THE POLITICAL AND LITERARY CAREERS OF F. B. SANBORN

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

Benjamin Blakely Hickok

1953

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

The Political and Literary Careers
of F.B. Sanborn

presented by

Benjamin Hickok

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

Russel B. Nye
Major professor

Date March 4, 1953

O-169

THE POLITICAL AND LITERARY CAREERS

OF F. B. SANBORN

By

Benjamin Blakely Rickok

AN ABSTRACT

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

Year 1953

Approved R. W. Boyce

The Political and Literary Careers of F. B. Sanborn

This thesis is limited to a critical study of Sanborn's political and literary careers. Divided into six chapters with a preface, an introduction, and a bibliography, the study includes a discussion of Sanborn's early life, his life at Harvard, his career as a teacher, his political career, his literary career, and his personality.

The greatest problem in writing a critical study of Sanborn is the organization of material. First, as Sanborn was almost totally incapable of writing anything which was well organized, his biographer is forced to organize his life for him. Second, much of the Sanborn original material has been destroyed or scattered. Third, some of the Sanborn papers are inaccessible. The love letters and tokens that passed between Sanborn and Ariana Walker are, presumably, cached in the cornerstone in the gable of Sanborn's house in Concord; his correspondence with Edith Emerson is held by a private collector and is not for publication; and an unknown number of letters which passed between Sanborn, the other members of the Secret Six, and John Brown were destroyed by Sanborn after Brown's capture at Harper's Ferry.

Chapter I, "His Early Life," discusses the influence of heredity and environment upon the development of Sanborn's political, literary, religious, and social attitudes, and portrays vividly the most important influences: the members of his family, his life in Hampton Falls, his public and private education, and his life's greatest passion—Ariana Walker.

Chapter II, "His Life at Harvard," discusses his intellectual environment at college: his teachers, his academic and social activities, his life among the famous of Boston and Concord as revealed in his college journal, and his tragic first marriage. Most of the chapter is devoted

to his literary activities as founder and editor of The Harvard Magazine and to an appraisal of the numerous essays, critical reviews, verse, and editorial comment which he wrote for it.

Chapter III, "His Career As a Teacher," recounts his work in Emerson's school and the Concord School of Philosophy. The chapter is pertinent to this study because Sanborn's life was intertwined with the lives of the Concord great through such activities as his Concord Dramatic Union, his entertainments for his school, his daily meals at Mrs. Thoreau's, and his daily relationships with the Alcotts, the Emersons, and Ellery Channing—activities which prefigured his literary career as their biographer and editor.

Chapter IV, "His Political Career," tells of his work in four important projects. He supplied money, men, and arms for John Brown's activities in Kansas and Virginia through his work as secretary of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee; he wrote biographies of John Brown and bitterly defended his memory in the public prints; he was editor-in-chief of the Boston antislavery weekly, The Commonwealth; and he was a political columnist for the Springfield (Mass.) Daily Republican for forty-nine years.

Chapter V, "His Literary Career," is chiefly concerned with Sanborn's voluminous work as biographer and editor of Thoreau and as literary columnist for the Springfield Republican. As Sanborn's importance to American literature derives chiefly from his work on Thoreau, the major portion of this chapter is devoted to a critical analysis of Sanborn's texts, the reviews which these received from contemporary and modern critics, and the "improvements" which Sanborn made in transcribing his original sources. The rest of the chapter attempts to evaluate his work

as the biographer and editor of Bronson Alcott, Emerson, Parker, Ellery Channing, and Hawthorne; his work as a writer of verse; his labors as literary editor of The Commonwealth; and his work as the writer for the Republican of twice-weekly columns of literary news, comment, history, and criticism that included an amazing variety of literary topics.

Chapter VI, "His Personality," discusses Sanborn's personal traits and attempts to estimate Sanborn's importance to the world. It may be said that Sanborn was a romantic politician, a bitter, vindictive, and controversial defender of John Brown, a poor scholar, a bad writer, an irresponsible editor, and a second-rate journalist. Yet, as Odell Shepard says, "There was in him a power of steadfast devotion and admiration which atoned for many defects. He served as a reflector--flawed and cracked though it was--for men and women and events that might well, without him, have been forgotten or less well understood."

It must be said, however, that the later study of Sanborn's work as a social reformer--a career which was generally applauded--may serve as an antidote to this somewhat disillusioning portrait.

THE POLITICAL AND LITERARY CAREERS OF F. B. SANBORN

By

BENJAMIN BLAKELY HICKOK

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1953

THESIS

VITA

Benjamin Blakely Hickok

candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Final Examination: March 4, 1953, 3:00-5:00 P. M., Room 212, Morrill Hall.

Dissertation: The Political and Literary Careers of F. B. Sanborn

Outline of Studies:

Major Subject: American Literature

Minor Subject: English Literature

Biographical Items:

Born, July 26, 1914, Oneonta, New York

Undergraduate Studies, Bachelor of Arts, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, 1932-1936

Graduate Studies, Master of Arts in Speech, State University of Iowa, 1939-1940; Michigan State College, 1946-1953

Experience: Instructor in English, Athens College, Athens, Greece, 1936-1939; Instructor in English and Reading, Foundation School, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky, 1940-1941; Instructor in English Composition, Speech, and Dramatic Art, Department of English, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky, 1941-1942; Cryptographer, Army Airways Communication System, 1942-1945; Michigan State College: Instructor, Department of Communication Skills, 1946-1948; Director, English for Foreign Students, 1946-1947; Director, Writing Clinic, 1946-1949; Assistant Professor, 1948-

Member of Pi Delta Epsilon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In this preface I would like to thank those who have helped me in the preparing of this critical study and I would like to indicate the attitude I have taken in transcribing my materials. In point of time, I am indebted first to Dr. Claude M. Newlin for suggesting this study. To Dr. Russel B. Nye, my major professor, and to Dr. Carson C. Hamilton and Dr. Lawrence Babb, the members of my committee, I can now appropriately indicate my deep appreciation not only for their criticisms and suggestions for improving my manuscript but for their sympathetic personal consideration and encouragement. I also want to thank Dr. Arnold Williams of the Department of English and Dr. Stuart Gallacher and Dr. William Seaman of the Department of Foreign Languages for the help which they have given me on various problems.

I owe a special debt to several people. To Mr. Francis Bachiler Sanborn I am grateful for his extraordinarily outspoken, vivid, and honest observations of his father and for the warm hospitality which he and Mrs. Sanborn provided me at their summer home in Sea Girt, New Jersey. To Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer I extend my thanks for her innumerable courtesies to me while I was in Concord, for her notes on Sanborn material and her transcriptions of letters received in the Concord Public Library after I had completed my research there, for checking occasional references and sources, and for her many notes on Concord persons, places, and things. I must thank particularly Mrs. Charles K. Darling

of Concord, long a friend of the Sanborns, for her vivid and intelligent reminiscences and anecdotes, which have added such a breath of life to the knowledge of Sanborn's personality; Mr. Richard Hooker of Blandford, Mass., Sanborn's colleague on the Springfield Republican, for his courteous hospitality and his reminiscences of Sanborn as an editor and columnist; Miss Dorothy Morris of the staff of the Clarke School for the Deaf for her amusing stories of Sanborn's visits to the school; Miss Clara Endicott Sears, the Fruitlands Museum, Harvard, Mass., for her reminiscences of the Sanborns; and Mr. William Henry Harrison, director of the Museum; and Mr. Francis H. Allen of Cambridge, Mass., for his numerous letters to me in answer to many questions, particularly on matters of Thoreau scholarship. I owe a peculiar debt to Dr. Walter Harding of the Schools of English of the University of Virginia not only for the use of his large collection of Sanborn manuscripts and materials but for his encouraging me in a study that has often proved grim, frustrating, and disillusioning.

To Mrs. Kathryn Whitford of Milwaukee I am indebted for her generous offer of her Sanborn bibliography, her notes on Sanborn's "Our Boston Literary Letter," and for a thirty-page biographical sketch, all of which formed what she terms an "aborted effort" at a study of Sanborn. None of her material is included in my main text, however, with the exception of some of her notes on Sanborn's "Our Boston Literary Letter," which appear in the last few pages of Chapter V, for these pages formed the only portion of my first five chapters which had not been typed when

her notes arrived. I am also grateful to Mr. Boyd B. Stutler of New York City for notes on Sanborn as a biographer and friend of John Brown, and to Mr. George T. Pratt, principal of the Clarke School, for his notes on the Sanborn letters in the school library.

For helpful suggestions and information of all kinds I must thank the following: Dr. Odell Shepard, Waterford, Conn.; Dr. Ralph L. Rusk, Columbia University; Dr. Madeleine B. Stern, New York City; Dr. Henry Seidel Canby, New York City; Dr. James C. Malin, University of Kansas; Mr. Albert Mordell, Philadelphia; Dr. Edward Spencer Cowles, New York City; Mrs. Frederick Burroughs Smith, Clinton, N. Y.; Mr. Frederick T. McGill, Jr., the Newark Colleges, Newark, N. J.; Mr. George Sidney Hellman, Monsey, N. Y.; Mrs. William Cram, Hampton Falls, N. H.; Mrs. Frank C. Huntington, Oneonta, N.Y.; Miss Josephine L. Sanborn, Haverhill, Mass.; Mrs. Beatrice L. Buckman, Woburn, Mass.; Dr. O. O. Fisher, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. John F. Gough, Jersey City, N. J.; Mr. Theodore L. Bailey, Shaker Heights, Ohio; Mr. William M. Cummings, St. Paul, Minn.; Mr. Stanley W. Atkinson, Cranston, R. I.; Mrs. Alfred Burlen, Exeter, N. H.; Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; and the editors of the New York _Times_, the New York _Herald-Tribune_, and the _Antiquarian Bookman_ who published my "author's query."

I think of what the librarians have done for me with affection toward them as well as gratitude. I am tremendously grateful to Mrs. Anne Alubowicz and her staff of the library reference room at Michigan

State College for their innumerable services. I am particularly indebted to the librarians or trustees of the following institutions for their generous kindness and for permission to use rare materials in their possession: Miss Sarah Bartlett and her staff of the Concord Free Public Library; Mr. Clarence L. Brigham and Mr. Clifford K. Shipton of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.; Miss Carolyn Jakeman of the Houghton Library of Harvard College; Miss Margaret Rose and Mr. John H. Humphry of the City Library Association, Springfield, Mass.; Mr. Nelson Coon of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, Watertown, Mass.; Mr. Stephen Riley of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston; Dr. Carl M. White and Mr. Roland Baughman of the Butler Library, Columbia University; Mr. Zoltan Horaszti and Mr. Richard G. Hensley of the Boston Public Library; Miss Ruth Kerr of the Watkinson Library, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Marnesba D. Hill of the Trevor Arnett Library, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Donald C. Holmes, Mr. George A. Schwegmann, Jr., and Miss Katherine Brush of the Library of Congress; Mr. Tyrus G. Harmsen of the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, Cal.; Mr. R. N. Williams, II, of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Mr. Lester G. Wells of the Syracuse University Library; Mr. Robert W. Hill of the New York Public Library; Mr. Edward W. Forbes of the Fogg Museum, Cambridge, Mass.; and Miss Esther Usher of the Essex Institute, Salem, Mass. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Rodney Armstrong and the staff of the Davis Library

of the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H., who spent several days in my behalf in attempting to find Sanborn material in their library and in searching for material in the public library of Hampton Falls.

The following people were most helpful in tracking down Sanborn material: Gladys Hunkins Webster of the New Hampshire Historical Society, Concord; Miss Barbara Simonson of the Yale University Library; Mr. Colton Storm of the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan; Miss Helen M. McFarland of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka; Mr. Francis L. Berkeley, Jr., of the Alderman Library, University of Virginia; Miss Mary H. Davis of the Medford Public Library, Medford, Mass.; Mr. Alexander Clark of Princeton University; Marjorie Lyle Crandall of the Boston Athenaeum; Mrs. Alene Lowe White of the Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. George K. Boyce of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York City; Miss Pauline F. Pulsifer of the public library of Haverhill, Mass.; and Miss Helen A. Gaffney of the Hamilton College Library, Clinton, N. Y.

I would like specially to thank the All College Research Committee of Michigan State College for its generous award, which allowed me to obtain much of my material on microfilm, without which my research would have been immeasurably more difficult.

To my wife and children, the widow and orphans of my doctorate, I must acknowledge my greatest debt, for they are the ones who have suffered most profoundly from this long labor. I thank them for their patience and endurance and extend to them the hope and promise of a new life together.

The search for Sanborn material has been long and I feel sure there is a great deal more scattered about the country in the files of private collectors and in libraries. I should like very much to know about such material.

I would like now to indicate the attitude I have taken in transcribing my materials, particularly Sanborn's letters and other manuscripts. Sanborn's autograph is rather like Emerson's and Thoreau's, though it is much more of a scrawl than Emerson's and shows none of his tendency toward copper-plate. From the appearance of Sanborn's autograph I presume he wrote, as he did everything else, at a high rate of speed, connecting a string of words together in such a way that the first letter of many words not customarily capitalized seems to be a capital. Though most of Sanborn's words can be deciphered, his punctuation offers a problem that requires that I maintain a consistent attitude. Since Sanborn apparently did not often pause at the end of a phrase long enough to write the expected punctuation, he used a great variety of dashes--long and short, straight and curved, above and below and in the middle of the line. As no printer's font and no typewriter is capable of reproducing these dashes, I have tried to indicate them as best I could by the use of a hyphen or a dash in its normal place in the line.

For purposes of this dissertation, I have attempted to be scrupulously accurate in my transcriptions of material. I have not knowingly at any time changed a word or a letter, added or subtracted or changed a mark of punctuation, or changed a capital letter without indicating or

questioning the change. I have also tried to avoid as much as possible the use of such academic apparatus as "[sic]," for I feel that it often gets between the writer and the reader. As I have no desire to gain the reputation which Sanborn has for his frightful liberties with his texts and his "improvements" of his originals, I should appreciate knowing of any errors no matter how slight.

B. B. H.

INTRODUCTION

When F. B. Sanborn was two and a half he was playing alone one afternoon upstairs in the back bedroom of the family's old farmhouse in Hampton Falls. He was seated on the floor by the great chimney entertaining himself with a stick while a thundershower spattered against the windowpanes. A bolt of lightning struck the house, ran down the chimney and diverted itself in the bedroom. His sister rushed upstairs to see what had happened. Placidly looking up, young Sanborn declared that the great noise had been caused by his pounding on the floor with his stick. "I believed myself already capable," says Sanborn, "of making some stir in the world."[1]

Though Sanborn did indeed make a great stir in the world, he is today utterly forgotten. As the secretary of his class at Harvard said of him after he died, "A new generation has grown up which little appreciates how large a figure he stands among Harvard graduates who have really done much in their day."[2] Almost no one excepting those few persons who remember him while he was alive and those few scholars who have written about his friends can tell you one fact of his unusually full and busy life.

---

[1] Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, "History and Poetry from the Life of F. B. Sanborn of Concord, Massachusetts," The Granite Monthly: A New Hampshire Magazine Devoted to History, Biography, Literature, and State Progress, XXXVII (July, 1904), 23.

[2] Edwin Hale Abbot, "News from the Classes," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, p. 559.

Sanborn himself divided his life into four parts when he wrote in his Recollections of Seventy Years, "In mature life I have had, in a humble way, four distinct careers--political, literary, socially reformatory, and journalistic or publicist."[3] Yet these two volumes of his autobiography do not present much of Sanborn. The first volume, theoretically concerned with the events of his political career, is in truth a biography of John Brown, though the book narrates in detail Brown's relationship to Sanborn and the Secret Six of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee. The second volume, supposed to focus on Sanborn's literary career, is concerned with half-finished portraits and anecdotes of his famous literary friends. But the volume is such a hash of scraps and tatters that, excepting its first fifty-six pages, Sanborn scarcely appears in it. His third volume, in which he intended to discuss his career as a social reformer, he never completed, though he was at work on it as late as January, 1916, a year before he died. A fourth volume that would have completed his life cycle--his career as a journalist and publicist--he never started, though he doubtless had it in mind.[4]

---

[3]Sanborn, Recollections of Seventy Years (Boston: Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press, 1909), I, 20, referred to hereafter as Recollections.

[4]Writing to John M. Glenn of New York City, Sanborn in a letter from Concord dated October 5, 1909, discusses the memoir of Enoch Cobb Wines, the social reformer, which Sanborn has just finished, and continues: "I am to say something, in a 3rd. volume of my 'Recollections' concerning my connection with prisons, and shall perhaps use some of the pages here written out, besides others not properly admissible here." (Franklin Benjamin Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.) In another letter, to William Bromley, dated Concord, December 16, 1909, Sanborn says: "I am at work on my 3rd volume, to appear next May." (The Thoreau Library

It seems to me that, though Sanborn divided his life into four careers, it is more logically divided into three: his political career, his literary career, and his career as a social reformer. His political and literary careers in a way formed a unit; his career as a social reformer was carried on in a world apart. Therefore I have chosen, for purposes not only of time but of unity, to limit this thesis to a critical study of Sanborn's political and literary careers, his two lives so closely interwoven. In both he knew approximately the same people; in both he operated in the same intellectual environment. In his political career he focused his attention on four important projects; he supplied money, men, and arms for John Brown's activities in Kansas and Virginia through his work as secretary of the Massachusetts Kansas State Committee; he wrote biographies of John Brown and stanchly defended his memory in the public prints; he was editor-in-chief of the Boston antislavery weekly, The Commonwealth; and he was a political commentator in the weekly columns which he wrote for forty-nine years for the Springfield Daily Republican. During all but four of these many years, he was a resident of Concord, and through most of these activities he was supported in his principles, attitudes, and activities by his literary

---

of Dr. Walter Harding, Schools of English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.). The volume was, however, not published with the first two volumes in 1909, and Sanborn says nothing more about the projected volume until as late as January 15, 1916, in a government penny postcard to Bromley from Westfield, New Jersey, where he was living with his son, Francis Bachiler Sanborn: "I am also writing my 3rd vol. of Recollections." If any portion of such a manuscript exists I have not seen it. In none of the correspondence which I have examined does he mention a projected fourth volume.

friends--Theodore Parker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Bronson Alcott, Henry David Thoreau, Ellery Channing, and the Samuel Gridley Howes. Their interests too were focused on John Brown, though they did not work at a desk in the Niles Building in Boston as Sanborn did to put their theories of civil disobedience into practice. By 1890, though most of them had died, their spirit lived on in Sanborn's memory as he wrote his two weekly political and literary letters for the Republican, and the lessons which his heroes had taught him influenced everything he wrote.

But in his career as a social reformer, he lived a life that most of his friends knew nothing about. He met--with the exception of the Howes--an entirely new group of personalities, occupied himself with practical problems of the imprisoned, the insane, the orphaned, the blind, the deaf, the destitute that did not much concern his friends in Concord, and rushed about the nation to attend conferences and meetings on problems of social science that Concord knew not of. But it is the career that was most universally applauded, and I intend to complete my biography, of which this dissertation is a part, with an account of his work in social reform.

The reader will doubtless ask, therefore, why I have included a chapter on Sanborn's career as a teacher. Sanborn never spoke of this as one of his four careers, for it was to him a parenthesis in his political and literary activities, and, except for his account of the Concord Summer School of Philosophy, he scarcely mentions his activities as a

teacher in his autobiography. In his teaching career, however, he was closely associated with many of the Concord literary great. Emerson invited him to Concord to take charge of his school, and Sanborn as principal and teacher taught Emerson's children, and some of the children of Hawthorne, Henry James, Sr., and John Brown, George Luther Stearns, and the offspring of a great many more of his political and literary friends and acquaintances. As a member of the Concord School Committee and years later as a member of the faculty of the Concord School of Philosophy he was intimately associated as a teacher with Bronson Alcott. But during his first seven years in Concord as principal of Emerson's little school, his life was intertwined with the the lives of the Concord great and small. His Concord Dramatic Union, his Friday night dances and entertainments for his school, his picnics and skating parties at Walden Pond, his daily meals at Mrs. Thoreau's, his rooms at Ellery Channing's, his dinners, teas, and conversations at the Emerson's --all these activities brought him into daily contact with the famous literary lights of Concord and pre-figured his literary career as their editor and biographer.

For the person who sets out to write a critical study of Sanborn the greatest problem is the organization of material. I mean this in several different ways. In the first place, since Sanborn's voluminous writings have formed a basis for my work, and since Sanborn was almost

totally incapable of writing anything which was well organized, I have been forced to organize his life for him. Out of what his critics have called his "zigzag biographies," his "upside-down histories," and out of the autobiography which Rusk refers to as a "bedlam,"[5] I have tried to construct a consecutive, organized narrative.

In another fashion, tracking down the facts of Sanborn's lives and organizing the pieces has been a difficult but interesting problem. I began this study in February, 1951, and after spending a month in the libraries of Harvard, Boston, and Worcester, I made my first trip to Concord. Among the first people I interviewed was Mrs. Charles K. Darling, who was an intimate of the Sanborns for many years. When I asked her if any of Sanborn's three sons were still living, she said, "There is a mystery about Francis--the youngest. Although the town committee here in Concord invited him to a big celebration a few years ago, the letter was not returned, nor was it answered, nor did he appear. No one knows anything about him. The first son, Tom, committed suicide, you know. And Victor has been dead many years."

Soon after this I received a letter from Dr. Walter Harding, then of the Department of English at Rutgers, asking whether I knew the whereabouts of Francis B. Sanborn, because he wanted his permission to publish three of his father's letters. I replied that Francis was dead.

---

[5] Personal letter to me from Ralph L. Rusk, Department of English and Comparative Literature, Columbia University, New York 27, New York, May 1, 1952.

But knowing that his father had died in Westfield, New Jersey, I wrote a letter to the city clerk asking him to check the death record for the address of his son. I received no reply. Harding, through an error in the DAB, had been searching the city directories of Plainfield, New Jersey, in the hope of finding his man. But as all of Sanborn's obituaries stated that he died at his son's home in Westfield, I suggested that Harding look around Westfield. Through the Westfield telephone book, Mr. Francis Bachiler Sanborn and his wife were discovered very much alive indeed, and I had the opportunity August 28, 1951, of spending a wonderfully pleasant day with them at their summer home in Sea Girt, New Jersey.

My conversation with Mrs. Darling and Mr. Sanborn will indicate too why I have had, in the third place, a difficult time organizing Sanborn's manuscripts, for they are fantastically scattered. Mrs. Darling had been asked to take care of the house after Sanborn's funeral and to make sure that nothing was disturbed. "I came in one morning," she said, "and found Miss Josey Leavitt, Mrs. Sanborn's sister, burning a great pile of papers and a lot of books. I felt terribly. I said, 'Now you are to get out of here at once. Whatever possessed you to do such a thing? I was put in charge here, and above all things you were not to burn anything, nor was anyone else.' I think it was a morning or two later," continued Mrs. Darling, "that I unlocked the front door and found Francis in the living room negotiating with a book dealer and I felt badly."[6]

[6]Conversation with Mrs. Darling, Saturday, March 10, 1951.

The dispersal of the manuscripts is further explained by what followed. Both Victor and Francis were bored with the literary activities of what Victor called "My Respected Parent and Horrible Example," and had little interest in preserving or keeping the material. "My brother and I burned practically everything that father left behind," Francis told me, "because we weren't in a position to retain it or administer it." Consequently, what manuscripts were left were disposed of by gift or by sale through Goodspeed, Libbie, Henkels, and other dealers. As far as I have been able to determine after some search, the chief depositories of Sanborn's manuscripts are the Concord Free Public Library, the Harvard College Library, the Boston Public Library, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the American Antiquarian Society, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Huntington Library, Columbia University Library, the Library of Congress, the Essex Institute at Salem, the Trevor Arnett Library of Atlanta University, and the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

But as Sanborn was a voluminous correspondent, and as he lived well into our own century, there are many people living who corresponded with him and who have in their possession letters which he wrote them. I have been able to get in touch with several of these correspondents through the usual "Author's Query" in the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, The Antiquarian Bookman, and through the routine publishing of my thesis topic in American Literature.

Actually, however, none of these problems of organization is particularly unusual or peculiar. What is really extraordinary is the whereabouts of the rest of the material. In 1880, when Sanborn had been married to his second wife, Louisa Augusta Leavitt, for eighteen years and had three sons by her (Thomas Parker, fifteen; Victor Channing, thirteen; and Francis Bachiler, eight) he built a new house at 22 Elm Street, Concord, on the bend of the Sudbury River. Into the gable on the west side he built a stone on which this inscription was carved:

1830

A.R.I.A.N.A.

1880

To the casual observer, if he notices the stone at all, this inscription says nothing, but to Sanborn and Mrs. Sanborn, to their sons and neighbors and the townspeople in general it said more than it should. For ARIANA was Ariana Walker, Sanborn's first love and his life's greatest passion; 1830 was the year of her birth and 1880 was the fiftieth anniversary of her birth and the date the stone was put into place. Into this stone Sanborn placed the letters, journals, and tokens that belonged to him and Ariana, whom he had married in 1854, eight days before she died.

At least it is believed that Sanborn placed these love letters in the stone. When Victor and Francis sold the house to Major and Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer, the present owners, they at first insisted upon attaching an entail to the deed which would forbid any future owners,

including the Hosmers, from opening the stone. But, as the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts forbid such entails, the Sanborns sold the house to the Hosmers and gave them a clear title to the property.

Two summers ago at Sea Girt, I asked Mr. Francis Sanborn how he would feel about the stone's removal. "I wouldn't have anything to say about it," he answered. "But what feeling I do have would be opposed. I do not believe there are any papers in there, and what was there would be a matter of family concern. I am rather opposed to opening up emotional and romantic subjects. But I rather deprecate such things. I think romance is for young people. And I think it's better to forget such things when one is old. But those people bought the house and they can do anything they darn please."

"How do you feel about the papers being removed?" I asked.

"I don't think there's a manuscript there. I doubt it very much. Never heard it mentioned before. We never alluded to it in our family at all, because none of us approved of it."

In March, 1951, I first met the Hosmers. As we sat talking in their living room, I asked her what had become of the love letters. "They're still up there in the rock in the chimney," she replied.

"And will stay there," put in Major Hosmer, "while I live."

"And maybe not, and may . . . be . . . not!" said Mrs. Hosmer slowly, and I could see that, had I brought my hammer and chisel, she would have gone out and climbed the chimney herself.

Though the date on the rock is 1880, Sanborn was making typed copies of the love letters and journals in 1905. Was he copying from the originals or from copies he had previously made? As the date 1880 on the stone would customarily indicate to most people that Sanborn placed the stone in the gable or the contents in the stone sometime that year, could he have taken out the letters in 1905, or did he put them back in after he had finished his typed copies? Or is the A.R.I.A.N.A. stone today a symbol of something that isn't there?

Then there is the question of what became of the journal or journals which Sanborn wrote while at Harvard, and the question of what happened to Ariana's, both of which are valuable. A portion of the Harvard journal was published in 1922 in the Century Magazine, edited by George Sidney Hellman. As I have never been able to find the journal, I presumed Mr. Hellman might have it in his possession and I addressed a letter to him in July, 1951, asking where it was. He replied in part:

Monsey, New York
July 27, 1951

Dear Mr Hickok -

> I do not recall who is the present owner of the Concord Journal published in 1922 in the Century Magazine. I obtained it from Mr Sanborn when visiting him at his home about 45 years ago.

As it is my opinion that Sanborn's Harvard and early Concord journal is perhaps the best thing he ever wrote--the most carefully phrased and with the most precise attention to detail and accuracy--and as his journal contains the most vivid pictures of important persons, places, and things, I hope that someone who reads this study will help me discover this lost treasure--or treasures.

Besides these lost manuscripts, there is an unknown quantity of material concerning the most intimate details of the John Brown New England conspiracy which can not appear in my study. When John Brown was captured at Harper's Ferry, Gerrit Smith, one of the conspirators, began to show symptoms of insanity. He at once detailed his son-in-law to get in touch with all the other members of the Secret Six, the administrative group of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee, and to see that all of their implicating letters were burned. "Not a letter having any suggestion of the plot," says Gerrit Smith's biographer, "remains in the files from Brown, Sanborn or Stearns."[7] Sanborn too testified that he "spent hours . . . searching my papers to destroy such as might compromise other persons."[8] I am, however, a person of sufficiently suspicious nature that it is hard for me to believe that all of the conspirators--Samuel Gridley Howe, Theodore Parker, Frank Luther Stearns, and Thomas Wentworth Higginson destroyed all of their letters, and I hope that at least part of what must have been a singularly exciting and important correspondence will in time be found in some secret hiding place.

Nor have I been able to bring together in this study the letters which passed between Sanborn, Edith Emerson, and Ralph Waldo Emerson. It

---

[7] Ralph Volney Harlow, Gerrit Smith: Philanthropist and Reformer (New York: Henry Holt, 1939), p. 408.

[8] Recollections, I, 187.

must be considered a verified fact that Sanborn proposed marriage to Edith, that Emerson objected vehemently, and that Sanborn in turn became even more difficult. This correspondence is in the hands of a private collector, who declares the letters are "not for publication."

These problems have made my life difficult and the discovery of the truth difficult. But both the truth and the life have been interesting.

CHAPTER I

HIS EARLY LIFE

Franklin Benjamin Sanborn was born on the brisk winter day of December 15, 1831, in the Sanborn homestead in Hampton Falls, New Hampshire. Situated some two miles from the village center on a little plateau called "The Hill," the old weatherbeaten clapboard farmhouse was ample enough to hold a father and mother, six children, a grandfather, and two spinster aunts, not to mention numerous relatives who dropped in for hours or weeks to visit, attend services at the meeting-house, or revel at the militia musters. Four children had already been born to Aaron Sanborn and his wife, Lydia Leavitt: their first son, Jeremiah, had died soon after birth; their second, Charles Henry, was now ten; Sarah Elizabeth was eight; and Helen Maria was just a year old. Two other boys, Lewis Thomas and Joseph Leavitt, followed Frank within the next twelve years.[1]

This same year, when the Jacksonian Democrats had come into power in Hampton Falls, Sanborn's father was chosen Town Clerk, an office which required him to record the township's vital statistics. When he saw that his fifth child was a son, he named it Benjamin for his father and grandfather, to which Grandmother Leavitt added "the favorite middle name of 'Franklin' in honor of the great doctor." Foreseeing that

---

[1] Recollections, I, 14; Victor Channing Sanborn, Genealogy of the Family of Samborne or Sanborn in England and America, 1194-1898 (Privately printed, 1899), pp. 295-296.

the child would be called Frank, he vowed that no son of his should be known by his middle name. So he strode to his office, took down the register of births and wrote, "Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, male." This reversal of the great doctor's names could stand as a symbol of much of the "upside-down history" and "zigzag biography" which Sanborn was to write later.

This whimsical act also symbolized his father's personality. Though "upright and charitable," he was, says Sanborn, "a serious, rather saturnine person," who in his later years displayed a spirit that was "stoical, with a touch of the cynic." "Governing his family more by severity than affection," he was "seldom gracious, except to the poor, and rather severe to his children, who grew up to hold opinions quite unlike his own." But the trait in the father that seems most openly revealed in the son is that he was "independent to the verge of self-will."[2]

Aaron Sanborn was, however, a man of many diversified interests and talents, and he had, says Sanborn, "almost as many arts as a Stoic philosopher." He could make and repair the family's shoes, he molded his own cobbler's wax, framed his own carts and harrows, hewed lumber, grafted trees, was a daring horseman, and raised the largest pair of oxen ever seen in Hampton Falls. As an orchardist he gained considerable reputation in New England for having hybridized a new apple called

---

[2] Recollections, I, 14-15; Victor C. Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 467 and Sanborn, "The New Hampshire Way of Life," Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 613-628. The latter was written by F. B. Sanborn for inclusion between pp. 613 and 628 of this volume, and is, in my opinion, one of the best pieces he ever wrote.

the Red Russet. Though Sanborn inherited from his father none of his manual deftness nor mechanical skill, he did show to a remarkable degree his father's tendency to become interested in a wide variety of activities.[3]

Sanborn's physical inheritance came from his mother, Lydia Leavitt, a daughter of Squire Thomas Leavitt of Hampton Falls, the Jeffersonian justice of the peace, town moderator, and selectman. She was a woman "of extreme beauty"--which he says he did not inherit--endowed with "a fair complexion, good feminine stature, with blue eyes, thick jet-black hair, a brilliant color, and a most amiable expression."[4]

Sanborn's paternal grandfather and two spinster aunts also lived in the homestead. Old "Grandsir" Sanborn was, in his personality, the "reverse" of Sanborn's father, "the type of a smiling English yeoman, full of good will and hospitality, and at peace with all the world." He was, though seventy-two, the little boy's particular caretaker: they were in each other's company until his death when Sanborn was sixteen, and they slept in the same bedroom off the great kitchen.[5]

And there were Aunt Dolly and Aunt Rachel Sanborn. On a farm of a hundred acres or more where there was much work to be done, maiden aunts were indispensable. As Emerson once said when asked what he

---

[3] Sanborn, "The New Hampshire Way of Life, 1800-1860," in Victor Channing Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 615; Warren Brown, History of the Town of Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, From the Time of the First Settlement Within Its Borders: 1640 until 1900 (Manchester, N. H., 1900), p. 555; Recollections, I, 15.

[4] Brown, History of Hampton Falls, p. 419; Recollections, I, 15.

[5] Recollections, I, 15; Sanborn Genealogy, p. 466.

would have done without his Aunt Mary, "Ah, that would have been a loss,--I could have better spared Greece and Rome."

Aunt Dolly was "purely domestic; had certain cooking 'resaits,' that had come down to her, and that nobody else could manage." She was a gossip, set in her ways, Puritanical and narrow in her world view. "She had the ways of the last century, just as she had its dishes and warming pans and ideas of costume." She "sat in her room or lay in her bed and knew the ownership of every horse that passed the house, by his step. 'I wonder where Major Godfrey was gwine this mornin'; his horse went down the Hampton road about half-past four.'" Or she would observe to Sanborn at breakfast, after he had returned late the night before from a cooking party with the neighbor boys in the woods, "The clock struck two jest after you shet the door." Yet she had the humanity to withhold these revelations, says Sanborn, from the head of the family. Though Sanborn certainly possessed a more intelligent world view than Aunt Dolly, his inherent interest in the affairs and personalities of men was not unlike the curiosity of this typical New Hampshire old maid.

Sanborn's Aunt Rachel was different. Gentle and unselfish, she "possessed a more sympathetic and attractive character. She was fair and delicate of complexion, blue-eyed, with pleasing features, a sweet, rather sad, voice." She was skilled in spinning, weaving, and gardening, tended her bed of sage, lavender, and old-fashioned flowers which she had introduced from the garden of the parsonage of Dr. Langdon, the retired President of Harvard, whose botanical knowledge had

been used in the growing of flowers and herbs in his garden just across the road. Unlike Aunt Dolly, she had been courted by a romantic youth, who, "wandering about the wider world little seen by her," broke off their engagement. As Sanborn sat beside her in the musty garret reading the political newspapers and the Waverly novels kept in the old leather trunk, he sometimes saw the tears falling as she "spun patiently" at her wheel.

But she amused Frank with her fund of stories such as the one about the Hampton Falls farm boy who had come back from a term at Phillips Exeter. When, at Dr. Langdon's tea-table he was asked if he preferred cream in his tea, he replied, "No, thank ye, Miss, the superfluity of cream disturbs the tranquillity of tea, and renders it quite obnoxious."

She was the philanthropist of the family, a one-woman board of charities. She spent less of her time at the homestead than Aunt Dolly, who was "as much a part of the old house as the oak arm-chair, or the chimney-corner cat." She had taken care of Parson Abbot's children; she mothered her sister's numerous offspring after she had made a poor marriage, nursed her father, mother, and sister when they lay dying. And when Parson Abbot drowned one dark night while rowing across Windham Pond, she cared for Mrs. Abbot when she was affected with the symptoms of insanity and "became a sort of aunt to the whole family." Because of her charitable works, Sanborn saw less of her than of Aunt Dolly, busy as she "developed her curiosity to a microscopic degree." But his Aunt Rachel, he says, "impressed my imagination more, and, when

she died, in 1849, I wrote some verses about her that were printed." "She was gentle by nature and by grace, and deserves," he wrote half a century later, "not to be forgotten." Difficult as it is to discover any facts that might explain Sanborn's later career in public charities, Aunt Rachel's interests may stand as a most important influence on Sanborn's developing ideas.[6]

The farm land on which the homestead stood had been settled by the family's ancestor, the first settler of Hampton. He was the Reverend Stephen Bachiler, whose non-conforming, independent, lusty, and doggedly persistent ways had brought upon his head the wrath of Governor Winthrop and the Lords Brethren of Massachusetts.

Born in England in 1560, educated at Oxford, he had been forced because of his religious beliefs to forsake his vicarage in Hampshire to become the minister of a group of merchants and husbandmen who had obtained a large tract of land, the Plough Patent, in Maine. In June, 1631, Governor Winthrop noted the arrival of their first group. "These were the company called the Husbandmen, and their ship called the Plough. Most of them were familists and vanished away." A year later Winthrop noted that old "Mr. Batchellor (being aged 71)" and about sixty "other honest men" had arrived with their families. Though Bachiler discovered that his followers had scattered, that his Maine parish had failed to materialize, and that he had lost a major part of his life's savings, he organized a church at Lynn.

---

[6] Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 621-623.

But the General Court of Massachusetts immediately ordered him to "forbeare exercising his gifts as a pastor or preacher publiquely in our pattent, unless it be to those he brought with him, for his contempt of authority and till some scandles be removed." For seven years Bachiler was ordered about from parish to parish until 1638, when he was permitted by the Lords Brethren to begin a plantation at Hampton in New Hampshire, where he laid out the town with the help of young John Winthrop.

The Hampton church likewise was soon torn asunder. As the old man was spiritually sympathetic with such mystics and enthusiasts as Roger Williams, Henry Vane, John Wheelwright, and Anne Hutchinson, and as he "did solicit the chastity of his neighbor's wife, who acquainted her husband therewith," he was excommunicated. After long controversy he fled to Strawberry Bank, a Maine fishing village near the original Plough Patent he had hoped to settle, "fell into the snares" of his housekeeper, "one of Satan's shepherdesses," married her in his eighty-eighth year. After she was convicted of adultery, he sailed for England, settled his property on his three grandchildren--two of whom were Sanborns--and died "peacefully" in Hackney at the age of 100.[7]

---

[7] Sanborn, "The Hard Case of the Founder of Old Hampton: Wrongs of Rev. Stephen Bachiler," Granite Monthly, XXIX (1900), 215-227; Victor C. Sanborn, "An Unforgiven Puritan," Granite Monthly, XLIII (1911), 73-113; Winthrop's Journal, ed. James Kendall Hosmer, 2 vols. (New York: Scribner's, 1908), I, 65, 81. (Sanborn in the introduction to his article cited here says, "The immediate occasion of the following address was a desire to make available to the people of the five towns originally founded by Rev. Stephen Bachiler...the facts of his life before his foes brought his name into scandal.... The recent historian of Hampton Falls, Mr. Warren Brown (my cousin), was misled by inadequare papers in his

All of the Sanborns in America were descended from this lusty centenarian through his daughter Anne, whose husband was probably William Samborne of Brimpton, Berkshire.[8] Added to this inheritance were the characteristics of Edward Gove, who, as a leading member of the colonial governor's administrative assembly, proved a rebellious and democratic spirit. For inspiring an open but quixotic rebellion of the New Hampshire farmers against the Crown in 1683 he was thrown into the Tower of London for high treason.

Though the chromosomes for non-conformity do not always conform, Sanborn's voluminous accouts of these two ancestors suggest that he may have inherited certain qualities: admirable determination; courage to the point of foolhardiness; hatred of arbitrary rule by the oligarchy,

---

possession to revive the scandal in a manner very disagreeable to the many descendents of Mr. Bachiler. With this exception,...Mr. Brown's history...is a very useful and commendable volume." [p. 215] Victor C. Sanborn in his "An Unforgiven Puritan," cited above, gives the reader a choice of interpretations: "Two portraits are offered of him. In one, you may see an erring and disgraced old man, hunted from place to place by his own mistakes, fleeing from England to America and finally hiding in England from the results of his senile misconduct. I prefer to see in the other a high-minded but unsuccessful patriarch, with the defect of his qualities, at variance with the narrow and doomed intent of the Bay oligarchs, spending his life in the vain search for religious freedom and rebelling at the limitations and prescriptions which time was to show were impossible in a free and gradually enlightened democracy. Driven from place to place by the autocracy first of the English church and then of the Winthrop colony, at last he saw triumphant the principles of social and religious enfranchisement for which he spent his life, his means and his best ambitions." [p. 113]

[8] Sanborn Genealogy, p. 74.

whether political or ecclesiastical, and love of its opposite, democracy; independence of mind and a natural tendency to refuse to conform.[9]

All of Sanborn's American ancestors were born in Bachiler's original town of Hampton, from which five towns sprang: Hampton, Hampton Falls, North Hampton, Seabrook, and Kensington. Hampton Falls held its first town meeting in 1718 and voted in 1726 to raise its own minister rates and become independent. Located in Rockingham County, in the most southeasterly corner of the state, its village center lay only 41 feet above sea level. Of its 7,400 acres, one seventh were salt marsh which had drawn the first farmers there, for in the mud and silt of the marshy flats grew a rich, abundant black grass that fattened the cows and burst the haylofts.[10]

Hampton Falls was a farming community. In fact, says Sanborn, "For many years the bulk of the New Hampshire people were farmers or farm-laborers,--the mechanics, except in the largest towns, worked on their own farms or their neighbors' a part of the year, and the minister of the parish, the country doctor and lawyer, and the village schoolmaster all had farms large or small. . . . The blacksmith at the corner of the road might also be a farmer, and the carpenters and cabinet-makers, if they prospered at all, became land-owners."[11]

---

[9] Sanborn, "The So-Called Rebellion of 1683," Granite Monthly, XXXII (1902), 39-56 and 85-111; J. C. Sanborn, "Edward Gove's Insurrection of 1683--The Second American Rebellion," Granite Monthly, X (1887), 185-188.

[10] Sanborn, "History and Poetry from the Life of F. B. Sanborn of Concord, Massachusetts," Granite Monthly, XXXVII (1904), 20.
Brown, History of Hampton Falls, pp. 13, 341-343.

[11] Sanborn, "The New Hampshire Way of Life," Sanborn Genealogy, p.615.

Everybody at the homestead worked hard to try to make the farm and orchards yield a profit.[12] As a boy of eleven Sanborn learned all the common activities of farming--driving oxen, riding the horse to plow and rake hay, planting and hoeing corn and potatoes, weeding the garden, cleaning the barn, chopping wood.[13] The family carted their beef, hay, wool, potatoes, corn, chickens, and Red Russet apples "to the nearer market towns of Exeter and Newburyport,--or rarely Portsmouth, fourteen miles off," and sold them or traded them for the sugar, flour, molasses, salt fish, dried fruit, and cotton cloth brought to the country stores by the coastal schooners from Boston. Boston, the fifth largest city in the United States, a metropolis of 61,392 people, lay fifty miles away at the farthest edge of their universe of import and export trade.[14]

But Hampton Falls slept blissfully through the clamor of world commerce. A dead little place, the prejudiced called it, "a desolate, sordid, dismal little place."[15] Indeed, though it was politically aware,

---

[12] It is odd that in his numerous reminiscences, Sanborn never indicates the size of their farm or tells whether it did yield a profit. It is the opinion of Sanborn's niece, Miss Josephine L. Sanborn, of 19 Oxford Street, Haverhill, Mass., that the farm comprised 50 acres. Brown's History of Hampton Falls lists the state, county, town, and school tax paid by each inhabitant for various years (pp. 469-475). This, however, does not say much, for too many variables must be considered. Sanborn's remark in Recollections (II, 297) that while he was at Phillips Exeter his "means were limited" probably tells us the most.

[13] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 29.

[14] Sanborn, "The New Hampshire Way of Life," Sanborn Genealogy, p.615; Brown, History of Hampton Falls, p. 344.

[15] From my conversation with Mr. Francis Bachiler Sanborn, third and only surviving son of Sanborn, at his summer home, 10 New York Boulevard, Sea Girt, New Jersey, August 28, 1951. Mr. Sanborn, 80 at that time, appeared young and agile and in full command of his faculties. In my

it was little stirred by economic and social change. It never seemed to prosper, if growth in population, excitement, and thriving industries symbolize prosperity. In 1830 its census taker counted 582 people; in 1840, 656; in 1850, 640; in 1860, 621; in 1870, 679; and in 1880, 673.[16] When the family drove to Newburyport to sell their supplies, they drove past Hampton Falls' only store, its sign advertising "Foreign and Domestic Goods" rotting into illegibility.[17] Of local industry there were the gristmill, the sawmill, and the carding, fulling and dyeing mill at the river falls.[18] Gradually, after 1840, shoe shops dotted the town, and the "young men and some of their elders made sale shoes for the manufacturers of Lynn and Haverhill; the women in the houses 'binding' the uppers before the soles were stitched on." Hills and Sleeper employed a number of men in the room over their store, and it was in such a place that Sanborn learned shoemaking. "My brother and I learned this art; he to perfection, I rather awkwardly; and it was from the profits of my first box of shoes that I paid the cost of my foot journey to the White Mountains, in September, 1850."[19]

When Sanborn was nine the Eastern Railroad was opened for travel. "Evefything was done," says the town historian, "to drive it away as

---

opinion, he is extraordinarily outspoken, frank, honest, and objective in his remarks, which at times in their honesty bespeak some sadness and disillusionment in the ideas and activities of his father. He remembers Hampton Falls, however, as it appeared to him when a child.

[16] Brown, History of Hampton Falls, p. 14.

[17] Ibid., p. 346.

[18] Ibid., pp. 335-340.

[19] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 86.

far as possible, which has since proved a great disadvantage to the town and all who wish to do any business. The value of railroads to the community was not at all understood at the time." However, he points out, "Many places which before the days of railroads were centers of trade and business have by change in communication declined," and adds a trifle sadly, "This has been true to a certain extent of this town, which has not since been nearly as important a point as it was in stage times."[20] So the people saved themselves from the soot and cinders of the railroad and settled back again to live in the memory of stage times, when Hampton Falls was the stage town, when its taverns stabled 125 gleaming horses for the coaches of commerce and travel on the turnpike, the artery between Hampton Falls and the heart of the gay, busy world. And the farmers could talk of the day when the stage furnished them a fine market for their hay and grain at good prices.[21]

Yet there were many social activities: town meetings, society meetings, church on Sunday. The men joined the Free Masons and the Odd Fellows and both gentlemen and ladies could join the Anti-Tobacco Society. The Rockingham County Division of the Sons of Temperance was piously conceived in 1847, and the Cadets of Temperance a year later. But "from some cause," says the town historian, after a few years the Anti-Tobacco Society burned itself out and the Cadets of Temperance, "like the good little boy in the Sabbath-school book, died young."[22]

---

[20] Brown, p. 394.

[21] Ibid., p. 448.

[22] Ibid., pp. 413-415.

The scholar may read it for himself in these 637 pages: George Washington slept here, Lafayette's carriage halted on the main street, Gen. Winfield Scott stopped at the tavern--spring of '39--and her most distinguished son, the Honorable Meschech Weare, President of New Hampshire, was honored by the Granite State in 1853 with a monument made from Italian marble that cost the state legislature $2,500, "the expense of the town for grading and fencing [amounting to] $274.80."[23]

Sanborn obtained his early education from the Hampton Falls Schools and his brother Charles. Before he was four his sisters took him to the red schoolhouse on the ridge leading to his Grandfather Leavitt's farm.[24] Though Sanborn says that "naturally, in such a community, the common schools were good,"[25] a contemporary says "'multitudes' of the schoolhouses were pronounced to be 'absolutely dangerous to health and morals,' and this in the most flourishing villages as well as in the rural districts."[26] The town at its annual meeting elected a prudential committee to hire the teachers, and the committee's choice, says the town historian, "too often turned on who was committee to hire, and not on the merit of the candidate."[27]

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 268-272, 441-443.

[24] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 22.

[25] Sanborn, "The New Hampshire Way of Life," Sanborn Genealogy, p. 617.

[26] Report of the Commissioner of Common Schools, New Hampshire, 1847, p. 13, in James Truslow Adams, New England in the Republic, 1776-1850 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1926), p. 365. (Sanborn was about 15 when this Report appeared.)

[27] Brown, p. 527.

There were, of course, three academies within walking distance of the homestead: the famous Phillips Academy at Exeter, Hampton Academy (where Rufus Choate fitted for college) and Rockingham Academy, run by the Baptists in Hampton Falls. The public schools were taught in the winter by young college students training for the ministry, or by graduates of these three academies.[28] Yet a brilliant man of such calibre as Francis Bowen, then also a tutor in philosophy at Harvard, appeared as one of Sanborn's teachers.[29] Bowen, however, was perhaps the exception in "the old-fashioned district school, in which everything was taught to both sexes, from the alphabet upward, and in which there might be pupils twenty years old, taught by a youth of fifteen." Nevertheless, Sanborn felt "its advantages were obvious; for though the teacher might have forty pupils and thirty-five classes, to be taught in 340 minutes, at the rate of nine minutes and eight seconds to a class,--yet the younger learned so much from hearing their elders recite, that as much knowledge, irregularly gained, got into the heads of the bright pupils as is more methodically insinuated into them now by the newer modes of teaching."[30] At any rate, before he was eleven he had begun algebra and Latin and read along "by himself" for several years in Nepos, the colloquies of Erasmus, Terence, and Virgil. When

---

[28] Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 617; Recollections, II, 257-258.

[29] Recollections, II, 258; Samuel Eliot Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936 (Harvard UP, 1936), pp. 290-293.

[30] Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 618.

he was eleven a schoolmaster from nearby Epping induced him to study Greek grammar, but his father put a stop to it, and he "unwillingly gave it up." He took up Greek again when he was fourteen, and read it regularly the rest of his life.[31]

Sanborn owed much of his education to his brother Charles, ten years his senior, from whom he learned the rudiments of Latin and French at ten and German at sixteen.[32]

But Sanborn obviously gained his greatest knowledge through his own private reading, extraordinary for one so young, and pursued with zeal and pleasure among the books in the public and private libraries of the village. It was "random reading, with little method or guidance, but in my retentive memory," he says, "it laid a foundation for the miscellaneous knowledge in many directions which I had acquired before entering college, and which gave me in some degree an advantage over other students who had followed the stricter discipline of the classical schools. It also furnished me with much material for illustration and remark when I became a teacher myself, as I did in a small way, but without compensation, while in college."[33]

"Though my political opinions began to manifest themselves at seven and eight," he says, "yet my literary life began even earlier,

---

[31] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 29; Recollections, II, 257-258 and I, 18.

[32] Sanborn, "Dr. Charles Henry Sanborn of Hampton Falls," Granite Monthly, XXVII (1899), 37.

[33] Recollections, II, 259-260.

and under influences very favorable to the formation of scholarly habits." Though the boy had access to the libraries of his father, his brother Charles, and his Grandfather Leavitt, he found most important the libraries founded by Dr. Langdon, the retired president of Harvard, the library of Parson Jacob Abbot, his successor, and that of the Ladies' Sewing Circle of the Unitarian parish.[34]

The Reverend Samuel Langdon, D. D., thirteenth president of Harvard, had lived in the old parsonage within a few yards of the homestead.[35] He was "as little qualified for the presidency [as his predecessor] either in learning or sense of government," and when Langdon became president in 1774, "'it gave great delight to the sons of liberty,' but no particular gratification to the Sons of Harvard, who got rid of him as soon as they dared."[36] They dared in 1780, and he preached in the Hampton Falls Congregational meeting house till, dying in 1797, he bequeathed his library to the church "for the use of the ministry, —an odd collection of Latin, Greek, and English books," "historical folios, quartos, octavos, and pamphlets." Parson Abbot, on the other hand, founded the Social Library "owned in shares by his parishioners and usually kept in the parsonage," a collection of books "wholly in English, and more popular in its quality."[37] What was contained in the

---

[34] Ibid., II, 255; I, 17-18.

[35] Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 617. (This disagrees with Sanborn's statement in Recollections, I, 17.)

[36] Morison, p. 100. For Sanborn's attitude toward Dr. Langdon, see his "Doctor Langdon (1723-1797), of Boston, Portsmouth, Harvard College, and Hampton Falls," Granite Monthly, XXXVI (1904), 209-228 [part 1] and 267-287 [part 2].

[37] Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 617; Recollections, I, 17.

newly started "Ladies Library," run by the Sewing Circle of the Unitarian parish, besides a complete Shakespeare, Sanborn does not say. But we may safely assume that it housed little of froth and frivolity, for it was "under the energetic management of Miss Fanny Caldwell, the sister and housekeeper of our widowed clergyman, Parson Caldwell."[38] All of these personal and public libraries laid "the foundation of a reading and studious community," a fact probably common in New Hampshire. It was the first state to pass a law "authorizing towns to aid in establishing and maintaining public libraries," the first library being established at Peterborough, near Hampton Falls, in 1833.[39]

If Sanborn's memory serves him right, he must have been precocious indeed; his tastes, catholic perhaps by necessity, are characterized in his long, detailed catalogs of his boyhood reading matter. Typical were Paine's The Crisis, Burnet's Theory of the World Before the Flood, Doddridge's Life of Colonel Gardiner, and Howie of Lochgoin's God's Judgment on Persecutors. He read the Old Testament through before he was eight, and "this of itself was a literary training to one who was old enough to feel the force of its remarkable English style." And there were Pilgrim's Progress and Pope's Essay on Man.[40]

In the Social Library he found "books of travel, adventure, and history" as well as fiction. There he read Maria Edgeworth, Hannah More, and English and American poetry, chiefly Burns, Moore, Thomson,

---

[38] Recollections, II, 256.

[39] Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XX, 131.

[40] Recollections, II, 255-257, 263-264.

Campbell, Southey, and Longfellow. But his "greatest find" at the age of eight, was a volume of Shakespeare which included Henry VI, Richard III, and Henry VIII, "which I almost learned by heart before, at the age of twelve, I got hold of the whole series of the Plays" in the newly started Ladies' Library.[41] Of biography he says he "had, of course, made the customary readings in American history and biography in my boyhood, and delighted in the myths of Parson Weems" and he was "quite as familiar with the model biography of Franklin, by his own modest and skillful hand."[42]

During these early years he saved his money to buy his own library, to which he kept adding during the rest of his life. His first purchase was Scott's novels, then "Marmion," Byron's "Childe Harold," and the one-volume American edition of all Byron's poems, plays, and letters. Carey's Dante in the Ladies' Library and his own Tasso gave him his first taste of Italian literature.[43]

When he became fourteen he began to read Hawthorne, Carlyle, and Emerson, and "perceived that the bent of my mind was with that school of writers."

> "Sartor Resartus" and Hawthorne's "Mosses" were the first volumes of these authors that I read; but I came upon Emerson's poems as they were copied into the newspapers from the Dial, and the "Western Messenger" of James Freeman Clarke, where they first appeared. Without my understanding their full import, they addressed in me that poetic sentiment which, with no corresponding gift of poetic expression, I shared with him and many others. So early did I begin to

[41] Ibid., II, 255-257.

[42] Ibid., II, 263.

[43] Ibid., II, 259.

> read Emerson's writings,...that I can hardly remember when I did not know them, in part and superficially. A natural affinity for that school of thought which he most clearly represented, and something akin to his intuitions in my own way of viewing personal and social aspects, really brought me into relations with him before I ever saw him, or ever heard that thrilling voice, which few could forget who had once listened to its deeper tones.

He began this reading of Emerson when he was sixteen, for he could remember "perusing with indignation Francis Bowen's scoffing review of the 'Poems,'" and at seventeen he read "Nature" in its new edition of 1849.[44]

He was, however, little affected by literary criticism in those days. Though he felt "indebted to a very different school of authors, the writers for the weekly Boston Post, for much literary news and entertainment in their book reviews," he derived his keenest pleasure from the long quotations from the book being reviewed, "while the criticism passed by my boyish mind, as the idle wind."[45]

Nor were his literary activities and interests merely passive, for he was composing verse and dramatizing much of his reading with his playmates, and by the time he was 18, and his brother Charles was studying German poetry, Sanborn studied with him. The first piece Sanborn printed was a version of Bürger's "Wild Huntsman," which came out in the New Hampshire Independent Democrat when he was seventeen.[46] Sanborn's ear for verse was keen, and it is quite remarkable how well he could capture in English such a song as Thekla's from Schiller's Piccolomini, which he wrote two years later:

---

[44] Ibid., II, 260-262.

[45] Ibid., II, 264.

[46] Ibid., II, 266.

The cloud doth gather, the oak-wood roar,
The maiden roams on the green of the shore;
The wave it is breaking with might, with might,
And she singeth out in the gloomy night,
    Her eye all beclouded with weeping:

"The heart has withered, the world is void,
And giveth nought further to be enjoyed;
Thou Holy One, call back thy child to thee!
The joy of the world has been tasted by me,--
    Mine was it, living and loving.[47]

---

[47] Franklin Benjamin Sanborn papers, in the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass. The reader might like to compare Sanborn's version with a literal translation of the poem and with Coleridge's version, which, of course, Sanborn may have seen. There are also lines in the version of Charles Lamb that Sanborn may have studied.

Here is a literal translation:

The oak-forest bellows, the clouds gather, the damsel walks to and fro on the green of the shore; the wave breaks with might, with might, and she sings out into the dark night, her eye discoloured with weeping: the heart is dead, the world is empty, and further gives it nothing more to the wish. Thou Holy One, call thy child home. I have enjoyed the happiness of this world, I have lived and have loved.

Here is Coleridge:

The cloud doth gather, the greenwood roar,
The damsel paces along the shore;
The billows, they tumble with might, with might;
And she flings out her voice to the darksome night;
    Her bosom is swelling with sorrow;
The world it is empty, the heart will die,
There's nothing to wish for beneath the sky:
Thou Holy One, call thy child away!
I've lived and loved, and that was to-day
    Make ready my grave-clothes to-morrow.

These versions are from The Works of Frederick Schiller: Historic and Dramatic (London: Bell and Daldy, 1869), pp. 247-248 and were brought to my attention by Dr. Stuart A. Gallacher, associate professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, Michigan State College, to whom I am indebted also for critical comments on Sanborn's metrical version.

Sanborn says that his "political opinions began to manifest themselves at seven and eight years old."[48] As a baby he was not much younger than the current brand of Jacksonian politics. That lusty political infant had been born--the conservatives of New Hampshire declared--by the dark of the moon. Jackson's election in 1828 had been "an earthquake," and his inauguration had turned into a drunken brawl.[49]

The President's creed was "Let the people rule!"--a creed that symbolized a great deal to those who were sick of Jefferson's theory that an educated aristocracy endowed with virtue and talents should rule a democracy. "Jackson is one of us," the people said: he believed in political equality and equal opportunity for all; he hated monopoly and the complexities of capitalistic finance.[50] The people elected him because they believed that the government of the nation was too centralized, that the federal Constitution was being interpreted too loosely; they felt the Supreme Court and Congress had erred in chartering a second United States Bank, by maintaining a high protective tariff, and by refusing to parcel out the land in the West in the way the people liked. Every one of these political acts, they declared, toadied to the banking, commercial, and manufacturing lords of New England. The farmers,

---

48 Recollections, II, 255.

49 This material on Jacksonian democracy is taken from Allan Nevins and Henry Steele Commager, The Pocket History of the United States, rev. ed. (New York, 1951), pp. 166-177; Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, The Rise of American Civilization (New York, 1934), I, 542-580; James Truslow Adams, New England in the Republic: 1776-1850 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1926), pp. 302-376; and Marcus W. Jernegan, "Andrew Jackson," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XV, 575-576.

50 Nevins and Commager, p. 170.

particularly in the South and West, felt they had been discriminated against. Jackson would bring a Utopia where the common man ruled.[51]

The people in New Hampshire responded to this new brand of democracy. Though political sentiment in the state in 1790 sided with the Federalists, the representatives of wealth and culture, the old order had changed. From New Hampshire's earliest beginnings the leading industry had been farming, and the farmers, the great mass of the people, had demanded a change. Although they contended, at first, rather mildly in political affairs, their patriotism was so fired by their animosity toward England in the Revolution and the War of 1812 that between 1805 and 1816, their candidates had been elected for six terms to the Federalists' five.[52] When Jackson's victory at New Orleans "gave a lustre to the treaty of Ghent, the defeat of the Federalists was assured,"[53] and in 1816 they "met with irretrievable defeat." In 1829, following Jackson's election, the farmers elected Benjamin Pierce Governor of the state and from that time until 1855, excepting for a temporary reverse in 1846, the people elected Jacksonian Democrats.[54] "Even in 1840, when Van Buren was defeated by a great majority, New Hampshire gave him more than 6,000 plurality."[55]

Sanborn remembers that his political opinions began to form when he was seven years old because, he says, "I certainly took a lively

---

[51] Marcus W. Jernegan, "Andrew Jackson," pp. 575-576.

[52] James Fairbanks Colby, "New Hampshire," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XX, 132 and 125.

[53] Sanborn, New Hampshire: Epitome of Popular Government (Boston: 1904), p. 250.

[54] Colby, "New Hampshire," p. 132.

[55] Sanborn, New Hampshire, p. 253.

interest in New Hampshire elections in 1839-40."[56] "In a democracy like ours (and New Hampshire in my boyhood was more nearly a pure democracy than any region, not excepting modern Greece, which I have since visited) it is singular how early the political instinct is developed and stimulated."[57] His instinct for politics was no doubt stimulated by his family history and his early environment. As far back as 1683, his quadruple-great-grandfather, Edward Gove, had led a rebellion against the arbitrary and fascistic rule of Governor Cranfield, Charles the Second's royal lieutenant in New Hampshire. Another ancestor of the same generation equally interested in the early politics of Hampton was Lieutenant John Samborne, leader of its military forces, selectman, and commissioner. When Charles II decided to make New Hampshire a royal province in 1679, one of the king's advisers wrote to the Lords of Trade that in Hampton one of the four men "most eminent and best qualified for His Majesty's Council [was] John Samborne."[58]

But far more recently, on Sanborn's mother's side of the family, his Grandfather Leavitt "was not only a Jeffersonian Democrat, but their leader in this region," and frequently a member of the legislature.[59] Though he was a gentleman of "natural high spirits"[60] and "of a cheerful

---

[56] Recollections, II, 255.

[57] Ibid., I, 20.

[58] Sanborn Genealogy, p. 77.

[59] Sanborn, "Thomas Leavitt and His Artist Friend, James Akin," Granite Monthly, XXV (1898), 231.

[60] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," Granite Monthly, XXXVII (1904), 81.

turn," he would occasionally threaten to bolt the party when he thought he had been slighted politically. On one such occasion the Hon. Levi Woodbury, the U. S. Senator from New Hampshire whom President Jackson was soon to appoint Secretary of the Navy, in an effort to mollify him, wrote him a letter implying, says Sanborn, that "Squire Leavitt had done his duty in the March election when the Jackson Democrats carried the state by 4,000 majority." "Indeed," says Sanborn, "no New Hampshire Democrat was more faithful to his party, through good and evil, than 'Squire Tom.'"

Grandfather Leavitt was also town moderator, selectman, and the local justice of the peace. Frank as a boy many times watched democracy at work, for his grandfather held court in his dining room where "he used to sit in his great chair, by the east door, looking out upon his bee-hives and the four great elms that overshadowed the house."[61] At his grandfather's house and at his own he heard "the Jackson and Van Buren and Marcus Morton gospel of Democracy"[62] discussed enthusiastically while his grandfather, a fat old man with shaggy gray hair and clear-cut features, punctuated his points with his gold-headed cane.[63]

As all of Sanborn's relatives were Democrats--excepting his Whig uncles in Boston--he was "naturally of that partisan faith as early as eight years old." One of his mother's cousins, Moses Norris, was a Congressman and later a Senator; his Uncle Benson Leavitt was a senior

---

[61] Sanborn, "Thomas Leavitt," pp. 231-233.

[62] Recollections, I, 21.

[63] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 82.

alderman and acting mayor of Boston; and the other Leavitts of Pittsfield were vocal in politics.

The boy did considerable reading in the political newspapers stored in the garret. His father subscribed to Isaac Hill's New Hampshire Patriot and New Hampshire Register before Sanborn was born, and these liberal sheets now "feasted [his] eager appetite for political fact and fiction." When he was nine, "the weekly edition of the Boston Post came in, a brilliant and unprincipled journal, very entertaining to a boy." Politically opposed to these were "the mild Exeter News-Letter, anti-Democratic, and an occasional Portsmouth Journal, Boston Mercantile Journal and other Whig newspapers, which the clergy and wealthier farmers and merchants, and my own Whig uncles, took, who sent copies to their trenchant Democratic father, the old Squire."

Frank's brother Charles was without question the person most influential in the forming of his political philosophy; at a time of great political crisis, it was Charles who stimulated him to make the basic decision that was to affect his political attitude for the rest of his life. Though most of the Sanborns and the Leavitts had been Democrats, united in attitude, "there came a change o'er the spirit of my dream," Sanborn says. "The invincible New Hampshire Democrats themselves quarreled, and in 1844 our brilliant Congressman, Hale, of Dover, refused to go with the majority of his party for the annexation of Texas."[64] When the state legislature directed its senators and representatives to vote for the measure, Hale publicly denounced it. Though the

[64] Recollections, I, 20-23.

Democratic State Convention reassembled and struck his name from their ticket, Hale ran just the same--as an Independent Democrat. But as no one received a sufficient majority, that section of New Hampshire went unrepresented for two years. Then, after a whirlwind campaign, known as "the Hale storm of 1845," he was elected representative, chosen Speaker of the House, and later became the first Senator to avow opposition to slavery.[65]

In 1844, when Hale divorced the rest of the Democrats, Charles, just twenty-two, left the party with him and other important Democratic leaders. Two years later they carried the state against Franklin Pierce, Moses Norris, and "other sachems of the pro-slavery Democracy in New Hampshire." In June of that year George Gilman Fogg, editor of the Concord Independent Democrat, which had been started the year before "to aid in the political revolt," was chosen Secretary of State in New Hampshire. He immediately selected Charles assistant secretary, and the latter "combined work in the state house with a share of the editorial tasks at the Democrat office." Charles worked for the anti-slavery party for more than ten years, twice representing Hampton Falls in the state legislature. He was one of the few members of the House who prevented the Democrats from leaving Mr. Hale out of the United States Senate, and helped elect him again the next year.[66]

When his brother became a leader of the Independent Democrats, Sanborn was just thirteen. He joined the party with him, though he

---

[65] "John Parker Hale," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XIII, 633-634.

[66] Sanborn, "Dr. Charles Henry Sanborn of Hampton Falls," Granite Monthly, XXVII (1899), 37-38.

was still too young to vote. This "introduced a political schism in both branches" of his family, the Sanborns and the Leavitts. His father remained with the old party, but one of their cousins joined the new one with them. Cousin Moses Norris, the Congressman, and the other Leavitts of Pittsfield "were active in the pro-slavery Democracy."

> The schism was never healed, and it was the occasion of much grief and some anger to my father to see his sons arrayed against him and his party at elections. In time, the Boston alderman [Uncle Benson Leavitt] also became warm in his opposition to the anti-slavery party; so that neither at home nor when I visited Boston did I find sympathy with my opinions among my elders. This did not shake my youthful enthusiasm in the least. I had joined the party of youth, and among my schoolmates and younger friends, and in their families, there was much encouragement for my growing sentiments.

These sentiments were also encouraged by the clergymen whom he met, who were apt to be anti-slavery men.[67]

Grandpa Leavitt was too old to join the Independent Democrats.[68] "The loss of his sons, the illness of his wife, and the comparative neglect of his affairs by his absorption in politics, where he did not find the official promotion he hoped for, had combined with increasing age to diminish his natural high spirits." "Given to bewailing the degeneracy of the times,"[69] "he continued to have gloomy anxieties for the future of the country from the sectional strife between North and South. When a comet appeared, in one of his later years," says Sanborn, "he told me, in confidence, that it foreboded Civil War on account of the niggers."[70]

---

[67] Recollections, I, 23-24.

[68] Sanborn, "Thomas Leavitt," p. 233.

[69] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 81.

[70] Sanborn, "Thomas Leavitt," pp. 233-234.

But the Hale storm, "this apparently trifling contest, was the germ of great events, for Hale was the first Senator chosen on a distinct anti-slavery platform; and the revolt in the New Hampshire Democracy prefigured the general reorganization of parties in 1856."[71] Sanborn, excited and influenced by his brother, aligned himself from that time forward against slavery and sympathized almost without exception with the liberal, left-wing party or power.

