there were “more than 200 religious weeklies in the United States” (John 25) and by 1883, “. . . most states had at least a handful of religious publications to choose from”—states like New York and Pennsylvania boasting as many as 78 and 79 (Longinow 246). But consideration of 1890s periodical culture reveals a scene that, like Protestantism as a whole, reflected diminished overt religious concerns. Several key periodicals with secular faces by the late nineteenth century in fact had religious roots. Media giant *The Youth’s Companion* famously began as a religious children’s weekly in 1827, only to become an increasingly secular publication throughout the course of the nineteenth century. And as late as 1870, Dickinson family friend and popular author Josiah Gilbert Holland was one of two founders of *Scribner’s Magazine*, “[p]ositioned strategically as a Christian, but non-denominational magazine” (Scholnick, “J. G. Holland” 70). The magazine had begun with specific (though liberal) religious requirements: “Each number, Holland ordered, must contain at least one contribution of direct spiritual

significance; ‘no man shall write a poem, or a story, or a review, or a disquisition who does not recognize Jesus Christ as the center and sum of our civilization’ (John 24).¹⁷³

By the 1890s, however, the magazine was pursuing an aesthetically-centered cultural public education program under the editorship of Richard Watson Gilder.

More importantly, some key religious periodicals had undergone an increased secularization of their contents.¹⁷⁴ “Congregational weeklies,” writes Frank Luther Mott of two hospitable outlets for the publication of Dickinson’s poetry,

had a tendency to become more literary than religious, more journals of opinion than church papers. Thus those great and often brilliant periodicals, the *Independent* and the *Christian Union*, became nonsectarian by the end of the century—and indeed some unkind critics called them nonreligious. That was untrue, however; even after the *Christian Union* changed title to the more secular word *Outlook* in 1893, it was rather more preoccupied with religious points of view than were such journals as the Methodistic *Harper’s Weekly*. The

¹⁷³ Holland was liberal in that he held to a “nonsectarian and nondoctrinaire” system of beliefs (John 24).

¹⁷⁴ Candy Gunther Brown notes in antebellum periodicals, too, an ambiguity in “religious” and “secular” publications, something she attributes to “the common practice of reprinting articles from other papers” (141). The postbellum shift, however, appears to reflect larger shifts in editorial policy. See, for example, Robert J. Scholnick, “J. G. Holland and the ‘Religion of Civilization’ in Mid-Nineteenth Century America” on *Scribner’s Monthly* (later *Century*). Mott, writing of religious newspapers in the 1794-1825 period, explains “their chief points of difference from the secular papers were in political neutrality, in editorial discussions of church polity, in the use of more religious and denominational news, and in the employment of literary miscellany chiefly of a religious cast” (*History*: 137).

Independent and *Outlook* did not forget their Congregational upbringing.

(*History*IV: 29 2)

Mott is right—such magazines clearly had religious roots that showed. In fact, the persistence of such questions about their religiosity, and the religious standards to which secular magazines were held, illustrates R. Laurence Moore’s argument that over the course of the nineteenth century, American religious institutions became less identifiably “religious” but more pervasively present in the culture at large.¹⁷⁵

Still, we might question the integrity of the category “religious periodical” in the late nineteenth century and wonder too what it meant for there to be a concerted pursuit of the publication of Dickinson’s poetry in such periodicals. That Higginson, Todd, and Susan placed Dickinson’s “religious” periodical poetry largely in journals with the most broad-based appeal is clear. Mott, writing of the many “different kinds of religious publications,” enumerates thirteen “classes” in his description:

(1) magazines of comment and literature with church backgrounds, such as the *Independent* and *Outlook*; (2) journals of liberal variety, but still denominational, such as the *Churchman* and *Christian Register*; (3) well-edited denominational spokesmen, such as the *Congregationalist* and *Christian Advocate*; (4) the hundreds of regional Protestant denominational journals, which attempted with indifferent success to combine, as the *Andover Review* put it, prophetic utterance

¹⁷⁵ Moore argues that “much of what we usually mean by speaking of secularization has to do not with the disappearance of religion but its commodification, the ways in which churches have grown by participation in the market, or more specifically how religious influences established themselves in the forms of commercial culture that emerged in the nineteenth century . . . “ (5).

with news and gossip; (5) the many interdenominational journals, of which the *Christian Herald* was foremost . . . [and so on]” (Mott *History*IV: 289).

In addition to her publication by the *Independent* and *Outlook*, Dickinson’s *Christian Register* poem and the numerous reviews and articles in other weeklies meant her poetry had a presence not just in the places with the most broad-based appeal, but in a wide spectrum of religious publications.¹⁷⁶ Religious periodicals are of interest, then, because Dickinson’s editors invested in the category, and the category as a whole invested in Dickinson.

The investment in and by this class of periodicals, I would suggest, was not accidental. Religious periodicals effectively illustrate how publishing networks are engrained firmly in social ones, so the close ties the Dickinson family and Todd and Higginson had to a religious community bear remembering when we consider Dickinson’s publication and distribution. Moody might have been exhorting people to join “any church,” but those like the Dickinsons with a history of family membership and participation in a particular church, I would argue, gained access more readily to publishing arms related to that organization. The Amherst community, to begin with, had a distinctive religious identity as a whole. Amherst College, which was started in direct opposition to liberal (Unitarian) Harvard, was “opposed” by “the Harvard Unitarians . . . as ‘a priest factory,’ a sectarian tool” (Sewall 34). And the Dickinson family’s involvement in that local religious community was deep. Dickinson’s grandfather,

¹⁷⁶ It seems significant that Buckingham, in remarking on possible uses of his documentary history, singles out religious weeklies: “[These documents] make it possible, for example, to learn more about the role of religious family weeklies in contributing to the popular literary taste of the period” (Introduction xi-xii).

Samuel Fowler Dickinson, was highly instrumental in starting the Congregationalist college. Samuel Fowler left Amherst after much personal sacrifice in disgrace and went to Lane Theological Seminary and Western Reserve College, his work at the latter judged poorly after he died. It is likely, then, that son Edward's intense efforts to restore the family name in Amherst were directed not only at a geographic community but at the circuitry of a church community, in which it also likely was in need of restoration.¹⁷⁷

The family's implication in the civic-religious community remained strong with Austin and Emily's generation, despite reservations Austin himself expressed about formally joining the church.¹⁷⁸ Both Edward and Austin served as treasurer for Amherst College and Austin famously oversaw construction of the new First Congregational Church. Church even served as a staging ground to play out conflict resulting from Austin and Todd's affair. Austin bemoaned his 1890 reinstatement (as "the only outlaw of the region" as "the head of parish affairs" [Longworth 120]), and when Todd sang in Amherst's First Congregational Church quartet, Susan went elsewhere—"she mounted a missionary effort to establish a Sunday school at a small impoverished settlement east of Amherst . . ." (Longworth 201). Religious doubts and unsanctioned behavior aside, Austin, Lavinia, Susan, and Todd all had deep-seated places in a religious community. Remembering the contacts and friendships these positions afforded illuminates the

¹⁷⁷ On Samuel Fowler's efforts in establishing Amherst College and subsequent difficulties and on Edward's compensating efforts, see Sewall (33-43) and Lundin (14-15).

¹⁷⁸ On Austin's doubts, see Sewall (95, 105-107, 110).

significant role religious periodicals played in Dickinson's posthumous production and reception.

Indeed, while Todd, whose maternal grandfather had been a Congregational minister (Longworth 18), often led the charge in the effort to publish and promote Dickinson's poetry during the 1890s, prominent Unitarian Higginson's name surfaces unusually often in an analysis of how Dickinson was distributed via religious publications. A *Christian Union* piece on the forthcoming *Poems* (1891), for instance, ends up focusing on the upcoming publication of a Higginson lecture in conjunction with "several kindred papers from 'The Independent' and 'The Christian Union'" ("Literary Notes" 172). Higginson, it bears remembering, was not only a member of the day's literati; he was a member that liberal religious groups could claim as their own. (By the close of the century, after the vigorous revival efforts staged by Methodists and others and the general unifying impulse among Protestant groups, the differences between Unitarian Higginson and Congregationalists would appear relatively minimal.) Higginson in fact was a shining example of the merger between the pulpit and social causes that liberal religious groups increasingly pushed for in the nineteenth century. Moreover, remembering Higginson's lead role in a charge on a Boston courthouse, his participation in the Kansas fights between abolitionists and landholders, his part in planning John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry, and his role as the first commander of a regiment of black soldiers, recalls the clergyman, Larry Olpin reminds us, as a masculine

figure (6-7).¹⁷⁹ If, as Ann Douglas argues, the clergy progressively was feminized/emasculated in nineteenth-century America, we gain further appreciation of the dramatic figure Higginson cut for his colleagues.

Dickinson's specific religious community often is overlooked in analysis of her poetry, Jane Donahue Eberwein argues in her fine analysis of the Congregationalist roots of Dickinson's sacramental language; to ignore the role the church community played in the distribution of Dickinson's poetry similarly glosses over a historical reality.¹⁸⁰ The Dickinson family's relationship with the Jenkins family, for instance, illustrates a rich crosscurrent between church relationship and publication. As minister of the First Congregational Church in Amherst from 1867 to 1877 (Buckingham, Index 580), the Reverend Jenkins witnessed Edward Dickinson's formal joining of the church and spoke to regenerate Emily on request of her father. As close friends too of the Dickinson clan, the Jenkins children served as childhood playmates of Austin and Susan's children. Reverend Jenkins even returned to Amherst to conduct the separate funerals of Edward and Emily.¹⁸¹ Son MacGregor Jenkins's "Childhood Recollections of Emily Dickinson"

¹⁷⁹ In Olpin's words, ". . . Higginson was a MANLY man" (8), though he makes this statement while observing Higginson's support of woman's rights.

¹⁸⁰ See "Emily Dickinson and the Calvinist Sacramental Tradition." Eberwein points out how conceiving of Dickinson's sacramental language in Catholic terms has diverted attention from the very specific role the sacraments played for Congregationalists. Her analysis, while excellent, by default demands direct involvement to determine influence, however; it seems to me possible that Dickinson might have received Catholic imagery and language through other venues.

¹⁸¹ On Jenkins's involvement with Edward's and Emily's religious status and on his role at their funerals, see Lundin (189, 227, 262).

thus seems at home in the liberal *Christian Union* on grounds of both religious background and personal connection, and Jenkins family's supplying of a Dickinson poem to M. A. DeWolfe Howe in the 1890s took place in the context of an enduring family friendship with Susan and the children.¹⁸²

The submission process followed by Dickinson's editors likewise illustrates the relationships and contacts they had access to as members of that community. Attempts by Todd, Higginson, and Susan to place poems in religious periodicals (*The Independent*, *The Christian Register*, and *The Christian Union*) were not "cold" but arose instead from interest expressed by each publication, either formally through critical reviews and notices or through the more informal channels of personal connection. Higginson clearly was well connected to the *Christian Union*, as evidenced by its ready publication of his "introduction" of Dickinson after *The Century* stalled for too long. And Susan's employment of the *Independent* as a protest vehicle reveals the degree to which the family had a relationship with editor William Hayes Ward. It was through personal channels that Susan first learned of Ward's interest, and it was to the family's personal relationship with the editor that she appealed when grounding her right to submit the poems. Even Susan's ready surrender of Dickinson manuscript poems to Ward's "sister" shows a close understanding of the journal's workings. That sister, Susan Hayes Ward, in fact eventually served as office editor for the journal and Susan's promise to send more poems for her reflects her smart understanding of the extent to which personal

¹⁸² For that poem's first publication, see M.A. de Wolfe Howe, Jr.'s November 1894 article in *The Book Buyer*, "Literary Affairs in Boston." Jenkins would go on to write a novel based on Dickinson and a memoir (*Emily Dickinson: Friend and Neighbor*), which offered an early positive portrait of Susan.

relationships could lead to publication.¹⁸³ Finally, the John White Chadwick *Christian Register* review that so “delighted” Lavinia came after the author already had been corresponding with Higginson. The two prominent Unitarians both were involved with the *Nation*—Higginson was the journal’s poetry critic and Chadwick served as “a reviewer . . . from its first volume till the last year of its life . . .” (B[acon], “Chadwick,” *DAB* 589). Their co-promotion, beyond Dickinson, of priest-poet Father John Tabb shows Higginson sending the poet Chadwick’s way and Chadwick later forwarding a letter to Higginson in which Tabb endorses Dickinson’s poetry. In the end, the paper trail connected to Dickinson’s publication in religious periodicals is thick—with numerous correspondents involved and inside information passed readily.¹⁸⁴

That the editors were selling *poetry* to the magazines no doubt helped. Poetry, Dickinson’s periodical publication shows, had a ready market in religious venues; and ministers, Elizabeth Horan argues, were a useful group in the books’ marketing.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Elizabeth Horan cites Ward’s reading of Dickinson to his sisters as evidence of “the success of marketing Dickinson as a poet to be read ‘at home’” (“Mabel Loomis Todd,” 74). That at least one sister (Susan Ward) offered a prominent critical review of the decade’s poetry and eventually served as Office Editor (1902-1908) suggests, as do the editorial positions held by Abbott’s and Barrows’s wives, how permeable home and work worlds could be for women in publishing. For the article, which praises Dickinson, see Susan Hayes Ward, “A Decade of Poetry, 1889-1899.” On her official position, see *The Independent* anniversary issue, in which she figures as the only female editor among those pictured.

¹⁸⁴ See also Dennis Wortman, whose 7 October 1891 *Christian Intelligencer* article tells of having “spent a forenoon last summer with Miss Dickinson’s manuscripts . . .” (210).

¹⁸⁵ Horan, who focuses on how the books were aimed at a ladies’ market, writes that “Ministers were important as opinion leaders, and they also could influence women’s taste . . .” (“Mabel Loomis Todd” 74). Some of Todd’s many speaking engagements,

Fiction, as literary historians have documented, to great degree excited strong disapproval through much of the nineteenth century on moral grounds.¹⁸⁶ That censorious attitude had softened by the 1890s, but longstanding practice appears to have built up an alternate interest in poetry as literary outlet. One major selection criterion for American poetry anthologists of the 1820s and 1830s, Alan Golding asserts, was its morality (6)—a principle that held with later anthologists like Rufus Griswold, whose work illustrated a more largely held belief (tempering the need for historical coverage) “that American poetry should be represented by specimens of the utmost moral purity, that poetry’s function is inspirational” (14). American poetry anthologists like Samuel Kettell, Rufus Griswold, and George B. Cheever, Golding adds, “were all ministers” (174 n8). And while Golding cites an 1878 collection as “[t]he last . . . to use moral virtue as a selective principle . . .” (20),¹⁸⁷ Carlin T. Kindilien’s classic, if mocking, description of typical poetry volumes in the 1890s still asserts a primary role for religion in the era’s poetry. “Only the love lyric approaches the religious poem in popularity,” he claims. “No volume can receive the audience’s nod without at least one expression of orthodox religious sentiment, preferably Protestant, but the work of a Catholic poet is occasionally accepted” (Kindilien 14). And Edmund Clarence Stedman, surveying the American

Horan notes, came from “invitations” that “Higginson obtained” “[i]n his capacity as a clergyman” . . . (“Mabel Loomis Todd” 74).

¹⁸⁶ See especially Cathy Davidson’s important *Revolution and the Word: the rise of the novel in America*.

¹⁸⁷ The year even saw the purposeful exclusion of “hymns and ‘religious’ poems” from an English anthology of American verse (Golding 20).

scene with considerably more pride in 1885, saw the nation's poetry as finding particular success in its concern with things religious. "The religious verse of America, whether the work of poets at large, or of those whose rage is chiefly confined to it, . . . ranks in quality, if not in quantity, with the hymnology of other lands" (50).¹⁸⁸

The three religious periodicals that published Dickinson likewise showed investment in the genre. The poetry in the *Christian Union*, Mott writes, "was not very remarkable" ("*Outlook*" 424), but the journal's broad and early interest in "things Dickinson" points to an abiding interest in the culture of poetry. More notably, *The Independent* attracted respect for its poetic offerings, a fact bolstered by Susan's judgment of the magazine; that respect comes through even in Mott's twentieth-century judgment of the weekly. And even in the *Christian Register*, dominated by regular departments that conveyed church-related news, its poetry presentation lacking unusual care, the genre clearly filled both pragmatic and aesthetic needs.¹⁸⁹ As if proof of the

¹⁸⁸ A later claim of his in this respect makes even more clear the nationalism he was asserting for this achievement. "No country has possessed a group, equal in talent, that has presented more willingly whatsoever things are pure, lovely, and of good report We have no proof that the immorality of a people like the French, with exquisite resources at command, can evolve an art or literature greater than in the end may result from the virile chastity of the Saxon mind," Stedman writes in a chapter on John Greenleaf Whittier (123-124).

¹⁸⁹ In the two years' worth of issues I analyzed for its poetry content, the weekly contained at least one poem (October 1, 1891) and at most seven (April 3, 1890), with an average of between three and four poems per issue and a median number of three. The magazine generally placed those poems in top-left positions; one was most likely to find those three poems immediately following "Pro and Con" (the correspondence department); immediately following the "Religious Notices" department; and heading up "The Home" department. Of the poets appearing therein, fifty-five were penned by different "Reverends," making for appearance slightly more frequent than every other issue; add to that total poems like "The Church Bells" by non-ministerial authors, as well

integral function poetry held in religious communities, a collection of it served even to fund the building of a church.¹⁹⁰ And poems included throughout the periodical showed their deep-seated role in the church's ceremonies and programs. Various "Reverends" were frequently authors of the magazine's poems, and poems further paid homage to church programs when they acknowledged, "suggested by a sermon of Rev. Reed Stuart" (Montgomery 496) or "After a sermon . . . at Scituate" (Parsons 599). The periodical likely contributed to church programs too. The high number of Easter poems in the April 3, 1890, issue suggests the magazine's useful function as performance text.

Religious magazines thus offered a ready hand in delivering "poetry" to an especially interested audience. Too, these publications, while not as prestigious as others that published Dickinson's poetry, like *Scribner's Magazine* and *St. Nicholas*, or as "national" as the *Youth's Companion*, offered a local affirmation and advertisement of the Dickinson publishing project. While neither Lavinia nor Austin subscribed to the *Christian Union*, which published Higginson's opening introduction of Dickinson, Congregationalist Amherst offered ready access to the periodical and appeared to give

as poems "suggested by a sermon of Rev. Reed Stuart" (July 30, 1891) or "After a sermon . . . at Scituate" (September 18, 1890), and the sense of religious purpose to the verse broadens. Despite the preponderance of ministerial figures, the single most published poet in this sample was a woman. Hattie Tyng Griswold, author of *Home Life of Great Authors* (1887) and the then-forthcoming *Personal Sketches of Recent Authors* (1898), had twelve poems published, especially impressive considering that the periodical did not publish "clusters" of multiple poems by a single author (*The Independent* published as many as four Dickinson poems together).

¹⁹⁰ An item reported on a book of reprints that "The little book of poems and sentences issued by the ladies of the Unitarian church of Oakland, Cal., under the title 'Borrowings,' has had an almost phenomenal success, over \$1,100 being already realized from the sale of copies for the benefit of the church building fund" ("Literary Notes" 383).

evidence of the reach of the Dickinson publishing project—Vinnie “was not expecting the notice so early, when a friend put it in [her] hand” (AB 65) and Austin’s “attention was called to the article by a neighbor . . . in whose copy [he] read it . . .” (AB 66). The three religious periodicals that published Dickinson’s poetry thus offered a highly accessible outlet that brought her to a highly trained community of readers that in turn made “success” visible to the editorial team. For “[God is a distant, stately Lover,—],” however, it would be that very active model of readership and dialogue that would encourage the poem’s denunciation.

III.

Periodicals long had fostered open dialogue with and between their readers—a practice that distinguishes the medium from “the book” for its capture of reader response and public record of the publication process. In the eighteenth century, Paula Bennett points out, “the spaces where women’s writing appeared—typically, letter and poetry columns—had become the designated public sites for the discussion of gender issues,” offering a venue for readers to trade barbs (*Poets in the Public Sphere*6). And examples abound of how periodicals used space to communicate with contributors: the nineteenth-century *Godey’s* lectured readers about payment expectations and commented on submissions (Weber 39; Okker 33); the *Knickerbocker* even “took pleasure in sparring with its writers” in its aptly titled “Gossip With Readers and Correspondents” (Weber 40); and *St. Nicholas* apparently garnered its “most-loved” status in part from the reader interactions it encouraged. Even Dickinson’s original appeal to Higginson, prompted by

one of his articles, illustrates the accessibility that periodicals provided to writers; that Higginson's article was a "Letter to a Young Contributor" reveals Dickinson's response was predicated on the illusion of dialogue. The class of magazines perhaps most strongly associated with active reader-editor dialogue, nineteenth-century women's magazines, offers abundant evidence of the significant role such an outlet could have for readers. Patricia Okker's analysis of *The Ladies' Home Journal*, for instance, finds that the "sisterly editorial voice" of it and other women's magazines "tended to value and present readers, writers and editors as equally important participants in a periodical conversation" (31). Responding to this voice, readers wrote *Journal* editor Louisa Knapp "about personal problems, such as alcoholic husbands" (Okker 23); the magazine "for some time had a staff that "individually answered millions of inquires and appeals" (Okker 149).¹⁹¹

Okker notes that "letters to editors" were not unique to "periodicals edited by and for women"; unusual, she claims, was how these periodicals' letters departments "broke down the barrier between editor and audience, to create an actual dialogue" (31).¹⁹² That may be the case, for while my analysis of the *Christian Register* reveals a periodical heavily invested in debate and in reader-to-reader dialogue, I would argue that it was "multivocal and dialogic" (Okker 31) in different shades and ways. While I would emphasize, for instance, the barriers removed in a publication like the *Register*—and

¹⁹¹ On letters to the twentieth-century *Ms.*, see Okker (165).

¹⁹² Children's and religious magazines might be considered similarly oriented toward women. In any case, a like example arises with the *Outlook's* "Aunt Patience Department," established by Lyman Abbott's wife. "Aunt Patience" "received many hundreds of letters from children of all ages, published some of them with comments, answered others personally" and sent correspondents an annual Christmas card" (L. Abbott 338-339).

point to its reader-to-reader dialogue as even more exemplary of the phenomenon—I would emphasize also the barriers that remained, through the superintending of that dialogue and through a rigorous model of reading that the *Register* advocated and policed.

That the *Register* was part of a movement well worth noting, editor Samuel J. Barrows showed no doubt. The *Register* glows with the general self-satisfaction in the medium the era largely fostered, showing a true appreciation for periodicals as a cultural phenomenon and achievement. One item applauds *Scribner's* printing of indexes for volumes 1 through 10 of the magazine, because “This index will place this excellent body of material within the reach of students” (“The Magazines,” 18 February 1892, 111). And an apology about limited coverage in the “Magazine” department gushes, “No better index is furnished of the energy of modern thought than the unabated stream of periodical literature. It is not merely mist, bubble, and foam: it represents a large volume of thought flowing through many channels and irrigating many minds” (“The Magazines,” 1 May 1890, 282). Barrows, a clergy with reporting experience at the *New York Tribune*, ably edited the weekly from 1880 to 1896 (M[ussey], “Barrows,” *DAB* 653). Mott justly calls him “versatile” (IV: 294), but it is worth noting that he was aided significantly by his wife, Isabel. She reports that he said, “I will take the Christian Register, if you will share the work with me” (I. Barrows 106) and that when he was away on his extensive trips, she “always looked after putting the paper to press, reading proof, writing my own

share of editorials etc. . . “ (I. Barrows 108).¹⁹³ The paper they created certainly was more than a newsletter, but it contained an abundance of localized news, reports, and appeals. The magazine’s regular departments dominate, including, with some variation: “Editorial,” “Musings,” “Brevities,” “Pro and Con,” “Spiritual Life,” “The Sunday School,” “Religious Intelligence,” “Business Notices,” “Marriages,” “Religious Notices,” “The Pulpit,” “Sermon Gleanings,” “Spirit of the Press,” “Literature,” “The Home,” “Personals,” “Science,” “Here and There,” “Clubs, Guilds, and Societies,” “Education,” “Temperance,” “Charities and Reforms,” and “Pleasantries.” These titles, as headings for announcements and reports, say something about the *Register*’s priorities. They also suggest the rather modest role the *Register* held in that “unabated stream of periodical literature” that “irrigat[ed] many minds.”¹⁹⁴

The periodical certainly fostered an ambitious set of goals, however. Other religious periodicals might have aims of reform and instruction within their own churches, but the *Christian Register* ’s mission statement says quite bluntly that it “was

¹⁹³ Similarly, *Outlook* editor Lyman Abbott says his wife “was an unofficial co-editor” “[f]rom the first” (338).

¹⁹⁴ Scholarship on the *Christian Register* is scarce. Mott discusses it briefly in the context of his broader profile of religious magazines but offers no detailed profile of it, as he does for the more general interest *Independent* and *Outlook* (previously *Christian Union*). My own assessment of the *Register*, based on my study of two years’ worth of the magazine, concurs on several key points with Candy Gunther Brown’s chapter on religious periodicals in her recent unpublished doctoral dissertation, *Salt to the World*. Brown argues that “Evangelicals viewed periodicals, alongside other kinds of publications, as means to enter the world in order to exert a transformative spiritual influence. Subsidiary to this overall agenda, periodicals did particular kinds of cultural work: unifying denominational and evangelical identities by establishing communication networks within and between groups; giving evangelicals a hearing in the world; defending ‘truth’ and refuting ‘error’” (138).

started to promote the spread of Unitarianism in America” (31 December 1895, 859). Stroupe claims that “No direct relation existed between the numerical strength of a denomination and the number or circulation of its publications” (27). Still, the competition between Protestant denominations and the corresponding emphasis on numbers and on territory—how many converted, how many tracts and Bibles distributed, and where—meant a perceived close connection between the dissemination of a religion and its periodical. As a result, standard periodical business gained special urgency; a *Register* appeal for circulation efforts, for instance, remarks that with an increased subscription list “it may be enabled to become a more efficient missionary for the spread of the religion of Jesus and all that this stands for” (S.W.B. 2-3). And satisfaction with distribution likewise could offer proof of a larger effectiveness. The *Register*’s editors reprint, for example, an item from the *Congregationalist* about the presence of Unitarianism in California: “Unitarianism, by the way, is more active and aggressive here than in the East. I have found it organized in almost every community I have visited, its ministers identified with educational and other local interests, while the *Christian Register* is seen in all reading-rooms and some hotels, even when there is no other religious paper” (“Brevities,” 26 June 1890, 407). Although criticizing Eastern Unitarians (and, considering the rival nature of the source, possibly Unitarians as a whole), the statement ties religious mission to periodical distribution, and the *Register* becomes proof positive of denominational success.

These evangelical goals encouraged a perceived preacher-periodical correlation where, it should be added, periodicals had the advantage. Earlier in the century, one

source likened “a well conducted religious periodical” to “a thousand preachers, flying in almost as many directions, by means of horses, mail stages, steam boats, rail road cars, ships, etc., etc., offering life and salvation to the sons of men in almost every clime” (qtd. in Humphrey 105). But with ministers “on the markets” (Douglas 8) after the final act of disestablishment in 1833, periodicals also became a necessary stop-gap measure. Preachers, the *Register* implied, were facing increasingly precarious audiences. One item chastised an evangelical minister for “caus[ing] . . . a breeze” when he criticized “the excessive fanning on a hot Sunday evening in his congregation”; that “some of the audience left the church for a cooler situation and one less exposed to draughts,” the item implies, was understandable (“Brevities,” 31 July 1890, 486). And in one joke, a “rather dry” minister explains that he keeps his audience because he preaches at the penitentiary (“Holding His Audiences” 612).