> All the political literature of the dismal years of the Mexican War and the territorial agitations that followed were well known to me in specimens--for nobody could possibly read it all; and my mind was fully made up on the main question. That slavery was wrong, that we of the North were governed by a minority small in numbers but powerful in wealth and influence, made up of the slaveholders and their commercial and manufacturing allies at the North and West, and that the mass of the people must free themselves from this dominating aristocracy, were truths that appealed to my naturally democratic sentiments so early that I hardly remember when I thought otherwise. Yet I never gave in to the doctrine of the Garrisonians that the Union established by our fathers should be given up; although at times it seemed as if only in that way could the evil institution of slavery be thrown off. I was instinctively of the faith that our national Constitution was an anti-slavery document, as Gerrit Smith and John Brown declared--and as in fact it proved to be, when the revolt of the slave States forced upon the nation the alternative of emancipation or the destruction of national existence.

Though this shows the turn of his mind, he had arrived at these conclusions gradually. His thinking had been affected by two or three "strong influences." One of these was the National Era, a weekly published in Washington, in which Harriet Beecher Stowe, Whittier, and similar writers "maintained the attitude of the voting emancipationists." Another was Horace Greeley's Tribune, which, while clinging to

---

[71] Recollections, I, 23.

the Whig Party as long as it could, dealt "the most trenchant blows at the monster of misgovernment which then controlled affairs in the United States." A third influence--the strongest--was "the tenor of all good literature," and he says:

> All literature worthy of the name is and must be on the side of freedom, though it may also be a maintainer of reasonable authority. For without freedom no good literature can be born or long exist. The poets are on the side of freedom and the virtues and graces are so, too.[72]

Paralleling the trend of this bitter political activity in New Hampshire and the homestead were growing religious agitations. "My religious education was hardly so early and continuous," says Sanborn, "as my literary studies." His grandparents and great-grandparents had been loyal parishioners of Dr. Langdon, the pastor of the Congregational flock. But Grandfather Leavitt, "more for political than spiritual reasons," joined the seceding Baptists and refused to pay the church-rates assessed by Hampton Falls. He was arrested, a fact that made him "more a political leader than before," for "while the Congregationalists or the 'standing order' were generally Federalists, the sects (Baptists, Methodists, etc) were apt to be Jeffersonian Republicans."[73] He continued with these Freewill or Christian Baptists until 1815[74] when he headed the movement for a Universalist society in town. Aaron and

---

[72] Ibid., pp. 30-31.

[73] Ibid., I, 18-19.

[74] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 32.

his brother became members, and old Grandsir Sanborn "good-naturedly joined, having already given up his Federalist politics." These Universalists never settled a pastor, had preaching in private homes and schoolhouses for a few years, set up a theological library, and became Unitarians in 1838.

But neither Sanborn's grandfathers nor his father or brother often went to church, although the women of the households did, and Sanborn was not required to go regularly or attend Sunday school. He read the Universalist and Unitarian books, was familiar with the Bible, and, he says, "at the mature age of nine, after reading how Origen and other Greek fathers believed in final salvation for all, I declared myself a Universalist." However, he never heard a Universalist preacher until he entered Harvard, but had the habit of attending the Baptist, Congregationalist, or other churches, "wherever there was good preaching and singing."[75] Yet, we see how he was often motivated by a compulsion for doing God's work.

In later years Sanborn never attended church, but, as a citizen of Concord, belonged to the "Sunday Walkers" or "Walden Pond Association." He probably irritated the Concord people less than Thoreau, who made it a point on Sunday morning to be walking against the stream of traffic pressing toward church. Sanborn "never went to church," says his son.

---

[75] Recollections, I, 19-20.

"He didn't speak much about religion. But I think he felt as I do, that the Unitarian creed is a very satisfying creed because it is free of superstition."[76]

Grandfather Leavitt's secession from the Congregationalists was a symbol of the trend of the times, a trend which led to the Toleration Act, passed in New Hampshire in 1819. "It provid [ed] that no person should be forced to join any church or contribute to the support of any ecclesiastical institution without his consent." Church and State were divorced.[77]

When Sanborn was eighteen he met Ariana Walker. She was Cate Cram's cousin from Peterborough, and she had come to Hampton Falls for a visit. The fact of their meeting seems trivial. Yet it culminated in a spiritual bombshell, in a series of circumstances which brought Sanborn his greatest happiness and his greatest grief, which he never ceased writing about, and which affected him so deeply that, I maintain, we may never be able to determine its precise influence upon his life and work. It could be proved, I believe, that his loss of Ariana ruined his life; it could also be proved that it was she to whom he owed his determination, his mental stimulus, and his insatiable activity in four careers. To Theodore Parker he wrote:

---

[76] Conversation with Francis B. Sanborn, August 28, 1951.

[77] Some Remarks on the "Toleration Act" of 1819 (Exeter, N. H., 1823) in James Truslow Adams, New England in the Republic, p. 322.

> Her influence turned the course of my life. I was a boy, untrained, without self-possession or an aim. With her, step by step, I know not how, I have come to the larger hopes and richer experience of manhood. Everything I have done, thought, studied, loved, has been for her and by means of her. She has given me hope, courage, faith--all that I most needed, and when I most needed them.[78]

Sanborn has treated no other single episode in his life in such elaborate detail, and he continued to write about her in the public prints till the day he died.

She was not the first girl Sanborn had met: he says he had been "susceptible to the beauty of girls" and "slightly attached, at school or elsewhere, to this maiden or that with fine eyes and a social or narrative gift."[79]

He had belonged for two years to the Hampton Falls Anti-Tobacco Society, "a rather exacting literary society" which had been established in 1845 by the minister of the Unitarian parish. Meeting in the upper social hall of the district school, its members read plays, debated, and produced a monthly journal in manuscript called the Star of Social Reform, which elicited contributions--supposed to be anonymous--from its members. Some of its literary contributions were then read aloud at the regular monthly meetings. Sanborn "early became a

---

[78] Concord, Massachusetts, Free Public Library (hereafter referred to as "Concord Library"), letter file 5: letter number S-25, dated Peterborough, New Hampshire, July 27, 1854, almost four years to the day after he met her. Sanborn was not yet on intimate terms with Parker when he wrote this, as may be seen by the opening salutation: "My dear Friend: Feeling sure that you will excuse the familiarity of this address..."

[79] Recollections, II, 268.

contributor, both in prose and verse," and one of his contributions was a mildly ridiculous burlesque of a dramatic poem then widely read, the "Festus" of Philip Bailey. Sanborn's verses, purporting to be a newly discovered scene from this work, appeared in the July, 1849, issue, and Cate Cram, the editor, carried them and a ballad of his on one of her visits to Ariana in Peterborough. Cate told "Anna"--as she was called--about this "handsome boy-poet," and Anna, "always interested in poetry and romance,"[80] was amused and intrigued by his performance. She urged her closest friend, Ednah Littlehale of Boston, to write "a laughing notice" of the Festus scene, which pretended to be cut from the London Enquirer, and she followed it by a criticism of the ballad.

Naturally, the perpetrator of the first hoax had an interest in meeting the perpetrator of the second. He first saw this "lovely vision of youth and spiritual grace" in the Hampton Falls church July 20, 1850.[81] The two sat opposite and looked at each other across the church. Seated next to Cate, Anna "wrote on her folding fan with a pin,--'I don't dare look at Frank S.--he is handsome,--a poetic face,"[82a] while he

---

[80] Sanborn, "The Smiths and Walkers of Peterborough, Exeter, and Springfield," Granite Monthly, XXVII (1899), 235.

[81] Sanborn, "History and Poetry from the Life of F. B. Sanborn," Granite Monthly, XXXVII (1904), 113. (Written at the age of 72.) Though "the impression on both our hearts...was never effaced," Sanborn's impression of the date as given in this article disagrees with that given in "The Smiths and Walkers," p. 235, which he wrote when he was 67.

[82a] Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society. In Sanborn's "History and Poetry," p. 112, the text reads, "I don't dare look at Frank S.: he has a poetic face." (I must again emphasize here the difficult problem the editor of Sanborn faces in choosing a text. I do not have the original letters and journals of Ariana Walker, though I have

took stock of her in her dark hair and bonnet of French lace with blue strings. He saw her again that night in "her pink barège . . . made low in the neck." "The impression on both our hearts," he says, "was instantaneous, and never effaced." Two nights later she wrote Ednah Littlehale:

> I have seen F. S., the young poet, a face like the early portrait of Raphael, only Frank's eyes and hair are very dark. ...When we began to talk earnestly I forgot everything else in my surprise and pleasure. I was astonished and delighted. There was a charm about everything he said, because he has thought more wholly for himself than anyone I ever met. . . . In books, too, I was astonished at his preferences. It seemed strange that Shelley should be the favorite poet of an uncultivated, I should say, self-cultivated boy; but so it is, and he talked of him and of the poems as I never heard anyone talk, after his own fashion. . . . He excused himself for staying so late, but said the time had passed rapidly. C[ate] seemed very much surprised that he had spoken so freely to a stranger; I think he himself will wonder at it. The conversation covered so many subjects that I could not help laughing on looking back upon it; he might have discovered the great fault of my mind, a want of method in my thoughts, as clearly as I saw his to be a want of hope. But talking with a new person is to me like going for the first time into a gallery of pictures. We wander from one painting to another, wishing to see all, lest something finest should escape us, and in truth seeing no one perfectly and appreciatingly. Only after many visits and long familiarity can we learn which are really the best, most suggestive and most full of meaning; and then it is before two or three that one passes the hours. So we wander at first from one topic of conversation to another, until we find which are

---

made a careful search. Much of the Walker material appears on typed sheets in the Sanborn Papers at the American Antiquarian Society, on at least one sheet of which Sanborn has typed:"(Copied March 26, 1905)". Which version of this material is nearest the original? (1) Sanborn's typed copy at the American Antiquarian Society? (2) His printed version in the Granite Monthly for 1899? (3)His printed version in the Granite Monthly for 1904? (4) His version printed in Recollections in 1909? Until I find the originals I can hope to present no authentic transcription.

those reaching farthest and deepest, and then it is these of which we talk most. My interest in Frank S. is peculiar; it is his intellectual and spiritual nature, and not himself that I feel so much drawn to. I can't say it rightly in words, but I never was so strongly interested in one where the feeling was so little personal.[52b]

Their second evening together occurred a week later, after which she noted in her journal:

Last night F. S. was here again. We had been wishing he would come but did not expect him. He was in a fine mood, but one or two things I regret in the evening's talk. He had spoken of many things earnestly, and at last he mentioned James Richardson's proposal that he should enter the ministry.[53] We all laughed. I wanted to say something of his future life; but I seemed to have no right. He said "That is the last thing I should choose." "No," said I, with decision, "preaching is not your mission." I felt as if I must go on, but I restrained myself and was silent. He must have thought we ridiculed the idea of his becoming a minister, because we thought him unequal to the work. I did not feel this so fully then as I did after he was gone; but it hurts me to have so repulsed him, for I think he wished us to say something more--to talk with him of himself and of his future. O golden opportunity! I fear it is lost and will not come again.

But Mrs. Cram urged her to write the following note:

NOTE.

When you spoke last night of Mr. R.'s proposition that you should enter the ministry, I have thought that what I replied might and must have given you a wrong impression. When I said with decision that I did not think preaching your mission, it was not because I feared you would fail in that, or in anything for which you should heartily strive; but because it seems to me as if no one should take such a mission upon himself unless he feels a decided call, and is sensible of a peculiar fitness.

[52b] In this single-spaced material concerning Ariana Walker, Sanborn's ellipses are indicated by spaced periods, mine by unspaced periods.

[53] Richardson was "a classmate in college of Thoreau,...was then the Unitarian pastor in Haverhill, and a friend of Whittier as well as of Thoreau." (Recollections, II, 284.)

Your work in life seems to me more clearly pointed out than that of most men; it comes under that last head in "Representative Men"; we need you as a writer. I know how much of a struggle and even of suffering such a life must contain, but Plato says, "When one is attempting noble things it is surely noble also to suffer whatever it may befall him to suffer."

I feel that there is that within you which cannot rightfully be hidden; and your success seems to me sure, if you will but bend your whole energies to this end. I wish I were wise enough to suggest something more than the goal to be reached; but I am sure you will have other and more efficient friends who will give you the aid of experience.

Perhaps you will think I presume upon a short acquaintance to say all this; but it is so often given to us "to foresee the destiny of another more clearly than that other can," and it seems to me only truth to strive "by heroic encouragements to hold him to his task." Will you pardon my boldness? I give you God-speed.

Your friend,
ANNA W.[84]

Before they had known each other two weeks, during which there had been "memorable conversations in the summer evenings," she produced "a remarkable analysis" of him, an analysis, as Sanborn says, "of a nature not easy to read."[85]

THE CHARACTER OF F. B. S. AT EIGHTEEN

Mind analytic, the intellect predominating and governing the heart; feelings do not often obtain the mastery. Intellect calm and searching, with a keen insight, equally open to merits and demerits. Much practical ability and coolness of judgment. He is unsparingly just to his own thought, and is not easily moved therefrom. With great imagination he is not at all a dreamer, or if he is ever so, his dreams are not enervating and he has power to make them realities. He is vigorous, healthy, strong. Calmness of feeling as well as of

[84] Recollections, II, 271-275.
[85] Sanborn, "Smiths and Walkers," p. 236.

thought, is a large element in his nature; but there is fire under the ice, which, if it should be reached, would flame forth with great power and intensity. Imagination rich and vivid, yet he is somewhat cold; wants hope, is too apt to look on the dark side of things.

Has great pride. It is one of the strongest elements of his character. Values highly independence, and thinks himself capable of standing alone, and as it were apart from all others; yet in his inmost soul he would be glad of some authority upon which to lean, and is influenced more than he is aware by those whose opinions he respects. There is much religion in him. He despises empty forms without the spirit, but has large reverence for things truly reverenceable.

He is severe, but not more so with others than with himself: yet he likes many, endures most, and is at war with few. His feelings are not easily moved, loves few--perhaps none with enthusiasm. He is too proud to be vain, yet will have much to stimulate vanity. He fancies himself indifferent to praise or blame, but is much less so than he imagines. He is open, and yet reserved; in showing his treasures he knows where to stop, and with all his frankness there is still much which he reveals to none.

Has much intellectual enthusiasm. Loves wit, and is often witty; has much humor too, sees quickly the ludicrous side of things, and though he wants hope is seldom sad or despondent. Has many noble aspirations yet unsatisfied. Still seeking, seeking, groping in the dark. He wants a definite end for which to strive heartily; then his success would be SURE. Much executive power, executes better than he plans.

Loves the beautiful in all things. He has much originality; his thoughts and tastes are peculiarly his own. Is impatient of wrong, and almost equally so of inability. Is gentle in spite of a certain coldness about him; has strong passions in spite of his general calmness of intellect and affection. A nature not likely to find rest, struggle is its native element; wants a steadyaim, must work, standing still is impossible; but he must have a great motive for which to strive.

August 5, 1850. Many contradictions in this analysis, but not more than there are in the character itself.[86]

[86] Recollections, II, 277-278.

Her analyses did not end with this. She seems to have been a reader of minds, a kind of self-appointed psychiatrist, constantly analyzing the people she met, trying to determine their thoughts and define their personalities, making inferences as she watched their words, looks, and actions. And she was constantly scrutinizing herself, questioning her own thoughts and actions, trying to determine the motivations for everything she thought, said, and did.

This dominant characteristic--or obsession--may have been born of her invalidism, for she had been "suddenly attacked" four years before "with a painful and ill-understood lameness, which kept her . . . from walking freely, and was accompanied by nervous attacks which often seemed to threaten her life."[87]

Sanborn replied to her note with this sonnet:

Our life--a casket of mean outward show,
Hides countless treasures, jewels rich and rare,
Whose splendid worth, whose beauty, wondrous fair,
Only the favored few may see and know
On whom the partial Gods in love bestow,
To ope the stubborn lid, the silver key;
And such methinks, have they bestowed on Thee.
Or shall I say? o'er all things base and low
  Thou has the blessed power of alchemy,
Changing their dross and baseness into gold;
  And in all vulgar things on earth that be,
Awakening beauty, as the Greek of old
  Wrought vase and urn of matchless symmetry
From the downtrodden and unvalued mould.[88]

[87] Sanborn, "Smiths and Walkers," p. 239.
[88] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 118, written August 6, 1850.

Sanborn, Cate, and Anna met the evening of August 7, and he was shown Anna's analysis in the presence of the two girls.[89] Anna wrote in her journal August 8:

> The conversation began by Cate's showing him my Analyses. I sat in a low chair at C.'s feet, and watched his face while he read. It was steady; I could not read it, and I admired his composure, because I do not think it arose from a want of feeling.... Then [he] turned to his own [analysis], and began to talk of it; not easily, but with difficulty and reserve.... He said I overrated him; he was quick but confused, and he complained of a want of method, strictness and steadiness of purpose, in his intellectual nature. I thought these rather faults of habit than of nature; few minds left so wholly to themselves, with so little opportunity, would have been other than desultory.
>
> To be overestimated, or to feel himself so, is extremely painful to Frank, and he constantly referred to it. "I shall not, I think, be injured by your praises," said he at one time; "I have a mirror always near me which shows me to myself as I really am." In referringto that part of the analysis where I spoke of his being less self-dependent than he thought himself, he said, "Yes, I want some superior friend to whom I can go at all times, and who will never fail me."

They then talked of his future:

> I looked at him quietly, and talked more clearly of school and college, and all the possibilities which the future held out to him, and the probabilities.
>
> I told him it was the discipline he needed most,—not so much the books he would study as the power he would obtain over his own thoughts, and the opportunities which such a life would open to him. He then spoke of himself, and said that he feared a sedentary life would "only hasten

---

89 In editing this material for his Recollections, Sanborn omitted the indication of ellipsis in such a way that the reader gains the impression that he was subjected to reading aloud his analysis before the entire Sewing Circle on Munt Hill. By comparing the text in Recollections pp. 275-276, with the material in "History and Poetry," p. 118, one sees that the only persons present--they are the only persons mentioned--are these three, and they were at Cate's house, presumably, the evening of August 7.

> what would come soon enough of itself." And for the first time I observed the hollow chest and the bright color which indicate consumptive tendencies in him. Health must not be sacrificed; his work in life must not be hindered by bodily weakness; this is an important consideration.... Finally, all solved itself in the question, "What is really my work in life?"

Returning to the analysis, she continues:

> I told him that it would not bear severe intellectual criticism; it must necessarily have many and great faults. He said, "It is almost perfect, except that you stood at too high a point of view, so that some defects were concealed," --and seemed surprised that he should have laid himself open so far in so short a time. But "I see that I must have done so, unless you have much clearer eyes than most people." "Not that," said I, "but I have a habit of studying souls; persons are more to me than to most. I read in them as you read in books. I have seen in you tonight some new traits of character." He then asked me to add them to the analysis; but I would not promise to do so. "I hope," he said, "that you are not going to conceal anything. Talk to me as if I were a chair or a table; I can bear any truth,--do not fear to wound me."[90]

That night she wrote in her journal a passage typical of her introspective moods:

> When he was gone I felt so full of regret that I had not spoken more wisely to him that I covered my face with my hands and let the warm tears flow fast,--but it was only for a moment. I was excited as I seldom am; felt strong and free, and as I looked out of the window had an inclination to throw myself down on the cool grass below. The girls would not let me talk; they went to their rooms,--but I lay waking all the night through.... Had I helped him? was this meeting of ours to have any influence upon his life? and if so, would it work for good or evil? was this the beginning or the end of some new life? Lastly, how had he thought of me? finely and highly, or had I seemed poor and bold?... It is true then that he loves

---

[90] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," pp. 118-120. (This is a surprising revelation, as Sanborn often spoke of his robust health, was rarely sick, and lived to the age of 85, his death resulting from complications of a broken hip sustained in an accident.)

> X. [Cate]? These and a thousand other questions I went on asking, while the night wore away. I rose ill and feeble, and all day have suffered much.... I have written F. a note, the principal object of which is to ask him to tell me himself when his decision is made as to his future life....[91]

Early in September, says Sanborn, "the Sibyl who had thus foreshadowed my character, after so short an acquaintance, but in virtue of her lively sympathy and the insight of genius, had also, with a calm judgment not always vouchsafed to the sibylline class, thought out the practical path for her new friend to follow."[92] She extended this advice to Sanborn in a letter to Cate Cram in Hampton Falls, asking her to show him parts of it. She did not feel that Richardson was a suitable tutor for Sanborn:

> James Richardson's faults of mind are so exactly those which F. complains of in himself, that I fear he would not obtain from him that discipline which he most needs. There is not enough reality about J. R. to satisfy the wants of a true and strong nature; not that I fear contagion, for Frank has more power of self-preservation than any person I ever met,...but his teacher should be a man of strict and accurate mind, with an element even of intellectual severity in it,--with a soul open to enthusiasm but not possessed by it,--ready and willing to impart its wealth to others.

She then made a new suggestion.

> He should remain at Hampton Falls, and take private lessons of Mr. Hoyt at Exeter, during this winter at least. Going into Exeter once or twice a week would be easy for him, and all that would be needful in his case. And from all I hear of Mr. Hoyt he is admirably fitted to be Frank's guide....

---

[91] Ibid., p. 120.

[92] Recollections, II, 284. (Written when he was 77.)

> If I were Frank I should go to Mr. H. and tell him just how it was with me,--that it was the discipline of education that I wanted, and not to be fitted for any particular profession; and I should ask his advice as to the studies best to pursue.

His course in life, she felt, should be this:

> To devote the next four or five years to as severe study (and I do not mean by study mere getting of lessons) as a strict obedience to the laws of health will allow; to take for this time intellectual discipline as the principal, though not the exclusive end and aim of life.... At the end of those years he may work with his hands at anything he pleases; there is no labor which a noble soul cannot dignify. He shall make shoes or be a farmer, or whatever else he finds easiest,--if he does also his appointed spiritual and intellectual work. ... I would not condemn him to the hard struggles of the merely literary man, even if his physical strength would allow; for in this money-loving Yankee land want and suffering are the sure accompaniments of such a life; but I would have him fitted to use to the full those powers of mind which God has given him for the benefit of others; and I would have this work of a writer the highest end and aim of life,--although other things may be the needful and even beautiful accessories.[93]

After a trip through the White Mountains Frank took Ariana's suggestion and made the arrangement with Dr. Joseph G. Hoyt of Phillips by which he was to go to Exeter weekly for a year to recite to him in Greek.[94][95]

The weekly trip to Exeter gave the two lovers "the incidental advantage," says Sanborn, "not foreseen by either of us, that I could

---

[93] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," pp. 121-122.

[94] For an account of this trip, in which he followed the route taken by Henry and John Thoreau in September, 1839, see Sanborn, "Mount Washington in 1850," ed. Walter Harding, Appalachia (June 15, 1952), pp.17-20.

[95] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 123. This was the fall of 1850, and Sanborn was going on nineteen.

receive my letters and parcels from Anna, and send my own without attracting too much notice from friends and relatives,--who were generally excluded from knowledge of our correspondence. This was at Anna's request, her position being more difficult than mine."[96]

Her position was difficult for several reasons. She continued to suffer from her long periods of self-analysis in which she wrote voluminous, soul-searching, emotionally overwrought letters. For example, when Sanborn declared his love in November, 1850, she wrote at great length to say: "Frank, I never dreamed you loved me. . . . Ever since I saw you on that last night at Hampton Falls I have thought that you loved Cate," and concluded her long missive with:

> Frank, is it all real? do you truly love me? Can you say so calmly and deliberately? Think of it, Frank,--all the possibilities and probabilities of suffering and struggle which such a love would bring to you. Ah, you cannot love me well enough to meet them without shrinking. I am not worthy of it. Dear Frank, be patient with me for a little season,--let me have time to know myself....
>
> Frank,--I must be sure that you love me, and that you did not speak from a passionate impulse. Think of me,--feeble, helpless, bound as I am--with faults that you have not seen, and a nature less rich than you have thought it. Can you strive for me,--struggle for me,--suffer for me? can you love me patiently, earnestly, enduringly?...
>
> Anna.
>
> ...Ah, Frank,--if I should become a sorrow and a hindrance to you,--then will you not wish that I had never entered into your life only to darken it? [97]

---

[96] Recollections, II, 287.

[97] Typed manuscript, p. 76, Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society. On p. 77 appears this remark by Anna: "Edmah spoke beautifully of Frank; she said, 'He is the only one who has loved you to whom I could give my child without regret.' "

Life for both of them was difficult. In the back of their minds they doubtless feared more than anything else the aggravation of her illness, and she dwelt often on thoughts of death, writing him a poem in March, 1851, that begins:

> Oh Father, send thy holy angel Death,--
> Thy gentle angel Death,
> Thy loving angel Death,
> To set the captive free.[98]

Her brother George kept at her, expressing "his fears," as she wrote Ednah, "that I should love [Frank]," and of "the imprudence of a love like this" and of "the grief it would be to him, and of the separation it might cause between us, etc. etc." He spoke too "of the uncertainty of what Frank might be,--and that even if he had genius, that had proved a painful gift to many." But to George she said: "I ought to say to you that position, etc. would not weigh with me: actual poverty I have no right to choose, but moderate means I have."

Perhaps, then, it was pressure which brought her to tell Sanborn that they could be "only friends."

> And Ednah, I did tell him so,--calmly and gently, but with firmness--resisting his agony, his tenderness, his generosity. I was strong in the feeling that his best good was in this. Frank said to me, "Anna, do you know what it is that you have said to me? I think you cannot, or you would not sit there so unmoved." My heart bled, Ednah,--but then I was firm. When he went from me, he came suddenly back, and said, "...You say you 'give me back my love,'--you cannot give it back; that is a mockery; I shall always love

---

[98] Ibid., p. 57. Sanborn made four copies of this poem of four stanzas, omitting on some of the copies the second stanza. She enclosed it to Cate with a note which asked in part that she destroy it. Sanborn saw it, however, before Anna died.

you, through time and eternity. I will not take your decision tonight; tomorrow you will love me more, think more gently of me; I will not think of this as final,"—and so he went away....

When he came again he was as I never saw him,—wretched,—a misery finally merged in the dreadful coldness and utterly frozen state of which he speaks in this letter,—yet conscious of its own unhappiness. I was wise at first, Ednah,—gentle, but firm, forcing him to resist the evil spirit; but finally, when it was overcome, and he turned towards me as Saul must have done towards David, and the full tide of his love flowed over me,—I was weak,—I yielded, and to his earnest questions I answered that I loved him. But, Ednah, this was only for a little time; before he went away, even, I knew that I had wronged him, and confessed that I had wronged him, and confessed that I spoke from an impulse, and not from the deepest conviction....

Since then, dear, I have seen Frank several times, and have told him how I have erred,...but I have permitted him to think that it shall be as he wishes for the present; that we are to write to each other as of old,—only there is no expectancy (he said "I cannot say no hope") of any nearer love. Frank says, "Anna, I will not ask anything more of you than you give me; but if I do not love you, I cannot do my work in the world. I can only come to God through you, Anna,—have you not felt that? I have dedicated myself to His service through you, and will you refuse me this help?..."

Mrs. Cram says, "Anna, do not refuse Frank now; he has so connected you with every thought of his new life and hopes,—he has grown so much through his love for you,—that I feel as if it would crush him now to lose all hope. Even if you think you shall not love him, do not say so till his plans are more fixed, until life is surer to him"; and I think she is right....[99]

In September, following this dreadful uncertainty, Frank entered Phillips Academy as a regular pupil, though he was probably considerably older than the rest of the students in his class.[100] The charter of

---

[99]Typed manuscript, pp. 59-61, American Antiquarian Society.

[100]Sanborn was to be twenty his next birthday, December 15, 1851; his stay was to be a brief seven months.

this academy, founded seventy-three years before by Dr. John Phillips, declared that the school was established for "promoting Piety and Virtue, and for the education of youth in the English, Latin and Greek languages, in Writing, Arithmetic, Music and the Art of Speaking, Practical Geometry, Logic, and Geography, and such other of the Liberal Arts and Sciences of Languages as opportunity may hereinafter permit."[101]

One of the most remarkable features of the school was its democratic spirit: its admissions officer showed favor to no social caste. "Representatives of distinguished families have studied here, as have members of humble ones, and wealth or social distinction has counted for very little in popular school estimates. . . . The institution has been essentially and healthily democratic."[102] It must have pleased this young man of nineteen who had been so little away from home,[103] who may have smelled a little of the hayseed and the cowbarn, and who had been so deeply involved with his brother in democratic political maneuvers to read on the bronze tablet in one of the halls: "[Phillips Academy] shall ever be equally open to youth of requisite qualifications from

---

[101] Oscar Fay Adams, Some Famous American Schools (Boston, 1903), p. 17.

[102] Ibid., p. 92.

[103] "A few visits [says Sanborn] to Newburyport and Portsmouth, the largest towns in my region, three visits to Boston among my relatives, an early trip with my father to his cattle pasture in Pittsfield, and a walking tour to the White Mountains and the upper valley of the Connecticut, returning through Lebanon, Concord and Northwood, in the year 1850—such was the range of my travels at the age of nineteen." (Recollections, I, 29) Of course, Exeter was only about four miles from Hampton Falls, geographically speaking.

every quarter." For democracy, according to its founder, was "the great end and real business of living."[104] Moreover these theories were applied in a remarkable way to everyday practices: the trustees refused to bar colored students, and its teachers preached the gospel of the honor system, self-reliance, independence, and hard work.[105] The boys were placed on their honor from the hour they entered to the hour they left: even the youngest observed this code both in work and in conduct. This meant that they were allowed, under the "radical change" instituted by Dr. Soule, the principal, to prepare their lessons in their rooming-houses without teacher supervision; in fact, the academy did not have a study-hall.

Yet the motto of this unorthodox school was, "more or less consciously," Disce aut discede, which the boys in the Latin class translated "Work or Walk," and freedom from the tutor's vigilance did not mean that the students were permitted to escape hard work. Furthermore, the boys may have had a kind of incentive for study, for Phillips already had gained an enduring reputation through such distinguished alumni as Daniel Webster, Joseph Cogswell, John Palfrey, Jared Sparks, Edward Everett, Lewis Cass, John A. Dix, Richard Hildreth, and George Bancroft.[106]

---

[104] Adams, p. 93.

[105] Ibid., pp. 89-94.

[106] Charles H. Bell, History of the Town of Exeter, New Hampshire (Exeter, 1888), pp. 294-295.

Of the three teachers at the academy, Sanborn mentions only Dr. Soule, the principal and his instructor in Latin, and Dr. Hoyt, who taught him Greek and mathematics. Though Dr. Soule was a man of "rare natural qualities" and though he "understood well how to appeal to the best instincts of his pupils," it was Professor Hoyt who did most for Sanborn. Anna's analysis of the differences in the intellect of these two persons may have been astute, but there was much in Hoyt's personality that Sanborn already possessed or adopted. The Exeter town historian, comparing Hoyt to an equally intelligent predecessor, says:

> He had much of the same impatience with outgrown methods, and much of the same power of impressing his own personality upon his associates and pupils. He was not only not afraid of novelties, but courted them. He never half supported a measure; he was for it or against it with his whole might. The scheme of allowing greater liberty to the students, and of trusting more to their own self-government, he supported with characteristic warmth. He was in the board of instruction for eighteen years, and few of those connected with the academy from the beginning have left a more marked impress upon its management and character than Professor Hoyt.[108]

Sixty years later the pupil was moved to write about "my good old teacher, Joseph Gibson Hoyt of the Exeter Academy, to whom I am more indebted for the sounder part of my education than to any other teacher."[109]

Hoyt was, among other things, an ardent abolitionist. He not only influenced the youth's mind in his classes but introduced him to his circle of political friends: Judge French, father of the sculptor; James Bell,

---

[107] Recollections, II, 284.

[108] Bell, p. 295.

[109] Sanborn, "Missouri and New Hampshire," Granite Monthly, XLIV (1912), 107.

the leading lawyer of western Rockingham County, son of a former governor and senator; Bell's partner in law, the liberal Congressman Amos Tuck; Dr. Gorham, a classmate of Emerson at Harvard; Dr. Perry, Emerson's senior there in surgery and medicine; Dr. Abbot, Soule's brilliant predecessor; and Miss Betsey Clifford, who lived in the old Gilman blockhouse that stood above the winding river. She had given Daniel Webster "some lessons in politeness" while he had boarded in her home as a boy at the academy. She used to invite Sanborn to tea and took "a lively interest," he says, "in my education, urging me . . . to learn Hebrew, whatever else I might study, because it was the language of the Old Testament."[110]

Sanborn's admiration for Dr. Hoyt was reciprocated, for, after Hoyt left Phillips in 1859 to become Chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis, he offered Sanborn a position on his staff. But "such were my political relations," says Sanborn, "that I knew my presence in Missouri would be an embarassment [sic] for my old instructor, to whom I wished every success in his new field of action."[111]

Though Sanborn says that his academy schoolmates "were also interesting persons," he does little more than name names. As the academy provided no dormitories for its sixty boys,[112] they lived in Exeter homes or boarding houses. Sanborn lived in a sort of co-operative, "which was

---

[110] Recollections, II, 295-296.

[111] Sanborn, "Missouri and New Hampshire," p. 116. On this same page Sanborn makes the interesting remark that two years before this he had been offered the headship of Lawrence Academy, which became later the University of Kansas, an offer which came from Amos Lawrence the younger.

[112] Recollections, II, 296.

a resource for those students whose means were limited. We lived well," he says, "but economically, and had that companionship out of school hours that college dormitories allow."[113]

Sanborn records little of interest in his life at Phillips. He read the odes of Horace, and translated some of them into verse, printed a few verses in the newspapers and "composed an ode for a school celebration at Exeter, which met with some favor from the few who read it." He carried on a "constant correspondence" with Anna, in which they "criticized literature, and touched upon all those topics that absorb the thoughts of young lovers."

He did, however, have one most ironical experience. In the spring of 1852 before he graduated, Daniel Webster, a candidate for President, sent Dr. Soule a printed copy of an address, enclosing a letter in which he indicated "his continued affection for the school." Dr. Soule, perhaps anxious to cement alumni relations, suggested that a committee of students be formed to frame a suitable reply. "We met," says Sanborn, "and chose a committee from all the classes, and to me, as representing the advanced class, was assigned the duty of drafting the document. It was a singular choice, for I had not only been a pronounced opponent of Webster, since his 7th of March speech in 1850, . . . but I had written and printed in the Independent Democrat a savage attack on Webster in heroic pentameters." Sanborn however "produced a letter which was generally accepted," and which Webster's private secretary, George Abbot of

---

[113] Ibid., II, 296-297.

Hampton Falls, said gave "some pleasure" to the elderly statesman.[114]

While the relatively short period of his life spent at Phillips Exeter was not crowded, Sanborn upon graduation could look ahead toward a new opportunity—Harvard College—to which he was admitted in July, 1852, as a member of the sophomore class.[115]

---

[114] Recollections, II, 301.

[115] It is strange that Sanborn left so few traces of his life at the academy. Mr. Rodney Armstrong, the Librarian, in a personal letter to me dated September 15, 1952, says in part:

"Your request [for information concerning his career here at Phillips Exeter] involved some days of work on your behalf by a number of staff members. We have now examined all the school publications, memorabilia and ephemera that we have for the period with which you are concerned. We find no reference to Mr. Sanborn's having taken part in any student activities and it was too early for any report to have been made on any athletic activities he might have had; neither do we have any scholastic record for him except for the fact that he was graduated. I am sure that we have done a competent job for you in this matter and the unfortunate fact is that we do not have anything of interest to you here."

CHAPTER II

HIS LIFE AT HARVARD

"I entered Harvard in July, 1852, practically without 'conditions,' and with some reputation for scholarship, which caused the high scholars in the sophomore class to have some fears that I might prove a troublesome rival in the strife for honors. But I had no such ambition."[1]

This was the Harvard of the last days of President Sparks. Summing up his administration in his resignation, the President wrote: "Order and tranquillity prevail in all the departments; and I can say with entire satisfaction, that, during the four years in which I have superintended its administration, not a single occurrence has taken place, which has given me anxiety or uneasiness."[2]

Either President Sparks was exhausted by his administrative duties into happy forgetfulness or he was endowed with a unique nervous system, for during his first year in office Professor George Parkman of the Medical School was murdered, and his body hacked to pieces, and during his second, Professor John White Webster, Parkman's colleague and friend, was hanged for the crime in the courtyard of the Leverett Street jail.[3]

---

[1] Recollections, II, 302. Sanborn may have entered Harvard in July, but he was not officially admitted by vote of the faculty until its September meeting. (See Records of the College Faculty (1850-1855), XIV, pp. 165 and 168, Harvard Archives).

[2] Samuel Eliot Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard (Harvard UP, 1936), pp. 281-282.

[3] Ibid., pp. 282-286.

It is strange, too, if President Sparks had felt no "anxiety or uneasiness" during the recent bitter controversy between the Harvard administration and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in which he had learned that the university must free its government from politics if it hoped to protect the academic freedom of its faculty.

Following President Quincy's battle with the Democrats and Calvinists, the Corporation of Harvard, all Unitarians, had been at peace with the Whig political administration of Massachusetts. But the Abolitionists were angry because Harvard did not preach abolition; the Democrats, because Harvard was a school for the upper classes; the Calvinists, because Harvard was living proof of human depravity.

Worst of all, Harvard was being attacked repeatedly by those political groups that felt the college symbolized "old fogyism." "The college fails to answer the just expectations of the people of the State," declared George Boutwell, the Democratic leader then eyeing the Governorship. Harvard should prepare young people to become "Better farmers, mechanics, or merchants;" it should welcome boys who "seek specific learning for a specific purpose;" and it should be an institution where "every student might study what he chose, all that he chose, and nothing but what he chose."[4]

The people were demanding vocational training; they were impatient with Jefferson's ideal of raising up a learned aristocracy to govern a political democracy. The Independent, the newspaper of the

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 286-287.

people, stated tartly that they saw a great wrong "in the tenure by which the dominant sect at Cambridge is holding this child of the Commonwealth in its suffocating grasp. Harvard College belongs to the people of Massachusetts and by the grace of God, the people . . . will yet have it and hold it, if not in one way, then in another."

Boutwell therefore presented a bill before the state legislature to increase "the Harvard Corporation to fifteen fellows elected by the legislature for a six-year term." Boutwell's report was postponed by the political earthquake of 1850 in which the Free-Soilers joined the Democrats, elected him Governor, elected Sumner to the Senate, and won control of the state legislature and Council. President Sparks at once petitioned the newly elected legislature, defending the rights of the college. The Boutwell measure, by this time modified by a hand sympathetic to Harvard, stripped the administration of "most of its political members," and was an "important step in diminishing church and state representation on the Board of Overseers." The college had learned "that to protect academic freedom she must at the earliest opportunity free her government from political elements; and that, as a price of freedom, she must look to her own alumni and to the public, not to the Commonwealth, for support."[5]

Sanborn was admitted into this atmosphere of "order and tranquillity" by a vote of the faculty September 27, 1852. President Sparks resigned a month later because of "a precarious state of health," but he

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 288-293.

consented to continue the work of his office until February, 1853, when the Corporation appointed Professor James Walker to the presidency.

Walker was "another good man and fair scholar who proved a presidential failure." A graduate of the Harvard Divinity School, he had been minister for twenty-nine years to the "Harvard" Church in Charlestown, where he had become one of the leading protagonists of Unitarianism. He was "a famous preacher, cogent, meaty, sententious; it was largely the respect and attention with which his sermons were received by the students that marked him for the presidency." His inaugural address was one of the "most solid, sensible, and prophetic orations ever delivered on such an occasion." Though intelligent, President Walker was constitutionally unable to get things done or advance his ideas. In this he did not distinguish himself from his predecessors, Everett and Sparks. The only curriculum change he instituted during his reign was to add the first course in music, though he was as deaf as a post and was "totally devoid of aesthetic sense."[6] Sanborn never mentions him except to say that he was the first cousin of Anna's father.[7] Though Sanborn was not related to him by marriage until the fall of his senior year, we have no record that the two met each other academically, socially, or spiritually.

Sanborn felt his Harvard teachers influenced his life and thought but little. "I was more indebted," he said many years later, "to Concord

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 281 and 293-295.

[7] Sanborn, "Smiths and Walkers," p. 245.

than to Cambridge for my literary inspiration and training," and he adds, "With all respect for Harvard College, as it was when I was matriculated a student there in 1852, it must be said that I owed more to several other persons than to any of the college Faculty, and more to Emerson and Theodore Parker than to all the professors and tutors together."[8] Though from various sources we know who some of the teachers were during the period he attended Harvard--Louis Agassiz, Francis Bowen, George Martin Lane, Josiah Parsons Cooke, Francis Child, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles--Sanborn speaks of few.

With the possible exception of President Walker, Francis Bowen was probably the only member of the faculty whom he had known personally before he entered college. He mentions returning from a class under Agassiz, but he writes more fully of two of his teachers, Longfellow and Sophocles. In his college journal published after his death he describes an evening spent with Longfellow:

> Tuesday, Jan. 16, [1855]. Called this P.M. on Prof. Longfellow, where I stayed from five to eight-thirty. I found him alone in the parlor, where a wood-fire was burning in the ample fireplace. It was snowing outside, but within was bright and cheerful and elegant, among the books and pictures and busts in the great parlor. He asked me about Exeter and Andover, wishing to send his nephew somewhere to school. I told him what I knew of the two places, and hoped he would decide on Exeter; but he thought there might be too much freedom allowed there for a boy like his nephew. At six I rose to go, but he urged me to stay. I told him "young men were apt to receive more pleasure from their visits than they gave." He smiled, and said that feeling had prevented him from going to see Goethe when in Germany for

[8] Recollections, II, 313.

the first time, for which he had always been sorry. He was accessible to strangers, particularly to Americans; but Mr. Longfellow thought he should have nothing to say to him, and so did not go.

He told me about his life at Bowdoin before he became professor here, and of his first seeing Mr. Emerson. It was on board the boat coming from Portland. Mr. Longfellow had a letter to Emerson, and was saying so to a friend, who told him that the man himself was on board. They went across the deck and found Mr. Emerson sitting inside a coil of rope, with his hat pulled over his eyes. They talked of Carlyle, to whom Emerson gave Mr. Longfellow a letter, and said he had been sending him some American literature.

"I suppose you sent him Irving," said Mr. Longfellow.

"No," said Emerson; "he is only a word-catcher."

Mr. Longfellow found Emerson's letter a welcome introduction to Carlyle, who spoke in the warmest terms of him and his visit to them (C. & Mrs. C.) at Craigenputtock. . . .

At tea I saw Mrs. Longfellow, whom I admire very much. Afterwards we talked in the parlor about spiritualism and many other things, and at a little past eight I came away.[9]

The only other teacher whom Sanborn describes is Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles, a campus character. A native of Tsangaranda, Thessaly, he had been educated at Amherst, had become a tutor in Greek in 1843 at Harvard, and taught there for thirty-six years. Sanborn says:

Without being a model teacher--for he did not give his Class the full advantage of his remarkable scholarship in his native language--he piqued our attention by his oddities, and stimulated those who wished to learn by his evident interest in a careful pupil. His comments, like those of Professor Lane in the Latin recitations, were often sarcastic, and generally dry and humorous....

---

[9] Sanborn, "An Unpublished Concord Journal," ed. George Sidney Hellman, The Century Magazine, CIII (1922), 831-832. (In the material quoted from this journal, spaced periods indicate Hellman's ellipses; unspaced periods indicate mine.)

> He lived by himself in the west entry of Holworthy, and there cooked and spread his frugal meals, and his lexicons and papers and college exercise-books. We used to smile at seeing him gravely pacing the diagonal paths of the College Yard, carrying fruit or loaves, or, mayhap, cheese, beloved of the Greek peasant, tied up in a large handkerchief. He had even then, I think, begun his poyltry-fancying diversion of breeding and feeding fowls in the basse-cour of some friends house, not far from the College,--at first at Miss Fay's, I believe, and afterwards at Mrs. Winlock's, farther away from his ascetic cell in Holworthy.[10]

Although Sanborn protests that he "had no ambition," the fact is he became one of the first group of scholars. The faculty at its meeting of November 14, 1853, awarded a "Detur" to him and four others of his class, the secretary to the faculty recording that he was to receive "Longfellows [sic] Poems. 2 Vols. 16to Calf."[11] And when Professor Sophocles, in behalf of the committee on the assignment of parts, reported the list of appointments for the May exhibition for 1854, Sanborn was the first on the list for the junior class. Sanborn's part was a metrical version of a portion of Book VI of the Odyssey, which he entitled "Ulysses and Nausicaa," of which the following will suffice as a sample:

---

[10] Sanborn, "A Harvard Ascetic--Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, X (1901), 207-211. ("Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXV, 262, gives this beginning date as 1842.)

[11] Record of the College Faculty (1850-1855), XIV, 289 and 291 (Harvard Archieves). A "Detur" is a prize book given to a student at Harvard whenever he makes all A's. Usually the book is one finely printed, or, if not finely printed, beautifully bound.

The trembling maidens fled afar,--
  Nausicaa staid behind;
A while in doubt Ulysses stood,
  irresolute of mind:
Should he implore the fairfaced maid,
  a suppliant at her feet?
Or there at distance from her stand
  and courteously entreat?[12]

His extra-curricular efforts were chiefly literary. As secretary of Hasty Pudding, he had to keep the records of the society in rhyme in the tradition of Washington Allston. Hasty Pudding's activities in this period were chiefly social, though its initiation was literary in spirit, the candidates being forced to deliver an oration, sing an original song, and present a Greek, a Latin, and an English essay. Except for singing the song, Sanborn doubtless had little difficulty meeting the requirements. As he had "no tone sense, and didn't know one tune from another, though he seemed to know all the words to all the hymns in the hymn book," the singing must have proved a grave trial, unless his judges in the feat thought he was trying to be funny.[13]

Hasty Pudding "sought out the wits of each class, regardless of gentility, and until late in the nineteenth century remained the principal college society to which any bright young man, regardless of social background or money, might expect to be elected."[14] It produced

---

[12] Exhibition and Commencement Performances (1853-1854) in the Harvard Archives.

[13] From my conversation with Francis B. Sanborn.

[14] Such "bright young men" did not, however, include Ralph Waldo Emerson (Morison, p. 202).

its first theatricals in 1844, held mock trials such as "Dido vs. Aeneas for breach of promise," debated questions in politics, literature, and morality, and perpetrated a good deal of tomfoolery.[15]

The only other society to which Sanborn belonged was Alpha Delta Phi,[16] a social fraternity which had operated secretly on the campus for ten years until in 1846 it was officially recognized by the Faculty.

One other fact indicates that Sanborn did not always pursue the serious. "Voted," the faculty secretary recorded, "That Sanborn, Junior, for being in the College yard at the hour of midnight on New Year's eve, and openly encouraging and instigating other students to make a disturbance, be publicly admonished."[17] Sanborn's levity in the Yard may come as a bit of a shock until one compares his act to one of the numerous revolutions of President Quincy's time--to name the worst--when the undergraduates raised the black flag of rebellion over Holworthy Hall, smashed the furniture and glass in the recitation rooms, detonated a bomb in the chapel, and sent a written ultimatum to the Board of Overseers.[18]

Many of Sanborn's hours must have been occupied in writing to Anna, whose conflicts of soul yielded now to her heart, now to the

---

[15] Ibid., p. 183.

[16] Sanborn to "Dear Francis and Molly" (Mr. and Mrs. Francis B. Sanborn) around Christmas, 1906, printed here through the generous courtesy of Dr. Walter Harding of the Department of English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

[17] Record of the Faculty (1850-1855), XIV, 303.

[18] Morison, pp. 252-253.

pressure from her father and brother. In August of his first year she had written from Hampton Falls a voluminous letter which began:

> I must write with a pencil, for they have taken my pen. 10'/2 at Night.
>
> And you and I have parted, Frank,--I shall see you again, and you will see me,--and yet we have parted.
>
> I did not tell you all that I promised my Father. I promised him that, tho' I should continue to hold the relation of a near friendship to you, I would in all things so far as I could,--avoid anything which would excite remark; and I think he felt that, while I should not sedulously avoid you, I ought not volumtarily and with intention to put myself in your way--and that I must give up coming here again.[19]

Finally, however, when her brother George realized that Anna's love for Sanborn could not be extinguished, "he adopted the youth, who had so unexpectedly become dear, as a younger brother," and we know that her father later gave his blessing to the pair.[20]

Sanborn wrote a good bit of verse to her during the four years of their courtship, the best of which seem to be his sonnets:

> I know not, Anna, if I should repine,
> And sigh because not yet the poet's wreath
> Is on my forehead, nor a song is mine
> That shall ring thro' the world and laugh at Death.
> Time is there yet for me, for Homer's hair
> Was white as his own Nestor's when he sung,
> And stealthy Age came in disguise of Care,
> Ere Dante chanted with his golden tongue
> The psalms of happy spirits; and what fire
> Burned in the heart of Milton when he stood
> Sublime old man! uplifted by desire
> To that grand Heaven, that home of Endless Good,
> Whereof he spoke to men in words that shame
> The hissing world and even applauding fame.[21]

---

[19] Typed manuscript, p. 69, Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society. Sanborn's transcription of this takes up three typed, single-spaced pages with the three-eighths inch margins so typical of all his typewritten material.

[20] Recollections, II, 292.

[21] Written July 30, 1853; now in the Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society. (I shall have more to say of his versifying later.)

But Ariana was increasingly preoccupied with growing presentiments of death. Just before the opening term of his junior year, in August 1853, their engagement was made public. She then showed him a long letter she had penned in April and labeled "TO BE SENT AFTER MY DEATH":

> Do not grieve too much because I am gone home,--do not thou be in love with Death because that gentle Angel has kissed my lips, and taken me away in his arms. See now, my own,--thou must live for me too,--and none of my hopes in thee must fail. My life has been of so little service to the Father! but do thou labor for me Darling, do not faint or falter! God hath need of thee; it was He who gave, and it is He who taketh away. Gladly would I have remained with thee,--thy true wife, thy helper and thy friend; but He has not so willed it; He knoweth what is best for us.
>
> But do not thou cease even transiently to live, because I am gone hence. Let thy grief for me be holy, and let it only urge thee on to higher and nobler labors; let the sorrowful, the poor, the oppressed, the weak all be blessed thro' the great love which has filled thy heart, and which now flows over thee like a flood. Ah! if thou knowest what it is to feel alone, guard all others from that pain! Work, dearest! work for God's sake and for mine,--let thy sorrow only elevate and nerve thy heart! Let me bless thee more deeply than living, and thro' thee let me live still on the beautiful, dear Earth.
>
> ...If life should offer thee consolation,--if thou should'st feel, like Dante, thy lonely heart warmed and cheered by some holy presence,--reject not the comforter, nor blame thyself as false to me; for who knoweth God's mysteries, or how it will be with us when we are angels?...[22]

During his junior year he was "often called away by the phases of her illness, which, like everything about her, was strange and unexpected. From the depths of what seemed a mortal illness, and which no

---

[22] Typed manuscript, Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society, page unnumbered. It is this manuscript which bears the note, "(Copied March 26, 1905)." Sanborn made three or four copies of this particular letter.

physician thoroughly understood, she would rally to a hopeful prospect of full recovery"[23] until August, 1854, just before school, the end came. To her dearest friend, Ednah Littlehale, then in Europe, he wrote the details:

Peterborro' [sic] N. H.
September 9, 1854, Saturday afternoon.

Dear Ednah;

You will know before this reaches you of the death of our dear one,--my love, my angel, my maiden wife. She died in my arms on Thursday the 31st of August, eight days after our marriage, and just a year from our engagement....

I will tell you something of the closing scenes,--the last week or two of her life. Ever since early in August I have felt that nothing but a miracle could save Anna's life. She grew weaker every day, and nothing could be done for her. She continued to walk about until some two weeks before her death; after that I carried or drew her from room to room. She grew so thin, and towards the last her eyes for the most part wore a dull look, showing extreme weakness. On the 23rd we decided to speak to Mr. Walker about our marriage,--for it seemed time. I did so, and he approved it most heartily. We sent for Mr. Robinson [her pastor] and were married that afternoon. Anna lay on her new bed in the parlor, supported by pillows, in her night-dress, for she was too weak even to wear her dressing-gown. I sat beside her and held her hand, and we were married. It was a sweet and blessed union; no one can tell how much it added to our joy. After that I was with her day and night, when she would let me, and I watched with her the night before her death....

She suffered much pain constantly in her back, and much of the time very severely elsewhere,--for the diarrhea continued until a short time before her death. Besides these she had many other pains,--indeed she must have suffered terribly. Tuesday the 29th George Walker came from Springfield;

---

[23] "History and Poetry," p. 132. Sanborn in a letter to Parker, dated Peterborough, N. H., July 27, 1854, said: "I find since I came here, what I dreaded I should see.... She seems now to have the marks of that dreadful disease, a settled consumption." (Concord Library, 5: S-25.)

he stayed till Thursday morning, when, having urgent business, and all of us thinking he might safely do so, he went home. The Doctor thought then she might live a week or two, and she was as well as for some days before.

All day Thursday she continued as well as usual till about four in the afternoon. In the morning she had put her arms about my neck and kissed me, in remembrance of the day of our engagement,--for she had been so weak for some time that she could not easily caress or be caressed. We had talked together more than usual, too, and she seemed bright. I was with her most of the day,--but a little before four I rose to go up stairs. She said she [wished to?] be moved before I went, and I lifted her up to a position in which she began to cough. This brought on a difficulty of breathing, and I then supported her with pillows. Her breathing grew worse, and she said she should die. I came forward of the pillows, and put my left arm round her; and she lay thus in my arm till she died. She could speak with difficulty, and at last it was a great effort for her. She asked the doctor questions, and was evidently in great pain; she panted for breath and perspired copiously. After an hour or two she said, "God is with me,--God--,--" there she stopped. She spoke little after this till just before her death; she then asked what time it was? They told her a quarter to eight. She expressed a fear that she should not die before midnight,--and never spoke again. Soon after she drew my right hand across her breast and laid it on her heart, turned her head to my shoulder and looked up with deepest love in my face. A few minutes before eight she grew quiet, and died without a struggle at eight.

I scarcely knew when the spirit passed....

She was placed in the tomb here after the funeral on Saturday.... Monday she was buried at Springfield, in Mr. Bliss's grounds in the Cemetery.... In the spring violets and roses will be planted there,--and other flowers. I mean a cross shall stand at the head of the grave,--to be moved between the graves when I am buried there, if possible that I shall be. When you come back, all this will have been done,--and the grave will be pleasant to look upon.[24]

---

[24]Sanborn adds a footnote: "This was done, and for some years the spot was adorned with flowers and with the murmur and flow of fountains, above the valley and below the ridge crowned with trees. But in time the shade and moisture killed the flowers, the fountain ceased, other graves were made there, and a tall shaft replaced the cross, which I then had removed to the cemetery in Hampton Falls where my parents and brothers are buried. My own grave will now be in Concord, with my children and later friends."

> I came directly back to Peterboro, where I shall stay till the 20th; then I shall go home to Hampton Falls, and sometime in October I mean to go back to Cambridge. At present I am busy arranging Anna's papers, books, etc. I have arranged her letters, and yours are to be given you when you come home. She has left some token to you (her copy of Shelley), and you shall have a lock of her hair if you wish it. Her pictures she gave to various friends, and many of her books; the rest are mine, as is the greater part of her property.
>
> ...Hers was a wonderful life,--a fair poem from beginning to end,--with sorrow and joy, strife and peace in it,--but as a whole, sweet and beautiful. All this I mourn for; all that any friend can miss do I miss; and besides there is a deeper grief to me. As I took the rosebuds that had lain on her breast in the coffin, I kissed them with sudden tears; for I thought;--["] Ye lay where my head will never lie again, -where my own rosebuds would some day lie." I felt at once all the loneliness of my life,--I who had so longed for love and a home, and my wife's bright face and graceful hand,--now saw all these hopes laid waste.[25]

Forty-five years later Sanborn still spoke of her as "the person who had the most inspiring influence on that portion of my life which preceded my acquaintance with Emerson and John Brown."[26] "Surely," he

---

[25] Typed manuscript entitled "THE DEATH OF ARIANA WALKER (August 31, 1905). From a letter to Ednah Cheney in Europe," Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society. Ariana died August 31, 1854, and it is interesting to note that in 1905 Sanborn, then almost 74, was devoting his time to copying out large portions of her numerous letters and journals.

Ednah Littlehale, Ariana's dearest friend, married Seth Cheney, the famous American engraver, and became "an author of note" ("Seth Wells Cheney," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., VI, 411 and DAB). For her opinion of Anna see Reminiscences of Ednah Dow Cheney (Born Littlehale), (Boston, 1902), pp. 57-58.

[26] Sanborn, Sanborn Genealogy, p. 467. (Our feeling of what her influence was on his later life may, therefore, be modified by the fact that in Recollections, II, 315, he records that he first met Emerson in July, 1853, and in his published journal he describes a visit to Emerson November 2, 1854.)

wrote to Parker ten days after she died, "God has some great work for me to do or he would never have given me such wealth of love."[27]

The thought of returning to Harvard before the October exhibition was abhorrent to him, but Parker prevailed on him to return sooner, and by the end of September Sanborn wrote him: "Your letter strengthens in me a determination already formed. . . . I shall come back to college with full health and with a resolute purpose of study--with less worldly ambition than before, and so perhaps a greater ability to do a good work. I must not forget either, that I have the work of two now to finish."[28]

Back at Harvard he plunged into his greatest single activity at the college. With two other seniors (one of whom was Phillips Brooks) and three juniors (one of whom was James B. Greenough) he started a new

---

[27] Sanborn to Theodore Parker, September 11, 1854 (Concord Library, letter file 5: S-27).

[28] Sanborn to Parker, September 24, 1854 (Concord Library, 5: S-28). Sanborn and Anna had so often "worshipped together" in Parker's congregation that he enclosed "a note to be read on Sunday, if you think it best" in his letter to Parker from Peterboro, September 1, 1854 (Concord Library, 5: S-26). Ten days after this he told Parker that he had heard that "you read my note yesterday in the Music Hall. I was not sure that you would think it best to do so.... I know that I was most earnestly remembered in your prayer." (Peterboro', September 11, 1854 (Concord Library, 5: S-27).

campus publication, The Harvard Magazine. In the first issue, published in December, Sanborn stated the purpose of their magazine in the preface which he wrote:[29]

> THE question is often asked respecting our College, and the good old town in which we students are collected,--some hundreds of young men, nominally pursuing a liberal education, --why they have originated so little. Other universities have led the way in some of the many paths of science; we have Oxford classical editions; Königsberg, Berlin, and Edinburgh metaphysics; Parisian physics; Tübingen, Andover, and various other theologies; but have we yet seen Cambridge ethics, metaphysics, physics, or theology? and are we not just beginning to have Cambridge mathematics? At other universities, men say, systems are developed and perfected; here they are only criticized, and not always in the most catholic spirit. Nay, it is even said that we cannot start and sustain a college magazine; and we are told that repeated failures have proved the truth of this reproach. Notwithstanding which, we have dared to come forward with this our first venture in a new enterprise; and it becomes us, at starting, to hint at our purposes and our hopes.
>
> ...We believe that among the three hundred and fifty students in college there are many who have something to say to which others will gladly listen, and, in their turn, answer to some purpose. We believe that it is possible for us to exhibit some fruit of our studies besides that which our semi-annual examinations and exhibitions and our commencement parts

---

[29] Proof that Sanborn wrote this and the contributions that follow is offered in The Harvard Magazine Index, compiled by the librarian of the Harvard Archives. The first (unnumbered) page states: "This index of author's names which have been written in the different copies of the Harvard Magazine by previous owners, has been prepared by collating copies of the Magazine which have come to the Library from various sources from time to time.

"Names which did not appear in the official set, but were found elsewhere have been copied into it.

"In the few cases where different authors have been found in different copies, both names have been indexed and all copies kept."

display. We doubt not there are subjects which we may investigate and discuss, inquiries which we may pursue, books which we may analyze; and that the result of all this may be of some value when set down in print....One has hunted mathematics into its lair;...another...metaphysics....Here is one who has drunk deep at the sweet fountain of Grecian poesy;...another shall cut a path for us through the thorny hedge which defends the castle of German literature.... Botanists, chemists, mineralogists, geologists, even political economists, shall be most welcome to us....

But there are other fair grounds into which we hope to make incursions,--the realms of Imagination. Science and history and philosophy are not everything, and we would not court them exclusively. Non omnia possumus omnes. We cannot all demonstrate or investigate or philosophize;--we hope to have some dreamers among us. As a people, we are deficient in the culture of the imagination. As one of our noblest thinkers once said, "We would give more to see a good crop of mystics at Cambridge, than great naturalists, metaphysicians, or scholars." We hope to draw to our pages men of this class,--enthusiasts, men of aspiration, poets, and humorists,--as well as the representatives of positive and conservative requirement. "Where there is no vision, the people perish"; and we fear that, without the help of enthusiastic and imaginative youths, our plan will prove abortive....

We open our columns freely to everything that is new, and at the same time worthy of notice. Whoever has new facts or new explanations to offer, throwing light on any unexplored regions into which modern research is penetrating, shall have from us a patient and attentive hearing. We are not of those who reject with a sneer all inquiry of this kind; but would cheerfully help, to the extent of our power, to extend on any side the domain of human knowledge. We believe that there may be new sciences, as well as progress in the old ones; nay, that men have as yet learned but few letters in the great alphabet of nature.

In the discussion of all subjects we shall aim to give the greatest freedom, and invite the most opposite opinions. It is the curse of our country that our literary men are, more than in most nations, the slaves of public censure. The fear of arousing a prejudice or awakening hostility constantly harasses the American scholar. Here, at least, we mean to be free from it. To whom, indeed, should freedom of thought be dear, but to him whose business is thought?....

But we may be told that we are issuing a manifesto far too lofty and sounding for the magnitude of the enterprise.... We can only say, we hope not. We hope to make our Magazine

a noticeable and dignified representative of the progress of sound learning in our University, worthy of the institution which sustains it and of the young men whose hearts are in its success. We are new at the labor we have undertaken, but we do it with a will. And we call on all our classmates, and the undergraduates generally, to aid us in a work so deserving their efforts.

In the name of the Senior and Junior Classes,

F. B. SANBORN,
C. A. CHASE,
PHILLIPS BROOKS,
J. J. JACOBSEN,
J. B. GREENOUGH,
E. T. FISHER.[30]

CAMBRIDGE, November, 1854.

As one of the six editors he passed judgment on the manuscripts of such contributors as Charles Francis Adams and his brother Henry; James Kendall Hosmer, who had probably begun his interest in a history of German literature alluded to in Sanborn's preface; William Pitt Preble Longfellow, later to become a famous architect and writer on architecture; Robert Treat Paine, the great philanthropist; and Theodore Lyman, who became a foremost natural scientist.

Sanborn contributed twenty-three items to the first volume of the magazine: eight poems, seven book reviews, six essays, one art review, and the "Editor's Table" in one issue.[31] As Sanborn contributed eight poems and one long essay on poetry, it might be appropriate to consider these first. His essay entitled "Poetry," which appeared as the feature article in the second issue indicates what he expected from poetry. He considers first the nature and origin of poetry, then its present condition, and last, its hopes for the future. "When we speak of this or that

[30] Sanborn, The Harvard Magazine, I, 1-3.
[31] The Harvard Magazine Index, Harvard Archives.

person as a poet," he says, "we use the word to denote a certain elevation and subtility of thought, by which the soul, as it were, approaches nearer to nature, and so gives to other souls a truer transcript of what this wondrous play of life unfolds to us, than common spectators could get for themselves." Thus, he continues, the poet "seems to create what he only translates out of the unperceived wealth of Providence."

After calling up the names of the great poets of the past, he declares that the character of modern poetry is that of a "tiresome mediocrity; and this is true of England, of Germany, and of America." Then he considers what constitutes rare poetical genius and "in what way our age will probably be enriched by the labors of a genuine bard":

> It is not by skilful verse-making, or the most careful attending to the rules of art, that men win for themselves great fame as poets. It is more than ever necessary, in this materializing age, and especially among a nation of materialists like our own, that we recognize the vital worth of inspiration. All high excellence in art, in eloquence, and most of all in poetry, is the inspiration of God, more or less direct as the work done is more or less perfect.... He who seeks for a less noble motive than this, is guilty of a profanation of his powers, a debasing of the divinity within him. Before we can attain to greatness in anything, we must first be lifted out of ourselves by an enthusiasm which transfuses us, and for the moment annihilates self.

The time for such inspiration, some say is past; some say "the age of great poets is gone for ever." He, on the contrary, finds inspiration in the achievements of his own age:

> Shall the modern knight-errantry of science, the great crusades of commerce, and the matchless conquests of civilization be left unsung? Can we see nothing inspiring in the earth-shaking revolutions of nations; the steady progress of freedom; the increasing heroism of man? Has our social life become all a dusty path of custom, along which no flowers of poesy can blossom?... Has Nature also deserted us?

Are the stars grown dim? Is the sun less godlike? Are the fields less fair, the flowers withered, the rivers dumb, the mountains dwindled, the skies faded? Is eternity less sublime, death less pathetic and solemn, God more commonplace? ... No;--

> "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings."

When He appears whom God shall at length send to touch our daily life with the poet's magic wand, we shall be astonished at our old blindness.... As our own wisest poet says, "We shall sit in an aurora of sunrise, which will put out all the stars...."

For myself, I look for the dawning of a new era in poetry with a longing that cannot be uttered, and a hope that will not be quenched.... Somewhere this chosen seer and singer of immortal lays I shall yet see. Nor does it matter whence he comes.... But whoever he may be, of this one thing be sure, he will not deal with Nature at second hand. No mask of custom or falsehood of conformity will suffice to hide realities from him....

Does this seem visionary, and are we all tempted to smile when we compare this glowing hope with things as they really are?... Do we measure by this ideal standard the college poets who yearly or half-yearly offer their heads for such stunted laurels as "Fair Harvard" has to bestow? I confess, that, when such a comparison is made, it ought to provoke our hearty laughter. We put our criterion of poetical merit far below what it should be, in judging of the productions of class poets and college rhymesters generally. Would it were different! Would that the writing of a poem, to be read before the students of the oldest literary institution in America[32] were felt to be a serious and earnest matter, requiring no small degree of talent and fidelity in him who attempts it! Until it be so, and until a taste for the best poetry is more cultivated among us, we shall lack one of the noblest graces of a liberal education, and one of the sweetest delights of life.[33]

---

[32] Does he refer here to the Hasty Pudding Club, whose minutes were kept in verse by the secretary? (Morison, p. 183).

[33] The Harvard Magazine, I (January, 1855), 49-54.

And on the next two pages Sanborn follows his stirring essay of hope with two of his own verse translations. One must admire his courage in offering his own head first to the college critical guillotine. His two poems, labeled "Freshman Translations," consist of two excerpts from Horace, which do not, of course, sing of a new era in poetry. Yet much of the original he has rendered very nicely, the substance and spirit of Horace being carried over into good English meter:[34]

THE NINTH ODE OF HORACE

SEE how Soracte white with snow
Stands shining, while the laboring woods
Bend with their burden, and the floods
Feel freezing Winter chill their flow.

Heap well the hearth and melt the cold,
My Thaliarch! and bring the wine,
That noble four-years-old of thine,--
All that the Sabine vase will hold.

Leave other cares to Heaven, whose will
Calms warring winds and raging deep,
While aged ashes on the steep,
And gloomy cypresses, stand still.

Seek not thy future lot to know,
And count the gifts of Fate for gain;
Nor thou, O boy! the dance disdain,
Nor scorn to feel love's gentle glow.

While joyless Age blights not thy flower,
Now in the manly games delight,
And love the pleasures of the night,--
Light whispers at the trysting hour;

The gay laugh of the hidden one
In secret corner so betrayed,--
The pledge from arm of pouting maid,
Or half-consenting finger won.

---

[34] For this critical comment I am indebted to Dr. William M. Seaman, associate professor of ancient languages in the Department of Foreign Languages, Michigan State College.

THE THIRTY-FIRST ODE.

WHAT asks the poet, praying thee, Apollo,
While the new wine he pours?
Not the rich harvests which the ploughshare follow
On green Sardinia's shores;

Not gold, nor ivory, nor the flocks that feed in
Calabria's sunny land;
Nor fields that quiet Liris kisses, leading
His still stream o'er the sand.

Prune your rank vineyards, ye whose fortunate valleys
Bear the Calenan vine!
O prosperous merchant, drain from golden chalice
Thy traffic-purchased wine!

Thou to the gods art dear,--they often lead thee
Safe o'er the western sea;
For me, my olives and light mallows feed me,
And pleasant succory.

These to enjoy, with health and soul unwarming,
Son of Latona, grant!
To know no dreary age my spirit staining,
Nor e'er the lyre to want. [35]

His other verse was of varying merit, some of the best being the following which he had written in one of his love letters to Anna:

As calmest waters mirror Heaven the best,
So best befit remembrances of Thee
Calm, holy hours, from earthly passion free,
Sweet twilight musings,--Sabbaths in the breast.

No stooping thought, nor any grovelling care,
The sacred whiteness of that place shall stain,
Where, far from heartless joys and rites profane,
Memory has reared to thee an altar fair.