But a more general optimism imbued consideration of the relationship between the “pulpit” and the “press”: “The modern pulpit is not complete without a printing-office,” one editorial declared, “and the modern newspaper is not complete without connection to the pulpit” (“Brevities,” 12 November 1891, 743). Postbellum evangelist Dwight L. Moody, argues Bruce J. Evensen, used the “mass media” “to reach readers unable to hear his preaching in person and to create a climate of opinion that would encourage ‘a great anxiety to be present’” (120). Beyond hype, the pulpit-press connection offered other benefits. One *Christian Register* review of Chadwick’s printed sermons highlights the extensive reach such publications afforded, noting their distribution to “little companies in Germany, Russia, and the farthest East . . .,” and

argues in addition of the cognitive advantage printed sermons offered: “Spoken sermons touch the heart. Printed sermons, giving time for reflection, mould the thought . . .” (W. H. L. 446). Still another advantage—and one not usually associated with ephemeral periodicals—was immortality: “It is one advantage of the Register pulpit that voices from the past may speak from it as well as those from the present,” reads an item commenting on the paper’s inclusion of a sermon by a since-deceased speaker (“Brevities,” 20 March 1890, 178). For a denomination disinclined to sponsor itinerant preachers or condone revivalistic practices, the print media offered welcome advantages for sharing and recording its message.

These idealized beliefs in the power of the periodical press, remember, were held by a decidedly modest publication—plain and admittedly “in-house”—that served as a tool to relay information within the church. Remarkably, however, such confidence seems well grounded. Textbook characteristics of periodicals are present in full force in this modest publication, perhaps predicated in part on the periodical’s complementary relationship with the spoken word (as opposed to the more literary *St. Nicholas*, which pushed itself forward as book-periodical hybrid). While “periodical sharing,” for instance, is a practice highly difficult to document (though widely acknowledged), the evangelical bent even of the Unitarians and the record-sharing nature of the *Christian Register* means the periodical documents the dissemination of itself and other magazines.¹⁹⁵ Appeals came from Malden, Massachusetts, for “the address of persons

¹⁹⁵ Current scholarship’s statements on this practice follow nineteenth-century periodicals’ claims about distribution beyond their numbers. On an 1851 estimate of ten readers per one paper, see Ronald J. Zboray (“Technology” 204). Tracking this social

who wish to give their *Registers* or other Unitarian periodicals to appreciative readers” (“Brevities,” 6 February 1890, 82) and from Texas for people to send their *Registers* directly to others (“Snowed Under” 211). And two items from John S. Brown of Lawrence, Kansas, give us a specific idea of the kind of response such appeals received. He reports, “In my Post-office Mission work I have received and distributed 850 *Christian Registers* the past year, ending April 15, 1890. For the coming year, I would like 1,000 clean, well-kept, and well-read *Christian Registers*” (“Post-Office Mission” 294). A later item thanks people, only to follow with a request and report: “Ten additional ones per week could be used to good purpose. The *Register* is regarded with greater favor than any paper I send through the post-office. Since April 15, 1891, I have sent to my correspondents 472 *Registers*” (“A Card” 55). Beyond the *Register*, similar items noted the distribution of *St. Nicholas* to children of “operatives” at the “Ames Plough Works at North Easton, Mass.” (“Literary Notes,” 3 December 1891, 799) and requested, along with the *Register* and other “denominational papers and magazines,” “the standard monthlies;—*Harper’s*, *Century*, *Atlantic*, *Forum*, *Arena*, and the like” (“Periodicals Wanted” 51). What follows, though vague, offers an enthusiastic testimony about the response such requests received and the perceived power of the periodical press:

practice becomes important because periodical scholarship attaches it to claims for the medium’s influence and popularity. Examples abound, but see, for instance, Kirsten Silva Gruesz’s passing statement that “nineteenth-century periodicals passed through a number of hands, with the buyer sharing a single copy with multiple individuals . . .” (23).

The response to former appeals for such reading matter in these columns has been very liberal; and we have been able to send, mainly South and West, large quantities of selected periodicals. From many sides, and from remote places, where reading matter is as scarce as it is abundant with us, come testimonials of the value of the mission In view of the great good to be done, all who have good reading coming into the home should hesitate either to destroy it or allow it to accumulate uselessly. A little of the tide of reading matter that almost threatens to deluge some homes may thus be drawn off into channels where it will be of great use. (“Periodicals Wanted” 51)

Clearly the model for earlier nineteenth-century print culture Nord describes held fast with *Christian Register* management. The desire “to supply reading material to everyone, regardless of demand, regardless of location, regardless of ability to pay” (Nord, “Systematic” 242) surfaces as a central concern in the magazine; the magazine’s record of communication about the effort helps us begin to imagine how such a project was carried out.

Too, when considering qualities of multivocalism and dialogism detected in literary, family, and women’s magazines, the *Register* offers ample evidence of such practices. Indeed, while the *Register* offers ample editor-reader communication, it also features arguably the most elusive form of dialogue—reader-to-reader—in full force throughout the periodical. The magazine records, to a certain degree, the actions that reading prompted and reveals the very decided advantages that a specialized, “in-house”

publication could have.¹⁹⁶ In addition to the requests for donations to various missions, readers might write in for “Information Wanted”: “Can any reader of the Register furnish or put me in the way of finding two beautiful poems which were popular fifteen years ago, ‘The Creed of the Bells’ and ‘The Child on the Judgment Seat’?” one K.L.W. asks (“Information Wanted,” 19 November 1891, 761). Remarkable as this request may seem, what bears further comment is that people apparently responded to it, as another item reported: “‘K.L. W.’ returns thanks to several of our readers for sending her copies and information in regard to the poems concerning which she asked” (“Brevities,” 3 December 1891, 791). Other appeals included requests for “a few good books to form the nucleus of a library” (“Books Needed” 67), the “December 22, 1887, issue of *Christian Register*” (“Brevities,” 17 April 1890), and “an office desk” for a “charitable” society (“Brevities,” 13 November 1890, 733). The request for the desk in particular shows the degree to which the periodical engaged in administrative functions beyond the production and distribution of itself—“If any one who has such a desk to give or lend will notify M.C.J., *Christian Register* office, it will be sent for” (“Brevities,” 13 November 1890, 733) shows the periodical’s willingness to serve at the least as contact point for the coordinated donation and pickup of the item. But one of the most remarkable examples of “reader response” comes in the following anecdote, which I quote at length:

¹⁹⁶ Longinow likewise asserts as evidence “that the Pentecostal Herald’s readers did more than passively scan its pages” : “the manner in which so many talked back, by means of letters, to this newspaper” (253). And Brown comments that “[t]he relationships forged between lay correspondents and readers served to supplement, and in some instances replace, relationships in a local church community” (162).

It is often said that honesty is the best policy. It was honesty, not policy, that led Rev. A. W. Jackson to protest against the piracy of the Encyclopaedia Britannica; but his honesty has been suitably rewarded. In the course of a communication to the *Christian Register* a week or two ago he incidentally mentioned that he did not own a copy of that work. His remark was perfectly ingenuous. However, he writes us that five days after the issue of the paper containing his letter the expressman brought to his door “a heavy box containing the Britannica in all its glorious proportions. No pirated edition, let me make haste to say, but an honest one,—one that a man may be proud, not feel ashamed to see upon his bookshelves.” Mr. Jackson has no clew whatever to the identity of his anonymous benefactor; but “since it seems reasonable plain that the one who sent me this treasure reads the *Register*,” he adds, “through the *Register* I will express my gratitude.” (“Brevities,” 17 March 1892, 166-167)

The magazine, in this case, offers the original place for an opinion to be voiced, delivers that opinion to others, prompts the giving of the encyclopedias, and registers in the end a thank-you note for the gift.¹⁹⁷

The cacophony of voices the *Register* featured most often were engaged in debate, however.¹⁹⁸ Few topics were considered to be beyond argument: editorial

¹⁹⁷ Of course, periodicals have an investment in the image of themselves as effective contact points. Such exchanges, after all, seemed to illustrate the reach of a periodical's distribution and the extent to which it was read. Ezra Greenspan tells how in one *Putnam's* serial, “Frederick Cozzens drew attention to its power of mediacy when he had Mr. Sparrowgrass assure his wife that, although he didn't know the answer to her question about local New York place names, he knew how to find the answer: ‘I will make it a public matter through the pages of *Putnam*’” (305).

comment anticipated disagreement even over published poems (“Rev. H.G. Spaulding’s sonnet on ‘Ibsen’s Dramas’ will probably create a difference of opinion” [“Brevities,” 29 May 1890, 338]). And the editor configured the periodical’s space to showcase varying opinions. Barrows reputedly “had a strong sense of justice and always gave writers of different views ample space to plead each his own cause. When opposing views were offered, he held the balances with unswerving firmness, leaving the public to decide between the opponents, but unhesitatingly expressing his own opinion in the editorial columns with dignity and unfailing courtesy” (I. Barrows 107-108). The *Register*’s editorial correspondence department—notably titled “Pro and Con”—offered the most prominent arena for debate; even the department’s title anticipates and configures letters within as such.

But beyond such designated spaces was a fabric of dispute and multiple opinions that filled the publication. According to Longinow, the practice of reprinting material in a manner that fostered or mimicked debate was not unusual for nineteenth-century Christian newspaper editors; “the typical editor,” he says, citing “newspapers in the nineteenth century upper Midwest,” “read scores of newspapers—secular and religious—before each edition of his own, seeking material suitable for inclusion alongside

¹⁹⁸ The church had a tradition of debate and conversation, as established by Douglas’s evocation of Catharine Maria Sedgwick’s 1820s diaries. The diaries “reveal an earnestness of communal talk and intellectual pursuit that makes the Unitarian circle of Boston intelligentsia . . . sound like an extension of a Harvard Divinity School Seminar” (Douglas 38).

contributed material from staff writers” (247).¹⁹⁹ The *Register* was no exception. Pastiche that it was, it follows, for example, a reprinted Dayton *Christian World* article with a response of its own (“Are Unitarians Christian” 487) and represents the defense to an original article by reprinting two articles from another periodical (“Mr. Savage’s Catechism Defended” 217). And one extreme case reveals the dramatic level that such debates could reach: a challenge leveled by the *Sacred Heart Review* responds to a claim by the *Christian Register* “that parochial schools do not educate as well as the public schools.” The Catholic periodical proposed:

Let the *Register* select three men, experienced, fair-minded educators. The *Review* will select three; and let these six select one to be added to their number. Let the *Register* select for examination fifty parochial schools, and the *Review* will select fifty public schools of the same grade and age. Let the committee examine them, and publish the result of the examination; and let this result, instead of the talk, talk, we have now, be accepted as evidence. We now offer to place with the *Boston Daily Globe* \$500 against \$500 to be placed there by the *Christian Register*. If the result of the examination favors the *Register*, it may take the \$1,000. If it favors the *Review*, the money must be used to build a parochial school in this parish. (“Editorial,” 13 February 1890, 98)

¹⁹⁹ Brown describes the practice as assuming an even more collaborative form, so that editors solicited “excerpt[ed] passages” for reprinting; one periodical “urged readers to look for useful texts . . . in their scrapbooks”; and another “asked readers to draw ‘their pencils around choice paragraphs,’ so as to share these passages ‘with their friends’ through the magazine” (173).

The challenge leveled by the *Review* not only proposes how order might be imposed on a fractious debate. Its number-laden terms also set conditions by which to arrive at a “result” that will replace “talk, talk . . . as evidence.” Of course the purported cry to end the debate opens up more possibilities for disagreement: the involvement of a third party (the *Boston Daily Globe*) confirms another publication as an outlet for dissent, and while the *Register* agrees to pursue conjointly the question, it demeans the *Review*’s proposed bet (“We do not believe in betting” [“Editorial,” 13 February 1890, 98]).

Clearly, religious periodical culture, with its duel-like arguments, modeled for its readers a system of opinionated and activist reading. Stories abound of nineteenth-century religious readers writing in to various publications with fastidious distress. Such readers “charged [*The Century*] with having spoken slightly of the Methodist Church in a certain article or story” (Tooker 32) and editors excised or altered passages that might seem irreverent (John 155). Fear that getting one writer for *Scribner’s* (later *Century*) would mean having ““to run the guantlet [sic] of either the mothers or the ministers”” (John 155) reflects the perceived consolidation of power—and complaints—in two groups. Division over theological issues could seriously damage circulation, as when the Presbyterian division into New and Old Schools caused one South Atlantic States editor “to lose about 25 percent of his 3,000 subscribers, including nearly all those from North Carolina” (Stroupe 15-16). And, in another case, a Southern Baptist editor in disagreement with church leadership resigned his editorship only to return “with his own publication, the *Baptist Champion*” (Stroupe 29). In fact, that “active reading” could mean activist reading was something such publications encouraged. For, says Michael A.

Longinow, “it can be argued that editors of religious newspapers quite effectively urged readers, upon putting down their newspaper, to pick up their Bible, their lesson plans for Sunday School, or a pen and paper for letter-writing to a Congressman or Methodist bishop” (248).²⁰⁰

But to encourage such reading was to incur its consequences as well.

Congressmen and church officials were not the only recipients of readers’ letters. A *Christian Register* reader, one of Barrows’s “Musings” relates, “stopped his paper because an extract made from a contemporary and published without comment and indorsement, and simply to show the ‘Spirit of the Press,’ did not conform to his opinions” (654).²⁰¹ With a readership so trained for action, the most careful reading became quite necessary—both for the prevention of groundless acts and for Barrows’s own retention of a stable readership base. The climate of debate, of dialogism, thus

²⁰⁰ “Religious” readers were well-trained to function in print culture at large, if we go by the accounts that detail their objections to a variety of secular publications. See especially Nord, “Reading the Newspaper,” who in looking at early twentieth-century readers’ responses notes that “. . . the newspaper text often prompted the reader to think of another special text: the Bible” or, in other cases, “trigger[ed] a pat religious response” (253). In extreme cases, as Brown documents, “evangelicals’ sense of a priesthood of all believers encouraged clerical and lay editors to publish periodicals in the name of their respective denominations” (142-3). Such papers could be protests of sorts: “Unofficial periodicals at time prompted denominational unity, but independent papers also stimulated the multiplication of denominations and the formation of extra-denominational societies: with only a few exceptions, new periodicals preceded and, to some degree, prepared the way for the emergence of new causes” (Brown 143).

²⁰¹ Readers wrote in complaints to the *Century* about perceived slights toward their denomination. And Robert Scholnick writes about how the magazine, as *Scribner’s Monthly*, “regularly attacked the theological rigidities of the denominational ‘machines’”; one series of articles, he continues, prompted a vigorous debate led by the denominational publications (“J. G. Holland” 70).

coexisted with one of instruction, where the magazine made clear that activist reading carried with it a burden of responsibility.

To that end, the magazine itself enacted a careful kind of reading. A keen interest in literary items of the day thus paired enthusiasm in the day's literary culture with discussion of the smallest of details. In fact, it bears remarking that while plenty of periodicals sought to meddle with Dickinson's poetry (most notably, Aldrich's proposal of an alternate stanza for "I taste a liquor never brewed"), it was a religious periodical that speculated on textual errors in the poems—an early *Independent* review that caused Todd great consternation.²⁰² Indeed a kind of textual pickiness or fastidiousness surfaces throughout the *Christian Register*—one published letter, for instance, complains about "the false accent which the author had forced upon 'arbutus'" ("Arbutus" 551) in a poem reprinted from the *Christian Register*. And in notes that called attention to the literary offerings of other magazines, attention was drawn to a Whittier poem in "complete and perfect form" ("Literary Notes," 31 July 1890, 495). Composition matters became topics for debate—one item notes not only the *Scribner's* publication of Lowell's "last poem," but the accompanying facsimile and note by Charles Eliot Norton about the poem's unfinished state. *Was the poem a first draft?* the notice speculates with great interest—remarking on "[t]he blank left for an adjective, and the corrections in some of the lines" ("The Magazines," 17 March 1892, 175).

²⁰² For the review, see [Kinsley Twining and William Hayes Ward], "Poems by Emily Dickinson." Twining and Ward incorrectly identify "a few serious misprints" in *Poems* (1890) (55). The charges leveled by the review prompted publisher Thomas Niles to question Todd and Higginson to write to critic Maurice Thompson, the supposed author. On the incident, see Bingham (*AB* 77-79).

More general notices of magazines, moreover, performed the larger reading of periodicals for readers. Readers learned something about the layout of such publications, with the *Register*'s response to "sensational headlines" in a recent *Independent*. "[I]ts editorial columns," the *Register* narrates, "were prefaced by a telegram introduced by seven head-lines displayed in the fashion of the secular newspaper, and opening with 'Wonderful News'" ("Brevities," 9 April 1891, 227). The treatment of that news, an archeological discovery, the *Register* opines, sets the *Independent* apart: "if such a dispatch had come to the average daily newspaper, it would have been tucked away in some obscure corner of the paper, probably flattened under a column of base ball news; but no one knows better than Dr. Ward of the *Independent* the significance of such a discovery" ("Brevities," 9 April 1891, 227). This statement comments on Ward's archaeological training and affirms for readers a special role for the religious weekly. It also, however, performs a more basic role: while position and typography (capitals here) are not stable categories, while front page placement and capital letters are not flush with inherent significance, they did signal for contemporary readers the proportionate importance of the material. The *Register*'s commentary here thus both enforces and enacts nineteenth-century readerly practices. A notice of the *Century* gratefully acknowledges "several graceful poems, mostly from the pens of women, and one or two sketches and stories in a lighter vein" ("The Magazines," 10 April 1890, 235) and another comments with relief on *Scribner's Magazine* that "There is enough fiction and poetry, however, to offset" other material of a heavier nature ("The Magazines," 1 May 1890, 282). Statements like these mimic the kind of reading other editors, writers, and

publishers believed was taking place—as did the *St. Nicholas* writer that laid out a periodical hierarchy in “A Diet of Candy” or the advertising specialist who described women grabbing hairpins after reading the advertisements “to mutilate the pages [of a magazine] in a languid quest for the month’s poetry” (qtd. in Garvey 173).

Readers were instructed too, proffered editorial advice about how to read. As such, they might be given homework assignments. Commenting on one selection reprinted in the *Christian Register*, an editor “advise[d] readers to make themselves acquainted with the complete article . . .” (“Editorial,” 13 August 1891, 517). And, lest they shirk their readerly duties, subscribers were warned during summer vacation, “We hope every subscriber to the Christian Register who is taking a holiday at mountain or sea has had copies sent to his or her temporary address, and if so, that they are always read” (A. W. L. 535). But readers also were “instructed” through editorial efforts to make the workings of the periodical more transparent, often through the space provided in the “Brevities” and “Editorial” departments. One item, for instance, proposed a “wastebasket” issue, which “would be made of the things that do not get published anywhere except at private expense. . . . It may be supposed that very little of such stuff comes to this office; but those of our readers who don’t like the things we publish might be interested to read sometimes those that we reject” (“Brevities,” 24 September 1891, 615). Or, another exhorts: “Many authors do not know what they owe to the art of printing. If their articles were published in their original handwriting, fame for them would be impossible. How many readers would Horace Greeley or Dean Stanley have

had, if people had had to decipher their chirographic Choctaw?” (“Brevities,” 27 March 1890, 194).

Keenly attuned to the administration of the print culture it participated in, the weekly weighed in on matters of courtesy and professionalism related specifically to religious periodical practices—summarizing, in one case, a debate over the unauthorized reprinting of Phillips Brooks’s “Lenten lectures” and ultimately weighing in itself: “There is an especial reason why no report of an address by Dr. Brooks should be published against his protest. It is that Dr. Brooks talks with such rapidity that it is impossible to take him verbatim” (“Editorial,” 23 April 1891, 257).²⁰³ As a magazine that printed, along with original items, reprints and transcriptions, the magazine rose up to define “original” and “intention”—an issue that it touched upon in defending its publication of Dickinson’s poem. In some cases, this distinction exhibited the customary pride of ownership that accompanied first printings elsewhere, as, no doubt, when the periodical notes that a Julia Ward Howe poem “was especially prepared for our columns”

²⁰³ The prior item summarizes the debate:

A question of journalistic courtesy as well as of journalistic ethics has lately been raised in the religious journals. The *Churchman* published reports of the Lenten lectures of Rev. Phillips Brooks against his protest. Dr. Brooks has published a card to that effect. The *Independent*, in commenting upon the matter, says: “He has no right to protest against the report of a public address. The *Churchman* did right.” The *Christian at Work*, however, takes a different view, and says: “The *Churchman* did wrong: under the circumstances it should not have printed these reports. The *Christian at Work* once received a like protest from Rev. Dr. R.S. Storrs against the publication of a sermon preached by him; and, although it was already in type and placed in the forms ready for printing, we took it out and cancelled the publication. The Golden Rule ought to operate in such matters as this, and certainly among religious newspapers. (“Editorial,” 23 April 1891, 257)

Barrows’s opinion on this matter surprises when we consider the solidity of his own reputation as stenographer; as set down in *A Sunny Life*, even Brooks himself endorsed Barrows’s skill (108).

(“Editorial,” 17 December 1891, 823). But such comments also speak of the periodical’s opinionated and activist readership. The periodical’s place in a culture of argument and debate suggest why it was so easy for readers to write in with complaints over Dickinson’s *Register* poem; the standards of “reading” the periodical modeled and sought to enforce make clear that activist reading carried with it a burden of responsibility. How the *Register* editor and Todd and Higginson subsequently defended Dickinson’s “religious propriety” would seek to remove objectionable material from the paths of such readers. But the burden of responsibility the *Register* placed on its readers ultimately offered another avenue by which to defend Dickinson and hold his readers responsible for their reactions.

IV.

In seeking to make Dickinson less objectionable to quarrelsome readers, the defense that *Register* editor Barrows mounts, as well as the subsequent editorial acts by Todd and Higginson, resituate Dickinson in a sentimental religious poetry context. Todd already had presented Dickinson similarly in *The Independent*. The three Todd-submitted poems the magazine first published put Dickinson on comfortable terms with a readership likely looking less for overtly religious poems than for poems more vaguely suitable for a sentimental religious context—poems, in fact, that would have been well suited for any general interest/literary late nineteenth-century periodical. One chronicles a funeral from the deceased’s perspective (“Emigravit”) and another tells of “A Jewel” the speaker fails to guard adequately and thus loses. “Fringed Gentian”—a not entirely

religious poem, but the most religious of the Todd-submitted group—relates how “God made a little gentian; / It tried to be a rose / And failed” until the frost prompted similar flowers to blossom and the flower realized its own potential. The poem’s closing line—“Creator! Shall I bloom?”—suggests that the speaker, like the gentian, has endured “frost.”²⁰⁴ All this happens, the poems’ opening “God” and closing “Creator” make clear, in a God-created and God-ordered world—again, not an aggressively religious point in 1890s America, but one easily compatible with such a setting. And while the submitted “Renunciation” set forth an eerie spiritualist tale, “The Martyrs,” which Susan held up as proof of Emily’s holiness, further solidified Dickinson’s compatibility with such a setting.²⁰⁵

When Barrows stepped forward to defend Dickinson, then, he did nothing to present her as an overtly religious poet or person. Instead, he adopted much the line Todd did in submitting Dickinson poems to religious magazines, seeking to make her inoffensive and compatible with such a setting through, most prominently, “her deep communion with nature” ([S. Barrows], “Emily Dickinson’s Poems” 133). And, he asserts, even “the recluse” “did not wish her life to be lived wholly apart “from the life of her kind,” quoting for proof the highly popular “If I can stop one heart from breaking”

²⁰⁴ See also Dickinson, “[God made a little Gentian -]” (FP 520).

²⁰⁵ See Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion of “Renunciation” and “The Martyrs.” Later *Independent* poems were definition poems—“Hope is a subtle glutton” (“Hope”), “The Past is such a curious creature” (“The Past”), “Fame is a bee” (“Fame”)—or poems that lament loss (“Spring’s Orchestra”), glorify or sanctify a “broken heart” (“Consecration”), and, with clever analogy, illuminate a state of severe disappointment (“Disenchantment”).

with its self-effacing message of service and sacrifice ([S. Barrows], “Emily Dickinson’s Poems” 134). Establishing Dickinson’s suitability with the kind of poetic program the *Register* supported, Barrows claims, “She wrote her own hymnbook and her own ritual; but we should as soon think of charging Emerson with irreverence as of so charging her” ([S. Barrows], “Emily Dickinson’s Poems” 135)—the popular comparison between Dickinson and Emerson especially suited for a Unitarian audience.²⁰⁶

Todd’s major defense came in her Introduction to *Letters* (1894), which makes dominant a two-paragraph defense of Dickinson’s religion. Dickinson, she claims, was simply of a nature contrary to the old-time religion of her town’s patriarchy; “she had in her heart too profound an adoration for the great, ever-living, and present Father to hold a shadow of real irreverence toward Him, so peculiarly near” (342). For those who remembered the revolt by other denominations toward Calvinist-based religions, it would have been clear what Todd meant by “old-time religion”; Dickinson, such a statement emphasizes, was fully in step with her times.²⁰⁷ The statement, moreover, was one that many Protestant groups—Methodists *and* Unitarians—could relate to despite their varying theologies. Once again, the practice of cribbing introductions by reviewers

²⁰⁶ Of the three “American sages and seers” Buckingham notes Dickinson was compared to, she by far was compared most frequently to Emerson (56 notices), with Whitman (20 notices) and Thoreau (14 notices) coming in far behind (“Poetry Readers and Reading in the 1890s” 167).

²⁰⁷ Although Klaus Lubbers cites a case in which Todd’s description of Dickinson’s “strict, Puritan upbringing” led to a review that cited the poet’s Calvinist roots as reason for “the real reverence which underlies the most startling of Miss Dickinson’s utterances . . . the reason for the hatred of cant and shame which is conspicuous in all of Miss Dickinson’s writings” (54).

served to spread Todd's message—*The Boston Daily Advertiser* (23 November 1894), *Boston Home Journal* (24 November 1894), *Boston Herald* (27 November 1894), and *Amherst Record* (19 December 1894) all followed Todd's lead, and articles in the *Hartford Courant* (29 December 1894) and *Boston Evening Transcript* (21 November 1896) shored up claims of Dickinson's spiritual legitimacy.²⁰⁸

Higginson contributed to that line of defense, in part by way of a cautious stance. After the *Register* poem was published, he frantically contacted Todd before his October 1891 *Atlantic Monthly* article, concerned in part with Dickinson's calling God the "Eclipse they call their Father."²⁰⁹ But beyond this concern, Higginson's co-promotion with Chadwick of priest-poet Father John Tabb only a few years later presented Higginson with a convenient and useful point of comparison that could ground Dickinson in religious respectability even after he had left active participation in the project.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ Even before *Letters* appeared, moreover, a note in the *Outlook* on the forthcoming letters says "they exhibit, writes a friend, her sense of nearness to the great Father whom she knew with such directness" ("Literary Notes" 340)—the "friend," Buckingham convincingly posits, being Todd (339).

²⁰⁹ Higginson asks if Lavinia and Austin had approved his article. "How can I print the passages about 'Eclipse they call their Father' & 'pure and terrible' without their permission . . .," his August 4 letter exclaims (*AB* 154). Dickinson's mention of an "Eclipse" surfaced in her response to his query about her family's religion: "They are religious, except me, and address an eclipse, every morning, whom they call their 'Father'" (qtd. in Higginson, "Emily Dickinson's Letters" 185).