[35] The Harvard Magazine, I (January, 1855), 55-56. These odes from the first book may have been entitled "Freshman Translations" to make anonymity certain and to avoid the inevitable comparison that would be expected between these and the high hopes expressed in his essay on poetry. He had never been a freshman at Harvard but entered with the sophomore class.

Yet frequent visitors shall kiss the shrine,
  And ever keep its vestal lamp alight,--
  All noble thoughts, all dreams divinely bright,
That waken or delight this soul of mine.

Even Love shall dare with faltering steps draw near,
  Trembling and blushing at his own sweet zeal,--
  With face half hidden shall devoutly kneel,
In timid reverence and in holy fear.[36]

Though none of these seem great, one or two poems contain fairly vivid imagery, as this sample from "The Pilgrim" may show:

THE way is long, the way is lone,
  The wintry fields are brown;
Full coldly on my frosty path
  The freezing stars look down.

Through drooping woods I journey on,
  Where never wood-bird sings;--
The drowsy owl from bough to bough
  Slow flaps his gloomy wings,
While from the pine-tree's waving hair
  An endless murmur swings.[37]

In general, one may say that Sanborn's early verse is sweetly pleasant, that it has little punch, that it contains a few good images (particularly when he is forced to be more specific and vivid when rendering another language into English), and that it is perhaps most reminiscent of the minor poets of the English romantic and Victorian schools.

Besides his essay entitled "Poetry," Sanborn wrote five others for the new magazine: "The Dial," "The Writings of Sylvester Judd," "Womanly

---

[36] "Memories," The Harvard Magazine, I (March, 1855), 160-161. Another version of this, which includes the first twelve lines printed here plus a couplet, appears in Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 120. In the latter he indicates he wrote this poem while Anna was still alive; the version printed here, however, would seem to be written to one dead.

[37] Ibid., (January, 1855), pp. 65-66.

Ethics," "'Lilian,'" and "King Arthur," the first two being perhaps of most interest.[38]

In his essay on The Dial, he states in a footnote that he has been "chiefly indebted for [his] facts . . . to conversations had with several persons intimately concerned in the publication" of the magazine, and continues, "We may have made mistakes in these facts, but we are confident they are few." As these conversations were doubtless held with Emerson, Alcott, Thoreau, and Parker, the essay may be interesting and particularly so for its definition of "Transcendentalism" evolved by the person who was later to be called "the last of the Transcendentalists":

> Judging from the common tone of the newspapers and of society, a Transcendentalist is a sort of chaos of obscurity, nonsense, and atheism. To hear the talk of many well-meaning clergymen, one would suppose that Transcendentalists, and especially German Transcendentalists, are a set of pernicious sophists, who are laboring with all the ingenuity of the Devil to destroy good morals, uproot piety, and introduce a universal anarchy. We are glad to find, however, that juster views on this point are gaining ground among us.
>
> As those who talk thus wildly about Transcendentalism are usually great sticklers for authority, it may be well to begin our definition by stating that Socrates and Plato, and the noble fathers of the Stoic school, were Transcendentalists,--that Paul and all the Apostles were so, pre-eminently, --that Luther and the great saints and martyrs of the Christian Church were so too,--that all great poets, painters, sculptors, musicians, are of this sect, and will be so till the end of time. For Transcendentalism is neither more nor less than Idealism,--Spiritualism; not in its wretched modern sense,--for our so-called Spiritualism is but a thinly veiled Materialism,--but in its best and highest meaning. The Transcendentalist believes in what transcends the senses; he belives in inspiration, flowing ever fresh and

---

[38] These essays appeared in The Harvard Magazine for 1855 in this order: "'Lilian,'" (March), pp. 128-133; "The Dial," (April,) pp.154-159; "Womanly Ethics," (June), pp. 259-262; "King Arthur," (July), pp. 297-310; and "The Writings of Sylvester Judd," part 1 (September), pp. 345-356 and part 2 in vol II (October), pp. 393-402, the last two articles appearing after he had graduated.

> pure from the Infinite Source of all wisdom and power; he believes in the human soul, its power, its divine lineage, and its glorious destiny. He values the past, but he values more the present, and most of all the future,--that great promised land of all our hopes. He does not believe that all truth is enshrined in any book, or any institution, for he holds that man is always greater than his achievements, and God infinitely greater than either our memory or our comprehension. Such, briefly, is Transcendentalism in its most general sense.

He then contrasts Transcendentalism with Sensationalism, speaks of the influence of Kant, Fichte, Jacobi, Hegel, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and others--Plato and the Alexandrians, Plutarch and Epictetus, the sacred books of the Hindoos and the Persians, Coleridge and Carlyle. "Emerson, too, through his lectures and his Nature, had produced a deep, if not a wide, effect in New England. Emerson, indeed is the Representative Man of American Transcendentalism, nor can we better describe the period of its culmination, in 1840 and 1841, than in his own felicitous words." Sanborn then quotes from Emerson in The Dial:

> No one can converse much with different classes of society in New England, without remarking the progress of a revolution. Those who share in it have no external organization, no badge, no creed, no name.... Without concert or proclamation of any kind, they have silently given in their several adherence to a new hope, and in all companies do signify a greater trust in the nature and resources of man than the laws or the popular opinions will well allow.
>
> This spirit of the time is felt by every individual with some difference,--to each one casting its light upon the objects nearest to his temper and habits of thought;--to one, coming in the shape of special reforms in the state; to another, in modifications of the various callings of men, and the customs of business; to a third, opening a new scope for literature and art; to a fourth, in philosophical insight; to a fifth, in the vast solitudes of prayer. It is in every form a protest against usage, and a search for principles.

He then discusses the organization of The Dial, which "opened with as brilliant display of talent among its contributors as any American

magazine has shown, before or since." And he discusses the contributions made by his present friends at Harvard toward the work of the movement and its mouthpiece: Emerson, Alcott, Parker, Thoreau, J. S. Dwight, and Ellery Channing the younger. "Why, then," he asks, "did The Dial fail to succeed? . . . The chief reason was, we think, that it was in advance of the times." And he says:

> Since 1840, a great change has taken place in New England, and much in literature that was then laughed at and neglected is now admired. But then...the freshness of its criticism, the originality of thought manifested in it, its independent opinions, all were forgotten by an undiscerning public.
>
> Besides this, it was not managed with the practical skill and shrewdness which, in the recent case of Putnam's Magazine, have given that such marked success. Neither Margaret Fuller...nor Mr. Emerson, its last editor, was very well fitted for such a place....
>
> But brief as the existence of The Dial was, the influence of the movement in which it originated was by no means so short-lived. In 1840, the Transcendentalists were a sect neither numerous nor held in much consideration, but since that time their mark has been set on the best literature of the country. They have, to a great degree, revolutionized the public mind. The effect of their labors may be traced in the higher tone of criticism, and the more generous philosophy, which now prevail.[39]

Sanborn's varied interests and the quality of his literary criticism may be typified by noting some of his other essays and reviews. At times in his reviews he was caustic--but witty--as when he says of the Poems of Thomas William Parsons, "At the present high price of paper, it is hard to see why this book was ever published."[40] At other

---

[39] The Harvard Magazine, I (April, 1855), pp. 154-159.

[40] [Review of] Poems (Boston, 1854), Ibid., I (December, 1854), 44.

times, as in his review of Louisa May Alcott's first book, Flower Fables, he could speak more gently than the book deserved, perhaps out of deference to his new friend, her father:

> The children...declare loudly for the book.... But others also can find a pleasure in the love and knowledge of Nature which the book shows.... The men and women who write stories for children do a greater work for the world than we are wont to think of. Horace praised poets because they formed the "tender mouth" of children, and turned them from the vile to the beautiful. Miss Alcott does not need to
>
> "Claim
> The shelter from her sire of an immortal name,"
>
> for she has earned praises for herself.[41]

Indeed, Sanborn's tastes in literature might seem perverted if one stopped reading his reviews after listening to his enthusiasms for such anonymous works as "Lilian" and Ida May, both of which effected Sanborn's eyes, "which would grow moist" over them.[42] We may be saved from a bad opinion of him as a critic when we witness his even greater enthusiasm for several other superior works of literature, an enthusiasm shared by highly competent critics of his own time and ours.

For example, of James Parton's Life of Horace Greeley he says, "No sort of book is so fascinating as a well-written biography,--and especially if its hero be a man of strong and amiable character." This Life, he says, "satisfies both these requisites": to have "produced such a man is an honor to our country," for he is "an upright,

---

[41] [Review of] Flower Fables (Boston, 1855), Ibid., I (March, 1855), 150.

[42] [Review of] "Lilian," in a long essay of the same title, Ibid., I (March, 1855), 128-133; [review of] Ida May (Boston, 1854?), Ibid., I (December, 1854), 46.

generous, and sincere man,--a democrat to the core,--a genuine philanthropist,--a hater and assaulter of all kinds of pretence." And he thanks Mr. Parton--"whoever he may be"--for writing the book.

> He does it, too, in a most readable manner; his style, without being faultless, is clear, picturesque, and energetic. Moreover, he is thoroughly independent. He does not glorify his hero at the expense of truth, so far as we can see, but he speaks his mind in the frankest way on every subject that comes before him. If you want to know what he thinks of the old political parties, or this nine days' wonder of a new one,--of Fourierism, of Spiritualism, of Calvinism, or of any conceivable ism, or champion of it, coming up for notice in this book,--Mr. Parton makes a clean breast, and gives you his "screed." Now we like this in an author, especially in an American author.

Sanborn then says that "this book suggests to young men like ourselves the gravest questions for discussion:"

> Read it, and it will set you thinking of the organization of labor,--that great problem of the age, which it should be America's mission to solve; of People's Colleges, or some other way of remedying the inefficiency of our collegiate system; and of a dozen other reforms which you will find advocated by the editor of the Tribune. Above all, it will fill you with courage and hope.... You will wonder that you ever doubted the capacity of mankind for virtue and heroism, and you will learn to put your trust in the future, for which Horace Greeley so manfully labors, and over whose destinies the eye of Infinite Love for ever watches.[43]

A brief glance at Milton Flower's recent biography of Parton indicates that Sanborn's review was discerning and intelligent.[44]

Sanborn's astuteness as a literary critic is perhaps most clearly shown in his essay on "The Writings of Sylvester Judd," a long essay of

---

[43] [Review of] Life of Horace Greeley (New York, 1854), Ibid., I (March, 1855), 149-150.

[44] Milton E. Flower, James Parton: The Father of Modern Biography (Duke UP, 1951), pp. 30-33.

twenty pages which came out in two installments. If, as Parton once said, "A man is, in a degree, that which he loves to praise," this review of Judd's work should tell us much about Sanborn.[45]

First, Sanborn prophesies that Judd's Margaret will "become a classic,--one of the freshest spring flowers of American literature, in the estimation of all, as now of a few." Margaret concerns the growth of a girl raised in "a rude, drunken family" in a small New England town. When she asks the village schoolmaster about God, he puts Tooke's mythology into her hand, and she comes to worship a world of nymphs and dryads. When a stranger comes to town, he teaches her about Christ, and in time, by a series of improbable coincidences, the town is burned to the ground and she inherits two million dollars.

> She changes her town...into a paradise,--a town fit for the Millennium.... A new church is built.... The neighboring churches are scandalized, the doctrine is so heretical.... Beside the roads and in the woods, statues of Peace, Faith, Hope, Love, Truth, Beauty...are set up.... The people all work and all worship; woman has her rights, and is contented; the children are well educated. Poverty decreases fast, and crime is almost unknown. Nearly all the base and selfish people in the book live regenerated in this wonderful town.

But it is Sanborn's criticism of the book which seems significant:

> It has not the merit of a well-constructed plot. There is great improbability in many of the incidents,--great inconsistency in many of the characters. The conclusion, with its millennial perfection,...is wholly impossible and imaginary. Yet, in its subordinate parts, it is managed with great skill usually, and its general effect, one would say, is almost perfect. It is a singular combination of tragedy,

---

[45] Ibid., p. 31.

comedy, and idyl, the idyllic element predominating, however, and shaping the course of the story.

> ...In power of humorous description and portraiture, we have no hesitation in ranking Mr. Judd with the masters of humorous writing.... Mr. Judd, too, is one of those few writers who have been successful in copying the New England dialect....
>
> Next to the humor displayed in Margaret, is its vivid descriptive power.... Not even Ruskin surpasses Mr. Judd in this.

Here Sanborn gives two pages of quotation which he uses to illustrate Judd's keen observation and use of vivid details. There is also, Sanborn says, "a rare and rich beauty in the dreams which visit Margaret's childish sleep." "They suggest the supernatural," he feels, and impress the reader that she is only half human. "Something of the same art with which Hawthorne makes the realms of fact and fancy unite, appears in this dreaming of Margaret."

Sanborn is also interested in the ideas which Judd presents: "The purely theological parts of the book are by no means the best; . . . and though his system converted Margaret, we must say it is somewhat inconsistent and shadowy." And Sanborn feels that "in politics, in religion, and in social philosophy he was far in advance of the majority of his countrymen."

Sanborn finally concludes that Mr. Judd's "defects are many and grievous."

> His chief sin is a total want of taste in selection and arrangement. His beauties of thought and sentiment are diamonds in the rough, and gleam sometimes, as we may fancy the pearls did, <u>after</u> they were cast before swine.... He jumbles clumsy and graceful, charming and odious, together in a bewildered mess....

> These three defects--want of taste, of method, and of accuracy--are the most striking in these books, and from them spring most of those faults which have been commented on by us and others. They effect the stule more than the matter,--that still challenges our admiration and love.[46]

It is surprising how Sanborn's remarks parallel those of our contemporary critic, Van Wyck Brooks. The latter of course could pick up a copy of Margaret a hundred years later. Could Sanborn be expected to see Judd's work with intelligent perspective? The fact is that Brooks' critical comments justify Sanborn's. Brooks speaks of Judd as "the Hawthornesque novelist," agrees with Sanborn that the novel was "obscure and confused," and then spends an amount of space equal to Sanborn's to support his opinion that "many pages and even chapters were vividly picturesque and charmingly written."[47] It is quite possible, and not at all improbable, I believe, that Brooks saw Sanborn's review, for the two critics see eye-to-eye on the writings of Sylvester Judd.

Sanborn's new interests and expanding world view are characterized by one other contribution to The Harvard Magazine; his review of five Women's Rights Tracts, the product of the minds of Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and Mrs. C. J. H. Nichols. In the third, Enfranchisement of Women, Sanborn feels that Parker "ably supports his position, that women should be freed from all the external restraints which they now complain of, and that to them, as widely as to men, the whole field of human action should be opened."

---

[46] The Harvard Magazine, I (September, 1855), 345-356 and II (October), 393-402.

[47] Van Wyck Brooks, The Flowering of New England (New York: The Modern Library, 1936), pp. 384-385.

In the first, Sanborn speaks admiringly of Wendell Phillips' view and quotes Phillips as saying: "It is no fanciful, no superficial movement, based on a few individual tastes, in morbid sympathy with tales of individual suffering. It is a great social protest against the very fabric of society." Of Higginson's Woman and her Wishes, Sanborn says: "Mr. Higginson's Essay is written with that earnestness which characterizes all he does and says. He has devoted himself to this reform with the same noble spirit which has already made him one of the foremost friends of the slave, the drunkard, and the unfortunate of all classes."

Sanborn then concludes his review in a stirring statement that points prophetically toward his own long career in the public charities and social reform:

> We confess we do not see how the arguments and appeals of these orators and essayists can be met, or what answer the advocates of things as they are can make to them. It becomes us, young men, just beginning the world for ourselves, to examine into these things, and choose which side we shall take. ... One thing is certain, that the existing social system is sadly imperfect, and allows the perpetration of fearful wrongs. Can we not do something to change it?[48]

It is easy to see from the above that Sanborn bent many of his energies toward understanding and promoting Transcendental literature and ideas. This was due presumably to the fact that he had become a friend

---

[48] [Review of] Woman's Rights Tracts: Nos. 1-5, The Harvard Magazine, I (January, 1855), 100-101. Sanborn reviewed: (1) Speech of Wendell Phillips at Worcester, October, 1851; (2) Theodore Parker's Sermon of the Public Function of Woman and (3) Enfranchisement of Woman, reprinted from the Westminster Review for July, 1851; (4) T. W. Higginson's Woman and Her Wishes; and (5) Mrs. C. J. H. Nichols' The Responsibilities of Woman.

of many of the great of Concord and Boston. The time he spent at Harvard, he said many years later, "gave me the opportunity of knowing the men who afterward had much to do with shaping the policy of the nation." During his first year as a sophomore, he stayed with his uncle in Boston during the entrance examinations and met Harriet Beecher Stowe, then at the height of her fame with Uncle Tom's Cabin, while she was staying with her brother in the house across the street. Later in the year he met the Alcotts and Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe and began a friendship with Theodore Parker. A year later he heard Charles Sumner speak in Faneuil Hall, met Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and called on Whittier in his cottage in Amesbury. In July, 1853, he visited Emerson in Concord and made an effort to hear him whenever he lectured. "Thus," says Sanborn, "the circle of my political and literary friends was formed in good part during my first two years in college."[49]

At the evening parties and open-houses at Theodore Parker's he heard the endless debate between anti-slavery and pro-slavery factions. By May 30, 1854, the day the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was passed, the discussions in the parlor had grown violent. What angered Sanborn and his friends was that this act stipulated that the Missouri Compromise had been replaced by the Compromise of 1850, which let the people of Utah and New Mexico decide for themselves whether they were to have slavery. Most infuriating was the fact that it organized two territories, Nebraska and Kansas, allowed settlers to carry slaves into them, and

[49] Recollections, I, 35-47.

authorized these settlers to determine whether their states should enter the Union slave or free.[50] Sanborn felt:

> It depended on the people of the North to say whether they would, in the words of Webster, "uphold the interests of slavery, extend its influence, and secure its permanent duration," or whether the majority of the people of the United States...should carry out that professed object of the Constitution of Washington and Franklin, "To establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." These were the great interests really at stake in the political contests from 1854 to 1861, and in the Kansas campaigns of 1856-58. Feeling this as warmly and foreseeing it as clearly in 1854 as it is now visible in retrospect, and aided in this clearness of insight by the remarkable political wisdom of Theodore Parker, I announced such opinions in one of my college declamations, and acted upon them steadily thereafter.[51]

Sanborn has often been called a hero-worshiper, the Concord Boswell.[52] Hero-worshipers are not always dear to their hero; yet Sanborn's journal for his senior year at college, and contemporary evidence indicate that the great sought him out. Alcott frequently dropped into his room at college. After he was asked to take charge of Emerson's school at Concord, Emerson and Thoreau often called on him and his sister at their rooms at Ellery Channing's, and Sanborn was often invited to join

---

[50] Allan Nevins and Henry S. Commager, The Pocket History of the United States, rev. ed. (New York, Pocket Books, Inc., 1951), p. 207.

[51] Recollections, I, 48-49. (Such an announcement of opinions in Sanborn's parts or exhibition speeches I have not yet found, though I have examined all pertinent copies of Exhibition and Commencement Performances in the Harvard Archives.)

[52] Van Wyck Brooks, The Flowering of New England, p. 431.

these figures and their famous friends at dinner and conversation. Thomas Wentworth Higginson reveals, in this personal letter to a member of his family, how one of the finest minds in New England reacted to Sanborn at this time:

> We had a pleasant visit last week from the most interesting young man of the day, Frank Sanborn, a Senior at Cambridge, and editor of the "Harvard Magazine." He is three inches above my head and very handsome, a person of great talent and noble character; and did you never hear of his romantic engagement, marriage, and bereavement? He is only twenty-three now.[53]

Sanborn's college journal is, in my estimation, the best thing he ever wrote. Had he continued it--as he may have--and had he continued it as conscientiously as I believe he did during these college and early Concord days, his mission in life would have been fulfilled. But I do not know what became of this journal or journals. It is my greatest hope that the originals may be found, for their importance to a study of the great men and ideas of Concord can not be overestimated.

The journal we have is filled with minutely reported details of persons, places, things, and ideas: who was there, how they looked, where they sat, what they said. Some excerpts will indicate the extraordinary opportunity that befell Sanborn during his senior year at Harvard. In one of his first entries he describes a visit to Emerson in Concord:

> November 2, 1854. Suddenly I went to Concord by railroad, and getting to Mr. Emerson's house at 2 o' cl'k, found him just arrived at home from Keene. We sat by the dining-room fire and talked awhile--of Stonehenge and of new theories, of

[53] Mary Thacher Higginson, ed., Letters and Journals of Thomas Wentworth Higginson (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1921), p. 86.

Bossuet and his book, of cones, etc. Speaking of pines, Mr. Emerson said Issac [sic] Porter offered to shew him on his Maine woodlands trees a thousand years old, for there is no limit to the life of trees; they die only by accident.

We walked out across the pasture to Walden Pond, and Mr. Emerson spoke of an Englishman, Cholmondely, who had lately come to Concord, a Preel man, a Puseyite, who had been to Australia and written a book called "Ultima Thule" thereupon.

"He is the son of a Shropshire squire, and is travelling during his nonage. He is better acquainted with things than most travelling Englishmen are; they are a singularly verdant race. The Englishman who stays at home and attends to what he knows is one of the wisest of men, but their travellers are most unobservant and self-complacent. I asked this man if he saw any difference between our autumn foliage and that of England. He said no, but all men who have eyes notice it at once; ours is tulips and carnations compared with theirs. So, too, he told me he went to hear a Mr. Parker in Boston; he thought him able, but was shocked at some of his doctrines. He began," said Mr. Emerson, "to talk to me about original sin and such things, but I said: 'I see you are speaking of something which had a meaning once, but has now grown obsolete. Those words once stood for something, and the world got good from them; but not now.'"

Just then we met the man himself, and Mr. Emerson invited him to dinner on Saturday.[54]

In another journal entry he reports a conversation with Alcott:

November 20, 1854. Coming in from Agassiz's lecture, found Mr. Alcott in my room. Talked with him a few minutes and then took him to dinner. There we spoke of Agassiz and science. Mr. Alcott complained of naturalists that they begin with matter,--they should begin with spirit,--as in the "Vestiges" the author supposes man developed as a final product from inorganic matter. This is wrong. The Deity does not work in this way, building up man out of matter, but man is rather a link between God and matter. Matter is the refuse of spirit, the residuum not taken up and made pure spirit. It is like a swarm of bees. They are conical, like the arrangement of things and man. All the bees depend on the queen bee; so all matter depends on man.

---

[54]These last two paragraphs prove the authenticity of Sanborn's Journal, for they have been copied verbatim into a letter to Oliver Wendell Holmes, dated Concord, March 20, 1884, which is now in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library.

"This which we are now engaged in," said Mr. Alcott, "is an instance of what I mean by the use of matter by spirit. Out of the food before us each selects what is needful for him, and rejects the rest. So spirit, selecting what is for its use, rejects the rest, and to it this refuse is matter.".[55]

I spoke of A. T. Davis. Mr. Alcott said:

"He is a simple, earnest man, but to him matter is everything; spirit at its extreme limit is still matter. It is better to say boldly that we are not formed from matter, but that we ourselves form it, that the eye creates what it looks upon, the desires what they act upon, etc."

"This is nearer the truth," said I; but Mr. Alcott seemed to imply it was almost the exact truth. Turning to Baxter he said:

"We are waiting for you theologians to set forth this view, but you are slow to do it."

Baxter replied that the majority of men who listen to sermons would not understand a statement of this kind; "Shall we preach only to the few while the many go uncared for?"

"Can you ever preach to many at once?" said Mr. Alcott (not in these words), "and would you preach to the Irishman on the railroad, with his brain built of potatoes and such things? No, you must pass by Patrick and speak to men who are before him; they will hand it down until by and by Patrick will get it."

We all demurred a little to this. I said the greatest minds often found themselves equally appreciated by the high and the low. Baxter spoke of Christ's apostles, who were "Irishmen" in Mr. Alcott's signification.

"Not at all," said he. "Christ made them what they were, to be sure; but he had good timber to make them of; they were not really common men. It is not the distinctions of society that I speak of, but those in the nature of man."

Baxter spoke of Dr. Lothrop's congregation.

"They are a sort of human brutes," said Mr. Alcott, "and they say, like people, like preacher. How few there are who really hear a man!" he went on. "Those who do so must dine on him; you must eat him up to get the good of him. Christ's disciples did so. That is the meaning of transubstantiation, nothing else. So nowadays men feed on

[55] In these excerpts from the journal, the ellipses of the original editor, George Sidney Hellman, are indicated by spaced periods, mine by unspaced periods.

Mr. Parker; he is strong meat to them; and they go away only to come back with appetite for more. 'That was good,' they say; 'we must have some more of that.' It is not so much so with Emerson; he is a finer food. A man who eats meat gets hungry sooner than I do; he has a ravenous appetite."

Five days later Sanborn dined at Alcott's home and discussed the Dial with him, evidently in preparation for his essay in the Harvard Magazine.

Saturday, Nov. 25.... We talked about the "Dial." Mr. Alcott got his journal and showed me some memoranda of the "Symposium," or Transcendental Club, of his first acquaintance with Emerson, &c.... He told me the names of most of the writers for the "Dial." He showed me also what he called "Tablets," extracts from his diaries, arranged in a certain order, under the signs of the zodiac. They consist of apothegms, short essays, and the like, and are designed for publication. In this connection Mr. Alcott told me Emerson's way of writing.. He puts down in his commonplace-book whatever he thinks worthy, and in the fall, when he is preparing his lectures or when he is making up a book, he goes over his commonplace-book and notices what topic has been uppermost in his thought, and arranges his fragments with reference to that. This accounts for the want of formal method in his books. They are crystallizations.

Then, too, there seem to have been a great many dinner parties, which converged on the Hotel Albion, where Sanborn talked with the great on many topics. In one such session the conversation was focussed on George Bancroft and Edward Everett:

Saturday, Dec. 2. A little past 3 I went to the Albion, expecting to meet Mr. Alcott. He was not there, but I found Emerson and John Dwight, H. Woodman and Cholmondely, the Englishman.

About a quarter to four I went for Mr. Alcott and found him with Kimball, of the last divinity class. He soon got ready and went down with me. We sat thus:

Alcott, Woodman
Emerson Cholmondely
Sanborn, Dwight

> ...Woodman spoke of Everett as a "curse to American scholarship," and this led to a discussion of Everett's merits. I suggested Bancroft as one of our best American scholars. Mr. Emerson laughed, and spoke of his speech in New York the other day, his "Triune God," "arrogant Arius," "devout Athanasius," and the like. Bancroft, he said, is not a religious man. To which Dwight heartily assented. They thought this Trinitarianism assumed out of deference to New York sentiment, which is Presbyterian and Episcopalian.
>
> "In conversation," Mr. Emerson said, "Bancroft will take any side and defend it skillfully; he is a soldier of fortune." He thought his speech at the Phi Beta dinner in Cambridge, where Lord Ashburton was present, was one of his best efforts. Quincy and Story had spoken, but rather stiffly and coldly; Bancroft warmed up the audience. He spoke of Bancroft's ostracism in Boston on account of his politics as an instance of Boston proscription.

On another such occasion Sanborn dined with James Russell Lowell, Emerson, one of the Richard Henry Danas, Cholmondeley, Sanborn's best friend at college (Edwin Morton), and two others. Sanborn's entrance brought them to speak of Alcott:

> Something was said of his meeting Carlyle in England. Emerson said it was a fault in Carlyle and Browning and the rest that they failed to appreciate Mr. Alcott. Carlyle walked with him through Piccadilly, the splendor of London, as I understand it, and said:
>
> "Here, sir, this Piccadilly has existed for ages, and will continue to exist for ages after your potato gospel has gone to the dogs." Neither was Mr. Alcott pleased greatly with Carlyle.

Then, after a long discussion of the relative merits of Browning, Tennyson, and Shelley--whom Sanborn ranked above Wordsworth--they pulled their chairs up to the warmth of the fireplace and "drew closer about the nuts and apples and wine."

Sanborn sat beside Dana, and they talked about Rufus Choate, whom Dana thought the "greatest genius and best logician at the American bar":

He said he never uses a fallacy without knowing it, and never allows his opponent to use one without detecting it. I spoke of his meretricious oratory. Mr. Dana allowed that to some extent, but said the judges watched no one so closely as Mr. Choate, lest something in his argument should escape them. Under this display of rhetoric lay a masterly logic. Dana told a good story of Choate. In a case of fraud the other day, perpetrated, or planned at least, on the coast of Sumatra, Mr. Choate was examining a witness who was an accomplice with the principal. The witness was telling the argument used by that man to gain his coöperation, such as the distance from home, the difficulty of detection, &c. But there seemed to be something more. Choate insisted on knowing what it was. At last, said the witness: "Well if you must know," he said, "even if we were found out, we 'd get Choate to defend us, and we should get off, though they found the money in our boots." Mr. Choate was a good deal put down by this answer, being sensitive on that point.

The day after Christmas, Sanborn was debating whether or not to go to East Boston to hear Emerson, but he finally decided to go, and heard him lecture on England:

It was full of good things, but I thought not so fine as the lecture of last spring on poetry. It was the first time I had ever heard him before an audience. His manner and voice were much as in conversation, and his appearance was fine, as always. After the lecture I spoke with him, and on the boat he came and took me aside to make me a proposal for teaching in Concord. I got into his carriage and rode to the American House, where he lodged.

Emerson did not again talk with Sanborn about the school until the tenth of March at one of their afternoon dinners at the Albion. Sanborn "promised to take the matter into consideration, for to leave Cambridge now," he writes in his journal, "is contrary to my wishes, however glad I may be to get so fine a situation."

By March 28th, however, he was directing the activities of the school, which he records was "vexatious, but is getting better every

day." He saw considerable of Emerson, Thoreau, and Ellery Channing, and he had two long conversations with Emerson about Pascal and Carlyle from which he gleaned some thoughts of his own for his commencement oration. It must have been a happy time for him, a time of fulfilment, a conclusion to many hopes. One of the last entries in this journal typifies his emotions:

> Monday night, [April] 16 [1855]. Tonight the Ripleys called, and a little past eight Mr. Emerson came in. He stayed perhaps an hour and talked of Pascal and philosophy and other things. Should I have believed three years ago, when I was in doubt and trouble at Exeter [sic], that in so short a time I should be living here of all places in the world, and that this greatest and finest of all Americans would be making me an evening call? That I should be teaching his children, visiting his house, and drawing new lessons of life from his serene and simple dignity? Truly my life has been a strange one! But there was one who read my secret, and brought order of confusion. Does she still watch over and guide me as before?

What a pity that we do not have more of this journal, and what a misfortune for American letters that we do not find a continuation of Sanborn's desire to be accurate and precise in his recording of details. In his final entry he writes:

> I omit all notice of many things which I would gladly have written here,--walks and talks with Mr. Emerson, and pleasant hours spent at his house,--for they should have been written down at the time, and were not, and I will not injure them now by recalling them so imperfectly as I should.[56]

How his mind and art were to change! Could he have remained the Concord Boswell, observing and reporting with this loving care all the ideas and activities of his friends, he would have done his work in this world. But, as we shall see, he came to believe himself more than a Boswell. His mission, he must have felt, was to improve on his originals.

---

[56]Sanborn, "An Unpublished Concord Journal," ed. George Sidney Hellman, Century Magazine, CIII (1922), 825-835.

When Sanborn accepted Emerson's proposal to take the principalship of his school in Concord, the Harvard faculty at its meeting of March 19, 1855, "Voted that Sanborn, Senior, be allowed to absent himself from College for the rest of the term, in order to avail himself of an advantageous opportunity for keeping school, and on presenting himself for examination in the studies of the class to receive marks for the same." He resigned his Abbot scholarship, permitting the income for the last six months to be given to Merritt, a junior.[57]

Extreme busyness must have characterized Sanborn's last term at Harvard, just as great activity and a multitude of labors were to characterize the rest of his life. Not only was he holding down his new full-time job as teacher and headmaster of his school in Concord, but he was able, in the time left to him, to keep up his duties as secretary of Hasty Pudding, take part in the May exhibition, be elected to Phi Beta Kappa, be rated eighth of the eighty-two in his class, and write and rehearse his commencement oration. Characteristically fighting the main current of convention, he declined, as did the first scholar, Francis Barlow, the election to Phi Beta Kappa, "possibly from a dislike of what they may have deemed an unjustifiable aristocracy."[58]

His dissertation for the May exhibition was entitled "The 'Thoughts' of Pascal," which quite probably grew out of his conversations with Emerson on "Pascal, Carlyle, etc." he mentioned in his journal entry for April 12th. "What is the result," he asks, "of this system of Pascal's?"

---

[57] Records of the College Faculty, XIV, 400, 409 (Harvard Archives).

[58] Victor Channing Sanborn, "Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, A.B.," The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, LXXI (1917), 291. This statement is Victor's, not his father's.

> It leads directly to universal skepticism--it is, indeed, only the skepticism of Montaigne, enforced by religious conviction and fortified by the most rigid logic. But this skepticism--this universal doubt, according to Pascal, is the only road to the divine certainty of religion. When man has learned his own nothingness--has abjured his reason and disowned his affections--then the grace of God gives him the sure light of faith.
>
> I confess I can look upon these doctrines only with abhorrence. I find a certain truth in them, but a truth distorted and terribly perverted.

Then he continues, "As I have read these Thoughts, I have involuntarily, by the strange association of contrast, compared the book with a very extraordinary one which has appeared in our own age--I mean Carlyle's Sartor Resartus."

> Carlyle dwells on the greatness of human nature.... He belongs to the party of Hope.... Pascal, on the contrary, assaults and degrades human nature. True, he does it with a noble motive,...but neither our respect nor our sympathy can overcome our aversion to his gloomy system. He belongs to the party of Despair....
>
> But why has Pascal--holding such atrocious opinions and supporting them with such pernicious logic--so won for himself the admiration and respect of the world? Not, I venture to say, because of these opinions, but in spite of them. We admire his wondrous skill in the use of words--his wit, his learning, his eloquence; we venerate his strict morality and his unbending courage. "It is better to obey God than men" was the grand truism so often uttered by his lips and so firmly maintained by his life. In the midst of persecution he never gave up his integrity. Pope and Cardinal thundered against his heresies,--Pascal answered calmly, "If my letters have been condemned at Rome, that which my letters condemn has been condemned in heaven."
>
> I repeat it--it is for his courage and integrity that we honor Pascal--not for his bigotry and misanthropy. But let me say I honor him still more for that which was the root of his integrity and his courage--his piety. Mistaken as I believe him to have been, I must still do homage to that fervor of devotion which, however misdirected, must always command the veneration of earnest men. I can conceive of nothing more touching--nothing more sublime than the consecration

> to God's service of a heart however humble, or a life however obscure,--and the testimony of such a consecration I find in the Thoughts of Pascal.[59]

Sanborn's last act at Harvard was the performance of his commencement oration at the graduation exercises July 18th. Writing in his journal for September 15th, and noting the events of the past summer, he said: "Early in July I wrote my commencement oration, and read it to Mr. Emerson, who praised some and censored some."[60] His topic was "The Schoolmaster of the Future," and was one of thirty-nine orations, disquisitions, dissertations, and essays presented to the "Illustrissimo HENRICO-JOSEPHO GARDNER, GUBERNATORI...REIPUBLICAE MASSACHUSETTENSIS," according to the commencement program. Compared with such topics as "The Jesuits in Paraguay," "The Roman Navy," and "Humboldt's Aspects of Nature," Sanborn's oration was eminently practical. It is not possible, however, that the listeners could have repeated the theme ideas of the speeches if the other thirty-nine were as long as Sanborn's. Sanborn was the sixth speaker of the "Juvenes in Artibus Initiati":

> Within the last hundred years have occurred the most astonishing political revolutions which authentic history records.... But the social revolution which has been accomplishing itself in the same period is quite as remarkable, though perhaps, less obvious; and the tendency of all these changes, whether in the church, the state, or the community, has been to develope and fortify individual freedom at the expense of established institutions.

---

[59] Exhibition and Commencement Performances (1845-1855), No. 32, May 1, 1855. in the Harvard Archives. The copy is dated April 21, 1855.

[60] Sanborn, "An Unpublished Concord Journal," p. 835.

In politics this strong individualism weakens the authority of the state, making men revolutionists in Europe, and followers of the Higher Law in America; in religion it loosens the bands of the church, giving rise to all manner of protest and dissent; in philosophy it manifests itself as Transcendentalism, which is the stronghold of the individual against authority and against numbers. Let me briefly point out some of the results of this same principle in education.

No one...can have failed to notice the increasing importance of the secular teacher.... Wherever a clergyman maintains his authority, it is not so much by virtue of his office as by his personal weight of character. None sees these things more clearly than the clergyman himself; and he therefore either quits his pulpit for the lecturer's or the schoolmaster's desk or assumes a double office. All the week days in the winter months he is a minister-at-large, and rushes from lecture room to lecture room with the zeal of an apostle. What ideas he has he puts in his lectures rather than in his sermons, being fully persuaded that his highest duty is towards his audience, not his congregation.

Thus has lecturing become a profession.... In our villages the schoolmaster supplants the lawyer and the clergyman,--and is become the shepherd of the people....

To what then are we tending? Evidently to a state of individual teaching and discipleship, corresponding to the individualism in politics and religion which I have noticed. Corresponding, and yet leading to widely different results,--for while the one hastens to dissolve organizations, and to compel each man by himself to his own guidance, the other--Individual Education--reunites and reconstructs society. In exalting school-keeping to the rank of a dignified profession, I see that we are preparing for that fortunate time when the cultivated, the earnest and religious men and women shall find their proper place as guides and teachers of those around them....

I have said that the Teacher's office is becoming the most important one in the community.... What man holds so responsible, so influential, so sacred a place, as he who is to form the characters of the young.... God forbid that I should disparage any honest and useful occupation,--but I must say that the ambition which leads so many to the study of law seems to me pernicious and vulgar. Such, too, is the position of the church at the present day.... But against the teacher's profession no such objection rises. There the prize is worthy, there the work is noble, there the field is free....

> Young men who are seeking a path in life--young women, who with the love of God in your hearts, are longing for some pious task to do--I entreat you to come forward, in humility, yet in hope, to the serious, blessed labors of Education.[61]

Somewhat sadly Sanborn must have recorded in his journal in September that Mr. Emerson "came to hear me deliver [my oration] at Cambridge, but was just too late."[62] Considering that Sanborn was sixth on the program, Mr. Emerson probably arrived late out of a desire for self-preservation.

So the members of the class of '55 bade farewell to each other after the exercises, each to go his own way in the world. Two beside Sanborn were to become teachers; fourteen were to become lawyers; and five, preachers--in spite of Sanborn's farewell oration. Fifteen entered business and banking or sold real estate, and fourteen others became engineers, scientists, librarians, politicians, army officers, farmers, or architects.

Sanborn was eighth in his class, though actually seventh from the top of the list, as two graduates tied for first position. One of these, Francis Barlow, became the great general of the Civil War and the Secretary of State and Attorney General of New York; Phillips Brooks, one of the great preachers of the age; William Pitt Preble Longfellow, an outstanding architect; Charles Ammi Cutter, one of America's great librarians; James Reed, an exponent of the teachings of Swendenborg; Theodore Lyman, a foremost marine biologist; and Benjamin Lyman was to teach for a time with Sanborn in his Concord school and become later one of the world's leading geologists. But none but Sanborn was to become famous

[61] Exhibition and Commencement Performances (1845-1855), XV, No. 44, in the Harvard Archives.

[62] Sanborn, "An Unpublished Concord Journal," p. 835.

in four careers. Fifty-five members of the class were accounted for by Edwin Abbot, the class secretary, forty years later, but what happened to the other twenty-seven who walked out of the yard that hot July day?

"Philosophers," Sanborn said many years later, "who seek to know the causes of things, are apt to be interested . . . in the manifold influences that make men individuals."[63] In these first two chapters, I have tried to trace some of the manifold influences on the mind and personality of this young man whom Emerson must have greeted--after the graduation ceremonies--not at the beginning of one career but at the beginning of four.

[63] Sanborn, "History and Poetry," p. 82.

CHAPTER III

HIS CAREER AS A TEACHER

When Sanborn speaks in his autobiography of the "four distinct careers" which he had "in mature life," he does not number among them his career as a teacher. Yet, while still a senior at Harvard he began teaching in Emerson's school in Concord. In 1879 he was a prime mover in starting the Concord Summer School of Philosophy with William Torrey Harris and Bronson Alcott, and from that year till 1888 he delivered many of its lectures. And in this same period he became a lecturer on "practical social science" at Cornell, Wellesley, and Smith.

He was principal and teacher in Emerson's school for eight years--from March, 1855, to March, 1863, when he became editor of the Boston Commonwealth.[1] He could never devote his full attention, talent, and boundless energy to his pupils because he was so deeply involved throughout this period in his activities as John Brown's New England agent. In spite of the fact that Sanborn considered this first career of little importance, his teaching and his school elicited much praise from many of New England's most critical minds.

Schoolteaching ran in the family. All of his brothers and sisters except Lewis became teachers during part of their lives. Charles taught school before he entered politics; Helen Maria taught at the district school in Hampton Falls; Sarah Elizabeth became his assistant in the

[1] Sanborn Genealogy, p. 468.

Emerson school; and his youngest brother, Joseph, became his pupil in the school, graduated first in the class of '67 at Harvard, returned to the school to teach, and was invited by the future United States Commissioner of Education, William Torrey Harris, to teach in his St. Louis system.[2]

It was indeed a singular honor Emerson paid Sanborn when he selected him above all others to teach his own children. The honor was italicized when Sanborn was entrusted with the education of the three sons of Horace Mann, two sons of Henry James, Sr. (Robertson and Wilkie), the children of Judge Ebenezer Hoar, two daughters of John Brown, young Frank Stearns, and Julian Hawthorne. On an average, Sanborn and his small staff taught between forty and sixty pupils.

One of these—and he was no scholar[3]—was Julian Hawthorne, who has written vividly and at length about Sanborn and his school. He gives us a clear portrait of him in these words:

> There came to Concord a tall, wiry, long-limbed young scholar with brilliant dark eyes looking keenly beneath a great shock of black hair, a quick, kindly, humorous smile brightening over his thin, fresh-hued face and finely moulded features, expressive at once of passion and self-control. He walked with long steps and with a slight bending of the shoulders, as if in modest deprecation of his own unusual stature.

Sanborn's little one-room schoolhouse, forty feet long by twenty wide, had a big stove in its center, and three of its walls were panelled with blackboards. The pupils sat at desks accommodating two each, the

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 295-296, 474-475.

[3] Louise Hall Tharp, The Peabody Sisters of Salem (Boston: Little, Brown, 1950), p. 305; Julian Hawthorne, The Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, ed. Edith Garrigues Hawthorne (New York: Macmillan, 1938), pp. 77, 80. The testimony of the latter, I am told, is to be used with caution, as he is said to be inaccurate.

girls sitting on one side of the central aisle, the boys on the other. Sanborn's desk stood on a low rostrum at the entrance-end of the building.

Sanborn took the little red schoolhouse offered him and painted it gray. Perhaps the act symbolized a break with New England tradition such as Horace Mann approved of.[4] Sanborn's curriculum and activities were not so radical as Bancroft's in his school at Round Hill,[5] but they met with the approval of the most critical personalities. Five years after the school opened, Ellery Channing wrote Nathaniel Hawthorne, back from his consulship in Liverpool. Hawthorne was remodeling Alcott's old "Hillside" and was looking about for a school to which he could send Julian. Channing wrote:

> In numbering over the things that had been added to the town, t' other day, I left out the first and best, which is, the school for girls and boys, under the charge of Mr. Sanborn. No words that I could use on this occasion could do justice to his happy influence on the characters of those confided to him, and more especially of the girls. He has supplied a want long felt here, and, by having a school for young children, leaves nothing to be desired.

Channing thought the mere fact of being able to associate with him and "those he has drawn about him," was important. He said he'd never heard of a school before "where there was so much to please and so little to offend."[6]

---

[4] Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, pp. 80, 77.

[5] Russel Blaine Nye, George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel (New York: Knopf, 1944), pp. 67-73.

[6] Julian Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife (Boston, 1889), II, 264-265. Channing's letter is dated Concord, September, 1860. Hawthorne decided to send Julian to Sanborn's school, but he did not send Rose and Una, though they took part in its extracurricular "jollifications" (p. 267).

James Russell Lowell also sent Hawthorne advice, but this was to tell him not to send Julian to Sanborn's school. Lowell's letter, however, in the light of today's educational theories, compliments Sanborn's methods and point of view though it indicates why the school would not solve Julian's scholastic difficulties:

> Any clever man (like Mr. Sanborn) will begin to take what one may call aesthetic views of teaching after being for some time at the head of a school of his own. I mean that he will attach more importance to the general development of his pupils and less to their fitness to pass a special examination such as is needed here.[7]

Channing himself had not always been so enthusiastic about the school. He had written Sanborn a letter a year and a half before in which he declared he felt Sanborn had labored under "peculiar disadvantages" in his school from a poor choice of teachers, "who were not adapted by their peculiarly hard and formal characters to be of use to the young." But, he hoped, Sanborn would do better with the new:

> You need flexible, attractive and happy persons about you, who will make a sunshine in that "shady place," a schoolroom; not cold, selfish, icy people, who if they were in Nova Zembla would be only throwing a lower depression into the thermometers.

He liked particularly the appearance of Miss Louisa Leavitt, Sanborn's cousin, and said that he had heard from those who knew that she possessed the best "school-marm quality": that is, she was "quite taking with the young people."[8]

---

[7] Lowell to Nathaniel Hawthorne, Cambridge, February 26, 1862, in Mark Antony DeWolfe Howe, ed., New Letters of James Russell Lowell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), p. 103.

[8] Channing to Sanborn, Concord, March 19, 1859 in Recollections, II, 332.

Two of Sanborn's class registers for 1859 and 1860 tell us much about the school and its curriculum, though Sanborn's nearly indecipherable notes may have led to some false conclusions. For the four months between September, 1859, and the end of January, 1860, an average of fifty-five pupils attended his school. In contrast to Bancroft's boarding school, which was for males only, Sanborn subjected his boys and girls to no mile runs through the woods or early risings at 6:00.[9] Classes ran from 9:00 to 12:00 in the morning and 2:00 to 4:30 in the afternoon, with the school in session six days a week, Wednesday and Saturday afternoons being offered as holidays.[10]

Sanborn, Miss Waterman, and Miss Leavitt were the principal instructors. Miss Waterman taught Latin grammar, Latin reader, Viri Romae, Virgil, spelling, "History M & T," Latin composition, Ovid, drawing, and four years of French, apparently meeting all of these classes daily except for the "1st and 2nd French," Latin composition, and drawing. Miss Leavitt evidently took most of the classes in arithmetic and algebra, and the Latin, American authors, exploration,[11] geography, and U. S. history. Two persons were called in to teach music--Miss Pratt and Miss Ensign--the former also teaching a class in Locke. If Sanborn taught the classes listed in one of the registers which do not seem to be assigned to any of his assistants, it may be possible that he taught

---

[9] Nye, George Bancroft, p. 69.

[10] Reports of the Selectmen (Year Ending April 2, 1860) in the Concord Library, in which is included the "Report of the School Committee of Concord for the Year Ending April 2, 1860."

[11] The word "exploration" here was first read as "explanation," though what either of these "courses" might include is a question.

Lucretius, chemistry, natural philosophy, Plutarch, geometry, Latin, Greek, "Clark's Algebra," "Pierce's Algebra," spelling, French, German, Tacitus, and Milton. Listed also in the registers are classes in Shakspeare, "Book-Keeping," Caesar, "Mental Arithmetic," and geology. Neither parents nor children probably complained of a lack of variety.[12]

Sanborn employed a great variety of persons as his assistants: Elizabeth Ripley, Elizabeth Hoar, Edith and Ellen Emerson, Alice Jackson, Martha and Anne Bartlett, Caroline Pratt, Mr. Whittemore—"the affianced of my cousin Caroline"—and Benjamin Lyman, who became one of the world's great geologists in later life.[13] He looked about, too, to find intellectual or intellectually prominent guest lecturers: Dr. Elias Jackson, who lectured on chemistry, Dr. Reinhold Solger, his Prussian assistant, "who lectured on history and geography so well that Emerson was going to school again himself."[14] Alcott, whom Sanborn insisted should fill the newly created office of Superintendent of Schools, often talked to the pupils, and Louisa found her visits to the schoolhouse a delight.[15] To the exhibitions of his pupils and to their examinations he invited such

---

[12]"F. B. Sanborn / Register / 1859-60," in the Sanborn Papers at the American Antiquarian Society. This and another register contain the lists of subjects, their teachers, and the class lists.

[13]There were several others. See Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman, Concord, May 2, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society); Sanborn to Parker, Concord, March 13, 1859 (Concord Library, 5: S-40); Sanborn to Parker, Concord, February 12, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-51); Sanborn to Parker, Concord, January 21, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-50); Sanborn to Lyman, May 27, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society), and many other letters in these two collections.

[14]Van Wyck Brooks, The Life of Emerson (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1932), p. 284.

[15]Reports of the Selectmen (Year Ending April 2, 1860), "Report of the School Committee of Concord," passim; Madeleine B. Stern, Louisa May Alcott (University of Oklahoma Press, 1950), p. 82.

brilliant minds as Theodore Parker and Sarah Alden Ripley, who catechized and questioned.[16] And in one letter to Parker he says he anticipates few pupils for the fall term of 1860 and shall "give up the plan of lectures from abroad, and contract my canvass in proportion to the ship and the burden."[17]

When Ellery Channing, once a pupil at Bancroft's school, wrote Hawthorne, "I have never heard of a school before where there was so much to please and so little to offend," he regrettably does not compare Sanborn's educational theories and methods to Bancroft's. Bancroft set up a "revolutionary" curriculum, stating in his prospectus that the studies in his school were to be of a "liberal nature." He and Cogswell declared, however, that they wanted to give "a practical character to [their] institution, and educate not for an ideal world, but for the world as it is." Sanborn did not issue a prospectus or advertisement for his school giving its specific purpose and objectives, but his methods were doubtless progressive for the times.

Though Julian Hawthorne felt that "Sanborn's school was certainly a nice place to be in," he describes in detail Sanborn's sternest disciplinary measures. Evidently Sanborn was customarily gentle and kind, but not so immoderately bland as Thoreau, who announced in his school

---

[16] Letter from Sanborn to Parker, Concord, July 10, 1858 (Concord Library, 5: S-39).

[17] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, March 13, 1859 (Concord Library, 5: S-40).

"he should not flog, but would talk morals as a punishment instead."[18] Since Julian Hawthorne as a lad was strongly prejudiced against Sanborn and came to be perplexed later by the "feminine gentleness" of this "courteous and smiling ogre,"[19] he was particularly interested when, "amid the placid tides" of the school, "the wave foamed and struck":

> Sanborn being late in taking his chair one afternoon, suddenly all the pupils started sneezing. Gourgas, a queer-looking chap, of French extraction, looked about with a grin. He took his hand our of his pocket and scattered an ounce or so of snuff.... At this juncture in must step Sanborn. He halted, like the heroes of Victorian romance, drew himself up to his full height, for a moment was bewildered, and the next moment understood.
>
> Poor Gourgas, foredoomed, broke into a guffaw. Upon him Sanborn fixed eyes more terrible than Thoreau's. "Who has done this?" he asked.
>
> "It was me, sir!" A sin in grammar, to boot!
>
> He was ordered into the adjoining room, and Sanborn, ruler in hand, stalked stiffly after him. Whack--whack--six times repeated. Then a pause, muffled voices: the executioner and his victim reappeared, the latter leading. He had stuck one hand in his pocket to hide the palm, reddened and swollen from his punishment. He managed also to keep up his smile--a manful gesture--and we liked him the better for his crime.[20]

On another such occasion Sanborn wrote to Parker: "Some talk has lately been made about me because I led a truant boy from the school to the boarding house with his hands tied behind him." The boy was "a troublesome child--full of all wickedness whom I thought to punish in this way." But the situation was aggravated when "some foolish and

---

[18] Henry Seidel Canby, Thoreau (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1939) p. 67.

[19] Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, pp. 78, 84.

[20] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

malicious person" in Concord wrote to the Boston Herald about it, noting that the boy's father was formerly a clergyman at Danvers. "It will be a week's wonder [?] I suppose," concluded Sanborn, "and then be forgotten." His taking the two daughters of John Brown at the school also made some talk against him.[21]

But most often discussed by his contemporaries and by twentieth-century biographers of his contemporaries was Sanborn's tremendous success in making school a delightful experience. In fact, in his efforts to entertain and gladden his students, he amused most of Concord. Julian Hawthorne summarizes Sanborn's efforts:

> Frank Sanborn's little schoolhouse was surrounded by the great, fresh outdoors, and neighboring such abodes of felicity as the Alcotts' house to play and dance in; picnics at Esterbrook Farm, five miles north in the woods; bathing and skating at Walden Pond; the grand masquerade at the town hall; the regatta on the river below the old Red Bridge; a week's encampment on Monadnock Mountain—boys and girls, judiciously selected, but chaperoning themselves on horseback parties. Such diversions are quite as much characteristics of old New England as the school was.[22]

Louisa Alcott felt that of all the changes that had occurred in Concord the one that "promised the greatest interest" was Sanborn's school. She was delighted with his observations on troublesome boys, blooming girls, fencing, dances, and picnics. She was thrilled when Sanborn organized the Concord Dramatic Union, which produced plays in the church vestry and the Town Hall; she agreed "that the stock company

---

[21]Sanborn to Parker, Concord, March 11, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-52).

[22]Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, p. 85.

of the Concord Dramatic Union rivaled Walpole's amateur group." She, as "first old woman" in the company, played with Edith and Edward Emerson, George Bartlett, John and Carrie Pratt, Carrie Cheney, and Anna Alcott in his productions of Kill or Cure, The Morning Call, Old Poz, The Lady of the Lake, Naval Engagements, The Cricket on the Hearth, The Haunted Man, The Loan of a Lover, and in Dickens scenes at Christmas.

Then there were Sanborn's Friday evening parties for his school. They square-danced to music played by the former turnkey of the jail, who called the figures smartly. Louisa enjoyed dancing to "Portland Fancy" or "Steamboat Quickstep" and watched Sanborn's more "frivolous" guests waltz to "Buy a Broom."

On Monday evenings the Alcotts received, and the favored boys of Sanborn's school talked with the ladies, played whist, or made poker sketches, and later in the evening drank Mrs. Alcott's root beer and munched her ginger cakes.[23]

Every year Sanborn dismissed the school for a nutting expedition in the fall, a party at Conantum on May Day, and a "pic nic" on the 19th of April. "We found the columbine, anemone, shadbush, dandelion, strawberry, andromeda and some other flowers in bloom," he wrote Lyman one spring, "besides those I wrote you of in my last."[24] He rowed Miss Waterman and Miss Whiting up the river in his boat, while Edith Emerson rowed up in

---

[23] Stern, Louisa May Alcott, pp. 82-109.

[24] Letter from Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman, Concord, May 2, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society).

another, and Louisa Leavitt arrived in the carryall. "I wish you could be prevailed on to stay all night," he wrote Parker, who was coming up on the noon train from Boston to participate in the July examination of his school, "and go to my pic nic at Walden on Wednesday--where we shall have dancing, singing, swinging and rowing on the pond." That evening there was also going to be a dance for his school at the Town Hall.[25]

But Sanborn's attentions were not centered exclusively in his own school. As Secretary of the Concord School Committee, he worked strenuously with Bronson Alcott to improve the rest of the schools in Concord. He wrote long reports annually on behalf of the committee, which consisted of two other persons for the school district at the center, and one person representing each of the other six districts. He also helped Bronson Alcott prepare his annual reports of the Superintendent, reports so voluminous that in at least one year they had to be printed in a supplementary volume. Though Sanborn was Secretary for four years, his report for the year ending April 2, 1860, is perhaps most interesting.

Sanborn's long report was occasioned by an attempted repeal of the District System, to which Concord had "so tenaciously adhered," that forced a reorganization of the School Committee. This reorganization, he says, possessed novelty and worked well.

The town of Concord owned its own schoolhouses and raised its money for schools in the town meeting, but it had for many years--as in Hampton Falls--entrusted the selection of teachers and the management of the

---

[25]Sanborn to Parker, Concord, July 10, 1858 (Concord Library, 5: S-39).

schools to the Prudential Committees in the districts. The general School Committee published their views of abolishing the old District System in all their printed reports, but Sanborn, realizing that democracy was not operating in this microcosm, reported that the other side had no such means of publishing its views:

> The Prudential Committee man, if he make a report, must necessarily do so to the smaller audience of a district meeting. His views and opinions, however sound and able, do not reach much beyond the walls of his school house, as he has no power or authority to print, and no machinery of a department of the government to spread his reports through the community.

His views were therefore rarely heard, says Sanborn, and the strength of his view is indicated only when, "by some such legislation as that of last winter, every one of these little democracies, the districts, finds its very existence imperilled":

> Then with a voice that makes itself heard above the cries of party, and the din of business, and the tumult of society, they thunder out a No that compels a pause and a retracing of steps, however awkward or unwilling. "We are competent, and we will manage our children's schools in our own way," swells up from a thousand districts in a roar, like that of the mingled rivulets united in a mighty cataract.
>
> To secure the favorable eddies, not to attempt to stem such a current, was the effort of our citizens, and they effected their purpose by a plan which combines the advantages of both systems.

To do this, the people enlarged the School Committee so that it comprised three members from the district in Concord Center, and one from each of the six outer districts; they authorized the committee to employ a Superintendent at a salary of $100 a year; they recommended that they hold monthly meetings and appoint a sub-committee for each school of not less than two members. Sanborn was elected Secretary,

John S. Keyes, Chairman, and at Sanborn's insistence, Bronson Alcott, Superintendent, and these nine "endeavored faithfully to carry out the other votes and wishes of the town."

By this plan, Sanborn reported, each

> district has been represented, its local wants and views made known, its interests protected, and its coöperation secured. The meetings of the committee have been more formal and methodical, than when only two or three met together. The sub-committees have felt more responsibility for their own schools, have watched them closer, and kept up an acquaintance more intimate with them, than if they were not expected to report on them at each monthly meeting. The superintendent has discharged his delicate and responsible duties, we believe, to the eminent satisfaction of all with whom he has been brought in contact, and the year's work has thus been harmonious and efficient. The revision of the regulations, and the list of text books, and the classification of our schools, have furnished abundant work for even the enlarged committee, and our meetings have never failed of interest for want of matter. The whole financial system has likewise been revised, and a better economy introduced into all its departments.

Sanborn's report then records the condition of the schools, the need for salary raises for their teachers, the poor preparation of students who move up into the high school, the "pain" the committee suffered at the school examinations upon noting that the French pupils were more numerous than those in Latin.

> Therefore, without neglecting the so-called practical studies, we should give what aid we can to the study of Language and Literature not only in our High Schools, but in all the rest. We will not anticipate what the superintendent has to say on this point.

As for the Intermediate School, which suffers from the presence of "half-a-dozen vicious, idle, and dull boys and girls, who get little or no benefit from the school, but are a serious injury to it," it could be improved by providing a Town Reform School.

At one of the Sunday evening meetings at the Town Hall, Sanborn records that Alcott spoke on "Home Culture in its Ideas and Results," Emerson on "The Value of Learning and Books," and Sanborn on "The Practical Duties and Relations of Parents to their Children and the Schools."

As for the salaries which Concord paid its teachers, I wonder whether Sanborn's was half the combined salaries of Messrs. Allen and Shepard for "teaching High School $647 60," or did it equal that of Miss Goodall in the North Primary School, who "received $133 50 for the 41 weeks of school"?[26]

At any rate, he must have felt his salary was good enough to support a wife, for he got married just before beginning his last year as principal. Earlier, Sanborn proposed marriage to Edith Emerson.[27] Her father refused him her hand--for what reason I do not know, though I can

---

[26] "Report of the School Committee of Concord for the Year Ending April 2, 1860," in Reports of the Selectmen (Year Ending April 2, 1860), Concord Library.

[27] Several facts make it discreet to include this statement in my biography: (1) Sanborn's proposal of marriage to Edith Emerson was mentioned to me briefly by a scholar in Boston before my first trip out to Concord; (2) the fact of Sanborn's proposal to Edith and of the letters which passed between them was verified by the person who holds these letters but who declares that they are "not for publication." (3) I have corresponded with two leading American scholars asking for verification of Sanborn's relationship to Edith and of Ralph Waldo Emerson's vehement refusal, and they have verified these facts in writing, though they do not want to be quoted. One person has denied the possibility of these facts: Sanborn's son, Francis. When I told him what I had learned, he burst out emphatically, "Impossible!" However, it is rarely customary for fathers who have loved and lost to discuss their former loves with the children of the woman whom they finally marry.

guess. The letters, which I presume were those Sanborn received from Edith and her father, are held by Mr. George Goodspeed of Concord, who declares they are "not for publication." We can only imagine what must have gone on in Sanborn's mind as he determined to take this important step: his life's greatest passion died with Anna; his second love was thwarted by the man he admired and loved. He married his cousin, Louisa Leavitt, one of his assistants at the school.

There are no facts which mark the progress of this affair with Miss Leavitt, except several which would seem to forecast anything but the happy outcome. Most of the references which Sanborn makes to her in his letters simply indicate that "Miss Leavitt is not well." In one other letter, Sanborn writes Lyman: "Miss Waterman is an angel, but she is not strong, and is now recruiting. Miss Leavitt is not an angel and sometimes quarrels with me smartly; but is a good teacher."[28] In another to Lyman he says:

> I am having a week's vacation now- after which Miss Leavitt will not be in the school till September, if she is then. The reason of her going now is the overplus of teachers and the deficiency of scholars —she being the one most easily spared. It is a trial to her and a great grief to her friends here, especially the Emersons who are very fond of her.... It is possible I may begin next September with only Miss Waterman for assistant and some 35 scholars- but I hope for better things, as the orthodox deacon said of universal salvation. My school and myself seem the sport of uncertainties.[29]

---

[28] Sanborn to Lyman, March 26, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society). No place of writing is indicated, and the date is written by some hand other than Sanborn's.

[29] Letter from Sanborn to Lyman, Concord, May 27, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society).

The fact is, however, that Sanborn and Louisa Leavitt were married August 16, 1862, and he reported the happy affair to Theodore Parker in a letter from Clark's Island, where they were honeymooning:

> Although the dolce far niente of this Castle of Indolence is not favorable to letter writing, I shall still send you such an epistle as my dreamy state will allow, descriptive of what has happened since I left Concord. You have heard something, no doubt, of the wedding, for several Concord people were there. We drove in from Woburn with Caroline and Jennie,[30] and were a little behind the hour appointed so that everybody was there--perhaps a hundred people - We walked in alone up the aisle and took our places; the ceremony lasted ten minutes,- ten minutes more were consumed in greetings at the carriage door- ten minutes in waiting at the Old Colony Station- and finally reached Plymouth.... In the morning we breakfasted, ...and at 5 oclock set sail for this place.... The housekeeping is on a good basis, and the garden full of all sorts of dainties including figs and sweet potatoes and Chinese yams. We have sailed and walked and danced, and I have bathed. I have a higher appreciation of women too than ever before, and have begun to doubt some of the severe judgments which my way of life has led me into of late years. This will be a pleasure to you, I know, as it is to me.[31]

But to return to his school. What conclusions may we draw of Sanborn as a teacher? It is the opinion of Sanborn's son that his father was not a good teacher. "He was too conscious of what he knew," he says, "and too intolerant of pupils who didn't absorb knowledge readily. He didn't have the power to impart his knowledge."[32] This opinion,

---

[30] I believe these persons were Louisa Leavitt's sisters.

[31] Sanborn to Parker, Clark's Island, August 20, 1862 (Concord Library, 5: S-6).

[32] Conversation with Francis B. Sanborn, August 28, 1951.

however, in no way agrees with that of Julian Hawthorne, who observed all that Sanborn did-- which included giving Julian the lowest mark in the class in declamation. Hawthorne speaks first of Sanborn's preoccupation with national politics:

> The John Brown episode had just terminated in that memorable scene where the scaffold once more became the platform of martyrdom, and none among the champions of the martyr had been more ardent and explicit than this young scholar. In him was illustrated the finest type of the pure New England strain, which took so strenuous and unfaltering a part in the process of our national regeneration. By the natural affiliation with one another of magnanimous and patriotic souls, Sanborn became united in purpose and sentiment with the high aspirations and performances of the elder great men of his time--with Garrison, and Wendell Phillips, Channing, Emerson, Alcott, and May.

But, says Hawthorne, he maintained his independent mind and held his own with these great men, though he at the same time approached them reverently. And Hawthorne concludes with this great tribute:

> His outward occupation, meanwhile, was, as we know, that of the simple and conscientious master of a country school for boys and girls, but that school became the model, often imitated but never rivaled, of advanced educational enterprise; and when after many years, the doors of the little gray schoolhouse on the village street closed forever, the name of Frank Sanborn was known and honored wherever, in New England, there was appreciation of manhood, fidelity, generosity and enlightenment.[33]

Though the title of "schoolteacher" applies, strictly speaking, only to Sanborn as the director of destinies in Emerson's schoolhouse, he continued his activities as an educator when he became at forty-seven a founder and a lecturer at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy, which began in 1879.

---

[33] The Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, p. 78.

In both educational endeavors he was intimately associated with Bronson Alcott, who admired him tremendously. Alcott first met Sanborn at his series of Conversations which a group of students invited him to conduct at the Harvard Divinity School.[34] He was "a youth of fine genius and great promise," Alcott wrote in his journal at the time.[35] Then when Sanborn began teaching in Concord Alcott wrote of him:

> He is sensible and manly and commands the respect of all who know him.... He thinks highly of Parker and accepts his methods of thinking and modes of reform. In politics, he is a Republican, and something revolutionary in a quiet way--perhaps abetting Captain Brown and the Emigrant Aid measures. I think he is brave, and likely to do good service for freedom if necessary.[36]

In 1860 Alcott and Sanborn joined Emerson, Thoreau, Channing, Wasson, and Hawthorne to form the Concord Club, which held conversations once a week in the members' homes.[37] In 1876 many of the same figures formed the Fortnightly Club, and in 1882 Alcott and Sanborn, with William Torrey, founded a group called the Mystic Club for the purpose of reading the work of Jakob Boehme.[38] In Alcott's mind all of these groups pointed hopefully toward a school of philosophy in Concord.

---

[34] Odell Shepard, ed., The Journals of Amos Bronson Alcott (Boston: Little, Brown, 1938), pp. 264, 268.

[35] Ibid., p. 268, entry for April 13, 1853.

[36] Ibid., p. 317, entry for June 9, 1859.

[37] Ibid., p. 325, entry for January 11, 1860.

[38] Ibid., p. 530, and Kurt F. Leidecker, Yankee Teacher: The Life of William Torrey Harris (New York: Philosophical Library, 1946), p. 369.

Alcott seemed to depend on Sanborn for the fulfilment of his life's hopes. Once, in 1870, while Sanborn was helping edit the Springfield Republican and was living away from Concord, he paid a visit to Alcott, who wrote in his journal:

> Sanborn comes and breakfasts with us. His family have left Springfield for the summer. I cherish the hope of his returning to reside here in Concord. With Sanborn and Harris as neighbors, what might I not hope for! My cup would overflow.

Concord, his journal continued, was the "proper seat for an Academy of Philosophy, Literature and Religion," and, Alcott declared:

> Here should be founded the Divinity School to which young men and women might resort for the inspiration and insight which our colleges fail to cherish. And here should the journals and newspapers representing the freshest and ripest thought, the aspiration and enterprise of the country, be edited.[39]

This was in May, 1870, and with "marvellous persistence"[40] Alcott pursued his idea of a school. Two years later he wrote his other disciple, Harris, then superintendent of schools in St. Louis:

> Sanborn has returned to Concord to reside permanently. And I do not surrender my hope that some day you are to make our little town your home also. A new spirit is awakening here and only the taking things at the turn is wanting to make it a literary and philosophical centre in the future as well as the present. So you see I dream on still as of yore.[41]

---

[39] Journals of Amos Bronson Alcott, p. 408, entry for May 3, 1870.

[40] Leidecker, Yankee Teacher, p. 368.

[41] Alcott to Harris, Concord, September 19, 1872, in the letters from Sanborn to Harris recently presented by the latter's daughter, Miss Edith Davidson Harris, to the Concord Free Public Library. (It is reprinted in part in Leidecker, Yankee Teacher, p. 369.)

Alcott's ideal began to take "positive form" six years later--in 1878--during a first visit of Dr. H. K. Jones to Concord. Jones was a doctor from Jacksonville, Illinois, where, as "the reviver of antique Platonism in his time and land," he held conferences and conversations on Plato.[42] When he arrived for a second visit, he was accorded a round of social and "Platonic" meetings at Alcott's, Emerson's, Sanborn's, and Judge Hoar's, and the group made earnest plans for the first session of the Concord Summer School of Philosophy, which was to open July 15, 1879.

Sanborn wrote to Harris January 12th:

> Could you come here and teach a class in Speculative Philosophy during the five weeks from July 15 to Aug. 20 -- not necessarily all the time, but to give ten lessons at about $5 each? Mr. Alcott and I are arranging a course of five professors for five weeks, with a few extras- to a class of about 50 persons in the "Concord Summer School of Philosophy."

He then listed the people they had thought of as their lecturers and added, "I am to be Dean of the Faculty-- What think you of a scheme like this?"[43]

The first draft of the prospectus was sent off to Harris confidentially. As regular professors, Alcott was to speak on Christian theism, Harris on speculative philosophy, Ednah Littlehale Cheney on "The History and Moral of Art," David A. Wasson on political philosophy.

---

[42] Recollections, II, 485-486.

[43] Sanborn to Harris, Concord, January 12, 1879 (Concord Library, 11: S-18). I am indebted to Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer, 22 Elm Street, Concord, for transcribing this letter for me.

listed among the "special lecturers" were Sanborn, who was to talk on what had now become his major field, philanthropy and social science, and Thomas Wentworth Higginson, who was to discuss American literature. Thomas Davidson was to describe Greek life and literature, and George H. Howison of M. I. T., philosophy from Leibniz to Hegel. However, by the time the session opened, Howison's name did not appear, and the program announced that Prof. Benjamin Peirce of Harvard would discuss physical philosophy; the Rev. Dr. Cyrus Bartol of Boston, education; Dr. H. K. Jones, Platonic philosophy; and Ralph Waldo Emerson, memory. F. G. O. Blake, Thoreau's literary executor, was to read selections from Thoreau's manuscripts.[44]

Sadly for Sanborn, however, the duties of Dean did not fall to him. He was appointed Secretary, "the business man" of the organization, as Harris phrased it.[45] The other officers of the school from its beginning included Alcott, who was Dean, and S. H. Emery, Jr., the director. These three, with Dr. Harris and Dr. H. K. Jones, constituted "the faculty."[46]

The first session opened in the historic old Orchard House. Harris seemed a bit surprised when, instead of the thirty or forty students anticipated, over 200 appeared.

---

[44] Leidecker, Yankee Teacher, pp. 369-370, and Raymond L. Bridgman, ed., Concord Lectures in Philosophy; Comprising Outlines of All the Lectures at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy in 1882 (Cambridge, Mass., 1883), p. 10. Leidecker's carefully documented work does not agree with Bridgman's list of lectures for the first session, which, according to the title page of this volume were "Collected and Arranged by Raymond L. Bridgman [,] Revised by the Several Lecturers [,] Approved by the Faculty."

[45] Leidecker, p. 403.

[46] Bridgman, p. 9.

Harris styled himself "chief consultant," but his biographer says, "the whole tenor of the School, the type of programs offered, with emphasis on Hegel, Kant, problems of immortality, the history of philosophy and the spiritual interpretation of Dante and Goethe, reflected his mode of thinking." Tickets were handled by Sanborn, who also delivered two lectures.

The majority of the students were women, most of whom were teachers, and many people considered the School an experiment in co-education. The old and the young sat side by side at the lectures; there were people of nearly every religious persuasion, though the School was notably free from the "mongrel tribe of free-lovers, new lights and persons half insane, who prowl around every movement that holds out the least promise of giving them an entering wedge."[47]

It was soon clear that the 1880 session would require more space, and with part of the generous gift of $1,000 from Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson of New York City, the new Hillside Chapel was built on the sloping lawns toward the back of the Orchard House property. Through Mrs. Thompson's efforts, too, the School was incorporated, Sanborn being among the seven who signed the articles of incorporation.

The little brown wooden Hillside Chapel accommodated 150 people. In its one room there was in front a low platform, on which stood the speaker's table with its bowl of flowers fresh from Concord's ponds and meadows. Placed about the little hall were busts of Plato, Pestalozzi,

---

[47] Leidecker, Yankee Teacher, pp. 370, 403-405.

Ralph Waldo Emerson and Bronson Alcott; a mask of Anaxagoras hung upon the wall. Behind the table sat the faculty, Sanborn at the left. Off in the corner sat Emery, gold watch in hand. After waiting five minutes for the guests to seat themselves on the movable camp chairs and the unpainted wooden chairs, he rose and addressed the speaker: "The time for beginning has come, Dr. Bartol." This was Emery, the director of the School, who had left his lucrative stove business in Quincy, Illinois, to devote himself to the life of literature and the immortal soul.[48]

Here sat the students devoted to the chief purpose of the School, which Sanborn aptly stated in his introductory address the summer of the Emerson Commemoration:

> The chief purpose of our School [is] to cultivate in the men and women of our time a serious contemplation of the most serious and lofty questions which confront us in the morning or the evening of our days,—and to approach these problems, not doubtfully and with timid or malevolent apprehension, but with a loving and brave confidence.[49]

After the speaker, who always sat during his lecture, finished, Emery presided during the discussion which followed for an hour or more. "Opinions [were] offered and sustained by reasons, but no attempt [was] made to reach a verdict."[50]

Throughout its eight years the School solicited the abilities of some of the best minds in America. There were, of course, Bronson Alcott,

---

[48] Ibid., p. 406; Raymond L. Bridgman, ed., Concord Lectures in Philosophy (1882), p. 9.

[49] Bridgman, p. 53.

[50] Ibid., p. 9.

"the patriarch, with nimbus of white hair;" Dr. H. K. Jones, of rather ample build, who spoke fluently on Plato and said decidedly and distinctly what he thought in the discussions; and Sanborn, who "was ever alert in discussion," and whose "lectures were appreciated for their factual content and choice wording." But the man adored by everyone was Ralph Waldo Emerson, who lectured on "Memory" at the first session and on "The True Gentleman" and "Aristocracy" the second summer. The last time he left his home in 1882 was to attend Harris's lecture on Sartor Resartus.

The rest of the lecturers during the years were of many interests and of varied intellectual sizes and shapes. Thomas Davidson, just back from Greece, lectured on Attica, and shocked his listeners with his remarks which applauded socialism and Emile Zola; Denton J. Snider of Harvard, also a specialist on Greece, took his audience to Aulis and Chalcis with photographs which he projected dimly on the sheet hung above the platform. John Albee, who characterized himself as "too philosophical to succeed in literature, and too literary for a complete philosopher," delighted his audience with his pleasing "imaginery conversations." Edmund Clarence Stedman, H. G. O. Blake, Julian Hawthorne, and Julia Ward Howe also contributed lectures on literature.

The number of clergymen who spoke exceeded those of any other professional group, and their lectures were "often more wordy than wise." The most remarkable fact about them was the diversity of their beliefs and experiences. There were the Rev. Dr. Cyrus A. Bartol, who lectured on education; William H. Channing from London, who presented four lectures on oriental and mystical philosophy; and Dr. Andrew P. Peabody, who talked

on "Conscience and Consciousness." Dr. Elisha P. Halford of Pennsylvania, a political philosopher in his own right, discussed "The Philosophy of the State," Dr. F. H. Hedge talked on Kant and "Ghosts and Ghost-seeing," and Dr. John S. Kedney delivered four lectures on "The Philosophy of the Beautiful and Sublime." There were among the clergy not only the usual smattering of Methodists, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians but also the Roman Catholic Brother Azarias, president of a church school in Maryland, and there would have been Protap Chunder Mozoomdar of Calcutta, a Hindu, had he been able to arrive in time for the 1884 session.

Scientific interests were less well represented, though John Fiske of Harvard spoke on "The Origin and Destiny of Man," in which he gave a rather exhaustive explanation of evolution, John Watson appeared from Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, to lecture capably, and Ednah Littlehale Cheney discussed "The Relation of Poetry to Science."

Next to the clergy there was a preponderance of college presidents and members of the faculty. University Presidents Noah Porter of Yale, James McCosh of Princeton, John Bascom of the University of Wisconsin, and J. H. Seelye of Amherst and Professors Benjamin Peirce and C. C. Everett of Harvard, T. Sterry Hunt of Montreal, H. S. White, W. T. Hewett, and C. C. Shackford of Cornell, and J. W. Mears of Hamilton College discussed those subjects for which they were famous, chiefly philosophy, religion, and ethics. William James appeared in the audience in 1882. His relation with Harris was somewhat strained, as James knew of Harris's contempt for empiricism, but Harris enlisted his personal

good will, though James continued to complain he could not follow the abstractions in Harris's lectures. James, however, was asked to lecture, and he spoke the following summer.

The audience, too, was made up of "the serious student and people who cared for the School's message." There were such intellectuals as Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, who also lectured and took part in the discussions but who had fuzzy white whiskers and tried to get past little Francis Sanborn, situated at the door, without a ticket. There were George Parsons Lathrop, Hawthorne's son-in-law and editor of the Boston Sunday Courier, Chief Justice Durfee of Providence; George H. Calvert, the mayor of Baltimore and a man of literary reputation; Attorney General Ebenezer Hoar; and J. C. Bundy, the editor and publisher of the Religio-philosophical Journal, a Spiritualist, who tried to persuade Harris to help him establish a Psychical Research Society in Concord. Both the faculty and its audience included a remarkable number of people of fame and distinction in philosophy, American letters, and public life.

Sanborn made many contributions to the thinking of the group in his lectures, which included a variety of topics. In the first summer session he talked on "Social Science" and "Philanthropy and Public Charities," and in 1880 he discussed "The Philosophy of Charity." In the third session, however, he discussed "Roman Literature," "English and German Literature," and "American Literature and Life." In 1882, the year of the Emerson Commemoration, Sanborn delivered a long ode, "The Poet's Countersign," a tribute to his beloved friend, and the address

of introduction at the special exercises. Next day he spoke on "Oracular Poetry Among the Hebrews, Greeks and Persians," and two weeks later he read from Thoreau's manuscript of "The Service" and lectured on "Oracles of New England."[51] Sanborn took his work in the School seriously and he was "understood to have thought the Summer School of Philosophy . . . his most valuable literary success."[52]

The importance of the school must be considered. "As an intellectual leaven in American life," says Leidecker, the Concord School of Philosophy can hardly be over-estimated." And he continues:

> It was so recognized in the 80ies [sic]. Without a doubt, there was no university at the time that could have been more serious in its attempt to expound sound philosophy. American philosophy received a powerful impetus. It introduced the deepest thoughts to young students and to the serious-minded laity. Even the New York Times acknowledged in 1880 that Concord had become the trysting place of eminent thinkers who, it must be owned, had given transcendentalism a new turn.

With the death of Bronson Alcott March 4, 1888, many felt that the School had finished its course. Accordingly, the 1888 session of the School consisted of the Alcott Memorial Service on June 16th. Sanborn delivered the biographical address and Harris spoke on Bronson Alcott's philosophy. The School had not been a financial failure, for it had brought in a net income of 31 cents, which Sanborn says he pocketed as his treasurer's salary. Alcott's dream had come true.[53]

---

[51] Leidecker, Yankee Teacher, pp. 403-421; Raymond Bridgman, Collected Lectures on Philosophy, 5-12, 14-17, 53-54, 81-83, 124-129; Sanborn, ed., The Life and Genius of Goethe: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy (Boston, 1886).

[52] Edwin Hale Abbot, "News from the Classes," Harvard Graduates' Magazine (June, 1917), p. 559.

[53] Leidecker, pp. 407-408.

Of Sanborn's last excursion into education, I can say practically nothing. Though he lectured at Cornell, Wellesley, and Smith, the librarians at these institutions report that they hold none of the manuscripts of the lectures nor any information about their content. One lecture given at Cornell remains in manuscript in the Sanborn Papers at the American Antiquarian Society, and this consists of some thirty sheets of a carbon copy which evidently he had made of Samuel Gridley Howe's Greek journal. Around this Sanborn had woven a lecture on Howe's work in public charities.

Dr. James Ford in his chapter on social ethics in Morison's The Development of Harvard University, says, "Recognition that the merits of prevailing ideals of individual and collective behavior are an important subject of study came rather late in academic instruction" at Harvard. Though some attention had been given to these problems in the Departments of Education, Economics, Philosophy, and Government, it was not until these social sciences became fairly well developed that Harvard realized a need for coordinating instruction in social policy and purpose with them. The result of this was the founding, by the Rev. Dr. Francis Greenwood Peabody, of the Department of Social Ethics in 1906. Peabody had begun a course in 1883 which considered problems of charity, labor, temperance, prison discipline, and divorce. But, says Ford, "No other college courses devoted exclusively to these subjects

during the early 'eighties have been discovered, excepting those given by Professor Graham Taylor at the University of Chicago and by Frank B. Sanborn at Cornell." Peabody's approach was unique, however, says Ford, "in attempting to determine the moral ends of social policy before framing measures of social amelioration."[54]

It is difficult to append a fitting conclusion to the discussion of Sanborn's work as a teacher. There is, however, a paragraph in Lewis Mumford's The Golden Day that may help us form an opinion of Sanborn's efforts. Mumford speaks of the aftermath of the Civil War and the barbarized population which the war left behind. "All that was left of Transcendentalism in the Gilded Age," Mumford feels, "was what Howells showed in the hero of a Hazard of New Fortunes--'an inner elegance.'" And Mumford draws this conclusion:

> The surviving idealist did not, perhaps, particularly believe in the practical work he found himself doing; but he did not believe in anything else sufficiently to cease doing it. In a quite simple and literal sense, he lacked the courage of his convictions: what was even worse, perhaps, was that he never acquired any new convictions that might have given him courage. The post-war generation shows us nature-lovers like John Burroughs but no Thoreaus, schoolmasters like Sanborn and William Harris, but no Alcotts, novelists like Howells, but no Melvilles. It is not hard to define the difference; to put it crudely, the guts of idealism were gone.[55]

---

[54] James Ford, "Social Ethics," in Samuel Eliot Morison, The Development of Harvard University Since the Inauguration of President Eliot (1869-1929), (Harvard UP, 1930), p. 223.

[55] Lewis Mumford, The Golden Day: A Study in American Experience and Culture (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), pp. 165-166.

CHAPTER IV

HIS POLITICAL CAREER

Sanborn's first important career--the political--divided itself into four projects. He supplied money, men, and arms for John Brown's activities in Kansas and Virginia through his work as secretary of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee; he wrote biographies of John Brown and bitterly defended his memory in the public prints; he was editor-in-chief of the Boston antislavery weekly, The Commonwealth; and he was a political columnist for the Springfield Daily Republican.

In March, 1855, when Sanborn accepted Emerson's offer to become the principal and teacher in the school at Concord, he entered a circle holding political opinions "much the same" as his, though "modified by peculiarities of age and native character." Within the group were, of course, Emerson, "the calm advocate of principles," Thoreau, "who went a step farther in his theories of government and society,"[1] and two antislavery fighters, Samuel and Rockwood Hoar. Samuel Hoar, as a member of the Massachusetts legislature, had been chosen by his colleagues in that group to "challenge the constitutionality of certain laws in South Carolina relating to the imprisonment of free negroes," an act which caused the legislature of that Southern state to exclude him ever after from its courts.[2]

---

[1] Recollections, I, 49.

[2] "Samuel Hoar," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XIV, 301.

In May, 1856, while Emerson was contributing to the fund for Kansas aid, Josiah Quincy was writing Judge Hoar:

> I can think of nothing but the outrages of slave-holders at Kansas, and the outrages of slaveholders at Washington;[3] outrages which, if not met in the spirit of our fathers of the Revolution...our liberties are but a name, and our Union proves a curse.... The palsy of death rests on the spirit of freedom in the so-called Free States.

The tone of Quincy's letter--"but less despairing, as befitted younger men"--was that of the circle in which Sanborn lived in 1856. There were John A. Andrew, the brilliant young Boston lawyer who was to become war Governor; Frank Bird, founder of the Bird Club, which met to dine and discuss politics; Senators Charles Sumner, Henry Wilson, Anson Burlingame; William S. Robinson, who as "Warrington" wrote liberal political columns;[4] James Freeman Clarke, and others. Theodore Parker was organizing committees, circulating petitions, working for the Emigrant Aid Company, counseling politicians, preaching and lecturing against slavery. "Insurrection," he said, "must be tried many times before it succeeds."[5]

Surrounded by such men of action, Sanborn had to act. He was in a difficult position: his first duty was to his school and to the success of his first job. But the world was stirring. The Republicans met in Pittsburgh on Washington's Birthday and called for a national convention to nominate candidates and draw up a daring platform.[6] Dr. Howe,

---

[3]Quincy was referring to Preston Brooks' caning of Senator Sumner.

[4]Recollections, I, 50-51.

[5]Henry Steele Commager, Theodore Parker (Boston: Little, Brown, 1936), pp. 249, 251.

[6]"Republican Party," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXIII, 392.

the famous philanthropist, George Luther Stearns, the wealthy, public-spirited merchant of Medford, Gerrit Smith, the millionaire politician and philanthropist of Peterboro, New York, and Thomas Wentworth Higginson, the fighting pastor of the "unsectarian" church in Worcester, all had joined the fight to raise funds and buy arms for the Free-State Kansas pioneers,[7] among whom now was one of Sanborn's brothers.[8]

Committees were important: "The promotion of the gravest possible movements by the agency of committees is a traditional custom of the Anglo-Saxon peoples," he felt.

> It was a committee of barons that extorted from King John the great charter of English liberties at Runnymede. It was by committees of Parliament that King Charles was driven from the throne.... The committees of correspondence devised by Samuel Adams in 1772 prepared the American Revolution and gave it unity needful for success.... Since that time almost every great movement in America has been carried on by committees in this manner, and the results of such action, when earnestly taken, are often remarkable.[9]

So in June Sanborn became secretary of the Concord Town Committee to raise funds for Kansas, secretary of the Middlesex County Committee in July, and secretary of the Massachusetts Kansas State Committee in August. He took as much time as he dared from his school to carry on

---

[7] Recollections, I, 51.

[8] Sanborn, "John Brown in Massachusetts," Atlantic Monthly, XXIX (March, 1872), 324. Sanborn does not say which brother, and the letter to Parker from Concord, June 10, 1865, mentioning his brother in Kansas, does not help (Concord Library, 5: S-30). However, Sanborn's niece, Miss Josephine L. Sanborn, 19 Oxford Street, Haverhill, Mass., in a personal letter to me dated July 27, 1952, says she thinks it was Lewis, who was twenty-two at the time.

[9] Sanborn, "The Virginia Campaign of John Brown," Atlantic Monthly, XXXV (March 1875), 324. The reader should note that this is Sanborn telling why he was moved to join the work of committees through testimony given 19 years later. We do not know that these thoughts motivated him at the time.

all the correspondence of these first two organizations and ride about Middlesex in an effort to organize town committees.[10] He wrote Parker June 10th:

> We are to have a Kansas Aid meeting here on Thursday evening the 12th and would be very glad to get some man to speak who has lately come from Kansas. Conway[11] who has gone down to Boston today will get Mr Nute[12] if possible - but if there is any other man of whom you know who could tell us clearly the state of things there, will you not ask him to come- His expenses we will pay of course, and more if he desires it- I am one of the Committee and have carte blanche to ask whom I please. Mr Emerson and Judge Hoar will speak - also Conway, and Mr Nute if we can get him. Perhaps other Concord men will also speak We hope to raise a good sum here, as there is much desire to do something- It will probably be a great meeting- Should any of the Congressional speakers, such as Galloway, Mr Hale or others be in Boston without engagements they would find this a good place to speak- They are to day at Concord N. H. I believe. But most of all we want recent news from Kansas - Every new dispatch increases the desire in me to do something- and I have again debated the plan of going myself Armed settlers are needed, and all subscriptions here, so far as I can influence them shall go for that purpose[13]

During the first half of his summer vacation Sanborn drove about Middlesex County in a shay organizing town committees and raising money

---

[10] Recollections, I, 51-52.

[11] This was Moncure D. Conway, clergyman and author, who ordained in the Methodist Church, later espoused Unitarianism, was dismissed from his churches in Washington and Virginia for preaching against slavery, edited the new Dial in Cincinnati, and worked as editor with Sanborn on the Boston Commonwealth until Sanborn replaced him (Mary Elizabeth Burtis, Moncure D. Conway, (1832-1907), (Rutgers UP, 1952), passim, and the DAB).

[12] Doubtless this was the Rev. Dr. Ephraim Nute, Unitarian minister of Lawrence, Kansas (Oswald Garrison Villard, John Brown (1800-1859): a Biography Fifty Years After, rev. ed. (New York: Knopf, 1943), p. 215).

[13] June 10, 1856 (Concord Library, 5: S-30).

as fast as he could for arms and supplies. With what remained of the summer he set forth in August as an agent of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee on a tour of "inspection and consultation" that took him through Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska Territory. His purpose in going, he says, was "to inspect the emigrant route through Iowa, in order that it might be kept open for men, arms and ammunition during the autumn of 1856." He was, however, "only to enter Kansas, if there was time for it, or urgent necessity." He conferred with the secretary of the executive committee of the National Kansas Committee in Chicago, with the Governor and the Adjutant-General of Iowa about the loan of some of their State muskets, and inspected the 400 miles of land route between Mount Pleasant and Council Bluffs by which his group were sending emigrants to Kansas, the Missouri River route having been cut off by pro-slavery fighters.[14]

From August, 1856, the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee became "the working center of aid to the Free-State men of Kansas." It was reinforced by subordinate groups--the Middlesex County Committee, of which Sanborn was secretary; the Worcester County Committee, of which Higginson was an active member; and by the Hampden County Committee, of which Sanborn's brother-in-law, George Walker, was chairman. Finally, in November, Sanborn determined to give up his school; he indicated his state of mind in a letter to Theodore Parker:

---

[14] Recollections, I, 51-72.

Hampton Falls Nov 28th 1856

My dear Friend;

Lest you may think that in deciding to give up my school for the present and devote myself more entirely to the cause of Kansas I am acting in too inconsiderate a manner I wish to explain the why a little more fully than I have yet done-

In the first place I attach the greatest importance to the Kansas question as being the point where as often happens the whole moment of a great issue rests amid circumstances in themselves trivial- It is the most practical form in which the issue of freedom and slavery has ever presented itself, and will justify any exertion or outlay--

Then the cause has suffered from the beginning for want of men enough devoted wholly to it to give it system and perpetual vigor- and has depended too much on transient excitement and activity. All our committees are sad instances of this - so that even my own inexperienced labors have seemed great compared with those of many others. What is needed is men who will make this their study and business and until we can find a dozen such men in Massachusetts we have no right to hope for any great good-

Especially at this time- the most critical for Kansas that has been or will be I think, there is need of steady and uninterrupted efforts on the part of the committees - and nobody knows how much they may do if they will--

I have found too that I cannot carry on my school and work in this also- if I attempt both I do neither well-- It then becomes a question which I shall give up- I greatly prefer my school and the quiet of Concord to any such business as this - but when I see how much even I may do for Kansas I cannot hesitate between the certainty of a pleasant winter and the chance of serving the country--

I see in almost every person traces of an indecision which is fatal to any good settlement of our difficulties. Instead of coming out and facing the real evil, we are all [?] and shooting short of the enemy, being held back every one for some personal reason. I am determined for one [once?] to cut through all these meshes and do thoroughly what I have been so long talking about. I dare say I shall effect nothing but I shall live in a world of realities and not of shadows when I am steadily following this one purpose.[15]

You may not understand this - for you do not leave so much room between the will and the deed as most men do--- Besides what I may do myself in this way I hope I shall be of

---

[15] Though Sanborn talks about "a world of realities," was it not a rather romantic world that he wanted to live in?

some use as an example- for when my friends see that I or any one else can leave business and pleasure and work wholly for this cause they will attach more importance to it, and perhaps others may do the same and certainly I have no right to expect this course from others unless I am willing to take it as soon as any. And as I am really ready to give up every thing for this, it does not seem a very violent step to leave my school for a few months-

I have not left out of sight the objections which you make against it - that there are men better fitted for it - and that I am fitted for something else[16] But if nobody else appears, and if I cannot be quiet in my own proper work because of this matter is it not a good sign that I ought to try at least? I reason with myself as Xenophon did after the death of the generals in the third book of the Anabasis, quod vide. The river must be got over the ferryman does not appear, and I am not a good swimmer - nevertheless I must some how attempt the passage--

There are besides many objections which are naturally unknown to you - but having thought of them all for six weeks I have come to this decision at last- My place in Boston may prove an important one, and it may not; if not I shall abandon it to some one else and take some other place if I can get it-- The State Committee may if all is managed right become the head of a great league against the extension of slavery - and it may also fail entirely-

I am sorry to take such a course against the advice of many friends and my own inclinations- but I do not feel able to refuse when there seems such a necessity for it-

I wish I could hear your sermon tomorrow and spend the evening with you- but I shall not be in Boston till Monday - and so send this letter to represent me [17]

In December, putting a Harvard student in charge of his school for a few months, he took active charge of the office of the State Kansas Committee in School Street, Boston, as its secretary and general agent. Of this group George L. Stearns was chairman, Patrick Tracy Jackson was treasurer, and Dr. Howe, Dr. Samuel Cabot, and Judge Thomas Russell were among its active members.[18]

---

[16] Sanborn does not say for what work Parker thought him best fitted.

[17] Concord Library, 5: S-32.

[18] Recollections, I, 73.

Out of this committee work grew Sanborn's intimacy with John Brown. Sanborn's political career--his tremendous efforts for freeing Kansas from slavery, his intensely loyal support of John Brown in life and in death--had officially begun.

Sanborn met Brown for the first time a few days after New Year's, 1857. "I was sitting in my small office," he says, "when Brown entered, and handed me a letter of introduction from my brother Walker of Springfield,"[19] and another from Governor Salmon P. Chase of Ohio.[20] It was one of the great moments of Sanborn's life, for Brown became his "life's hero," and Sanborn became "ever afterward his most ardent Massachusetts friend and defender."[21] He wrote Higginson on January 5th a letter containing his first impressions:

> "Old Brown" of Kansas is now in Boston, with one of his sons, working for an object in which you will heartily sympathize--raising and arming a company of men for the future protection of Kansas. He wishes to raise $30,000 to arm and equip a company such as he thinks he can raise this present winter, but he will, as I understand him, take what money he can raise and use it as far as it will go. Can you not come to Boston tomorrow or next day and see Capt. Brown? If not, please indicate when you will be in Worcester, so he can see you. I like the man from what I have seen-- and his deeds ought to bear witness for him.[22]

---

[19] Ibid., I, 75 (George Walker, Ariana's brother).

[20] Villard, John Brown, p. 271.

[21] These phrases from Villard (p. 271) constitute a high compliment, as Sanborn later considered Villard his rival biographer and rebuked him bitterly, as we shall see later. Villard must have been a remarkably even-tempered, fair-minded person.

[22] Sanborn to T. W. Higginson, January 5, 1857, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 271.

Sanborn introduced Brown to Theodore Parker and Dr. Howe, and soon after this, Brown became acquainted with Patrick Jackson, Dr. Samuel Cabot, Jr., Amos Adams Lawrence, Judge Thomas Russell, Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison, the last of whom he met one Sunday evening at Theodore Parker's. Garrison, diametrically opposed to Brown's views "saw in the famous Kansas chieftain a tall, spare, farmer-like man, with head disproportionately small, and that inflexible mouth which as yet had no beard concealed."[23] Brown had no patience with Garrison, who considered it morally wrong to take up arms in the fight against slavery. and burst forth with impatience against people "who only talked and would not shoot."

Parker became one of five persons "who grouped themselves as an informal committee to aid Brown in whatever attacks he might make on slavery." Though he doubted "whether things of the kind will succeed," he added, "We shall make a great many failures before we discover the right way of getting at it. This may as well be one of them."[24] The State Kansas Committee gave its first practical encouragement to Brown on January 7 when it voted to present him with "two hundred Sharpe's rifles, carbines, with four thousand ball cartridges, thirty-one thousand military caps, and six iron ladles,--the same to be delivered to said committee, or to their order, on demand." The committee also authorized him to draw on its treasurer $500 for expenses. Brown was to

---

[23] William Lloyd Garrison: the Story of His Life Told by His Children (New York, 1885), III, 487-488.

[24] John Weiss, Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker (New York, 1864), II, 161.

report periodically on the condition or disposition of these supplies, bought the previous September by Dr. Cabot "to be loaned to actual settlers for defence against unlawful aggressions upon their rights and liberties."

On February 18 Sanborn introduced Brown to the Massachusetts legislature at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Federal Relations. The State Kansas Committee was preparing to obtain a State appropriation of $100,000 on the ground that, as Sanborn said, "The rights and interest of Massachusetts have suffered gross outrage in Kansas, an outrage which is likely to be repeated unless measures are taken by you to prevent so shameful an abuse." Sanborn's introduction of Brown was stirring:

> As one of the petitioners for State aid to the settlers of Kansas, I appear before you to state briefly the purpose of the petition. No labored argument seems necessary; for if the events of the last two years in Kansas, and the prospect there for the future, are not of themselves enough to excite Massachusetts to action, certainly no words could do so. We have not provided ourselves with advocates, therefore, but with witnesses.... Your petitioners desire that a contingent appropriation be made by the legislature, to be placed in the hands of a commission of responsible and conservative men, and used only in case of necessity to relieve the distress of the settlers of Kansas,--especially such as have gone from our own State.... Such an act would both encourage our friends in Kansas and dishearten their oppressors; and the moral effect of it would be greater than any which would follow from the expenditure of a much larger sum.
>
> Let it not be understood, however, that the petitioners ask for this as a simple act of charity, or are willing to rest their case on the common arguments for a charitable donation. The question involved is not merely whether the hungry shall be fed, the naked clothed, and the houseless sheltered; it reaches far beyond this: it is the issue between freedom and slavery, in Kansas and in the nation....
>
> Viewed in this light, we feel justified in regarding our petition as the most important matter which the General Court has now to consider.... Is it not true, sir, that yourself and nine tenths of your colleagues in this body were elected

as declared supporters of two all-important measures,--the re-election of Charles Sumner and the establishment of freedom in Kansas? And do you believe that the one which you have so triumphantly accomplished is one whit more dear to the people than the other?... Can you hesitate, then, to give expression to the will of the people,--not merely in words, which cost nothing and are worth nothing, but in substantial deeds?

It has been suggested that some persons doubt the constitutionality of the proposed measure. That is rather a question to be decided by the legislature than a point to be argued by the petitioners; but... I have no doubt they can fully show its constitutionality, of which they make no question. The name of Judge Parker, attached to the Cambridge petition, and the decided opinion of several eminent jurists, confirm their belief. We have invited Captain Brown and Mr. Whitman to appear in our behalf, because these gentlemen are eminently qualified either to represent Massachusetts in Kansas or Kansas in Massachusetts. The best blood of the "Mayflower" runs in the veins of both, and each had an ancestor in the army of the Revolution.... These witnesses have seen the things of which they testify, and have felt the oppression we ask you to check. Ask this gray-haired man, gentlemen,--if you have the heart to do it,--where lies the body of his murdered son; where are the homes of his four other sons, who a year ago were quiet farmers in Kansas? I am ashamed, in [sic] presence of this modest veteran, to express the admiration which his heroism excites in me. Yet he, so venerable for his years, his integrity, and his courage,--a man whom all Massachusetts rises up to honor,--is to-day an outlaw in Kansas. To these witnesses, whose unsworn testimony deserves and will receive from you all the authority which an oath confers, I will now yield place.

Brown himself then spoke at length, reading from a manuscript which he was to use at Hartford, Concord, and elsewhere. He gave an account of the destruction of life and property by the Missouri invaders in 1855-56, recounted the inactivity of the federal government, described the last attack on Lawrence, but omitted any references to the murders which he and his men had committed at Potawatomie and any mention of the Kansas Free State reprisals.

Though Sanborn and the Committee considered the appropriation "the most important matter which the General Court has now to consider," the legislature appropriated nothing. It remained for the State Comittee to keep up the money and supplies.[25]

Sanborn invited Brown to Concord. Brown stayed with him in the house which Sanborn was then renting from Ellery Channing, the two men dining across the street at Mrs. Thoreau's. There Sanborn introduced him to Thoreau, another kindred spirit in matters of civil disobedience. While Sanborn walked over to his school to settle some matters which required "the gift of authority," Emerson dropped in at Thoreau's and was introduced to Brown. Emerson invited him to be his guest that night, and from the conversation that evening there "came to Emerson and Thoreau that intimate knowledge of Brown's character and general purpose which qualified them, in October, 1859, to make those addresses in his behalf which were the first response among American scholars to the hercism of the man who, in Emerson's striking phrase, 'made the gallows glorious like the Cross.'"[26]

Brown was invited to speak in Concord, and evidently "had a good meeting" with the townspeople, showing them first a Bowie knife and then a "trace-chain with which his son John had been bound in Kansas, and made to keep up with the mounted men who were carrying him to his imprisonment at Lecompton.[27]

---

[25] Sanborn, The Life and Letters of John Brown, Liberator of Kansas and Martyr of Virginia (Boston, 1885), pp. 369-373; Villard, John Brown, p. 274.

[26] Recollections, I, 102-105.

[27] Ibid., I, 108. Sanborn speaks ambiguously here about the date, though he indicates Brown probably spoke from the manuscript of the speech he presented before the legislature.

At the end of March, after lecturing in various towns, Brown met Sanborn and Judge Martin Conway at the Metropolitan Hotel in New York and proceeded to Easton, Pennsylvania, with them to confer with Andrew H. Reeder, the first governor of Kansas Territory. Their purpose was to induce Reeder to return to Kansas and lead the Free-State party there. Nothing came of their pleadings, however, for Reeder was unwilling to leave his law practice and his family again.[28]

Back in Boston and Concord, the executive committee of the State Kansas group on April 15

> Voted, That Captain John Brown be authorized to dispose of one hundred rifles, belonging to this committee, to such Free-State inhabitants of Kansas as he thinks to be reliable, at a price not less than fifteen dollars; and that he account for the same agreeably to his instructions, for the relief of Kansas.

At the same meeting it was

> Voted, That Captain Brown be authorized to draw on P. T. Jackson, treasurer, for five hundred dollars, if on his arrival in Kansas he is satisfied that such sum is necessary for the relief of persons in Kansas.

Brown had by now received so much property from the Committee that he made out a will "for the protection of [it] in case of accident to him." During these three or four months when Brown was in the East, Sanborn saw much of him. "This," Sanborn says, "gave me opportunity to see him under many circumstances, and to form my opinion of his extraordinary character--an opinion that I have had no occasion to change."[29]

---

[28] Ibid., I, 115-118; Sanborn, John Brown, p. 387; "Andrew Horatio Reeder," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXIII, 296.

[29] Recollections, I, 118-120.

Brown had been concerned not only with what would become of the Committee's property after his death but with what would happen to his family in such an event. He appealed to Amos Lawrence for "One Thousand Dollars cash" to purchase "an improved piece of land which with a little improvement I now have might enable my family consisting of a Wife & Five minor children . . . to procure a Subsistence should I never return to them." Though he made this appeal March 19, it was not until August that Sanborn, as the agent for Stearns and Lawrence, traveled to North Elba, paid for the purchase and the improvement of the land, and transferred the deeds to the property to Brown's family. The house was "then not much more than a frame, boarded and clapboarded, and much of it lathed, but with only two or three plastered rooms." It was at the edge of the forest in the wildest country, just east of Lake Placid in a little patch of cleared land; when Sanborn arrived the women of the household were gathering and drying wild berries for the winter, and Watson and Salmon Brown were busy burning logs and clearing more space for planting crops. Despite their rather primitive existence often bordering on starvation, "the whole family seemed to be cheerful in the midst of poverty and anxieties."[30]

Brown arrived back at Tabor, Iowa, August 7, 1857, and wrote Stearns saying that he had been sick, that he was disappointed at the lack of funds for his projects, and that he was "in immediate want of from Five Hundred to One Thousand Dollars for secret service & no

[30] Ibid., I, 122-133; Villard, John Brown, pp. 279-281.

questions asked." He thanked the committee for all they had done to help his family at North Elba. He enclosed a tract written by his new drillmaster, "Colonel" Hugh Forbes, the purpose of which was to win the allegiance of officers and soldiers of the United States Army in Kansas. Sanborn replied that he thought "the dull and heavy paper" unwise. Brown's pleas for money were upsetting, for "it was not easy for any of us in that autumn," says Sanborn, "when business was greatly depressed, to raise money for an object so indefinite."[31]

Brown, however, showed little desire to return to Kansas; he gave himself and others various excuses for not returning. Higginson became first impatient and then angry, until Sanborn felt called upon to defend the old man. Writing September 11, he said to Higginson:

> You do not understand Brown's circumstances.... He is as ready for a revolution as any other man, and is now on the borders of Kansas safe from arrest but prepared for action, but he needs money for his present expenses, and active support. I believe he is the best Disunion champion you can find, and with his hundred men, when he is put where he can raise them, and drill them (for he has an expert drill officer with him) will do more to split the Union than a list of 50,000 names for your Convention, good as it is.
>
> What I am trying to hint at is that the friends of Kansas are looking with strange apathy at a movement which has all the elements of fitness and success--a good plan, a tried leader, and a radical purpose. If you can do anything for it now, in God's name do it--and the ill result of the new policy in Kansas may be prevented.[32]

Finally, in November, Brown crossed into Kansas to recruit men for the Harper's Ferry raid. Though there is evidence that he had discussed

---

[31] Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 422-423; Villard, pp. 297-298.

[32] Sanborn to Higginson, Boston, September 11, 1857, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 303.

as early as the fall of 1854 a plan to raid Harper's Ferry,[33] he did not reveal this to any of his men until November, 1857. To Higginson in a letter of February 2, he wrote:

> I now want to get for the perfecting of BY FAR the most important undertaking of my whole life; from $500. to $800, within the next Sixty days. I have written Rev Theodore Parker, George L. Stearns, and F. B. Sanborn Esqur, on the subject; but do not know as either Mr Stearns, or Mr Sanborn, are abolitionists I suppose they are. Can you be induced to opperate at Worcester, & elsewhere during that time to raise from Anti-slavery men & women (or any other parties) some part of that amount?... Hope this is my last effort in the begging line.[34]

He then wrote to Sanborn and the others requesting a meeting of the conspirators at Gerrit Smith's in Peterboro, New York. Brown's anxiety to arrange this meeting was probably brought on by the subversive activities of his drillmaster, Hugh Forbes. The latter was an Englishman, who had been a silk merchant in Siena, and had commanded troops under Garibaldi in 1848-49. Brown had had the intelligence to realize that Forbes might be useful as a military strategist and as a leader of his raw troops. The Committee in Boston "had never been consulted by Brown in regard to paying Forbes, nor of course had Brown given Forbes any assurances that they would pay him the salary stipulated for his services." The members of the Committee were, therefore, shocked when Dr. Howe and Sanborn received letters from Senator Charles Sumner, enclosing two letters Forbes had written him, in which he complained of ill-treatment at their hands, and holding them responsible for the termination of his

---

[34] John Brown to Higginson, Rochester, February 2, 1858, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 320.

[33] Villard, p. 54

labors with Brown, by which, he said, " he had been reduced to poverty." Of course, the Committee immediately wrote Brown to determine the relationship between him and Forbes, and the "correspondence temporarily closed in January, 1858."[35]

On the evening of February 22, 1858, at Gerrit Smith's baronial estate in Peterboro, Sanborn met and dined with his host and hostess and their guests, Higginson and Parker having sent their regrets. After dinner, Sanborn, Smith, Brown, and Sanborn's college friend, Edwin Morton, who was living with the Smiths as the tutor of their son, retired to Morton's room on the third floor. "Here," says Sanborn, "in the long winter evening that followed, Brown unfolded for the first time to me his plans for a campaign somewhere in slave territory east of the Alleghanies":

> Now he read us the singular constitution drawn up by him... for the government of the territory, small or large, which he might rescue by force from slavery, and for the control of his own little band. It was an amazing proposition--desperate in its character, wholly inadequate in its provision of means, and of most uncertain result. Such as it was, Brown had set his heart on it as the shortest way to restore our slave-cursed republic to the principles of the Declaration of Independence; and he was ready to die in its execution.

Brown asked for only eight hundred dollars--he said he would feel rich with a thousand--to carry out this hazardous adventure.

> Being questioned and opposed, he laid before us in detail his methods of organization and fortification; of settlement in the South, if that were possible, and of retreat through the North, if necessary; and his theory of the way in which such an invasion would be received in the country at large. He desired from his friends a patient hearing of his statements, a candid opinion concerning his plan, and, if that were favorable, then such aid in money and support as we could give him.

---

[35] Recollections, I, 134-135; Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 425-433. (Peterboro is near Rochester, New York.)

The three men listened until after midnight, pointing out objections and suggesting possible difficulties. Nothing could shake Brown's purpose.

> Every difficulty [he had] foreseen and provided against in some manner; the grand difficulty of all-the manifest hopelessness of undertaking anything so vast with such slender means--[he] met with the text of Scripture: "If God be for us, who can be against us?" He had made nearly all his arrangements: he had so many men enlisted, so many hundred weapons; all he now wanted was the small sum of money. With that he would open his campaign in the spring, and he had no doubt that the enterprise "would pay," as he said.
>
> We dissuaded him from what we thought certain failure; urging all the objections that would naturally occur to persons desiring the end he was seeking, but distrusting the slender meand and the unpropitious time. But no argument could prevail against his fixed purpose; he was determined to make the attempt, with many or with few, and he left us only the alternatives of betrayal, desertion or support.

The next day they discussed and argued further, and Brown presented his rebuttal to all arguments.

> We saw we must either stand by him or leave him to dash himself alone against the fortress he was determined to assault. To withhold aid would only delay, not prevent him.

Finally Smith and Sanborn left the group, as the sun was setting over the snow-covered hills, and went out for a walk. Smith said to him:

> You see how it is; our dear old friend has made up his mind to this course, and cannot be turned from it. We cannot give him up to die alone; we must support him. I will raise so many hundred dollars for him; you must lay the case before your friends in Massachusetts, and ask them to do as much. I see no other way.

There was little left for Sanborn to do. "I had come to the same conclusion," says Sanborn, "and by the same process of reasoning. It was done far more from our regard for the man than from hopes of immediate success.

But the Lord knows His own soldiers, and the far-reaching results of Brown's action in Virginia are now well known of all men."[36]

Brown did not, states Sanborn, indicate that he would start the campaign by seizing Harper's Ferry. Sanborn said good-bye to his friends and set out for Boston. But he had scarcely left when Brown sat down and penned this letter to him:

> My Dear Friend
>
> Mr Morton has taken the liberty of saying to me that you felt 1/2 inclined to make a common cause with me. I greatly rejoice at this; for I believe when you come to look at the ample field I labour in: & the rich harvest which (not only this entire country, but) the whole world during the present & future generations may reap from its successful cultivation: you will feel that you are out of your element until you find you are in it; an entire Unit. What an inconceivable amount of good you might so effect; by your counsel, your example, your encouragement, your natural, & acquired ability; for active service. And then how very little we can possibly loose? Certainly the cause is enough to live for: if not to [word omitted] for. I have only had this one opportunity in a life of nearly Sixty years, & could I be continued Ten times as long again, I might not again have another equal opportunity. God has honored but comparatively a very small part of mankind with any possible chance for such mighty & soul satisfying rewards. But my dear friend if you should make up your mind to do so I trust it will be wholly from the promptings of your own spirit; after having thoroughly counted the cost. I would flatter no man into such a measure if I could do it ever so easily. I expect nothing but to "endure hardness:" but I expect to effect a mighty conquest even though it be like the last victory of Samson. I felt for a number of years in earlier life: a steady, strong, desire; to die: but since I saw any prospect of becoming a

[36] Recollections, I, 144-148.

"reaper" in the great harvest I have not only felt quite willing to live: but have enjoyed life much & am now rather anxious to live for a few years more. Your sincere Friend
John Brown[37]

That this "touching and prophetic" letter did not draw Sanborn "into the field as one of Brown's band was due to the circumstance," says Sanborn, "that the interests of other persons were then too much in my hands and in my thoughts to permit a change of my whole course of life, except under the most unmistakable direction of that Spirit who governs the fate of nations and of men." And Sanborn then makes an amazing statement: "Long accustomed to guide my life by leadings and omens from that shrine whose oracles may destroy but can never deceive, I listened in vain, through months of doubt and anxiety, for a clear and certain call."[38]

---

[37]This version of the letter from Brown to Sanborn, from Peterboro, N.Y., February 24, 1858, is transcribed from a facsimile of the original given in Sanborn, John Brown, between pp. 444-445, versions of which much edited in their spelling, capitalization, and italicizing may be found in the Atlantic Monthly (July, 1872), pp. 50-61, in the Atlantic Monthly (March, 1875), pp. 323-331, in Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 444-445 (a printed version), and in Recollections (published 1909), I, pp. 150-151. Of Sanborn's liberties with the texts which he quotes--the work of himself and the works of others--I shall speak from time to time in this study. The reader will find it interesting to see the changes he has made in each version. Often the change may consist of only one mark of punctuation, but note the difference in meaning that results when one finds a question mark after the word loose in the 1872 Atlantic version and an exclamation point in the Atlantic version of 1875. Sanborn's editing, suffice it to say at this point, has caused considerable anger, irritation, and discussion among scholars. (Villard's transcription appears in his John Brown at pp. 322 and 323.)

[38]Sanborn, "The Virginia campaign of John Brown," Atlantic Monthly, XXXV (March, 1875), 331 (published when he was 43). It is interesting that the first quotation in this paragraph above was reprinted in Sanborn's John Brown (published when he was 53), p. 445, n. 1, down through the word "life," and the second quotation was reprinted as it stands here. In Recollections (published when he was 77), I, 151, note, Sanborn printed the first sentence approximately the way it is printed here, but he omitted the second sentence entirely. Many inferences may be made from these passages. Who the persons were whose interests were "too much in my hands

On the day Brown wrote this moving letter to Sanborn he left Peterboro to visit the home of Dr. and Mrs. J. N. Gloucester, a wealthy Negro couple of Brooklyn, who had accumulated a fortune through hard work and intelligent investments. To them he revealed his plan. These friends and other colored people helped him with advice and money, and from William Still, one of their number, he learned much about Pennsylvania routes and stations on the underground railroad.[39]

Before continuing to Philadelphia on a mission to enlist the aid of other Negro friends, he made a quick trip to Boston to confer with the Secret Six, as they now began to call themselves. Although the facts have never been clear and Sanborn and his rival biographers spent much ink making and refuting statements, Sanborn states categorically in his biography of Brown that the latter at this time "communicated freely" to Parker, Howe, Stearns, and Higginson "his plans of attack and defence in Virginia." However, he says, "It is not known that he spoke to any but me of his purpose to surprise the arsenal and town of Harper's Ferry," and, he continues:

---

and thoughts" he does not say, and his correspondence as yet sheds no light. He was to marry Louisa Leavitt August 16, 1862, four years after this, and he proposed marriage to Edith Emerson sometime between 1855 and 1862. Whether he was in love at this time or whether someone in his family was ill or dying or dependent upon him for support he does not say. One could infer that Sanborn was a coward, that he feared posterity might wonder why he had not joined Brown as an active participant in the movement, and had thought to mislead the reader and suggest that some insurmountable obstacle stood in his way. This passage is made much of by Robert Penn Warren in his John Brown: the Making of a Martyr (New York: Payson and Clarke, 1929).

[39] Villard, John Brown, p. 323.

> Both Dr. Howe and Mr. Stearns testified before Mason's committee, in 1860, that they were ignorant of Brown's plan of attack; which was true so far as the place and manner of beginning the campaign were concerned. It is probable that in 1858 Brown had not definitely resolved to seize Harper's Ferry; yet he spoke of it to me beside his coal-fire in the American House, putting it as a question, rather, without expressing his own purpose. I questioned him a little about it; but it then passed from my mind, and I did not think of it again until the attack had been made, a year and a half afterward.[40]

Brown was still anxious that Parker help him compose a "substitute for an address you saw last season, directed to the officers and soldiers of the United States Army," and to Sanborn he appealed for a suitable reading list for his followers. He had written previously: "I want to put into the hands of my young men coppies of Plutarks lives, Irvings life of Washington; the best written Life of Napoleon and other similar books, for use at Springdale."[41] Sanborn sent him the desired list but Parker did not reply.

Brown needed more money and Sanborn, in a letter to Higginson dated March 8, 1858, indicated how the group went about this:

> Hawkins [Brown] has gone to Philadelphia today, leaving his friends to work for him. $1000 is the sum set to be raised here--of which yourself, Mr. Parker, Dr. Howe, Mr. Stearns and myself each are assessed to raise $100--Some may do more --perhaps you cannot come up to that--nor I, possibly--But of $500 we are sure--and the $1000 in all probability.... Hawkins goes to prepare agencies for his business near where he will begin operations. Dr. Cabot knows something of the speculation, but not the whole, not being quite prepared to take stock. No others have been admitted to a share in the business, though G. R. Russell has been consulted.[42]

---

[40] Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 450-451. Sanborn seems to refute this statement in Recollections, I, 153.

[41] Brown to Sanborn, Feb. 26, 1858 (Concord Library, 5: B-1).

[42] Sanborn to Higginson, March 8, 1858 (Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library), reprinted in part in Villard, p. 325.

A meeting was called for March 20th at Dr. Howe's office to discuss money matters further, Sanborn reported to Higginson March 21st:

> Mr. Stearns is Treasurer of the enterprise for N. E.--and has now on hand $150 having paid H--- $100.... Mr. Stearns has given $100 & promises $200 more, but holds it back for a future emergency. Mr. Parker has raised his $100 & will do something more. Dr. H. has paid in $50 and will raise $100 more.... I paid Brown $25--my own subscription--but have as yet been able to get nothing else--though I shall do so.[43]

Though by April 1st Brown had received $375, three weeks later he had received only $410 and was pleading for the remainder of the promised thousand.

On May 8th Brown opened his Provisional Constitutional Convention at Chatham, Canada West. None of the Secret Six could attend the meeting: they had terrifying problems of their own. Colonel Forbes had been to Washington "betraying the Virginia plan to Republican Senators, and perhaps to members of the proslavery Administration." On the second of May, Sanborn, Howe, and Stearns met for consultation and Sanborn reported the result May 5th in a letter to Higginson:

> It looks as if the project must, for the present, be deferred, for I find by reading Forbes's epistles to the doctor that he knows the details of the plan, and even knows (what very few do) that the doctor, Mr. Stearns, and myself are informed of it. How he got this knowledge is a mystery. He demands that Hawkins be dismissed as agent, and <u>himself</u> or some other be put in his place, threatening otherwise to make the business public. Theodore Parker and G. L. Stearns think the plan must be deferred till another year; the doctor does not think so, and I am in doubt, inclining to the opinion of the two former.

On May 7th Gerrit Smith wrote Sanborn:

---

[43] Sanborn to Higginson, Boston, March 21, 1858 (Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library), reprinted in part in Villard, p. 326.

> It seems to me that in these circumstances Brown must go no further, and so I write him. I never was convinced of the wisdom of his scheme. But as things now stand, it seems to me it would be madness to attempt to execute it. Colonel Forbes would make such an attempt a certain and most disastrous failure. I write Brown this evening.

Higginson, always the man of action, had different opinions, and made haste to write them to Parker on the 9th:

> I regard any postponement as simply abandoning the project; for if we give it up now, at the command or threat of H. F., it will be the same next year. The only way is to circumvent the man somehow (if he cannot be restrained in his malice). When the thing is well started, who cares what he says?

To which Parker replied, "If you knew all we do about 'Colonel' Forbes, you would think differently. Can't you see the wretch in New York?" At the same time Dr. Howe wrote to Higginson:

> T. P. will tell you about matters. They [the other members of the Six] have held a different view from the one I have taken, which agrees mainly with yours. I think that the would-be traitor is now on the wrong track. I told him some truth, which he will think to be false (for he thinks evil), and he will probably be bungling about in the dark and hesitating until the period for his doing harm has passed. Forbes has disclosed what he knows to Senator Seward, or says he has.

Howe had written a masterpiece of deception to Forbes:

> I said to Senator Sumner that I had confidence in the integrity and ability of Captain Brown; but it is utterly absurd to infer from that any responsibility for his acts. I have confidence in the integrity and ability of scores and hundreds of men for whose words and acts I am in no wise responsible. I never made myself responsible, as a member of the Kansas Committee, or as an individual, neither legally nor morally, for any contract between Captain Brown and you. I was an active member of the committee from its formation until it ceased active operations (which was long, long ago), and never heard of any contract with you.... So the brains are out of that allegation, and I will not heed any ghosts

> of it which you may parade before me or the public.... I infer from your language that you have obtained (in confidence) some information respecting an expedition which you think to be commendable, provided you could manage it, but which you will betray and denounce if he does not give it up! You are, sir, the guardian of your own honor.... In order, however, to disabuse you of any lingering notion that I, or any of the members of the late Kansas Committee...have any responsibility for Captain Brown's actions, I wish to say that the very last communication I sent to him was in order to signify the earnest wish of certain gentlemen , whom you name as his supporters,...that he should go at once to Kansas and give his aid in the coming elections. Whether he will do so or not, we do not know. I may, perhaps, save you trouble by declaring that though I am willing to do my uttermost to aid your family,.. I will not read letters couched in such vituperative and abusive language as you have hitherto used to Mr. Sanborn and me. I will read only far enough to see the spirit of the communication; and if it is similar to that of your former letters, I shall put it in the fire.

With this communication, correspondence with Forbes for the most part ceased.[44]

Sanborn in the meantime was in communication with Brown, and, taking all things into consideration, wrote to Higginson on May 18th:

> Wilson as well as Hale and Seward, and God knows how many more have heard about the plot from F. To go on in the face of this is mere madness and I place myself fully on the side of P [arker] and S [tearns] and Dr. H [owe] with G. S [mith] who does count. What Dana says of F's character seems probable. Mr. S [tearns] and the Dr. will see Hawkins in New York this week and settle matters finally.[45]

What had particularly alarmed the conspirators was the letter from Senator Henry Wilson to Dr. Howe: "You had better talk with some few of our friends who contributed money to aid old Brown to organize and arm

---

[44] Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 458-460. (This incident and others in the narrative appear more sketchily in Villard, pp. 326-339 and in Recollections, I, 154-160.)

[45] From the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in Villard, p. 339. (A garbled version of this appears in Sanborn, John Brown, p. 460.)

some force in Kansas for defence, about the policy of getting those arms out of his hands & putting them in the hands of some reliable men in that Territory," and he added these underlined words: "If they should be used for other purposes, as rumor says they may be, it might be of disadvantage to the men who were induced to contribute to that very foolish movement."[46] Stearns therefore wrote Brown May 14th telling him that because of the information he had received from Senator Wilson, "it becomes my duty to warn you not to use [the arms] for any other purpose, and to hold them subject to my order as chairman of said committee."[47]

Stearns wrote Brown another letter the next day requesting him to meet him in New York the 20th. There it was decided "that hereafter the custody of the Kansas rifles should be in Brown's hands as the agent, not of this committee, but of Mr. Stearns alone." After this important point was made, Stearns returned to Boston and met with Gerrit Smith (who was in town addressing the Peace Society) and the other members of the Secret Six, Higginson excepted. As they had previously agreed that the attack must be postponed, and since Stearns had solved the delicate problem of the use of the Kansas rifles, "the questions remaining were whether Brown should be required to go to Kansas at once, and what amount of money should be raised for him in future." They resolved unanimously that Brown should return to Kansas at once, that the

[46]Reprinted in part from the Mason Report, p. 177, in Villard, p. 339.

[47]Sanborn, John Brown, p. 461.

attack should be postponed till the winter or spring of 1859, at which time the committee would raise "two or three thousand dollars" for his purpose. When Brown arrived on the 31st he was frightfully depressed, therefore, to hear of these decisions, and to learn further that he was "meantime to blind Forbes by going to Kansas, and to transfer the property so as to relieve the Kansas Committee of responsibility, and they in future not to know his plans."[48] Higginson reported that Brown stated to him afterward that he considered the six "were not men of action, they were intimidated by Wilson's letter &c. & overrated the obstacles."[49] Nevertheless, Dr. Howe reported to Higginson that Brown left Boston June 3rd "with five hundred dollars in gold, and liberty to retain all the arms, and that 'he went off in good spirits.'"[50]

Dr. Howe wrote two letters in answer to Senator Wilson's and made these extraordinary statements:

> [Boston, May 12, 1858] I understand perfectly your meaning. No countenance has been given to Brown for any operation outside of Kansas by the Kansas Committee....
>
> [May 15, 1858] When I last wrote to you, I was not aware fully of the true state of the case with regard to certain arms belonging to the late Kansas Committee. Prompt measures have been taken, and will be resolutely followed up, to prevent any such monstrous perversion of a trust as would be the application of means raised for the defence of Kansas to a purpose which the subscribers of the fund would disapprove and vehemently condemn.[51]

---

[48] Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 462-464.

[49] Villard, p. 340.

[50] Sanborn, John Brown, p. 464.

[51] Ibid., p. 462.

Accusations of dishonesty and duplicity arose then and later from these activities of the Committee; Sanborn himself admitted that "it is still a little difficult to explain this transaction concerning the arms without leaving a suspicion that there was somewhere a breach of trust." Villard, who doubtless spent the greatest care in untangling this mess, has this to say in comment:

> Mr. Stearns had advanced large sums to the Kansas Committee, which had never been repaid, asking at the time that the arms if unused should come back to him, that he might reimburse himself for his outlay. It will be remembered that the Kansas Committee had agreed to this by formal vote.... Mr. Stearns now simply exercised this option, and so notified the immediate conspirators verbally, and then presented all the arms, whose possession he had that minute assumed, to Brown.

As for the accusations of "duplicity" and "gross prevarication" heaped upon Dr. Howe and the Committee, Villard says:

> Technically, the Committee has a valid defence. Doubtless in the business world, and especially according to the standards of certain large industrial concerns of late years, the Committee's strategem is quite defensible as a simple way out of a trying difficulty, and an easy method of obtaining for Brown the desired arms. It cannot be denied that frankness and straightforwardness would have dictated the notifying of Senator Wilson that the arms had passed into the possession of individual members of the Committee, which would not thereafter be responsible for them or the uses made of them.... It must be pointed out, too, that the decision of the little Boston group, after giving Brown the five hundred dollars and arms, in 1858, to know no more of his plans, is the first sign of the effort to evade responsibility which became so apparent after the raid.[52]

This then was the state of affairs between Sanborn and his colleagues in the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee and John Brown fifteen months before the attack on Harper's Ferry. There was little for the old man to do but to acquiesce: "It was essential that they

[52] Villard, pp. 341-342; Sanborn, John Brown, p. 465.

shld. not think him reckless, & as they held the purse he was powerless without them."[53] So he called his faithful followers together, informed them of the decision of the Six, and told them they would have to seek their own salvations until further notice.

As this is a study of Sanborn and not of John Brown, it should suffice to record that from the day Brown bade farewell to the Secret Six in Boston in June, 1858, until May 9, 1859, Brown accomplished little. Villard feels that if the Massachusetts friends of John Brown had known fully what little good he achieved after he arrived in Kansas, they would have disapproved of his use of their cash and weapons.[54]

Gerrit Smith "and others" rejoiced in his work in Missouri in a raiding party in which, as Brown wrote, "Eleven persons are forcibly restored to their natural; & inalienable rights, with but one man killed." However, with the killing of one man, as Brown said, "Hell is stirred from beneath." The act of bringing eleven slaves out of Missouri and the murder of one white master produced war, not peace, between the settlers of Kansas and Missouri at a time when both pro-slavery and anti-slavery factions were attempting to live on the land in some semblance of peace. "Of constructive work," says Villard, "there was no more to his credit than when he left the Territory in 1856." Brown had, however, the great satisfaction of being in Kansas in August when the people voted on the re-submitted Lecompton Constitution, and saw the final defeat of the Kansas pro-slavery forces at the ballot box.

---

[53] Higginson's memorandum in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in Villard, p. 340.

[54] Villard, pp. 378-379.

On March 12th Brown saw his eleven black charges onto the ferry for Windsor, Canada, having carried them 1100 miles through border territories in the dead of winter; on April 11th he was in Peterboro with Gerrit Smith; and he spent his last birthday--May 9, 1859--with Sanborn in Concord.[55]

Sanborn had been "faithfully laboring for him." Forbes had subsided: the ruse of sending Brown back to Kansas had worked, for Forbes's truths seemed too fantastic for belief.

Villard states that "the other conspirators besides Mr. Higginson were still ignorant of the precise locality Brown had chosen for his attack; but were perfectly aware of its general outlines."[56] Sanborn says that of the $4000 which had been contributed to the secret committee at least $3800 "were given with a clear knowledge of the use to which it would be put."[57] Brown met the members of the committee frequently while he was in Boston. As Theodore Parker had been forced to go to Europe in a last attempt to stave off his fatal consumption, the burden of the enterprise rested on Howe, Sanborn, and Stearns.[58]

During his stay with Sanborn Brown addressed another meeting at the Town Hall. Bronson Alcott wrote in his journal: "I thought him

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 343-395; Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 467-494.

[56] Villard, p. 397.

[57] Sanborn, John Brown, p. 523.

[58] Villard, p. 397.

equal to anything he should dare: the man to do the deed necessary to be done with the patriot's zeal, the martyr's temper and purpose."[59] And while in the East he made the acquaintance of John M. Forbes, a public-spirited business man of Boston; Senator Henry Wilson, whom he met at a dinner of the Bird Club; his benefactor, Amos A. Lawrence, whose ardor for Brown had nevertheless cooled since the Missouri raids; and John A. Andrew, who was so impressed with him that he gave them twenty-five dollars for his work. He made his last public appearance at a meeting of the Church Anti-Slavery Society at Tremont Temple during the last week of May, but spoke only a few words.[60] Sanborn had had a hard job raising money, but Stearns and Smith contributed largely to the fund Brown needed before starting on the final enterprise. Sanborn wrote to Higginson: "Capt. B. has been here for three weeks, and is soon to leave--having got his $2000 secured. He is at the U. S. Hotel; and you ought to see him before he goes, for now he is to begin." But as Higginson could not get to Boston, Sanborn wrote him June 4th:

> Brown has set out on his expedition, having got some $500 from all sources except from Mr. Stearns, and from him the balance of $2000; Mr. Stearns being a man who "having put his hand to the plough turneth not back." B. Left Boston for Springfield and New York on Wednesday morning at 8½ and Mr. Stearns has probably gone to New York today to make final arrangements for him. He means to be on the ground as soon as he can--perhaps so as to begin by the 4th July. He could not say where he shall be for a few weeks--but a letter addressed to him under cover to his son John Jr.

---

[59] A. Bronson Alcott, MS statement in Mrs. George Luther Stearns' Emancipation Evening Album, owned by the Stearns family, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 398.

[60] Villard, pp. 397-400.

> West Andover, Ashtabula Co. Ohio, [would reach him.] This point is not far from where B. will begin, and his son will communicate with him. Two of his sons will go with him. He is desirous of getting someone to go to Canada and collect recruits for him among the fugitives, with H [arriet] Tubman or alone, as the case may be, & urged me to go,---but my school will not let me. Last year he engaged some persons & heard of others, but he does not want to lose time by going there himself now. I suggested you to him.... Now is the time to help in the movement, if ever, for within the next two months the experiment will be made.

To which Higginson replied that he didn't feel he could do anything this time, and added:

> My own loss of confidence is also in the way--loss of confidence not in you, but in the others who are concerned in the measure. Those who were so easily disheartened last spring, may be again deterred now.[61]

"It had all begun to seem to me rather chimerical," Higginson wrote in one of his autobiographical essays.[62]

By July 3rd Brown reached Harper's Ferry, his objective being to study the lay of the land and to find a place where his group could live and carry on its operations nearby. Through a chance acquaintanceship with a kindly farmer named Unseld they found the Kennedy Farm, and were able to rent its two houses and pasture from July to March for $35. Brown showed the receipt of the transaction to Unseld so that he and the farmers round about might suspect nothing.

---

[61] The letters in this correspondence are in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library. One could infer in Sanborn's letter to Higginson that his school formed a convenient excuse for his not going to Canada. But the inference seems unfounded after reading Higginson's declaration of faith in Sanborn.

[62] Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cheerful Yesterdays (Boston, 1893), p. 222. In chapters 7 and 8 Higginson gives his side of this narrative.

Back in Boston, the Secret Six knew only that Brown was writing them from Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and that he needed more money. Excepting possibly Higginson, none of them knew that Brown was focussing his attention on Harper's Ferry.[63]

"The attack on Harper's Ferry by John Brown and his seventeen men, October 16, 1859, and his subsequent capture by the United States marines under Colonel Robert Lee," says Sanborn, "were telegraphed to a startled world the next day or two, and reached me in my quiet schoolrooms at Concord on Tuesday morning." As he had made plans for the "annual chestnutting excursion" of his pupils on the following Thursday, he had a moment to decide what to do.

He soon found out that an indefinite number of his letters--and those of Gerrit Smith, Dr. Howe and others--had been captured at the Kennedy Farm. But he did not know how many of the other secret records were in the hands of Senator Mason and Governor Wise of Virginia.

He consulted at once with Stearns, Howe, and Wendell Phillips and spent Tuesday and Wednesday evenings burning such papers as "might compromise other persons." On Thursday he sent his pupils and teachers to the picnic, took a chaise and drove to Medford, picked up Stearns there, and drove to Boston to consult John A. Andrew to find out if they were liable to arrest in Massachusetts as witnesses or conspirators.[64]

---

[63] Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 526-529; Villard, p. 410.

[64] Recollections, I, 137-138.

On Saturday he wrote Emerson from Boston:

Boston Oct 22nd 1859

My dear Friend;

I hope you will still allow me to call you so, though my conduct must seem to you for the present inexcusable. At some future time I hope to show you why I must act as I did, for the good of others as well as my own. As it is [,] the heaviest burden falls on me; but I can bear it. I have done nothing of which I or my friends need be ashamed, and I trust [?] to see the day when I can stand up in Concord and vindicate myself-- For the present I shall have blame enough, then I hope my friends will say what good they can--or at least keep silence--

You know better than most why my absence is peculiarly hard just now. My school I hope will go on in other hands-- ... I could not bid you goodbye, or give you a hint of my going; so sudden was the necessity--Do assure my scholars and their parents that I acted what I thought was best for all--

Give my love to Edith and tell her I would have said goodbye to her on Thursday if I could. I hope she will be well and happy-- Remember me too to Ellen and Edward and to Mrs Emerson--

For yourself, dear sir, what can I say.

Forever and forever farewell, Brutus!
If we do meet again, why we will smile;--
If not----------

Yours in truth
F. B. Sanborn [65]

Yet, somehow, on Saturday the 22nd, he was writing to Theodore Parker from Quebec:

Dear Friend;

You will be surprised at the date of this letter; but it will be explained by the news which the papers have already given you of the Harper's Ferry insurrection. Our old friend struck his blow in such a way- either by his own folly or by the direction of Providence that it has recoiled, and ruined him, and perhaps those who were his friends. His letters have fallen into the hands of Buchanan, and as among them are many of mine, and I am the agent of others in the matter, I thought it best, and so did Mr [Wendell] Phillips and Mr Andrew that I should disappear for awhile, to prevent getting

[65] Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society.

testimony. Accordingly I left Concord on Thursday noon, unknown to all except my two sisters- reached Portland the next morning and this place this P. M. Saturday. I shall wait here until I see what turn things will take, and then return to Concord or go to England as may seem best. So I fear the School has ended, tho' I have written to have it kept up if possible,- and my good name for a while will be under a cloud in N. England I fear too that Gerrit Smith and Morton and perhaps others will suffer from it, but this is little compared to the loss of Brown and the premature explosion of the mine. The poor old man fought like a hero, and will die like one - by the rope, it is most likely. Two of his sons were shot by his side and three fourths of his men. There has been nothing so much in the "high Romantic fashion" seen in this country for many a year.[66] Now he lies in a Virginia jail, tormented with questions, wounded and waiting his trial for murder and treason. What course the Gov't will pursue remains to be seen, but most likely they will follow up the matter as closely as possible, and we shall have plenty of treason trials and bloody threats, and some bloodshed- All this will weaken the Slave Power, and the good of the tragedy will outweigh the evil, no doubt. The Republicans fear very much the effect on their party, but I fancy it will do it more good than harm in the end. It will injure Seward, however, and perhaps make Douglas our next President.

My own reasons for taking the very important step which I have taken, and which is likely to ruin my worldly prospects for years to come, besides estranging and shocking my friends, were these. When I saw that my letters were in the hands of the enemy, I knew that I might be in their power if I staid at home; if not to be tried and punished for treason, yet to be annoyed by arrest and subpoena and forced to give evidence against my friends, perhaps. If I were out of the way, I knew the evidence against them would be much less, and perhaps scarcely any, and in the uncertainty as to what Buchanan will do and how far public rage will go, I thought Canada the best place of refuge. I could not make preparations for flight without exciting suspicion; I therefore took advantage of a holiday, and was far away before any of my Concord friends knew of it. I shall be much blamed for it all, and that by many whose good opinion I value highly, but I believe I did what was best. The emergency was serious, and I knew it was no child's play I was going about.[67]

---

[66]One should note Sanborn's frequent use of the word "romantic." Much could be inferred concerning Sanborn's attitude toward the conspiracy from this particular word.