²¹⁰ Significantly, comparisons of Dickinson to Father John Tabb, the "Catholic priest and poet known for his epigrammatic religious, intense verse," (Buckingham, Index) appeared largely from two quarters—John White Chadwick and Higginson. The comparison was no accident. The poet, whose "poetic career was sponsored and advanced by Unitarians and Congregationalists" (Litz 51 n3), benefited directly from Higginson and Chadwick's efforts. Approaching Higginson first, as the *Nation's* poetry critic, Tabb sought "his judgment on my verse" (qtd. in Litz 49). Higginson himself later

Chadwick, apparently the first to associate the two, “gave one-sentence mention to Dickinson in two reviews of the poet John Banister Tabb” (Buckingham, *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 426), the first being a 3 January 1895 *Christian Register* article. The task was left to Higginson, however, to flesh out more fully the comparison, most notably in his 23 May 1895 article on “Recent American Poetry” in the *Nation*. Higginson sees in both “the same fine, shy, recluse observation of nature and of men, and the same terse brevity of utterance (“Recent American Poetry” 441), finding greater “depths reached by” Dickinson and more “variety of interests” and “finish” and “form” in Tabb. The comparison thus is of manner, style, method, pose; but in the person, Higginson pushed forward a religious coupling—that of “the celibate woman and the celibate priest” (“Recent American Poetry” 441). In one sense, this simply establishes Dickinson further as the recluse the Todd-Higginson machine had created, asserting fully her status as “New England Nun.” It also, however, more firmly places Dickinson in the religious tradition Higginson had hinted at from the beginning, where

explained “He wished me to read & criticize his poems & I turned them over to Chadwick of Brooklyn” (AB 315). Thus began a dynamic whereby Chadwick, called “Godfather” by Tabb, advised the poet on his *Poems* (1894) (qtd. in Litz 51 n3), Chadwick and Higginson both promoted the priest-poet, and Tabb continued to foster contact with both. Tabb apparently drew on Chadwick for both advice and endorsement in his contact with Copeland and Day, his publisher—letters invoke Chadwick as a figure of advisement and critical judgment; it seems not unlikely that Tabb used Chadwick’s early letter of support to procure the publisher (see letters dated 9 February 1894 and 11 February 1894 in Litz [50, 51]). But we see also dramatic overlap between publication and endorsement: Tabb’s receipt of Dickinson’s *Poems* (1891) immediately preceded Chadwick’s stated connection of the two to Tabb; Tabb’s response, which told of his “mark[ing] the thoughts ‘that take one’s breath away’” (qtd. in Litz 63) implies his respect for Higginson’s critical judgment; and Chadwick’s forwarding of Tabb’s letter to Higginson reflects the mutual involvement of both critics with these two authors.

the poet reflects Blake, exhibits Emerson, and ultimately stands next to a priest-poet who has “poems like Herrick or Vaughan in their delicate perfection, pieces of almost flawless chiseling . . .” (“Recent American Poetry” 442).

But there were editorial adjustments, too, ways of presenting Dickinson’s poetry that made her more palatable for such audiences. Right before the historically supportive *Christian Union* published a “bellwether review” that coldly reviewed Dickinson’s *Poems* (1891), they also rejected five Todd-submitted poems.²¹¹ It is not clear on what grounds the poems, which were quite absent of any religious sensibility, were rejected. But by contrast, the three poems that the periodical (now named *Outlook*) published several years later were made accessible to the interests of the vague and sentimental

²¹¹ See the 18 June 1892 “Recent Books of Verse.” Buckingham says that this *Christian Union* review “suggests that Higginson and Todd could no longer count on a generally favorable reception for Dickinson in the editorial rooms of the religious and family weeklies” (*Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 316). There were criticisms leveled on several areas—a cold reference to the “great crudities of her work” and multiple charges of editorial intervention to make the work presentable, for instance. What stands out in this religious publication, however, were charges of religious impropriety—the catchy condemnation of Dickinson’s “‘Emersonian self-possession’ . . . toward her Master.” Specifically, the review charges, “We do not believe that the poem entitled ‘A Prayer’ was meant to be irreverent, but it comes dangerously near it; nor can we see any compensating advantage gained. It is the eagle who can look Phoebus in the face, but in certain troubled conditions of the atmosphere much lowlier birds may safely apostrophize him” (“Recent Books of Verse” 317). Without the condemned poem reprinted, readers of course had to turn to the volume to find its problems—finding it immediately following “The Martyrs,” a straight-as-arrow religious poem that had failed to distract the reviewer. Although the review appeared after the publication of the *Register* poem, there were multiple pieces in the magazine before the June 18 review that were neutral or favorable toward Dickinson, including notices that reprinted Dickinson-related information and MacGregor Jenkins’s “A Child’s Recollections of Emily Dickinson.” See, however, the 10 October 1891, “Magazine Notes,” which describes Dickinson’s “remarkable poems” as being “remarkable almost as much for their defects as for their indications of genius . . .” (212).

Protestantism of late nineteenth-century America, much like the Todd-submitted poems in *The Independent*. The three poems' one-word titles—"Immortality," "Sufficiency," and "Departing"—emphasize the poems' epigrammatic qualities, a characteristic of Dickinson's verse that Todd favored and promoted, and their function as definitions, a type of title-poem equation that Todd tended toward. The *Outlook* devoted an entire page to the poems and, more than the space, truly presented Dickinson (through engraving and short biography) and her poems to its audience.

If read too firmly in a Christological context, "Departing" takes on potentially troubling implications—in its "departure," "A Perished Sun" (Son) assumes additional glory. Those left behind, "endear" what has departed and "doubl[e]" their prior impression of "the Golden presence," thus inflating the "S[o]n" in His absence (Dickinson, "Departing" 141).²¹² But the poem's potential subversion pales in comparison to the damage that would have been inflicted had the whole of another of the three poems, "Immortality," been printed. While we have Todd's admission of lines altered in the *St. Nicholas* "Sleeping Flowers," we have no stated reason for the truncation of this poem.²¹³ As printed, though, the poem ends conveniently at the point where it enters into the damaging questioning of religious tenets and practices.

With the first twelve lines alone, "Immortality" posits the existence of another life and places faith at the center of such a belief:

This World is not Conclusion;

²¹² See also Dickinson, "[We learn in the Retreating]" (FP 1045).

²¹³ On Todd's changed editorial policy toward this poem and others published in *Poems* (1896), see Caroline C. Maun.

A sequel stands beyond,
Invisible as music,
But positive as sound.

As printed, the twelve-line “Immortality” closes with testament of how compelling is this idea (that “beckons” and “baffles”):

To gain it, men have worn
Contempt of generations,
And crucifixion borne. (Dickinson 141)

Where “Immortality” ends with commemoration, however, the twenty-line “[This World is not Conclusion]” turns to undercut that very sacrifice. “Faith,” in the poem’s close, is a less than sure-footed creature embarrassed by its own stumbling—“Faith slips - and laughs, and rallies - / Blushes if any see -” (Dickinson FP 373). The “Evidence” “Faith” meets is insubstantial—“a twig”—and the official religious acts meant to show “the way” are the response of an evangelizing force—“Much Gesture, from the Pulpit - / Strong Hallelujahs roll-” (Dickinson FP 373). Such overblown acts prove ineffective, however, for “Narcotics cannot still the Tooth / That nibbles at the soul - ” (Dickinson FP 373). If the *Outlook*-published “Immortality” emphasizes how heaven “beckons,” that is, “[This World is not Conclusion]” underscores how it “baffles.”

The truncated “Immortality,” with its message of a “beckon[ing]” beyond, dominates the layout in that it takes up half the space allotted for the poems and offers its three stanzas in an unusual staggered format. But “Sufficiency” dominates the visual spread in another way—by providing a metaphor that became the representative graphic

for the entire layout. The poem's speaker eschews pearls, brooches, gold, and diamonds, claiming she already "own[s] the ample sea," is "pelte[d]" by the Emperor "with rubies," is "The Prince of Mines," and is "continual[ly]" being "crown[ed]" with "a diadem" (Dickinson, "Sufficiency" 141).²¹⁴ The poem makes ordinary an array of riches on the premise that the speaker has access to such treasures in abundance and at their source. But the poem suggests too that such access is to metaphoric riches of love, literature, or religion—the speaker "own[s] the ample sea" and is "the Prince of Mines" (Dickinson, "Sufficiency" 141). The visual presentation of the Dickinson page, however, grounds the author in the very material treasures her poem rejects—her picture appears as a framed memento hanging from a necklace and the entire border is festooned with a looping string of pearls. And the whole, as an edited package, similarly encases her in a safe and publicly pretty package.

Shortly thereafter, the Todd-edited *Poems* (1896) appeared. Freed of Higginson, whose editing Bingham-Todd would slyly diminish in *Ancestors' Brocades*, Todd stood responsible alone for the preparation and editorial policy of this final collection.²¹⁵ As

²¹⁴ See also Dickinson, "['Tis little I - could care for Pearls -]" (FP 597).

²¹⁵ Todd, who calls Higginson "generous and kindly" (222), does not slander him to the degree that she does Susan. Bingham-Todd, however, elevate Todd's own editorial work, downplay Higginson's contribution (see *AB* 35), but more constantly blame Higginson for making the poems "conventional" (62). Most damaging, however, is a passage that criticizes the choice of Higginson as an editor from the start. Bingham, as Todd was wont to do, inflates Todd's father's literary associations to understate Higginson's station: "Himself a poet as well as a man of science, he had explored with Henry Thoreau the woods and fields of Concord. He had walked in the Shenandoah Valley with Walt Whitman when the latter was a government clerk in Washington and he himself was computing stellar distances and planetary perturbations. Against such a background the attainments of Thomas Wentworth Higginson did not loom large" (33).

Caroline C. Maun has pointed out, that volume represents not a pinnacle of editorial achievement and integrity, but features instead an unusual number of poems that underwent radical surgery—many, like the *Outlook*'s "Immortality," with entire stanzas removed. "That so many of the omissions for the most part deal with Dickinson's curiosity regarding madness, bitterness about death, and the uncertainties of religion indicates that these were subjects which Todd revised purposively," concludes Maun in her analysis (71). Of those three issues, "Irreverence," Maun asserts, "was in fact Todd's chief concern in editing the *Third Series*" (66).

Criticisms of Todd's and Higginson's editorial work—mounted by many, voiced multiple times—have pointed to the cowardice of their position and, especially in Todd's case, the deceit involved.²¹⁶ Some have speculated that Susan Dickinson, who offered a remarkable critical understanding of Dickinson, would have proved a more daring editor—a statement, I have argued, that is played out in the Dickinson periodical poems she pushed forward. Defenders, on the contrary, have positioned Todd and Higginson as defenseless in the face of contemporary standards and have been grateful for these early

On Todd's exaggerated sense of her father's literary and scientific accomplishments, see Longworth (12-13, 15).

²¹⁶ Buckingham notes, though without harsh judgment, that "The poems chosen for publication in the nineties are among her least difficult" ("Introduction" xv). Todd's editorial position becomes especially suspect in light of her destructive treatment of some of the manuscripts. Franklin first speculated in 1978 that Todd, on the basis of personal animus toward Susan, might have mutilated a Dickinson manuscript packet that showed "intent to destroy . . . a laudatory poem about Sue . . ." ("Three Additional Dickinson Manuscripts," 113n8, 113). A subsequent article more positively identified Todd "as the person who mutilated" one packet "and, perhaps, erased" one manuscript's verso ("Emily Dickinson's Packet 27" 347). See also Smith with MacDonald, "Mutilations: What Has Been Erased, Inked Over, and Cut Away?"

editors' work that introduced Dickinson to a larger reading public. But this judgment of the 1890s reading public has been increasingly criticized. Dickinson, Willis Buckingham shows in his documentary history of her 1890s reception, was hardly discovered by twentieth-century critics. Instead, *Poems* (1890) and, to a degree, *Poems* (1891) were popular and well-received in the 1890s. Although after Aldrich's infamous *Atlantic Monthly* review Dickinson would meet with "high-minded silence from the elite and largely New York critics" and a mixed "middle level" that saw her "as troublesome but interesting," her poetry also garnered "widespread noncritical enthusiasm . . ." (Buckingham, Introduction xiii). The criticisms that appeared, he notes, came from a narrow group of the literati and showed in the partial rejection of her poetry by a small group of highbrow periodicals. Buckingham, by reprinting all known reviews, rather than privileging the names prominent in a critical literary tradition, seeks "to minimize bias against the common reader" (Introduction xviii) and brings to light the wide acceptance by readers of the poet.²¹⁷

My analysis of the rejection of Dickinson's "God is a distant, stately lover" shows the public did have difficulties to some degree with the author and argues that they used the open channels which periodicals provided in print culture to express their objections—indeed, as I have suggested, the complaints were in part a system of debate that the *Register* fostered. But, to return in closing to the defense *Register* editor Barrows mounts of Dickinson's poetry, the very ability of readers to voice such complaints and

²¹⁷ Buckingham notes that "by treating opposed view equally . . . the handful of critics who cleverly savaged Dickinson's verse" have been "overrepresented" ("Poetry Readers and Reading in the 1890s" 176n4).

make them felt throughout the system of complaint, carried with it a burden of responsibility. Barrows, that is, does much more than characterize Dickinson as an inoffensive nature poet and, in fact, might be said hardly to have “sooth[e] offended subscribers.” He also, quite significantly, admonishes and offers a remarkable commentary about listening and reading—how readers might have, how they should have, read the poem. Barrows reminds readers about how they should have received the poet—that first there was a review of *Poems* (1890) and that the poem followed thereafter. Why this order is important has to do with the reception of the poem: “Those who had read Mr. Chadwick’s interesting analysis of the poems were undoubtedly much interested by the additional specimen of her singularly individual style and habit of thought. Others found the poem not so easily explicable, and there were a few upon whose ear its strange accents jarred as if flippant and irreverent” (132). According to Barrows, there were two other responses to the poem beyond “interest[]”; both, however, derive from improper reading—from groups of people who earlier had not read “Mr. Chadwick’s interesting analysis of the poems . . .” (132). Moreover, “[t]hose who had read but a score of the fifty ‘Poems’” in the volume, Barrows continues, “were already ‘prepared,’ as a musician would say, for the discord, and found its resolution in the more finished, restful cadence of some other of her verses” (132)—one needed to have read less than half the poems, in other words, to have been adequately “prepared.”²¹⁸ Finally, Barrows instructs,

²¹⁸ Lubbers cites this review as evidence that Barrows was among the few that asserted for Dickinson an *ars poetica* (the others being Maurice Thompson in *America* and *The Catholic World*) (27-28).

The words ‘For the *Christian Register*’ over the lines we published were misleading. We are accustomed thus to patent original and unpublished poems in our columns; but the truth was that these verses were not written directly for the *Register*, or any other paper. They were simply the musings of a soul insulated in its own privacy. There is no advertisement of self here, no thought of notoriety, no singing for gold or gain. (132)

Barrows’s explanation here disassociates the poem from being a direct statement by the periodical (and disassociates it from the commercial world at large—an interesting move for a publication that reprinted the suggestion that poets wrap their product in “brown paper” and proposed an arts advertising campaign in horse-cars). It also, however, offers another lesson in reading—a reminder of the lesson given elsewhere that periodicals are a form, a machine, an assemblage of various motives and statements and debate. That the readers of the *Christian Register* should have forgotten that, his essay suggests, was a failing of their own.

V.

The response Dickinson’s poem elicited, and the model of reading the *Christian Register* promoted and recorded, connect to recent scholarship that considers the history of reading. In this scholarship, as Jonathan Rose points out in his own “history of audiences,” newfound confidence undergirds the elusive task of charting “the minds of ordinary readers in history, to discover what they read and how they read it” (1). As records of reader response, periodicals have not assumed an especially favored status in

recent demands for empirical research in documenting the history of reading.²¹⁹

Researchers privilege instead public records (from, e.g., libraries and schools) and, excepting memoirs, non-print documents (e.g., letters and diaries).²²⁰ That Barrows never published in the *Register* the letters complaining about Dickinson shows the allure of such resources: clearly, they offer invaluable information about reading practices (although memoirs, if published, seem a surprising entry in a list that privileges unpublished over published letters). But what a source like the *Christian Register*, and religious weeklies as a category, can offer is an evocative and similarly untapped site for examining “reading” not only as represented, but as instructed and responded to as well. In a source like the *Register*, as with diaries and unpublished letters, writing cues up

²¹⁹ Nord observes that varying “streams of readership/audience research” “share the conviction that what is needed is not more philosophy, not more theory about audience activity or passivity, but rather more empirical research, research that links different levels of analysis, research that links actual readers not only to texts but to social contexts in which the readers lived and the texts were read” (“Reading the Newspaper” 267, 268). For a useful overview of different scholarly paths by which “reading” has been examined (literacy studies, book history, reader response, and the “ethnography of reading” [293]), see Janice Radway, “Beyond Mary Bailey and Old Maid Librarians: Reimagining Readers and Rethinking Reading.”

²²⁰ Barbara Sicherman writes that “By supplementing publication and distribution records with sources such as diaries, letters, commonplace books, and autobiographies, it is nevertheless possible to discern the importance of print culture in helping to shape the identity of an emerging middle class and its individual members, at least some of them” (141). And see Rose, who enumerates that “Common readers disclosed their experiences in memoirs and diaries, school records, social surveys, oral interviews, library registers, letters to newspaper editors (published or, *more revealingly, unpublished* [my emphasis]), fan mail, and even in the proceedings of the Inquisition” (1). Rose’s list offers an abstraction of recent scholarship that correspondingly draws on each of the resources. The privileging of unpublished over published letters to the editor reflects Nord’s work on unpublished letters to *Chicago Tribune* and *Chicago Herald* editor James Keeley. “Better than letters submitted for publication,” Nord writes of their merit, “manuscript letters suggest a diversity of purpose and style” (“Reading the Newspaper” 251).

reading—we capture reading in the response it evokes. But unlike these non-print counterparts, the *Register* makes more readily apparent multiple layers of reading—readers writing in, other readers writing back—a hall of mirrors where the two acts prompt each other and are recorded time and again. The *Register*'s letters might lack the illusion of access that scribbled marginalia evokes; the acts, though, of editing and publishing draw us into a world positioned somewhere between record (ala library logs) and representation (ala fictional scenes of reading).²²¹

But even if the “reading” I have found in the *Register* can be classed solely as representation, consider the real benefits it conferred for the magazine. While a magazine like *St. Nicholas* pushed itself to advertisers by touting the quality of its readers,²²² religious magazines apparently gained a strong reputation for the kind of reading that went on in them. Mid-century readers of the *American Messenger* were asked “to read it closely and to use it intensely. They [American Tract Society officials] urged readers to mark up their copies and pass them along to neighbors” (Nord, “Religious Reading,” 252 n23).²²³ An 1892 *Printers' Ink* made clear the qualities of religious readers that advertisers found attractive: “Of all the class publications, those

²²¹ As H. J. Jackson notes in a “genre study” of *Marginalia* (2001), that sense of access certainly is debated: “Critics disagree . . . about the reliability of readers’ notes, and consequently about the ways in which they might legitimately be used to reconstruct either a reading environment or the mental experience of a particular reader” (6).

²²² On *St. Nicholas*'s billing itself to advertisers as affording access to an elite group, see Garvey (57-58); on a similar portrayal of *Ladies' Home Journal* readers, see Ohmann (*Selling Culture*, 113-114).

²²³ Nord writes that officials asked this of readers even though they “thought of the *Messenger* as more ephemeral than a book . . .” (Nord, “Religious Reading” 252 n23).

devoted to religion are regarded with the most favor by general advertisers and used more largely than any others It is said they are more thoroughly read, and each copy has a larger number of readers than most secular papers As a class, they demand a higher rate for advertising space” (in Mott IV: 290).²²⁴ It is not surprising, then, that religious magazines were “the earliest favored media for advertisers” (John 25). Or, that with the later development of advertising agencies, “One of the first agencies to focus on periodical advertising was Carlton & Smith, specializing in religious periodicals” (Tebbel and Zuckerman 145). Religious magazines, clearly able to cash in on their representation of reading, reputedly “carried more national advertising than any other medium” (Ohmann, *Selling Culture* 107).²²⁵

²²⁴ Of antebellum story papers, Ronald Zboray writes: “Some publishers assumed that the papers would simply sell themselves, that local readers would exchange the papers with relatives and acquaintances in distant places” (200).

²²⁵ Brown notes that “Especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, many editors intentionally distanced themselves from financial motivations” (180)—an attitude that changed “[b]y the 1860s,” when “evangelicals expressed increasingly positive evaluations of how market strategies could be used to extend the gospel’s influence over wider audiences” (181). They also consequently became entangled with their share of related scandals, as well illustrated by the *Independent* alone. In the mid-1860s, publisher Henry C. Bowen “was sometimes criticized for allowing [advertising] to encroach on the reading matter, and also for accepting questionable patent medicine copy” (Mott 372). Later,

Washington Gladden is said to have left the *Independent*, of which he was religious editor, because the departments of financial and insurance notes were made up chiefly of this veiled advertising [“reading notices”—advertisements which were passed off as regular reading matter”]. In 1874 the trustee in bankruptcy for Jay Cooke & Company brought an action against . . . Bowen . . . to set aside as contrary to public policy a contract by which Bowen was to lend the use of his editorial columns to sell the bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad. Bowen was to get a percentage on all bonds sold and had actually received \$50,000 in bonds and \$460,000 in stock. (Mott 11)

Finally, whether considered as representation or record, the presentation of “reading” in the *Christian Register* and in periodicals as a category clearly challenges the widely-held notion that no one was reading poetry in late nineteenth-century America. As Buckingham’s collection of reviews has established for Dickinson, the presence of harsh critical reviews does not mean a lack of readers. And as illustrated by the objections raised over Dickinson’s *Register* poem, rejection in fact can challenge the belief that nobody cared for the tucked-in-a-corner poem endemic to nineteenth-century periodicals. Poetry, the Buckingham-edited collection reveals, seeped quickly into the public’s memory and consciousness. An 1893 *Congregationalist* article reports on a parlor game based on Emily Dickinson’s poetry, which required a combination of memory and puzzle-solving skills: this welcoming event for a new pastor asked attendees to match different halves of Dickinson poems (Hoyt 321-323), thus calling on players’ familiarity with an author who had received wide public introduction only at the beginning of the decade. And the whole of the *Register* shows layers of readerly interest in the genre. Editorial comments noting the lightening effect of poetry in other magazines lend credence to editor Walker’s contention (of the *Cosmopolitan*) “that every magazine that went into the household, should publish verse, since so many women keep scrapbooks filled, not with prose, but with lyrics and sonnets and ballads” (Towne 38-39). And K. L. W.’s *Register*-voiced request for “The Creed of the Bells” and “The Child on the Judgment Seat” recalls other widely-ignored forums where readers requested similar pieces of information. In one installment of “The Literary Querist,” a department in the Scribner’s-published *Book Buyer* filled with reader-submitted

questions, readers quoted remembered lines in search of sources, sought information about poets like Emma Alice Brown (“whose poems have been in the papers for twenty-five years past” [759]), and queried with concern the omission of a favorite poem from an author’s collection. Readers tenaciously seized pieces of poems—remembered vaguely for “beauty,” a title, a line or stanza—and groped in periodicals for the missing pieces. Periodicals, records and representations of readerly desire and disgust, offer an invaluable arena by which to approach those readers.

Chapter 4

Prizes for Poems: Dickinson and *The Youth's Companion*

While the *Christian Register's* dialogism permitted—and maybe invited — criticism of Dickinson's poem, the magazine as an institution operated on terms congenial to Todd and Higginson's project. That is, it published the poem immediately upon receipt; solicited a response from Todd when complaints arrived; and, in absence of one from Todd, published its own defense of the author. By contrast, *The Youth's Companion*, the subject of this final chapter, exhibited a remarkable level of will and institutional power. Publishing nine first Dickinson printings and six reprints in just over six years, the *Companion* repeatedly proved capable of vigilante acts, publishing as first printings poems that were not, delaying the publication of poems after their submission, and, through a longstanding practice of reprinting, lifting poems from books and other sources and appropriating them whenever and wherever they wanted.

Dickinson's correspondingly mottled publication record makes a compelling final case for how the day's periodical network was not subservient to the book-publishing industry. Reading Dickinson in such a publication shifts the perspective from which we conceive of Dickinson's editing and distribution, making central to the narrative an

institution of power and girth, a magazine, rather than individuals like Todd, Higginson, and Susan. That institution, while notably “unaffiliated with a major book publisher” (Kelly 11), did not need such a relationship to make its mark. As a result, the *Companion* made central its own concerns and agenda, not least of those being its editorial presentation of “reading” and “writing.” Remembered chiefly for its high circulation numbers (around 500,000 in the 1890s) and its annual premiums campaign, the *Companion* famously awarded readers prizes in return for recruiting additional subscribers. In this commercially savvy weekly, I argue, “writing” was devalued but “reading” was sold to its audience as a ticket to class mobility as the magazine staked out a claim in the late nineteenth century for the pragmatic power of print. The message was conveyed in the way the *Companion* portrayed “reading” in its pages, but perhaps more important were its editorial policies and practices, which helped the magazine embody the act of reading and ultimately represent *itself* as reading rewarded. Reading Dickinson in such a publication reveals an apparently large disconnect between the poet’s artistic integrity and the commercial world of nineteenth-century periodicals. It ultimately foregrounds a different textual condition than the one customarily valued—one of repetition rather than originality. To find value in that condition shifts our understanding of how a magazine might invest itself in an author.

I.

Established in 1827, the *Companion* began as a weekly children's paper with religious roots and instructional aims.²²⁶ Founders Nathaniel Willis and Asa Rand set up the paper as spillover territory for material that their *Boston Recorder* (also religious) could not hold: "We could about half fill the Recorder with interesting selections, adapted to our juvenile readers, from the various publications which we receive and peruse," the prospectus claims ("Prospectus of the *Youth's Companion*" 1).²²⁷ Rather than throw such material away, the authors continue, they would collect in such a place as the *Youth's Companion*.²²⁸

Because it addressed children as a distinct audience, the early but solemn fare elicits applause as novel for its time. Mary A. W. Davis's essay on "The First 'Youth's Companion'" relates the lengths to which she and her sister went to raise the money for a subscription and to arrange for the magazine's delivery. Her 8 September 1892 essay

²²⁶ For an early, pre-dissertation web edition connected to this chapter, see "Emily Dickinson and *The Youth's Companion*" (eds. Ingrid Satelmajer and Matt Hill). I offer here a revised history of the *Companion* based on my unsigned history of the magazine on the website. I thank Matt Hill for his comments and contributions to that earlier history.

²²⁷ According to Frank Luther Mott, Willis was the chief figure behind the early *Companion*. Rand, his partner in the parent magazine, "withdrew entirely after three years" ("*The Youth's Companion*" 264).

²²⁸ Sources on the *Companion* include: Mott, "*The Youth's Companion*," Richard D. Cutts, *Index to The Youth's Companion: 1871-1929*; L. Felix Ranlett, "The Youth's Companion as Recalled by a Staff Member"; M. A. DeWolfe Howe, *A Venture in Remembrance*, esp. ch. 5; and the Lovell Thompson-edited *Youth's Companion* (an anthology). For a full-length study, see Katherine C. Busch's M.A. Thesis, "An Analysis of 'The Youth's Companion.'" See also R. Gordon Kelly, *Mother Was a Lady*, which examines cultural messages imparted by a group of children's magazines of which the *Companion* was a part.

closes by revealing both to what extent the paper had changed and the keen appreciation that she had for the early issues:

When I see the paper in the hands of my grandchildren, with its polished covers, so smooth and grateful to the touch, its interesting tales, its beautiful illustrations, and its many instructive lessons, I wonder if they feel a tittle of the satisfaction with which our young fingers pressed that little two-leaved sheet, the *first Youth's Companion*.²²⁹ (Davis 447)

Still, early material receives just billing as dreary—the first issue carries titles like “Death Bed Scene of a Child Six Years Old,” “A Child’s Prayer for His Minister,” and “Filial Duties.”²³⁰ And histories of the magazine all but celebrate the date on which the

²²⁹ For other reminiscences, see “The Companion and Its Friends”; “The Companion in 1836”; and “A Youth’s Companion Family in 1827.” Such delight was not constrained to the *Companion*, either. The ready market for children’s periodicals in general is evidenced by the public joy expressed by those who waited for Lydia Maria Child’s *Juvenile Miscellany* (founded 1826). Caroline Karcher reprints Caroline Healey Dall’s recollection of this periodical’s regular arrival:

‘The children sat on the stone steps of their house doors all the way up and down Chestnut Street in Boston, waiting for the carrier,’ recalled Dall. ‘He used to cross the street, going from door to door in a zigzag fashion; and the fortunate possessor of the first copy found a crowd of little ones hanging over her shoulder from the steps above . . . How forlorn we were if the carrier was late!’ (Caroline Healey Dall, *Unitarian Review*, June 1883, 525-26, qtd. in Karcher 91. Karcher’s ellipses).

²³⁰ “Filial Duties,” as an example, begins: “Last week, we said a few words to our youthful readers in regard to the duties of children to their parents. But we proceeded no farther than to describe the *spirit* or *disposition* of mind which belongs to them, and from which all actions and words of filial obedience should proceed. In this paper we propose to assign *reasons*, why children should feel thus; *why* they should love and reverence their parents” (3). The reasons, in brief, are as follows: “Because of their age and character”; “Because your parents love you”; “Because the peace of families depends upon it”; and “God requires it” (“Filial Duties” 3).

magazine changed ownership. Bought in 1857 by Daniel Sharp Ford and John W. Olmstead, the magazine's circulation increased tenfold in the first decade of new ownership, but truly began its colossal rise after the Ford-Olmstead partnership dissolved in the 1860s. Less anonymity, less religion, more "original material," more fiction, and increasingly famous contributors: these are some of the changes Ford instated as he more broadly marketed the magazine for the whole family.²³¹

Add to that new package an increase in page and type size, and you have a magazine reflective of changes taking place at large in American periodicals during that period. Still, the *Companion's* roots did show. Although less material was anonymous, for instance, Ford kept his own name from the magazine's pages. After announcing the change of ownership through an 1 August 1867 masthead that named "Perry Mason & Co." the publishers and "D. S. Ford" the Editor, Ford never again printed his own name in the magazine and appeared only in the publication by way of his obituary in the 1 February 1900 issue.²³² Even by the 1890s, much of what the magazine printed was unsigned—at times, such compositions being excerpted material and, at other times, the material being unsigned original pieces. "[T]he whole conduct of the paper," editorial staff member M. A. DeWolfe Howe writes, was "anonymous and impersonal in the extreme. When a member of the staff died or retired, nothing was said about it in print—the *Companion* was itself held to be an unchanging, undying personality, irrespective of

²³¹ On those changes and on the tenfold increase, see Mott ("*The Youth's Companion*" 266).

²³² On Ford's anonymity, see Cutts (Introduction vi).

individuals” (*Venture*105). As the most famous example of the policy that supported the magazine’s image over that any one individual, C. A. Stephens, the magazine’s star and prolific contributor, wrote under multiple fictitious names in addition to his own with the magazine’s knowledge and approval.

And while the weekly shed its overtly religious nature, it maintained an emphasis on “safe” contents. Notorious for its alcohol-, tobacco , and romance-free pages, the *Companion* billed itself as a “family paper” and thus enforced restrictions that would make the paper appropriate for all.²³³ In an 1896 essay in *The Writer* offering advice to potential contributors, the *Companion* editors set out the following “tabooed subjects and forms”: “fairy tales, legends, or allegories, political or religious stories, or stories that tend to revive sectional feeling between the North and South”; translations; and “anything that takes the form of essay or letter” (“Editorial Talks with Contributors” 144). The guidelines published in *The Writer* also repeatedly urge contributors to be original, but safety for the *Companion* lay in its adherence to formula, its offering of contents upon which readers could count. A leaflet sent out to writers relayed a formula for writing *Companion* stories that writer Ray Stannard Baker says was “the chart for sure-fire success; which is to be sedulously followed. Don't experiment. Don't originate; repeat!” (qtd. in Kelly 33). Howe, one-time editor himself, confirms the use by contributors of a formula when he describes writers famous primarily to *Companion* readers: “They were writers of fiction, short stories and serials, constructed almost invariably according to a

²³³ The risks of not meeting such standards are apparent from accounts about activist religious readers in Chapter 3.

formula, dealing largely in taboos, which left them with the narrowest of markets if they were found unacceptable for the *Companion* It should be added that when once a writer mastered the *Companion* formula, he was in luck” (*Venture* 109).

In its commercial practices, however, the *Companion* broke ahead of its competitors. It pioneered, Richard Ohmann recognizes, in bringing full-color ads for record prices to the public (*Selling Culture* 26), and by the 1890s, readers had a consumers’ paradise before them every time they opened the magazine. Libby’s Extract of Beef, The Famous Plymouth Rock \$3 Pants, Edwards’ Orange Spoon—all paraded their merits before the reader in a dazzling array of font types and illustrations. Promising cures for everything from hernias to rheumatism, careers in telegraphy and law, nutritious food for those who would “demand it,” and attractive and practical garments, the advertising pages offered the world to readers in the comfort of their own homes. The advertisements came on pages Ford counted as additional to a core amount always guaranteed to readers. But those pages were integral, fused wholes—articles woven throughout the advertisements and print-only ads with little to distinguish them from preceding articles. Readers found expectations of the magazine met in these advertisements as they discovered elaborate illustrations by the Spencerian Pen Co. and the California Fig Syrup Co. and a bevy of news stories, testimonials, and stories from “real” people—all popular features in the *Companion*.²³⁴

²³⁴ Ellen Gruber Garvey’s argument about the reciprocal relationship between “content” and “advertisements” clearly stands here. See also the ad in the November 11, 1897, *Companion*, which offers readers additional reading material. The Alfred Dolge & Son Autoharp ad tells readers to “Write for Illustrated Catalogue and story ‘How the Autoharp Captured the Family ([Dolge ad] 567).”

Despite Ford's deserved credit as a marketing genius, the circulation's one-hundredfold increase from 4,800 in 1857 to around 500,000 in the 1890s, the magazine's long life of one hundred years as a weekly, and the popularity of features like its serials and the premiums issues—despite or because of all these things—off-handed slurs of the *Companion* surface regularly, as in one history's reference to it as “the scarcely cultural *Youth's Companion* . . .” (Tebbel and Zuckerman 58).²³⁵ Studies of advertising and the creation of mass audiences by magazines forget the magazine altogether or mention it as a sidebar to those that they really are interested in presenting as innovative. This dismissal of “magazines called *The Youth's Companion*, the *People's Literary Companion*, and *Comfort* [which] all had circulations of more than half a million at some time before 1893,” Richard Ohmann recognizes, “amounts to cultural snobbery if not class contempt.”²³⁶ And historians of children's periodicals praise instead the quality monthly *St. Nicholas*—labeling it most loved, respected, and cherished and rendering the longer-lasting and more widely distributed *Companion* as gawky elder sibling, a

²³⁵ For the circulation numbers see Mott (“*The Youth's Companion*” 266, 268). The remark by John Tebbel and Mary Ellen Zuckerman comes when they write about Boston's declining position in magazine publishing in postbellum America. The city, they say, was “proclaiming itself as still the nation's cultural capital but boasting only one magazine (the scarcely cultural *Youth's Companion*) in the 100,000 class” (58).

²³⁶ The common act of placing 1893 at the center of stories of magazine revolution (for “narrative convenience”), Ohmann points out, also ignores earlier successes of “elite monthlies” like the *Century* and “seems to discount magazines for women” (another group long interested in mass audiences) (*Politics of Letters* 140).

magazine that in Ford's era never fit the "children's only" slot or achieved its younger sibling's prestige or "look at me" performance.²³⁷

Derisive labels ("scarcely cultural") or claims about the *Companion* (it "never had . . . as many first-class contributors as some of the others" [Galante 12]) rarely offer the bases for their judgments. But such statements, while reflecting the "cultural snobbery" and "class contempt" Ohmann detects in the critical neglect of the magazine, also elide potentially more useful considerations of the magazine's product and policies. Original Dickinson poems, as I will relate, received a less-than-royal reception by the *Companion*, and the magazine on the whole generally downplayed poetry as a genre. But while I find it useful to foreground the modest role poetry assumed in the magazine, I also believe that the publication rhythm Dickinson's poetry assumed simply reveals the concerns and priorities of—not Dickinson's editors or any book—but the magazine.

²³⁷ Despite evidence of *St. Nicholas*'s business acumen and the *Companion*'s high-quality contributors, the former receives tributes as a monthly anthology and creator of greats whereas the latter receives respect for its business practices as a weekly. Where for one its luminary figure is an editor, for the other it is the owner-editor, more renowned for his marketing than his editorial achievements. Although R. Gordon Kelly's excellent *Mother Was a Lady* includes the *Companion* (along with *St. Nicholas*) as one of "the quality children's magazines of the period . . ." (31), Kelly's definition of "quality" cuts a wide berth in its attempt to distinguish such magazines from those like *Frank Leslie's Boys' and Girls' Weekly*, which "helped to set the style for later pulps" and prominently featured "a steady succession of dime-novel serials with lurid illustrations keyed to the more sensational episodes in the stories" (28). His descriptions elsewhere of the group as "the three longest-lived [children's] magazines" (3) and "the era's major children's periodicals" (15) adhere more closely to general estimations of the magazine. The magazine's longevity and circulation numbers mean children's literature critics never dismiss it; recognition of it, however, always comes against a backdrop of qualified praise.

II.

Todd first submitted a batch of poems to the *Companion* for publication consideration on 1 May 1891 (Todd, "List of Articles").²³⁸ Although still part of the largely productive flurry of submissions that took place after the publication of *Poems* (1890), Todd by that point was experiencing more mixed results with Dickinson submissions. Six poems and an article sent to *St. Nicholas* in February and a single poem sent to *Harper's Bazar* in March had been rejected (Todd, "List of Articles"). And the recent success with the *Christian Register*, of course, had met with reactions that made it less than unqualified. Todd was accustomed to re-submitting her own rejected pieces. Now she sent to the *Companion* the same six poems *St. Nicholas* had returned less than a month earlier: "Simplicity," "Hope," "Saturday," "Vanished," "The Storm," and "Old-fashioned" or "Arcturus" (Todd, "List of Articles"). The *Companion* paid fifty dollars for the poems and an article by Todd.²³⁹ But, as Todd explained years later to her daughter, "The poems had not yet appeared in the magazine when I found that all but one, 'Saturday,' had been included in the forthcoming volume [S.S.]. I wrote at once to Mr. Niles [from Roberts Bros., publisher of the books] . . ." (AB 158). Since the

²³⁸ This submission narrative has been unclear for some time. *Ancestors' Brocades*, the standard source, offers only a retrospective mention of the poems' submission and Bingham's narration of the ensuing negotiations conflicts with the dates in Todd's diary. My own account tempers Bingham's narrative with information from Todd's diary and from an unpublished resource in Yale's collection that I never have seen quoted: a small black book of Todd's in which she kept a record of poems and articles that she submitted for publication.

²³⁹ Todd had tried to place an article on Dickinson in the *Independent*, *Arena*, *Belford's*, and *St. Nicholas* (Todd, "List of Articles"). The article the *Companion* accepted never was published (AB 159 n19).

Companion had paid for the poems on the assumption that they would be *original* publications, the poems' impending appearance in book form was indeed a problem. Niles's reply on 19 August 1891 presented Todd with two options: to offer the *Companion* "'other poems in lieu of any wh. may be published in the volume . . . or to refund the amt. paid for such poems'" (AB 158).

In *Ancestors' Brocades*, Bingham shows Todd choosing the former option and working to correct the wrong in a reasonably prompt fashion by presenting *Companion* editor Edward Stanwood with additional poems on a 30 September 1891 trip to Boston.²⁴⁰ Stanwood, Bingham claims, "selected seven, including 'Saturday' and 'Vanished' from those originally sent" (AB 158). Todd's own diary, however, offers a different record of the September 30 trip that reveals she only then informed Stanwood of the problem: "I saw Niles about the poems—they seem greatly delayed—and I went to the *Youth's Companion* to explain about including the poems they had accepted" (Todd diary, 30 September 1891). In fact, she offered the *Companion* substitute poems to choose from via mail, working on selecting, copying, and mailing fifteen of them on October 1, 2, and 3.²⁴¹ Not until October 13 does Todd record the end of her negotiations with the magazine: "[Found ?] letter from *Youth's Companion*. They had selected five

²⁴⁰ Stanwood was a principal assistant of Ford's from 1887-1899 (Kelly 186 n24) and Editor from 1900 through 1914 (Mott, "*The Youth's Companion*" 262).

²⁴¹ Todd's diary entries read: ". . . I looked over some more poems to send to the *Youth's Companion*" (October 1); "Spent the morning in copying about fifteen poems for the *Youth's Companion* to select from in place of the first five" (October 2); "Then I did up poems for *Youth's Companion*, & wrote letter with them" (October 3) (Todd diary). Her record book's entry on the poems more precisely states that she sent fifteen and offers a list of the fifteen she submitted (Todd, "List").

of the poems I sent to replace the five used in the book, previously accepted by them. Pleasant letter” (Todd diary).

Todd’s statement on the five-for-five exchange nowhere suggests that two poems (“Saturday” and “Vanished”) from the original batch could be used—a point, as I will discuss later, of some consequence. Bingham’s explanation that Stanwood chose five poems plus two originally submitted apparently reflects instead what actually was published, rather than sanctioned, from both 1891 batches: “A Nameless Rose,” (December 24, 1891), “Vanished” (August 25, 1892), “Autumn,” (September 8, 1892), “Saturday” (September 22, 1892), “In September” (September 29, 1892), and “My Little King” and “Heart’s Ease” (May 18, 1893). In addition, two more original poems (contributor unknown) appeared near the end of the decade: “Ready” (November 11, 1897) and “Nature’s Way” (January 20, 1898).²⁴²

That Todd sent twenty-one poems to the magazine in 1891 alone means she saw a high number of poems as potentially suitable for the *Companion*. The fact that she originally submitted the first six to *St. Nicholas* suggests not only that Todd saw those poems as part of her campaign to cast Dickinson as “children’s friend,” but that the *Companion* appeared, to her, another suitable outlet for that campaign. And while the *Companion*, Todd’s second choice, would have been second in prestige, its enormous

²⁴² See also, in order, Dickinson, “[Nobody knows this little rose;]” (FP 11), “[She died - *this* was the way she died.]” (FP 154), “[The name - of it - is ‘Autumn -]” (FP 465), “[From all the Jails the Boys and Girls]” (FP 1553), “[September’s Baccalaureate]” (FP 1313), “[I met a King this Afternoon!]” (FP 183), “[I’m the little ‘Heart’s Ease’!]” (FP 167), “[They might not need me, yet they might -]” (FP 1425), and “[Were nature mortal lady]” (FP 1787). For a record of these poems’ variants that uses the *Companion* poems as base texts, see Satelmajer and Hill.

circulation, which meant it could distribute a poet to at least 500,000 households, seems no small compensation. Still, if Todd indeed was looking for a children's outlet, she likely found reason for disappointment with the *Companion*. Although *St. Nicholas* made efforts to appeal to an audience beyond children, the *Companion* had set itself up as a publication for the whole family by the 1890s. The *Companion* included in its layout a separate "Children's Page"—signaling a broader appeal throughout the rest of the periodical—and Dickinson's poems never were included on that page. Not surprisingly, Todd, when citing proof that Dickinson was "children's friend," pointed specifically to only the two *St. Nicholas* poems.

Magazines commonly cited prominent contributors' names to prove a magazine's reputation (and literary critics follow suit), but conclusions about magazine's reputations also derive from the less easily detectable signs of its attitude toward those contributors. While Todd had no reason to expect differently, then, the paper's larger practices in publishing poetry would have offered cause for disappointment for an editor accustomed to "dainty" books and *St. Nicholas*-coddled poems. The *Companion* showed no special interest in and gave no special treatment to its poetry. The 24 December 1891 issue—the first in which an "original" Dickinson poem was published—reveals the rather modest role poetry played in the magazine's program. Self-described as having "Twelve Pages, including Four Extra Pages," the *Companion*'s "Four Extra Pages" mixed advertising with reading material, a bonus to the eight pages always promised to *Companion*

readers.²⁴³ The contents follow the magazine's then-standard format: short stories and serials interspersed with reprinted poems (pages 1-3), miscellany interspersed with short poems (original and reprinted) (pages 4-5), longer non-fiction and short story (page 6), more non-fiction and miscellany (page 7), the anecdote page—a mixture of miscellany, and original poems (page 8), the children's page—a mixture of poems, puzzles, and stories (page 9), miscellany and ads (pages 10-11), and a concluding page with a regular medical column and additional miscellany and ads (12) (Appendix 1).²⁴⁴ Like many contemporary magazines, this overview suggests, the vast majority of the *Companion's* non-advertising material was prose. Only ten poems appear throughout, the longest of which is 30 lines (and is twice as long as the second longest); the average length of the poems is under 11 lines. Both the quantity and length appear fairly standard. In the fourteen issues in which Dickinson's poetry—reprinted and original—was published, the numbers are similar. The magazine published in those issues from six to eleven poems that were on average from 11 to an unusually high 19.3 lines.

Of the ten poems in the 24 December 1891 issue, two appear on what Mott calls the “anecdote” page—the prime spot for original, adult-level poems—and four of them appear on the children's page. That kind of concentration was not unusual in the magazine: these pages frequently featured original poetry. The Children's Page often signaled an end to the poetic material in the magazine, as verse rarely ventured into the

²⁴³ In the 24 December 1891 issue, only three of the mixed pages were at the close of the magazine; the other appears almost halfway in, thus avoiding the impression that such pages were extraneous.

²⁴⁴ This summary largely agrees with one that Cutts gives of the *Companion's* contents as it was “[b]y the mid-nineties” (Introduction xiii).

pages of miscellany, advertisements, and terms of subscription that followed. Indeed, the absence of poetry on pages on which advertisements appeared seems to have been more common than its presence. Poetry instead was kept for the main body of the paper, bolstered by the cultural respectability of the material surrounding it and shoring up that surrounding material itself in turn.

It was bolstered, however, by little else. The cramped format of the *Companion* meant all poems were squeezed in among news items, and they lacked illustrations. Even the lead position for poetry—the opening spot on the anecdote page, according to Mott—was not altogether auspicious. A poem appearing there might have been “*the* poem of the issue” (Mott 271) but by then the reader already had worked through pages of serial installments, advertisements, and miscellany. No elaborate frontispieces announced poems here; the magazine’s poetry never set the tone for the magazine as did the lead poems for *St. Nicholas*. The heavy use of illustration in publishing the genre, as I argue earlier, suggests an effort by the *St. Nicholas* editorial program to “sell” the genre to its readers, much as Richard Ohmann notes post-Civil War advertisers increasingly employed illustrations (*Politics of Letters* 146). Although *St. Nicholas* sets a very high standard, the *Companion* as a whole is illustrated much less lavishly, sporting a format that has stood comparison to newspapers. Poetry’s function within the weekly as “space filler” did carry visual benefits with it, offering in a type-dense publication the visual break of poetic white space while highlighting its position among the columns of surrounding prose. Still, excluding the children’s page, the magazine’s illustrations linked largely to prose. Cutts describes the feature poem of the week in the 1880s as

“complete with increasingly artistic illuminations of title and author” (Introduction xii), but such illustrations, in the issues in which Dickinson was published, were highly modest and not necessarily connected to the lead poem. Indeed, the strongest links between illustrations and poems in the *Companion* were on the “Children’s Page,” where simple poems were submerged in florid illustrations.

Dickinson’s specific case seems to illustrate further a careless treatment of the genre. Although textual scholars turn to original texts for authority, Dickinson’s *Companion*-published poems offer a mottled textual record. These “original” texts, of questionable authority in any traditional sense, raise questions about the integrity of Todd’s editorial operations and the publication practices of the *Companion*. In fact, of the nine poems advertised as original texts in the *Companion*, three were not truly “original”: “A Nameless Rose” (December 24, 1891), “Vanished” (August 25, 1892), and “Ready” (November 11, 1897) all had been published elsewhere before their respective *Companion* appearances. In at least one case, the error seems to have arisen innocently: the poem that almost thirty-three years later would be published as “A Nameless Rose” in the *Companion* had appeared in the 2 August 1858 *Springfield Republican* as “To Mrs. -- --, with a Rose.” The mistake appears simply the result of the gap between Dickinson’s own publication efforts during her lifetime and the larger push that took place after her death.

The publication of the other two poems, “Vanished” and “Ready,” however, suggests shoddy or surreptitious behavior. “Ready,” which I will cover in detail later, surfaces as an especially problematic poem—its source a mystery, its appearance in both

the *Companion* and another periodical preceding by more than thirty years its first appearance in a book. But “Vanished” neatly illustrates the point. Todd had included the poem in the original group of six that she had submitted to the *Companion*. When she offered alternatives for the five that would appear in the book before they could in the magazine, it seems reasonable to conclude that “Saturday” alone, not slated for inclusion in the book, remained slated for publication as an “original.” In fact, “Vanished” retained a firm place in the magazine’s publication plans, appearing second after “A Nameless Rose” over nine months following its actual original print publication in *Poems* (1891).

“Vanished” offers an extreme case of a larger condition. Whereas it is possible to talk about the effective timing of the two poems published by *St. Nicholas*, for instance, the murky path that original poems in the *Companion* followed betrays any level of cooperation between Dickinson’s editors and the magazine. Not only, that is, was the *Companion* “non-compliant” with original poems—printing as “original” ones that were not. The magazine’s act of effectively holding on to them shows little cooperation with the book publication schedule and thus never offers Dickinson’s editors the kind of editorial coup that they achieved with the poems in *St. Nicholas*. In fact, while Todd comes off badly in her editorial dealings with the *Companion*, withdrawing the submitted poems at a late date and at a less-than-prompt pace, the *Companion* arguably was to blame even for that mix-up. That is, because the *Companion* delayed publication of Dickinson’s poems, it placed Todd in a timetable she had not as yet faced. Although the monthly-published *St. Nicholas* took three months to publish the first of two Dickinson poems, it still waited only three issues. And the weeklies had responded with great

speed. *Life* published “Nobody” (March 5, 1891) just over a month after receiving it (sent on January 28, 1891), *The Independent* published poems Todd sent on 14 January 1891 less than a month later on February 5, and the *Christian Register* published “God is a distant, stately lover” in its next issue. By comparison, the first batch of *Companion* poems, accepted 13 May 1891, still had not been published by mid-August, when Todd wrote Niles about the poems being included in the book. If the *Companion* had followed the timetable of the other weeklies, or even *St. Nicholas*, the poems easily would have been published before the book’s November publication date.²⁴⁵

Once the poems did appear, they followed a scattered course, coming at staggered intervals over a period that lasted almost one-and-a-half years. As if a Christmas present to its readers, the *Companion* followed the November publication of *Poems* (1891) with Dickinson’s “A Nameless Rose.” After that, however, it waited until August 1892 to publish “Vanished,” the aforementioned originally-submitted poem that actually had appeared in the November *Poems* (1891). Three seasonally-appropriate poems appeared next in September: “Autumn,” “Saturday,” and “In September.” But after that, the *Companion* let months go by until finally printing “My Little King” and “Heart’s-Ease” in the 18 May 1893 issue.

²⁴⁵ While it is possible that Todd and Higginson later decided to include the *Companion*’s five, it seems more likely that Todd knew these poems were in the book but only realized as the book’s publication drew near that the poems would not be published soon enough by the *Companion*. On around 9 May 1891, not long after Todd’s May 1 submission, “[t]he selection of poems for the second volume was nearing completion,” Todd commented (AB 128). It is interesting to note that, of the poems for which I have submission dates, Todd’s experience bears most similarity with the timetable for the Susan-submitted “Renunciation” in *Scribner’s*.

M. A. DeWolfe Howe, one *Companion* editorial staff member, writes of the magazine's practice of buying manuscripts in advance of publication. "Manuscripts that might conceivably be used at some future time, possibly years ahead," he explains, "were bought in appalling numbers, and filed away in great cabinets, under the classifications—Boys', Girls', Family, Adventure, Humorous—to which they might be assigned some day in the standardized make-up of the paper" (*Venture* 109-110). According to Richard Cutts, the *Companion* practiced its policy of advance buying even when dealing with C. A. Stephens, its most popular author, returning over 150 unused manuscripts to him when the paper was absorbed by *The American Boy* in 1929 (Cutts, "A Study in C. A. Stephens" 22)—support, he claims, that some have offered for the argument that the *Companion* eventually failed because it bought too much material in advance ("A Study in C. A. Stephens" 6-7).²⁴⁶ The *Companion's* inclusion of Dickinson poems thus suited its own needs. The magazine used the poems to fill out its set format for poetry—original poems appeared on more prestigious pages, and reprints appeared scattered throughout, punctuating the magazine's popular short stories and serials. Despite Todd's arguable intentions, Dickinson's poems never showed up on the "Children's Page," even those that adopt a childish, simpering tone. Nor did they often step forward as the issue's "lead poem," if we are to follow Mott's and Cutts's standard of said poem appearing in the top left corner. Of the nine Dickinson poems published as "original" in the *Companion*, only two came out in the supposed "lead spot" of the paper—"My Little

²⁴⁶ On the *Companion's* merger with/absorption by the *American Boy*, see Mott ("Youth's Companion" 274, 274 n18).

King” and “Heart’s-Ease,” which appeared together in the 18 May 1893 issue. Two of the poems did not even appear on the anecdote *page*—the prime neighborhood for poetry in the magazine—showing up instead among the miscellany that came immediately after the opening stories.²⁴⁷

But Dickinson’s poems appeared tucked in corners in other magazines; the treatment “Morning” received in *St. Nicholas* was unusual, not the norm. More telling is how the published original poems foreground the magazine’s own publication schedule. Rather than chart that publication course around the appearance of any book, its independence from any book-bound world makes necessary a search for the magazine’s own desired effect. At times this effect could seem haphazard, with tangential connections and fusions that appear odd, if not misplaced. Was some layout editor responsible, for example, for consciously placing Dickinson’s “Autumn” directly following the unsigned “Caught by an Alligator”? The latter describes a man who loses part of his leg to an alligator; the former casts autumn in bloodily graphic terms:

The name of it is autumn,
The hue of it is blood—
An artery upon the hill,
A vein upon the road.

²⁴⁷ While of debatable significance, the *Companion* at least paired the non-anecdote page poems with other original publications, rather than the reprints that usually appeared in the section. One compelling explanation for why Dickinson rarely appeared in the prime spot for poetry is that the spot seems to have been reserved for longer pieces—poems that often were significantly longer than the other poems in the issue. The two Dickinson poems that did appear in the spot actually were paired together, creating with two an impression usually fostered by a single long poem.

Great globules in the alleys,
And Oh! The shower of stain
When winds upset the basin
And spill the scarlet rain! (Dickinson, "Autumn" 448)

Likewise, while the placement of Samuel Hoyt's "Enthronement" after the unsigned "The Mexican Elections" comes across as utterly appropriate (the former argues that those who are above the world around them are, de facto, "enthroned"; the latter tells in positive terms of the recently re-elected President of Mexico), other moments almost caricature the act of layout. For example, directly on the heels of a story about how a young white boy is given charge over a group of older, black workers and wins them over ("Burt Colby's Assistant"), we find "The Keyboard," a spritely poem in which a "queen" rules over "Five-and-thirty black slaves," and "Half a hundred white."²⁴⁸

The *Companion's* use of seasonal poems, however, shows how the magazine could use texts purchased in bulk at its own schedule. The magazine relied heavily on seasonal poetry to tie it to a specific time—a placement that seems to us hardly remarkable but gains significance when we consider that the magazine's attention to "seasonal changes" had surfaced only as recently as the 1880s (Busch 53).²⁴⁹ To look at

²⁴⁸ For the first example, see the 8 September 1892 *Youth's Companion* (444). For the second example, see Steen and "The Keyboard," from the 24 December 1891 *Youth's Companion*.

²⁴⁹ Busch says that "Little or no attention was paid to the seasonal changes or events during the 1850's and 1860's" (48).

June issues over several years is to encounter such poems as “Heralds of June,” “Dandelions in the Afternoon,” “An Out-Door Wedding,” and “A Rondel for June.”²⁵⁰ Dickinson’s “Autumn” and “In September” both appear in their respective September 8 and September 29 issues for obvious reasons. And “Saturday,” while appropriate for a school year’s ending issue (its “boys and girls” “[e]cstatically leap” “[f]rom all the jails” [468]), fits even better in the month that featured prominently the Spencerian Pen Co. ad: “Papa! School begins in a few days . . .” (Saturday is the “only afternoon / That prison doesn’t keep” [468]).²⁵¹ In the spring that followed, the *Companion*’s printing of “Heart’s-Ease” offers a look at the reliable spring pansy,²⁵² joined on the same page by William H. Hayne’s poem “Sylvan Worship,” a poem that sets out a jubilant scene in nature. The overwhelming number of seasonal poems one encounters in the era’s collections may all but numb the mind; these poems clearly contributed, however, to the sense of seasonal rhythm and time that the era’s magazines were trying to mark.