[67]Had Sanborn realized up to this time that the conspiracy was "no child's play"? Had this been for him a kind of exciting re-enactment of the Scott romances he had read so avidly as a boy?

You will hear much about this from other correspondents, and you will see the newspapers, no doubt. Possibly you may see me in person when you are in England again. There I might find something to do, which I perhaps cannot here, and you know I must be earning my bread. Yet I may go back and take my school again- who knows? All is in God's hands, who does not show his cards to every looker on.

The news of your improvement, in Miss Stevenson's last letter, and the good spirits of your note to me, are very pleasant things. Nor am I sorry to hear of your resignation- great as the loss is- for I know your health requires it and has long done so--

The winter in Italy I hope may do you as much good as in Egypt- and that you will go on fattening until you weigh as much as an Archbishop--

...Mr. Emerson is scarcely any better, and has not a very cheerful winter prospect before him. All were well at the Ripley's when I was there four days ago - and I am in excellent health--

He finished the letter next day:

I have been today to the English Cathedral and heard the morning service with the prayers for the Queen, the Gov. General etc and a sermon on keeping the Sabbath, in which one of the most cogent arguments was this; "If you worldly men find it so hard to get thro' a Sunday here, what will you do when you get to Heaven, where it is all Sunday?" This afternoon I went with an English Colonist and his wife to the Plains of Abraham, and saw the place where Wolfe fell, and also where he climbed up, but did 'nt fall-- It is a romantic town- this Quebec- with its narrow crooked streets and its motley crowd of English French, Yankees, Indians, soldiers nuns, peasants etc. I am at the Metropolitan Hotel, a Yankee house with few lodgers but if I stay long I shall take lodgings in some private boarding house. I have been thinking I may return to Boston, and live there in hiding should it be needful; perhaps in your house, where I could make a good use of your books - but all the future is uncertain. I may live to regret having engaged in such a plot, tho' at present I only lament its unfortunate issue. I am now awaiting letters and papers to inform me of the state of things in the U. S. since I left there, and whether I may or ought to return. I want to hear how the breaking up of my school has been received, and how it sounds to be denounced by your friends and know that you in part deserve it. I have also left a great burden on my sister in the care of my affairs, and shall want

to relieve her as soon as I can. But except these little anxieties, I am in good spirits, and take the matter like a philosopher. I do not know now that I shall see Mr Lyman when he comes home and hear his account of you, as I hoped to do. I dined with Geo Higginson a week ago, and he read me some portions of James' letters about you, for whom he has a great liking, as I hope you have for him....

I have not been to the Music Hall one Sunday since Summer- but have spent them all in Concord until this one- You see my Parting Song was omincus. I may write poetry this winter if I get nothing else to do. The Fraternity are to print my poem [s?] of last year, with Mr Leighton's- I may read it on the banks of Thames, and call that fame which is only exile.-- Please tell Miss Stevenson, with my love, that I shall write her soon, and that she may still send her letters to Concord. Remember me with kind regards to the Apthorps and Hunts; give my love to Mrs Parker, and believe me Ever

Yours affectionately
Frederick B. Stanley
nè [sic] F. B. Sanborn[63]

This particular letter, with its material of importance along with its material of no importance, indicates Sanborn's attitude toward himself, toward others, and toward major and minor issues at this moment, for the little details say almost as much as the major issues.

While Sanborn was at Quebec he received a note from Wendell Phillips, written the 21st but not received for several days, in which Phillips enclosed notes from John A. Andrew on the legal aspects and outlook of Sanborn's case:

MY DEAR FRIEND:

I write more especially to inclose a copy of the conclusion to which John A. Andrew came, after looking up the law for our friend George Stearns. You see he thinks that parties who have in Massachusetts given aid to a treasonable act consummated in Virginia, would, if indicted, be tried in Massachusetts. This is different from the opinion he gave us

[63] Concord Library, 5: S-46.

in the afternoon [Thursday] and on which you based your action. I send you his exact words, and the whole of his paper, that you may have the whole before you--to see whether you will now change your plan and return. I have marked, at the close, the paragraph specially interesting to you.

John A. Andrew's Opinion (Oct. 21, 1859)

"In order to constitute the offence of 'levying war,' there must be more than a mere conspiracy to do it: some overt act of war must be committed.

"In order to constitute guilt (in any given person) of the overt act, he must be present at its commission. But he may be constructively present, though actually absent: that is to say, he may be remote from the principal scene of action, but performing some auxiliary or ancillary act, --such as keeping watch for the immediate actors, guarding them against surprise, having at hand for them means of escape, or the like; thus performing a part in that which constituted the overt act, or was immediately ancillary thereto.

"But a man cannot be guilty of an overt act of levying war, who was not present at the overt act of war; who participated in none of the transactions of the principal actors at the scene and did not, in any manner, render assistance, or attempt to do it, or put himself in a position where he might do so, if occasion offered at the time, nor perform any part in pursuance and in aid of the ends of the principal actors, anywhere, at the time of the overt act being committed.

"Still, if one joins in a conspiracy to levy war, and war is, afterwards, in fact levied, and he perform any act, which in the case of a felony, would render one an accessory, he thereby renders himself a principal to the treason, since, in treason all who are guilty at all are principals. Thus--if he gives arms, ammunition, horses or what not, to aid the war, pursuant to the conspiracy, such acts, when the war has been actually levied, will doubtless be deemed overt acts of treason, in themselves; but the party committing them can only be tried in the District where they were committed. A man who gave a cannon in Maine to the service of the cause of treason could not be tried for it in Texas, merely because it was in Texas, that other men, afterwards, fired it. But I think it would be regarded as of itself an act of treason, the war having been actually levied by other principal conspirators, for which he might be tried in Maine."

I asked J. A. A., "Shall I write him that you think he had better return?" He replied, "Send him what I have written, and let him decide for himself."

You know better than we what the precise contents of your letters were, and so can better judge; but, as you could not be carried hence as a witness, nor, if Andrew be correct, as an alleged criminal, you may think things are so changed that you'll return.

George Stearns went to-day to see Emerson at Concord. They have kept the school going, and it will go ahead for a fortnight or more, awaiting your return. Emerson seemed, from what Stearns told me, to think you had done wisely in leaving.

No news to-day...[69] Old man will probably recover, and I live in hope we'll see him again yet. Be sure we'll leave no stone unturned.

If you write home while you deem it best to stay away, send your letters under cover to me, and tell them to send to me any letters for you, that I may mail them hence. It would not do to mail to you, even under an assumed name, or receive from you through a village post office.[70]

On October 22nd[71] Phillips wrote Sanborn again:

DEAR FRIEND:

I've not been able to get speech again with your counsellor, but Worcester [Higginson] and Dr. Howe and Emerson think there can be no risk to any one in your being here, and urge your immediate return. I concur in their opinion, and write at their request. Emerson says that at Concord they suppose you have gone South to Harper's Ferry. Perhaps it is as well to let them fancy so, and thus avoid the possibility of your absence directing attention to the real key of the movement.

We are in motion with fresh plans, and need your counsel and knowledge of men and means. I wrote you yesterday by mail, and to-day telegraphed. No news.

---

[69] Here Phillips refers to persons by code name, persons of no consequence to this study or, now, to the world at large.

[70] Recollections, I, 137-191. (Phillips did not sign his letter.)

[71] Sanborn, as we see, wrote two letters on Saturday, October 22, 1859, one from Boston and one from Quebec. Yet Phillips is writing Sanborn from Boston on Saturday, October 22.

"The real key to the movement," Sanborn explains, "was in my hands, because most of the correspondence with Brown had passed by my hands and those of my classmate Morton. . . .I had foreseen this in my flight to Canada, because I knew that without my answers the correspondence, if in the hands of Virginia, could not well be understood."

Sanborn's sister was meantime watching the affairs of the school and keeping open the main line of communication between him and his former world, and on Sunday, October 23rd, she wrote:

MY DEAR F.

I got your letter last night. As I had previously, on Friday, had a call from Mr. Emerson and Mr. Stearns, who thought the school should by all means go on for the present, I immediately went to see Mr. E. and had a consultation. By his advice, and almost command, I have suppressed the notes to Judge Hoar and Miss Waterman. He having seen Mr. Phillips and knowing Mr. Andrew's opinion, is strongly persuaded that you can return with safety, and will be here again in a few days. In the meantime the school is to go on with as little interruption as possible. I am to take all the classes I can, and help rule, if need be; Miss Waterman to take all the Latin but Lucretius; Ellen Emerson all the Greek except her own, and the German. It is thought that in this way all the scholars can be kept fully at work; and if this don't do, Mr. Emerson will immediately undertake to get a man--Mr. Abbot or some one, for a short time.

Accepting his advice, and the opinion of your legal friends, I shall act as if your absence were to be only for a few days; and not at once attend to the various orders you have sent. Your absence thus far has not apparently created any particular sensation. Mr. Emerson's children think you have gone to aid in some way the prisoner. Miss Whiting told me in confidence that she thought you had gone to see Gerrit Smith. Mr. Emerson has promised to see Judge Hoar and confer with him. I have had some letters, all of which, except one from Miss Stephenson, I have done with as I thought best, after reading them. The one from Miss S. is marked confidential--therefore I neither read it nor send it without your order. I have taken care of E[dwin] Morton's letters, what there was about.

> I have ordered the coal, kept up the household arrangements as usual, and presented the same face to people as if all was going on peaceably. I am a little confused--stunned --at this great and sudden change; but am quite well, and do not bestow a thought on what people will say, even if the worst should come. Helen [Sanborn's other sister] is here, and will stay a few days longer.... I shall in a few days send to Charles if he does not come here. I have not seen the Ripleys--and as no one knows that I am in pain, I do not have to submit to consolation. I don't like to have people think that your own safety was the principal motive for your going away; but if they do, there is no help for it.
>
> I have no doubt much good will come out of this to all immediately concerned, and don't consider that you need any vindication. I hope you will get through this all without breaking down. We have now and then apprehensions of somebody's coming to disturb things here, but do not believe there is much danger of that. I shall hope to hear from you very soon. Tell me whose writing is this slip--a friend who knew you first through Anna. He writes without name about some letters of his.
>
> Good-bye.
>
> S. E. S.

Hard upon this letter came a note from Emerson:

> By all means return at the first hour wheels or steam will permit. I assure every one that you shall be here Wednesday or Thursday.
>
> Sunday Night. Yours ever, R. W. E.

Sanborn hurried back to Concord at once, "and took up the daily routine of life as if nothing had happened."

He had not been home more than three or four days when Colonel Charles Miller, Gerrit Smith's son-in-law, appeared at his door to tell him that Morton had just left Quebec for England, and that Gerrit Smith was going insane. Miller's mission was to destroy all papers that might implicate his father-in-law in the plot.

Two days later, November 9, Emerson wrote Sanborn from Boston:

MY DEAR SIR:

Would it not be better that you should take legal counsel at this time, by explicitly stating your liabilities, if any exist, to a counsellor? I was talking this morning with Mr. [John M.] Forbes, who looked with some uneasiness at the telegraphic despatch of this morning, and afterward I had a little conversation with Judge Hoar. The Judge does not overestimate the United States power, yet could answer no question in the dark. And it is only on the contingency that there may be anything in your case not known or probable to them, that the suggestion can have any importance.

I have been talking with a few persons on the possibility of finding any gentleman here who might have private influence with Gov. Wise for Capt. Brown, and am to see others in the morning.

Yours ever,
R. W. Emerson.[72]

Though Sanborn preferred to speak to Rockwood Hoar, it was not proper for the judge to hear in advance Sanborn's testimony, and, says, Sanborn, "I was not inclined to unbosom myself to any lawyer, in advance of some necessity for it, which I did not then see." Sanborn replied to Emerson, speaking particularly about the matter of the envoy to Governor Wise:

There is hope in every effort to save Brown--but not much, as it would seem, in the representations of a private gentleman to Governor Wise, who is in this matter the servant of others. It is the Bellua multorum capitum of Virginia that will execute the sentence if it is done; and that is perhaps implacable. Escape, difficult as it seems, is probably Brown's best chance for life. If a reprieve, or an arrest of judgment for another month were possible, a rescue would not be so hard to manage. Brown's heroic character is having its influence on his keepers, as we learn; but at present he does not wish to escape.[73]

---

[72] Recollections, I, 192-199.

[73] Ibid., I, 192-200.

Sanborn, James Redpath, Richard Hinton, T. W. Higginson, and John W. Le Barnes had been plotting to help Brown escape, but finally abandoned their projects November 28, four days before Brown's death. Stearns had appealed to Kansas' boldest "jayhawkers" for help; Lysander Spooner of Boston hatched a plan for kidnapping Governor Wise and holding him for ransom. John W. Le Barnes thought up several amazing schemes, in one of which Sanborn was involved. This called for an attack on the prison at Charlestown, and at a meeting November 22 in New York "some German-born lovers of liberty, . . . who had fought tyranny in their native land" agreed to take part in the attack. In a short time "a hundred or more" men were reported to the conspirators in Boston as ready to go as a reinforcement to the groups which were forming under John Brown, Jr. in Ohio. The hundred or more stipulated, however, that if the Ohio group decided not to lead the band, only fifteen or twenty of their own force would volunteer. By Sunday, November 27, the plotters had decided to "rendezvous some distance from Charlestown, to make a cross-country rush on that town, and, after freeing the prisoners, to seize the horses of the cavalry companies and escape." This attack was to occur November 30 or December 2, the day Brown was to be hanged.

But money was needed--a hundred dollars to pay each rescuer--and promises to provide the widows and children with financial security and bodily safety. From $1500 to $2000 was needed by Tuesday, November 29, and from $500 to $1000 the day after. On the day when Le Barnes was to determine whether the group were to "go or stay," George H. Hoyt, Brown's counsel who was returning to Boston from Ohio, announced that nobody in

Ohio had any such plan of rescue. Sanborn wired Le Barnes to give up the plot and return to Boston, and telegraphed Higginson: "Object abandoned." Then he wrote Higginson: "So I suppose we must give up all hope of saving our old friend."[74]

During all this time, Sanborn had continued to wonder what would happen to himself, how the law would act, and what he would do if he were threatened with seizure. Then, too, he was occupied with numerous meetings, and with watching the newspapers for reports of developments. He wrote to Theodore Parker:

Boston, Nov 25th 1859

> Dear Friend;--I wrote you nearly a fortnight ago, since when many things have happened--some of which you will learn from the English and American papers--Brown had then been lately sentenced, and Gerrit Smith just gone to the Insane Asylum; just afterwards Dr Howe and Mr Stearns thought it prudent to go to Canada to avoid the possibility of an arrest as witnesses. It would have been better if they had staid at home, yet such are the laws that they could only have been protected here by unlawful force. I dont think the U. S. will push the matter as far as to arrest any witnesses They may be summoned, but I dont believe our officials are willing to take the risk of arresting them-

Sanborn says his own course will be this:

> If summoned as a witness I shall refuse to obey and shall tell the officer; if he arrests me he does it at his peril for I will certainly shoot him if I can, and a dozen men in Concord would do the same sooner than see me taken off-- This information will probably affect his return on the summons, and I shall not expect to see him with a capias. If he comes however, to arrest me, I shall resist to the uttermost, and probably kill or seriously wound my captor.[75]

---

[74] Villard, pp. 511-528, particularly 511-517.

[75] Is Sanborn boasting and strutting here? Could it be said that Sanborn was bravest "on paper"?

> I shall then refuse all writs of habeas corpus, and only allow myself to be rescued by force; nor will I allow any one to give bonds for me, if I can help it— If carried to Va- I shall refuse to testify— But I do not look upon any of these things except the summons as probable.

In the meantime, he tells Parker, he goes about his business as usual:

> Last Saturday night a great meeting was held in the Tremont Temple in aid of Brown's family, at which Mr Emerson and Phillips spoke, together with Rev Mr Manning of the Old South and Dr Neale who prayed. You will see the report of the meeting in the Herald- probably- it was very enthusiastic. Mr Emerson has a great admiration for Brown—and has spoken bravely for him. So have some others—but he has been his own best advocate—and his speeches and letters from Charlestown are the best anti-slavery documents yet printed. I will send you the report of his trial, and paste some slips into it--giving other facts--

He feels that the state of Virginia is in a great panic:

> 1000 soldiers are at Charlestown to prevent a rescue, and yet every day the town is in mortal fear. A few nights ago a sentinel challenged a cow, who not being able to give the password was shot. Some say it was because she had two powder horns sticking in her head. The rumors of an attempted rescue are either wholly unfounded or grossly exaggerated. Something may be attempted--but as it now seems with no prospect of success. All sorts of schemes are proposed--one by the Plug Uglies of Washington to go and rescue Brown for $500--another by the Germans of N. Y.--But I think the old hero will be hanged next Friday[76] just a week from today--and that day will be the most venerable yet seen in the annals of Slavery--

Sanborn says that the good results of Brown's activities appear everywhere:

> The North is strengthened- the South fearfully weakened. Business is embarassed [sic] at the South--and the wealthy men begin to talk of selling their property and going to Europe— Discussion also is freely proposed--but there is

---

[76] One might detect here a note of hope that nothing will deprive the conspiracy of its martyr.

> no such good news yet-- Brown's bearing in prison is thoroughly noble--his answers to questions and every word he says are fatal [arrows?] to the South. It is a great deal better that he was not killed in the attack in the Engine house--as I at first hoped, and as his enemies thought. His trial has aroused a feeling never before known among us--and which frightens and enrages the South beyond measure-- No farther disclosures have been made for some weeks implicating otherpersons, and the general impression at the North is that few persons knew of the scheme. My own relation to it is hardly imagined by my friends I think--Probably Brown will die without revealing his plan any more fully-- The fugitives in Penn. have escaped and are in safety-- The trial of Stevens and Hazlett before the U. S. Court at Stanton [?] comes in May; before which time much will have occurred, and it is even possible there may be no U. S. to prosecute-- Congress meets in ten days-- Mr Sumner has got home and is said to be in good condition. I hope to see him tomorrow or Sunday-- The session will be the most violent we have ever seen--

As for the other conspirators, Mrs. Howe has told Sanborn that Dr. Howe should be returning from Canada soon, Gerrit Smith is recovering from his insanity, and Edwin Morton is probably in Europe.

On Sunday morning, two days later, he finished the letter. The latest news had come from George Hoyt, Brown's youthful lawyer, who had given Governor Wise of Virginia affidavits establishing Brown's insanity:

> [Hoyt] thinks a case can be made out, but of course it will do no good, and Brown w'd feel insulted by such a defence. Hoyt also says that the Virginians mean to summon as witnesses, Dr Howe, Mrs Russell, Mrs Gloucester of Brooklyn, myself and one or two others, and he advises in the name of Montgomery Blair and the Republican party that we should evade an arrest. But <u>I shall not</u>, and I think one or two others will not. Dr Howe may do so--though I think he will soon return from Canada and go on as usual with his business. I saw yesterday a letter from Mr Stearns, who is with him, hinting that they might not come back very soon--but I think they will-- I have written the Dr urging it--and shall write Mr S- today--also I mean to see Mrs Howe and urge it on her--the Dr's reputation for courage suffers from his absence--unjust as I think--but such is the fact. Hoyt thinks there is no chance of saving Brown--that he will be hanged.

> Various plans for a rescue have been proposed, but none likely to succeed- so strong is the force about him, and the distance to a friendly [countyy? county?] so great. Wise believes that attempts will be made, and will have 1500 troops about the gallows. All Virginia, and indeed all the South is still in a panic, and will be for months to come even if there should be no farther revolts or rescues--

He reports on a call he has paid Senator Charles Sumner that morning, who has recovered fairly well from the near-fatal caning he had suffered three years before:

> He starts for Washington on Wednesday--stopping by the way in N. Y. and Phila-- He does not mean to speak for the first two or three weeks unless it is forced upon him, but will post himself up on the facts of the Harper's Ferry case before speaking- He says he has promised his physicians not to go to work too hard at first-- He has a full view of the dangers of the coming winter--the fights and assassinations which may happen there during the session, and is prepared for all events--... Everything shows how greatly this event has strengthened the North.

After discussing the health of several of the important citizens of Concord, Sanborn concludes his long letter:

> My own health is excellent--and though these affairs keep me busy and alarm some of my friedns they do not much annoy me- I go armed whenever I leave Concord- but I suppose there is really little need of it- We are to have a meeting at Concord tomorrow night to make arrangements for a solemn service on the 2nd December- the day of Brown's execution. His family will be provided for by the North--and his body buried with honor, it is probable.[77]

---

[77] Concord Library, 5: S-48.

It was a clear, warm, beautiful day, December 2, 1859, when the sheriff at Charlestown, Virginia, with a single blow of his hatchet cut the rope and

> the man of strong and bloody hand, of fierce passions, of iron will, of wonderful vicissitudes,--the terrible partisan of Kansas--the capturer of the United States Arsenal at Harper's Ferry--the would-be Catiline of the South--the demi-god of the Abolitionists--the man execrated and lauded--damned and prayed for...John Brown, was hanging between heaven and earth.[78]

Far away from the scaffold, in Concord, the people had gathered to hear Thoreau read from the poets, Emerson from John Brown's words, and Alcott from the Wisdom of Solomon, the Psalms of David, and Plato, and to hear an ode written by Sanborn for the occasion. Sanborn had also written a dirge which was sung by the large audience, among whom was Simon Brown, the former lieutenant-governor.

The townspeople still felt that Sanborn was not out of danger and listed his dirge and his ode as written "by a gentleman of Concord." In fact, only a week later, on the 9th, George Hoyt, Brown's lawyer, after a conversation in which Sanborn "rather slighted his fears" for himself, wrote Sanborn:

> I feel it my duty to point out the dangers, even if I cannot prevail on you to avoid them. It is probable you already see the new trap which Senator Mason has set for you. His resolution of inquiry empowers the committee of the Senate to send for persons and papers. Once in the city of Washington, a witness before that committee, it will be easy to take you into

---

[78] Elizabeth Preston Allan, Life and Letters of Margaret Junkin Preston (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1903), p. 117, reprinted in Villard, p. 557.

> Virginia. If you avoid anything, you must shun the process of this committee of investigation. Mason is an old fox.[79]

On December 12, John Andrew wrote Senator Fessenden of Maine on the same subject and with the same concern for the personal safety of the conspirators. The letter is important, for it seems to defend Sanborn's flight to Canada as a measure which protected political interests in Massachusetts:

> I am confident [wrote Andrew] that there are some half dozen men who ought not to testify anywhere, and who never will, with my consent as counsel, or otherwise, do so. Not that they knew, or foreknew Harper's Ferry;—but, that their relations with Brown were such & their knowledge of his movements & intentions, as a "practical abolitionist," aiding the escape of slaves by force,—even at the risk of armed encounter,—that they could not without personal danger say anything. Nor could they be known as having those relations, without giving some color to the charge that Republicans cooperate in such movements.[80]

Sanborn's worst fears were realized when, on January 16, Monday, he received a summons to appear before the Mason Committee.

> I was thus summoned; last Monday I went to the P. O. as usual about 5 1/2 P.M-- As I was looking in the boxes, a man called me by name, I turned and said, "How do you do?" upon which he handed me the summons, telling me what it was. I looked at it, said, "You must make your return, sir" put it in my pocket and came away. As I turned he said, "Shall I write them you will be there?" "Make such a return as you please," said I, and went home. Perhaps if I had refused to go, he might have had the authority to arrest me, but no doubt I could have been set free on a habeas corpus-- These proceedings are another step towards tyranny- but we have got very near the end of that- [81]

---

[79] Recollections, I, 203-204.

[80] John A. Andrew to Senator William P. Fessenden, written from Boston, December 12, 1859, reprinted in Villard p. 530. (The original was in the possession of Villard.)

[81] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, January 21, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-50).

He was to start January 22nd, "as it is rumored, for Washington, but as some think - for Montreal, where they say I am to watch the course of events at W- and act accordingly." The day for his appearance was fixed for January 24th.

> The summons is a simple subpoena and no attempt was made to arrest me. Should I fail to appear at W- on Tuesday, it is thought I shall be arrested by order either of the Com. or the full Senate. Two Concord men- Mr Keyes and Mr Bull have just returned from Washington, and both advise me about going there, but in different ways. Mr Bull thinks the Investigation is to be strictly carried [?] out, and that they will be rigorous in their search for evidence, and urges me not to go to W- Mr Keyes thinks the Committee will be fair and lenient in their examination, and that they will not pursue the matter very far- and he advises to go and testify- Mr Sumner is his authority- while Mr Wilson is Mr Bull's- So you see how uncertain everything is,- too uncertain, in my view, to warrant a long journey Southward-- My school has been arranged so that I can be absent for a fortnight and perhaps longer - and that is what I expect now to do....
>
> It is possible I may be kept here by another cause Mrs Ripley has just had a light attack of vanoloid- and I suppose I was exposed to take it from her, and now is about the time I ought to have it appear.[82] Should I be taken with it, I should be excused from attendance on the Committee for some weeks, I presume--
>
> ...Realf, Brown's Secretary of State has reached Washington; and was to testify yesterday. His evidence, if believed, will make a sensation. He mentions you and Higginson as knowing Brown's plan and states that Wilson had rec'd a letter from B- but disapproved the scheme- Whether Seward is to be involved by R- remains to be seen. Forbes is out of sight, and it is to be hoped will stay so- No other witnesses from this way are yet summoned, but Giddings, R. [Plumb?] of Cleveland and John Brown jr are said to have been summoned in this, and it is said the Marshal had orders to arrest them if they refused to obey....
>
> There seems no immediate prospect of an organization at W- The Southern men are under pledge to resist a vote on the plurality rule - the only method of choice, now- And another ballot cannot be got, it is said. Sherman will be

[82] One can sense Sanborn's hope that he may contract vanoloid.

the man when a choice is made- The Northern members feel plucky (in the House) and there will be some wholesome truth uttered by them when they begin to debate in good earnest- Seward has not spoken, and, it is said, will not, for a while- the same with Sumner- Many say that Seward's chances for the Presidency are ruined; I don't think so. He is stronger in N. E. than ever, I think--and Banks would give way to him more readily than [?] to another. But a thousand things may happen before that - - Gerrit Smith is at Peterboro, much better though not yet well. Helen Morton is there, and writes me now and then. She says few of his friends have written him letters of sympathy or congratulation on his recovery, and that in his shattered state, this is a great burden to him. He would value a letter from you very much, I know- even a few words.... Morton, as I wrote you is in England.[83] Possibly I may be by March 1st but you must send my letters here as usual, till you hear I have sailed- Dr Howe was here two days since; he will be in Canada in a week or two, and if he goes to Washington, wait till after the trial of Stevens, which begins, Feb 1st- I dont believe he will go at all. Stearns is not likely to be summoned just yet- but will go away for awhile - Redpaths's Life of Brown is out, and selling fast; it will probably reach over 100,000 and perhaps a quarter of a million in a year- It is a good book, though hastily written- He will print another book in a month, containing the speeches of Phillips, Thoreau, Emerson etc - and the Services at our meeting of the 2nd Dec in full- This also will have a large sale - The Brown family will realize $10 000 or $15 000 from their fund; the daughters may be at my school, if I am here I have heard nothing directly from you for some weeks.... I am well, and in spite of [rumors? summons?] and warnings, in a cheerful frame of mind; in fact I was scarcely ever happier. See what it is to have a good conscience! Nor do I feel alarmed at the state of the country. Fermentation is better than putrefaction, and we are in a healthy irritation just now. What the end will be no one can see; but it must be good at last -- --... Worcester's Dictionary is out at last; Emerson's book is not, Mr Hawthorne's. [sic] "The Professor Story" in the Atlantic opens well, and will be better I think, than any other of Holmes's stories. ...But the world of fiction is a little remote and tiresome at this very real time. -- Should I go abroad I should try to be with you in Rome by April- then in Germany for three months - but all is uncertain.[84]

---

[83] One should note that Sanborn, in this paragraph, sees himself fairly well in relation to the entire picture. Does the reference to Gerrit Smith suggest that Sanborn sincerely believed him insane?

[84] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, January 21, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-50).

Sanborn evidently proposed to Senator Mason that he would be willing to testify in Massachusetts, "through fear of lack of protection in Washington." Mason "assured" Sanborn that he would be "personally responsible" for his safety. "I was not so much concerned for that," says Sanborn, "as resolved never to testify before slaveholders in regard to my friends." He then wrote Mason telling him that if he were summoned, "under no conditions" would he appear before his committee but would "throw [himself] upon [his] rights as a citizen of Massachusetts; reminding him also that he could hardly rely on his offer of protection, since [his] friend, Senator Sumner, had been brutally assaulted a few years earlier, in the Senate chamber itself."

> Upon the receipt of this missive, Mason reported me to the Senate as a contumacious witness, and my arrest was voted, February 16, 1860, as that of John Brown, Jr., and James Redpath was. A few of the Southern Senators, seeing that my attitude about State Rights was quite similar to theirs, voted against my arrest, and began to send me their political speeches.

Sanborn then left for Canada, "not choosing to be seized," as he says, "before I was quite ready."[85] He hit North Elba in his trip toward the border and made arrangements for two of Brown's daughters, Sarah and Anne, to enter his school in March.[86]

During the period between Brown's capture at Harper's Ferry and the last of February, the other five conspirators had acted in varying ways. As Villard says, "None had apparently asked themselves how far

---

[85] Such a statement could indicate an amazing conceit.

[86] Recollections, I, 206-207.

they would be compromised in the eyes of the law when John Brown failed."[87] Of the six it is Villard's opinion that Parker and Higginson alone "stand out as being entirely ready to take the consequences, whatever they might be." Theodore Parker had, of course, a legitimate excuse for being in Europe, and was there before the attack on Harper's Ferry. He testified:

> Of course, I was not astonished to hear that an attempt had been made to free the slaves in a certain part of Virginia. ... Such "insurrections" will continue as long as Slavery lasts, and will increase, both in frequency and in power just as the people become intelligent and moral.[88]

As for Higginson, he stayed in Worcester where he could have been taken at any moment. He reasoned that

> no one who stands his ground will be molested. I think the reason why Phillips & I have not been summoned is that it was well understood that we were not going to Canada. Mason does not wish to have John Brown heartily defended before the committee & the country--nor does he wish to cause an <u>émeute</u>, either in Massachusetts or Washington. He wishes simply to say that he tried for evidence & it was refused him. If his witnesses go to Canada or Europe, he is freed from all responsibility.[89]

Stearns had gone with Sanborn to Boston to consult with John Andrew four days after Harper's Ferry, and Stearns and Howe left for Canada October 25. Stearns "escaped from Dr. Howe," as his son put it, on December 2, the day Brown died, and testified before the Mason

---

[87] Villard, p. 528.

[88] <u>John Brown's Expedition</u>, reviewed in a letter from Parker, in Rome, to Francis Jackson, Boston (Boston, pamphlet, 1860), p. 7, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 529.

[89] Higginson to Sanborn, Worcester, Mass., February 3, 1860, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 529. Villard says this letter was never sent.

Committee in Washington February 24, 1860. Unafraid through the trial, he said, when asked if he disapproved of the raid on Harper's Ferry, "I should have disapproved of it if I had known of it; but I have since changed my opinion; I believe John Brown to be the representative man of this century, as Washington was of the last--the Harper's Ferry affair, and the capacity shown by the Italians for self-government, the great events of the age. One will free Europe and the other America."

Sanborn's actions stand somewhere in between the brave, manly words and acts of Higginson, Parker, and Stearns, and what I feel were the despicable activities of Dr. Howe and Gerrit Smith. As for Dr. Howe, who had fought fiercely in the '20's in the Greek army in its war for independence, and who had been imprisoned by the Prussians for five months for distributing supplies during the Polish uprisings, has actions were unbelievable. On November 14, though he was still with Stearns in Canada, he published a "card" addressed from Boston in which he made several rather credible statements;

> Rumor has mingled my name with the events at Harper's Ferry. So long as it rested on such absurdities as letters written <u>to</u> me by Col Forbes, or others, it was too idle to notice. But when complicity is distinctly charged by one of the parties engaged [John E. Cook], my friends beseech me to define my position; and I consent and less reluctantly, because I divest myself of what, in time, might be considered an honor, and I want no undeserved ones. As regards Mr. Cook...I never saw him...never even heard of him until since the outbreak at Harper's Ferry. That event was unforeseen and unexpected by me; nor does all my previous knowledge of John Brown enable me to reconcile it with his characteristic prudence and his reluctance to shed blood, or excite servile insurrection. It is still, to me, a mystery, and a marvel. As to the heroic man who planned and led that forlorn hope, my relations

> with him in former times were such as no man ought to be afraid or ashamed to avow. If ever my testimony as to his high qualities can be of use to him or his, it shall be forthcoming at the fitting time and place. But neither this nor any other testimony shall be extorted for unrighteous purposes, if I can help it.[90]

This called forth from Higginson a bitter rebuke, and he wrote Sanborn that he regarded Dr. Howe's card "as anything but honorable."[91] Sanborn stooped to defend Howe in a statement that aroused Higginson to reply November 17: "Is there no such thing as <u>honor</u> among confederates?"[92] Dr. Howe took three months to think over Higginson's stern letter, and on February 16 he replied, defending his writing of his card:

> I was not very decided in the belief of its expediency. It was done, however, in consequence of an opinion which I held, and hold, that everything which could be honestly done to show that John Brown was not the Agent, or even the ally of others, but an individual acting upon his own responsibility, would increase the chances of escape for him and his companions.

Further, Dr. Howe repeated to Higginson that in his last interview with John Brown, the latter "did not then reveal to me his destination, or his purpose. We <u>had no conversation about</u> his future <u>plans</u>. His appearance at 'Harper's Ferry' was to me not only unexpected but quite astonishing. The original plan as I understood it was quite different

---

[90] Published in the New York <u>Tribune</u>, November 16, 1859, and reprinted in part in Villard, p. 531.

[91] A first draft of a letter dated Worcester, November 15, 1859, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 532.

[92] A first draft of this is in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library.

from this one; & even that I supposed was abandoned."[93] When Howe appeared before the Mason Committee, Sanborn said, its questions were "so unskilfully framed that [the witnesses] could, without literal falsehood, answer as they did."[94]

Most reprehensible of all were the actions of Gerrit Smith, whose activities following Harper's Ferry and to the day of his death seem dishonorable. When the news of the attack hit the newspapers, he began to see his social and political position crumble. "The outcries against him as an accessory, in the pro-slavery press and by his political enemies, the rumor that the Virginia authorities were about to requisition the Governor of New York for his extradition, and the bloody and futile character of the raid itself, all reduced him to a state of terror."[95] Says his biographer:

> None of these things, talk, spending money or the underground railroad, called for real courage, the kind of courage necessary to act and to face the consequences of action. When Smith found his strong talk carried over into action by John Brown, to whom abolitionism meant something more than a battle of words, he completely lost his nerve.[96]

On November 7, five days after John Brown was sentenced to death, Smith, through careful strategy, was admitted to the Utica Asylum for

---

[93] S. G. Howe to T. W. Higginson, Boston, February 16, 1860, in the Higginson Collection, Boston Public Library, reprinted in part in Villard, p. 532.

[94] Recollections, I, 230. The letter from Sanborn to Parker, Concord, February 12, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-51) gives contemporary evidence of the same attitude.

[95] Villard, p. 535.

[96] Ralph Volney Harlow, Gerrit Smith: Philanthropist and Reformer (New York, Henry Holt, 1939), p. 421.

the Insane. The statements given out to the press and to private persons "suggest that Smith was suffering from an extreme case of what moralists call a guilty conscience and from a terrific nervous strain resulting therefrom."[97]

Though Dr. John P. Gray, the superintendent of the asylum and Smith's personal friend, wrote a careful and weighty diagnosis of Smith's grave derangement of mind and critical organic weakness, Smith's rapid recovery, as his biographer points out, is incredible. He could not be present, of course, at the investigation of the Mason Committee because Dr. Gray declared emphatically that his illness would not permit it.[98] And one of the "most baffling aspects of Smith's connection with the Harper's Ferry incident," says Harlow, "was his subsequent denial, emphatic and repeated, of any real complicity in the enterprise; baffling because the denial is so patently at variance with the facts, and because of Smith's well-deserved reputation--in all other activities throughout his life--for absolute candor and frank, open dealing." He only admitted he was acquainted with John Brown, and that he had given him small sums of money. "But he most indignantly repudiated the idea that he had prior knowledge of Brown's plans and that he had played an important part in the shaping of these plans."

When a group of Democrats in upstate New York, the Vigilant Committee, circulated a pamphlet describing the work of the anti-slavery

---

[97] Ibid., p. 411.

[98] Ibid., p. 413.

secret "central association," Smith sued the three authors $50,000 each, and published a pamphlet of his own, two thousand copies of which were distributed to the members of Congress, President Puchanan, and to anyone else of influence in the country whom Smith could think of. To compound his felonious duplicity he printed a three-column letter in the New York Herald "denying most emphatically any complicity in John Brown's plot," and even went so far as to accuse the Herald of implying that the Harper's Ferry affair was "concocted under [his] roof"!

When Barlow of the Vigilant Association threatened to prove before a court that Smith "had counselled, or participated in, movements . . . nearly like those charged," Smith was in a predicament. Barlow, however, after long consideration, agreed to settle the matter out of court "and all parties," wrote Smith complacently, "are entirely satisfied with the way in which it ended. It was left to me to prescribe the terms: and they were promptly acceded to. All were deeply and painfully sensible of the great wrong done me."[99]

When Smith wrote Sanborn in March, 1860, asking him to remind him of what had taken place, Sanborn replied "that it did not seem worth while to refresh his memory." Smith would have been able to piece the

---

[99] Ibid., pp. 414-420. Harlow has been careful to give us only the facts which he could find to document this aspect of Smith's life, but the inferences one makes seem inevitable. O. B. Frothingham did not please the Smiths and Millers in his first edition of the Smith biography, and the second edition, rewritten by Elizabeth Smith Miller, omitted the offending material.

fragments together had not his son-in-law made certain that Sanborn, Stearns, and Howe had burned all of the implicating correspondence.[100]

Sanborn continued to wonder what disposition the Mason Committee would make of his case. "Mason is a third rate lawyer," he wrote to Parker, "courteous, vinosus and tobaccochewing, and asks all the questions, while Davis sits at his elbow and prompts him now and then." Although Howe "was enabled to give his testimony without enlightening them or stretching the truth," says Sanborn, "I could not expect such a special Providence as he had, and shall not go."[101]

By the first of April, Sanborn decided the Mason Committee had dropped the matter.[102] Two evenings later, having just come in from making a call about nine o'clock, he sat at his desk in his carpet slippers. Julia Leary, his Irish servant, had gone to bed, and his sister Sarah was in her room. Someone knocked at the front door. Sanborn walked downstairs, opened the door, and a small man entered. "Does Mr. Sanborn live here?"

---

[100] Recollections, I, 225-243. The letter to refresh Smith's memory was dated May 10, 1860, is cited in Harlow, p. 416, and is in the Gerrit Smith Miller Collection of Syracuse University.

[101] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, February 12, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-51).

[102] Such letters as Sanborn to Parker, Concord, March 11, 1860 (Concord Library 5: S-52); Concord, April 1, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-53); and letters such as Sanborn's to Lyman, Concord, begun April 1, 1860 and finished April 3, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society), indicate by negative evidence that nothing very serious was on his mind, as the letter of April 3, for example, discusses the enrollment at the school, Edward Emerson's and Annie Keyes' illnesses, and so on.

"That is my name, sir," he answered, putting out his hand to welcome him.

"Here is a paper for you," the man said, handing him a note.

Sanborn stepped back under the hall light to read it:

> Sir:--
> The bearer, a worthy young man, solicits your aid in procuring employment.
> Saugus, April 1, 1860 BUFFUM.

When he looked up from the note, three men had entered the hall. One of them stepped forward.

"I arrest you," he said.

"By what authority? What is your name?"

"I am from the U. S. Marshal's office."

"What is your authority--your warrant?"

"We have a warrant," said one of them.

"Show it! Read it!"

The small man began to read the Senate's order for arrest. At that moment Sarah rushed down the stairs, flung open the other hall door and began screaming for help.

The man hastily folded up his warrant. Another snapped handcuffs on Sanborn's wrists. The four rushed him off his feet. As they reached the door, Sanborn braced his feet against the posts. They forced him through. He set his feet against the supports on the verandah.

They fought down the steps and along the gravel walk.

The Church-bells began ringing. People were gathering. At the stone posts by the gate, he braced his feet again. They couldn't move him.

A carriage was waiting. The men lifted him off his feet, but he kicked down the carriage door. One of the men, black-bearded, grabbed his feet and held them together. Suddenly Sarah darted forward and grabbed the man's beard. He screamed and let Sanborn's feet fall to the ground.

Old Colonel Whiting rushed up and began beating the horses. Ann Whiting climbed up to the box beside the driver and shouted she was going as far as he did.

The horses started up. The people rushed at the men still holding Sanborn. Just then J. S. Keyes, Sanborn's lawyer, ran up shouting to him.

"Do you petition for a writ of habeas corpus?"

"By all means," shouted Sanborn. Keyes rushed off toward the house of Judge Hoar.

The Judge had already begun filling out the writ. In ten minutes, John Moore, the deputy sheriff, rushed back, demanding the men to surrender their prisoner.

They refused.

Moore shouted to the crowd, called together a posse comitatus. His Irish neighbors rushed on the men, and grabbing Sanborn away, pushed them into the carriage which lurched forward. The neighbors rushed after it, and pursued it as far as Lexington.

Sanborn was committed to the custody of Captain George L. Prescott, and spent the night in his house near the Old Manse, armed with the six-

shooter of Mr. Bull, the Concord grape man. The fray had lasted two hours.[103]

Next morning he was taken to Boston by Sheriff Moore and carried to the State House. When he arrived, a member of the legislature, Brown of Concord, was presenting the following resolve to his colleagues in the House of Representatives:

> Whereas, a citizen of this Commonwealth has been seized and an attempt has been made to carry him beyond the limits of this Commonwealth, under the pretext of a warrant from the Senate of the United States; and whereas a writ of habeas corpus has been issued by the Supreme Judicial Court...to test the validity of this warrant and the seizure thereon; and whereas it greatly concerns the liberties of this Commonwealth that this question should be thoroughly argued and well considered, therefore
>
> Resolved, That the Attorney General is hereby instructed to appear before the Court in said proceedings to aid the petitioner for said writ of habeas corpus, and, if he shall deem it expedient, in view of the importance of the issue involved, to employ additional counsel to assist him therein; and the Governor is hereby authorized to draw his warrant upon the Treasury of the Commonwealth for the payment of such additional counsel.

---

[103]This account is an attempted amalgamation of Sanborn's account (age 77) in Recollections, I, 208-218 and the contemporary statement (age 28) signed by Sanborn and presumably written at 11:30 that evening, which was printed, together with the reporter's version, in the American Traveller for Saturday, April 7, 1860 (from the clipping file on Sanborn in the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, Watertown, Massachusetts). The account also gives the text of the habeas corpus signed by E. R. Hoar, the return on the writ by Sheriff Moore, a report of the legislature and court proceedings, and the memorial by Sanborn. See also Sanborn to Parker, Concord, April 1 and 8, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-23), and Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman (Pennsylvania Historical Society), dated Concord, May 2, 1860, Concord, April 22, and Concord, May 27. There is also an excellent account in the Alcott-Whitman Papers, (Harvard Library),(Louisa May Alcott to Alf Whitman, Concord, April 5, 1860) and a far fuller account from May Alcott to Alf Whitman in a letter of the same date. The event is described briefly in Madeleine B. Stern, Louisa May Alcott p. 97 and Louise Hall Tharp, The Peabody Sisters of Salem, pp. 276-277. The Sanborn "kidnapping" has been recounted from many different sources in most of the books on Sanborn's contemporaries. One contemporary reaction to the event can be seen in Daniel Ricketson's indignant note to Sanborn, pompously condemning the kidnappers, dated New Bedford, Mass., April 5, 1860, in the Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society.

Brown then told of the incident the previous night, and "his narrative was several times interrupted by loud applause." A lengthy, heated debate ensued among the members of the legislature:

> Mr. Haskell of Ipswich [felt] ...the matter should be left with the Judiciary department....
>
> Mr. Bishop of Lenox opposed the resolve as being a step toward placing the State in conflict with the General Government. The Supreme Court, in his opinion, was the proper tribunal for the settlement of this question of personal rights.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Mr. Tucker of Boston said...he regarded this as a case not requiring any particular sympathy, such as might perhaps naturally be excited in the case of a fugitive slave....
>
> Mr. Eldridge of Canton rejoiced that the issue was met at Concord yesterday by the Democracy of that town, as a similar issue against tyranny was met in 1775. The whole power of the government of the United States was not able to take an unarmed man out of the town of Concord, and he was glad to hear that the whole community, without regard to party, Democrats as well as Republicans, rallied to his defence....
>
> Mr. Stone of Waltham...thought it an attempt to commit the State in favor of resisting the attempt to take Mr. Sanborn at all hazards, and he regretted the introduction of the resolve.
>
> Mr. Hale of Boston said if anything was proved by the recent event, it was the fact that the Concord people were able to take care of this matter for themselves. There is no need of Legislative interposition. Suppose the Legislature had adjourned. Does anybody suppose that Mr. Sanborn's rights would be any less safe than they now are.

Mr. Griffin then arose and was granted permission to introduce a memorial which Sanborn had written while this discussion had been taking place. Reviewing the events of the night before Sanborn said that

> Carleton [one of his kidnappers] did neglect and refuse to give up the body of your memorialist, or remove his handcuffs, but your remonstrant was taken forcibly by your Sheriff from the custody of said Carleton....
>
> All which he conceives to be a grievous violation of his rights as a citizen of this Commonwealth.

After the yeas and nays were taken, "leave was granted by a vote of 70 to 142.

At eleven o'clock Sanborn was taken to the Court House. Chief Justice Shaw and Associate Justices Metcalf, Bigelow, Merrick, and Hoar were present. John A. Andrew had volunteered his services as Sanborn's counsel, and he was assisted by Samuel Sewall (Mrs. Alcott's cousin), and E. S. Keyes.[104] The U. S. District Attorney, C. L. Woodbury, was assisted by Milton Andros, who was appearing for Carleton, the defendent. A great crowd had gathered, including "many legal gentlemen," Wendell Phillips, and Walt Whitman.

After reading the documents involved in the case, and after discussing the history of the case, Sanborn's counsel, Keyes, said that "the case presented many grave questions of a fundamental character, but he thought there were preliminary ones arising upon the face of the precept, which must dispose of the matter." He stated the preliminary questions, which were:

> 1st, that the Sergeant-at-Arms has no power out of the limits of the District of Columbia, where the United States have exclusive jurisdiction.
>
> 2nd--That the precept is directed to the Sergeant-at-Arms by name, and could be served by him alone.
>
> 3rd--That the Sergeant-at-Arms could not depute his power to any other person, and therefore that Silas Carleton cannot justify himself under the warrant produced.

---

[104] Sanborn in his Recollections, I, 212, says his counsel was Robert Treat Paine, but he confuses this detail with the fact that Paine was to be his counsel in the case of Sanborn vs. his kidnapper, Silas Carleton, which would have been tried in June had Sanborn not dropped the charges. See his letter to Parker April 1, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-53).

Keyes then declared that no law of Congress conferred any power upon the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and then presented decisions of the courts of Massachusetts to prove that "no other person can serve warrants, than the person to whom they are directed." Woodbury, for the prosecution, drew heavily on the opinion, which says, in speaking of implied powers of the federal Constitution:

> There is not a grant of power that does not draw after it others not expressed, but vital to its exercise, though subordinate; and asserts that any argument to the contrary and against the action taken leads to the total abrogation of the power of Congress to maintain its dignity, and secure itself from rudeness, contempt or conspiracy, or protect the sanctity of the law-making power; and urging that the limits of its powers in that kind are not restricted to the District of Columbia, any more than its legislative powers.

Andros, also for the prosecution, read the law of January 24, 1857, which spoke of the powers of the House and its committees, and stated that a witness who

> "shall wilfully make default or refuse to answer, shall, in addition to the pains and penalties already" in force, be liable to a fine of between $100 and $1000, or imprisonment from one to twelve months, under an indictment in any court of the United States.

This law, said Woodbury, recognizes "as already in existence the powers claimed."

At half past one, the court took a recess and appeared at four o'clock. Chief Justice Shaw declared that "on account of the urgency of the case the whole court had been called in, and what he was about to state was the result of the deliberations they had had."

> The question was, whether the arrest by Carleton was justifiable upon the ground stated. There was no conflict of authority between the Executive of the United States, and the executive officers of this Commonwealth....

> It had been agreed to consider first, certain preliminary questions.
>
> As regards the first point taken, they were not prepared to say that the Senate could not have its precepts served outside of the District of Columbia.
>
> On the third point, that the Sergeant-at-Arms could not depute his authority to another person--there was no doubt, and all the Court were agreed that he had no such authority.
>
> A warrant of this sort must be limited to the person to whom it is given by the Senate.
>
> "The order of the Court is that the said Sanborn be discharged from the custody of the said Carleton."

At the giving of this decision there were some "demonstrations of approval, which were speedily checked by the officers," but when the spectators reached Court Square "they indulged in hearty cheers." And Carleton and his allies were speedily arrested.

Sanborn was taken by his "enthusiastic friends" in a carriage to East Cambridge to avoid rearrest in Boston and was put on the train for Concord.[105]

"It was but 22 hours," he wrote to Parker, "from the time the wretches appeared at my door, till my return to Concord, set free by the Supreme Court, with the cannon thundering and the crowd huzzaing about me at the station." From the station everyone trooped to the Town Hall to hear Emerson, Thoreau, Alcott, Higginson, and Reynolds the minister vow to "protect" him henceforward "against any Senate's officer."[106] It was Sanborn's greatest moment.

---

[105] Recollections, I, 217.

[106] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, April 1, 1860 (finished April 8), (Concord Library, 5: S-53).

Sanborn, however, still had misgivings about his future security and wrote on the 11th to Lyman:

> I slept out of my house last night, and am to do so tonight, but do not mean to leave town, nor to give up going into school if I can help it. There are rumors that a force is coming here tonight, with Mc Nair[107] in person, but I doubt it-if so, you will hear of it by this steamer. The people here are all on the watch, and with half a dozen exceptions, all on my side, and this is so generally, throughout the North. Things never looked so good for me and my cause as now, I think--though many are alarmed at the state of things. I do not much care now if they take me to Washington; for I have wakened people to the importance of the matter, and they will soon put an end to Mason's tyranny.[108]

And on the 22nd he wrote that he had been "warned by timid friends to go to Canada, or elsewhere," but that he saw "no cause to leave home" where he felt safe.

> Do not you be anxious about me, for I shall keep in a prudent position. I am likely to get sufficient notoriety. A great point has been gained by the successful resistance here--[109]

Sanborn never made the trip to Washington, but his affair provided what the Traveller reported as "one of the most exciting times that Concord has witnessed for many a day."[110]

---

[107] Mc Nair was the Sergeant-at-Arms of the U. S. Senate who had been directed to arrest Sanborn, but who had sent his deputy, Carleton.

[108] Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman, Concord, April 11, 1860 (Lyman Papers, Pennsylvania Historical Society).

[109] Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman, Concord, April 22, 1860 (Lyman Papers).

[110] "Sigma," in the American Traveller, April 7, 1860, quoted above.

There is little more to be said about Sanborn's active political career, for I have found little evidence that he took part in any kind of political activity after the kidnapping and trial in Boston. "Such affairs," writes his son Victor in the Sanborn genealogy, "interfered with the success of the school, and the outbreak of the war so reduced the pupils that in the winter of 1862-'63 Mr. Sanborn accepted an offer from the friends of emancipation to edit their weekly newspaper, the Boston Commonwealth, only remaining in that capacity seven months, however." Governor Andrew then "called him" to be the first secretary of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities October 1, 1863. "Mr. Sanborn was thus withdrawn from active participation in the war," writes Victor, "having the interests of many thousand poor persons to look after." And Sanborn himself says, "[I] worked as I have never done, before or since, to understand, explain, and reform the charitable and statistical work of Massachusetts."[111]

These statements seem to serve as words of apology and self-justification and to support at least two conclusions which might be drawn from the facts of Sanborn's active political career. If one believes that the death of John Brown and the publishing of Hinton Helper's The Impending Crisis were the two most important causes of the Civil War, Sanborn's activities achieve great importance. Indeed, Sanborn worked intensely to support the anti-slavery cause, but much of his work, it could be said, was motivated by romanticism. For example, one

---

[111] Sanborn Genealogy, p. 469.

can see that John Brown was not, for Sanborn, a mere human being: he was instead Sanborn's great hero and God's second son come to earth to redeem mankind from inevitable destruction. Sanborn, too, was more than a secretary in charge of the Kansas State office in the Niles Building; he was, in his own mind, a warrior, fighting beside his old hero to down the powers of darkness. He was, however, primarily a warrior in a war of ideas; he could not think of participating in the skirmishes in Kansas and Virginia. The rifles and ammunition that passed across his ledgers in the Kansas State office were for other men.

But this romantic fog in which, it may be said, Sanborn operated was at times dispelled. When news of Brown's capture at Harper's Ferry was flashed to his schoolrooms in Concord, Sanborn suddenly realized that this was no child's play and that in fact he could be hanged for treason by the government of the United States. Then in the first explosion of reality he penned the note to Emerson and fled as fast as he could for Quebec. There, however, he began to see himself as "the real key to the movement," as Wendell Phillips said, and, after he returned to Concord and found himself the focus of attention, his romantic illusions began to return. Yet the horrible fact of the power of the Mason Committee and the distressingly unmanly activities of Howe and Gerrit Smith disturbed his illusion. By the time of the kidnapping, therefore, when for once he had to fight for his life, he felt perhaps the time had come for him to find some occupation that involved less of the Waverly novels and more of personal safety. Such security appeared in the opportunity that Howe and his colleagues offered him in the offices of the Board of State Charities.

It cannot be declared that, because Sanborn kept out of the actual fighting in the trenches in the Civil War, he was a coward, for many honorable men at the time had no thought of participating, or, if they did, they had the legal right to hire a substitute. Yet, it seems to me, as I have already indicated, Sanborn could be accused of cowardice. And here we could come to another conclusion: that Sanborn in his office and not John Brown, was living a life of reality, and that John Brown, not Sanborn, was the romanticist. But whichever conclusion is correct, it may be said, I feel, that Sanborn's mind was similar to that of Gerrit Smith's. Sanborn did not "worry about the possible connection between words and deeds."[112] His abolitionism consisted mostly of words in support of principles; when he saw his words translated into blood in the engine house at Harper's Ferry, and when he saw his physical safety threatened, he withdrew from the conflict.

So far I have presented a factual narrative of Sanborn's activities in behalf of John Brown up to the time of Brown's death at Charlestown. Sanborn's efforts to help and defend Brown did not, however, stop here. Though Sanborn's active career in politics soon tapered off, he spent the rest of his life passionately talking and writing about his great hero and defending all of his activities. Though I will consider Sanborn's literary and journalistic careers separately in later chapters,

---

[112] Harlow, Gerrit Smith, p. 421.

it seems appropriate in this chapter to discuss his biographical studies of Brown and his qualifications as a Brown scholar.

Actually Sanborn saw very little of Brown from the day he met him in his office just after New Year's, 1857, until shortly before June 3, 1859, a period of about eighteen months.[113] Officially, as secretary of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee, he was associated with him for four months after that, and he says in his reminiscences:

> I seem to have known him better, and to have seen him oftener than those who have journeyed beside me in life's path for sixty years. My actual intercourse with him hardly exceeded a month; my correspondence was some two and a half years (from February, 1857, to September, 1859), and that infrequent; yet the momentous events in which he had a share give to that brief intercourse the seeming duration of a lifetime.[114]

From the day Sanborn met Brown in the office of the State Kansas Committee, "he was ever afterward his most ardent Massachusetts friend and defender" in life and in death.[115] Only three months after the two met, Brown gave Sanborn a little notebook which contained his "Articles of enlistment, and By-laws, of the Kansas Regulators" and other Kansas notes.[116] "In itself—for Brown--," says one historian, "the little book no longer possesed a practical value, but recognizing Sanborn's weakness,

---

[113] Villard, pp. 271 and 396; Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 17, 524; Recollections, I, 75 and 158.

[114] Recollections, I, 84.

[115] Villard, p. 271.

[116] Sanborn, "The Virginia Campaign of John Brown," Atlantic Monthly, XXXV (February, 1875), 224-233.

he sensed that in sealing the affection of this emotional youth, it signified an incalculable investment in sentiment and loyalty."[117] Within ten days after he received the little notebook, Sanborn wrote Brown a letter which contained a pledge, to which he held himself for exactly sixty years:

Concord April 26th
1857

> I thank you for remembering me as you have done, and I shall prize anything from you as a memento of the bravest and most earnest man it has been my fortune to meet. You need not fear that you will be reckoned an unprofitable servant. Your name will be handed down as long as those of Putnam and Stark. Your friends here all take a deep interest in your future career, and hope they shall meet you again in better times.
>
> For my own part, I hope so most earnestly, and should we never meet in this world we shall certainly seek each other out in the other; and should you fall in the struggle, I will take it on myself to see that your family is made comfortable and your memory defended against any who attack it--and if I can in any way serve you, I shall reckon it an honor to do so.[118]

Although Sanborn knew Brown briefly, he was one of the chief contributors to what has been labelled "The John Brown Legend" and never for a moment during the sixty years allowed himself to shrink from defending Brown's memory--which was attacked bitterly and often. A history of Sanborn's defense has been narrated with meticulous care in what has been called "the first major contribution in the field by one

---

[117] James C. Malin, John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six (Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1942), p. 344.

[118] From the Trevor Arnett Library, Negro Collection, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, reprinted in facsimile in Malin, pp. 346-347. (I also have a photostat copy.)

who is primarily a historian." James C. Malin, professor of American history at the University of Kansas, has written "an exhaustive and rigidly critical monograph-with-documents" for the purpose of establishing the facts of John Brown's activities and throwing out the unhistorical material.[119] In the first part of his book, he presents a factual history of Kansas in the 1850's, obtained from a thorough study of contemporary Kansas newspapers; in part two he traces the development of the John Brown Legend, as this appeared in the writings of those who wanted a martyr for the abolition cause, of those who had to have a hero, of those who had to "justify themselves by justifying events with which they had been identified, or who for other reasons contributed to the development of the Legend."[120] In the third part he re-appraises John Brown in Kansas by presenting evidence not previously used by Brown's biographers and historians and by re-examining the evidence these same writers have already used.

---

[119] Review of Malin's study by J. G. Randall in the American Historical Review, XLVIII (July, 1943), 819-820. Randall also says of this study: "While, therefore, this book is highly important as to Brown, being the first major contribution in the field by one who is primarily a historian, it is also a significant project in historical criticism. It should claim the attention of journeymen in the guild, and masters as well, whose interest may be more in technique than in the scourge of Osawatomie.... Under Malin's competent hand the legendary Brown falls away.... Malin is not writing biography. He is content with rigorous historical limitations."

[120] Review of Malin's study by Philip M. Hamer in The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXX (March, 1944), 581-582. Hamer says of this work: "In the attainment of the two objectives stated in his preface, to 'establish facts as objectively as possible' with reference to a most controversial subject and to 'contribute somewhat toward an understanding of the larger problem of human behavior,' Professor Malin has been highly successful."

It is the second part of Malin's study which concerns us, for here he presents a clear, critical account of the feud carried on by Sanborn and a host of others, who, in Malin's opinion, built up, through inference, opinion, hope, disgust, self-deception or justification, fiction, or fantasy, a John Brown whose memory, as Randall says, "has been less a fabric of historical truth than a hodge-podge of hagiology, controversy, and emotional retrospection." In this section of 250 pages Malin devotes about sixty-five to what he calls the "Sanborn Period in John Brown Biography."

Malin's view of Sanborn is not pretty, but it is important for us to inspect his evidence for several reasons: (1) it indicates vividly the development of Sanborn's interest in writing the biography of Brown; (2) it indicates the development of his attitude toward specific details of Brown's activities; (3) it shows Sanborn's qualifications as a scholar and biographer; (4) it sharpens our perception of at least one side of Sanborn's personality; (5) it fixes Sanborn's place and relative importance in a long line of writers on John Brown; and finally (6) it provides many implications for us as we study in later chapters his work as a biographer of the literary great, as a historian, and as a journalist.

Brown's corpse had scarcely cooled before the battle began among those who fought to establish him as a hero and a saint, those who fought to establish him as a murderer and a fraud, and those who said they were willing to accept the truth about him, good or bad, wherever it might be found. Of course all the factions protested that they were

the seekers after truth, among them Sanborn, who was drawn into the battle early. Malin's aim in his book is "not to prove, to praise, or to condemn; it is to establish facts as objectively as possible."[121] It is his facts and opinions about Sanborn that I shall present now.

Sanborn had something to do with the first full-length biography to appear after Brown's death, that of James Redpath, which was published January 10, 1860.[122] Says Malin:

> Redpath's major offense was not that he was biased in favor of Brown and wrote a eulogy, rather than a biography. The unforgivable in his record was that scarcely anything in his book was true, either in general effect or in detail; that he falsified the documentary record itself, inventing freely both incidents and details. He was not content with coloring and interpreting facts, he attempted to establish a false record, allegations of fact, as a basis for history.[123]

Sanborn was enraged when Charles Eliot Norton, in reviewing the book for the March Atlantic, said:

> It would have been well, had this book never been written. ... [Redpath] has shown himself incompetent to appreciate the character of the man whom he admires, and he has, consequently, done great wrong to his memory.

---

[121] Malin, p. vii.

[122] James Redpath, The Public Life of Captain John Brown (Boston, 1860), 408pp. Malin (p. 299, n. 12) gives as evidence of Sanborn's part in the enterprise a letter from Sanborn to Redpath, April 2, 1878, in the Hinton Papers, Kansas State Historical Society (hereafter designated as KSHS). Redpath acknowledged in his preface the help of Thomas H. Webb, Richard Hinton, and his own wife. I have, however, found no other suggestion in any of Sanborn's works or correspondence that would indicate that he had any part in the Redpath volume.

[123] Malin, p. 303.

Though Norton pointed out that Redpath had not collected all the available letters, his chief grievance was that he had "written in the worst temper and spirit of partisanship . . . in the spirit and style of an Abolition tract," and had made Brown "little more than a mere hero of the Abolitionists." He rightfully belonged, declared Norton, "to the same class with Scotch Covenanters and the English regicides."[124]

Redpath, Malin feels, had missed his great opportunity to write a biography of John Brown, and Norton had missed his opportunity to write a review which would have attacked the book on its merit as history, on the "soundness of its factual foundation." But Norton had missed a far more fundamental idea, Malin says, an idea that was to be missed throughout the factional feud that has been carried on ever since Brown first started West toward Kansas:

> Norton [says Malin] failed to understand that the thing that gave Brown so broad an appeal as a symbol was the highly contradictory character of his writings, sayings, actions, and the anecdote and folklore that had already come into existence. With so varied a material for the imagination to work upon, men of most every shade of opinion might find something from which each could rationalize Brown's career and set up for himself a hero in his own image. Norton failed to realize that Redpath had the same right as himself in this matter, and after all, Norton's review went only a little beyond a contrast of his own heroic creation with that of Redpath.

Nor did Sanborn at this time or at any time afterward realize this point: he had also created a hero in his own image. He wrote "a strong letter" to Higginson "condemning the magazine for printing Norton's

---

[124] Atlantic Monthly, V (March, 1860), 378-381.

review." The letter was not printed, but, says Malin, "Here is a significant foretaste of aggressive warfare which Sanborn was to carry on against anyone who dared to differ with his peculiar version of the John Brown Legend."[125]

Redpath followed his "quickie" with his Echoes of Harper's Ferry,[126] published in May, "comprising the best Speeches, Sermons, Letters, Poems, and other utterances of leading minds in Europe and America, called forth by John Brown's invasion of Virginia."[127] Among the selections were the ode and dirge which Sanborn, "the gentleman of Concord," had composed for the martyr service on December 2nd.

The next biography to appear was that of an Englishman, Richard D. Webb, whose Life and Letters of Captain John Brown . . . with notices of some of his confederates appeared in London in 1361. As Emerson and Norton had declared that the public would never be satisfied about Brown until Brown was allowed to speak for himself, Webb called himself "editor," but his "facts" were taken from Redpath, whose biography he had heartily condemned. Sanborn therefore had a part, directly or indirectly, in the first two full-length biographies.[128]

---

[125]Malin, pp. 293-304. This letter, undated, is in the T. W. Higginson Papers, KSHS.

[126]Mr. Boyd B. Stutler, 580 Fifth Avenue, New York City, one of the leading authorities today on John Brown, says of Redpath's biography (in a letter to me dated July 4, 1952): "James Redpath...wrote a 'quickie' to fill public demand - and it had a tremendous sale. It has value in preserving contemporary thought and opinion as lifted from letters and the newspapers, but also must be used with caution."

[127]Published in Boston, 1860, 513 pp.

[128]Malin, p. 306.

In 1872 Sanborn began his version of the Brown personality and activities with two articles in the April and July issues of the Atlantic Monthly. "It is still too early, perhaps," wrote Sanborn, "to tell the whole of the remarkable story of John Brown, the hero of Virginia in the nineteenth century, as that romantic chieftain of like plainness of name and vigor of spirit, John Smith, was its hero in the seventeenth century," and he continued with a sweeping false generalization, "They exhibited in view of all the world the qualities which all the world with one consent, since the world was made, now agrees to call heroic." He admitted in the sentence following, however, that "their contemporaries did not all have this opinion of them."[129]

In the July article, as Malin indicates, he stated that Brown's engagement of Forbes "was quite unknown to Brown's Massachusetts friends" until Christmas, 1857, though Sanborn had written to Brown concerning Forbes September 14: "You say Col. Forbes has a small school at Tabor, do you mean a childrens school, or a school for drilling? I am glad you have so good a man with you as he is said to be, and hope his service may be made available." "In this early writing," Malin feels, "not only did Sanborn show a lack of candor, but he proved remarkably unfamiliar with his subject in several respects, or else saw fit to create a wrong impression, because, for instance, he stated that John Brown was in Kansas until January 1858."[130]

---

[129] [Sanborn] "John Brown in Massachusetts," Atlantic Monthly, XXIX (April, 1872), p. 420. Malin makes a slight error in his transcription of the first sentence.

[130] Sanborn to Brown, September 14, 1857, in the Trevor Arnett Library, Negro Collection, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, reprinted in part in Malin, p. 348. (I have a photostat copy of this in my possession.)

A good word, I feel, should be said for the writing in these two articles, however, for it seems careful, with greater attention paid to sentence structure and chronology than was customary in Sanborn's later writings. There is less, too, of the New England antiquarianism than one finds later, when Sanborn shoots off into genealogical bypaths that are boring, though he does pleasure himself here in some Sanborn, Higginson, and Parker heredity in a footnote.

Sanborn had written the two articles cautiously, writing them in the third person, submitting them for anonymous publication, and referring, for example, to the historic conclave at Gerrit Smith's in Peterboro as "a meeting in Central New York." In a footnote in which he speaks of "Mr. Sanborn" and "Mr. Edwin Morton," he says:

> Much of the subsequent correspondence with Brown and his friends passed through their hands, and it is probable they may have the key to anything that is still unexplained in the movements of Captain Brown.[131]

We can see that Sanborn had been afraid to include the part Gerrit Smith had taken in the conspiracy,[132] perhaps because of the libel suits which Smith had waged in 1860 and 1865-67 against those who claimed he was connected with the enterprise. But Sanborn wrote him October 13, 1872:

---

[131] [Sanborn?] "John Brown and His Friends," Atlantic Monthly, XXX (July, 1872), pp. 50-61.

[132] Mention of the name Gerrit Smith occurred in a passage such as this: "A few friends of Brown were there gathered [for a meeting in Central New York], among them another Massachusetts man, Mr. Edwin Morton,...then residing in the family of Mr. Gerrit Smith as a tutor and private secretary." (p. 51.) Gerrit Smith's words as given in Recollections, I, 147 are quoted, but Smith's name is not given as the speaker.

> I have often been urged to publish what I knew of John Brown and his plans, more especially of late, since the appearance of some papers, respecting him in the Atlantic Monthly.... May I ask if there is any reason, in your opinion, why the whole truth should not now be told, without respect of persons? We were witnesses, and in some sense participants, in a great historical event, in regard to which the evidence (on which the truth of history must rest) is every year passing away, by the death of persons and the decay of recollections.... Before all the witnesses are dead, would it not be wise to put upon record the authentic facts, in time to have any errors in the statement pointed out and corrected?[133]

Of course, as Smith's biographer has pointed out so well, "one of the most baffling aspects of Smith's connection with the Harper's Ferry incident was his subsequent denial, emphatic and repeated, of any real complicity in the enterprise; baffling because the denial is so patently at variance with the facts." Though Smith now had, thirteen years later, the energy required to be president of a railroad and to speak at the Republican National Convention, and though his mind was eminently clear about a host of other subjects,[134] he replied feebly:

> From that day [the day of the attack at Harper's Ferry] to this I have had but a hazy view of dear John Brown's great work.... Now your bare proposition to write of this matter has given me another sleepless turn. In every such turn I fear a recurrence of my insanity....
>
> If you could defer your contemplated work until after my death...you would lay me under great obligations to your kindness. So, too, you would, if in case you write it before my death [you should] make as sparing a use of my name as possible.