In all, the effect is one that exists independent of Todd and Higginson’s marketing efforts. While there would have been plenty of time for the poems to appear before the publication of *Poems* (1891), the magazine fails both to ride and to contribute to the wave

²⁵⁰ See Walter Storrs Bigelow, “Heralds of June” (June 15, 1893); Antony E. Anderson, “Dandelions in the Afternoon” (June 9, 1892); Caroline D. Swan, “An Out-Door Wedding” (June 12, 1890); and Louise Chandler Moulton, “A Rondel for June” (June 12, 1890). Of course, exceptions existed. One also could encounter a poem that described grasses, ferns, and green leaves in a November issue. See Madeline S. Bridges, “The Water Mirror” (November 3, 1892).

²⁵¹ For the ad, see the 8 September 1892 *Youth’s Companion* (451).

²⁵² On the flower and the poem, see Elizabeth Petrino (149-150).

of excitement that built around that volume. The bulk of the original poems, published in August and September 1892 and May 1893, instead came out during a notably quiet period in Dickinson's early 1890s reception. Buckingham records only one item each for the months of August and September 1892, and nothing between early March and mid July 1893.²⁵³ Not until the end of 1894 did significant attention surface again as the press previewed and reviewed *Letters* (1894). By then, more than a year had passed since the May publication of two original Dickinson poems, and it would be three more years until another original poem appeared. The *Companion*, mammoth organization independent of book-publishing circuit that it was, clearly put its own needs and editorial program first.

III.

It is not simply enough to say that the *Companion* did these things because it could, however. Its use of Dickinson's original poems also exhibits larger attitudes toward the social value of literary activity. A sustained examination of the magazine's representation of "reading" and "writing," I believe, connects Dickinson's textual record with the *Companion*'s pragmatic portrayal of "things literary" and the value the *Companion* placed on "reading" (and readers) over "writing" (and writers). To cast the *Companion*'s concerns as such aligns with standard portrayals of the magazine's audience. People who had not heard of the popular St. Nicholas league, E. B. White once contended, had "'spent ['childhoods'] on the other side of the tracks reading the *Youth's*

²⁵³ For the August and September items, see [Andrew Lang], "The Superior Sex," and "Jottings." The first item, a reprint, only mentions Dickinson in a sneering aside; the second item, like the *Companion*, uses Dickinson (an excerpt here) to celebrate the season.

Companion” (qtd. in Garvey 57). That side, Ellen Garvey recognizes, “was clearly better populated” (57), and that side, many have noted, lay well outside the city limits. Howe describes the reported excitement felt by residents of “country towns” when the *Companion*’s Premiums Issue arrived (107), L. Felix Ranlett speculates on the premiums issue’s effect on “the rural boys and girls who made up the majority of *Companion* subscribers” (99), and Louise Harris claims the *Companion* “especially” “became required reading” in Midwest schools (117). In fact, the *Companion*’s reputed audience recalls the large group that eagerly read Josiah Gilbert Holland’s work earlier in the century, as described by Robert Scholnick. These readers “hunger[ed]” “for practical advice to enable them to do as he was now doing: earn a decent living so that they could raise their families securely His Protestant readers had their roots in the country,” Scholnick continues, “but faced the challenge of adjusting to the more complex world of cities. They needed to develop a broad range of personal skills and habits, from dressing appropriately [sic] to saving money and—when they had made enough—spending it in a dignified manner” (“J. G. Holland” 60-61).

That a magazine could serve as a guidebook for its readers was a belief prevalent in the era’s children’s magazines. Indeed, as R. Gordon Kelly’s landmark *Mother Was a Lady* argues, a group of postbellum children’s magazines that included the *Companion* consistently concerned themselves with promoting standards of the gentry, “the social group with whom the principal writers and editors tended to be affiliated” (37). This “elite . . . of culture and refinement,” Kelly explains (61), pushed forward “self-discipline, conscience, and character” (67), “service and duty” (67), and “the traditional

gentry virtues” of “fortitude, temperance, prudence, justice, liberality, and courtesy” (72). All these things, moreover, were considered transmittable, so regardless of class or taste, a child could become a “gentleman or lady” in character (Kelly 67). My own consideration of representations of “reading” and “writing” in the *Companion* finds much to agree with in Kelly’s model. Clearly, literary activity was judged in the context of greater social good. In the always-pragmatic *Companion*, America’s literary heroes, its “men of letters” could be useful citizens, serving (several apparently had) as diplomats, since people in such positions are “for the most part merely the instruments of communication between one government and another” (“Literary Diplomats” 520).²⁵⁴ But my own analysis, while finding abundant examples of character lessons, turns up a persistent presence of material reward in those lessons.²⁵⁵

The *Companion*’s view of its own position in such a formula finds voice in author Dora Donn’s 1894 story “Companion Day,” which connects reading to social mobility in a way that cements the *Companion*’s role. Relating the story of a recent visit to a one-time school roommate, Donn describes her surprise at the rural family’s comfortable and tasteful residence and at her friend’s fresh appearance; that friend, despite having six children, defeats the author’s expectations of finding her “with beauty faded and the weary looks so common to isolated farmers’ wives” (279). Pleasantly surprised by how

²⁵⁴ For more on this phenomenon, see Kirsten Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture*, who writes that “[a] number of the writers in this study held diplomatic posts . . .” (18).

²⁵⁵ By comparison, see the distinction Ellen Gruber Garvey notices in *St. Nicholas* “between its noncommercial contest . . . and its advertising competitions”: “noncommercial creativity was more prestigious than writing advertising” (76).

Mr. Brown, a man of “no regular education,” and the rest of the family talk with intelligence about a wide range of topics, Donn discovers the following day the secret to this family’s success: they use the *Companion* as an educational tool and as the point around which their weeks revolve. As Mrs. Brown explains, when the family receives the *Companion* every Thursday, they study each issue until the next Wednesday. On Wednesday, they follow a schedule where they discuss different categories of articles, recite poems, present from self-created magazine writing assignments, and read portions of the magazine out loud. No “scrapbooks” of the magazine for this family, either. Mrs. Brown shows Donn ten bound volumes of the magazine in which, she says, “‘There is not a torn or soiled paper there’ . . .” (Donn 279). Elsewhere, an unsigned *Companion* piece would frame rural readers in direct opposition to city residents, claiming entertainment distractions meant “the life of the city is unfavorable to reading habits” (“Seats of Learning” 585). Donn’s story aligns with the “farm-houses” of that article—“few” of which “are unprovided with periodicals” and “[m]any” of which “possess excellent books of their own, with sets of encyclopedias in which they are accustomed to ‘look up’ subjects” (“Seats of Learning” 585).²⁵⁶

²⁵⁶ See also the belief that rural readers more thoroughly read what reading material they had (Garvey 219 n46). Kelly notes the fascination children’s periodicals held with “rural and village life” (118), adding that editors and writers for these magazines “during the two decades following the Civil War had grown up in small, rural communities” (121). Pieces like “Seats of Learning” in the *Companion* suggest a defensive and protective posture toward such communities, however, that strikes me as different from the *St. Nicholas* celebration of a natural world. For an empirical analysis of late-nineteenth century working-class readers, see David Paul Nord, “Working-Class Readers: Family, Community, and Reading in Late Nineteenth-Century America.” Nord—who analyzes 1891 census data with consideration of income, region, nationality, and community—states, to the contrary, that “in nineteenth-century America both the production of reading

Donn's story recalls those recounted by Garvey in *The Adman in the Parlor* where women create comfortable homes beyond their apparent means by employing the help of a product like dress dye or by earning money from writing (139-141, 144-145). With *The Companion*, the message is made, Mrs. Brown not only can create an educational program for her children; she can enjoy material benefits indirectly bestowed by that program: a "cozy" house, "a well-kept lawn" highlighted with "bright foliage plants," vines, and "blooming pot plants"—"about everything outside and inside was not only the 'home' look," writes Donn, "but one denoting that the family are people of good taste and refinement" (279). Donn's story says something about the representation of reading in *The Youth's Companion*—about how a magazine geared to "the masses," and arguably intent either on educating them for social mobility or teaching them to be content with high character in a humble station, might present reading as an effective way to do either or both. But what this blatant self-advertisement foregrounds even more is how the magazine represented the reading of itself and embodied in its own editorial policies and practices a system that made itself—*The Youth's Companion*—reading rewarded.

In creating an atmosphere where reading led to tangible rewards, the *Companion* emphasized to its readers their role as consumers. Literary figures become bite-sized sources of trivia (Whittier was colorblind! Tennyson's lines "Every moment dies a man, / Every moment one is born" are mathematically incorrect!) or—a *Companion*

materials and basic literacy were closely correlated with population concentration" (236), with urban areas having higher literacy rates.

specialty—sources for character lessons.²⁵⁷ Certainly, the magazine did little to encourage its audience to be producers. Those who aspired to authorship met, for instance, the short essay on “Home Poets,” which tells how “[a]n old family album of scraps and personal items was shown not long ago to a modern girl with the rhyming mania, by way of a suggestion as to the employment of her pen” (304).²⁵⁸ The suggestion—that people keep their poems to themselves—comes down forcefully in the essay’s closing paragraph: “We repeat, poets are rare, and a hundred persons can write verse where one can write a poem. But many a versifier, if he would relinquish his foolish hopes of a place in the world’s literature, could win a delightful and delight-giving place as Poet Laureate to his own home” (“Home Poets” 305).

Indeed, when writing poetry becomes a young boy’s entrance into his career in the 1892 short story “John Wyman’s Prize Poem,” the story notably grants the largest prize to the least skilled versifier. When the poetry contest, with an award of “twenty-five dollars in gold,” is announced in a local school, contest judge Stephen Lawrence advises students of the qualities that he would value in their poetry: “common-sense,” that they be “at least as careful about the thought as about the expression of it,” and “a

²⁵⁷ On Whittier, see “Too Brilliant”; on Tennyson, see Babbage, “Tennyson’s Blunder.”

²⁵⁸ See also “A Stay-at-Home Poet,” which claims that Whittier “believed that the people who ‘stay put’ in this world gain more than those who are forever searching for greater opportunities” (189). Writers were encouraged to pursue home-based projects into the twentieth century. F. E. C. Robbins’s “A Writer of Fiction” tells of a simple woman who, inspired after meeting a fiction writer, begins a fictional diary that dresses up her less-than-ideal life. Her husband discovers her writing when she becomes ill, reforms his non-churchgoing ways, and attends church with Maria upon her recovery—her writing’s reward made visible by his reform and by her “new black silk—first she had had for a good many seasons” (542).

little local coloring” (Robbins, “John” 82). The title character, “a boy who looked upon everything in a matter-of-fact light” with the “plain speech of his “Quaker ancestry,” is an unlikely candidate for the prize, a fact recognized by all (Robbins, “John” 82). John Wyman, however, is fueled by a dream—to follow “a course of study in a scientific school,” work in “a manufacturing establishment,” and eventually own mills that would exceed the size even of those owned by Lawrence (Robbins, “John” 82). He composes a poem on “The Cushnoe River,” writing first a twenty-five page prose essay that he molds into a poem with frequent lapses in meter and rhyme scheme. Evidence of his practical nature, young Wyman creates “an exhaustive though somewhat crude account of the mechanical and commercial advantages of the Cushnoe River,” a composition in which “[h]is imagination came into play only when he wrote of the undeveloped water power, and discoursed of new manufacturing enterprises which he hoped to see some day along the river’s side” (Robbins, “John” 82).

Wyman’s poem does not win the contest. It garners him, however, an appointment with contest judge Mr. Lawrence of the Lawrence Mills. After declaring Wyman’s poem ““the worst specimen of verse handed in to that unfortunate committee,”” Lawrence surprises the young author: he would like to pay for Wyman’s education at a “first-class” scientific school (Robbins, “John” 83). Wyman refuses Lawrence’s offer (thus further proving his admirable character), but he does accept an offer to work at one of the mills so he can earn money himself for his education. The story closes by revealing Wyman as “the superintendent of the Lawrence Mills” and one who “once wrote a poem himself which won him a valuable prize” (Robbins, “John” 83). The more

conventionally poetic composition of Wyman's classmate wins its own prize, of course, but Wyman's "worst specimen of verse" truly cashes in by garnering for him a career and social mobility.²⁵⁹

Apparently it was fine for John Wyman to write poetry as long as it led him to a practical education, and it was fine for his female classmate to win the contest prize. She might even marry her fellow champion—as in another story where the boy loses but also wins—and become a well groomed "Home Poet."²⁶⁰ But to pursue writerly interests with any serious intent could demand the most violent of remedies. In "How to Cure a Poet," "a well-to-do farmer" debates how and whether "to discourage" his son's poetic "aspirations," which have been fed by publication in the local paper's "'Poet's Corner'" (678). A visiting Eastern publisher advises: "'Well, when John writes his next piece of poetry, take him out and bump his head against the wall. Bump it pretty hard. Repeat the operation every time he writes a poem, increasing the dose in violent cases, and I will guarantee a cure'" ("How to Cure a Poet" 678).²⁶¹ In the same vein, a series on "The Girl

²⁵⁹ The story diverges from a pattern Kelly notes—namely, that "[t]he principles and values of the businessman as a social type, however scrupulous his practice are almost never the focus of stories in the gentry children's magazines published during the Gilded Age" (66).

²⁶⁰ See J. L. Harbour, "The Dilloway Prize." Here, the contest is a spelling bee, in which an ill-mannered, unsocialized girl beats the polished class favorite, a boy. In the end, he becomes a "very successful superintendent" and she becomes his wife—"she was a successful teacher for several years, but gave up her position and the name of Jessie Benton to become Mrs. Hilton" (Harbour, "The Dilloway Prize" 366).

²⁶¹ In another case (signed J. L. H., so likely by Harbour), an editor writes Mary Ann, an aspiring rural novelist: "'Whoever you are and whatever you are, we earnestly advise you to give up novel-writing. You are evidently from the country; stay there. You have longings for a city life; give them up. If you have a good home, stay there in contentment

Who Thinks She Can Write” features three known female writers (Amelia E. Barr, Kate Field, and Jeannette L. Gilder) offering chilling advice to girls with literary pretensions.²⁶² Barr and Field both advise young girls “don’t,” the former emphasizing the life experience a writer needs and the latter all but damning the horde of women writers prevalent in her day.²⁶³ Emphasizing the extent to which it is unusual for a young girl truly to be a writer, Barr says of exceptions: “Such cases are, however, generally terminated by early death, and the work done is due to the rapid maturing power of disease . . .” (434).

If writing in *St. Nicholas* was a natural effort, in the *Companion* it was a chore or a testing ground. John Wyman’s success illustrates that a good character is really the best poetry, but others’ mistakes also could drive home the character-composition message. When “Jack,” faced with a school composition assignment, decides to write a story (because they are “easy”), his cheap newspaper-type tale becomes only a prelude to his reformatory second composition—an essay on “Truth” (J. Smith 196). And in “A Poet’s

until some honest, industrious young fellow comes to ask you to go with him to one of your own” (H[arbour], “Mary Ames’s Novel” 303). Mary Ann’s father advises that his daughter all but bump her head repeatedly on this stone wall of a letter: ““You keep it and read it ev’ry day for a year”” (H[arbour], “Mary Ames’s Novel” 303).

²⁶² See Barr, “The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: First Paper”; Field, “The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: Second Paper”; and Gilder, “The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: Third Paper.”

²⁶³ Barr’s essay begins: “It is an unthankful office for the aged to say to the young, ‘Do Not.’ And yet it is a genuine kindness to use these two disappointing words in answering nearly all young girls who think they can write” (434). Field’s command comes in an imaginary letter of advice: ““If you *can* help writing, try something easier and better paid. Remember *Punch*’s advice to those about to marry—‘Don’t!’” (447).

Emergency,” a village poet unable to fill an order for a dedicatory poem considers reciting another’s as his own; he ultimately presents, instead, the story of his temptation and thus situates his character as his work-in-progress (Clark 568-569). Those who fail to take composition tasks seriously enough are faced with nothing but failure. Where *St. Nicholas* publishes little Molly’s glibly composed “Thanatopsis,” young Simon in the *Companion* clearly dismisses ““ready-made poetry”” too rashly, abandoning his own poem after one line, as he is unable to think of a rhyme for “Rose” (“Writing Poetry” 87). In fact, those who compose poetry too easily are social oddities—a country poet who fills autograph books with her simple verses clearly serves as a joke between the author and *Companion* readers (Harbour, “An Autograph Poet” 166); and “Rhyming Rube,” a large man who ““speaks in rhymes,”” has “childlike” eyes and ““isn’t all [t]here”” (Harbour, “Rhyming Rube” 38).

Consider, too, how the *Companion*’s policies reinforced these messages about reading and writing. The magazine, remember, was notorious for its highly restrictive writing requirements. And while the *Companion* purportedly offered an open ear for new contributors, one of its most famous features treated writing as an assembly-line procedure. In the late 1880s, when the magazine embarked on what star writer C. A. Stephens called the ““true story plan of 1888,”” people submitted “real” stories for consideration, the *Companion* bought the stories for “material,” and staff writers rewrote the stories to make them suitable for the magazine’s publication (Cutts, Introduction ix). In the example Richard Cutts relates, the staff member receives even the by-line, so the original contributor garners not the satisfaction of his name in print but one thing only:

the cash payment made for the “material” (Introduction x). With the *Companion*, then, readers were readers first and last—as even their own self-submitted material became something to consume once digested by the editorial system.

But perhaps the most convincing presentation the *Companion* made of itself as reading rewarded came from the magazine’s annual premiums campaign, a capital accumulation program that referred to readers as “workers” and a strategy whereby the magazine abandoned an earlier reliance on goodwill recruitment for a policy of outright payment. Whereas an early magazine politely asks children to tell others about the *Companion*, later premiums issues offer material rewards in return for subscribers.²⁶⁴ Sign others up for the *Companion* under the premiums system and you received books, guns, bicycles, pianos—the more subscribers, the better the prize.

Accounts describing the *Companion*’s offices reveal a building that made clear its priorities. Editor Howe describes how “editors were wafted by elevators to the top floor” and “passed enough floor space devoted to ‘premiums’ to furnish forth a warehouse of miscellaneous articles foreshadowing the Sears-Roebuck buildings of the present” (*Venture* 108). And one staff member claims:

the visitors did look at the rotary presses and claim to be awed, but what really awed them were the storage rooms for the premiums They occupied an entire

²⁶⁴ Nathaniel Willis (original editor) and co-founder Asa Rand appeal to children as evangelists in the second issue: “We want you too, if you like it [the *Companion*] yourselves, to show it to your little cousins and mates; and talk about what you read in it when you see them” (“To Children and Youth” 7). On the excitement the annual premiums issue engendered, see Howe, who repeats reports of how “[b]oys and girls, snatching their papers from the postmistress, began rushing from house to house in search of fellow townsmen, of any age, who had not already been drawn into the *Companion* fold” (*Venture* 107-108).

intermediate floor. They consisted simply of great bins and shelves on which the premiums, already packed for mailing, stood in mysterious rows of cartons of various sizes, cryptically labeled. You did not see the steam engines, or dolls with eyes that would close, or the marvelectric experimental outfit, or the post card projector. What you saw were packages, thrilling in their anonymity and quantity. (Ranlett 100)

For a magazine also “thrilling in [its] anonymity and quantity,” an office building with its center filled with goods is an appropriate manifestation.

The visual appearance of the premiums issue, lavish in illustration, further asserts its own central role. The front page announced the significance of the issue—premiums issues in the 1890s start with a full-page ad from a changing line of places, unusual even for the ad-filled *Companion* and reflecting a clear sense of the occasion.²⁶⁵ The issue offered pages of books as premiums—covers often reproduced in detail with illustrations fanned out around them, their price often “one new name” with an additional surcharge of 10 or 15 cents. Books thus were on the same level as “The Raymond Patent Extension Speed Skate,” the “Outfit for Making French Confectionery,” Parcheesi, and the highly popular toy steam engine and were much more accessible than The Hawk-Eye Camera

²⁶⁵ The ad for Ivers & Pond Pianos, which leads the 1890 premiums issue, brags “We Pay \$3,000 for this single insertion of this advertisement in the PREMIUM LIST of ‘THE COMPANION.’ But it reaches the eyes of several million readers, is read by hundreds of thousands, and puts us in correspondence with thousands, and thus costs us less per actual reader than the lowest-priced card in the ordinary local paper” ([Ivers & Pond Pianos ad]). The text offers a *Companion*-like “sell,” which only brags about its lavish expenditure to make a point about its thrift.

(five new names and \$8 additional) or the “Lovell’s Diamond Safety \$85.00 Bicycles” (50 new subscribers in 1891, ordinarily 100).

Children might be tempted to zero in on a particular section—heading straight for that steam engine—but did so at great risk. Unlike the announcement number’s vague and desperate-sounding promises—where it pitched to its readers the idea that its success was based on “Eminent Contributors,” “Papers for the Household,” or “Valuable Miscellaneous Articles”—the premiums issue offered specific instructions that demanded precise reading of its audience. There were instructions on recruiting new readers; clearly spelled out “Conditions Under Which Premiums Are Offered”; lengthy explanations on “How to Send Money by Mail”; and details on negotiating the shipping system.²⁶⁶ And while advertising up front to the “workers” of 1891 the competition for “An Unexpected Offer!” of “Seven Thousand Dollars in Cash”, the *Companion* might nestle special promises for enticing new subscribers among book descriptions or include information on a photography contest among the described advantages of “The Complete Harvard Photograph Outfit.”²⁶⁷ Readers *could* treat the Premiums Issue as a mail-order catalog and simply pay for the featured items, but the magazine made a clear link between reading (the reading of the issue) and reward. Reading and consumption might not be passive here (readers, remember, were “workers” and not only were instructed to get more subscribers but then had to work their way through a detailed procurement

²⁶⁶ Canvassers were not, for example, allowed to “pay off” potential subscribers with forthcoming premiums.

²⁶⁷ See [Announcement], n.p. and [“The Complete Harvard Photograph Outfit”], 567.

system), but clearly both were a central facet of the *Companion's* editorial program and would play out, as I will argue, in its treatment of Dickinson's poetry.

IV

The value I believe the *Companion* placed on "reading" over "writing" and, too, the magazine's institutional girth help explain its rather loose treatment of Dickinson originals. But rather than simply conclude that the weekly's size and priorities meant a general disregard toward Dickinson, "writing," or authors at large, I would argue instead that the *Companion's* resources simply were invested in her in a different way than we are accustomed to tracking. To value "reading" over "writing," that is, could have textual consequences of another sort. Namely, the body of Dickinson *reprints* becomes an especially fruitful group to study, representative in ways the originals were not of some of the magazine's defining characteristics. Of course, the *Companion* had an especially intimate relationship with the practice of reprinting. With an original parent magazine (the *Boston Recorder*) compiled of excerpts from other papers, the *Companion's* first issue made no secret of where its own material would come from: "We could about half fill the Recorder with interesting selections, adapted to our juvenile readers, from the various publications which we receive and peruse" (Willis and Rand, "Prospectus of the *Youth's Companion*" 1). And while the *Companion* eventually advanced beyond its "industrious use of shears and paste pot," as Mott calls it ("*The Youth's Companion*" 264), it still used plenty of non-original material by the 1890s to fill its pages. Reviewing again the contents of that 24 December 1891 issue, for example, reveals that three of the

nine poems published are reprints (three of six, discounting children's page poems) and more than half the contents of the "anecdote page" are reprinted (Appendix 1).

Moreover, a number of pieces throughout the issue fall in a gray category where it is not clear if they are reprints or are simply anonymous.²⁶⁸

The association the *Companion* had with reprinting has been one factor behind the aspersions that have been cast on the magazine. Reprinting presented problems for nineteenth-century publishers. Explaining the advent of advance copies with blank pages, advertising manager John Adams Thayer tells how ". . . one day there appeared in a Philadelphia daily, accredited to a Chicago newspaper, a poem by Eugene Field, which a too zealous exchange editor had cribbed from some advertiser's advance copy of the forthcoming 'Journal'" (105).²⁶⁹ In Thayer's story, the "reprinter" acts especially unscrupulously, beating the purchasing publisher to the act of original publication. And reprinting even in its more mundane manifestations appeared to derail the conditions of payment set up by the publishing industry, arguably cheating authors of original payment and undermining the payment made by the site of original publication. Too, as a broader problem, it de-centered the author, the cultural office of which the nineteenth century spent so much effort in glorifying, and arguably carried the taint of "anti-Americanism,"

²⁶⁸ On the one hand, they do not attribute a particular source or give the appearance of quoting (as do the reprinted contents on the anecdote page); on the other hand, the *Companion* was so careful about claiming pieces it had paid for—that ever-present "For the Companion" tag—that it identified even the original publication of anonymous pieces.

²⁶⁹ Mott calls Thayer "one of the most aggressive advertising men of the times [roughly the 1890s]" and notes his position at *The Ladies' Home Journal* from 1892 through 1898 (IV: 47, 545); Thayer identifies himself, in his book's subtitle, as a publisher.

as it was considered a national project by high-minded periodicals to pay for and encourage a national literature. Such problems hinge, however, on what Meredith McGill persuasively casts in *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting 1834-1853* as a scholarly narrative that centers on authors' rights.²⁷⁰ With reprinting, McGill argues, critics have “[d]epict[ed] American authors more as victims than as products of these conditions of publication . . . “ (3) and have “invoke[d] antebellum publishing conditions as an index of the hardships American authors faced in gaining access to print” (4). Her own consideration of copyright debate in antebellum America reveals that it truly was a debate—one that highlighted the conflicting “rights” of various groups, including printers, and featured nationalist logic and rhetoric both by those who opposed and those who defended the practice of reprinting. The “landmark American copyright case *Wheaton v. Peters* (1834),” McGill argues, advanced a “theory of authorship” highly suited to “the ideological bent of the new nation”: it advanced from “a republican belief in the inherent publicity of print and the political necessity of its wide dissemination . . . “ (47). And in the international copyright debate, McGill illustrates, the anti-copyright argument drew on nationalist ideals, “argu[ing] that America could prove its independence not by producing a literature that measures up to . . . British standards, or by assuming the role of Britain’s equal partner in trade, but by supporting a radically different system of publishing” (93). That system held up the benefits of the general reading public over “the property rights of a foreign literary elite” (McGill 93) and

²⁷⁰ McGill surveys the entire culture of reprinting in a specific period—not just its considerable presence in periodicals.

pointed to “national values . . . in the process of a book’s production,” particularly in the act of resetting type (McGill 94).

In the 1890s, when the *Companion* freely reprinted Dickinson’s poetry, reprinting hardly drew the heated attention it had earlier.²⁷¹ More significantly, American magazine writing, even earlier in the century, had “by custom circulated without copyright protection” (McGill 106)—there really was nothing wrong, then, with the *Companion*’s continued use of reprinted material (as there had not been with its earlier, more free use of such material). The problem that remained—and that still remains in critical histories of the magazine—has more to do with issues of respect and quality. Magazines advertised their prestige, after all, with boasts of original texts secured; “quality” magazines like *Scribner’s*, *Century*, and *St. Nicholas* filled their pages with original “finds,” not with a fabric of clipped or summarized items. All of these magazines, as print publications and as engines of mass distribution, lacked what twentieth-century theorist Walter Benjamin terms “aura,” that which comes from an original’s “presence” in a unique time and space (229). But clearly, reprints in such publications offer a further remove from the original and, in addition, play out that condition in immediately apparent visual terms. Where the quality magazines presented texts in a lavish manner that advertised their investment in original “writing,” tags in the *Companion* (first the presence, later the absence) identified for readers which compositions were first printings

²⁷¹ McGill notes that “[b]y the time a modest international copyright law was finally passed in 1891, reprinting was only one facet of a highly centralized publishing industry that was increasingly interested in using copyright to regulate national and international trade” (4).

(or “For the Companion”) and which were not. That late nineteenth-century audiences themselves discerned a loss of value attendant with mass reproduction clearly surfaces in the attitudes held toward reproduced artwork. Garvey, who invokes Benjamin to explain the cheapening effect of one reproductive technology, tells how “chromolithography’s cheapness and liberal use of color, along with its free distribution in trade cards and as premiums, had made chromolithographed reproduction both a medium and an entire genre that was sneered at by adherents of high art standards” (21). Surely the cut-and-paste editorial policies found in the *Companion* (and other weeklies, like the *Christian Register*) opened the magazine up to similar derision.

The act of reprinting gains weight, however, when we recognize it as system, not accident—a product labored over that represents its own set of skills. McGill, who makes a case for reprinting as a “culture” (as opposed to an “obstacle” [41]), characterizes it as “systematic, not simply the product of geographic and historical contingencies,” “distinctive, explicitly defined and defended against other systems,” and “often unconscious as a principle of organization to members of this culture” (4). In the case of the *Companion*, we find an unusually well-developed “distinctive” “system” with a labor investment that demands a degree of respect. Mott writes that “[e]ditors are said to have combed thousands of printed pages for these anecdotes every week, but the result was well worth the effort” (“*The Youth’s Companion*” 267). And L. Felix Ranlett, one-time assistant librarian at the *Companion*, describes a labor-intensive process that involved scanning magazines, writing introductions, and translating foreign-language items (89, 87). Although Ranlett’s description is at times unclear about the separation

between resources available for fact-checking duties and the preparation of miscellany, he describes the periodical's clippings file as "a living encyclopedia. Its contents were culled all the time from more than two hundred magazines received from all over the world" (92). Clearly, the magazine's use of non-original material did not signal a lack of committed resources and effort.

It seems especially appropriate, then, that the *Companion's* first publication of a Dickinson poem offers a reprint—a poem that, like much of the magazine's contents, had been culled from another source. The poem itself stands out in the history of Dickinson's reception in the 1890s. Published in *Poems* (1890), the poem attracted critical attention for several years. One 1893 article quotes this poem and others in describing a creative hostess's "Dickinson evening" and in 1898 the poem became one of the first four by Dickinson to be translated into another language.²⁷² From the beginning, reviewers honed in on the poem's "I" to read it as a personal statement. "If I can stop one heart from breaking," the poem reads,

I shall not live in vain;
If I can ease one life the aching,
Or cool one pain,
Or help one fainting robin
Into his nest again,

²⁷² The social event is described by Florence S. Hoyt, "Intelligent Sociability." The translation of this and three other poems into German appears in A. von E., "For the Women's Section: Emily Dickinson, Part II."

I shall not live in vain. (“Life” 396)²⁷³

The statements of service throughout offer seeming insight into the Todd and Higginson-created mysterious writer. Like the later image Todd encouraged of Dickinson as “children’s friend” (and like the portrait Susan originally provided in her obituary of Dickinson), the poem offered reviewers counterevidence to the portrait of a solitary writer they were creating—the potential of “a kindliness” “behind that ‘door’” of her solitude (“New Books” 39).²⁷⁴ Entering a larger conversation where the appropriateness of a posthumous celebrity for the poet was debated, the poem could counter not only the poet’s reported real-life solitude, but quiet too any qualms about the posthumous attention being heaped on the reluctant writer.²⁷⁵ As late as 1898, the translator of this

²⁷³ See also Dickinson, “[If I can stop one Heart from breaking]” (FP 982).

²⁷⁴ On Dickinson as “children’s friend,” see my Chapter 1. Susan writes, “There are many houses among all classes into which her treasures of fruit and flowers and ambrosial dishes for the sick and well were constantly sent, that will forever miss those evidences of her unselfish consideration, and mourn afresh that she screened herself from close acquaintance” (“Obituary for Emily Dickinson”). If one E. Winchester Donald’s letter in *Ancestors’ Brocades* is any indication, readers also turned to “Life” to affirm the personal salve Dickinson’s poetry offered. Donald follows his citation of the poem with “I testify that she did not live in vain’—even as I thank you for your part in bringing to the light a hidden treasure . . .” (77).

²⁷⁵ With *Poems* (1890) coming across as “a private edition” (“Book Notes” 43), reviewers at their most critical could speculate “on what possible pretext the author’s wishes [to not publish] were not observed” (“Poetry and the Drama” 169). With Higginson’s publication in the *Atlantic Monthly* of his correspondence with Dickinson (and the subsequent *Letters* [1894]), the breach of any private trust seemed even greater. One reviewer recognizes that the poems and the letters “are public property now” and tells readers “you may get well into both before you are aware that you are a repository of betrayed confidence, and as such a compounder of felony” (M. Abbott 207); another speculates, “Readers of the letters of this shy, self-conscious and curiously expansive and effusive lady will, perhaps, regret that her lines were ever published at all” (“Literary Comments” 231).

and three other poems would introduce “Ready” by claiming of Dickinson: “Her life work was to be a friend—counseling, consoling, and helping others” (A. von E. 535). By thus taking the poem to signify that the poet *needed* a public, critics could affirm their own role in promoting Dickinson. The poem appeared to justify the posthumous publicity the books and periodicals granted her.

As a poem offering service to others, it also proved useful in quieting claims of Dickinson’s religious impudence. One early article that offered Dickinson’s poems as positive evidence of biography begins by claiming that she “sought surcease of sorrow and of pain through knowledge of the Infinite” (Nichols 58), quoting this poem as proof. And perhaps most usefully, Samuel Barrows included the poem in his *Christian Register* defense that followed publication of “[God is a distant, stately lover,—].” In the essay’s “defense of Dickinson’s religious propriety” (Buckingham, *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s* 131), the author outlines Dickinson’s “deep communion with nature” and, in so doing, backs himself into a corner by bringing up the counter-religious-institution “Some keep the Sabbath going to church.” By way of exit, however, he claims “And yet it is clear that she did not wish her life to be lived wholly apart from the life of her kind”: “Life” stands as proof ([Barrows] 134).

The poem offered additional comfort in its technical ability, proving not only social normality but literary normality as well. As a “really charming little piece at once of meaning and music,” as a piece of “fine work most finely done,” as one of several that are “technically quite flawless,” the poem could answer qualms about Dickinson’s poetic

eccentricities.²⁷⁶ “Life” makes unnecessary qualified praise and, as the first review to recognize it suggests, offers to her critics an *ars poetica* with which they are comfortable. With this poem, that first review claims, “She sums the mission of her volume” (“From the Book Store” 26). The poem blurs lines between projects of poetry and service, wrapping the whole of Dickinson’s project in a cloak of respectable aims and prosody.

The *Companion*’s choice of “Life” thus fell in line with a conservative appreciation of Dickinson where comforting gender, religious, and prosodic conformity met with popularity. Such a conservative beginning to the magazine’s publication of the poet presents a Dickinson that might have followed the *Companion*’s own instructions to contributors. And as with the original Dickinson poems the magazine published, the *Companion*’s adherence to its own needs showed up even in the schedule of the poems’ appearances: the magazine appropriated the poet when it deemed such appropriation best. Thus, while McGill finds in “the prominence of reprinted texts” in antebellum periodicals “a sense of near-simultaneity . . . crucial to the imagination of the federal form of the nation” (107), my reading of the Dickinson *Companion* reprints reveals nothing close to simultaneity.²⁷⁷ No flurry of reprints followed the publication of the books; the magazine instead took its own time and reprinted poems when it saw fit.

As with “Life,” the other Dickinson poems the magazine reprinted were singled out for positive notice by reviewers. In fact, the two separate poems titled “A Book” and

²⁷⁶ See, in order: “Books of the Week” (162); [Denis Wortman] (210); and [Hughes] 500).

²⁷⁷ McGill’s consideration of Poe’s dissemination recognizes, by contrast, the “patterns of repetition and delay” (149) that I am concerned with here (and in my project at large).

a third titled “The Hummingbird,” might be said even to have exhibited an unusual level of popularity.²⁷⁸ That popularity alone might have been enough for the magazine to reprint a poem. Certainly, it seems no surprise to find a piece of Dickinson’s well-known “The Humming-Bird” tucked into an extra page in the 19 September 1895 *Companion*:

A route of evanescence

With a revolving wheel;

A resonance of emerald;

A rush of cochineal. (II)²⁷⁹

Dickinson had circulated the poem widely during her own life, her own perception of its public appeal showing in the fact that she sent it to, among others, Higginson, Helen Hunt Jackson, and Thomas Niles, and that she donated it and three others to a charitable event (Franklin, *The Poems of Emily Dickinson* 1307). The poem also proved versatile to Todd and Higginson in the 1890s. Before it appeared in *Poems* (1891), Higginson used it in his widely-quoted October 1891 *Atlantic Monthly* article; later, Todd’s inclusion of another version in *Letters* (1894) showed readers something of Dickinson’s variety. Even before the poem made these “authorized” appearances, moreover, a prequel to its publication came by way of *Independent* literary critic Maurice Thompson’s letter to Higginson that refers to the poem, as Bingham notes, before its appearance in Higginson’s article. Rather than find Thompson’s knowledge of the poem “mysterious” (Bingham 79 n10),

²⁷⁸ For Dickinson reprints in the *Companion*, in addition to these four, see “Begin Here” (February 18, 1897) and “One Word” (March 18, 1897).

²⁷⁹ The Roman numerals for this poem’s citation signify its placement on one of the magazine’s “extra” pages. See also Dickinson, “[A Route of Evanescence]” (FP 1489).

we might recognize instead the avidity with which Higginson (and Todd and Susan) shared Dickinson's poetry and remember the extent to which Dickinson herself distributed this poem. Add the appearances "The Hummingbird" made in reviews or articles several years after book publication, and you have a text with extensive circulation before its print publication—one so long a part of the current cultural currency that the magazine could have lifted it from any number of sources.²⁸⁰

But the poems the *Companion* chose to reprint also adhered to the magazine's programmatic concerns. As with "Life," they followed certain cultural messages the *Companion* preached, offering ready illustrations of principles the magazine adhered to, literary snippets to prove editorial ideals. "Life," for instance, did not preach alone its message of service. The *Companion* prints on the same page a poem by Rev. J. D. Burns titled "Lowliness":

Not in the stately oak the fragrance dwelleth

Which charms the general wood,

But in the violet low whose sweetness telleth

Its unseen neighborhood. (396)

²⁸⁰ *Letters*, published 21 November 1894 (Buckingham, *Emily Dickinson's Reception* 343), might seem the most obvious candidate for the source of the poem, coming as it does much closer to the reprint's publication date than does Higginson's October 1891 *Atlantic Monthly* article. It is interesting to note, however, that the reprint follows, though with different punctuation, Higginson's quotation of the poem in a 23 May 1895 *Nation* article and follows the exact punctuation Higginson uses in his *Atlantic Monthly* article. The *Atlantic Monthly* article becomes a strong candidate for the source too when we remember the stir it caused (it was considered in the 1890s, along with the book prefaces, one of the major resources on Dickinson) and realize some of the links between the two periodicals: M.A. DeWolfe Howe spent time at both magazines and the *Atlantic Monthly* bought the *Youth's Companion*.

Burns's poem extends the message of close-by poem "Life." In his "Lowliness," service of the most valuable sort comes from an unlikely and humble source—even, as Dickinson's 1890s audience preferred to see her, from the most secretive and hidden of sources.

The power of the small, the far-reaching effects of the humble: "Life" and "Lowliness" also offer material well-suited to a magazine concerned with imparting character lessons to a purportedly upward-aspiring audience. But two other Dickinson poems the magazine reprinted, both titled "A Book," link that message to the *Companion's* vision of class mobility or contentment through reading, with which I have been concerned. In the first, books allow a physical transport once consumed:

He ate and drank the precious words,

His spirit grew robust;

He knew no more that he was poor,

Nor that his frame was dust.

He danced along the dingy days,

And this bequest of wings

Was but a book. What liberty

A loosened spirit brings! ("A Book," 11 January 1894, 20)²⁸¹

Books, the poem argues, allow a remarkable transformation whereby "spirits" gain vigor, economic conditions are transcended, and mortality is suppressed. The transformation,

²⁸¹ See also Dickinson, "[He ate and drank the precious Words -]" (FP 1593).

moreover, takes place wholly within the reader so that while the “days” remain “dingy,” the reader becomes airborne.

The *Companion*'s interest in the poem seems apparent. Indeed, any magazine would have found suitable a poem that extols reading as a magical act. The encomia both this and the other “A Book” offered to print culture were no doubt behind their frequent citation, for they affirmed both the project of Dickinson's publication *and* the activities to which editors, writers, reviewers, and readers were committed. The second “A Book,” this one from 1 August 1895, further establishes how reading makes possible class transcendence. In this especially popular poem, Dickinson again lays out the idea that books physically transport a person:

There is no frigate like a book
To take us lands away,
Nor any coursers like a page
Of prancing poetry.
This traverse may the poorest take
Without oppress of toil;
How frugal is the chariot
That bears the human soul! (“A Book” 364)²⁸²

²⁸² See also Dickinson, “[There is no frigate like a book]” (FP 1286). This poem further illustrates the complex transmission paths between original and reprint. It predates *Poems* (1896) (which substituted “a” for “the” in the final line) and so likely derived from *Letters* (1894).

The metaphor of transportation that begins the poem turns figurative language on its head. The compared item is the prototype: books are not simply “like” frigates; they are the ultimate “frigate.” Transportation, thus emphasized at the beginning, at first glance dominates the entire poem: books are not only ships—poetry is better than lively steeds, and both, understood as “reading,” ultimately compare to a “chariot.” Important to these metaphors, of course, is the idea that reading offers a method of mental transport that lies in direct opposition to the physically static position through which one takes such journeys. But the contradiction that Dickinson directly addresses through her metaphors is one of possibility beyond economic means. In the world she creates, reading offers such “traverse” to even the “poorest” and does so “[w]ithout oppress of toil.” Reading, the poem’s conclusion offers, is a chariot, but one available to more than an exclusive few—as a means of transport, it is “frugal.”

Among reviews of Dickinson’s poetry, no mention was made of class concerns in either poem called “A Book.” Instead, the poems—like “Life”—were turned to as summary statements outlining: the project of Dickinson’s own volume (“Here is the very essence and soul of the purpose of a book condensed into eight lines”); the effect of the book (“And this describes what her own book will do for many:”); the abilities of literature at large (“It is one of the most beautiful tributes to literature or the author that we have ever seen.”); and the power that books held for Dickinson herself (“She had the companionship of her books and they were more to her than to those for whom sentient

society is a necessity . . .)”.²⁸³ But in the *Companion*, where literary figures served pragmatic social functions, where a magazine could educate a family and beautify its home, where poems could win prizes, books could be the perfect vehicle for class contentment or social mobility.

Too, as *reprinted* texts, both poems titled “A Book”—indeed, all of Dickinson’s reprinted poems—were part of a practice that we might say puts the act of “reading” first. Reprinting is about sharing the reading experience of one with another, providing the reader with material that is not “original” in authorship or publication but is “original” to the reader, providing the reader with material available in a convenient central location. A practice like reprinting could instruct readers on acceptable sources for them—sources that might polish and refine them—and the collective whole the magazine offered could serve, as it does for the Browns in “Companion Day,” as the centerpiece of a library. It is a system where at the very least a type of “reading” by the editorial staff was put on display. And more than that, as these and other poems became pasted items the paper tucked in its corners, they showed the careful selection that went into finding even those items that were not “For the Companion.” By reprinting even pieces of popular poems, the *Companion* reveals its savvy eye to its readers. It is current not only on the topics of sun spots and “The Purchase of Irish Land”—news stories that flank “Life,” the first of the reprinted poems. Clearly it is current too on its cultural news.²⁸⁴ And for the

²⁸³ See, in order, Whiting (27), Chadwick (104), “Out and About” (412), and “Among the Newest Books” (509).

²⁸⁴ The magazine’s reflection of current cultural news also could show up in its poetry placement. It placed three Dickinson poems, for instance, next to poems by Frank

Companion, being up-to-date meant a mapping of U.S. interests that allowed its own charted map to be filled out with subscribers in each state.²⁸⁵

V.

The *Companion*-structured system of distribution and consumption proved highly useful in other contexts. Set up from its premiums program for the efficient delivery of goods throughout the country, the *Companion* started attacking in 1888 the project of distributing American flags to public schools throughout the country. The flag program clearly stands as part of the *Companion*'s efforts to associate its own identity with a national identity. Offering through its pages a system by which students could compete for the flag—by writing, for instance, on “The Patriotic Influence of the American Flag when raised over Our Public Schools”—the *Companion* pushed forward material benefits associated with national identity. As described by Warren Dunham Foster in his 1913 address on “What the Youth’s *Companion* Has Done for School Improvement,” the *Companion* campaign gained impetus from James B. Upham’s discovery of a dreary public school and garnered stunning results:

Dempster Sherman, who was at times mentioned with Dickinson as a promising “new” poet. For articles that mentioned both poets, see “The Record of 1890” from 17 January 1891 and George Pellew, “Ten Years of American Literature,” from 17 January 1891.

²⁸⁵ Celebrating its seventy-fifth birth in 1901, a self-laudatory article ties the nation’s nineteenth-century expansion with that of the *Companion*. Printing two small maps of the country, the first offers “A Map of the United States in 1827, when the *Companion* first appeared,” and the second offers a then-current picture of expanded boundaries and, printed with each state’s name, circulation numbers for the *Companion* (“The *Companion*’s Seventy-Fifth Birthday”).

Often, indeed, the raising of the flag was followed directly by school improvement of an immediately practical sort. A flag went to a school in Sheridan Country, Nebraska; it literally could not be raised, for within a radius of many miles in that dry and treeless regions there was nothing which could serve as a pole. So the teacher put up the banner inside the building, where, against the dark sod wall, it made a bright spot, which, she wrote, continually encouraged effort toward all that was worth while. Her next letter contains a vivid picture of the school patrons at work, plastering the schoolhouse. Her next tells of the building of a shed for the horses which the children rode to school, so that the great hay stack, which gave shelter as well as food, need no longer monopolize the dooryard. The flag may not have created the sentiment that led to one improvement after another, but the flag did put that sentiment to work. (12)

Foster's address makes prominent the ability of the *Companion* to make its own ideas national policy.²⁸⁶ It also mirrors the premiums system, in which readers worked, the

²⁸⁶ He indirectly credits the *Companion* with the ensuing movement whereby "State after state has passed laws that require the raising of the flag over all of its schoolhouses." He also directly lays out the attachment of the *Companion* to Columbus Day, starting with a February 1891 suggestion by the magazine "to all state superintendents of public instruction that every public school in the United States celebrate in just the same way the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America." Pushing forward an official celebration of Columbus Day by publicizing the occasion, the *Companion* printed in its pages and offered for distribution set programs that any school could follow in commemorating the holiday. Relying on a system much like its subscription campaign every year, the *Companion* asked readers to drum up support for its cause: "Let every pupil and friend of the Schools who read THE COMPANION, at once present personally the following programme to the Teachers, Superintendents, School Boards, and Newspapers in the towns and cities in which they reside. Not one School in America should be left out in this Celebration," the top of the 8 September 1892 published "official programme" declares. Schools could purchase the program then at \$1.00 for one hundred, gaining

Companion rewarded, and readers then incorporated material rewards into their own lives to create a “cozy” house and “well-kept lawn.”

The flag distribution program, like the *Companion*'s premiums program, illustrates that the consumer role the *Companion* sold never was fully passive. Both offer themselves as compelling examples of the “social process” Janice Radway urges us to consider in her “Reading Is Not Eating: Mass-Produced Literature and the Theoretical, Methodological, and Political Consequences of a Metaphor.” Radway takes issue with the dismissal of mass culture on the basis of its conception as a consumable—something that has led to theorists arguing that “mass culture . . . lulled its users into a state of somnolence, indolence, and passive receptivity to the ideological propaganda of others” (“Reading Is Not Eating” 10). “By focusing on . . . what people do with texts and objects rather than on those texts and objects themselves,” Radway argues, “we should begin to see that people do not ingest mass culture whole but often remake it into something they can use” (“Reading Is Not Eating” 26).²⁸⁷ Garvey has illustrated how active consumption could take place even with advertisements, a form that seems to stand in for the creation

access to, among other things, Edna Dean Proctor's “Columbia's Banner,” Theron Brown's “Song of Columbus Day,” and the unsigned “The Meaning of the Four Centuries”—the former an original ode and the latter an original address presented to *Companion* readers as a gift (“National School Celebration of Columbus Day”). And, although disagreements have since taken place over the exact author at the *Companion*, the program for the day's events offered its most famous gift of all, the staff-authored “Salute to the Flag” (“I pledge allegiance to my Flag and the Republic for which it stands: one Nation indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all.”). See [“National School Celebration of Columbus Day”], 446.

²⁸⁷ See also Barbara Sicherman's “Reading and Middle-Class Identity in Victorian America: Cultural Consumption, Conspicuous and Otherwise.”

of increasingly passive consumers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As readers were trained to respond to advertisements, she explains, official contests invited readers to play with and imitate the genre (55-72), leading in at least one contest to reader-created parodic collages (66 fig2-3). And even more significant as evidence of reconstructive acts, it seems, were unofficial, reader-originated responses: “While an individual advertiser could encourage attention to its own products by . . . even directing collectors to ‘put this in your album,’ it could not individually construct the practice of collecting cards and creating idiosyncratic, personal scrapbooks of them” (Garvey 78).²⁸⁸ Similarly, in the active consumer role the *Companion* sold its readers, the magazine made a clear link between reading (the reading of the premiums issue), activity (reader-“workers”), and reward.

But, in an extension of Radway’s argument, I would posit that readers/consumers are not the only ones who are not “as passive nor as quiescent as the traditional theor[ies] would have it . . .” (27). Editors too (whom I also have offered as “readers” in considering practices like reprinting) offer clearly active roles that textual scholars long have discerned but only are beginning to appreciate. Near the end of the nineteenth century, M. A. DeWolfe Howe joined some *Companion*-published Dickinson words with illustration when he “ordered [his] bookplate”—“a picture of a ship of ancient times” and this text:

“There is no frigate like a book

²⁸⁸ Garvey also recognizes, however, that even in moments of parody, “[ad games] both relied on and taught ad conventions and categories” (65).

To bear us lands away.” (*Venture* 19)

Howe, in recounting this act, chastises himself for his faulty memory—the frigate-like book, after all, *takes*, not *bears*, “us lands away.” His devotion, however, represents an elusive underworld interest maintained in Dickinson even after the 1890s mania had subsided. Critics offer different dates in marking the end of Dickinson’s 1890s popularity, but *Poems* (1896) “did not make a great stir” (*AB* 345) and generally met with a “weak, colorless, and routine reception” (Lubbers 75).²⁸⁹ Just months after the book’s September publication, Lavinia filed a lawsuit against Todd over a piece of land. The 1890s book-centered publishing effort, already damaged by Higginson’s departure after *Poems* (1891), fully broke down at this point.²⁹⁰

But, puzzle that it remains, four more Dickinson poems appeared in two magazines as late as 2 June 1898. With the dissolution of the Todd-Higginson editing team and the family’s embroilment in a legal battle, the mystery centers on who submitted the poems. George Whicher, who offered the first scholarly record of the poems in a 1949 article, suggests three possible avenues by which the poems might have reached the magazine, and Franklin supports, with refinements, one of those avenues in

²⁸⁹ Anna Mary Wells says “discussion of Emily Dickinson in the magazines was fairly plentiful” before 1900 (“Early Criticism” 257), although she does not cite evidence of that discussion after 1896. Lubbers dates the “long silence about Emily Dickinson” as starting “[l]ate in the winter of 1897” (83). And Buckingham says, “the Dickinson rage was largely over” from January 1892 on, something made evident by the silence of “the leading national literary monthlies” on *Letters* (1894) and *Poems* (1896) and by the “changed . . . tone[s]” of some previously supportive weeklies (Introduction xiii).

²⁹⁰ On the lawsuit and the resulting fallout from it, see Horan, “To Market: The Dickinson Copyright Wars.”

his recent variorum. Less puzzling, when considered in the entire context of Dickinson's 1890s periodical publication, is in which periodicals these poems appeared: *The Youth's Companion* and *Independent*. As the magazines that had published, respectively, the highest total number (originals and reprints) and the highest number of original poems, the two periodicals are fitting rearguards for Dickinson's 1890s publication.

In the case of at least one *Companion* poem, the aforementioned "Ready," the poem's highly puzzling publication signals a tantalizing possible chain of transmission in which texts outside of the book-publishing circuitry are essential for understanding underground production and transmission. Published by the *Companion* on 11 November 1897, the poem did not have a book appearance in any form until the publication of the 1931 *Letters* (Franklin FP 1425 note). Three years before the *Companion's* publication of the poem, however, the *Book Buyer* had published a version of it with different line divisions. The *Book Buyer* version appeared in an article written by M. A. DeWolfe Howe, an erstwhile *Companion* editor, who would return to the *Companion's* staff in 1899. The source of the poem Howe published, he claimed, was the Jenkins family—of which MacGregor Jenkins, author of "A Child's Recollections of Emily Dickinson," was a member ("Literary Affairs in Boston" 425). The source of the *Companion* poem, however, has been a mystery.

In speculating on the origin of "Ready" (and the other three texts), Whicher and Franklin suggest scenarios that follow familiar textual submission paths whereby a certain person (Todd, Bianchi, or Lavinia) directly or through another delivers the poem

for publication.²⁹¹ Another textual route seems possible, however—one that features periodical-to-periodical transmission. I wonder, that is, about the poem’s connection to the *Book Buyer* text. Howe, who featured the poem there, had a split employment history that explains how he originally arrived by the poem and that suggests how the poem might have appeared later in the *Companion*. Howe worked in an editorial capacity at the *Companion* from 1888 to 1893 (Mott, “*Youth’s Companion*” 262) and left the *Companion* in 1893 as *Atlantic Monthly* editor Horace Scudder’s “longtime first choice” for the position of assistant and eventual successor (Sedgwick, *The Atlantic Monthly* 212). He worked there with MacGregor Jenkins as part of the *Atlantic* staff, where Jenkins was “the magazine’s business and advertising manager” starting in 1893 (Sedgwick, *The Atlantic Monthly* 280). It was before Howe’s resignation from the *Atlantic*, prompted by eyestrain (Sedgwick, *The Atlantic Monthly* 212), that the Jenkins family would offer to him the “Ready” he published in the *Book Buyer*. Might Howe possibly have transmitted the poem to the *Companion*’s editorial staff for its 1897 publication, before his return to the magazine in 1899 (where he stayed until 1913)? Howe certainly had ample connections with the *Companion*. The *Companion* surely was capable of altering the poem on its own and even would have been arguably justified in printing it as “original”; its appearance in the *Book Buyer*, after all, had come in the context of an article.

²⁹¹ Whicher speculates on who submitted this (Todd, Bianchi, and Lavinia) and Franklin speculates that it came “from Lavinia Dickinson through William James Rolfe, a Shakesporean scholar and family friend, who assisted her about this time in trying to published ED’s poems in periodicals” (FP 1425, 1787, 1788, 1789 notes).

Howe's access to the Susan Dickinson family via MacGregor Jenkins even suggests the tantalizing possibility that Susan once again was asserting her editorial rights. Whicher discredits the idea that Martha, Susan's daughter, submitted the late 1890s mystery poems because, he posits, Martha and Susan would have "excit[ed] Lavinia's ire" in so doing (something we have no record of) and because they did not submit any poems between Lavinia's death in 1899 and Susan's death in 1913 (440).²⁹² Surely Susan did not seem fearful of that ire when mounting her editorial protest earlier, however.

As much as I would have liked to assert positively such a submission route, invoking at its source a figure who knew how to use periodical publication to circumvent a blocked book-publishing avenue, I find oddly appropriate the ghost editor who stands in for lack of definitive identification. What better evidence, along with Howe's self-designed bookplate, of an undercurrent of readerly interest that outlasted critical attention? Somehow, Dickinson's ghost editor conveyed the poems to a reader-editor, a consumer-producer, and they became publications that further prove periodicals were hardly "passive" or "quiescent" in relation to the book-publishing industry. Editor Howe would chastise himself years later for his faulty memory of the Dickinson poem that became his bookplate. Clearly, however, his error shows both his faulty memory *and* his

²⁹² Whicher writes that "neither she [Susan's daughter, Martha Dickinson Bianchi] nor Susan could have presumed to issue Emily's poems without exciting Lavinia's ire" (440). His entertains them as candidates because Martha "was contributing occasional poems to both the *Independent* and the *Youth's Companion*. It would have been easy for her to supply some examples of Emily Dickinson's work" (Whicher 440).

devoted ingestion, and the *Companion*'s multiple reprints and questionable Dickinson texts show similarly their own "consuming" production of the author.