"This pathetic response," says Sanborn, "unlike any that I had expected, affected me deeply, and showed me, to my sorrow, that I had too long delayed to ask the important question." He discussed Smith's letter

---

[133] Recollections, I, 230-231.

[134] Ralph Volney Harlow, Gerrit Smith: Philanthropist and Reformer (New York, 1939), p. 414. See also pp. 391-422, 474-482.

with Morton, Howe, and Phillips, who "differed in opinion as to what my duty was," and he answered Smith in a manner that was certainly, in my opinion, better than Smith deserved:

> I have delayed answering your note...because I did not wish to answer without due consideration. I am not satisfied that the course you suggest is the wisest or best; but such is my regard for your wishes in the matter...that I am willing to accede to it as far as concerns all mention of yourself.... I cannot pledge myself farther.[135]

Though Sanborn visited Smith for two days in July, 1874, "talking with the Smiths concerning the plans and achievements of Brown," and though Smith sent him in the next January a "Statement" in which he said, "I give an account of my acquaintance with some of John Brown's movements," Sanborn showed the statement to Morton and then wrote on the back of it these words: "According to the distinct recollections of Mr. Morton and myself, the above statement is incomplete, and fails to give the more important facts of the case. We can therefore make no public use of it."[136]

In the January, 1875, issue of the Atlantic Sanborn began a new series of five articles entitled "The Virginia Campaign of John Brown." As though he were anticipating Malin's study, Sanborn began:

---

[135] Recollections, I, 231-233. (The brackets in paragraph two of Smith's letter are Sanborn's.)

[136] Sanborn to Smith, Concord, November 18, 1872, in the Gerrit Smith Miller Collection, Syracuse University, reprinted in Recollections, I, 233-234; also 235-238. It should be noted that, with the exception of added punctuation in the date line, the changing of one other mark of punctuation, and the changing of an "until" in the original to a "till" in the printed version, Sanborn published this letter without alteration.

> [The short campaign of John Brown in Virginia] was the first decisive act of an inevitable tragedy, and such were its romantic features that, in the lapse of time, it will no doubt be gravely expounded as a myth to those who shall read American history some centuries hence. There seems to be no reason why John Brown, any more than William Tell, should escape this skeptical and generalizing spirit, which transforms history and even biography into a record of natural science.... Will there come a time when the Underground Railroad shall be regarded as typical of some geologic transition, and the foray at Harper's Ferry pass for the legendary symbol of a chemic reaction? Perhaps so; but in the mean time it will be best for those who know the matters of fact, just as they took place, to put these upon record, in order that this perversion or vaporization of genuine history may be deferred as long as possible.[137]

And his view of Brown as the recipient of divine grace is indicated in this passage:

> The work upon which he had entered was dangerous and even desperate; none saw this better than those who stood with him; but his commision was from a Court that could bear him out, whatever the results.... And can high courage and unselfish humility be less acceptable to the Heavenly Wisdom?[138]

But, Malin feels, Sanborn showed his ignorance of facts, for "he showed his ignorance of Brown's career in Kansas. . . . He mislocated the Brown settlement near Osawatomie in Lykins county, and he had Brown spend three successive summers in guerrilla warfare in Kansas, 1856, 1857 and 1858, a mistake which his own correspondence with Brown should have corrected." On the major issue of whether Brown had been present at Potawatomie, or had led a group which went on without him at Potawatomie, or whether Brown had himself committed murder—perhaps the most controversial issue of Brown's entire activities—Sanborn at this moment took this view:

---

[137] Sanborn, "The Virginia Campaign of John Brown," Atlantic Monthly (January, 1875) XXXV, 16. The four succeeding articles in this series appear on the following pages: February, pp. 224-233; March, pp. 323-331; April, pp. 453-465; May, pp. 591-600.

[138] Ibid., March, p. 331.

> On the 25th of May, while he was in another neighborhood, more than twenty miles distant, the so-called "Pottawatomie murders" took place; that is, the killing of the five pro-slavery partisans, Wilkinson, Sherman, and the Doyles, in the Pottawatomie district, by friends of Brown, though without his knowledge.[139]

Judge James Hanway, a prominent Kansas citizen, a friend and fighter at Brown's side and a voluminous writer for the newspapers, challenged Sanborn's version of the Potawatomie massacre, discarded Redpath, Webb, and Sanborn's theories and asked, "Why this studied attempt to excuse Brown from being an actor in the tragedy, when by all accounts he frequently asserted that he 'endorsed the deed'?"[140]

In 1878, Sanborn had the opportunity, says Malin, of "pursuing eagerly the establishment of his version of the John Brown Legend in the East" when he prepared a hundred-page biographical section called "Memoir of John Brown" for the Rev. Samuel Orcutt's History of Torrington, Connecticut.[141] Sanborn wrote to Redpath: "It is only a sketch for a fuller biography, which I mean to write this year and next, using the material I have, and what John Brown Jun. will put at my disposal." He congratulated Redpath on his book and said that as a result of a recent controversy involving Gerrit Smith's family, Smith's relationship to

---

[139] Ibid., February, p. 228.

[140] Malin, p. 349. Hanway was "Brown's most conspicuous defender in Kansas;" yet he had spent years trying to make people understand the facts of John Brown's life in Kansas, particularly the explosively controversial fact and fiction that surrounded the deaths at Potawatomie. See Chapter 12 of Malin's study, "Hanway's Challenge to the John Brown Legend in Kansas," pp. 310-343, for a complete knowledge of his efforts. The quotation used here appeared in his "John Brown's Parables," Lawrence, Kansas, Western Home Journal, February 4, 11, 18, 1875.

[141] Sanborn had the Memoir reprinted for distribution to some of his friends and to several libraries, where it may appear to be a separate publication.

John Brown was now public knowledge.[142] In a letter to Charles Dudley Warner dated March 6, Sanborn said, "I expect to take a hand before long in the Gerrit Smith business. Frothingham is perfectly right in his facts, but has not shown much tact in presenting them."[143] "This secret history of G. S.," he continued to Redpath, "has kept me from writing more than I have, for I could not appear as his accuser."[144]

Sanborn's Memoir pictured Brown as visualizing the Kansas troubles not merely as a battle against aggression but as the "battle ground of freedom." He again denied that Brown was at Potawatomie, declared that the insanity of John Brown, Jr. was caused by pro-slavery tortures, and his accounts of the battles at Black Jack and Osawatomie followed John Brown's accounts plus the glosses in Redpath.

---

[142] Hinton Papers, KSHS, reprinted in Malin, p. 364.

[143] This letter is in the Watkinson Library, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., to whom I am indebted for permission to reprint it. Sanborn was angry when he wrote: "At last, after many delays I send you an unbound copy of J. B. instead of a bound one, because the stupid binder has put all the Dr Howe heliotypes into the paper copies. I enclose a [Springfield] Republican slip containing some facts which do not appear in the little book. There are many misprints--the worst one calls Lewis Washington a great-grandson of G. W, whereas I wrote a greatgrandson of a brother of G. W, and it stood so in the copy as plain as possible." We could infer that Sanborn had done a rush job and had not read proof, or, if he had read proof, had not been able to make the printer change the final copy.

[144] Sanborn's reference to Frothingham is not explained, but he probably refers to O. B. Frothingham's Gerrit Smith, first edition, in which the author had tried, as tactfully as possible, to tell the truth about Smith's relation to John Brown without offending the family. He did not succeed either in truth or in tact, apparently, and the second edition, expurgated by Smith's daughter, leaves out the offending material. (Harlow, Gerrit Smith, p. 417, n. 69 and p. 454, n. 18.)

Hanway, of course, objected to Sanborn's treatment of the facts of Potawatomie,[145] to which Sanborn replied July 22:

> I am under obligations to you for your letter of the 6th inst. and will certainly give all due weight to the evidence you mention concerning the Pottawatomie killing affair. I will write to Mr. Adams[146] as you suggest, asking to see a copy of your communication.
>
> Mr. Redpath to whom I have quoted what you write me, says, "John Brown, Sr, was not at Potawatomie. A man who saw the killings and who took part in them, told me the story, and he said J. B. was not present. But he was only accidentally absent. He was 12 or 20 miles away, at some 'Creek' buying stores, if I rightly remember." This agrees with what Brown himself told me, as I remember it.
>
> I shall be glad however to hear and weigh the testimony on the other side. Mr. Charles A Foster, whom I know, and who met the men who killed the Doyles etc the next day or next but one says that neither John Brown nor John Brown Jr were present at the killing, and add that James Harris also told him so.[147]

---

[145] Malin states that this letter of July 6 to Sanborn is not available (p. 365). Hanway in 1856 in the spring had migrated to Kansas from Ohio, and had settled on Potawatomie creek in the township of the same name. He was a member of the Wyandotte constitutional convention in 1859, of the senate in 1860, and of the house of representatives of Kansas Territory in 1864 and 1869 (Malin, pp. 310-343). Hanway had written eight articles for the Ottawa, Kansas, Republic, beginning November 18, 1869, entitled "Reminiscences of Pottawatomie township, Franklin County Kansas," and revised two years later. His main point was that the facts of Brown's action at Potawatomie "did not discredit Brown, but, on the contrary, justified the act." (Malin's words, p. 310.) The complete versions of Hanway's main testimony, pieced together, appear in Malin, pp. 325-342.

[146] F. G. Adams was the secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society from February, 1876 till his death in 1899. "He was inclined to be a reformer, associating himself with anti-slavery, the Granger movement, woman suffrage, temperance and prohibition. He was not an extremist, however, and in his new office in the historical society held the scales fairly well balanced although personally inclined to favor the John Brown Legend." (Malin, p. 353.) By October, 1879, "he was fully committed to the Brown legend, even to the point of outright misrepresentation." (Malin, pp. 401 and 374.)

[147] Sanborn to Hanway, July 22, 1878, Hanway Correspondence, 1: letter B, reprinted in Malin, p. 365 (KSHS).

Adams at the Historical Society sent Sanborn some articles on John Brown clipped from newspapers, "almost certainly one or more of them . . . by Hanway," and the gift stimulated Sanborn to ask for Hanway's article "including the testimony of an eye witness, or a person claiming to be such." This final phrase with its insinuation, Malin thinks, is "typically Sanbornesque." Adams replied to Sanborn, enclosing the statement of James Townsley, of whom Judge Hanway had spoken. This statement and later more complete statements by Townsley, were, for Sanborn, earth-shattering, for Townsley had declared to Hanway:

> On divers occasions, and quite recently, James Townsley has stated to us as follows--to wit:--
>
> That he accompanied Old Capt. John Brown on the occasion of the Pottawatomie tragedy (so called) which occured [sic] on the 24th day of May 1856--that he states that he took the party, consisting of Old John Brown, and four of his sons, and a son in law, and one Wyans, and hauled them in his two horse wagon from the camp of John Brown, Jr on Ottawa Creek to Dutch Henry's Crossing where the tragedy occured, and that John Brown, Sr. did command the party and did order the killing of Wilkerson, Doyle and his two sons, and William Sherman, generally known as 'Dutch Bill.'
>
> Lane, Franklin Co — JOHNSON CLARK
> Kansas March 1878. — JAMES HANWAY
>
> Judge Valentine informs me, by letter that the said James Townsley also stated to him the same facts as above.
>
> J. H.[148]

[148] Two copies are in the files of the KSHS, the original in pencil, in what is probably Hanway's writing, though he did not sign. The second, in ink, is written by Hanway and includes the two signatures as above. Both are in the Hanway Papers, and the second is reprinted in Malin, pp. 363-364.

In November, 1878, that same year, the Springfield Daily Republican published an unsigned article about Richard Realf and his verse account of John Brown's "defense" of Lawrence.[149] The wife of the first governor of Kansas, Mrs. Sara T. D. Robinson, wrote a "characteristically vehement letter" to the Republican, stating that Brown had nothing to do with the defense of Lawrence, that he was not in command at the battle of Osawatomie, that if Brown was important in making Kansas a free state it was in his actions at Potawatomie, and that he went to Virginia because he'd given up producing a civil war between the North and South while in Kansas.[150]

Sanborn answered Mrs. Robinson's letter November 26, says Malin, "in that offensive sneering style he so often assumed when engaged in controversy. Mrs. Robinson and Sanborn seemed to thrive on controversy and this was their first encounter. Neither of them exhibited any spirit of either fairness or common courtesy."

> Sanborn alleged that Mrs. Robinson had drawn upon her memory instead of consulting contemporary sources. In particular he cited as final evidence John Brown's own account of the defense of Lawrence, of the battle of Osawatomie, and a hitherto unpublished letter written in June in which were described

---

[149] This appeared in the Springfield Weekly Republican, Friday, November 8, 1878, p. 2, col. 4, and I am indebted to Miss Margaret Rose, the reference librarian of the City Library Association, 220 State Street, Springfield, for the research she has done to track down the incomplete references in Malin, p. 367, n. 14. She also found an account of "Richard Realf's Suicide at San Francisco...," in the Daily Republican, Saturday, November 2, 1878, p. 4, col. 2.

[150] Miss Rose found this in the Sunday Republican, November 24, 1878, p. 2, col. 5 ("John Brown in Kansas: His Service and Importance There Disputed"). This completes Malin's footnote 14, p. 367.

> the events of May and June 1856.[151] He did not stop with quotation, but added his own interpretations which went further than what Brown had claimed. Regarding the Potawatomie affair he declared "that Brown was connected with this affair and approved of it, I have never doubted; that he was actually present he always denied to me, and I shall believe him until some eye witness proves the contrary. One eyewitness has told me two contradictory stories about it, and nobody has yet made public the whole truth."

Sanborn concluded his column with a most insulting remark, when he quoted Brown's opinion that at Lawrence[152] the leading men had decided in a very cowardly manner not to resist any process" which might be served, and, referring to Mrs. Robinson's husband, declared:

> If I mistake not, Dr. Charles Robinson, the husband of your Kansas correspondent, was one of the "leading men" whom Brown here censures. This fact, if it be one, may explain the pains taken by Mrs. Robinson to set aside the verdict of history.

It is difficult to imagine a sophisticated person allowing himself to engage in such ad hominem argument under any circumstances; it seems worse when Sanborn does it in the public prints. Then, too, as Malin points out, Sanborn had already expressed his belief that Brown was not present at Potawatomie, and, claims Malin, "there is no statement of his available in which he stated it as his opinion 'that Brown was connected with this affair.'" Strange, too, is his remark on the

---

[151] Brown to Sanborn, dated Near Brown's Station, K. T., June, 1856, reprinted in Sanborn, John Brown, pp. 236-241. Malin calls this "a notoriously misleading" letter. See Malin, p. 367, n. 15.

[152] Malin's version of the tangled story of the "sack" of Lawrence, Kansas, though difficult to follow, is approximately this: A major military conflict threatened between pro-slavery forces from Missouri and free-state forces concentrated in Lawrence. Geary, the new Kansas governor, desiring peace, led troops to Lawrence; a small force of Missourians arrived. After (perhaps) a brief skirmish, Gov. Geary was in command. (Malin, pp. 629-636.)

testimony of an eye-witness, for he had in his possession when he made the remark the testimony of James Townsley to Hanway and Clark. It is not possible that Townsley "told two contradictory stories about it," for "there is no record of any other statement by Townsley of that date that conflicts in any substantial manner."[153]

Mrs. Robinson answered Sanborn in a letter January 3, 1879, pointing out several errors of fact, such as Sanborn's misquotation of Brown on the defense of Lawrence, and the disagreement among the three eye-witnesses whom Sanborn had quoted. As for her husband's cowardly activities at Lawrence, he could not possibly have been at Lawrence, as he was being held in jail elsewhere at that time for treason.[154]

Sanborn's controversy with Mrs. Robinson astonished the truth-seekers in Kansas, but his brush with the wife of the former governor was mild compared to what came later. Among the principals to enter the controversy were Eli Thayer and G. W. Brown. Thayer, at an Old Settlers meeting in 1877, said that what had saved Kansas was the work he and his associates had done with immigration in the New England Emigrant Aid Company, an interpretation of history that gave no glory to Brown. The other principal was G. W. Brown, who, in publishing his Reminiscences of Old John Brown in the Lawrence Journal beginning in 1879, took the view that not only was John Brown responsible for the

---

[153] Malin, pp. 367-368.

[154] While governor, Robinson ignored a bogus pro-slavery legislature assembled in 1856, and, attempting to keep peace with the federal authorities too, he was indicted for treason and conspiracy by the pro-slavery party and was imprisoned at Lecompton.

Potawatomie massacre but he was not justified in doing so. When Governor Robinson himself was also attacked, he admitted that he had received credit for things he did not deserve and declared, "It is time for sensational history to give place to history based on facts, and that is why it is important to strip the romantic heroes of their borrowed plumes that they may be put upon the persons to whom they rightly belong," the free-state settlers.[155]

Sanborn saw his ikon being smashed and rushed into print December 3, 1879, with an attack that made him famous:

> The anniversary yesterday of John Brown's public murder in Virginia makes as good a time as any to consider the attacks now making in Kansas upon his memory, by Charles Robinson and his friends. These attacks are no new thing,--the old hero was always in the way of politicians. Dr. Robinson has been a politician most of his life, and in Kansas acted the politician's part.

Then, after comparing Brown to General Grant in the matter of the amount of human blood each shed, an argument he was to use often, he said:

> That John Brown was such a patriot-warrior, and is so honored by the world, few men outside of Kansas would attempt to deny. But in Kansas, ungrateful men and women, for one reason and another--old grudges, new hopes of a statue at Washington, or the natural antipathy that always exists between heroes and dastards--have undertaken the task of pulling down John Brown's reputation and setting up Charles Robinson's in the place of it. It is a dirty job, and has been with great propriety committed to another Brown--... Mud and filth are freely discharged by the combatants on both sides-- but, in the course of the billingsgate encounter, some historic facts

---

[155] Malin, on p. 379, does not give the precise source of this statement. The G. W. Brown and Eli Thayer theses appear on pp. 370-379.

> emerge from obscurity, and at least one historic doubt is in a fair way to be cleared up.... It is settled now, as to its main point--that John Brown did direct and approve the execution.... That he committed the deed with his own hand was never seriously maintained, and all that is now asserted by the malevolent ingrates of Kansas, is that he led the party which did the execution, and shot the first ruffian with his own pistol. This is the only important new charge made, and it rests on the second hand testimony of a certain "Mr. T" ...., doubtless, James Townsley.... There is no question that he is a very important witness, and in some degree an eye-witness.... He has not always told the same story, we understand he was himself a party to the execution, and therefore not an indifferent witness; and it is more than twenty-three years since the events took place.... This account [the Johnson Clark statement from the United States Biographical Dictionary] is intrinsically probable, in its main statements, --quite improbable in some of its particulars.

John Brown, Sanborn continued, did not shoot Doyle, in all probability, and the Townsley charge was therefore false, because Brown had told him that he had taken no part in the execution:

> The other declaration quoted as Brown's by Redpath, Sanborn and others, that he was not actually present at the execution, must, we think, be modified by the concurrent testimony of several witnesses, that he was at least in command of the party, and was near the place at the time. It is to be noticed that the men executed lived some distance from each other and it may have happened that Brown sent detachments to arrest the ruffians and dispatch them, while remaining himself apart from the actual deed. Brown's statements on the subject to the late Dr. Webb, of Boston, to James Redpath, to F. B. Sanborn and others, may have been understood by them in a broader sense than he intended.[156]

Though Sanborn did not sign this article which appeared in the editorial columns, "the authorship is unmistakable," Malin feels, "and was recognized at the time."

---

[156] [Sanborn?] Springfield Republican, Wednesday, December 3, 1879, p. 4, cols. 5 and 6, reprinted in the Topeka Commonwealth, December 18, 1879, and reprinted in part in Malin, pp. 380-381.

Sanborn is quick to point out the illogical arguments of others. It is pitiful to watch him accuse his opponent of fallacious reasoning while reasoning fallaciously and to hear him shout "dastard" and "ingrate" at those who attack his "Old Hero." For a man steeped in the best of philosophy, in the logic of Greece and Rome, it seems incredible that he could slip so readily into false generalization and name-calling, that he could so easily argue off the point, fail to define his terms, mistake the cause for the effect; that he could rationalize, commit errors of degree, sample his evidence inadequately, mistake opinion and inference for fact, and become incensed at the ad hominem and ad populum arguments of his opponents while opposing them with the same.[157]

Labelled "the dastard and ingrate attack" by his foes, Sanborn's column produced a series of demands in Kansas newspapers and correspondence that "living witnesses" step forth and state the truth. Though James Townsley had already related his version of the Potawatomie story, he repeated it--three columns of it--in the Lawrence Daily Journal for December 10, 1879. He stood by, he said, and watched John Brown shoot the elder Doyle. He heard John Brown say that he had to do it for the safety of the free-state settlers. He also proved that Redpath was not at all sure who had told him the version of the story that had been printed as fact and history in the first biography.[158]

---

[157] In the Atlantic for April, 1875, p. 463, n. 2, Sanborn speaks of Realf's use of "anacoluthon, or non-sequitur," though he uses it here to apply more to an error in rhetoric than to an error in logic.

[158] Malin, pp. 381-395.

It is impossible to present more than the main points in this war of words. Suffice it to say here that among some of the Kansans Sanborn was building up a bad name for himself, but that among others his self-justification gained support. Sanborn "seemed to be happy in his ignorance," wrote Governor Robinson, "and it would be folly to disturb his peace of mind with the truth," for the truth could not be found in "Sanborn's histories and romances." F. G. Adams, on the other hand, had so far accepted Sanborn's opinions that he read proof on Sanborn's John Brown when it appeared six years later. And Hanway declared, in commenting on Governor and Mrs. Robinson's position: "To cripple Sanborn the Governor attempts to cast away [sic] every conceivable odium on Sanborn's 'hero,' old John Brown. If he can accomplish this, of course Mr. Sanborn has no longer a hero in the person of old John Brown."[159] Kansas, too, could call names.

It is to Sanborn's everlasting credit, however, that on January 2, 1880, he wrote Redpath: "You and I must give in that the old hero was at Potawatomie and gave orders. I have this on private assurance of one who knows." Yet for two years Sanborn still had doubts, and in 1882 traveled to Kansas, which he saw for the first time in his life, to judge the evidence for himself. At the Hanway home he saw Hanway's letter to Redpath written in 1860 in which Hanway had given corrections of material in the biography and stated that he had sent the same material to Hinton, another biographer who had agreed with Redpath on

---

[159] Ibid., pp. 395, 396-7, 401, and 402 respectively.

most of the crucial issues. Sanborn admitted that it gave "the earliest account I have seen of the Potawatomie affair as it really was." In commenting on this, Malin says, "Could Sanborn have been so obtuse as not to realize that Redpath and Hinton had duped him and that Old John Brown himself had deceived him? Or had Sanborn once also known the truth and, knowing, lied?"

Sanborn also met John Hutchings, a Lawrence lawyer who had taken an active part in the feud. Sanborn decided to visit John Brown, Jr., on his way home to Concord to verify what Hutchings had told him of the Townsley statement, and wrote back to Hutchings August 29, 1882: "I have talked with the Browns about Townsley's statement. In the main it is true." That is to say, John Brown <u>had</u> shot the elder Doyle. Says Malin:

> One cannot but feel some sympathy for Sanborn, because, regardless of the issue of conscious earlier fabrications, it is difficult to doubt his sincerity on the main issue at this time.... Sanborn, and possibly the others, had come to believe in their own romancing.[160]

The next major phase in the controversy was begun by David N. Utter, a minister in a Unitarian church in Chicago and a member of the board of editors of the western paper of that church. In a letter to Mrs. Robinson he said:

> As I say in my reply, just sent, to the [<u>Christian</u>] <u>Register</u>, I am a voice from a new generation rising up to judge & condemn Brown not only for his continual failures but for that first great crime on the Potawatomie that had so large an influence in shaping his after career.

---

[160] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 403-404, and 315-320 ff. It is possible, Malin asserts, that this letter was not sent.

And to a larger audience in November, 1883, in the North American Review he wrote:

> To John Brown the fates had been unusually kind. His story fell upon a time when the world was eager for a hero, and when the people of the northern United States must make one of whatever material came to hand.... To hate slavery and to fight, these were the virtues in those days..., especially in New England's eyes.... The very fact that he had fought unlawfully added to his glory. No doctrine has ever been dearer to New England than the doctrine of the 'higher law.' This is an invisible and unwritten law which each man must find for himself, read and interpret for himself, and obey in his own way. If it leads him to disobey certain human enactments, so much the better....
>
> [Every sentence of his defense after Harpers Ferry] thrilled New England as though a prophet were speaking the very words of God. There arose in his defense, and to sing his praises, a company of men and women whose peers did not exist in America. They have made our history and written it, and they have made our literature. They made the public sentiment that abolished slavery, the sword that preserved the Union. When these men said, John Brown is a hero and a saint, the bravest and the cleanest of all the heroes of ancient and modern times, there was nothing for it but to accept the verdict.

Potawatomie, he said, could not be justified; Osawatomie was a fiasco, and John Brown ran for his life. As for Brown's "accounts of his exploits before his Eastern friends," they were "never modest" and "seldom truthful." Malin's comment on this is as follows:

> In this article Utter had committed at least four major offenses: The denial of justification for Potawatomie, denial of heroism at Osawatomie, branding Brown as "seldom truthful," but in some respects the most serious was his attack on the infallibility of the New England Transcendental Hierarchy, the self-appointed keepers not only of New England culture, but, according to their own estimates, of national civilization. The Brown Legend was largely of their creation and to expose the hoax was to strike a serious blow at the New England Tradition and one that might break the spell of its Authority. The deflation of other fakes and

> fakers would surely follow. More broadly, however, the Utter challenge was a phase of the New Realism of the late nineteenth century, which was overthrowing the mid-century romanticism and sentimentalism.[161]

Sanborn immediately attacked the Review for publishing Utter's article, stating that it "suffers from a system of irresponsible editing." Utter, he said, belonged to "the school of historians . . . which invents its facts and applies them to suit the audience, which spells every historic incident backward that it condescends to mention at all, and is as regardless of dates and sequences as a grasshopper is of dance-music."[162] Among the many exchanges, Sanborn replied to Utter's charge that Brown did not do what he expected "and not a slave was freed." Within nine years, he said, five million were freed—as though, says Malin, the Potawatomie murders were the direct cause of emancipation. Sanborn then said:

> What has this slanderer of the dead hero to offer against the unbroken testimony of history and the voice of mankind itself? Why he [Utter] says, "at the time of Brown's execution in Virginia, while the deluded abolitionists were exulting to the skies a man they did not know, a Free-State paper, the Herald of Freedom of Lawrence, was printing the plain unvarnished truth about him, and begging the republicans of America not to make a hero of him." The Herald of Freedom was incapable of telling the truth.

Sanborn concluded in his rebuttal by meeting specific charges with a comparison of John Brown and George Washington. Though the Topeka

---

[161] Malin, pp. 407-410.

[162] Malin, p. 410. "By his reference to dates and sequences [says Malin] he meant the justification argument which was based on an enumeration of supposed outrages against free-state men which justified Brown in retaliation."

Capital seemed to approve Sanborn's counter-attack, they said that "he claims quasi proprietorial rights in the fame of the old Abolition hero, and naturally falls afoul of the Kansas parson as a malicious trespasser."[163]

Sanborn's next public notice in the Republican was that Jason and John Brown, Jr. would reply to Utter's statements in the Review, if the editor would permit it, and that Sanborn's biography of Brown would appear within a few months, early in 1884. In another column, Sanborn declared that Townsley's statement was substantially true, but its errors would be corrected; the attack on Brown in Kansas was caused by jealousy among his rivals, but "it is too late in the day to make or refute such charges [as Utter makes]. Nobody can restore Arnold's name to honor, nor consign Ethan Allen's or Andrew Jackson's or John Brown's to infamy for cowardice or cruelty." In every great emergency, he said, God provides a superman to meet it when ordinary men fail. "Sanborn's most useful weapon was an attack on the motives or reputation of his opponents, rather than a statement of facts bearing upon the matter of issue," Malin feels.[164]

---

[163] Malin, pp. 410-411. This article, unsigned, appeared in the Sunday Republican, October 28, 1883, on the editorial page (p. 4, cols. 4-5).

[164] Malin's footnotes 15 and 17 and the second paragraph in the main text of his p. 411 are inaccurate and confuse what occurred. Malin does not realize he is quoting two articles instead of one. In one article in the Sunday Republican, November 18, 1883, p. 4, col. 3, someone (presumably Sanborn) states that the Browns will reply to Utter's statements if the editor of the North American Review will permit them. This article is headed "The Raid Upon John Brown."

The second article printed in this same issue on p. 6, col. 1, consists of a letter signed by David Utter, below which are four paragraphs unsigned which reply to Utter. In this the author (presumably Sanborn) replies to Utter with the statements which I have cited following the first sentence printed in my paragraph here.

Sanborn was, therefore, considerably dashed when the editor of the Review declined to print the articles of Jason and John Brown, Jr. "The reason given for this shabby conduct," said Sanborn, "is that The Review had engaged Senator Ingalls of Kansas to reply to Utter." Sanborn then attacked the Review for its "singular sense of justice and fair play."[165] When the Hartford Courant declared that John Brown's fame would be ruined if his friends did not refute Utter, Sanborn replied, "It is not very creditable to a New England newspaper to have nothing better to say."[166]

Jason's "pointless resumé of the Kansas struggle" was printed in the Republican that same day. In it, in replying to Utter's contention that John Brown's principles were those of Russian Nihilists, Jason said: "I doubt very much whether Mr. Utter knows anything about the principles of the Russian nihilists, and I would not accuse him of even using the truth expansively in that assertion." Malin pounces upon this and says, "That sentence is fatal. It was one of Sanborn's kind of sentences, not Jason's,—the word 'expansively' used in that manner was scarcely in Jason's simple vocabulary." And Malin is "convinced that Sanborn had a hand in preparing or more probably revising and editing Jason's letter."[167]

---

[165] "John Brown and His Sons," Springfield Sunday Republican, December 9, 1883, p. 4, col. 3, reprinted in part in Malin, p. 412.

[166] Ibid., December 2, 1883.

[167] This was probably an article entitled "Old John Brown: Jason Brown Answers the Calumniator of His Father" in the Sunday Republican, December 9, 1883, p. 7, cols. 3-4, reprinted in part in Malin, pp. 412-413. Malin's footnotes are somewhat confusing.

How all this contention affected New England we do not know, though Prescott Keyes, Sanborn's fellow townsman wrote Mrs. Robinson that he had always considered John Brown one "to be blindly worshipped," but that "I am afraid we here in Concord and New England have been too much dazzled by the side that Sanborn has taught us to look upon to realize that there was the other blacker side."[168]

A bitter battle followed between Sanborn and Robinson, both using tactics which were beneath them, Robinson receiving an article from a Chicago paper signed "S" contending that Robinson had ordered the massacre, and so on, Robinson finally printing this, in which he summed up Sanborn's states of mind:

> I sympathize with Sanborn in his dilemma, and would pity him were he not so conceited and vindictive. He has been driven from point to point till there is no place left for him to stand upon. He first said John Brown didn't do it, because he said he didn't. Driven from that position he then wanted to make it appear that it was the proper thing to do, as these men deserved death for their crimes. This position being found untenable he would like to make it appear that Lane and Robinson, or both, ordered it done. That proving to be absurd and impossible, he has arrived at the last ditch, and that is that murder, rapine and arson had become general in Southern Kansas and a blow must be struck, even if innocent men had to be dragged from their beds at midnight and hewn down with cutlasses in cold blood.[169]

This took place in January, 1884, but Robinson shot a most interesting round in February in a public exchange of letters with John Brown, Jr., when he pointed out that in 1877 Sanborn and young Brown had not

---

[168] Prescott Keyes to Mrs. Robinson, January 20, 1884, in the Robinson Papers, KSHS, reprinted in part in Malin, p. 414.

[169] Ibid., pp. 417-418.

admitted John Brown's participation at Potawatomie, and also at that time had not discovered that the massacre had saved Kansas. "This final point," Malin feels, "is tremendously important to the understanding of the evolution of Sanborn's defenses and Robinson brought it out clearly here for the first time."[170]

Sanborn was further irked when Amos Adams Lawrence presented two letters to the Massachusetts Historical Society and the story that he, as secretary of the Emigrant Aid Society, had given Brown a letter of introduction to Governor Robinson, but that the latter distrusted Brown because Brown showed no partiality between shooting federal officers and border ruffians. After an excited exchange of letters in the Boston Transcript during the summer months,[171] Sanborn waited for a dramatic moment to strike his crushing blow at Lawrence and Robinson. Choosing December, the anniversary of Brown's death, for his time and the august gentlemen of the Historical Society as his listeners, he dramatized his attack. In so doing, Malin feels, "Sanborn demonstrated preeminently his genius as a controversialist."

Sanborn hashed over a great heap of the old controversy, but saved his big find for the climax. While in Kansas in 1882 he had interviewed one Samuel Walker and had taken notes on the interview. As

---

[170] Malin, p. 425.

[171] Sanborn to Robinson, July 12, printed in the Transcript, July 18; Robinson to Sanborn, Transcript for August 15, Sanborn to Winthrop, December 2 and 4, in the Transcript for December 4 and 6, all 1884. Walker's letter of repudiation of Sanborn's statements about his testimony is dated December 14. Robinson Papers, KSHS (Malin, pp. 429-435).

Sanborn gathered from his interview, Walker stated that Robinson and Lane asked him to kill the border ruffians secretly, but Walker had refused. Sanborn then credited him with his own conviction that Robinson and Lane had proposed the murder to Brown, and it followed that Brown was acting upon orders. For Sanborn this night must have been an achievement for his prestige.

Unfortunately, within a few days, Walker himself repudiated Sanborn's account of the interview, and Walker's statement agreed, furthermore, with statements which he had previously made on the topic. The incident, says Malin, in which Sanborn's notes were placed over against the precise testimony "seriously discredits Sanborn as a witness."[172] This last point, of course, has serious implications for us in this study.

I shall not burden the reader with all the additional difficulties which Sanborn had with his public and private antagonists except to mention the major pain which he suffered when a new history of Kansas was written by a professor of English at the University of Kansas, Leveritt W. Spring, who referred to John Brown as a "parenthesis in the history of Kansas." In this instance Sanborn's method of discrediting what Malin labels "the best Kansas history of its time" which "in some respects has not been superceded" was to endorse in the Springfield Republican the growing determination of Kansas "that they will not have

---

[172]Malin, pp. 429-433.

Professor Spring teaching their young men and women in the state university at Lawrence. This looks like proscription for opinion's sake, if the professor's shallow judgment can be called opinion, which I doubt."[173]

Sanborn's long-awaited biography of John Brown appeared in 1885, printed by Roberts Brothers of Boston, and containing 645 pages, most of which is in fine print. In his introduction Sanborn wrote:

> Every year removes the actors and the witnesses of memorable deeds. I have therefore sought to preserve the record of one hero's life, in his own words (when I could), and in the contemporary evidence of those who saw and bore witness to what he did,—mingling myself with the account as little as possible, except for attestation and comment, when doubt might else arise. The plan was at first to print all the extant letters of BROWN, which I fancied would easily find place in a volume of four hundred pages; but I have in my hands letters enough to fill another book, and have not been able to use them.... I have aimed at accuracy, but of course have not always succeeded; and have necessarily omitted much that other writers will supply. My intention has been to put the reader in possession of evidence which either verifies itself or can readily be verified by a little research. Holding the key to much that has heretofore been obscure or ill related, I have furnished the true connection between events and persons where, in some cases, this had escaped notice. I shall gladly receive any correction of mistakes, but shall not pay much regard to inferential and distorted statements which traverse my own clear recollections,—supported, as these often are, by written evidence which I have not here printed, but hold in reserve.

---

[173] Sanborn's Republican column, reprinted in the Topeka Commonwealth, December 16, 1885, reprinted in part in Malin p. 438.

He acknowledges, among others, Higginson, Morton, Mrs. Stearns, "among the living"; and Dr. Howe, Phillips, Stearns, "and many more, who are now dead."[174] Of those "gentlemen of Kansas" he mentions Wilder and F. G. Adams, and he is "also indebted to" Redpath, Hinton, and Frederick Douglass. "I might include," he continues, "in this acknowledgment a few malicious slanderers and misjudging censors of BROWN, who by their publications have caused the whole truth to be more carefully searched out."[175]

Excepting the opinion of the Nation, Sanborn's major effort received frightful reviews. Said the critic in the Nation, "The present year seems likely to be remarkable for its series of authoritative biographies of men prominent in American history or literature," and he continued, "A laborious and almost exhaustive effort in that line is Mr. Sanborn's memoir of John Brown."

> For the first time [he continued] we have now the full facts, the correspondence, the contemporary testimony upon which the whole story rests. These have been collected with unwearying care, and are reproduced with a fullness of detail that would be excessive but for the historic interest of the subject. The claim made for Captain Brown as "Liberator of Kansas and Martyr of Virginia" will doubtless call forth criticism, as does every attempt to insert an epigram in the title-page; but it must be admitted that Mr. Sanborn exhibits his evidence as well as his verdict.

In general the reviewer felt that "Mr. Sanborn's book will always remain the permanent thesaurus of knowledge in regard to John Brown and

---

[174] D. W. Wilder was the compiler of the Annals of Kansas, and "wielded great prestige in newspaper circles, politics and Kansas history." He also wielded one of the most libelous pens in Kansas, writing pure nastiness—with Sanborn—in his remarks against Spring's history. (Malin, pp. 437-438.)

[175] Pages vi-vii.

his enterprise; it can never be superseded, because no other writer will combine the same opportunities and the same zeal." As to such specific interpretations as the Potawatomie massacre, the reviewer objected to calling the affair an "execution," which "implies the co-operation of judge, jury, counsel, witnesses, and the sheriff." He then declared:

> There is only one way to save Brown's moral character and his mental equilibrium in the presence of such a transaction, and that is to assume that he was divinely inspired in the Old Testament sense.... This Mr. Sanborn assumes with such high assurance that we wonder why he "long refused to believe that Brown participated in these executions."... Was this belief in Brown's divine inspiration incomplete until the proof of his participation in the massacres was complete?.... But the Potawatomie ghost will not down even in Mr. Sanborn's sight.... [As for the labored argument that if Brown was a murderer so was General Sherman] this part of Mr. Sanborn's work is so full of pernicious teaching that criticism is puzzled to know where to begin or leave off.... The teleological point of view gets the better of the historical in Mr. Sanborn's book constantly.

As for Sanborn's abilities as annalist and editor, the critic felt he had done his work "with great research and thoroughness" although "there is sometimes a certain amount of inflation in his tone, and there are more serious literary faults. It is curious to note in him how the habit of journalism works both ways--to condense comment, but to amplify quotation." Though some pruning of unessential material could have been done, he continued, Brown's letters "will be the subject of renewed study, for many years, from all possible points of view."[176]

---

[176] "Sanborn's John Brown," The Nation (October 15, 1885), pp. 324-325.

Leonard Woolsey Bacon, the critic for the New Englander and Yale Review, in writing the lead article for the April number, began: "It is rarely that we have taken up a book with larger expectations, and laid it down with a completer disappointment, than Mr. Sanborn's Life of John Brown," and he continued:

> There was everything to encourage us to expect a book of incomparable interest and value. There was the most heroic and statuesque figure in recent history to be delineated. There was the most thrilling episode in the epic of American emancipation to be narrated. There were some of the most characteristic scenes of American life to be depicted, tender, grotesque, awful, pathetic or sometimes of idyllic beauty. And the author seemed just the man for the work. He is a writer of unquestionable ability and good taste, both in prose and in verse. He has an honorable record of devotion to humane enterprises.

He sketched Sanborn's work as a member of the Secret Six, as a person intimately connected with Brown and the survivors of Brown's family, and as "the depositary of ample stories of authentic material, which he has increased by his own diligence." And Sanborn had "set his hand to the task" "at the right point of time, when the lapse of a quarter-century had just ripened the subject for the most effective treatment." Then the critic continued:

> By what effort of intellect he has been able to avoid producing one of the great biographies of all literature, it is not easy to understand. But he has avoided it with complete and impressive success. There are good sentences in the book, and even good pages; and there are abundant good materials; but the book is a literary failure.
>
> The author's main fault is his inability to tell a consecutive story. He deals freely in the pluperfect and future perfect tenses; and the reader is continually annoyed by announcements of what he is coming to by-and-by, and explanations of matters that had failed of due mention in their proper places. In this zig-zag fashion the story

> hitches along, and at the end of it one feels a vast profusion of unnecessary and unimportant details has crowded out matters of essential importance to the mere understanding of the story, to say nothing of things that would have contributed immensely to heighten the vividness and picturesqueness, and thus the substantial truthfulness of it.

Furthermore, the critic felt that Sanborn failed to appreciate that he was writing for a new generation and had failed to realize that they did not know the people he was talking about. Also he had given but mere passing mention to the "army of crusaders" who settled Kansas, to Brown's companions, and to "the immense tableau at the end" grouped around the scaffold, which gives "an opportunity for historical painting that is almost wasted." However, he continued, "the worst thing in Mr. Sanborn's book is his acrimonious attack on the officers of the Free State government of Kansas for taking the only attitude toward John Brown and his proprio Marte campaigns and 'executions' which it was reasonable or possible for them to take."

The critic then spent the greatest portion of his review criticizing Sanborn's justification of Brown's most-questioned acts. Sanborn's argument that Brown was no worse a murderer than Grant and Sherman was "deplorable drivel," for, he maintained,

> It is one thing to prove that Brown acted with an honest, righteous and unselfish purpose; it is a second thing to show that the effect of his act seemed to be good; and it is quite a different thing from either, to maintain that it is right for a private person, having satisfied himself that certain individuals deserve death, and that society would be better off without them, to call five men out of their beds at night, and split their skulls successively with a cutlass. But Mr. Sanborn does not clearly see the distinction, nor perceive that the only one of his arguments in vindication of his hero which is tenable, is the argument of self-defense, which seems, from his ex-parte statement, to be well sustained.

The best excuse that can be made for Sanborn is "to remember that he learned his casuistry among those shining lights of ethical science, the non-resistant abolitionists of Boston." As for the six gentlemen who "abetted the wild scheme" there was "neither lunacy nor any appreciable amount of heroism in their part of the business, to be pleaded in mitigation of their folly."

> Two conditions [he said] are necessary to justify armed insurrection against established government: first, a righteous cause; second, a reasonable prospect of success.... Never, since the beginning of government, has there been more righteous cause for rebellion than was found in the Virginia of 1859, and never a more unselfish heroism than in the attempt of John Brown. But of this attempt his confederate and biographer writes: "even now, as we look back on it, it seems devoid of the elements which would make success possible" (p. 122). Now to make an attempt at insurrection that is devoid of the possibility of success is wrong; the impressive and unlooked-for piety of Mr. Sanborn's reflections on the later outcome of the affair do not justify it; and the argument that divine providence used it for the furtherance of beneficent ends is very much like the old argument that we used to hear in defense of negro slavery, and not one whit more tenable.
>
> The argument of a special revelation to John Brown, "making known God's will to him in advance," as to a "prophetic, heaven-appointed man," ...we seem to find in the pages of our Concord friend a transcript from some old-fashioned commentator on Joshua and the Judges.... But who is to be the judge of the measure of heroism, and of the evidence of supernatural revelation, requisite to suspend the obligation of divine and human laws, he does not inform us. In the case of the Virginia invasion, this delicate function was assumed by such eminently discreet persons as Mr. Higginson, and Mr. Gerrit Smith, and young Mr. Sanborn, whose youth might be pleaded in his excuse, did he not repeat his folly in his maturity....
>
> ...Of such inward transactions between the prophetic soul and God, the administration of public justice can take no cognizance.
>
> ...No government can suffer a hostile invasion of its territory to go unpunished, even when it is undertaken with a permit from Mr. Sanborn.

In general, said Bacon, "the world has yet to wait for the Life of John Brown to be written."[177]

J. T. Morse, writing in the Atlantic that February, was no kinder. "So grand a subject cannot fail in time to inspire a writer able to do justice to the theme; and when such an one draws Brown, he will produce one of the most attractive books in the language. But in the meantime the ill-starred 'martyr' suffers a prolongation of martyrdom, standing like another St. Sebastian to be riddled with the odious arrows of fulsome panegyrists." Furthermore, he declared:

> With other unfortunate men of like stamp, he has attracted a horde of writers, who, with rills of versicles and oceans of prose, have overwhelmed his simple, noble memory beneath torrents of wild, extravagant admiration, foolish thoughts expressed in appropriately silly language, absurd adulation inducing only protest and a dangerous contradictory emotion. Amid this throng of ill-advised worshipers, Mr. Sanborn, by virtue of his lately published biographical volume, has assumed the most prominent place.

The critic admitted, however, that he had not worked "wholly to ill purpose, for he had been industrious in collecting and liberal in printing letters and original papers which will doubtless be of great service to the true biographer, who in time will surely come." The major portion of Morse's review covered most of the Sanborn arguments of justification and rationalization which Bacon had attacked, and need not be repeated here. His remarks on Brown's place in history are, it seems, pertinent to this chapter, for they show what a distinguished New England magazine, the Atlantic Monthly, may have been thinking:

---

[177] Volume IX (new series), XLV (complete series), (April, 1886), 289-302.

> [Mr. Sanborn] appears to say that the civil war and emancipation proceeded from the Osawatomie foray as directly as a tree springs from a seed,--an absurd, extravagant assumption. In fact, on the contrary, the results of this and of the Harper's Ferry raid were almost insignificant. They stimulated discussion, intensified passion, affected transitorily the emotions; they were forerunners--those who like the word may call them omens--of what was to come, but they were not efficient causes of great practical effects.... At the time of their doing, these acts neither led the reason, nor strengthened the convictions, nor aroused the consciences of people outside the pronounced anti-slavery ranks. It was Garrison, primarily, with Parker and Phillips and the other talkers, of whom Brown spoke contemptuously, who were really bringing the minds and hearts of the Northern people to the condition necessary in order to make the war a possibility and emancipation an inevitable result.... Brown is chiefly valuable thermometrically, as showing to what degree of heat persons were arriving in this antislavery business between 1856 and 1859.... It was because others were nearly as hot as he, and because at each small remove from the same measure of heat the multitudes who felt the lessened warmth greatly increased, that his position is valuable to the historian. He was not a man who induced many to follow him, who convinced men and caused them to cohere and persist, through permanent influences of reason and the sense of right. He startled people and set them talking, excited all and repelled most.[178]

One wonders, as he finishes this review, if Morse considered Sanborn one of the "talkers" and whether Sanborn's probable wrath at such reviews were in any way modified by Morse's point of view.

Other reviews need not be quoted except to show in general their stand on the book. The Catholic World agreed with the Nation's attitude toward Sanborn's biographical procedure. It stated in definite terms that the doctrine "that the final standard of right and wrong

---

[178] [J. T. Morse,] Atlantic Monthly, LVII (February, 1886), 272-275. Though this article was unsigned, Morse is given as the author in both Villard and Malin.

is every man's own fancy" fit every fanatic who disturbs society--Brown and the New England radicals of the mid-nineteenth century generally.[179]

In the British Academy, the reviewer thought Sanborn's book completely trustworthy but "certainly heavy reading." Of John Brown and his companions he differed from the rest of the reviewers as to their importance:

> The glory of John Brown and of his companions is not that they were instrumental in liberating a race, or that they were on this side or that in politics and public movements, but that they were single-minded.... Such men do not merely save men from physical bondage; they are the redeemers of the world.[180]

The most thoroughly hostile review was that by David Utter in the Dial, but as we have seen his point of view, we need not repeat his ideas here. "In spite of this unanimity in condemning Sanborn's handling of his subject," says Malin, "the book ran through four editions and for a generation was the leading work on John Brown, as Redpath's had been for the preceding twenty-five years."

There were other more private reactions to Sanborn's biography. Mrs. George Luther Stearns, his colleague's widow, after failing to get a publisher for an essay on Brown by Von Holst, a German liberal, wrote Richard Hinton: "F. B. S. had contrived to make the hero so unpopular in Boston, and its vicinity that no publisher would touch the manuscript tho Von Holst's name carried such weight. It was only by the payment of an exhorbitant sum that I could manage to put it into print."[181]

---

[179] January, 1886.

[180] The Academy, XXIX (February 20, 1886), 122-124.

[181] Mrs. George L. Stearns to Richard Hinton, March 3, 1895, in the Hinton Papers, KSHS, reprinted in part in Malin, p. 444.

Sanborn, however, did not stop writing about John Brown after he completed the 1885 biography. The first volume of his autobiography, Recollections of Seventy Years, published when he was seventy-six, is virtually a third biography of Brown, though it emphasizes Brown's relations with Sanborn and the other members of the New England conspiracy. "Mr. Sanborn has written and spoken so often about Brown," said the critic in the Nation, "that one might wonder that he had anything more to say." But, said the critic, "Considering the acrimony with which every detail has been fought over hitherto, Mr. Sanborn's uncontroversial spirit is as refreshing as it is unexpected. He has exchanged gall for rosewater." The merit of the volume, the critic felt, was in the fact that Sanborn furnished a good many unpublished Brown letters and that he inserted others in this volume that had been scattered about through many other previous publications. But, commented the critic, "The reader will not get from him a final, symmetrical chronicle--for Mr. Sanborn's mind is too miscellaneous to produce a finished work of art--but he will learn many indispensable facts."[182]

The writing of biographies of Brown did not stop with Sanborn; in all, thirteen biographies and the study by Malin have appeared. In 1894, Richard Hinton, Brown's associate in Kansas, printed his John

---

[182] "Frank Sanborn's Reminiscences," The Nation, LXXXIX (July 22, 1909), 76-77.

Brown and His Men, a book that has in it "a wealth of detail," a work which "must be used by any one writing a rounded story," though it requires re-checking, for it is "irresponsible."[183] Next, Joseph Chamberlin in his biography became something of a special pleader for George Luther Stearns.[184]

With the turn of the century came the work of William E. Connelley, who had been encouraged by Sanborn, Wilder, and Hinton to demonstrate "an especial peeve" which he had for the Robinson forces.[185] And of "no great value" are the works of John Newton (1902), who contributed a re-write, and William E. B. Dubois (1909), who stressed the part the Negroes played in the Harper's Ferry plot, but added nothing new.[186]

---

[183] Personal letter from Boyd B. Stutler to me, July 4, 1952. Stutler's more complete criticism follows: "Richard J. Hinton...was not as intimate and as deeply involved as his writings would lead the reader to believe. He has a wealth of detail and his work must be used by any one writing a rounded story, but requires re-checking. Hinton was notoriously careless in setting down names, dates and places - and was inclined to stretch his connection with the events of the times." "Irresponsible" is Malin's word: "Hinton's biography...is typical of Hinton, the irresponsible."

[184] Malin, pp. 444-445. Says Stutler: "The little work written for the Beacon Biography series by Joseph E. Chamberlin (1899) has merit of compression. It should be better known." Joseph Edgar Chamberlin, John Brown (Boston, 1899), 138 pp.

[185] William Elsey Connelley, John Brown (Topeka, Kansas: Crane, 1900), 426 pp. Says Stutler: "[He] was a Kansas historian and his book (1900) deals more extensively with the Kansas interlude. He was also a pro-Brown controversialist, with an especial peeve at the Robinson group, and particularly with George W. Brown and his writings (Brown's first anti-Brown pamphlet was solicited and paid for by Charles Robinson.) Says Malin: " [It] was highly partisan, and besides, made no contribution to knowledge." (p. 459.)

[186] John Newton, Captain John Brown of Harper's Ferry (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1902), 288 pp. Malin does not mention Newton. Stutler says of him and Walter Hawkins: " [They] can be dismissed as rewriters (their books were published in England), drawing their material from published American biographies." Malin does not mention Walter Hawkins, Old John Brown (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1913), 117 pp.

But in 1910 appeared Oswald Garrison Villard's John Brown: a Biography Fifty Years After, which "stands head and shoulders above the group, in presentation of fact, in detail of exact research, in approach with as nearly complete unbiased mind as such a character will admit, and in his evaluations."

> As proof of the impartiality of his work, the book was not pleasing to the Brown family, Sanborn (who was very critical and somewhat abusive in his reviews), and other Brown partisans. At the same time it was assailed by the anti-Brown group, represented chiefly by the Robinson element in Kansas.[187]

In general, as Malin says, "The reviewers gave Villard's book the highest praise for thoroughness of research and accuracy of judgments and fairness of point of view." Yet Malin himself says that "the net conclusion must be that Villard made little original contribution to the Brown question beyond the revelations of the Townsley period, but he gave a dignified and independent, although favorable, restatement for the benefit of the third generation."[188]

---

[187] Letter from Boyd B. Stutler.

[188] Malin, pp. 478-485. Malin also complains that Villard allowed his literary secretary, Katherine Mayo, to examine materials and interview persons; that he "did not subject his authorities to a systematic historical criticism with particular reference to the evolution of their testimony;" that he was hostile and biased against the members of the Kansas State Committee in Mass.; that "he exploded myth after myth in the most thorough-going manner and then accepted uncritically other myths of no greater or even less authenticity, or drew conclusions quite at variance with the facts."

Thomas Wentworth Higginson wrote in his copy of the first edition, now in Stutler's possession: "One of the most remarkable books in existence, to which my Boston collection [of letters in the Boston Public Library] contributed largely, I verifying many points in it. I read it in proof but made no suggestions, not wishing to take responsibility. I have gone through it hastily for the first time and have not found a single misprint & only [a] few suggestions for a new edition in it. Two passages referring to Howe & Sanborn were omitted out of [word omitted] on my part."

Sanborn was very much alive when Villard's book appeared, though then in his seventy-eighth year, and took a whack at him in The Outlook for April, 1911. He referred to him as Brown's "guesswork historian," and said: "In that combination of past and future which constitutes the grand peut-être or impossible might-have-been [,] Mr. Villard excels," and blasted away in a rather childish fashion:

> Dr. Abbott praises the impartiality of Mr. Villard; in this case it must have been the impartiality of ignorance.[189] Now, more than half a century later, partisan exaggeration still continues, to which is added the bias of long-cherished personal hatred and jealousy of reputation.... Nobody familiar with facts at the time they occurred as events would believe the testimony of Charles Robinson or G. W. Brown, unsupported by others.... Mr. Villard cites the testimony of all sorts of persons, good witnesses and bad, swift witnesses and slow, and prints a great deal which is evidence and a great deal which is not. He does not seem capable of drawing sound inferences from his own collection of testimony.

And at this point Sanborn had the audacity to quote the testimony of an anonymous "old Kansas resident (better acquainted with the facts of the war of 1856 . . . than any other man known to me, now living)." Sanborn held Brown to be "the peer of Leonidas, Joan of Arc, Cromwell, Garibaldi, and Toussaint L'Ouverture," and so on, and reiterated that he "was recognized a hero by Victor Hugo, by Garibaldi, by Emerson, Phillips, Parker, Garrison, Thoreau, Higginson, and many others, who

---

Through the generous courtesy of the Boston Public Library, I have in my possession most of the Higginson-Sanborn correspondence on microfilm. Sanborn wrote several bitter and angry letters to Higginson to try to prevent his letters from being presented to the library authorities and thus to public view, but his pleas came to nothing.

[189] Lyman Abbott had reviewed Villard's book in "John Brown: A Review and an Impression," The Outlook, XCVII (February 4, 1911), 273-5.

knew him and could read with ease the outlines of his simple and grand character." Then, in one of the most vivid examples of the Sanborn mind at bay, he declared:

> I have watched the course of emotions in the ambitious nature of Mr. Garrison's grandson; and as he guesses at motives in other men, whether he knew them or not, I may be allowed the same liberty of guessing at his motives--since I do know him. Being a partisan journalist (not a good training for impartial history), he set out to contradict much of the current belief about Brown. He denied Brown's descent from the Mayflower company...; he represented John Brown as a restless, dissatisfied wanderer from place to place, which was no more and no less true of him than of St. Paul, of King Alfred, of Columbus, of Franklin.... He tries the theory that Brown was insane..., but he does not know what true insanity is. He guesses at Brown's character in the mass, and, of course, guesses wrong; but overcome at last by the dignity and romantic heroism of Brown's nature, Mr. Villard throws aside his contradictions, and acclaims him as an inspiring champion of liberty against oppression. May Dr. Abbott do the like!

Though Villard was the best of Brown biographers, four writers followed. Hill Peebles Wilson "was a hatchet-man hired to do a hatchet-man's job." When Villard's work appeared in 1910, Wilson wrote Mrs. Robinson that he proposed to write a book to "reverse a popular verdict recently secured by Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard" that John Brown's actions in Kansas[190] were "altruistic." The same year (1913) appeared the rewrite by Walter Hawkins, followed twelve years later by Robert Penn Warren's John Brown: The Making of a Martyr.

---

[190]John Brown: Soldier of Fortune. Stutler says: "To one who knows the background Wilson's book is thoroughly discredited and if used at all should be used with the greatest caution.... He proposed [to write the book] for $5,000 - Mrs. Robinson signed a contract with him to do the work. Wilson took the precaution to have his contract recorded in the county office of record; Mrs. Robinson died before the work was published and the executors refused to pay. Wilson had borrowed money on the contract, and therefore had to go to court to collect. He got his $5,000. His book had a second edition in Boston." See Malin, pp. 485-487 and 459 ff.

which "followed the Wilson or Southern point of view. . . , although in less extreme form." Warren's "real contribution, however, was in the analysis of Brown's prison period, wherein he demonstrated that Brown was uncandid, contradictory and untruthful."[191] In 1935 appeared David Karsner's John Brown: Terrible Saint, a rather odd piece of work, for, although Karsner was "a prolific Socialist propagandist," he had not profited sufficiently from the scholarship before him "even to give John Brown an orientation within the Marxian frame of reference"--which would not have been hard to do. In fact, according to Stutler, the latest biography of Brown was published fairly recently in Russia, and Brown now appears as the hero, philosopher, and darling of the Communist Party.

It is almost amusing to watch the pecking system at work among the biographers of John Brown. Malin's study, for example, appeared in 1942, and in it he critically evaluated most of the thirteen biographies. Villard, then, in the new and revised edition of his book a year later, was able to evaluate Malin's study and called it "the

---

[191] Malin, pp. 487-488. Stutler says: "Robert Penn Warren is another matter. I consider his work secondary to Sanborn and Villard; the only difference being in attitude and approach, and of course in conclusions which were probably pre-conceived. His work reflects but very little of original research, but it does reflect a lot of Villard. But it does have its points, though biased, in stimulating study of controversial events from the viewpoints of the pro-Brown Sanborn, the pro-Southern Warren, and the nearly as could be impartial Villard. Warren's studies did not take him too deeply into the subject from delving into original sources. For instance, he uses a good part of Villard's bibliography with its errors in certain names and a couple of non-existent publications. His work as an anti-Brown exponent must be distinguished from that of Hill Peebles Wilson and for good reasons stands on a much higher plane."

most important book on John Brown of late years." It was typical of Villard's fairmindedness to say, "It is wholly anti-John Brown and devoted to destroying the 'myth,' with special criticisms of Villard's John Brown and all other biographies. It is the product of enormous research and contains many heretofore unpublished facts."[192]

All this leads us now to an evaluation of Sanborn's biography by our contemporary critics so that we may see where Sanborn stands today in the long line of biographers. Stutler, whose new biography of John Brown will appear in the spring of 1953, says:

> Sanborn's Life and Letters of John Brown is of the utmost value, particularly for the long series of letters and for certain details set out fully and completely. Generally, he is accurate as to names, places and dates in relating the story; the chief defect is in special pleading and in eulogy - for Sanborn was not without interest personally. He has been charged with manhandling the John Brown letters and of suppression of vital facts - but a close study will, I think, prove that in the letters at least the "suppressions" were merely omission of non-essential statements. I think he was thoroughly honest in his presentation of the story as he knew it and saw it - but his radical thinking at times led him down strange paths.

As for the accuracy of Sanborn's editing, Stutler says:

> I have tried as best I can to find the letters (originals) which have to do with the most controversial events and my conclusion is that Sanborn, in changing the language, was not attempting to hide or "suppress," but was simply trying to translate Brown's rough-hewn language into something like Harvard English. Villard reconstructed several of the letters, including the Owen Brown autobiography, and I think he came to the same conclusion. Sanborn was an intellectual snob of the Harvard breed; strongly impressed with his own superiority, and with an inordinate love for basking in the light of reflected glory - such as his association with the Concord intellectual group and, in a lesser way, John Brown.

---

[192] Villard, p. 709a.

> You have no doubt seen the Boston Public Library Quarterly for October, 1951, in which Walter Harding takes him apart for tampering with a Thoreau letter. He over-edited the Brown letters in the same way. But all in all, his Life and Letters, supplemented by his other writings, is indispensable.

This saga of Sanborn's interest in John Brown has been long. As Villard said in his review of Malin's study in the Saturday Review of Literature nine years ago, "As long as there are two Kansans alive they will be at each other's throats over John Brown, the hero and the murderer."[193] Or, as Governor Robinson said in his reply to one of Sanborn's bitter attacks: "Neither [Sanborn] nor I can change permanently the current of history. Disinterested gleaners will gather every strand, & sooner or later every actor will stand in his true light not excepting John Brown, F. B. Sanborn & the writer."[194]

This material has shown the development of Sanborn's attitude toward the crucial issues of Brown's life, the development of his interest in writing Brown's biography, and his development as a scholar.

Of course, development may not be the precise word here. Like all words, it has different connotations for different people. For many, the word development connotes change. In some ways, Sanborn's interest in Brown and his attitude toward him cannot be said to have developed, for it never changed. Sanborn took the pledge to defend Brown's memory from those who attacked it, and he never repudiated this pledge.

---

[193] Volume XXVI (June 26, 1943).

[194] Robinson's letter to the Boston Transcript, July 22, 1884, printed August 15, 1884, and reprinted in Malin, p. 449.

Unfortunately, Sanborn's philosophy of biography is all too clearly stated in a letter to Villard, who was calling on Sanborn for material for his new life of Brown:

> What I would like to guard biographers against is what I notice in your Howe letter,-an effort to change the world's verdict on heroes. It cannot be done; and passing time only makes it more favorable to the true hero. The multitude often make mistakes,-but not so many as the learned do; and the mass of men, after some time be past, know their friends from their foes. They do not mistake La Fayette for Mirabeau, or Leonidas for Xenophon, or a martyr for a lunatic. Securus judicat orbis terrarum; and men like Emerson and Parker and Thoreau anticipate the world's judgment.[195]

Is it possible that Sanborn believed that once a label is placed upon a man, he is forever to bear that label? Did he fear that this young gentleman--the course of whose emotions he had been watching--would put aside the verdict of History, who had already recorded that Sanborn's biography was definitive? It is a curious attitude indeed. Was it the product of rationalization, self-deception, or justification? Could Sanborn have believed what he was saying?

What does all this evidence show of Sanborn's qualifications as a scholar? For many, the criteria of good scholarship are intelligence, emotional control, the ability to distinguish fact from inference, opinion, and judgment; scholarship demands a willingness to draw inferences and conclusions with care, a willingness to accept the truth even though it hurts. Sanborn had sufficient basic intelligence to be a good scholar. But it seems to me he did not always use his intelligence.

---

[195] Sanborn to Villard, Concord, October 28, 1909, in the John Brown Papers, Special Collections, Butler Library, Columbia University. (I have a photostat copy of this.)

He was too easily moved by his emotions, particularly his joys and hates. His vindictiveness and conceit did not allow his mind to operate. His preconceived belief in John Brown allowed him no other interpretation. And even worse than that: it allowed no one else's.

Guard against changing the world's verdict on heroes, he wrote Villard, which was to say, guard against changing Sanborn's verdict. For the Sanborn verdict was, to begin with, the verdict of Emerson, Parker, and Thoreau.

Sanborn's blindly loyal defense of John Brown does not condemn the other works he published, for he did not always labor under the same preconceptions, he did not always have the same ax to grind and the same self to justify. When a man sees a prophet attacked--one of the minor prophets to some people but a Son of God to him--that man may not be responsible for what he does. But the world still has the right to hold him responsible. Sanborn's other activities did not always carry with them the romantic overtones and implications that were gathered together in the soul and body of John Brown.

The third main endeavor of Sanborn's political career occurred from February 14, 1863, to October 2, 1863, when he was editor of the Free-Soil Boston weekly, The Commonwealth. The paper had been started six months before by Howe, Stearns, and Stearns' brother, and "the reasons that led to it" were clearly described in a letter Sanborn wrote to Gerrit Smith:

> 1st A desire to have a newspaper which could freely criticize the action of the Government without suspicion of being disloyal or unfriendly to the cause of Freedom, avoiding, at the same time, some of the prejudices attaching to the Liberator and such papers.
>
> 2nd The low condition of the daily press in Boston, where it has been almost impossible to get any timely and true word said, and where there is an unconquerable tendency to ignore the antislavery principles which Massachusetts has always maintained.
>
> 3rd The hope that such a paper might become a center of thought and influence, and in time, becoming a daily, exert, (more wisely) the power which the Tribune has wielded.[196]

The backers of the enterprise early enlisted as its first editor Moncure Daniel Conway. In its first issue published September 6, 1862, Conway declared in an editorial that the new weekly was the organ of no political party or individual, that it would be critical of the Administration, and that he was "asking for justice that was above governments and the will of the people." But within a month trouble began to brew between him and his backers and on October 11th he printed the following statement over his name:

> In the second number of the Commonwealth my name appears as the editor of this paper. But it subsequently appearing that the forces and persons which would naturally communicate with the public through this medium were in number and importance such as to make it improper to identify any single individual, my name was withdrawn at my request. I take this method of emphasizing this impersonality. Whilst there is a general sympathy and common aim amongst those who edit the Commonwealth it is but just to say that the paper is not representative of any one person's view.

---

[196] Sanborn to Gerrit Smith, Clark's Island, Plymouth, Mass., August 3, 1863, in the Gerrit Smith Miller Collection, Syracuse University Library.

Stearns, who first thought Conway ideally fitted for the job, and Stone, the publisher of the paper, began to take a different view. Stearns declared that though Conway professed to be a follower of Emerson, he was actually a follower of Tom Paine, that he seemed to be more a product of the eighteenth century than the nineteenth, and that he was extravagant in his use of language.

When the abolitionists needed a man to send to England to convince the English that slavery was the real issue of the war, they suggested Conway, partly perhaps to get rid of him as editor. Though Conway's boat did not sail till April 11th, Sanborn was the principal editor beginning with the February 14th issue.[197]

"In February, when I came into the paper," wrote Sanborn to Gerrit Smith, "it was in a bad way, and had disappointed most of its friends." Though Sanborn set to work at once "to raise its tone and character, and especially to give it a greater literary value than it had ever had,"[198] its policies probably reflected the thoughts of several minds.

Though the paper emphasized political fact, fiction, and opinion during his terms as editor, it also featured contributions by many of the great literary stars of New England and columns on the charities of Boston "from the pen of a gentleman who has made himself familiar . . . with our institutions of benevolence."[199] Its political columns

---

[197] Mary E. Burtis, Moncure D. Conway, pp. 89-94.

[198] Sanborn to Gerrit Smith, August 3, 1863.

[199] The Commonwealth, April 3, 1863, p. 2, col. 2. (Though this gentleman may have been Sanborn, he was probably Howe.)

included such news as General Hooker's address to the Army of the Potomac, "Physiognomical Studies" of famous generals such as Beauregard and Burnside, and bitter lampoons of General "Legree" Banks, whom it pulverized in Sanborn's first issue:

> If the steamer that goes to New Orleans does not take out an order cashiering Banks, after the execrable proclamation, which shows that he is but a born slave-driver, and which flouts the President and countermands his plain order that our soldiers shall assist the negroes to maintain their freedom, it will show the President to be a traitor to Liberty, and a Liar before the American people.[200]

There were also such standard columns as "Letter from Washington" and "Congressional," which reported in minute detail the activities at the Capitol. Reports and reprints of speeches by leading abolitionists were frequent, the oratory ranging in literary quality from Wendell Phillips' celebrated "Toussaint L'Ouverture" to the pompous gas of Gerrit Smith, which contained such passages as this oft reiterated:

> My hearers, we will all stand by the Government--will we not? Although some of us are Democrats and some Republicans and some Abolitionists, we will nevertheless lock hands as Americans--will we not? We will all of us, notwithstanding our party divisions and party interests, generously and patriotically band ourselves together to crush this causeless and accursed rebellion--will we not?[201]

Sanborn also printed such items as "Two Interviews with the President," "Letters in Reply to 'The Argument for Slavery,'" and reports and letters telling of visits to Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson's

---

[200] "Legree Banks," February 14, 1863, p. 2, col. 5. (Lincoln had issued his Emancipation Proclamation just six weeks before, on January 1st.)