Conclusion

“I never . . . could fathom why verse was put in magazines: it has something to do with the making up, has it not?” (Robert Louis Stevenson, qtd. in R. Burlingame 260).

In the comic weekly *Life*, a Todd-submitted poem by Emily Dickinson appeared on 5 March 1891. The poem, published under an editor-assigned title of “Nobody,” reads:

I'm nobody! Who are you?
Are you nobody, too?
Then there's a pair of us. Don't tell,
They'd banish us, you know.

How dreary to be somebody!
How public, like a frog
To tell your name the livelong day,
To an admiring bog! (146)

This text, which I first encountered while conducting research for a class assignment, started me on my consideration of a periodical-published Dickinson. Concerned as I was with tracking textual variants for the assignment, I was struck by the editorial bravura the

text reflects. In addition to adding a title to the poem, someone had changed Dickinson's punctuation throughout and had altered "tell your name the livelong June" to "tell your name the livelong day"—an option included nowhere in Dickinson's manuscript. But quite as striking to me was a feature of the text that comes not from editorial alteration but from a rather basic textual choice presented in the manuscript: the decision to have the speaker warn the other "nobody" about being banished rather than being advertised.

On the manuscript as reproduced, "banish" and "advertise" compete visually with each other and challenge any general editorial policy. Dickinson initially wrote "banish"; but the word "advertise" appears directly below, underlined. Years later, Thomas Johnson would choose "advertise" over "banish us" for his 1960s reader's edition in adherence to an editorial policy in which he gave precedence to underlined variants. Ralph Franklin questions the soundness of this editorial policy, but he validates this particular case: ". . . the 1960 version is more appropriate to the sense: to a nobody who wants to remain a nobody, being advertised is a worse fate than being banished" (*Editing* 135).

"Advertise" might be "appropriate," but the choice becomes "more appropriate" on the basis of something other than simply the poem's inherent "sense." That "sense," after all, has been developed in conjunction with a body of Dickinson myths that make appropriate the idea that this recluse, hiding behind her capitalized anonymity, shrinking at any hint of publication, would object to being "advertised." Question that portrayal of the author, as Dickinson scholarship has, and consider it in a recent feminist and cultural

studies framework, however, and “banish us” volunteers itself as perhaps the more appropriate variant. To read “banish us” means we might consider the speaker addressing another “Nobody” on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation. The speaker in this case, then, might be someone who needs silence in order to “pass” and who hides evidence of a marginalized position only to criticize the bog-like culture at large. Banishment thus becomes the dreaded and logical consequence for such a “Nobody.” Textual evidence and the current interrogation of the myths surrounding Dickinson accordingly demand, I argued then, that we not stabilize our reading of this variant.

Now I offer this poem—straddling both variants in the background, published in a periodical in the foreground—as an appropriate entry into some parting thoughts on 1890s poetry and periodical culture. In *Life*, the poem might caution “They’d banish us,” but its surroundings show why one might worry that “They’d advertise.” Tucked in the corner of a page filled with jokes and cartoons, the poem becomes little more than a clever quip itself. On the page opposite, one ad among many croaks out, “Waterproof Outfits / for coachmen.” As I observe in my first chapter, though, the poem unsettles current critical scholarship because it is *not* advertised. Unlike Dickinson’s publication in *St. Nicholas*, the *Life* poem, “banished” in its small corner, appears to be space filler.

The text offers a puzzle when considered in the context of the Todd-Higginson production of Dickinson. Susan, in her obituary of Dickinson, had described the poet’s “wit” as “[a] Damascus blade gleaming and glancing in the sun . . .” and had criticized

Poems (1890) to *Independent* editor William Hayes Ward in part because it “left out” Dickinson’s “witty humorous side.”²⁹³ But Todd and Higginson never really pursued that facet of Dickinson’s writing and certainly failed to mount an image campaign on the order of the *St. Nicholas*-centered “children’s friend.” Did such a plan never exist? Or did the textual manifestation of it never take hold because the *Life* poem, unlike Dickinson’s “Morning” in *St. Nicholas*, was unable to support the effort to launch an alternate persona?

Narratives charting such editorial programs are necessary because they focus on a group that has commanded little serious interest. My Chapter 1 indulges in such a narrative in that it traces the *St. Nicholas* poems as part of what I argue was a conscious editorial campaign. And while my Chapter 2 unseats the dominant Dickinson editorial team from the center of the poet’s 1890s production narrative, it still engages in a narrative of editorial purpose. But as I argue in my final two chapters, periodicals hardly were sites commandeered by editors. Readers took over; institutions proved larger than individuals.

The “space filler” function I discern in a poem like Dickinson’s “Nobody,” however, speaks of a periodical’s editorial act that is difficult to track and not especially heartening to examine. The lavish visual presentation of poetry in a magazine like *St. Nicholas*, as I argue in Chapter 1, reveals both an editorial commitment and a system of mutual benefit, where the “many fine engravings,” as was said about a *Century* article,

²⁹³ See S. Dickinson, “Obituary for Emily Dickinson” and the 23 March 1891 letter in the “Correspondence with William Hayes Ward” link in *WSD*.

“added to the sumptuous appearance of the magazine” (Tooker 37). Still, consider, too, how even the common denigration of magazine poetry as “space filler” says something about poetry’s integral relationship with page layout. Poetry often *marked* space as much as filled it. If seasonal poems signaled publication time, the very periodicity of periodicals, the often consistent spatial placement of poetry meant poetry assumed a masthead-like function, announcing to readers that *this* was the front page, or *this* the start of the weekly’s literary department. That such poems as categories have become invisible to us has much to do, I suspect, with their integral relationship to the “time” and “space” that a periodical inhabits. The poems become inseparable from the periodical’s temporal issuance and spatial composition and are lost until we gather them around an “author” or a sub-genre. Robert Louis Stevenson’s cutting statement about magazine poetry (“I never . . . could fathom why verse was put in magazines: it has something to do with the making up, has it not?” [qtd. in R. Burlingame 260]) thus actually hits the mark. Poetry had very much to do with magazines’ “making up.” Rather than try to rescue it from such functions, we should work to understand even its humble roles and discern the value it held in those roles.

And the publications that printed poetry in such a manner—the comic, religious, and family weeklies—offer a similarly important uncharted territory. The greater the frequency of a periodical’s publication, the greater the challenge there is in researching the periodical—no doubt one reason for the relative neglect of weeklies. The “quality” monthlies have seemed more accessible to literary studies, in part because of their

sympathetic critical agendas and in part because of their closer formal proximity to “the book.” But the more modest printing of Dickinson’s poetry—the reprint “banished” to the *Companion*’s supplementary pages, the modest prime spots in *The Independent*, *The Christian Register*, and the *Companion*—reflects the larger bulk of her editors’ efforts.

To say that Dickinson’s poetry was “wrapped” in “brown paper” reflects not only the fact that she was sold; it suggests, too, the inauspicious outerwear her poetry so often assumed in the 1890s. “Space fillers,” hoards of “Nobody” poems were similarly “wrapped.”

Unpacking poetry in these, its more modest functions, will be key to understanding what poetry and periodicals stood to gain from each other.

Appendix 1

Summary Chart—*The Youth's Companion*, December 24, 1891

- Page 1 “Burt Colby’s Assistant” (Short story, 1 illustration)
- Page 2 “Burt Colby” concluded
 “The Keyboard” (8-line poem, reprint)
 “On the Town” (Short story)
- Page 3 “Town” concluded
 “Stars Between” (4-line poem, reprint)
 “Wintering in a Dug-Out” (Conclusion of serial, 2 illustrations)
 “Rocky Mountain Burros” (Essay, 1 illustration)
- Page 4 “Burros” concluded (1 illustration)
 “Humility” (4-line poem, original)
 “The Czar’s Character” (miscellany)
 “To an Old Clock” (7-line poem, reprint)
 “The Temperance Union” (miscellany)
 “Johnson’s Success” (miscellany)
 “Marrying a Title” (miscellany)
- Page 5 One column of miscellany (“Marrying,” “Dutiful,” “Turn Over,”
 “Cicero,” “For the Love of It,” cont.)
 One column of miscellany and announcement (“Love” concl.,
 Announcement—prizes for folk-lore stories, “Use of a Passport,” “How
 High Is the Atmosphere?,” “Considerate,” “Foreign English”)
 Two columns of ads
- Page 6 “Lord Shaftesbury” (biography, 1 illustration)
 “Keeping Up” (short story)
- Page 7 “Keeping” concluded (1 illustration)
 “Chief Good Thunder” (biography, 1 illustration)
 “In Old Times” (miscellany)
 “How to Cure Furs” (essay, with illustrations)
- Page 8 “Suggestions” feature
 “Elodea” (30-line poem, original)
 “Her Arrogance” (“character” piece)

- “Charity before Business” (miscellany)
 “China’s Emperor” (miscellany)
“A Nameless Rose” (12-line poem, original)
 “Discipline Triumphant” (miscellany)
 “In a Balloon” (miscellany)
 “‘Shirt-Sleeve’ Christians” (miscellany)
 “‘Jacko’” (miscellany)
 “The Border-Land of Science” (miscellany)
 “College Expenses” (miscellany)
- Page 9 Children’s Page
- “Christmas Time” (15-line poem, original)**
 “Follow your Color” (story)
“My Dolly Hung Her Stocking Up” (8-line poem, original)
 “Winnipeg” (story)
“A Christmas Wish” (8-line poem, original)
 “Nuts to Crack” (1-column feature of puzzles, etc.)
“An Acrostic” (center-page illustration/15-line rhyme, unclear)
- Page 10 One column of miscellany (“His Blue Bag,” “Out of Sight,” “Little Man,” “Deserved a Medal”)
 Three columns of ads
- Page 11 One column of miscellany (“Breaking a Bronco,” “Hard Travelling,” “Absent-Minded,” “Iowa Corn,” Untitled)
 Three columns of ads
- Page 12 Terms of subscription
 “Diphtheritic Paralysis” (medical column)
 “Comets’ Tails” (miscellany)
 Miscellany in remainder of second column (“Operating on a Tiger,” “Patrick’s High Standing,” “He Took Precautions,” “Well Said,” “At Last,” Untitled)
 Two columns of ads

Bibliography

- Abbott, Lyman. *Reminiscences*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company; Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1915.
- Abbott, Mary. "Emily Dickenson's [sic] Rare Genius." *Chicago Post* (October 6, 1891): 4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 207-209.
- Ahlstrom, Sidney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1972.
- Aldrich, Thomas Bailey. "In Re Emily Dickinson." *Atlantic Monthly* 69 (January 1892): 143-144. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 282-284.
- "Among the Newest Books." *Delineator* [N.Y., London, Toronto] 48, no. 6 (December 1896): 815. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 508-509.
- Anderson, Antony E. "Dandelions in the Afternoon." *The Youth's Companion* (June 9, 1892): 296.
- Anesko, Michael. "*Friction with the Market*": *Henry James and the Profession of Authorship*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- [Announcement]. *The Youth's Companion* (October 29, 1891): [1].
- "Arbutus." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 69, no. 35 (August 28, 1890): 551 (3).

- “Are Unitarians Christian.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 31 (July 30, 1891): 487 (3).
- B., E. S. “William Crary Brownell.” *Dictionary of American Biography*. Vol. 2. Ed. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1931.
- B., S. W. “Then and Now.” *Christian Register* (January 1, 1891): 2-3.
- Babbage, C. “Tennyson’s Blunder.” *The Youth’s Companion* (September 8, 1892): 448.
- B[acon], Theodore D. “Chadwick, John White.” *Dictionary of American Biography*. Vol. 2, part 1. Ed. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1929, 1930.
- Barr, Amelia E. “The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: First Paper.” *The Youth’s Companion* (September 1, 1892): 434.
- Barrier, Robert Gene. “A Critical History of *Scribner’s Magazine*, 1887-1914.” Diss. U of Georgia, 1980.
- Barrows, Isabel C. *A Sunny Life: the biography of Samuel June Barrows*. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1913.
- [Barrows, Samuel J.] “Emily Dickinson’s Poems.” *Christian Register* 70 (April 30, 1891): 274. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 131-135.
- . “Musings.” *The Christian Register* (November 13, 1890): 732.
- . “Musings.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 41 (October 8, 1891): 654 (2).
- [Bates, Arlo]. “Books and Authors.” *Boston Sunday Courier* 96 (November 23, 1890): 2. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 28-33.
- Becker, May Lamberton. Introduction to *The St. Nicholas Anthology*. Ed. Henry Steele Commager. Random House: New York, 1948.
- Beetham, Margaret. “Open and Closed: the Periodical as a Publishing Genre.” In *Investigating Victorian Journalism*, ed. Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden. New York: St. Martin’s, 1990.

- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*. Ed. and intro. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. Originally published in German by Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a.M., 1955.
- Bennett, Paula Bernat. *Nineteenth-Century American Women Poets: An Anthology*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- . *Poets in the Public Sphere: The Emancipatory Project of American Women's Poetry, 1800-1900*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2003.
- Benton, Megan L. "Typography and Gender: Remasculating the Modern Book." In *Illuminating Letters: Typography and Literary Interpretation*. Ed. Paul C. Gutjahr and Megan L. Benton. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2001. 71-93.
- Berkove, Lawrence I. "New Old Additions to the American Canon." *American Periodicals* 1, no. 1 (1991): 25-33.
- "The Best Poems in the World." *The Saturday Evening Post* 170, no. 48 (May 28, 1898): 8.
- Bigelow, Walter Storrs. "Heralds of June." *The Youth's Companion* (June 15, 1893): 304-305.
- Bingham, Millicent Todd. *Ancestors' Brocades: The Literary Debut of Emily Dickinson*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- . "Poems of Emily Dickinson: Hitherto Published Only in Part." *The New England Quarterly* (March 1947): 3-50.
- Blake, Caesar R., and Carlton F. Wells. *The Recognition of Emily Dickinson: Selected Criticism Since 1890*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1964, 1968.
- "Book Notes." *Boston Journal* (November 28, 1890): 4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 43.
- "Books Needed." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 69, no. 5 (January 30, 1890): 67 (3).

- “Books of the Week,” *Manchester Guardian* (August 11, 1891): 7. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 161-163.
- Brack, O. M., Jr. “Mark Twain in Knee Pants: The Expurgation of *Tom Sawyer Abroad*.” *Proof* (1972): 145-151.
- Brake, Laurel, and Anne Humphreys. “Critical Theory and Periodical Research.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* (Fall 1989): 94-95.
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 68, no. 6 (6 February 1890): 82 (2).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 12 (March 20, 1890): 178 (2).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 13 (March 27, 1890): 194 (2).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 16 (April 17, 1890).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 22 (May 29, 1890): 338 (2).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 26 (June 26, 1890): 407 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 31 (July 31, 1890): 486 (2).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* (November 13, 1890): 733 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 15 (April 9, 1891): 227 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 39 (September 24, 1891): 615 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 46 (November 12, 1891): 743 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 49 (December 3, 1891): 791 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* (January 21, 1892): 39 (3).
- “Brevities.” *The Christian Register* (March 17, 1892): 166(2)-167(3).
- Bridges, Madeline S. “The Water Mirror.” *The Youth’s Companion* (November 3, 1892): 584.

- “Brilliant.” *Boston Budget* (November 22, 1891): 11. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 240-242.
- Brookfield, Jane Octavia. “Introduction: A Collection of Unpublished Letters of Thackeray.” *Scribner’s Magazine* 1, no. 4 (April 1887): 387-388.
- Brown, Candy Gunther. “Salt to the World: A Cultural History of Evangelical Reading, Writing, and Publishing Practices in Mid-Nineteenth Century America.” Diss. Harvard U, 2000.
- Brownell, William Crary. Letter to Edward L. Burlingame. 9 November 1887, Emily Dickinson folder, Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- . Letter to Mr. Dickinson, 17 December 1888, Brownell Letterbook, Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- . Letterbook: 1888-1910. Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Bryant, John. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 2002.
- Buckingham, Willis J., ed. *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989.
- . Index to *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989.
- . Introduction to *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. xi-xxiii.
- . “Poetry Readers and Reading in the 1890s: Emily Dickinson’s First Reception.” In *Readers in History: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Contexts of Response*. Ed. James L. Machor. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993. 164-179.
- Burlingame, E. L. Letter to Susan Dickinson, 3 February 1890, Burlingame Letterbook, Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

- Burlingame, Roger. *Of Making Many Books: A Hundred Years of Reading, Writing and Publishing*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.
- Burns, Rev. J.D. "Lowliness." *The Youth's Companion* (July 16, 1891): 396.
- Busch, Katharine C. "An Analysis of 'The Youth's Companion.'" M.A. Thesis. U of Minnesota, 1962.
- Cameron, Sharon. *Choosing Not Choosing: Dickinson's Fascicles*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Capps, Jack. *Emily Dickinson's Reading, 1836-1886*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Carman, Bliss. "A Note on Emily Dickinson." *Boston Evening Transcript* (November 21, 1896): 15. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 504-508.
- "A Card." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 71, no. 4 (January 28, 1892): 55 (3).
- Carney, Mary. "Dickinson's Poetic Revelations: Variants as Process." *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 5, no. 2 (1996): 134-138.
- Chadwick, John W. "Emily Dickinson." *Unity* 26 (January 22, 1891): 171. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 102-105.
- Chadwick, John White, and Annie Hathaway Chadwick, eds. *Out of the Heart: Poems for Lovers Young and Old*. 1891. Rpt. Granger Index Reprint Series. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.
- Clark, Imogen. "A Poet's Emergency." *The Youth's Companion* (November 7, 1895): 568-569.
- "The Companion and Its Friends." *The Youth's Companion* (February 23, 1871): 60.
- "The Companion's Seventy-Fifth Birthday." *The Youth's Companion* (April 18, 1901): 205.

- ["The Complete Harvard Photograph Outfit"]. *The Youth's Companion* (October 30, 1890): 567.
- "Contributions accepted, 1886-1938." Charles Scribner's Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- "Correspondence with William Hayes Ward," *Writings by Susan Dickinson*, ed. Smith, Laura Elyn Lauth, and Lara Vetter, *Dickinson Electronic Archives* <http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson/susan/ward.html>.
- Cranch, C.P. "Christ in the Pulpits." *The Christian Register* (December 11, 1890): 803 (3).
- "Current Literature." *Tinsley's Magazine* n.s. 5, no. 28 (September 1891): 365-367. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 169-170
- Cutts, Richard. "Introduction." *Index to The Youth's Companion: 1871-1929*. Vol. 1. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1972. v-xvii.
- . A Study of C.A. Stephens. Diss. Pennsylvania State U, 1958.
- Dall, Caroline Healey. "Three Books Concerning Women." *Springfield Republican* (March 7, 1891): 8. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 121-122.
- Damon-Moore, Helen. *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the Ladies' Home Journal and the Saturday Evening Post, 1880-1910*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1994.
- Dandurand, Karen. "Another Dickinson Poem Published in Her Lifetime." *American Literature* 54, no. 3 (October 1982): 434-437.
- . "Dickinson and the Public." In *Dickinson and Audience*. Ed. Matin Orzeck and Robert Weisbuch. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996. 255-277.
- . "New Dickinson Civil War Publications." *American Literature* 56, no. 1 (March 1984): 17-27.
- . "Publication of Dickinson's Poems in Her Lifetime." *Legacy* (Spring 1984): 7.

- . "Why Dickinson Did Not Publish." Diss. U of Massachusetts, 1984.
- Davidson, Cathy. *Revolution and the word: the rise of the novel in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Davis, Mary A.W. "The First 'Youth's Companion.'" *The Youth's Companion* (September 8, 1892): 447.
- Dickinson, Emily. "Begin Here." *The Youth's Companion* (February 18, 1897): 77.
- . "A Book." *The Youth's Companion* (January 11, 1894): 20.
- . "A Book." *The Youth's Companion* (August 1, 1895): 364.
- . "Autumn." *The Youth's Companion* (September 8, 1892): 448.
- . "Called Back." *The Independent* XLIII (March 12, 1891): 1
- . "Departing." *Outlook* (January 25, 1896): 141.
- . "The Hummingbird." *The Youth's Companion* (September 19, 1895): II.
- . "Immortality." *Outlook* (January 25, 1896): 141.
- . "Life." *The Youth's Companion* (July 16, 1891): 396.
- . "The Martyrs." *The Independent* : 1.
- . "Nobody," *Life* 17 (5 March 1891): 146.
- . "One Word." *The Youth's Companion* (March 18, 1897): 123.
- . "Parting." *Scribner's Magazine* (June 1896): 780.
- . "A Poem." *The Christian Register* (April 2, 1891): 212.
- . *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition*. 3 vols. Ed. R.W. Franklin, 188-189.
- . "Renunciation," *Scribner's Magazine* (August 1890): 240

- . "Saturday." *The Youth's Companion* (September 22, 1892): 468.
- . "Sufficiency." *Outlook* (January 25, 1896): 141.
- Dickinson, Ned. "Ned's Notebook." Ed. Lara Vetter and Martha Nell Smith. *Dickinson Electronic Archives*. <http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson>
- Dickinson, Susan. Letter to Edward L. Burlingame, 15 July 1889, Dickinson folder, author files, Charles Scribner's Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- . "Notes Toward a Volume of Emily Dickinson's Writings." *Writings by Susan Dickinson*. *Dickinson Electronic Archives*
<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson>
- . "Obituary for Emily Dickinson." *Writings by Susan Dickinson*. *Dickinson Electronic Archives*. <http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson>
- [Dodge, Mary Mapes]. "Children's Magazines." *Scribner's Monthly* (July 1873): 352-354.
- [---]. "Helen Thayer Hutcheson." *St. Nicholas* 17, no. 3 (January 1890): 231-232.
- [---]. "Jack-in-the Pulpit." *St. Nicholas* 1 (December 1873): 100.
- [---]. "The Sad Story of Little Jane." Jack-in-the-Pulpit. *St. Nicholas* 2, no. 7 (May 1875): 450.
- . "The St. Nicholas Treasure-Box of Literature. Introduction: By the Editor." *St. Nicholas* 8, no. 2 (December 1880): 139-140.
- [---]. "Work and Play for Young Folk." *St. Nicholas* 11, no. 2 (December 1883): 182-183.
- [Dolge ad]. *The Youth's Companion* (November 11, 1897): 567.
- Donn, Dora. "'Companion Day.'" *The Youth's Companion* (June 14, 1894): 279.
- Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture* New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1988. Originally published Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

- E., A. von. "For the Women's Section: Emily Dickinson, Part II." *Der Westen* (June 19, 1898): sect. 3, 1. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 534-536.
- Eberwein, Jane Donahue. "Emily Dickinson and the Calvinist Sacramental Tradition." In *Emily Dickinson: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Judith Farr. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996. 89-104.
- "Eddie and His Twirl Poetry." Jack-in-the-Pulpit. *St. Nicholas* 2, no. 7 (May 1875): 451.
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* 69, no. 7 (February 13, 1890): 98 (2).
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* 70, no. 17 (April 23, 1891): 257 (1).
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* (July 2, 1891): 421 (1).
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* 70, no. 33 (August 13, 1891): 517 (1).
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* (November 12, 1891): 743 (3).
- "Editorial." *The Christian Register* (December 17, 1891): 823 (1).
- "Editorial Talks with Contributors: By the Editors of the Youth's Companion." *The Writer* (1896): 143-145.
- Ellsworth, William W. *A Golden Age of Authors: A Publisher's Recollection*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press Cambridge, 1919.
- "Emily Dickinson." *Readers Union Journal* (c. October 1891): 165-66. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 198-199.
- "Emily Dickinson's Second Volume." *Hartford Courant* (November 24, 1891): 4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 247-248.
- "End of Scribner's." *Time* 33 (May 15, 1939): 60.
- Erismann, Fred. "St. Nicholas." In *Children's Periodicals of the United States*. Ed. R. Gordon Kelly. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1984. 377-388.

- Erskine, John. "The Dickinson Feud." *The Memory of Certain Persons. Dickinson Electronic Archives*.
jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson/resources/feud/feudt1.html.
- Evensen, Bruce J. "The Mass Media and Revivalism in the Gilded Age." In *Media and Religion in American History*. Ed. Wm. David Sloan. Northport, AL: Vision Press, 2000. 119-133.
- Faderman, Lillian. "Emily Dickinson's Letters to Sue Gilbert." *Massachusetts Review* 18 (Summer 1977): 197-225.
- Farr, Judith. *The Passion of Emily Dickinson*. Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Field, Kate. "The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: Second Paper." *The Youth's Companion* (September 8, 1892): 447.
- "Filial Duties." *Youth's Companion* 1, no. 1 (April 16, 1827): 3.
- Filler, Louis. "The *Independent*: Indispensable Conservative in the Antislavery Crusade." In *Toward a New View of America*. Ed. Hans L. Trefousse. Burt Franklin & Co., 1977.
- . "Liberalism, Anti-Slavery, and the Founders of the *Independent*." *The New England Quarterly* (September 1954): 291-306.
- Foster, Warren Dunham. "What The Youth's Companion Has Done for School Improvement." *The New Country School: A Survey of Development*. W. K. Tate and Warren Dunham Foster. Boston, MA: Youth's Companion, 1914. 9-16.
- Fraistat, Neil. *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry*. Chapel Hill and London: The U of North Carolina P, 1985.
- Franklin, R.W. *The Editing of Emily Dickinson: A Reconsideration*. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 1967.
- . "Emily Dickinson's Packet 27 (and 80, 14, and 6)." *Harvard Library Bulletin* (1979): 342-348.
- , ed. *The Manuscript Books of Emily Dickinson*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, Belknap P, 1980.

- , ed. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition*. Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1998.
- . "Three Additional Manuscripts." *American Literature* 50 (1978): 109-116.
- "From the Book Store." *St. Joseph Daily News* (November 22, 1890): 9. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 26.
- Galante, Ferdinand. "A Study of the *St. Nicholas* Magazine under the Editorship of Mary Mapes Dodge (1838-1905)." M.A. Thesis. Wayne State U, 1938.
- Gannon, Susan R., and Ruth Ann Thompson. *Mary Mapes Dodge*. New York: Twayne, 1992.
- Garvey, Ellen Gruber. *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- "George Wharton Edwards." *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. Vol. XI. New York: James T. White & Co., 1909.
- Gilder, Jeannette L. "The Girl Who Thinks She Can Write: Third Paper." *The Youth's Companion* (September 15, 1892): 458.
- Golding, Alan. *From Outlaw to Classic: Canons in American Poetry*. Madison, WI: The U of Wisconsin P, 1995.
- Goodale, Dora Read. "Christina Churning," *St. Nicholas* 11, no. 2 (December 1883): 183.
- Gray, Janet. *She Wields a Pen: American Women Poets of the Nineteenth Century*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1997.
- Greenspan, Ezra. *George Palmer Putnam: Representative American Publisher*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State UP, 2000.
- Greetham, D.C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1994.
- Greg, W.W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-51): 19-36.

- Grigely, Joseph. *Textualterity: art, theory and textual criticism*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1995.
- “Grim Slumber Songs.” *New York Commercial Advertiser* (January 6, 1891): 4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 85.
- Handy, Robert T. *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*. London: Oxford UP, 1971. Paperback 1974.
- Haralson, Eric L. “Mars in Petticoats: Longfellow and Sentimental Masculinity.” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 51, no. 6 (1996): 327-355.
- Harbour, J. L. “An Autograph Poet.” *The Youth’s Companion* (April 29, 1886): 166.
- . “The Dilloway Prize.” *The Youth’s Companion* (September 17, 1885): 365-366.
- [---]. “Mary Ames’s Novel.” *The Youth’s Companion* (August 12, 1886): 302-303.
- . “Rhyiming Rube.” *The Youth’s Companion* (January 24, 1901): 38-39.
- Harrington, Joseph. *Poetry and the Public: The Social Form of Modern U.S. Poetics*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 2002.
- . “Why American Poetry Is Not American Literature.” *American Literary History* 8 (1996): 496-515.
- Harris, Louise. *None but the best; or, The story of three pioneers: The Youth’s Companion, Daniel Sharp Ford [and] C. A. Stephens*. Providence: C. A. Stephens Collection, Brown U, 1966.
- Hart, Ellen Louise. “The Encoding of Homoerotic Desire: Emily Dickinson’s Letters and Poems to Susan Dickinson, 1850-1886.” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 251-272.
- Hart, Ellen Louise, and Martha Nell Smith, eds. *Open Me Carefully: Emily Dickinson’s Intimate Letters to Susan Huntington Dickinson*. Ashfield, MA: Paris Press, 1998.
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

- Hawes, Libbie. "Poems by a Little Girl." *St. Nicholas* 8, no. 6 (April 1881): 470.
- Herford, Oliver. "[A poet named]." *St. Nicholas* 14, no. 5 (March 1887): 384.
- "Herford, Oliver [Brooke]." *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. Vol. 27. New York: James T. White & Co. 1939. 34-35.
- Herford, Brooke. "Christianity, But With the Door Open." *Christian Register* (May 21, 1891): 323 (3).
- Higginson, Mary Thacher. *Thomas Wentworth Higginson: The Story of His Life*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914.
- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. "Emily Dickinson's Letters." *Atlantic Monthly* 68 (October 1891): 444-456. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 182-197.
- . Letter to Mary Mapes Dodge. *St. Nicholas* Correspondence. Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- . Preface to *Poems by Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Mabel Loomis Todd and T.W. Higginson. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1890; reprint Gainesville, FL: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967.
- . "Recent American Poetry." *Nation* 60 (May 23, 1895): 402. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 440-442.
- Hills, William H. "The Annual Poetry Product." *The Writer* (1893): 221-222.
- "Holding His Audiences." *The Christian Register* 69, no. 38 (September 18, 1890): 612 (16). Rpt. *Chicago Herald*.
- "Home Poets." *The Youth's Companion* (June 15, 1893): 304-305.
- Horan, Elizabeth. "Mabel Loomis Todd, Martha Dickinson Bianchi, and the Spoils of the Dickinson Legacy." In *A Living of Words: American Women in Print Culture*. Ed. Susan Albertine. Knoxville: The U of Tennessee P, 1995. 65-93.
- . "To Market: The Dickinson Copyright Wars." *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 5, no. 1 (1996): 88-120.

- “How to Cure a Poet.” *The Youth’s Companion* (December 11, 1890): 678.
- Howe, M.A. de Wolfe, Jr. “Literary Affairs in Boston,” *The Book Buyer* 11, no. 10 (November 1894): 425.
- . *A Venture in Remembrance*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970, c1941.
- Howe, Susan. “These Flames and Generosities of the Heart: Emily Dickinson and the Illogic of Sumptuary Values.” *Sulfur* 28 (Spring 1991): 134-155.
- Hoyt, Florence S. “Intelligent Sociability.” *Congregationalist* 78 (March 2, 1893): 337-38. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 321-323.
- [Hughes, Rupert]. Chelifer (pseud.). “The Ideas of Emily Dickinson.” *Godey’s Magazine* 133 (November 1896): 541-43. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 498-503.
- Humphrey, Carol Sue. “Religious Newspapers and Antebellum Reform.” In *Media and Religion*. Ed. Wm. David Sloan. Northport, AL: Vision Press, 2000. 104-118. Rpt. of *Religious Telescope* (Circleville, OH) 27 November 1839.
- “Information Wanted.” Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 70, no. 47 (November 19, 1891): 761 (5).
- “Inquiring Friends.” *Christian Union* 43 (January 15, 1891): 88. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 100.
- [Ivers & Pond Pianos ad.] *The Youth’s Companion* (October 30, 1890). n.p.
- Jackson, H. J. *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory.” *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982. 3-45.
- Jenkins, MacGregor. “A Child’s Recollections of Emily Dickinson.” *Christian Union* 44 (October 24, 1891): 776-77. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the*

- 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 215-217.
- . *Emily Dickinson: Friend and Neighbor*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1930.
- John, Arthur. *The Best Years of the Century: Richard Watson Gilder, Scribner's Monthly, and the Century Magazine, 1870-1909*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1981.
- Johnson, Thomas. "Appendix 9: Poems Published in Emily Dickinson's Lifetime." *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. 3 vols. Ed. Thomas Johnson. Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1955.
- . "Appendix 10: Chronological Listing of First Publication Elsewhere Than in Collections," *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1955), 1207-1208.
- , ed. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1955.
- "Jottings." *Boston Transcript* (September 12, 1892): 4.
- Karcher, Caroline. "Lydia Maria Child and the *Juvenile Miscellany*: The Creation of an American Children's Literature." In *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*. Ed. Kenneth M. Price and Susan Belasco Smith. Charlottesville and London: UP of Virginia, 1995. 90-114.
- Kelly, R. Gordon. *Mother Was a Lady: Self and Society in Selected American Children's Periodicals, 1865-1890*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974.
- Kelly, Lionel. "Emily Dickinson: Imagining a Text." *Emily Dickinson Journal* 5, no.2 (1996): 155-161.
- "The Keyboard." *The Youth's Companion* (December 24, 1891): 665-666.
- Kindilien, Carlin T. *American Poetry in the Eighteen Nineties: A Study of American Verse, 1890-1899, Based upon the Volumes from the Period Contained in the Harris Collection of American Poetry and Plays in the Brown University Library*. Providence, RI: Brown UP, 1956.
- Klassen, Kenneth. Introduction. "The School of Nature: An Annotated index of writings on nature in 'St. Nicholas Magazine' during the editorship of Mary Mapes Dodge, 1873-1905." Diss. U of Kansas, 1989.

- L., A. W. "Meadville." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 70, no. 34 (August 20, 1891): 535 (3).
- L., W. H. "Rev. J.W. Chadwick's Sermons." *The Christian Register* 70, no. 28 (July 9, 1891): 446 (10).
- [Lang, Andrew]. "An American Sappho." *London Daily News* (October 3, 1891): 4-5. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 201-204.
- [---]. "The Superior Sex." *Critic* 18 (August 27, 1892): 112. Rpt. from undated *London Daily News*. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 317.
- Larcom, Lucy. "Poems and Carols of Winter," *St. Nicholas* 4, no. 2 [December 1876]: 65-74.
- . "Songs of Spring: Part I." *St. Nicholas* 4, no. 6 (April 1877): 365-369.
- . "Songs of Spring: Part II." *St. Nicholas* 4, no. 7 (May 1877): 459-465.
- Learned, Walter. "Molly's Poetry." *St. Nicholas* 14, no. 1 (November 1886): 58.
- Lease, Benjamin. *Emily Dickinson's Readings of Men and Books: Sacred Soundings*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Leyda, Jay. *The Years and Hours of Emily Dickinson*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1960.
- Letter. *The Christian Register* (February 19, 1891).
- "The Letter-Box." *St. Nicholas* 18, no. 7 (May 1891): 564-566.
- "The Letter-Box." *St. Nicholas* 18, no. 8 (June 1891): 644-646.
- "Literary Comments." *Springfield [Mass.] Homestead* (November 7, 1891): 5. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 230-231.
- "Literary Diplomats." *The Youth's Companion* (October 1, 1890): 520.

- “Literary Notes.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 31 (July 31, 1890): 495 (11).
- “Literary Notes.” *The Christian Register* 70 (June 11, 1891): 383 (11).
- “Literary Notes.” *The Christian Register* 70, no. 49 (December 3, 1891): 799 (11).
- “Literary Notes.” *Christian Union* 44 (September 12, 1891): 503. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 172.
- “Literary Notes.” *The Independent* 43 (January 1, 1891): 20. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 78-79.
- “Literary Notes.” *New York Tribune* (August 23, 1896): sect. 2, 22. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 459.
- “Literary Notes.” *Outlook* 50 (November 17, 1894): 809. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 339-340.
- “The Literary Querist.” *Book Buyer* n.s. 11 (January 1895): 759.
- Little, Greta. “The Care and Nurture of Aspiring Writers: Young Contributors to *Our Young Folks* and *St. Nicholas*.” *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly* 17, no. 4 (1992-1993 Winter): 19-23.
- Litz, Francis E., ed. *Letters—Grave and Gay and Other Prose of John Bannister Tabb*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1950.
- Loeffelholz, Mary. “Prospects for the Study of Emily Dickinson.” *Resources for American Literary Study* 25, no. 1 (1999): 1-25.
- Long, Kim Martin. “Selected Scholarship 1999-2003.” *American Periodicals* 13 (2003): 125-144.
- Longinow, Michael A. “The Foundations of Evangelical Publishing: 1900-1942.” In *Media and Religion in American History*. Ed. Wm. David Sloan. Northport, AL: Vision Press, 2000. 244-260.

- Longworth, Polly. *Austin and Mabel: The Amherst Affair & Love Letters of Austin Dickinson and Mabel Loomis Todd*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1984.
- Love, Harold. *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.
- Lubbers, Klaus. *Emily Dickinson: The Critical Revolution*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1968.
- Lund, Michael. *America's Continuing Story: An Introduction to Serial Fiction, 1850-1900*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1993.
- Lundin, Roger. *Emily Dickinson and the Art of Belief*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- "A Magazine Anniversary." *The Outlook* (January 13, 1912): 64-65.
- "Magazine Notes." *Christian Union* 44 (October 10, 1891): 689. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 212.
- "The Magazines." *The Christian Register* 69, no. 15 (April 10, 1890): 235 (11).
- "The Magazines." *The Christian Register* 69, no. 18 (May 1, 1890): 282 (10).
- "The Magazines." *The Christian Register* 71 (February 18, 1892): 111 (11).
- "The Magazines." *The Christian Register* 71, no. 11 (March 17, 1892): 175 (11).
- Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Mason, Miriam E. *Mary Mapes Dodge, Jolly Girl*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1949.
- Maun, Caroline C. "Editorial Policy in the Poems of Emily Dickinson, Third Series." *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 3, no. 2 (1994): 56-77.
- Maxwell, P. *Quarterly Illustrator* 1, no. 1 (1893): 86.
- McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville/London: University Press of Virginia, 1983; paperback 1992.

- . "Emily Dickinson's Visible Language." *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 2, no. 2 (Nov. 1993): 40-57.
- . *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991.
- McGill, Meredith. "Unauthorized Poe" and "Poe, Literary Nationalism, and Authorial Identity," *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.
- McKenzie, D.F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: The British Library, 1986.
- McKinney, M.S. "In the Twilight of Poetry." *The Saturday Evening Post* 171, no. 27 (December 31, 1898): 426.
- [Mission statement]. *Christian Register* (December 31, 1895): 859.
- "Mr. Savage's Catechism Defended." *The Christian Register* 70, no. 14 (April 2, 1891): 217 (9).
- Montgomery, William Howard. "Our Flag." *The Christian Register* 70 (July 30, 1891): 496 (12).
- Moore, R. Laurence. *Selling God: American Religion in the Marketplace of Culture*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.
- Morris, Adelaide. "'The Love of Thee—a Prism Be': Men and Women in the Love Poetry of Emily Dickinson." In *Feminist Critics Read Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Suzanne Juhasz. Bloomington: U of Indiana P, 1983. 98-113.
- Moses, Montrose J. "Her Choice." *St. Nicholas* 27, no. 1 (November 1899): 67.
- Mossberg, Barbara Antonina Clarke. "Emily Dickinson's Nursery Rhymes." In *Feminist Critics Read Emily Dickinson*. Ed. and Intro. Suzanne Juhasz. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1983. 45-66.
- Mott, Frank Luther. *American Journalism: A History, 1690-1960*. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Mott, Frank Luther. *A History of American Magazines*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1938-1968.

- . "The Independent." *A History of American Magazines* Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1938-1968.
- . "St. Nicholas." *A History of American Magazines*. Vol. 3. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1938-1968. 500-505.
- . "Scribner's Magazine." *A History of American Magazines* Vol. 4. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1938-1968. 717-732.
- . "The Youth's Companion." *A History of American Magazines* Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1938-1968. 262-274.
- Moulton, Louise Chandler. "A Rondel for June." *The Youth's Companion* (June 12, 1890): 322.
- . "With the Poets." *Boston Sunday Herald* (November 22, 1891): 24. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 243-246.
- Mudge, Jean McClure. "Emily Dickinson and 'Sister Sue.'" *Prairie Schooner* 52 (Spring 1977): 90-108.
- M[ussey], H. R. "Barrows, Samuel J." *Dictionary of American Biography*. Vol. 1. Ed. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. 652-654.
- "National School Celebration of Columbus Day." *The Youth's Companion* (September 8, 1892): 446.
- "New Books." *Boston Post* (November 27, 1890): 2. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 39.
- "New Holiday Books." *Cambridge [Mass.] Tribune* 14 (December 12, 1891): 1. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 268-269.
- "New Publications." *Boston Saturday Evening Gazette* (November 23, 1891): [4]. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 248-249.
- "News and Notes." *The Writer* (March 1891): 64-65.

- Nichols, Francis A. "Some Powerful Poems by Emily Dickinson." *Boston Sunday Globe* (December 14, 1890): 25. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 58-60.
- Noll, Mark A. "The Evangelical Enlightenment and the Task of Theological Education." In *Communication and Change in American Religious History*. Ed. Leonard Sweet. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1993. 270-300.
- Nord, David Paul. "The Evangelical Origins of Mass Media in American, 1815-1835." *Journalism Monographs* 88 (May 1984): 1-30.
- . "Reading the Newspaper: Strategies and Politics of Reader Response, Chicago, 1912-17." *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2001. 246-273.
- . "Religious Reading and Readers in Antebellum America." *Journal of the Early Republic* 15 (Summer 1995): 241-272.
- . "Systematic Benevolence: Religious Publishing and the Marketplace in Early Nineteenth-Century America." In *Communication and Change in American Religious History*. Ed. Leonard Sweet. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1993. 239-69.
- . "Working-Class Readers: Family, Community, and Reading in Late Nineteenth-Century America." *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2001. 225-245.
- Oberhaus, Dorothy Huff. "In Defense of Sue." *Dickinson Studies* 48 (1983): 1-25.
- Ohmann, *Politics of Letters*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan UP; Scranton, Pa.: Distributed by Harper & Row, c1987.
- . *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century*. London and New York: Verso, 1996.
- Okker, Patricia. *Our Sister Editors: Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors*. Athens and London: The U of Georgia P, 1995.

- Olpin, Larry. "In Defense of the Colonel: (Col. Higginson & a Problem of Literary Evaluation)." *Dickinson Studies* vol. 43, p. 24. Rpt. in *Higginson Journal* 42 (June 1985): 3-14.
- "On the Reading of Poetry." *The Century* (April 1900): 960-961.
- "Out and About," *Worcester [Mass.] Spy* (January 25, 1895): 4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 412-415.
- P., A. G. "The Companion in 1836." *The Youth's Companion* (February 7, 1889): 74.
- Parsons, T. W. "Lamp to my Feet." *The Christian Register* 69 (September 18, 1890): 599(3). Reprinted from the *Boston Transcript*.
- Patterson, Rebecca. *The Riddle of Emily Dickinson*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.; Cambridge: The Riverside P, 1951.
- Pellew, George. "Ten Years of American Literature." *Critic* n.s. 16 (January 17, 1891): 29. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 101-102.
- "Periodicals Wanted." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 69 (January 23, 1890): 51 (3).
- Petrino, Elizabeth A. *Emily Dickinson and Her Contemporaries: Women's Verse in America, 1820-1885*. Hanover and London: UP of New England, 1998.
- "A Plea for the Poets." *The Century* (1896): 316-317.
- "Poems by Two Little American Girls," *St. Nicholas* 15, no. 2 (December 1877): 109-110.
- "Poetry and the Drama." *Review of Reviews* [London] 4 (September 1891): 308. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 169-170.
- "Poetry of the Month." *Literary Opinion* 7, no. 65 (September 1891): 63. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 168-169.
- "A Poet's Emergency," *The Youth's Companion* (November 7, 1895): 568-569.

- “A Poet’s Pathetic Plea.” *The Writer* (February 1890): 33.
- “‘Point of View’: 1890-1923 Contributors,” *Scribner’s Magazine* Records: 1886-1941, Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Post-Lauria, Sheila. *Correspondent Colorings: Melville in the Marketplace*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1996.
- “Post-Office Mission.” *The Christian Register* 69, no. 19 (May 8, 1890): 294 (6).
- Pratt, Sarah S. “A Diet of Candy.” *St. Nicholas* 18, no. 7 (May 1891): 557-559.
- Price, Kenneth M., and Susan Belasco Smith. “Periodical Literature in Social and Historical Context.” *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*. Charlottesville and London: UP of Virginia, 1995. 3-16.
- “Prospectus of the *Youth’s Companion*.” *The Youth’s Companion* (April 16, 1827): 1.
- Pykett, Lyn. “Reading the Periodical Press: Text and Context.” In *Investigating Victorian Journalism*. Ed. Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden. New York: St. Martin’s, 1990.
- Radway, Janice. “Beyond Mary Bailey and Old Maid Librarians: Reimagining Readers and Rethinking Reading.” *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 35, no. 4 (Fall 1994): 275-296.
- . “Reading Is Not Eating: Mass-Produced Literature and the Theoretical, Methodological, and Political Consequences of a Metaphor.” *Book Research Quarterly* (Fall 1986): 7-29.
- Ranlett, L. Felix. “The *Youth’s Companion* as Recalled by a Staff Member” (1951). In *The Hewins Lectures*. Ed. Siri Andrews. Boston: Horn Book, 1963. 85-104.
- “Recent Books of Verse.” *Christian Union* 45 (June 18, 1892): 1212. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 316-317.
- “The Record of 1890.” *Literary World* 22 (Jan. 17, 1891): 24. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 101.

- “Record of Matter Accepted: 1886 to 1900.” *Scribner’s Magazine* Records, Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Reed, David. “Appendices: Content Analysis, Percentage Allocation to Various topics.” *The Popular Magazine in Britain and the United States: 1880-1960*. Toronto and Buffalo: U of Toronto P, 1997. 236-262.
- Reiman, Donald H. “‘Versioning’: The Presentation of Multiple Texts.” *Romantic Texts and Contexts*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1987. 167-180.
- “Rejection Files. Record of Manuscripts Received and Rejected: 1873-1888.” Charles Scribner’s Sons Archives, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Robbins, F. E. C. “A Writer of Fiction.” *The Youth’s Companion* (October 4, 1917): 542.
- . “John Wyman’s Prize Poem.” *The Youth’s Companion* (February 18, 1892): 82-83.
- Roggenbuck, Mary June. “*St. Nicholas* Magazine: A Study of the Impact and Historical Influence of the Editorship of Mary Mapes Dodge.” Diss. U of Michigan, 1976.
- R[ollins], C. P. “Theodore Low DeVinne.” *Dictionary of American Biography*. Vol. III. Ed. Allen Johnson and Dumans Malone. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1931.
- Rollins, Alice Wellington. “Effie’s Realistic Novel.” *St. Nicholas* 14, no. 4 (February 1887): 258-262.
- Rose, Jonathan. “A Preface to a History of Audiences.” *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2001. 1-11.
- Rosta, Paul. “The Magazine that Taught Faulkner, Fitzgerald, and Millay How to Write.” *American Heritage* 37, no. 1 (1985): 40-47.
- Runkle, Lucia Gilbert. “Mary Mapes Dodge.” *Our Famous Women: An Authorized Record of Their Lives and Deeds*. Hartford: A.D. Worthington & Co. Pub., 1884. 276-294.

- St. Armand, Barton Levi. *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture: The Soul's Society*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- . "Emily Dickinson and *The Indicator*: A Transcendental Frolic." *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 2, no. 2 (November 1993): 78-96.
- Sands, Marget. "Re-reading the Poems: Editing Opportunities in Variant Versions." *Emily Dickinson Journal* 5, no.2 (1996): 139-147.
- Satelmajer, Ingrid, and Matt Hill, eds. "Emily Dickinson and *The Youth's Companion*" <jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson/classroom/spring98/s98intro.html>.
- Scholnick, Robert J. "Don't Tell! They'd Advertise!: Emily Dickinson in the *Round Table*." In *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America* Ed. Kenneth M. Price and Susan Belasco Smith. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995. 166-182.
- . "J.G. Holland and the 'Religion of Civilization' in Mid-Nineteenth Century America." *American Studies* 27 (1986): 55-79.
- "Scraps of Verse from the Pen of Emily Dickinson." *Boston Herald* (December 29, 1890): 6. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 67-68.
- "Seats of Learning." *The Youth's Companion* (Nov. 16, 1893): 585.
- Sedgwick, Ellery. *The Atlantic Monthly, 1857-1909: Yankee Humanism at High Tide and Ebb*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1994.
- . "Magazines and the Profession of Authorship in the United States, 1840-1900." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 94, no. 3 (2000): 399-425.
- Sewall, Richard B. *The Life of Emily Dickinson*. 2 vols. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974.
- Shaw, John MacKay. *The Poems, Poets & Illustrators of St. Nicholas Magazine, 1873-1943: An Index*. Tallahassee: Florida State U Strozier Library, 1965.
- Sicherman, Barbara. "Reading and Middle-Class Identity in Victorian America: Cultural Consumption, Conspicuous and Otherwise." In *Reading Acts: U.S. Readers' Interactions with Literature, 1800-1950*. Ed. Barbara Ryan and Amy M. Thomas. Knoxville: The U of Tennessee P, 2002.

- Sixtieth Anniversary Issue. *The Independent*. 65 (December 10, 1908).
- Smith, H. Shelton, Robert T. Handy, Lefferts A. Loetscher. *American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents*. Vol. II. 1820-1960. New York: Scribner, 1963.
- Smith, Jack. "Jack's Attempts at Composition." *The Youth's Companion* (June 18, 1874): 196-197.
- Smith, Martha Nell. "The Poet as Cartoonist." In *Comic Power in Emily Dickinson*. Suzanne Juhasz, Cristanne Miller, Martha Nell Smith. Austin: U of Texas P, 1993. 63-102.
- . *Rowing in Eden: Rereading Emily Dickinson*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1992.
- . "Susan and Emily Dickinson: their lives, in letters." In *The Cambridge Companion to Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Wendy Martin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 51-73.
- , with Jarom MacDonald. "Mutilations: What Has Been Erased, Inked Over, and Cut Away?" *Dickinson Electronic Archives*.
<http://www.emilydickinson.org/mutilation/mintro.html>.
- Smith, Martha Nell, and Lara Vetter. Introduction. "Ned's Notebook." Ed. Lara Vetter and Martha Nell Smith. *Dickinson Electronic Archives*.
<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/dickinson>
- "Snowed Under." Pro and Con Department. *The Christian Register* 70, no. 14 (April 2, 1891): 211 (3).
- "A Stay-at-Home Poet." *The Youth's Companion* (April 13, 1893): 189.
- Stedman, Edmund Clarence. *Poets of America*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company; The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1885.
- Steen, Sallie Pate. "Burt Colby's Assistant." *The Youth's Companion* (December 24, 1891): 665-666.
- Stroupe, Henry Smith. *The Religious Press in the South Atlantic States, 1802-1865: An Annotated Bibliography with Historical Introduction and Notes*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1956.

- “A Suggestion for Authors.” *The Christian Register* (August 20, 1891): 538. First published in the *Book Buyer* [n.d.].
- Swan, Caroline D. “An Out-Door Wedding.” *The Youth’s Companion* (June 12, 1890): 322.
- “Talk About Books.” *Chautauquan* 12 (February 1891): 692. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 113.
- “Talk About New Books.” *Catholic World* 52 (January 1891): 600-604.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. “Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology.” *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 83-143.
- . “Textual Instability and Editorial Idealism.” *Studies in Bibliography* 49 (1996): 1-60.
- Tebbel, John, and Mary Ellen Zuckerman. *The Magazine in America: 1741-1990*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Terris, Virginia Rinaldy. “Emily Dickinson and the Genteel Critics.” Diss. New York U, 1967.
- Thayer, John Adams. *Astir: A Publisher’s Life-Story*. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1910.
- Thomas, Amy M. “Reading the Silences: Documenting the History of American Tract Society Readers in the Antebellum South.” In *Reading Acts: U.S. Readers’ Interactions with Literature, 1800-1950*. Ed. Barbara Ryan and Amy M. Thomas. Knoxville: The U of Tennessee P, 2002.
- Thompson, Lovell, ed. *Youth’s Companion*. Cambridge: Riverside; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954.
- Thompson, Maurice. “Miss Dickinson’s Poems.” *America* 5 (January 8, 1891): 425. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson’s Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 94-98.
- Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996.

- Todd, Mabel Loomis. Editorial comment and narrative bridges. *Letters of Emily Dickinson*, ed. Mabel Loomis Todd, 2 vols. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1894. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 343-348.
- . Diary. Mabel Loomis Todd Papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, microfilm.
- . "List of Articles by MLT 1883-1893." Mabel Loomis Todd Papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- . "Reminiscences of Emily Dickinson." *Boston Evening Transcript* (May 2, 1891): 9. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 141-142.
- "Too Brilliant." *The Youth's Companion* (September 1, 1892): 433.
- Tooker, L. Frank. *The Joys and Tribulations of an Editor*. New York: The Century Co., 1923, 1924.
- Towne, Charles Hanson. *Adventures in Editing*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1926.
- [Twining, Kinsley, and William Hayes Ward.] "Poems by Emily Dickinson." *Independent* 42 (December 11, 1890): 1759. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 52-55.
- "A Unitarian Duty." Editorial. *The Christian Register* (September 10, 1891): 581 (1).
- Unlocated clipping. Original publication place unknown (ca. November 15, 1891). Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 238-239.
- [Untitled]. *The Independent* (November 13, 1890): 732.
- [Untitled]. *Current Literature* 2, no.2 (February 2, 1889): 93-94.
- W., K. L. "Information Wanted" *Christian Register* (November 19, 1891): 761 (5).
- Walker, Cheryl, ed. *American Women Poets of the Nineteenth Century: An Anthology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1992.

- . *The Nightingale's Burden: Women Poets and American Culture before 1900*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1982.
- Ward, Susan Hayes. "A Decade of Poetry, 1889-1899." *Independent* 51 (September 28, 1899): 2610. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 546.
- Ward, William Hayes. "Sixty Years of the Independent," *The Independent* LXV (Dec. 10, 1908): 1345-1351.
- Watts, Emily Stipes. *The Poetry of American Women: from 1632 to 1945*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1977.
- Weber, Ronald. *Hired Pens: Professional Writers in America's Golden Age of Print*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1997.
- Wells, Anna Mary. *Dear Preceptor: The Life and Times of Thomas Wentworth Higginson*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.
- . "Early Criticism of Emily Dickinson." *American Literature* 1, no. 3 (November 1929): 243-259.
- . "ED Forgeries." *Dickinson Studies* 35 (1979): 12-16.
- Werner, Marta. *Emily Dickinson's Open Folios: Scenes of Reading, Surfaces of Writing*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1995.
- Wharton, Edith. "William C. Brownell." *Scribner's Magazine* LXXXIV, 5 (Nov. 1928): 598-602.
- Whicher, George F. "Notes and Queries: Some Uncollected Poems by Emily Dickinson." *American Literature* 20 (1949): 436-440.
- [Whiting, Lilian]. "Literature." *Boston Budget* (November 23, 1890): Unlocated. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 26-28.
- Willis, [Nathaniel], and [Asa] Rand. "Prospectus of the *Youth's Companion*." *Youth's Companion* (April 16, 1827): 1.
- [---]. "To Children and Youth." *The Youth's Companion* (June 6, 1827): 7.

- [Wortman, Denis]. "Among Some Books." *Christian Intelligencer* 62 (October 7, 1891): 3-4. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 210-211.
- Wright, Catharine Morris. "How 'St. Nicholas' Got Rudyard Kipling: And What Happened Then." *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 35 (1974): 259-289.
- "Writing Poetry." *The Youth's Companion* (Feb. 13, 1890): 87.
- Young, Alexander. "Boston Letter." *Critic* n.s. 14 (August 2, 1890): 60. Rpt. in *Emily Dickinson's Reception in the 1890s: A Documentary History*. Ed. Willis J. Buckingham. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1989. 3.
- The Youth's Companion* (September 8, 1892): 451.
- "A Youth's Companion Family in 1827." *The Youth's Companion* (Jan. 13, 1927): 39.
- Zboray, Ronald J. "Technology and the Character of Community Life in Antebellum America: The Role of Story Papers." In *Communication and Change in American Religious History*. Ed. Leonard I. Sweet. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993. 185-215.