[201] "Extracts from the Speech by Gerrit Smith in Albany, February 27, 1863," March 27, 1863, p. 4, cols. 1-2.

Southern colored regiment, the organizing of which was causing considerable discussion throughout the North. In the editorial columns for April 10th Sanborn printed a portion of the proclamation of President Lincoln appointing the 30th of the month as a day of "fasting, humiliation and prayer," in which Lincoln said:

> Let us then rest humbly in the hope authorized by the divine teachings, that the united cry of the nation will be heard on high, and answered with blessings no less than the pardon of our National sins, and the restoration of our now divided and suffering country to its former happy condition of unity and peace.

To which Sanborn or one of his colleagues replied:

> It is a cool assumption of the President, that the pardon of our national sins has any kind of connection with the restoration of our country to its "former happy condition of unity and peace." Our own opinion is, that if God had resolved not to pardon us at all, He would prove it by allowing the restoration of that old "unity and peace." That unity was crime; that peace worse than war.[202]

Perhaps the best summary of the editorial attitude appears in an editorial printed on the day Sanborn took over from Conway, a column which, though unsigned, contains the Sanborn touch. Headed "The Last Signs," the writer declares that there have been many Judgment Days in the history of the world, and that now once again arise the signs of doomsday: "men's hearts failing them for fear." The writer then quotes a private letter from the editor "of one of the oldest and most largely circulated papers in the West." But one thing can save the Union, says the editor, "and that is the resignation of Mr. Lincoln."

---

[202] "Vera Pro Gratis," April 10, 1863, p. 2, col. 2.

The writer next quotes from a private letter from a Judge of a Superior Court in Ohio, and proceeds to comment on its most important points. First, the Judge declares, "All that can save us is military success," to which the editor replies:

> We have never for a moment doubted the power of pure Christianity, to save this or any other nation.... If our President were great enough to throw himself into the chasm, and declare every slave in America free, instantly, up to the Northernmost confines of Delaware, the nation would be saved.

Then commenting on the Judge's phrase, "a military success," the editor declares that a military success that carries McClellans, Bankses, Andy Johnsons, "and the like of them into the South, (meaner men than any of the rebels)," will do the North great harm, and he continues:

> Yet what other "success" could we have just now? Must we not have something worth carrying South first? Must we not have a civilization first among ourselves? A Southern state occupied by Seymours and Woods, would be a lost, not a gained State.

Second, the Judge declares, "You have been in error in thinking slavery weak." To which Sanborn or his colleague replies vehemently:

> No, Sir! It is demonstrable that slavery is reeling and rocking even in the zephyrs which are all our rulers allow to touch it. And we predict that if to-morrow the war should end with the recognition of the Southern Confederacy, slavery would be soon prostrated in bloody and terrible ruin. It is not that this institution whose day of doom is near, is strong: it is that freemen are weak,--that makes our trouble. There is no North. It is not the fault of the President. Where is the man who is willing to take the responsibility of saying what he knows and thinks? Will the editor alluded to as saying that only Lincoln's resignation can save us, ever put that at the head of his columns? Will those that know that Seward is a nightmare on the nation, say it openly? Mr. Greeley and Mr. Bryant, know it: yet vainly do we look for any such intention in the Tribune and Post. None can converse with Sumner, Wade, Lovejoy, Bingham, Davis, Kelley,

> Ashley, and Thaddeus Stevens, without knowing that they have no faith in the ability of the Administration to carry us safely through this ordeal,--yet each one declines to throw himself in the chasm, by crying aloud and sparing not....
>
> No nation was ever saved but by a noble self-sacrifice. It would only take ten men to save Sodom.... A very few men--great-hearted men, would save this country.

And this brings the writer to the fearful concluding thought:

> "Has not luxury as surely devoured our vitals as slavery theirs?" Can we find the ten righteous men? Has not the corruption gone too far for recovery? "Not one man in ten believes in the immortal axioms of Jefferson." Would to heaven we thought that one man in a thousand believed in them! We would have no apprehension about the country then.[203]

After seven months of such editorializing and newsgathering, Sanborn left his post as editor to become the first secretary of the Board of State Charities, but a letter to Smith indicates that as late as August he hoped to remain with the paper. "Had there been unity of action among the radical men here," he wrote, the paper's mission might have been more nearly accomplished.

> I went in as an experiment, and if I leave it on the 1st of September I shall have fulfilled my part of the contract, but the paper will probably go down. It does not yet support itself, though much nearer that point than when I took it, and Mr Stearns does not wish any longer to be its sole supporter.

Sanborn was particularly worried about its finances and hopefully told Smith what was needed to keep the paper going:

> If continued another year, I have no doubt it can then take care of itself, and once established, it would get a firm hold on the public. It needs a fund of $5000--one half to be deposited on the 1st of September, the other to be held

---

[203] "The Last Signs," February 14, 1863, p. 2, cols, 1-2.

> for deposit on the 1st of March, if necessary. This sum is not large, and it might be a loan, to be repaid in five years if the paper became prosperous. I have become so much interested in it that I am willing to devote myself to it for another year, but I have so exhausted my substance in aiding Kansas and John Brown that I have not the means nor are there many here who have and will.... You have many channels for your munificence, but I have ventured to place these facts before you. Should the paper continue, I shall be its editor as well as publisher,--Mr Conway only writing for it like any other contributor [204]

Evidently Sanborn's appeal for funds met with no response, for on August 20th he wrote William Lloyd Garrison suggesting that he buy the paper and amalgamate it with the Liberator.[205]

After putting to bed the issue for October 2, 1863, Sanborn left his desk to become the first secretary of the Board of State Charities, quite probably a much better opportunity, but he remained on the staff of The Commonwealth as its literary editor until the paper was abandoned four years later. Rather sadly Sanborn wrote Gerrit Smith these lines, which sound a kind of benediction upon his work:

> I am told that I have been partially successful, and that it is now a very good paper, and has overcome many of the objections then urged against it. Of this, others can judge best.[206]

---

[204] Sanborn to Gerrit Smith, August 3, 1863.

[205] Sanborn to William Lloyd Garrison, August 20, 1863 (Boston Public Library, Ms A.1.2., vol. 32, p. 46).

[206] Sanborn to Gerrit Smith, August 3, 1863.

Though Sanborn's career with The Commonwealth was brief, his second venture as a political journalist and publicist lasted for forty-nine years. In 1868, after five years of service as secretary of the Board of State Charities, he accepted the invitation of Samuel Bowles to become a resident editor of the Springfield Daily Republican, a post which he held for four years and which brought him with his wife and two children to Springfield. During a few months of 1871, while Bowles was in Europe, Sanborn was managing editor and helped organize a war of words which defeated General Benjamin Butler's attempt to become the Republican governor of Massachusetts.[207]

But Sanborn was famous as the writer of two voluminous weekly columns, one political, the other literary, which he carried on for forty-five years. As "Our Boston Correspondent"—though he and his family were back in Concord--he turned out an average of some 3,400 words of fine print each week--a minimum of about 8,000,000 words during his life with the paper.

Though he evidently intended to keep the material in his "Our Weekly Boston Letter" focused on political events and "Our Boston Literary Letter" filled with literary news and comment, the contents of the two columns are often scarcely distinguishable. His method of writing and his material reflected his miscellaneous mind. Said a critic for the Boston Transcript:

---

[207] Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 469-470.

> Those familiar with his literary style cannot fail to appreciate those diversions into bypaths of literature which made the articles so interesting and afforded a glimpse into the erudition of the mind which evolved them. If Mr. Sanborn started to write upon a Republican State convention in Boston, the chances are that the reader, before he finished the article, would have learned something about the Butler campaign, the formation of the Free-Soil party, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the life of Daniel Brainerd, the Indian missionary, the Eliot Indian Bible, the early printing of Antwerp, the iconography of the Saco River, the Golden Ass of Apuleius, Salem Witchcraft, the Massachusetts Synodical propositions and other things more or less slenderly attached to the opening themes or to one another.[208]

For most serious writers, it would be more than enough to produce two such columns every week of their lives, but Sanborn tossed these off without a qualm while he engaged in a multitude of other duties during these forty-five years. He returned for two years to the Board of State Charities as its Chairman in 1874, was the State Inspector of Charities from 1879 to 1888, and in these capacities wrote the annual reports which, he said, filled 8,000 pages. Likewise he sped about the country to national and sectional meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, the National Prison Association, and the American Social Science Association, in all of which he was a founder and officer for many years. At the same time he for thirty years carried his heavy burden of duties as secretary of the American Social Science Association and as editor of its Journal of Social

---

[208] George H. Sargent, "Frank B. Sanborn's Jewels and Junk," Boston Evening Transcript, September 19, 1917, part two, p. 4, cols 1-7, in the clipping file on Sanborn in the library of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, Watertown, Mass., to which I am deeply indebted.

Science. There were frequent trips to Northampton, Watertown, and Boston to attend the meetings of the boards of trustees of the Clarke School for the Deaf, Perkins Institution for the Blind, and the Massachusetts Infant Asylum. As though this were not enough to occupy the time, he was writing the biographies and editing the works of Thoreau, Emerson, Bronson Alcott, Ellery Channing, Parker, and Hawthorne, a description of which fills most of my next chapter. He was also pouring articles on a great variety of topics into numerous magazines and newspapers, maintaining for three years a column in the Boston Advertiser, carrying on his war with Kansas over John Brown's body, writing a history of New Hampshire for the American Commonwealth Series, lecturing on social science at Cornell, Wellesley, and Smith, lecturing before innumerable literary, political, and social science groups on appropriate topics, carrying on at various times the "searching and historic investigation" into the abuses of the Tewksbury Almshouse, and similar inquiries before the state legislature into the hideous cost of the new Danvers Lunatic Asylum and the irregularities in the Westboro Reform School. In between he wrote his Life of Dr. Howe, edited the letters and memoirs of Dr. Pliny Earle, the distinguished head of the insane asylum at Northampton, and took two trips to the British Isles, the Continent, and Greece.[209] All these multitudinous duties were grist for

[209] Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 469-474; Victor C. Sanborn, "Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, A. B.," pp. 291-295; "Death of F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Daily Republican, February 25, 1917, p. 1, col. 1, p. 13, cols. 1-4; Alexander Johnson, "An Appreciation of Frank B. Sanborn," The Survey (March 10, 1917), pp. 656-657; Lindsay Swift, "Frank B. Sanborn, the Individualist," Harvard Alumni Bulletin (March 8, 1917), pp. 449-450; Edwin Hale Abbot, "News from the Classes," Harvard Graduates' Magazine (June, 1917), pp. 555-559.

his literary mill and helped him produce the needed column inches while at the same time they doubtless lowered the literary quality of his material because he had to write it at such a high rate of speed.

The Springfield Republican, for which he produced his columns, his occasional editorials and special assignments, still stands in the minds of most people as a symbol of the best in liberal, honest, intelligent, outspoken journalism. Its two principles of journalism which it printed often in its advertising and editorial statements of purpose were "first, to print all the news, and, second, to tell the truth about it." In one such statement its editors declared:

> THE REPUBLICAN aims not so much to convince its readers as to enlighten them,--to furnish the material for their own independent judgment, rather than to lead the way to their partisan action. It does not ignore the necessity or usefulness of parties, but it would put principles above them, and favor a party and support a candidate only as they could vindicate their right to be the best means to the desired ends. It especially holds, in times like these, when parties are decaying and changing, and when their organizations are controlled by their worse rather than their best elements, that American journalism serves its highest office in being sharply independent of them,--in refusing advance subordination to their policies and their candidates, and in bringing their every act and nomination to the severest tests of public usefulness. Only thus can a newspaper respect itself; only thus can it command the respect of its readers.

And their sense of responsibility to their readers was expressed:

> A further office of the best journalism should be to allay rather than to intensify the passions of partisanship. Not by any means to reduce our political differences to a colorless uniformity, or to dwarf the distinctions between contending men and means for the administration of government; but to oppose and expose those causeless occasions of alarm and distrust which the heat of partisan strife seeks to create, and in which personal happiness and common business interests are often needlessly sacrificed.

Among the special features of the Republican, wrote its editors, was "a weekly literary letter from Boston by one of the most accomplished critics in New England" and "another Boston letter on political and other congressional subjects."[210] Emily Dickinson[211] and a host of other discriminating persons were avid readers of Sanborn's columns. Indeed, wrote President Wilson to its editor, "There is no paper I read that gives such aid to my thinking as the Springfield Republican."[212]

But behind the scenes--at least in Sanborn's later years on the paper--the editors of his copy worried and stewed. In the first place, the very appearance of Sanborn's copy was a symbol of his personality. Though the editors demanded that typed copy must be triple-spaced with inch-and-a-half margins on four sides, Sanborn not only single-spaced his sheets but all of his margins were three-eighths of an inch wide.[213] Mr. Richard Hooker, grandson of the Samuel Bowles who was Sanborn's boss, and himself an editor of Sanborn's copy, tells me that "it was a

---

[210] Springfield Daily Republican, January 6, 1877, p. 4, col. 1.

[211] Van Wyck Brooks, New England: Indian Summer (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1940), p. 321.

[212] Woodrow Wilson to Griffin, written on stationery with the letterhead of The White House, Washington, but dated from Shadow Lawn, [Asbury Park, N. J.], October 10, 1916, in the Springfield Collection of the Connecticut Valley Historical Museum, Springfield, Mass.

[213] Furthermore, Sanborn never, at the beginning of a new paragraph, skipped a line or returned the typewriter carriage to the left margin, but dropped down to the next line. He invariably wrote his inside address as "C O N C O R D,Mass." (plus the date), rarely skipped a space after marks of punctuation, and always used the lower case o when writing numerals such as "1 9 o o." Both his autograph and typed manuscripts are unmistakable.

by-word in the office that his copy must always be edited with drastic care in order to avoid constant invitation to libel suits. When the task came to be put on my shoulders I found this a mild description of it."[214] As Edwin Hale Abbot, the secretary of Sanborn's class at Harvard, put it:

> Sanborn was an artist in words, and given always to the free use of unlicensed speech. He became very intimate with Theodore Parker in 1852, and until Parker's death in 1860, Sanborn's views of politics and religion were deeply affected and shaped by that intimacy. It is fair to assume that Parker's bitter and uncontrolled use of violent words shaped Sanborn's modes of expression and style.[215]

Sanborn's bitterest words were saved for the defamers of John Brown and for the nefarious projects of General Benjamin Butler. Early in Sanborn's career on the paper, he unearthed a choice scandal which involved Butler, Jonas French (owner of a granite quarry on Cape Ann), Postmaster Burt of Boston, one Ricker (one-time owner and later superintendent of the quarry), and Mullett of the Department of the Treasury in Washington. As the Boston post office was being enlarged by the addition of a $200,000 granite wing and the adjacent street was being widened also by act of Congress, Butler (said Sanborn) saw an opportunity to make some easy money. Butler bought the granite quarry through French; he then obtained the contract for the granite for the post office through Mullett of the U. S. Treasury. Then, said Sanborn:

---

[214] Personal letter to me from Richard Hooker, 241 Park Drive, Longmeadow 6, Mass., January 21, 1952.

[215] Edwin Hale Abbot, "News from the Classes," Harvard Graduates' Magazine (June, 1917), pp. 555-559.

> On the 3d of April, 1869, the gorgeous and expensive Mullett of the treasury department wrote to [an intimate] at Boston that he had that day had "a conference with Gen Butler and some other gentlemen from Massachusetts," and had devised a scheme by which the "embarrassing conditions of the law" about contracts could be avoided. "At the same time," adds the ingenuous but costly Mullett, "I do not propose either to make myself liable to a criminal prosecution, or place you in the same delightful position." All he wanted was to give Butler the contract, evade the law, and not get into trouble thereby.

When the first granite contract was given to French for building the basement of the post office, "so flagrant was the violation of law that [this contract] was annulled." The basement was, nevertheless, completed, "giving French a contract for the whole post-office, out of which, in Ricker's opinion, if French had been a good stone-cutter, instead of a distiller of bad rum, he might have made $1,000,000 for himself and Butler." However, continued Sanborn, when the post-office committee were making their investigation in the winter of 1869-70,"Butler was extremely anxious not to have any evidence put in connecting him with this job." At the investigation, Sanborn claimed, Ricker was instructed by French what to say on the witness stand. But as Ricker had a letter in his pocket from Butler inquiring about the price of the quarry, he "objected to committing perjury to get his employers out of a scrape; and finally refused to go before the committee and swear that Butler had nothing to do with the purchase of the quarry." For this, French dismissed Ricker from his post as superintendent of the quarry. The investigating committee then reported in favor of annulling French's contract because it defied the law and was made under the influence of Butler. But the recommendation of the committee was defeated, and Butler and French

triumphed. "Now," said Sanborn, "French expects to enlarge his contract and increase his profits by furnishing more stone for the post-office extension."

As for the Act of Congress which required that the streets near the post office be widened, Sanborn said:

> This will be the first time, I believe, that it has required an act of Congress to widen the streets of a Massachusetts town, and it is a good example of the distance we have got on the way to centralization. Under the French empire, when the chief-engineer of a little village among the Pyranees wanted a new pump-box for his fire-engine, he got an imperial decree from Paris before he could repair his 'masheen.'[216]

Sanborn spent a good part of many of his days listening to the debates in the legislature, and his disgust with the poverty of the legal mind at work led to some of his wittiest political reporting and comment:

> After an absence from Boston of nearly two weeks, [he wrote] I could not find that anything of special importance had got through the Legislature since I went away, except an act providing for the sale of eggs by the pound instead of by the dozen. Without examining this new statute, to see whether hard-boiled eggs are included under its beneficent enacting clause, I am prepared to say that it is a good thing, and highly characteristic of the present Great and General Court. Mrs Partington, according to Sydney Smith, was good at a slop or a puddle, but was no match for the Atlantic ocean. The assembled wisdom of the Grant party in Massachusetts, this winter, has proved no match for the Sumner question, the suffrage issue, the battle of the railroad giants, or the powers and privileges of the county sheriffs,--but it is just on a level with the hen's-egg controversy. Fancy Hoyt of Athol defending the right of a cheese-colored bantam to have its eggs sold for as much as those of the highest-stepping shanghai, and White of Plymouth brooding deeply over the exact difference between a pound and a dozen. I have not seen the debates, but doubtless Abbott had the bill laid on the table a week, till the committee had heard from him about mare's-nests in Malden.[217]

---

[216] Springfield Daily Republican, March 28, 1873, p. 5, col. 6, and p. 6, col. 1.

[217] Ibid., April 10, 1873, p. 5, col. 6.

But Sanborn did not confine himself merely to state politics. For example, in 1877, when the electoral votes for Tilden and Hayes were still being fought over by the state and national politicians, Sanborn commented on the situation by first telling a story:

> The taciturnity of the republican governors concerning national politics, in their annual messages, recalls to memory one of the stories of Mr Thompson, who came between Butler and Loring in the Essex district, like a dish of salad between two courses of salt pork. Well, pork is the subject of my story, as Thompson relates it. A worthy farmer, hearing a noise in his cellar, one evening, opens the cellar-door and listens. A mysterious drip is heard from the pork-barrel. "Who's there?" No answer. "What are you about there?" No answer. "Why don't you say something?" The thief, who has by this time put back the pork and replaced the cover, now makes reply, "Can't think of anything to say."

Then Sanborn added the moral:

> In view of the returns from Florida and Louisiana, the silence of the republicans, who have been expecting some of the pork, is not only excusable but natural and proper. So long as the party in the cellar is busy conveying pork from the Tilden barrel to the Hayes carpet-bag, there is not much that the spokesmen of the party in Boston and other state capitals can think of to say.[218]

As the unique political battle waged, Moody and Sankey happened to be playing Boston. This gave Sanborn the chance to quip: "If Moody can preach or Sankey can sing the self-righteousness out of a Boston republican, the age of miracles is not over." He then observed wryly that he had read this statement in the Journal, one of Boston's conservative Republican newspapers:[219]

---

[218] Ibid., January 11, 1877, p. 4, col. 5.

[219] Frank Luther Mott, American Journalism: a History of Newspapers in the United States Through 260 Years: 1690 to 1950 (New York: Macmillan, 1950), p. 262.

> The republican (voter) should not lose sight of the very important fact that the number of men who hold opposite opinions number as many hundreds of thousands as those who hold the republican theory. They may not be neither so intelligent nor so candid men, generally; but this fact, if such it is, only makes the matter more difficult.

Concerning the intensity of the controversy over which of the two candidates was to enter the White House, he observed that the Moody and Sankey revival was superseding the political uncertainty as a topic of thought and talk, and he reported on the kidney of the Boston newspapers in this national political crisis:

> Indeed, since the compromise bill was assured of success, last week, the feverish interest in politics has almost entirely disappeared. The newspapers are rational and honest, even the Traveller making distant approaches to impartiality, and the Journal reasoning as candidly as if it had never suppressed a piece of news in its life. The Advertiser has got so far as to intimate that a returning-board that is proved guilty of fraud ought not to be held to have a good character.[220]

A great deal of Sanborn's political comment was serious, and his influence was felt throughout New England. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., on one occasion, anxious to see a measure through the legislature, wrote Sanborn, "I want to know if the Republican can be counted on to sustain the measure," and he continued:

> I am confident that you will look at this thing as I do. Should this be the case, pray let me know. It is not time as yet to do anything and I hope to get [Governor] Claflin to lead off by a recommendation in his annual message. Should he do so, the course of the Springfield Republican would be of great importance;--and I have little doubt he would be greatly encouraged to do so could I tell him that your paper could be counted on.
>
> At any rate let me hear from you on the subject & tell me what you think of it.[221]

---

[220] Springfield Daily Republican, February 1, 1877, p. 8, col. 1.

[221] Charles Francis Adams, Jr., to Sanborn, 31 Pemberton Square, Boston, November 9, 1869 (Concord Library, 5: A-2).

Sanborn was serious when he discussed in September, 1893, the efforts of President Cleveland to establish a sound currency, a money crisis having been caused by a lowering of the gold reserve, a circulation of paper, and exorbitant silver purchases under the Sherman act. Sanborn declared in part:

> The one conspicuous friend of the American people, the champion of sound money, in the contest that is now going on at Washington, is temporarily getting the worst of it; as Lincoln often did in his administration, which that of Cleveland so much resembles in some respects. The attacks made on the president for this or that--in which some of his friends join rather unwisely--are clouding over the fair prospect of some weeks since, the Sherman-law legacy from the Harrison regime would soon be set aside, and the currency put on a sensible footing. What that footing shall be does not seem to me so important; the main thing is to get the silver purchase act repealed before it can do any more mischief. It has done nothing but mischief since the republicans passed it, under compulsion from their party associates in the silver states.

He then discusses the effect this issue is having on party politics and on the people:

> The split in the democratic party on this issue would be of little moment were it not for the readiness of the partisan republicans to use the situation as a means of mending the rents in their own organization. It is no harm for the democrats to break up,--the country would be better off if they were again divided, as in 1860; but it is a very hurtful thing to have the people's president deserted on this issue, which he had made, and which the good of the country requires to be carried out as Cleveland has shaped it. Can it be doubted that a vast majority of the people would vote now for the repeal of the Sherman law?

He then examines the effect this should have on the Democratic party in Massachusetts:

> The democratic campaign in Massachusetts should be opened on this basis,--the support of the president in his currency and tariff policy; with this boldly stated, it makes little odds what the republicans resolve in their belated convention next week. A policy of waiting for that party to declare itself is timid and ineffective; the democrats have prospered best in this state when they have forced the fighting on issues of their own making. It is therefore agreeable to notice that they have made a bold and not a cowardly platform, in accord with the character of their chief candidate; and that they have made the distinct issue of standing by the president in his warfare against the silver monopolists and the infatuated believers in an appreciation of gold, which Mr [David] Wells in the Forum so neatly refutes.[222]

Sanborn's reference to Wells' article is important, for it shows that Sanborn had the intelligence to discover the thinking of America's leading political economist before talking glibly in his columns about important issues. Examples of Sanborn's political ideas and attitudes may be multiplied indefinitely, but a few more should suffice.

When the Maine was blown up in the harbor of Havana, Sanborn commented on the temper of the people:

> The situation in regard to war with Spain seems to be this. Our government knows that if the mass of our people believe, no matter on what evidence, that the Spanish forces in Cuba designedly blew up our war ship,... they will not demand money but war.... Not one man in 10 wishes a money indemnity for an outrage such as the designed destruction of the Maine would at once be seen to have been. Not indemnity but security is what men of common sense would call for; this is not a lawsuit, but a case of international mad dog; all the money in Spain is useless if the dog is to run at large.[223]

Two weeks later he feared that the democratic process was being pushed aside during the emergency that existed over the Cuba incident, and he warned his readers:

---

[222] Springfield Daily Republican, September 30, 1893, p. 9, col. 1-3.

[223] Ibid., March 5, 1898, p. 5, cols. 1-2.

> We have been denouncing Charles I some 250 years for governing England (very badly) without Parliaments; and now the descendents of his refractory Puritans are advising our president to try the same foolish experiment.[224]

Sanborn had two pet hates which he voiced often and loudly: one, a hatred of those people, institutions, or forces who did not believe in or practice the democratic process; the second, selfish millionaires, for he forgave those who used their money to help support his reformatory enterprises. In his column for August 3, 1901, he voiced both hates:

> Timid as a millionaire always is when his gambling paper stocks are in danger at the market, he is insolent enough at other times,--as the world saw in a flagrant instance, when Rhodes and Chamberlain, in order to exploit the African gold mines to their fuller advantage, organized the Jameson raid, and set the example for Roosevelt and McKinley to make their equally iniquitous raid upon the Filipinos. From the Jameson raid came by due succession this abominable South African war, in which England, at the behest of the millionaires and the London mob,--those fit allies,--is practicing, one by one, all these cruelties of tyranny that one despot after another has invented since oppression began. She is exiling men by the ten thousand, for defending their native land, as the Persian despots did in their wars with Jew and Greek;...and she is carrying out in a more detestable manner the deadly policy of Weyler in Cuba against women and children. Our jingoes in the Philippines have imitated this fashion, at a considerable distance, and with more apparent success,--but if they ever mean to have permanent peace there, they must do as England is doing in South Africa,--make a solitude and call it peace. One after the other, their falsehoods about the Philippine situation are getting found out and abandoned,--and, like Jameson in the role of pacificator, they are talking about a peace which need never have been broken but for their own insolent folly and caprice.[225]

---

[224] Ibid., March 19, 1898, p. 12, cols. 1-2.

[225] Ibid., August 3, 1901, p. 5, cols. 1-2.

These few excerpts from some 2,300 political columns which appeared up through the end of February, 1917, should present something of Sanborn's political purpose, point of view, insight, and literary ability. Through the years there seemed to be no change in style, tone, or political interests. As Richard Hooker says, "Some men, as they grow older, grow more reckless in their statements; other men grow more cautious. What Sanborn's evolution was, I don't know."[226] As for the effect Sanborn had on his readers, Edwin Hale Abbot felt that "his bitter expressions frequently cut far deeper than he probably was ever aware. The result was that this habit at last stirred up a curious ecstasy of detestation for Sanborn among some even of his classmates."[227] Perhaps Wendell Phillips wrote the best comment on Sanborn's long life as a political journalist. He wrote his comment in a postscript to a letter to Sanborn, he phrased the sentence as though it were a question, but it was constructed so that the reader could anticipate only one answer: "(Is it your advent that lifts the Repub^n to such generous brave & useful action)".[228]

---

[226] Personal letter to me from Richard Hooker, 241 Park Drive, Longmeadow 6, Massachusetts.

[227] Edwin H. Abbot, "News from the Classes," p. 557.

[228] Wendell Phillips to Sanborn, 1868 (Concord Library, 5: P-4).

CHAPTER V

HIS LITERARY CAREER

Sanborn's importance to American literature stems from his work as biographer and editor of Thoreau, Bronson Alcott, Emerson, Ellery Channing, Parker, and Hawthorne. From November 2, 1854, when he made his first entry in his college journal after a visit to Emerson in Concord, to the hour of his death February 24, 1917, he wrote about the literary great and small. He wrote biographies and biographical articles about them for magazines and newspapers; he edited their works; as editor-in-chief and as literary editor of the Boston Commonwealth over a period of seven years he was responsible for the first publication of pieces by Thoreau, Channing, the two Alcotts, and others. But he was also prominent in his own time as a poet and as the author of "Our Boston Literary Letter" in the Springfield Daily Republican, a weekly column of literary news, history, comment, and criticism that included an amazing variety of literary topics.

The greatest volume of Sanborn's work was done on Thoreau, and one of his major efforts was a biography of Bronson Alcott, but on the rest of his friends he wrote relatively little, his work on Emerson, Hawthorne, and Ellery Channing consisting chiefly of small volumes in limited editions and of numerous magazine articles. Though he dreamed up large projects around the life and work of Theodore Parker, almost nothing came of them.

Sanborn's most important work was done as the biographer and editor of Thoreau. Sanborn knew Thoreau for seven years. Their acquaintance, he says, "sprang from the accident of my editing for a few weeks the 'Harvard Magazine.'" In it had appeared an enthusiastic review of Walden and The Week, and to acknowledge it Thoreau called at Sanborn's room in Holworthy Hall one day in January, 1855. Sanborn was at the college library at the time, and when Thoreau appeared there, someone pointed Thoreau out to him. Sanborn, however, did not introduce himself, but waited until his winter vacation to write him the following letter:

HAMPTON FALLS, N. H., Jan'y 30th, '55.

MY DEAR SIR,--I have had it in mind to write you a letter ever since the day when you visited me, without my knowing it, at Cambridge. I saw you afterward at the Library, but refrained from introducing myself to you, in the hope that I should see you later in the day. But as I did not, will you allow me to seek you out, when next I come to Concord?

The author of the criticism in the "Harvard Magazine" is Mr. Morton of Plymouth.... Accordingly I gave him the book which you left with me, judging that it belonged to him. He received it with delight, as a gift of value in itself, and the more valuable for the sake of the giver.

We who at Cambridge look toward Concord as a sort of Mecca for our pilgrimages, are glad to see that your last book finds such favor with the public.[1] It has made its way where your name has rarely been heard before, and the inquiry, "Who is Mr. Thoreau?" proves that the book has done its work. For my own part, I thank you for the new light it shows me the aspects of Nature in, and for the marvelous beauty of your descriptions. At the same time, if any one should ask me what I think of your philosophy, I should be apt to answer that it is not worth a straw. Whenever again you visit Cambridge, be assured, sir, that it would give me

---

[1] This was Thoreau's Walden, published in 1854.

much pleasure to see you at my room. There, or in Concord, I hope soon to see you; if I may intrude so much on your time.

Believe me always, yours very truly,

F. B. SANBORN.[2]

With the grace that must have been required to overlook what Sanborn calls "the pertness" of his note, Thoreau replied immediately:

CONCORD, February 2, 1855.

DEAR SIR,--I fear that you did not get the note which I left with the Librarian for you, and so will thank you again for your politeness. I was sorry that I was obliged to go into Boston almost immediately. However, I shall be glad to see you whenever you come to Concord, and I will suggest nothing to discourage your coming, so far as I am concerned; trusting that you know what it is to take a partridge on the wing. You tell me that the author of the criticism is Mr. Morton. I had heard as much,--and indeed guessed more. I have latterly found Concord nearer to Cambridge than I believed I should, when I was leaving my Alma Mater; and hence you will not be surprised if even I feel some interest in the success of the Harvard Magazine.

Believe me yours truly,

HENRY D. THOREAU.[3]

---

[2]Sanborn, Henry D. Thoreau (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1882), American Men of Letters, ed. Charles Dudley Warner. This work is not to be confused with Sanborn's much later biography, The Life of Henry David Thoreau, Including Many Essays Hitherto Unpublished and Some Account of His Family and Friends (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1917). The Literary History of the United States, ed. Robert E. Spiller and others (New York: Macmillan, 1948), III, 748, makes no mention of the 1882 volume and confuses the two by indicating that the 1917 volume was one of the American Men of Letters Series, which it is not. A twentieth-century American Men of Letters Series published by William Sloane Associates does, however, contain a biography, Henry David Thoreau, by Joseph Wood Krutch, published in 1948, a fact which only adds to the confusion.

[3]The Writings of Henry David Thoreau, VI, "Familiar Letters," ed. Sanborn, "Enlarged Edition" (Walden Edition), pp. 252-253. This letter and the one describing his trip to Minnesota (pp. 385-392) "were the only ones I received from him in a friendship of seven years," says Sanborn, p. 252, n. 1. Sanborn forgot that Thoreau wrote him a short, one-page letter in pencil, dated "Friday eve," which is noted in Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1908), p. 162. In this edition Sanborn was the editor of volume VI only.

Six weeks later Sanborn went to live in Concord as the teacher of Emerson's school, and he and his sister took rooms at Ellery Channing's, "just opposite Thoreau's." Sanborn met Thoreau "more than once at Mr. Emerson's, and was even beginning to take walks with him," his famous long legs being among the few, doubtless, which could keep pace with Thoreau's exacting requirements.[4] The author, however, did not call on the Sanborns until April 11th, when Sanborn recorded in his journal:

> Wednesday, April 11, 1855. Tonight we had a call from Mr. Thoreau, who came at eight and stayed till ten. He talked about a variety of things, about Latin and Greek, which he though[t] ought to be studied, and about other things. In his tones and gestures he seemed to me to imitate Emerson, so that it was annoying to listen to him, though he said many good things. He looks, too, like Emerson, coarser, but with something of that serenity and sagacity which Emerson has. Thoreau looks eminently sagacious, like a sort of wild beast.[5] He dresses plainly, wears a beard about his throat, and has a brown complexion.

Sanborn mentions another visit from him a month later and expands this portrait:

> Friday, May 18. To-night Mr. Thoreau came in as I was reading Demosthenes, and we fell to talking about Greek, Latin, Milton, Wordsworth, Emerson, Ellery Channing, and other things. But first of all let me describe Thoreau, since I believe I have not yet done so. The first time I ever saw him was when he made a flying visit to my room in Cambridge last January, and left a book with me for Morton. Then I did not know him, and supposed it might be some book agent or expressman. Since I came here I have often seen him. He is a sort of pocket edition of Mr. Emerson, as far as outward appearance goes, in coarser binding and with

---

[4] Ibid., p. 253.

[5] Whether this observation in this passage and the similar comparison in the passage for May 18 given below resulted from Alcott's remark in the journal entry for Saturday, December 2, 1854, or whether Sanborn saw this too, probably no one can say.

> wood-cuts instead of the fine steel-engravings of Mr. Emerson. He is a little under size, with a huge Emersonian nose, bluish gray eyes, brown hair, and a ruddy, weather-beaten face which reminds one of that of some shrewd and honest animal, some retired philosophic woodchuck or magnanimous fox. He dresses very plainly, wears his collar turned over like Mr. Emerson; and often an old dress-coat, broad in the skirts, and by no means a fit. He walks about with a brisk rustic air, and never seems tired. He talks like Mr. Emerson and so spoils the good things which he says; for what in Mr. Emerson is charming, becomes ludicrous in Thoreau, because an imitation.[6]

"Our friendship grew apace,"[7] says Sanborn, and "in the following summer I began to dine daily at his mother's table, and thus saw him almost every day for three years."[8] "I often joined in his walks and river voyages, or swam with him in some of our numerous Concord waters."

> In 1856 I introduced John Brown to him, then a guest at my house; and in 1859, the evening before Brown's last birthday, we listened together to the old captain's last speech in the Concord Town Hall. The events of that year and the next brought us closely together, and I found him the stanchest of friends.[9]

Just how intimate Sanborn was with Thoreau is difficult to determine. Thoreau's sister Sophia, according to one critic, "with a good deal of justification, protested that Sanborn had never been close to her brother."[10] In all of the great number of letters which I have collected, Sanborn refers to Thoreau in only eight of those which he wrote

---

[6]Sanborn, "An Unpublished Concord Journal," ed. George Sidney Hellman, The Century Magazine, CIII (1922), 831-838.

[7]Sanborn, Henry D. Thoreau (1882), p. 199.

[8]"Familiar Letters," ed. Sanborn (Walden Edition, 1894), p. 253. Though most of the biographers and critics of Thoreau have cited this figure, "three years," to indicate the length of Sanborn's intimate relationship with Thoreau, Sanborn says in his Henry D. Thoreau (1882), p. 199, a reminiscence which should have been clearer and fresher by some 12 years, "For two years or more I dined with him almost daily." Which is the fact?

[9]Sanborn, Henry D. Thoreau (1882), p. 199.

[10] Krutch, Henry David Thoreau, p. 250. Krutch does not document this statement.

before Thoreau's death. This could indicate that Sanborn saw so much of him that he did not consider their activities together newsworthy, or it could mean that he saw him so infrequently that he recorded what he saw or heard because it was unusual. At any rate Sanborn mentions Thoreau in the following eight letters, all to Theodore Parker. To Parker he wrote in December, 1855: "I have seen Mr Thoreau's Indian books--they look enticing--one of them is unintelligible Sanscrit."[11] Two years later, in January, 1858, he wrote:

> On Tuesday afternoon- if the weather is good I shall give a half holiday and invite the people to go and skate with my school on Walden Pond Will you not come up? Mr Stearns of Medford will probably come, and I hope to get Mr Emerson and Mr Thoreau on their skates- You will find it better than electricity-[12]

The other six letters were written in 1859 and 1860: In March, 1859, Sanborn wrote: "On the 27th Mr Emerson speaks again [in the Music Hall], and he has recommended the committee to send for Mr Thoreau, who read here ten days ago, a lecture on Autumnal Tints as good as anything he ever wrote."[13] In November Sanborn was writing: "Phillips spoke in praise of Brown at Brooklyn two weeks ago; Thoreau at the Fraternity, Nov 1st and Emerson Nov 8th all using unqualified praise."[14] Six weeks later he wrote: "Mr Brace came here to speak to our people about his Children's Aid movement in N. Y. and did so last

---

[11] Concord, December 13, 1855 (Concord Library, 5: S-29).

[12] Concord, January 17, 1858 (Concord Library, 5: S-38).

[13] Concord, March 13, 1859 (Concord Library, 5: S-40).

[14] Concord, November 14, 1859 (Concord Library, 5: S-47).

night in the Town Hall, to a good audience. Mr Alcott and Mr Thoreau dined with him here and discussed Darwin's principle of 'Natural Selection' in which B- just coming from Dr Gray's in Cambridge is much interested."[15]

Three weeks later Sanborn wrote that he had been summoned to Washington. "Should I go abroad," he wrote Parker, ". . . my school will keep up and everybody here is doing what he can for it. Friends appear in the most unexpected places— Mr Channing is a great friend of mine, and of much service — so is Thoreau." And in the same letter he mentioned the forthcoming printing of Redpath's Echoes of Harper's Ferry, "containing the speeches of Phillips, Thoreau, Emerson, etc."[16] Six weeks later Sanborn reported that "Mrs Ripley . . . has just been reading Darwin's book . . . and likes it much, as does Thoreau."[17] And the last mention Sanborn makes of Thoreau occurs when he tells Parker of Thoreau's address at the Town Hall mass meeting which followed Sanborn's heroic welcome from his Supreme Court trial in Boston.[18]

It is difficult from these brief scraps of evidence to determine whether Sanborn was close to Thoreau. Yet the brief glimpse we are afforded of Thoreau permitting Sanborn to look into his Indian books,

---

[15] Concord, January 2, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-49).

[16] Concord, January 21, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-50).

[17] Concord, March 11, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-52).

[18] Concord, April 1 and 8, 1860 (Concord Library, 5: S-53).

and of Sanborn's hope of getting Mr. Thoreau on skates may indicate considerable to the seasoned Thoreau scholar. We shall, however, never know what words passed between the two during those two or three years when Sanborn took his meals with Thoreau at his mother's dining table. If they had written to each other more often, we would perhaps know more about their relationship. Yet, on the other hand, as Thoreau was such a notoriously irregular correspondent, we might know less than we do.[19]

Thoreau died May 6, 1862, and "before the funeral services were finished in the village church, Emerson had read his eulogy and thus begun the process which was to transform Thoreau from 'a Concord worthy (or unworthy)' into a world figure. Other champions, determined that he should be given his due, were not wanting. Indeed, they were more numerous and fanatical than wise."[20]

Sanborn's precise influence on the growth of Thoreau's reputation is not perfectly clear. Sanborn made an effort to transform Thoreau into a world figure, but we can not be sure of the result of his effort. It is easy to collect the critical reviews of Sanborn's work as editor and biographer and to discover the little remarks made publicly and privately by his contemporaries and by ours about his successes and failures. But we can never collect the reactions of all

---

[19] Evidence of his irregularity is given by Thoreau himself in a letter to his sister Sophia, Concord, July 13, 1852, and in his letter to Daniel Ricketson, Concord, October 14, 1861, reprinted in The Portable Thoreau, ed. Carl Bode (New York: Viking, 1947), pp. 688 and 694.

[20] Krutch, Thoreau, p. 249.

the persons who read these reviews. Did Sanborn bring these people to a greater understanding of Thoreau and his work? What is our debt to Sanborn, if any?

Randall Stewart, in sketching the work of several writers "who attempted to present Thoreau favorably to the world," omits Sanborn's name from his thumbnail history.[21] Krutch, while noting that Sanborn published an early biography of Thoreau, indicates that Sanborn was "busily engaged in the effort to claim Thoreau for the abolition movement to which he himself had been committed."[22]

A year after Thoreau died, Sanborn began publishing his verse. Sanborn had been selected editor of the Boston Free-Soil weekly, The Commonwealth, a position which he held from February 14, 1863, until October 2, 1863, when he resigned to become the first secretary of the Board of State Charities of Massachusetts. After his resignation, however, he continued as literary editor of the paper until its death in 1867. His work as Thoreau's editor was done, however, between June 19 and November 6, 1863.[23] During this period he printed eight pieces of Thoreau's verse, "noting that they were from what he termed unpublished manuscripts."[24]

---

[21] "The Growth of Thoreau's Reputation," College English, VII (January, 1946), 208-214.

[22] Krutch, pp. 249-250.

[23] Allen, Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 76-77.

[24] Carl Bode, The Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau (Chicago: Packard, 1943), p. 275.

Four of these eight Sanborn printed in full for the first time: the "Inspiration" which begins "Whate'er we leave to God, God does," "The Funeral Bell," the "Travelling" which begins "Though all the fates should prove unkind." and "The Departure." "The Soul's Season" he printed as a complete poem, though it actually formed a part of "The Fall of the Leaf," most of which he printed in another issue. "Independence" and "Greece" appeared there in full for the first time, though the last fourteen lines of "Independence" had appeared in The Dial and in Miscellanies, and the last four lines of "Greece" had been used in the Week.[25]

Thus began Sanborn's career as an editor of Thoreau's verse, a function which he performed for fifty-four years. The greatness of this responsibility, as one can see, becomes formidable when one considers the books Sanborn wrote or the publications which he edited in which the verse appeared. Besides The Commonwealth, there were his first biography of 1882 and the two editions of the Familiar Letters. He included Thoreau's verse likewise in his The Personality of Thoreau (1901), and in his autobiography, Recollections of Seventy Years (1909), and in his final biography of Thoreau which appeared in 1917.[26] He also

---

[25]Allen, Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 76-77 and Bode (in the textual notes given for each poem). The poems appeared in this order: June 19, July 3, July 24, August 28, November 6 and October 9, October 30, July 24. There are two poems entitled "Inspiration," and two entitled "Travelling."

[26]Sanborn, The Personality of Thoreau (Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed), 71 pp., (also a limited edition of 515 copies by D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, Boston); Sanborn, The Life of Henry David Thoreau, Including Many Essays Hitherto Unpublished and Some Account of His Family and Friends (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1917), 542 pp.

acted as editor of a series of beautifully printed limited editions for the Bibliophile Society of Boston: The First and Last Journeys of Thoreau (1905), Godfrey of Boulogne (1907), and its 1909 edition of Walden.[27] Nor does this list include the poems or numerous lines from poems, sometimes printed for the first time, which he published in his articles for magazines, in his biographies of other Concord worthies, and in editions of their works, such as his edition of Ellery Channing's Thoreau, the Poet-Naturalist.

Sanborn's method of editing is therefore of considerable importance. Unfortunately, says Bode, in his Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau, "Sanborn's editing of the text of the verse conforms to a method no longer fashionable. It is a method that needs discussion in the present edition because of the fact that by far the largest proportion of the posthumous verse to see print (except for that in the Journal) has done so under his supervision."[28]

As Bode's "announced aim was to prepare a critical variorum edition of the poems"[29] "as they finally left Thoreau's hand,"[30] and as his "textual notes are models of thoroughness and monuments to the scholarship that went into time,"[31] it is important to present his more

---

[27] Sanborn, The First and Last Journeys of Thoreau, Lately Discovered Among His Unpublished Journals and Manuscripts.

[28] Bode, Collected Poems, p. 273.

[29] Carl Bode, "Rejoinder," American Literature, XVII (1945-46), 268.

[30] Bode, Collected Poems, p. 276.

[31] Raymond Adams, review of Carl Bode, Collected Poems, in The New England Quarterly, XVII (March, 1944), 116. Adams says further, "Surely the entire output of no other American poet has received as careful examination as have these verses of Thoreau."

significant facts and opinions on Sanborn's work. However we must bear in mind this statement by another outstanding student of Thoreau in his review of Bode's volume:

> The editor's interest was the establishment of the texts of the poems, not the establishment of their poetic value. This yielding to authenticity throws the poems which Thoreau himself published to the front of the book, and the volume is off to a good start. But the middle section, with manuscript evidence for every line but without Thoreau's sifting, suffers unevenness. Taken direct from manuscripts, they also suffer another disadvantage. They are printed with all their manuscript errors intact: the absence of apostrophes (in I've and o'er, for example), the irregular margins, the careless lack of capitalization, and the obvious errors of spelling. The editor has reacted too violently to the loose editing of "Thoreau improver" Frank Sanborn half a century ago and leaned too far in the opposite direction.... Once grant, however, the compiler's first concern with textual criticism and collation, and this volume takes on real importance.[32]

Sanborn's "handling of the text has been severly criticized," says Bode.[33] "The best that can be said for it is contained in a paragraph the publishers added to his last life of Thoreau. The paragraph deals with Sanborn's general method, but every word holds true for his treatment of the poetry too."[34] This famous paragraph, about which I shall say more later, declares:

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 115-116.

[33] The most severe criticism, Bode feels, appears in an unpublished master's thesis by Maude Ethel Cryder (University of Chicago, 1920): An Examination of the Bibliophile Edition of Thoreau's Walden. Bode is mistaken, however, when he adds that "Dr. Raymond Adams sums up the charges in the edition of Walden that he himself prepared (Chicago, 1930)." Though Adams does synthesize certain pages of the thesis, the rest of Miss Cryder's thesis will have to be discussed in this study in its appropriate place.

[34] Bode, p. 273.

> Mr. Sanborn was not a slavish quoter, and in dealing with Thoreau's Journals and those other of his writings which Thoreau himself had not prepared for publication, he used the privilege of an editor who is thoroughly familiar with his author's subjects and habits of thought to rearrange paragraphs, to omit here, to make slight interpolations there, and otherwise to treat the rough and unpolished sentences of the Journals, letters, etc., much as it may be supposed the author himself would have treated them had he prepared them for the press. If, therefore, the reader finds occasional discrepancies between the extracts from Thoreau's Journals as here given and the forms in which the same passages appear in the scrupulously exact transcript contained in the published Journal, he is not to set them down to carelessness, but is rather to thank Mr. Sanborn for making these passages more orderly and readable.[35]

Sanborn's changes of text differ in quantity and kind with each poem and with many of his editions of each poem. Though I feel it is not necessary to indicate here each change that he made, I think I should make important generalizations and give the more illuminating particulars. The curious reader may then refer to the textual notes in Bode for Sanborn's rendering of other texts.

As Bode points out that Sanborn "kept more closely to Thoreau's own readings in The Commonwealth than he did anywhere else or at any other time,"[36] let us consider first the quality and quantity of his editing for that newspaper. As my study will document so much evidence of Sanborn's radical editorial changes, it seems equally important to

---

[35] Sanborn, Life of Thoreau (1917), pp. xiv-xv.

[36] Bode, p. 275. As Bode has, to save space in the printing of his textual notes, replaced titles of books, names of libraries and manuscripts by symbols, I have had to expand the symbols to the things symbolized for the reader's convenience. If this at times fails to improve Bode's diction, the reader will understand. For these symbols see pp. 271-273, Collected Poems.

indicate how little he changed the texts of many originals. In Thoreau's poem, "The Departure," for example, he made three changes, all of which appear in the lines below--which I print with others to indicate the meter:

Basic Text as Given by Bode:	Sanborn's Version in The Commonwealth
And at night they did spread o'er him	And by night they spread o'er him
What by day they spread before him,	What by day they spread before him,
. . . . .	. . . . .
To the coast of this far Finland,	To the coast of that far Finland,
. . . . .	. . . . .
And still the more he stayed	And still the more he staid

In the next to last line given here, though Thoreau had changed the this to that and then cancelled it so that this was his preferred text, Sanborn kept that.

In "Independence" he changed the line "Even the nobles of the land" to read "Even the noblest of the land" in the following context:

> Be sure your fate
> Doth keep apart its state--
> Not linked with any band--
> Even the nobles of the land
>
> In tented fields with cloth of gold--
> No place doth hold
> But is more chivalrous than they are.
> And sigheth for a nobler war.

In "Greece" Sanborn made no changes whatsoever.

The progressive editings through the years of "The Fall of the Leaf" elicit considerable comment, however, from Bode. These progressive changes may be best shown by referring to a later volume, Poems of

Nature. An editor's note in this volume--which Sanborn edited with Henry S. Salt thirty years later--says:

> The first four of these stanzas {unnamed by Thoreau} were published in the Boston Commonwealth in 1863, under the title of 'The Soul's Season,' the remainder as 'The Fall of the Leaf.' There can be little doubt that they are parts of the same poem {77}.[37]

Bode says of this:

> The editorial judgment of Sanborn and Salt, as exhibited in Poems of Nature, is frequently suspect. The present case offers no exception. First of all, Sanborn, by implication, admits having invented a title for the poem. Secondly, he and Salt say in the editors' note that the remainder of the text in Poems of Nature was published in the Commonwealth as "The Fall of the Leaf." This is not quite correct. Poems of Nature has three additional stanzas at the end, besides the stanzas that constituted the Commonwealth version of "The Fall of the Leaf."
>
> In the Commonwealth, Sanborn heads "The Soul's Season" and "The Fall of the Leaf" with the notation "From an unpublished manuscript." What has become of Sanborn's original the present editor does not know. None of three related manuscripts in the Wakeman catalogue seems to fill the bill. Number 1035, "The Soul's Season," is described as having nine quatrains; number 1036, "The Fall of the Leaf," is described as having twenty-one quatrains; and number 1037, also entitled "The Fall of the Leaf" is described as having forty-two quatrains. The sample stanzas given for the first two items are included in the version used by Sanborn in the Commonwealth. The sample stanza given for number 1037 is not included, but is--incidentally--included in the verse printed in the present edition as Hintington Library manuscript 13201 {see Appendix A}; pointing out the ultimate repository of this poetry.
>
> After consideration, however, of the various factors just outlined, the lead of the editors of Poems of Nature is followed; and the basic text is the one they first offered to the public.[38] Sanborn's evidence is accepted by the present editor not because it is good evidence--the flaws in it

---

[37] Henry David Thoreau, Poems of Nature, "selected and edited" by Henry S. Salt and Frank B. Sanborn (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1895), p. 77. The square brackets printed here thus: { } indicate brackets by Sanborn but, unless otherwise signified, will in future indicate notes by Bode.

[38] That is to say, in The Commonwealth.

> have already been noticed--but because it is about the only evidence available. In such a situation it has seemed reasonable to give Sanborn the benefit of the doubt and follow his precedent.[39]

As for "Inspiration," Bode found no manuscript authority for the basic text, but referred to several manuscripts and texts, including The Commonwealth for June 19, 1863, Emerson's edition of the poem as it appears in his Letters to Various Persons, and three other Sanborn versions (the Poems of Nature, The First and Last Journeys of Thoreau, and the 1917 biography):

> Sanborn says of the present basic text that he printed it "just as it was left by the poet" -{Critic, March 26, 1881}. As was noted earlier he headed the version in the Commonwealth, "from an unpublished manuscript." Yet of the slightly different version in his 1917 biography, Sanborn also says -{page 267} that he there printed the full poem as Sophia Thoreau gave it to him for this same Commonwealth in the spring of 1863, wholly, he thinks, in Thoreau's handwriting and in Thoreau's own arrangement. The variations in the poem, then, as Emerson published it may be Thoreau's or may be Emerson's, Sanborn concludes.[40]

Although we are discussing Sanborn's editorial habits when publishing Thoreau's work in his newspaper, it might be interesting to note Emerson's editorial method in this connection. Of Emerson's work Bode says in general:

> Emerson felt free to make at least slight alterations in the texts that he printed. In addition he condensed some of the poems by omitting stanzas. However, the authenticity of his texts has been given the benefit of the doubt; and their variations have been recorded in the same manner as those of Thoreau's proven texts.[41]

---

[39] Bode, Collected Poems, p. 335.

[40] Ibid., p. 333.

[41] Ibid., p. 274.

As there is no manuscript authority for the basic text of "Inspiration," it is only possible to show how Emerson differed from that version first given in The Commonwealth by Sanborn. If I interpret Bode accurately, Emerson changed eight words, added one, interchanged the -ing and -ed endings of three words, capitalized one word, and changed eleven marks of punctuation. Sanborn did not necessarily stand by his original text and in later editions of the same poem he made at least twenty-five changes for his version in Poems of Nature and at least five changes for his version in his 1917 biography.[42]

As for the other two poems Sanborn first printed in The Commonwealth, he made these changes. In "Travelling" he printed lines one through six only, prefacing them with two other lines; yet he had the authority of a manuscript now in the Morgan Library for so doing. He made two changes in this printing, of which one was quite probably a misreading. I do not know what changes were made in "The Funeral Bell."[43]

Sanborn did not stop at this first effort to publish the work of his friend, but next began to help others in their efforts. According to two[44] versions which he gives us of these details, a plan had been

---

[42] Ibid., pp. 333-334 and contrast the versions in Poems of Nature, p. 3 and his Life of Thoreau (1917), p. 267.

[43] Bode, pp. 211, 292.

[44] William Ellery Channing, Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses, new edition, enlarged, ed. Sanborn (Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1902), pp. ix-xvi; Recollections, II, 385-396.

formed in 1853 for collecting a "series of walks and talks about Concord and its region, in which Emerson, Thoreau, Channing, and Alcott should be the recorders and interlocutors" and Channing the editor. For this work Channing had copied many pages from Thoreau's journals for the last ten or twelve years of his life. Very few of these pages had been published, though Thoreau had printed a few in his contributions to the Atlantic Monthly, and Emerson had used some in his eulogy. By November 1863 Channing had composed 134 large manuscript pages of his biography, at which time he wrote Sanborn:

> My plan is to prepare a sketch of Mr. H. D. T.'s life,—perhaps to make a book of 300 pages. I am very unwilling to ask your aid in this undertaking, but I cannot see my way without aid, and I have thought perhaps we might find a publisher in Mr. Redpath. I feel entirely certain that you will always afford me all the aid you can, but it does not diminish my unwillingness to ask it. There are many reasons why this is a matter of confidence that I cannot explain. I suppose I could complete this so that it might be printed in January (1864), perhaps. What I need, for any alacrity in the task, is some friendly guarantee of pushing on the enterprise, and I have no one now to confide the matter with but you. . . . That justice can be done to our deceased brother by me, of course, is something I do not think of. But to you and me is intrusted the care of his immediate fame. I feel that my part is not yet done, and cannot be without your aid. My little sketch must only serve as a note, and [sic] advertisement that such a man lived,—that he did brave work, which must yet be given to the world. In the midst of all the cold and selfish men who knew this brave and devoted scholar and genius, why should not you be called on to make some sacrifices, even if it be to publish my sketch? There might be persons who, if they were to surmise that we two had this object in view, would hire some literary jackal to dig up and befoul our brother's corpse. With this, then, let us conclude: About January 1st expect the sketch,—with no shadow of patronage or request in it but your own and mine.[45]

[45] Recollections, II, 386-387. (The ellipsis is Sanborn's.)

Channing was appealing to Sanborn, who was at this time literary editor of the Boston Commonwealth. "The tone of this note," as Sanborn says, "was probably sharpened at the very unhandsome criticism of Thoreau by Lowell, and by a fancy that his publisher might employ Lowell to forestall the promised biography with one which should have the same twist."[46] Though fifteen years had passed since Lowell had let fly his bitter barbs in his Fable for Critics, Channing's and Sanborn's mental wounds were doubtless still fresh from these pointed lines:

> There comes [Channing], for instance; to see him's
> rare sport,
> Tread in Emerson's tracks with legs painfully short;
> How he jumps, how he strains, and gets red in the face,
> To keep step with the mystagogue's natural pace!
> He follows as close as a stick to a rocket,
> His fingers exploring his prophet's each pocket.
> Fie, for shame, brother bard; with good fruit of your
> own,
> Can't you let Neighbor Emerson's orchards alone?
> Besides, 'tis no use, you'll not find e'en a core,--
> [Thoreau] has picked up all the windfalls before.[47]

---

[46] Ibid., II, 387. (See also Sanborn's entry in his journal for Saturday, March 10, 1855, in "An Unpublished Concord Journal," ed. Hellman, Century Magazine, pp. 831-838.)

[47] This version is taken from James Russell Lowell: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, ed. Harry Hayden Clark and Norman Foerster, American Writers Series, (New York: American Book Company, 1947), p. 90. The words "Channing" and "Thoreau" have been substituted for the original "---" in Lowell. Sanborn in his introduction to William Ellery Channing, Poems of Sixty-Five Years (Philadelphia and Concord, J. H. Bentley, 1902) and in his The Personality of Thoreau (Boston, Charles E. Goodspeed, 1901), pp. 2-3, positively identifies the opening blank as referring to Channing, the second blank, to Thoreau. Austin Warren interchanges the names in his "Lowell on Thoreau." SP, XXVII (July, 1930), 442-461. Sanborn's version of these lines does not agree with most of the versions of this poem. Sanborn leaves out lines three and four as printed above and makes other changes in punctuation and capitalization. The changes in punctuation and capitalization should not, however, be held against Sanborn as bad editing, as the versions of these lines given in three standard, scholarly texts do not

There was of course, as Sanborn says, "very little public interest in Thoreau or his manuscripts" at this time. But, as Redpath was enjoying considerable financial success with Louisa May Alcott's Hospital Sketches, which had first appeared in May, 1863, under Sanborn's editorial eye, Channing perhaps hoped the two publishers might offer a magic formula for the success of his enterprise.[48] Sanborn acquiesced with the "expected aid" and began to print the work, copyrighted in his own name, in weekly numbers early in 1864.[49] After several weeks, Sanborn omitted a weekly chapter to give his limited space to other contributors, and "the sensitive author," he says, "took offence, and

---

agree with each other. (See the Clark-Foerster edition of Lowell, p. 90, Henry David Thoreau: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, ed. Bartholow V. Crawford, American Writers Series (New York: American Book Company, 1934), pp. xi-xii and The Poems of James Russell Lowell (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 174.) For a further discussion of Lowell's and Stevenson's damaging influence on Thoreau's literary reputation, see the Thoreau, ed. Bartholow V. Crawford, pp. xi-xvii and Krutch, Thoreau, pp. 249-254, the essay by Austin Warren cited above in this footnote, and the essay by Stewart, n. 22.

As for Sanborn's promotion of Thoreau's literary reputation, I do not know that it was immediate. One's conclusions must be made from the evidence in this chapter and from such remarks as appear in Sanborn's Personality of Thoreau, pp. 1-2, in which he says: "But it did not occur to his friends in those years before the Civil War that he would so soon pass from our sight; nor, in fact, did many of us then appreciate, to the full, his remarkable gifts and their rare and original quality." The use here of the editorial us might be twisted to imply almost anything.

[48] Channing-Sanborn, Thoreau, the Poet-Naturalist (1902), pp. ix-xvi and Recollections, II, 385-396.

[49] Ibid., p. x, though this does not agree with Sanborn's date in Recollections, II, 387, which says "about Christmas."

recalled his manuscript, so that the work remained a fragment for ten years."[50] During the decade much of the unprinted Thoreau manuscript was published by others and stimulated an interest in the author, though it greatly decreased the value of Channing's material. By 1871, however, Sanborn had induced Roberts Brothers to print an edition of 1500 copies, which "in twenty years," says Sanborn, "was so completely sold out that it was with difficulty the publishers procured for me a single copy for presentation."[51]

Sanborn's own effort toward perpetuating Thoreau's fame resulted in 1882 in his biography entitled Henry D. Thoreau, one of the American Men of Letters series published by Houghton under the editorship of Charles Dudley Warner. A work of 324 pages, it required about a year to write.[52] I infer from letters from Sanborn to Warner that the latter

---

[50]It was finally published as Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1873), 357 pp. Hereafter the books will be carefully differentiated by author, editor, and date.

[51]Channing-Sanborn, Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist (1902), p. xi. Though Sanborn modifies this statement by saying that the book "sold moderately well," it cannot be considered a best seller. If 1500 copies were sold in 20 years, this would mean a sale of 75 copies a year.

[52]Sanborn's letter to Warner, Concord, May 7, 1881, would indicate that Warner had not yet decided to edit the series, and therefore he could not yet have determined that Sanborn should write the volume. Says Sanborn: "As to the Houghton biographies. I hope you will edit them without fail." The biography must have been out before July 10, 1882, because Daniel Ricketson thanked Sanborn for a complimentary copy in a letter to him of that date. (Sanborn's letter to Warner is in the Watkinson Library of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. The letter from Ricketson to Sanborn is in the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.)

had approached him about writing the biographies of both Parker and Thoreau for the series.[53]

Warner was not the first person to ask Sanborn to write a life of Thoreau. In May, 1881, Sanborn wrote Warner: "Houghton himself asked me--after a fashion--last December, to write a biography of Thoreau for his series, and I have a proposition from Roberts to publish a larger life of T, with letters, poems, etc."[54] At this time, Sanborn as usual had a multitude of other irons in the fire. He told Warner that he expected to bring out in July an edition of Parker's "Prayers" with a memoir of thirty pages by Louisa Alcott, and that his Autobiography of Parker he hoped would appear on the market for Parker's birthday, August 24th, before another biographer, the Reverend

---

[53] Sanborn's letter to Warner, Concord, May 7, 1881, says: "Now as to my writing a life of Parker for Houghton, if J[ulius] H. W[ard] is quietly hushed up, I will not now refuse, but I should doubt if H[oughton] would give me margin enough - I don't mean in pages, but in treatment. If he will stay abroad until Osgood and Howells have forgiven him, and will leave the whole thing in your hands, I will consider. Thanks for your suggestion of it." Sanborn in his letter to Warner for May 18, 1881 says: "Your position in regard to the Editorship is the true one, and I shall be glad to confer with you about Parker and Thoreau, but I suppose I must go forward in the meantime with my Parker matters, which are a little involved; but not so as to complicate your affair, if you come to a decision before August 1 [sic] .... Parker's Journals...have now come into my hands. The manuscripts in general are at the Library here." It is possible, of course, that Warner was seeking Sanborn's advice as to the best person to write the Parker biography, though biographies by O. B. Frothingham and John Weiss had already appeared.

[54] Sanborn to Warner, Concord, May 7, 1881 (Watkinson Library).

Julius H. Ward, "got round with his brush and dust-pan."[55] In the light of his preoccupation with these other "irons" some may feel that the faults in Sanborn's first biography of Thoreau are excusable.

Sanborn obtained his material for the biography from various sources. Thoreau's Aunt Maria provided the Thoreau genealogy directly in a letter to Sanborn which he prints in full in his book, and, indirectly, in other reminiscences which Thoreau had jotted down in an entry reprinted from his Journal.[56] Sanborn also dwelt at length on Thoreau's "maternal grandfather, from whom he is said to have inherited many qualities," a brief sketch of whom the old gentleman's widow had written for Dr. Ripley.[57]

For oral and written anecdotes, observations, reminiscences, or testimony he depended chiefly on Emerson, Daniel Ricketson, Bronson Alcott and his diary, and Ellery Channing and his Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, which proved "a mine of curious information."[58] He also made

---

[55] Ibid., and Sanborn to Warner, Concord, May 18, 1881 (Watkinson Library). In the letter of May 7 Sanborn says: "I ought to say to you what perhaps you know, that the Reverend Julius H. Ward says that he has arranged with Houghton to write the book, and has been to me to see whether such a book would interfere with any plans of mine. I told him no, that the more lives of Parker, the better--but I then and there resolved that I would have an Autobiography of Parker out before J. H. W. got round with his brush and dust-pan."

I do not know and Sanborn does not explain what he means when he says that Houghton asked him "after a fashion" to write the life of Thoreau.

[56] Sanborn, Thoreau (1882), pp. 2, 5-8.

[57] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[58] Ibid., p. 11.

some use of letters, as in chapter nine, where he depends almost entirely on the correspondence between Thoreau and Horace Greeley to indicate their relationship. Into other chapters he worked additional letters by Margaret Fuller, Daniel Ricketson, Charles Lane, President Quincy of Harvard, Sophia Thoreau, and others--letters both relevant and irrelevant.

Though he made several fairly long extracts from essays which Thoreau wrote while at Harvard, he does little more than mention such works as Walden and The Week by their titles, and records almost nothing from the Journal excepting the genealogical excerpt already mentioned. This, I might add, may be symbolic of Sanborn's interests.

Of course, Sanborn reported many of his own personal observations of Thoreau and his family while he was "for a time domesticated there."[59]

Daniel Ricketson, writing to thank Sanborn for his complimentary copy, said:

> It is, I think, the most Thoreau-like of any of the memoirs I have seen of our friend, by which I mean, the truest, most familiar, and life-like portraiture of him. It is more than a Thoreauana as I thought it might be when reading the proofs you sent me. I doubt not, that in common with the friends of T. I feel much obliged to you for the faithful and skillful manner you have accomplished your work.[60]

The leading reviewers were, however, not entirely enthusiastic about the book. Most sharply critical was The Nation, the best critical

---

[59] Ibid., p. 30.

[60] Daniel Ricketson to Sanborn, New Bedford, Mass., July 10, 1882 (American Antiquarian Society).

literary journal of the day. In his lengthy review, the critic said, "MR. SANBORN'S volume may be considered as a vindication, a criticism, a eulogy, or a biography; and in no one of these aspects is it a very successful literary performance." Then it continued:

> Thoreau's life was absolutely without incident, and where it might gain interest from an account of the lives of men with whom he was thrown, Mr. Sanborn fails to take advantage of his opportunities. He has a chapter, indeed, called "Friends and Companions," in which he undertakes to introduce the reader to Emerson, Hawthorne, Margaret Fuller, and Channing, but it is a bare introduction. We know very little more of them at the end of the chapter than we did at the beginning. Another chapter, on "Concord and its Famous People," produces exactly the opposite effect upon the reader from what the author evidently intended: the impression, namely, that Concord is a very stupid and provincial New England village, and that its celebrities must have owed their fame rather to the prevailing dulness than to anything that would elsewhere seem like remarkable brilliancy in themselves.

The reviewer then proceeded to attack Sanborn as a critic. As such, he said, "Mr. Sanborn fails, because he does not succeed in giving us a clear picture of Thoreau, either as an author or as a man."

> He has accumulated a great deal of testimony to show that his friends liked him; but this might be inferred from the fact that they were his friends, and also that they thought him a genius and poet and a remarkable man in many ways. Moreover, this we knew before. Not a single trait of Thoreau's character, except, perhaps, his capacity for enduring suffering, is brought out with any distinctness. This must be Mr. Sanborn's fault rather than Thoreau's, for every one is agreed that he was a man of marked character, whatever that was. Mr. Sanborn attempts to vindicate Thoreau from the charge of moroseness and aversion to human society--a difficult task at best, considering what his career was, and that he himself speaks of his life at Walden as "a protest against society."

---

[61] Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines (1865-1885), (Harvard UP, 1938), III, 331, 232.

Mr. Sanborn's "vindication does not," continued the reviewer, "make us feel that Thoreau, as a casual companion, would have been at all an agreeable or sociable person to meet." As for Sanborn's effort as a vindication, he said, "A vindication which does not vindicate could hardly be of much use as a eulogy":

> Mr. Sanborn, in his desire to be fair, fails to inspire us with any enthusiasm for his subject. Surely it is unnecessary, in giving an account of his personal appearance, to say that it was a "common mistake" to take him at first sight for a peddler. This may have done something to make him seem more human in a New England village, but in the world of letters it is hardly of sufficient importance to excuse its introduction. But the truth is, that at bottom Mr. Sanborn himself thinks a little better of a genius for being as commonplace in appearance as possible. It makes him more Yankee, more true to New England life.... The art of eulogy lies in knowing how to magnify a man's greatness and importance without seeming to do it; but the extreme of commonplace is as bad as that of exaggeration.

The critic then discussed Sanborn's attempted analysis of "The causes and meaning of the Transcendental movement."

> This is really the most important branch of his subject; for, whatever else Thoreau was, he was a Transcendentalist. It is very necessary for any one who undertakes to explain Transcendentalism to the reader of the present day that he should appreciate much more fully than Mr. Sanborn appears to do the difficulties the subject presents. Everybody is perfectly willing to believe that the Transcendentalists exerted a great and good influence upontheir contemporaries; that they recalled a sordid and material generation to a recollection of the supreme importance of the things not of this world. But what any one who looks into the subject finds it difficult to believe is that their talk about the "Superhumanities" and "Stellar duties" was founded on any philosophical system, or grew out of any intellectual opinions really deserving the name. To the worldly-minded the movement was always rather a subject for merriment; but now that we are all willing to take it seriously, what is needed is that it should be made, if possible, more intelligible. Was it an intellectual revolt against Convention and Form, connected and allied with the great modern revolutionary movement in politics? Was it an accidental local fruit of German philosophy? Was it a sort of New England Christian Platonism?

Mr. Sanborn, the critic declared, does not throw any light on these points, except to suggest that the basis of it was "a certain inward tendency of high Calvinism and its counterpart Quakerism, always welling forth in the American colonies."

> He undertakes to show [the critic continued], by a few extracts from their writings, how such Calvinists and Quakers as Wheelwright, Sir Harry Vane, Anne Hutchinson, William Penn, and Jonathan Edwards "prefigured the mystical part of Concord philosophy." It is surely an instance of the sarcasm of destiny that Jonathan Edwards should be held in any way accountable for a movement which was a rebellion against everything he had taught, and the promoters which in his day he would have had great satisfaction in driving out of Massachusetts. It is only on the principle that extremes meet that we can trace any connection between Emerson and Edwards. Mr. Sanborn's extracts only prove that in New England Christianity there was always a recognition of the existence of a principle of faith transcending human experience and knowledge. It is a good deal easier, to be sure, to show that this was true of the Quakers than the Calvinists. In the case of Edwards, the evidence produced by Mr. Sanborn is more than suspicious, for it consists of a description by him, when a boy of twenty, of the charms and attractions of a young lady to whom he was very much attached, and who seemed to him to have an interior beauty of character and mind quite transcending anything he had ever dreamed or imagined.

As for Thoreau as a poet, the critic declared that "Mankind seems to be gradually settling down to the conclusion that the sum and substance of the Transcendentalist philosophy was that its votaries looked at the world essentially as poets." Mr. Sanborn, the critic complained, "has a high opinion of Thoreau's poetical performances, but the specimens he gives are all more or less open to the charge of a want of originality." Sanborn had said of "Smoke": "Indeed, what Greek would not be proud to claim this fragment as his own?" How could Mr. Sanborn be so naive, asked the critic. "All the early specimens of his writing,

both prose and poetical, given by Mr. Sanborn, are imitative; and in prose he seems to have followed the footsteps of Carlyle in adopting, in mature life, a manner of writing which has little or no relation to his early style."

The critic then returned to the philosophy of the Transcendentalists as reflected in Thoreau:

> But, imitative or original, he was, like the rest of his school, an idealist; and...we believe it will be found that it was their idealism, their antagonism to the material, which in a material age and country gave the Transcendentalists their importance. They came to recall New England, and through New England the rest of the country, sunk in a sordid self satisfaction produced by its material prosperity, to the fact that there is something higher and better than money and money-getting, or the contented formalism of an outworn creed; that the pursuit of truth and beauty was all that really made man's life better than that of the beasts of the field. They put aside worldly ambition and desire as truly as ever did any mediaeval monk.... The result was almost startling. Their Yankee audience at first ridiculed them as dreamers; but when they found that what the Transcendentalists actually recommended was dreaming, then ridicule changed to wonder, and finally to a sort of awe-struck admiration.... The Transcendental gospel was not a new religion, but the New England apostles of the ideal, like Thoreau, impressed the imagination of their contemporaries as, in a different day and generation, the heralds of a new gospel might. Their message was the battle-cry of a spiritual warfare for whatever was true and lovely and of good report, against the sordid subservience to material convenience and utility which the intellect is always basely suggesting to the conscience and heart. The effect and value of a battle-cry cannot be measured by intellectual tests.[62]

---

[62] "Sanborn's Thoreau," The Nation, XXXV (July 13, 1882), 34-35. Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, p. 126, says the author of this is A. G. Sedgwick.

Two weeks later The Critic spoke. Its reviewing was "usually bright, incisive, and impartial, with a tendency to be conservative and not very profound."[63] Its reviewer noted that "The critics have been rather hard on Mr. Sanborn's 'Thoreau,' and not without provocation," and he continued:

> There is no denying the fact that he exaggerates the importance of his subject, or that the petty and irrelevant details with which his book is padded tend to depreciate the reader's opinion of the man whom it is designed to commemorate. This is, of course, doubly unfortunate; it increases the distance, already too great, between Thoreau and the general reading public; and it discredits the series of biographies which was so auspiciously inaugurated by Mr. Warner's 'Irving' and Mr. Scudder's 'Noah Webster.' It was intended, no doubt, that the American Men-of-Letters Series should be a series of standard works; this volume will never be accepted as a standard biography.... The task might much better have been entrusted to Mr. Burroughs than to Mr. Sanborn--or, indeed, any other writer whatsoever.

The reviewer then declared that "Mr. Sanborn should not have placed the 'poet-naturalist' on so high a pedestal. He should, moreover, have winnowed his wheat more carefully. The book would have better answered its purpose if it had contained two hundred, or two hundred and fifty pages, instead of three hundred and six."

The critic then became much kinder, continuing: "But having said thus much in condemnation of the work, we are disposed to assume another tone."

---

[63] Frank L. Mott, A History of American Magazines (1865-1885), III, 549.

> Mr. Sanborn's amiable hero-worship is infinitely preferable to the attitude of coarse contempt for Thoreau assumed by those reviewers who would deny his right to consideration in this series of lives. He, at least, errs in the right direction.

As for Thoreau's imitation of Emerson, "It was not because he was like Emerson, but because he was Thoreau, that he commanded the attention of cultivated minds both within and beyond the precincts of his native town. This point Mr. Sanborn duly enforces. He also shows us a more human side than is generally accredited to the recluse of Walden Pond."

In conclusion the critic said: "As we have pointed out above, the present volume has radical faults; but we would advise people to read it. It will enable them, despite Mr. Sanborn's indiscreet laudation, to form a fair estimate of Thoreau's actual position as an American man-of-letters; and it will give them a very good idea of a village which has become famous . . . as the chosen place of some of America's most distinguished sons."[64]

These leading reviews were followed by other mention in such publications as the Atlantic Monthly. In two sentences--of his three-sentence notice--the critic for the Atlantic declared:

> At last we have the material from which to form a notion of the strange personality which has so piqued curiosity. Thoreau's books have disclosed something of the man, but the biographical details which Mr. Sanborn has collected in his interesting volume were needed to enable one to get an external view; the subjective portrait of Thoreau to which we have been accustomed can now be compared more closely with the actual original.[65]

---

[64]"Mr. Sanborn's 'Thoreau,'" The Critic, II (July 29, 1882), 197-198.

[65]"Books of the Month," Atlantic Monthly, L (August, 1882), 286.

I do not know what Sanborn intended to do in his first biography, and he makes no statement of purpose or point of view. I infer, however, that he intended to present Thoreau as (1) the man in his environment, (2) the writer of prose and verse, and (3) the thinker or man of ideas. The result, however, is a portrait--or rather a preliminary sketch--of Thoreau as the man and the author. In Thoreau the thinker, Sanborn, I believe, never had much interest; he certainly evinces no interest in his ideas in this volume. Perhaps Sanborn may have felt that his probable readers had little interest; or it is possible that Sanborn at this time may still have considered Thoreau's philosophy "not worth a straw." I believe, however, that Sanborn took whatever matter was at hand and threw it into this first biography.

This work is, in my opinion, a hodgepodge. Sanborn's efforts have produced merely a literary grab bag; it is a work utterly lacking in focus and organization. It is, however, a work not without value, for in it are collected materials about persons, places, and things which would have been irrevocably lost had Sanborn not gathered them for us.

The book does not focus--though it sheds--light on its subject. As a work lacking organization of any kind, it stands as a symbol of all the "zig-zag histories" and "upside-down biographies" that Sanborn wrote later. For example, Sanborn had on hand material which he chose to use concerning Thoreau's friends and companions. Instead of working this material into some kind of co-ordinated unit, he spreads it out over three chapters which do not necessarily follow each other

nor pertain to each other. In Chapter III, containing thirty-three pages about "Concord and Its Famous People," Sanborn devotes fifteen to anecdotes and genealogy of Dr. Ezra Ripley, "the parish minister and county Nestor," eight pages to Daniel Webster--of all people--who "was never a lyceum lecturer in Concord, and [who] did not often try cases there, but [who] was sometimes consulted in causes of some pecuniary magnitude," and the rest of the chapter to the genealogy of little-known persons. Had Sanborn painted these citizens for us, he would have given us considerably more of Thoreau's environment, but so much of his writing is typified by information such as this:

> Rev. Peter Bulkeley, the founder and first minister of the town, was a near kinsman of Oliver St. John, Cromwell's solicitor-general, of the same noble English family that, a generation or two later, produced Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke, the brilliant, unscrupulous friend of Pope and Swift. Another of the Concord ministers, Rev. John Whiting, was descended, through his grandmother, Elizabeth St. John, wife of Rev. Samuel Whiting, of Lynn, from this same old English family, which, in its long pedigree, counted for ancestors the Norman Conqueror of England and some of his turbulent posterity.

Emerson, the two Alcotts, Hawthorne, and Ellery Channing are mentioned, and the village is dismissed--as far as its natural scenery is concerned --with a word about its elm-lined streets, though its spirit, of course, Sanborn had intended to portray in its leading citizens.

In Chapter IV, entitled "The Embattled Farmers," Sanborn says in his opening sentence:

> IT was not the famous lawyers, the godly ministers, the wealthy citizens, nor even the learned ladies of Concord, who interested Henry Thoreau specially,--but the sturdy farmers, each on his hereditary acres, battling with the elements and enjoying that open-air life which to Thoreau was the only existence worth having.

This leads him to his main point:

> To show what sort of men these Concord farmers were in the days when their historical shot was fired, let me give some anecdotes and particulars concerning two of the original family stocks,—the Hosmers, who first settled in Concord in 1635, with Bulkeley and Willard, the founders of the town; and the Barretts, whose first ancestor, Humphrey Barrett, came over in 1639.

Except for the fact that Thoreau's "favorite walk . . . passed by the great Hosmer farm-house," and the fact that Squire Barrett was "for some years president of the Middlesex Agricultural Society (before which, in later years, Emerson, and Thoreau, and Agassiz gave addresses)," and except for the fact that "Thoreau's special friend among the farmers was another character, Edmund Hosmer, a scion of the same prolific Hosmer stock, who died in 1881," the chapter does not mention Thoreau by name and is pointless.

Chapter VII, entitled "Friends and Companions," focuses a little more on Thoreau, though he plays only a supporting role. Sanborn presents us, for example—and in the following sequence—a passage by Channing on Thoreau as a friend; a passage on Thoreau's "earliest companion," his brother John; some verses by Thoreau on his brother's death; a description of Thoreau's friend, Ellery Channing, followed by Channing's description of himself; a letter by Thoreau to Sanborn encouraging him to continue to appreciate Channing's genius; another paragraph by Thoreau on Channing plus eight lines from The Week "commemorating first Hawthorne and then Channing;" a critique of two and a half pages by Sanborn of Channing's verse; a passage in which Alcott extols the "great and genuine" friendship that was possible with Emerson and

Thoreau, followed by a passage from Walden in which Thoreau extols "one of the last of the philosophers." This is followed by a list of the homes where Thoreau participated in Alcott's Conversations, and two passages in which Thoreau and Channing "commemorate" Hawthorne. On the next page Thoreau and Hawthorne die and are buried. Then Sanborn says, "Of Thoreau's relations with Emerson, this is not the place to speak in full"--though I find after a careful reading of the succeeding pages that he speaks but little of Emerson or of their relation. He then gives us a list of the persons who met at Emerson's in May, 1840, to converse on "the inspiration of the Prophet and Bard, the nature of Poetry, and the causes of the sterility of Poetic Inspiration in our age and country." This he follows by the statement that The Week, "this earliest of his volumes, like most of his writings, is a record of his friendships." Sanborn then mentions "that high-toned, paradoxical essay on Love and Friendship" which appears in it, and presents Alcott's familiar statement in his journal that "presently the press would give [him] two books to be proud of--Emerson's 'Poems,' and Thoreau's 'Week.'" This is followed by a letter from Emerson in England describing The Atlantic, the magazine which was to have been started there in 1848, and expressing the hope that Thoreau and the other Concord literary great would contribute to its American edition. Sanborn then presents a brief anecdote of the fugitive slave who spent a week in Concord with Thoreau, then an account of his own acquaintance with Thoreau--which I have already treated in full in this study--and the chapter concludes with a passage from Emerson's eulogy at Thoreau's funeral.

To say that this typical chapter is utterly devoid of organization is not to say that it contains nothing of value. It is, as Sanborn said of Channing's biography, "a mine of curious information."

The last three chapters of the volume are perhaps the best. Indeed, in these chapters--"Personal Traits and Social Life," "Poet, Moralist, and Philosopher," and "Life, Death, and Immortality"--Sanborn says much that is touching and of great interest. It is, however, typical of Sanborn's mind that he presents in the very last chapter what might have proved a unifying and practical outline for his book. "The life of Thoreau," he says here, "divides itself into three parts: his Apprenticeship, from birth to the summer of 1837 . . . ; his Journey-work (Wanderjahre) from 1837 to 1849, when he appeared as an author . . . ; and his Mastership . . . of the trade and mystery of writing."

In one of these last three, "Personal Traits and Social Life," he quotes suitable passages from Channing, Ricketson, and a "lady who knew [Thoreau] when she was a child, from the age of six to that of fifteen more particularly." These passages portray--for the first time--his physical appearance, defend him against the accusation of "churlishness and cynical severity," and tell of his delight in music. Sanborn then discusses Thoreau's career as a lecturer and as a man who believed in the dignity of physical labor. There is much of merit in this chapter.

Though Sanborn doubtless intended to save his chapter on "Poet, Moralist, and Philosopher" for a full discussion of Thoreau as a poet,

he had already scattered his more important evaluations of his verse through previous chapters. However, he begins this chapter by saying:

> THE character of poet is so high and so rare, in any modern civilization, and specially in our American career of nationality, that it behooves us to mark and claim all our true poets, before they are classified under some other name,--as philosophers, naturalists, romancers, or historians. Thus Emerson is primarily and chiefly a poet, and only a philosopher in his second intention; and thus also Thoreau, though a naturalist by habit, and a moralist by constitution, was inwardly a poet by force of that shaping and controlling imagination, which was his strongest faculty. His mind tended naturally to the ideal side. He would have been an idealist in any circumstances; a fluent and glowing poet, had he been born among a people to whom poesy is native, like the Greeks, the Italians, the Irish. As it was, his poetic light illumined every wide prospect and every narrow cranny in which his active, patient spirit pursued its task. It was this inward illumination as well as the star-like beam of Emerson's genius in "Nature," which caused Thoreau to write in his senior year at college, "This curious world which we inhabit is more wonderful than it is convenient; more beautiful than it is useful," and he cherished this belief through life. In youth, too, he said, "The other world is all my art, my pencils will draw no other, my jack-knife will cut nothing else; I do not use it as a means." It was in this spirit that he afterwards uttered the quaint parable, which was his version of the primitive legend of the Golden Age:--
>
> "I long ago lost a hound, a bay horse, and a turtle dove, and am still on their trail...."
>
> In the same significance read his little-known verses, "The Pilgrims."

After presenting the sixteen lines of what he entitled "The Pilgrims," the curious editing of which I shall treat later, he recounts Thoreau's methods in writing verse:

> It seems to have been the habit of Thoreau, in writing verse, to compose a couplet, a quatrain, or other short metrical expression, copy it in his journal, and afterward, when these verses had grown to a considerable number, to arrange them in the form of a single piece. This gives to his poems the epigrammatic air which most of them have. After he was thirty years old, he wrote scarcely any verse, and he even destroyed much that he had previously written, following in this the judgment of Mr. Emerson, rather than his own, as he told me one day during his last illness.

He then discusses Thoreau's indebtedness to the English and Greek poets:

> He had read all that was best in English and in Greek poetry, but was more familiar with the English poets of Milton's time and earlier, than with those more recent, except his own townsmen and companions. He valued Milton above Shakespeare, and had a special love for AEschylus, two of whose tragedies he translated. He had read Pindar, Simonides, and the Greek Anthology, and wrote, at his best, as well as the finest of the Greek lyric poets. Even Emerson, who was a severe critic of his verses, says, "His classic poem on 'Smoke' suggests Simonides, but is better than any poem of Simonides."

Sanborn then notes that no complete collection of Thoreau's poems has been made, and declares that, "amid much that is harsh and crude, such a book would contain many verses sure to survive for centuries."

Of Thoreau's verse which Sanborn quotes in other pages of the text, he is most enthusiastic about "Sympathy," which he discusses in Chapter VI, "Early Essays in Authorship":

> The measure of "Sympathy" was that of Davenant's "Gondibert," which Thoreau, almost alone of his contemporaries, had read; the thought was above Davenant, and ranged with Raleigh and Spenser. These verses will not soon be forgotten.

Sanborn seemed to exercise a good deal of critical acumen in his selection of Thoreau's verse for this volume. It seems significant that he chose "Smoke," "Sympathy," "To the Maiden in the East," "The Departure," "Brother Where Dost Thou Dwell," and "Prayer," as six of his seven examples of Thoreau's verse, six pieces that are often picked by twentieth-century anthologists and Thoreau editors. When, for example, Bartholow V. Crawford chooses seven poems for his volume of representative selections, four of them are among the above.[66]

---

[66] Bartholow V. Crawford, Henry David Thoreau: Representative Selections, pp. 342-350. Crawford selects "Smoke," "To the Maiden in the East," "Sympathy," and "Prayer."

Sanborn's editing of these verses is, however, amazing. The trusting and uninitiated reader presumes, of course, that he is reading Thoreau's verse as Thoreau intended him to read it. Such is not the case, and the nineteenth-century reader of Sanborn's literary productions little realized how much the master work had been tampered with. It is a little like listening to Stokowski's "transcriptions" of Bach, with all the liberties that those transcriptions include in both orchestration and performance. For example, as Carl Bode points out in his precise and scholarly presentation of the original manuscripts,[67] the poem which Sanborn calls "The Pilgrims" is edited as follows. Sanborn lifts sixteen lines from the original 82 which Thoreau entitled "The Hero." Beginning with line 62 in the original, Sanborn has included the twelve lines that follow—cancelled by Thoreau—and then chops off the last four lines of the original. He then changes punctuation and language as he wills, as may be best shown by printing these resulting sixteen lines in parallel columns:

---

[67] Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau, ed. Carl Bode (Chicago, Packard and Company, 1943), pp. 161-163, with notes on pp. 316-318 and 363-364.

Original Thoreau Manuscript	Sanborn's Transcription
When I have slumbered I have heard sounds As travellers passing Over my grounds-- 'Twas a sweet music Wafted them by I could not tell If far off or nigh. Unless I dreamed it This was of yore-- But I never told it To mortal before-- Never remembered But in my dreams What to me waking A miracle seems	When I have slumbered I have heard sounds As of travelers passing These my grounds. 'Twas a sweet music Wafted them by, I could not tell If afar off or nigh. Unless I dreamed it This was of yore: I never told it To mortal before. Never remembered But in my dreams, What to me waking A miracle seems.

This version, according to Bode, found its way also into Volume I of the Walden Edition of the complete Thoreau Writings, published in 1906 by Houghton Mifflin, Volume VI of which contained the "Familiar Letters" edited by Sanborn. Whether Sanborn had any influence on the editors of the other nineteen volumes in this edition I do not know.

Of course, Sanborn is granted the usual privilege permitted to editors or critics to "quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper," as the publishers say, but his editing of these excerpts goes beyond this license.[68] As I shall consider Sanborn's editing more fully later in this chapter, suffice it to say here that, except for "Implacable is Love," Sanborn's

[68] The reader may at this point desire to compare "Sympathy" (Sanborn, 164) with Bode, 64-65; "Implacable is Love" (Sanborn, 167) with Bode, 71-73; "Low in the eastern sky" (Sanborn, 165-167) with Bode, 38-39; "Where'er thou sail'st who sailed with me" (Sanborn, 175) with Bode, 29; "Brother, where dost thou dwell?" (Sanborn, 176-177) with Bode, 151-152; "The Departure" (Sanborn, 282-283) with Bode, 209-210; and "Smoke" (Sanborn, 287) with Bode, 27-28.

editing of the other poems in this 1882 volume consists chiefly of minor changes in capitalization, punctuation, and words.

Sanborn also discusses in this 1882 biography Thoreau's prose gifts. In doing so, it seems strange that he concentrates most of his attention on Thoreau's college essays. Whereas more recent critics such as Mark Van Doren, F. O. Matthiessen, Norman Foerster, or Henry Seidel Canby allude to these early essays, they spend more of their time in their analyses of the major writings.

About one of these college essays, Sanborn exclaims: "Here we have a touch of fine writing, natural in a boy who had read Irving and Goldsmith. . . . But how smooth the flow of description, how well-placed the words, how sure and keen the eye of the young observer!"[69] As for his method of writing, it was, says Sanborn, peculiarly his own, "though it bore some external resemblance to that of his friends, Emerson and Alcott":

> Like them he early began to keep a journal, which became both diary and commonplace book. But while they noted down the thoughts which occurred to them, without premeditation or consecutive arrangement, Thoreau made studies and observations for his journal as carefully and habitually as he noted the angles and distances in surveying a Concord farm. In all his daily walks and distant journeys, he took notes on the spot of what occurred to him, and these, often very brief and symbolic, he carefully wrote out, as soon as he could get time, in his diary, not classified by topics, but just as they had come to him. To these he added his daily meditations, sometimes expressed in verse,...but generally in close and pertinent prose.... From these daily entries he made up his essays, his lectures, and his volumes; all being slowly, and with much deliberation and revision, brought into the form in which he gave them to the public. After that he scarcely changed them at all; they had received the last imprint of his mind, and he allowed them to stand and speak for themselves.[70]

---

[69] Page 155.

[70] Pages 302-303.

Sanborn also shows the reader how Thoreau took notes:

> He had gauges for the height of the river, noted the temperature of springs and ponds, the tints of the morning and evening sky, the flowering and fruit of plants, all the habits of birds and animals, and every aspect of nature from the smallest to the greatest. Much of this is the dryest detail, but everywhere you come upon [illegible] strokes of beauty, in a single word-picture, or in a page of idyllic description.[71]

And Sanborn follows this with two passages, the one on the confiding heifer and the apostrophe to the Queen of Night. Sanborn then concludes the chapter by burying Thoreau for what is now the third time and by appending what most readers would presume was a quatrain by Thoreau. I was considerably surprised to discover by accident, therefore, that these lines--if the index to the volume is correct--were written by Sanborn's oldest son, Thomas Parker Sanborn.[72]

If Sanborn's purpose in this volume was to stimulate the public to read Thoreau, it seems rather doubtful that he succeeded. The poverty of Sanborn's comments and his failure to allow Thoreau to speak for himself do not overwhelm the reader until he looks into such excellent analyses of Thoreau's style and content as are provided by Van Doren and Matthiessen in their essays.[73]

---

[71] Pages 257-258. (Observe that Sanborn's treatment of this topic occurs in widely separate sections of his volume.)

[72] See page 260 and the Index (under "Poems"), p. 322. The motivation for including this quatrain is not clear to me. Perhaps Sanborn hoped to promote his son's career as poet, for these lines were written when Thomas was 17 (or younger). Thomas was very serious in his poetizing, and his tragic suicide in March, 1889, was attributed by some to the fact that he was not chosen class poet at Harvard. (He was born February 23, 1865, and died in March, 1889.)

[73] Mark Van Doren, Henry David Thoreau: A Critical Study (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), 138 pp. F. O. Matthiessen, American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), pp. 3-119.

Earlier in this discussion I observed that Sanborn seems, in this biography, less interested in Thoreau's ideas. He does, however, devote a chapter to "The Transcendental Period," and he makes other observations on Thoreau's mind and art. Sanborn chooses to look for his ideas chiefly in the college essays. In one Thoreau recommends "keeping a private journal;" in another he discusses "simplicity of style;" in others, he takes a novel view of punishments, or looks at the effect of story-telling, or speaks originally of the need for American independence of foreign opinion:

> We are, as it were, but colonies. True, we have declared our independence, and gained our liberty, but we have dissolved only the political bands which connected us with Great Britain; though we have rejected her tea, she still supplies us with food for the mind.

Provided, too, are excerpts from an "elaborate paper" on Milton's L'Allegro and Il Penseroso, from an essay on the source of our feeling of the sublime, and from another on Paley's Common Reasons. From one we see "the earliest record of the day's observations" of nature, and from the following Sanborn feels there is to be found the "key-note of Thoreau's whole after-life":

> Most of us are apt to neglect the study of our own characters, thoughts, and feelings, and, for the purpose of forming our own minds, look to others, who should merely be considered as different editions of the same great work. To be sure, it would be well for us to examine the various copies, that we might detect any errors; yet it would be foolish for one to borrow a work which he possessed himself, but had not perused.[74]

---

[74] Page 151.

As though to defend Thoreau from further charges of imitating Emerson, Sanborn emphasizes that Thoreau "brought to his intellectual tastes an originality as marked as Emerson's, if not so brilliant and star-like--a patience far greater than his, and a proud independence that makes him the most solitary of modern thinkers," and gives these early essays, written before Emerson's Nature, as his evidence. Though Sanborn provides no analysis, at least he allows Thoreau to be represented here in part, Sanborn's editing again doing grave injustice to Thoreau's literary skill, as we shall see later.

Sanborn's chapter on "The Transcendental Period," which the critic for The Nation severely castigated, begins well. In fact, I feel that in its first two pages Sanborn's writing seems extraordinarily good; it promises much. But the chapter soon turns into interesting, though unenlightening, anecdotes of the "pious egotism and the laughable vagaries of Transcendentalism." A minister of Malden tells in his diary about his trying experiences with a "one-horse Shay;" Emerson writes Thoreau of a call from Albert Brisbane, during which the latter discoursed on "the self-augmenting potency of the solar system;" Emerson writes Thoreau about Alcott and Lane's plan for Fruitlands; Lane writes Thoreau of their plans for this enterprise; Emerson describes with regret the withdrawal of "many intelligent and religious persons" "from the common labors and competitions of the market and the caucus;" Dr. Ezra Ripley writes Dr. William Ellery Channing a sad letter bemoaning the lack of "common sense " among the Transcendentalists and bewailing "that superiority which places a man above the power of doing good to his fellow-men." Sanborn characteristically closes the chapter with:

> Twenty years after this pastoral epistle, there came to Concord another Christian of the antique type, more Puritan and Hebraic than Dr. Ripley himself, yet a Transcendentalist, too--and JOHN BROWN found no lack of practical good-will in Thoreau, Alcott, Emerson, and the other Transcendentalists. The years had "come full circle," the Sibyl had burnt her last prophetic book, and the new aeon was about to open with the downfall of slavery.

What must be said in conclusion about this biography? When Norman Foerster reviewed Sanborn's biography of Thoreau that appeared in 1917, he complained that it was "full of digression and prosy circumstantiality; more full of them than Sanborn's smaller biography of thirty-five years ago."[75]

Though Daniel Ricketson said in his letter to Sanborn: "It is more than a Thoreauana as I thought it might be when reading the proofs you sent me," Ricketson's first thoughts while proofreading were, in my opinion, more nearly correct than he cared to admit. This work is, as Foerster says of the 1917 volume, "a treasury of Thoreauisms." Whether it can properly be called a "Thoreauana" is open to question, for the suffix -ana usually denotes "a collection of material pertaining to a given subject." As Sanborn's subject was Henry David Thoreau, and the major portion of the volume does not pertain to him, one stretches the term "Thoreauana" to make it fit Sanborn's volume.

Sanborn is a rememberer of things past, a genealogist, a New England antiquarian, and a collector of material in general. But, as a collector of material, he has done honorable service, for the editors and writers who have followed him have made good use of this literary

---

[75] Norman Foerster, Yale Review, new series, VII (January, 1913), 430-431.

grab bag, though, as Odell Shepard declares, "My experience with his work has bred a sort of irritation."[76] As Sanborn's son said to me: "Father wrote biographies. But the trouble was he admitted subjects of interest to him, but I think of doubtful interest to the general reader. He tackled a subject the way he wanted to, even though it didn't necessarily appeal to anyone else."

Had Sanborn bestowed on this work the precise care that he employed in his Harvard undergraduate days writing his entries in his college journal and organizing his critical essays for The Harvard Magazine, he would have produced an important literary work, for few men have had the opportunities which Sanborn had to sit at the feet of the literary gods and record their words.

Sanborn's next major effort to perpetuate Thoreau's fame resulted in 1894 in an edition of his letters. The history of the printing of these is somewhat tangled and confused. Francis H. Allen in A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau states that "the first regularly collected complete edition of Thoreau's writings" was The Writings of Henry David Thoreau, with Bibliographical Introductions and Full Indexes,[77] published in 1894

---

[76] Personal letter to me from Odell Shepard, Jordan Cove, Waterford, Connecticut, February 9, 1951.

[77] Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, p. 51. Actually Allen does not say this, but gives the title as Collected Works. This full title is given in The Literary History of the United States, III, 742. The full title appears on the half-title of each of the original ten volumes; it does not appear on the title-page.

by Houghton, Mifflin as the Large-Paper Edition, limited to 150 numbered copies. Printed that same year from these plates was the Riverside Edition.[78] Both editions contained ten volumes with introductory notes prepared either by Horace E. Scudder or H. G. O. Blake.[79]

Sanborn's volume, Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau, Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, was published by the same firm first in the Large-Paper Edition, limited to 150 copies.[80] Four months later appeared the Letters in the Riverside Edition, the plates of which had printed this Large-Paper Edition.[81] Familiar Letters, "upon its appearance in 1894, was added to the Riverside Edition as an eleventh volume, being brought out in uniform style, though it lacked the half-title with the volume-number."[82] The volume of Familiar Letters in the Large-Paper Edition was, I infer, added as volume eleven to the Large-Paper Edition.[83]

---

[78]Allen, p. 52.

[79]Ibid., p. 51.

[80]Ibid., p. 32.

[81]Loc. cit.

[82]Ibid., p. 51.

[83]The Literary History of the United States (hereafter referred to as LHUS) has added even greater confusion to the history of these editions by stating in III, 742: "In the same year [1894] Frank B. Sanborn edited Familiar Letters ..., which was added as Vol. XI, and the set now issued (1894) as the Cambridge Edition, reissued, Boston, 1932." Francis H. Allen, in a personal letter to me October 10, 1952, says he never heard of a Cambridge Edition. The Thoreau section of the Literary History of the United States is filled with such errors.

Sanborn's volume superseded the rather small Letters to Various Persons which Emerson had edited in 1865 for Ticknor and Fields, and it "has remained the standard edition ever since."[84] Some indication of its contents may be gathered from these comments by the critic who reviewed the volume for The Nation:

> MR. SANBORN'S edition of Thoreau's letters includes apparently all the letters in Emerson's edition of 1865, and how much added matter he has given us may be reckoned from the pages of his book. It has 464 to 207 of Emerson's, the amount of matter to a page being about the same in each.[85]

Sanborn prefaced the 130 letters and fragments of letters with a statement that his intention was "to give the world . . . a fuller and more familiar view of our friend" than Emerson's collection had allowed. To do this, he said, he had chosen "many letters and mere notes, illustrating his domestic and gossipy moods . . . and even the colloquial vulgarity that he sometimes allowed himself."

As the reviewer in The Nation said:

> Mr. Sanborn's matter is of two kinds--letters of Thoreau's not hitherto published in a book, and a good deal of editorial matter, rich in personal recollection and the fruit of much research, amounting to a brief biography. It gives the order and connection of Thoreau's life, accounts for his presence in this or that place and his flittings to and fro, gives some account of his friends as one after another of them appears upon the scene, explains various circumstances and obscure allusions, and, taken altogether, is a very real and palatable addition to the feast spread by Emerson and the fresh dishes from Thoreau's larder which have been added thereunto.

---

[84] Walter Harding, "Franklin B. Sanborn and Thoreau's Letters," The Boston Public Library Quarterly, III (October, 1951), 288.

[85] The Nation, LIX (October 18, 1894), 291-292.

Though the volume was doubtless of great value, the wretchedness of Sanborn's editing has been demonstrated for all time by Walter Harding, secretary-treasurer of the Thoreau Society and long a student of Thoreau, who is now at work with Carl Bode on a definitive edition of the Thoreau letters which should reach the public next year. Referring to Sanborn's preface quoted above, he says:

> One might expect from this announcement a fairly accurate edition of Thoreau's letters. But a comparison of the original manuscripts, where they are extant, with Sanborn's editing reveals quite a different picture.

"No better example," he continues, "can be found than Thoreau's letter to Horace Greeley of May 19, 1848." And to dramatize Sanborn's work he sets the text of this manuscript alongside Sanborn's transcription:

Original Manuscript	Sanborn's Transcription
Concord, May 19, 1848	Concord, May 19, 1848.
My Friend Greeley, I received from you fifty dollars today.-- For the last five years I have supported myself solely by the labors of my hands -- I have not received one cent from any other source, and this has cost me so little time, say a month in the spring and another in the autumn, doing the coarsest work of all kinds, that I have probably enjoyed more leisure for literary pursuits than any contemporary. For more than two years past I have lived alone in the woods, in a good plastered and shingled house entirely of my own building, earning only what I wanted, and sticking to my proper work. The	My Friend Greeley, -- I have to-day received from you fifty dollars. It is five years that I have been maintaining myself entirely by manual labor, -- not getting a cent from any other quarter or employment. Now this toil has occupied so few days, -- perhaps a single month, spring and fall each, -- that I must have had more leisure than any of my brethren for study and literature. I have done rude work of all kinds. From July, 1845, to September, 1847, I lived by myself in the forest, in a fairly good cabin, plastered and warmly covered, which I built myself. There I earned all I needed, and kept to my own affairs. During that time my weekly outlay was but seven-

fact is man need not live by the sweat of his brow -- unless he sweats easier than I do -- he needs so little. For two years and two months all my expenses have amounted to but 27 cents a week, and I have fared gloriously in all respects. If a man must have money, and he needs but the smallest amount, the true and independent way to earn it is by day-labor with his hands at a dollar a day -- I have tried many ways and can speak from experience. -- Scholars are apt to think themselves privileged to complain as if their lot was a peculiarly hard one. How much have we heard about the attainment of knowledge under difficulties of poets starving in garrets -- depending on the patronage of the wealthy -- and finally dying mad. It is time that men sang another song. There is no reason why the scholar who professes to be a little wiser than the mass of men, should not do his work in the ditch occasionally, and by means of his superior wisdom make much less suffice for him. A wise man will not be unfortunate. How then would you know but he was a fool?

This money therefore comes as a free and even unexpected gift to me --

My Friend Greeley, I know not how to thank you for your kindness -- to thank you is not the way -- I can only assure you that I see and appreciate it -- To think that while I have been sitting comparatively idle here, you have been so active in my behalf!

You have done well for me. I only wish it had been in a better cause -- Yet the value of good

and-twenty cents; and I had an abundance of all sorts. Unless the human race perspire more than I do, there is no occasion to live by the sweat of their brow. If men cannot get on without money (the smallest amount will suffice), the truest method of earning it is by working as a laborer at one dollar per day. You are least dependent so; I speak as an expert, having used several kinds of labor.

Why should the scholar make a constant complaint that his fate is specially hard? We are too often told of "the pursuit of knowledge under difficulties," -- how poets depend on patrons and starve in garrets, or at last go mad and die. Let us hear the other side of the story. Why should not the scholar, if he is really wiser than the multitude, do coarse work now and then? Why not let his greater wisdom enable him to do without things? If you say the wise man is unlucky, how could you distinguish him from the foolishly unfortunate?

My friend, how can I thank you for your kindness? Perhaps there is a better way, -- I will convince you that it is felt and appreciated. Here have I been sitting idle, as it were, while you have been busy in my cause, and have done so much for me. I wish you had had a better subject; but good deeds are no less good

deeds is not affected by the unworthiness of their object. Yes--that was the right way, but who would ever have thought of it? I think it might not have occurred even to somewhat of a business man. I am not one in the common sense at all -- that is I am not acquainted with the forms. I might have way-laid him perhaps. I perceive that your way has this advantage too, that he who draws the draft determines the amount which it is drawn for. You prized it well, that was the exact amount.

If more convenient the Maine article might be printed in the form of letters; you have only to leave off at the end of a day, and put the date before the next one. I shall certainly be satisfied to receive $25.00 for it -- that was all I expected if you took it -- but I do not by any means consider you bound to pay me that -- the article not being what you asked for, and being sent after so long a delay. You shall therefore, if you take it, send me 25 dollars now, or when you have disposed of it, whichever is most convenient -- that is, after deducting the necessary expenses which I perceive you must have incurred. That is all I ask for it.

The carrier it is commonly who makes the money -- I am concerned to see that you as carrier make nothing at all -- but are in danger of losing a good deal of your time as well as some of your money.

So I got off -- rather so I am compelled to go off muttering my ineffectual thanks. But because their object is unworthy.

Yours was the best way to collect money, -- but I should never have thought of it; I might have waylaid the debtor perchance. Even a business man might not have thought of it, -- and I cannot be called that, as business is understood usually, -- not being familiar with the routine. But your way has this to commend it also, -- if you make the draft, you decide how much to draw. You drew just the sum suitable.

The Ktaadn paper can be put in the guise of letters, if it runs best so; dating each part on the day it describes. Twenty-five dollars more for it will satisfy me; I expected no more, and do not hold you to pay that, -- for you asked for something else, and there was delay in sending. So, if you use it, send me twenty-five dollars now or after you sell it, as is most convenient; but take out the expenses that I see you must have had.

In such cases carriers generally get the most; but you, as carrier here, get no money, but risk losing some, besides much of your time; while I go away, as I must, giving you unprofitable thanks.

Yet trust me, my pleasure in your letter is not wholly a selfish one. May my

believe me, my Friend, the gratification which your letter affords me is not wholly selfish. Trusting that my good genius will continue to protect me on this accession of wealth, I remain Yours Henry Thoreau	good genius still watch over me and my added wealth!
P. S. My book is swelling again under my hands, but as I have leisure I shall see to those shorter articles. So look out.	P. S. — My book grows in bulk as I work on it; but soon I shall get leisure for those shorter articles you want, — then look out.

Harding's comment on Sanborn's transcription is this:

> Such "editing" scarcely needs comment. Thoreau's pithy and masculine style is corrupted until it is hardly recognizable. It has become a typical piece of Victorian sentimentalism in style if not in meaning. Notice the refinement of perspiration for sweat. Yet Thoreau preferred the latter word, and indeed later lifted the whole sentence from this letter and placed it in Walden: "It is not necessary that a man should earn his living by the sweat of his brow, unless he sweats easier than I do."[86]

Furthermore, Harding declares that small changes, not always of vital importance, are frequent. For example, Thoreau's letter to the Emerson family, written from Staten Island, July 8, 1843, shows at least 110 changes in punctuation, grammar, spelling, and wording in Sanborn's version.[87]

Then, too, Sanborn not only took liberties with his texts, says Harding, but he was careless in his editing:

---

[86] (Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1854), p. 77.

[87] Familiar Letters (1894), pp. 109-113. The manuscript, says Harding, is now in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library.

He occasionally dated the same letter differently in different printings, as for example the letter of February 12, 1843, from Emerson to Thoreau, which he dated correctly in an article in the Atlantic Monthly but which he misdated February 10, 1843 in Bronson Alcott at Alcott House.[88] In Familiar Letters he quoted a portion of a letter of December 2, 1847, from Emerson to Thoreau and a part of another letter of March 25, 1848, entering them together as one letter dated February, 1848, halfway between the two.[89] He was also careless with names. For example, in his 1882 biography of Thoreau, he asserts that the letter of July 21, 1843, was written to Sophia Thoreau,[90] when, as he correctly states in Familiar Letters, it was written to her sister Helen.[91] But perhaps the outstanding example of this sort of carelessness is the letter written to Thoreau by James Elliott Cabot on May 27, 1847, which Sanborn gives in two entirely different versions, one in Familiar Letters[92] and the other in his 1882 biography.[93] The two overlap in parts, but each contains material not in the other, and what should be identical sentences vary considerably in their wording. Since the manuscript has disappeared, one can only wonder what was in the original letter.

Harding feels that perhaps the spirit of "refinement" so common in Sanborn's age may explain, if not excuse, his editorial method, and that he was only one of the many editors of his day who felt they must "prettify" their texts. Harding concludes:

---

[88] Sanborn, "The Emerson-Thoreau Correspondence," (May, 1892), p. 20, and Sanborn, Bronson Alcott at Alcott House, England, and Fruitlands, New England (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press, 1908), p. 31.

[89] Familiar Letters (1894), pp. 148-149.

[90] Henry D. Thoreau (1882), p. 216.

[91] Familiar Letters (1894), p. 113.

[92] Ibid., pp. 156-157.

[93] Henry D. Thoreau (1882), p. 244.

> He performed a major service by preserving in print many Thoreau manuscripts which have since disappeared and which would otherwise have been totally lost. But one should approach his work with caution, realizing that the product is not pure Thoreau, but rather a Sanbornized Thoreau.[94]

Several things seem extraordinary to me when I study these parallel columns. What seems most extraordinary is this: though Sanborn, in my opinion, wrote few quotable sentences after he left college, he had the supreme self-confidence that allowed him to rearrange the sentences and the sentence structure of one of the best sentence-writers in the English language. Sanborn wrote such sentences as this:

> In these majestic lines, suggestive of Dante, of Shakespeare, and of Milton, yet fitting, by the force of imagination, to the simplicity and magnanimity that Thoreau had displayed, one reads the secret of that character which made the Concord recluse first declare to the world the true mission of John Brown, whose friend he had been for a few years.

--which is certainly one of Sanborn's better sentences--or this one, which any habitual reader of Sanborn will recognize as typical:

> James Hosmer, a clothier from Hawkhurst in Kent, with his wife Ann(related to Major Simon Willard, that stout Kentishman, Indian trader and Indian fighter, who bought of the Squaw Sachem the township of Concord, six miles square), two infant daughters, and two maid-servants, came from London to Boston in the ship "Elizabeth," and the next year built a house on Concord Street, and a mill on the town brook.[95]

Yet in this edition of Thoreau's letters he could edit the sentences of a man whose writing was infinitely better. Thoreau's sentence, "It is

---

[94] Harding, pp. 288-293. (Footnotes 86 through 93 are Harding's or are based on Harding's footnotes.)

[95] Henry D. Thoreau (1882), pp. 185 and 98.

time that men sang another song" is Sanbornized into the trite "Let us hear the other side of the story." Thoreau's "mass of men" is Latinized into "multitude" and where Thoreau talks about "work in the ditch," Sanborn corrupts it to "coarse work."

This process of Sanbornizing is bad enough, certainly, but what is more unfortunate is that Sanborn seems to have learned nothing about prose from his master. Thoreau, as Matthiessen points out, hated writers who used "torpid words, wooden or lifeless words, such words as 'humanitary,' which have a paralysis in their tails." And he praised Quarles for pressing "able-bodied and strong-backed words into his service, which have a certain rustic fragrance and force."[96] This leads me to wonder whether Sanborn had read Thoreau and to speculate on what Thoreau might have said to Sanborn had he lived to see his letters emasculated.

Furthermore, if seven years were not enough for Sanborn to get Thoreau's point, he had twenty more years to learn it from his friend Emerson, who used "bellyful," "stinking," "drivelling," "slut," "sot," "vomit," "sweat," and "swinish,"[97] and who said: "I confess to some pleasure from the stinging rhetoric of a rattling oath in the mouth of truckmen and teamsters."[98]

---

[96] Matthiessen, American Renaissance, pp. 86 and 110.

[97] Theodore Benson Strandness, "Emerson's Sensory Relations with Nature," (University of Minnesota: unpublished Master's thesis, 1942), pp. 13-17. This thesis explores much of the same territory discussed by Matthiessen, pp. 3-75.

[98] Quoted in Matthiessen, p. 35, from The American Scholar.

How does one explain Sanborn's "improving" of Thoreau? Was Sanborn tone-deaf? Two summers ago, when I talked with his son Francis, I said, "I've been troubled that your father never mentions the word music. Did he enjoy it?" To which Mr. Sanborn replied: "He didn't know one tune from another. No tone sense whatever. He seemed to know all the words to all the hymns in the hymn book, but had he tried to sing one he'd have fallen down lamentably."[99] If, then, he was tone-deaf, did his reading of Homer, Virgil, Milton, Shakespeare, and a thousand others teach him nothing? Sanborn knew Emerson's Nature and he should have absorbed such lessons in diction and linguistics as this which are found there:

> Every word which is used to express a moral or intellectual fact, if traced to its root, is found to be borrowed from some material appearance. Right means straight; wrong means twisted. Spirit primarily means wind; transgression, the crossing of a line; supercilious, the raising of the eyebrow. ... Children and savages use only nouns or names of things, which they convert into verbs, and apply to analogous mental acts.[100]

Sanborn may have been tone-deaf, but he was not deaf to noise or rhythm. Even while in college he could write these lines, which, though they have none of the punch of sentences by Thoreau or Emerson, do demonstrate a feeling for words:

---

[99] I have since found a reference--in a letter to Theodore Parker--to his joy in listening to a performance of Beethoven's Fifth.

[100] Frederic I. Carpenter, Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, (New York: American Book Company, 1934), American Writers Series, p. 21.

> See how Soracte white with snow
> Stands shining, while the laboring woods
> Bend with their burden, and the floods
> Feel freezing Winter chill their flow.

These are pale words and smell of lavender and old lace. But they are for the most part Anglo-Saxon words, and if Sanborn could write these he should have been able to see that it would be better to hire some responsible boy in the Concord High School to copy Thoreau's letters accurately than to tamper as he did with the originals.

Of course the reviewers of Sanborn's Familiar Letters knew nothing of Sanborn's unfortunate habits, and we must look at their reviews as critiques of a queer amalgam. They were in the position of judges who must decide which of the Siamese twins has better blood. The reviewer for The Critic felt that there was "probably no one living who could edit better the letters of Henry D. Thoreau than his companion and friend, Frank B. Sanborn," and he continued:

> The letters which Emerson collected some thirty years ago showed, as one might expect and as Mr. Sanborn points out, only one side of the poet-philosopher's character. Mr. Sanborn has gone farther. He has given us an insight into the interesting, open-hearted home life of the man, has shown us the lighter side of his nature, when he could write in chatty mood of domestic trials and comforts, and when he did not hesitate, even, to joke and to make puns as the spirit moved him.[101]

The critic in The Nation was also enthusiastic. After discussing the contents of the book, he praised Sanborn for his success in fulfilling his "purpose in undertaking a new collection, namely, to show Thoreau in a less aloof and stoical aspect than Emerson deliberately singled out."

---

[101] Charles E. L. Wingate, "Boston Letter," The Critic, (Number 657, September 22, 1894), p. 106.

> Thoreau's sister Sophia objected to the one-sidedness of Emerson's choice, and cherished a hope for something different and more complete which Mr. Sanborn has now piously fulfilled. The letters which do most to correct the stoicism and the didacticism of the earlier collection are those written by Thoreau to Emerson when he was in Europe, or elsewhere away from home, and Thoreau was living under his roof and looking out for things about the house and garden.

The critic then went on to show how keenly he too enjoyed the volume, and how much he learned about Thoreau's genius and character from reading his letters. There were his "close and beautiful friendship" with Mrs. Emerson, his "genial and pleasant" relation to the children. The letters showed too how "Thoreau's misanthropic bark was much worse than his bite," and how "he was nothing if not hyperbolical."

> And the favorite subject of his exaggeration was his indifference to mankind, his contempt for his contemporaries. Practically he liked many people, and some very much.... He is never happier in these letters than in describing one person and another. He had the keenest eye for character and its expression in the human face.

Most interesting to the critic was Thoreau's emergence as a "chameleon" in the correspondence:

> He knows well enough that neither Emerson nor Greeley would tolerate such pyrotechnics as he fires off in his letters to his friend Blake of Worcester. To read some of these is very much like filling one's belly with the east wind, but they contain passages of rare and tremulous beauty, some of his funniest exaggerations, and unquestionably some forms of expression concerning the deep things of God that cannot seem otherwise than irreverent and blasphemous to the conventional and traditional mind.... In his first letter to Emerson, he appears to be trying hard to be more Emersonian than he, but it is not long before he discovers a more excellent way, and when writing him is at his simplest and his best.

The critic then disinterred the old question of Thoreau's originality and its relation to Emerson's genius, and said at length:

> The right answer probably is, that though the influence of Emerson upon his youthful mind was very great, he could hardly have helped being much what he ultimately was if he had never known any such influence. There is much in his books that we could spare because we have it in Emerson in a much saner, sweeter form. But there is much more, especially of the concrete of nature, that is all his own, and there are sentences of such large and striking spiritual significance that beside the best of Emerson's they suffer no injurious reflection on their quality.

These reviews demonstrate some of the great success which greeted Sanborn and his volume and stimulated its publishers to issue the Manuscript Edition of Thoreau's works in twenty volumes in 1906. This edition, based on the Riverside Edition of 1894, was limited to 600 numbered copies, and the first volume of each set contained a piece of Thoreau's autograph manuscript bound in before the frontispiece.[102] From these same plates were printed The Writings of Henry David Thoreau in the so-called "standard" Walden Edition most often used by Thoreau scholars. Both the Manuscript and the Walden Edition included, of course, as its Volume VI, the Familiar Letters edited by Sanborn. He

---

[102] Francis H. Allen in his A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 52-53, gives the details of this volume. The major changes included the omitting of the four volumes of journal extracts edited by H. G. O. Blake in the 1894 volumes and the adding of the complete journal in fourteen volumes edited by Bradford Torrey. The collection of poems in Volume V was enlarged by "the addition of a number of poems taken from Poems of Nature," edited by Sanborn and Henry S. Salt in 1895, a volume which I shall discuss presently. As for the original autograph manuscripts bound into the front of the first volume, they "vary in interest, some of them adding materially to the value of the sets. Some of the sets, issued in fine bindings, have two frontispieces to each volume, a carbon photograph of a flower and a colored photogravure. The edition was printed on a specially manufactured paper with 'Thoreau' in the watermark."

had "enlarged" the present volume, he said in his introduction, "chiefly additional letters to Ricketson, and all those to C. H. Greene." He incorporated the Ricketson letters in their chronological places in the text, but the letters to Calvin H. Greene of Rochester, Michigan, and the two to Isaac Hecker plus his comments on all of these he incorporated in an appendix.[103] From the plates of this Walden Edition, too, came the five-volume edition, Thoreau's Complete Works, edited by H. G. O. Blake and issued by the same publisher in 1929 as The Concord Edition. With the re-issuing of the original 1894 volume in 1932, Sanborn's work has come down to our own generation, and is still, in January, 1953, the "definitive" edition of Thoreau's letters.

Knowing what I do about Sanborn's editorial propensities, I am at a loss to know what to think about some of the above critical reviews. As I have said before, the reviewers of Sanborn's volume were unwittingly reviewing the work of a team of writers. Whose writing were the critics reading? Was it Thoreau's or Sanborn's or a mixture? If it was a mixture, how rich was the mixture; that is, how great was the percentage of Thoreau? Do these critical comments by reviewers from two of the leading periodicals raise our opinion of Sanborn as a writer? Or do these reviewers make us marvel even more that Thoreau could thrill his critical readers with the power of his language in spite of Sanborn's corruptions?

---

[103] For the collation of the Manuscript Edition of the Collected Works see Allen, pp. 52-53; for a collation of The Writings of/ Henry David Thoreau/ Familiar Letters/ Edited by F. B. Sanborn/ Enlarged Edition//Device// Boston and New York/ Houghton Mifflin and Company/ MDCCCCVI/ see Allen, p. 33. The Walden Edition, says Allen, also included the same illustrations as the Manuscript Edition.

These are not the last of my speculations. Is it possible to determine whether Sanborn's prettifying made Thoreau more acceptable or less acceptable to the succeeding generations who read these reissued editions? If, as Harding feels, Sanborn translated Thoreau's style into "a typical piece of Victorian sentimentalism," perhaps Sanborn, if he tampered with the other letters as he did with this, attracted a multitude of readers who would have gagged on a dose of Thoreau undiluted. Perhaps, then, for a succeeding generation, Sanborn hindered Thoreau's popularity--hindered it, that is, if the literary public was influenced to accept or reject Thoreau as a personality revealed in his letters. Of course, until Harding and Bode publish their new edition of the letters, we shall not know to what degree each letter was Sanbornized. When we do know this, we shall probably find it difficult to determine to what degree Sanborn should be praised or damned, nor shall we know precisely whether his editorial meddling hastened or delayed Thoreau's fame. Perhaps this will be a study in itself. Or, perhaps the question is no longer of any importance.

And why did none of the critical journalists between the day of publication of Sanborn's biography in 1882 and the day of Harding's article in 1951 check Sanborn's scholarship? I leave the reader to speculate on this dismal thought.

It should be added in conclusion, however, that the work, with all its faults, has some importance, and such a student of Thoreau as Francis H. Allen declares that its "connective tissue of biographical and explanatory matter was a valuable addition" though he agrees that

"Mr. Sanborn went out of his way to paraphrase--and to paraphrase inaccurately--what might better have been quoted as written."[104]

In 1895, the year after Sanborn saw the first edition of his Familiar Letters through the press, he collaborated with Henry S. Salt in editing a volume of Thoreau's verse entitled Poems of Nature.[105] Salt was a British devotee of Thoreau's who had published a Life of the author in 1890. A modest little book--its second edition containing only 208 pages--it so impressed its readers that one Thoreau editor as late as 1934 could write: "By some scholars regarded as the best of all the biographies because neither opinionated nor adulatory."[106] How Sanborn and his rival biographer came to collaborate on this volume I do not know. According to Bode, Salt edited the volume in England from manuscripts which Sanborn and others sent him.[107]

The unsigned Introduction to the volume states:

---

[104] Francis H. Allen, Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence (The Thoreau Society, Booklet No. 7, Monroe, N. C., The Nocalore Press, 1950), pp. 12-13.

[105] Selected and Edited by Henry S. Salt and Frank B. Sanborn (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1895), 122 pp.

[106] Bartholow V. Crawford, Thoreau, p. lxii. Walter Harding of the Schools of English, University of Virginia, in a personal letter to me, April 29, 1952, also says: "I think Salt gets closest to the spirit of T, but he is rather outdated."

[107] Bode, Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau, p. 274.

> The fifty[108] poems here brought together...are perhaps two-thirds of those which Thoreau preserved. Many of them were printed by him, in whole or in part, among his early contributions to Emerson's Dial, or in his own two volumes, The Week and Walden, which were all that were issued in his lifetime. Others were given to Mr. Sanborn for publication, by Sophia Thoreau, the year after her brother's death (several appeared in The Boston Commonwealth in 1863); or have been furnished from time to time by Mr. Blake, his literary executor.[109]

ccording to Allen, "except as otherwise noted, these poems had been reviously published in the Week, Walden, Excursions, and Miscellanies, ut very often without titles." The exceptions were these: six were ublished for the first time in this new volume; eight Sanborn had rinted for the first time in The Commonwealth while he was editor; one e had printed for the first time in his 1882 biography; and one he had rinted both in his biography and in The Commonwealth.[110]

In discussing their selection the editors say in part:

> It has not been attempted to make this a complete collection of Thoreau's poems, because, as has been well said, 'many of them seem to be merely pendants to his prose discourse, dropped in as forcible epigrams where they are brief, and in other instances made ancillary to the idea just expressed, or to perpetuate a distinct conception that has some vital connection with the point from which it was poured forth. It is, therefore, almost an injustice to treat them separately at all.'[111]

---

[108]Actually, there are 49 in the volume itself and one other im-edded in the introduction.

[109]The preface, printed in italics, is transcribed here in the sual font.

[110]Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 34-36, 47, 6-77 and Bode, Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau under the separate itles. ("To My Brother" was first published in the 1882 biography, nd "The Departure" appeared both in that biography and in The Common-ealth.)

[111]Article on 'The Poetry of Thoreau,' by Joel Benton. Lippin-ott's Magazine, 1886. (Sanborn's footnote.)

In discussing Thoreau's attitude toward his verses, the history of Emerson's hypercritical remarks upon his poetic endeavors, and the truth of Emerson's remark that Thoreau's "biography is in his verses," the editors give a clear and accurate history of Thoreau's verse writing. Then they try to determine Thoreau's merit as poet:

> If metrical skill be insisted on as an indispensable condition of poetry, he can hardly be ranked among the poets; nor, where this criterion was dominant, was it surprising that, as one of his contemporaries tells us,[112] with reference to his verses in The Dial, 'an unquenchable laughter, like that of the gods at Vulcan's limping, went up over his ragged and halting lines.' But in the appreciation of poetry there is a good deal more to be considered than this; and, as the same writer has remarked, there is 'a frank and unpretending nobleness' in many of Thoreau's verses, distinguished as they are, at their best, by their ripe fulness of thought, quiet gravity of tone, and epigrammatic terseness of expression. The title of poet could hardly be withheld from the author of such truly powerful pieces as 'The Fall of the Leaf,' 'Winter Memories,' 'Smoke in Winter,' or 'Inspiration.'

They then point out the fact that Thoreau was always regarded as a poet by his friends and associates:

> 'Poet-Naturalist' was the suggestive title which Ellery Channing applied to him; and Hawthorne remarked that 'his thoughts seem to measure and attune themselves into spontaneous verse, as they rightfully may, since there is real poetry in them.' Even Emerson's final estimate was far from unappreciative. 'His poetry,' he wrote in his biographical sketch, 'might be bad or good; he no doubt wanted a lyric facility and technical skill, but he had the source of poetry in his spiritual perception. His own verses are often rude and defective. The gold does not yet run pure—is drossy and crude. The thyme and marjoram are not yet honey. But if he want lyric fineness and technical merits, if he have not the poetic temperament, he never lacks the causal thought, showing that his genius was better than his talent.'

---

[112] John Weiss, in the Christian Examiner, 1865. (Sanborn's footnote.)

The editors feel that what Thoreau said of Quarles, one of the poets whom Thoreau most admired, might be most aptly applied to himself:

> It is rare to find one who was so much of a poet and so little of an artist. Hopelessly quaint, he never doubts his genius; it is only he and his God in all the world. He uses language sometimes as greatly as Shakespeare; and though there is not much straight grain in him, there is plenty of rough, crooked timber.

They point out how Thoreau's style has an inherent likeness to that of Herbert, Donne, Cowley, "and other minor Elizabethans," and that the "Sic Vita" might "almost have a niche in Herbert's Temple."

Summing up his work as a writer of verse and prose, they declare:

> It must be granted, then, that Thoreau, whatever his limitations, had the poet's vision, and sometimes the poet's divine faculty; and if this was manifested more frequently in his masterly prose, it was neither absent from his verse nor from the whole tenor of his character. It was his destiny to be one of the greatest prose writers whom America has produced, and he had a strong, perhaps an exaggerated, sense of the dignity of this calling. 'Great prose,' he thinks, 'of equal elevation, commands our respect more than great verse, since it implies a more permanent and level height, a life more pervaded with the grandeur of the thought. The poet only makes an irruption, like a Parthian, and is off again, shooting while he retreats; but the prose writer has conquered, like a Roman, and settled colonies.'
>
> If, therefore, we cannot unreservedly place Thoreau among the poetical brotherhood, we may at least recognise that he was a poet in the larger sense in which his friends so regarded him--he felt, thought, acted, and lived as a poet, though he did not always write as one. In his own words--
>
> 'My life has been the poem I would have writ,
> But I could not both live and utter it.'
>
> Such qualities dignify life and make the expression of it memorable, not perhaps immediately, to the multitude of readers, but at first to an appreciative few, and eventually to a wide circle of mankind.

The high merit of this preface, only part of which has been reprinted here, can best be seen by comparing its view of Thoreau's verse with the views of our twentieth-century critics. Bode's introduction to his Collected Poems adds little to this, and Crawford says in his introduction to his group of representative selections:

> The literary world has, however, been of one mind in relegating to an inferior position most of Thoreau's verse. "Smoke" finds its way into the usual collections of American lyric poetry, and particular poems have their enthusiastic admirers, but so far there seems no renascence for Thoreau, the poet. The creative impulse, though fairly violent while it lasted, was short-lived. Looking back regretfully upon his youth, Thoreau once remarked that some of the verse Emerson so summarily condemned with it's author's approval was perhaps better than they had thought it. Nothing that we have seen leads us to lament Emerson's decision.[113]

The editors of The Literary History of the United States feel that "both in composition and in reception, Thoreau's poetry has had a checkered career":

> Because of its unevenness, because his friends, when their first enthusiasm faded, persuaded him that prose was his higher medium, his verse had been relegated to a place of little importance. But the second quarter of the twentieth century has witnessed a revival. Thoreau's poetry, say its recent advocates, belongs not with the past but with the present--has no kinship, in its conscious and militant heterodoxy, with standard patterns such as Whittier, Longfellow, Bryant, and Lowell established. "Thoreau, like Emily Dickinson,...anticipates the bold symbolism, airy impressionism, stringent realism, and restless inconsistencies of twentieth-century poetry." Like these scholar poets, he too was searching for suggestions from all schools and times which he approved of....
>
> Certainly, in the brief period during which he wrote it, Thoreau was deeply in earnest over his poetry. It is valid to argue that much of it is better than his own day supposed;

---

[113] Crawford, Thoreau (published in 1934), p. li.

> that had not Emerson's advice turned him from it, Thoreau's poetry might have attained further importance. As it is, many readers will probably prefer to agree with Emerson's dictum: "The gold does not yet flow pure, but is drossy and crude...."[114]

Bode, in his Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau, gives three major reasons why most people have ignored Thoreau's poetry:

> The first in importance, perhaps, is its uneven quality. The second, and related, reason is the fact that he himself lost enthusiasm for the poetic medium; the quantity of his production quickly dwindled. The third is the mistaken belief that the verses are mere fragments woven into the prose, especially in the Week, and inseparable from it.

This third reason, says Bode, "was given its fullest expression in the preface to the little volume of Thoreau's poetry, Poems of Nature." Because the view of its editors "must be faced by anyone compiling a fuller edition of the poem," he asks: "Was their stand well taken?"

As many of the poems in the Week had already been separately published, as many more had been composed separately in his Journal and then inserted in the Week, and as his fragments are often parts of longer poems, Bode concludes that the editors' argument is invalid. "The great number of his poems can stand as entities and by themselves. . . . The glowing lines and the quiet, the prosaic and the Transcendental--they are all here. Almost all have at the very least the large, astringent force of young genius."[115]

---

[114] Vol. I, 410-411 (published in 1947). The LHUS does not, unfortunately, contain footnotes, and I have not been able to find out who wrote the quoted statement.

[115] Bode, pp. ix-xii.

For obvious reasons, we shall probably never know precisely which change was made by which editor in Poems of Nature, but knowing the high quality of Salt's biography and the curious editorial philosophy of Sanborn, inferences seem inevitable.

In this volume they printed for the first time--but not necessarily in full--six poems: "Nature," "The Aurora of Guido," "A Winter Scene," "Poverty," "Ding Dong," and "The Thaw."[116]

The first two lines of "The Thaw" had appeared in a slightly different form in Excursions, and "Ding Dong," called in the original manuscript "The Peal of the Bells," is published here "somewhat revised and without the last stanza."[117]

Again the two editors made changes of varying kinds in their volume. In "The Aurora of Guido," for instance, they made the following:

---

[116] Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 34-36.

[117] These texts may be compared by looking at Bode, pp. 107 and 111, and Poems of Nature, pp. 89 and 119.

Original Basic Text Given in Bode:	Text by Sanborn and Salt in Poems of Nature:
GUIDO'S AURORA	THE AURORA OF GUIDO A FRAGMENT
The God of day rolls his car up the slopes, Reining his prancing steeds with steady hand, The moon's pale orb through western shadows gropes, While morning sheds its light o'er sea and land.	The God of day his car rolls up the slopes, Reining his prancing steeds with steady hand; The lingering moon through western shadows gropes, While Morning sheds its light o'er sea and land.
. . . . .	. . . . .
The early breeze ruffles the poplar leaves, The curling waves reflect the washed [?] light, The slumbering sea with the day's impulse heaves, While o'er the western hills retires the drowsy night.	The early breeze ruffles the poplar leaves; The curling waves reflect the unseen light; The slumbering sea with the day's impulse heaves, While o'er the western hills retires the drowsy night.
The sea birds dip their bills in ocean's foam, Far circling out over the frothy waves,—	The seabirds dip their bills in Ocean's foam, Far circling out over the frothy waves,— [118]

The poem, "Nature," appears in two versions in manuscripts preserved at Harvard and the Morgan Library. Of the following version printed as the basic text in Bode, the Harvard manuscript includes only lines 9-10 plus four extra lines not given here:

[118] In the stanza omitted here, a semicolon follows the last word in the third line in the Sanborn volume; no mark of punctuation appears in the original. (Bode, p. 217; Poems of Nature, p. 19.)

Basic Text as Given by Bode	Sanborn and Salt Text in Poems of Nature
O nature I do not aspire To be the highest in thy quire, To be a meteor in the sky Or comet that may range on high, Only a zephyr that may blow Among the reeds by the river low. Give me thy most privy place Where to run my airy race. In some withdrawn unpublic mead Let me sigh upon a reed, Or in the [?] woods with leafy din Whisper the still evening in, For I had rather be thy child And pupil in the forest wild Than be the king of men elsewhere And most sovereign slave of care To have one moment of thy dawn Than share the city's year forlorn. Some still work give me to do Only be it near to you.	O nature! I do not aspire To be the highest in thy quire,-- To be a meteor in the sky, Or comet that may range on high; Only a zephyr that may blow Among the reeds by the river low; Give me thy most privy place Where to run my airy race. In some withdrawn, unpublic mead Let me sigh upon a reed, Or in the woods, with leafy din, Whisper the still evening in: Some still work give me to do,-- Only--be it near to you! For I'd rather be thy child And pupil, in the forest wild, Than be the king of men elsewhere, And most sovereign slave of care: To have one moment of thy dawn, Than share the city's year forlorn.

119

It is possible to argue whether the two editors harmed Thoreau's verse by their punctuation of his lines. Certainly, I feel, the meaning is unimpaired by their punctuation, though I admit it may add overtones--or undertones--for one reader that it does not add for another. But it is difficult to believe that the editors improved on the original when they transferred its last two lines--which to me seem to furnish a quiet, simple completeness--so that they now appear as lines 13 and 14. Nor did the editors in this instance improve Thoreau's meter by changing his line "For I had rather be thy child" to "For I'd rather be thy child." We need not go into the changes in the rest of the poems, but shall let this serve as a typical example.

---

[119] Bode, p. 216, and Poems of Nature, p. 1.

Salt and Sanborn little realized when they estimated Thoreau's output how much he had actually written. Though they thought they had printed two-thirds of Thoreau's verse, they had in truth published only a quarter of it, for Bode's edition contains 204 poems. To conclude my criticism of Poems of Nature, I quote Francis H. Allen's brief estimate of the work:

> Their selection of fifty out of seventy-five or so poems that Thoreau had preserved was judicious and omitted much verse that adds no lustre to its author's reputation. The Introduction says, "In the present selection a return has been made, wherever possible, from the emendations introduced by Thoreau's editors to the original text." What emendations were referred to I have not ascertained. Alas, how often one wishes that Sanborn's own emendations could be similarly detected and discarded![120]

Good or bad, Sanborn and Salt's volume remained the only separate volume of Thoreau's poems for almost fifty years.

Sanborn's third extended sketch of his friend, The Personality of Thoreau, appeared in 1901 in a limited edition of 500 copies on French hand-made paper and 15 on Japan paper.[121] The Nation was the only critical journal of first rank to take extended notice of this little volume. The reviewer pointed out that this was Sanborn's third attempt to describe Thoreau, and, "although the briefest of them all, is the most satisfactory, mainly for the reason that it confines itself more closely to direct personal impression than the 'Life' of 1882 or

---

[120] Francis H. Allen, Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence, p. 13.

[121] It bore the imprint of Charles E. Goodspeed and D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, Boston.

the 'Familiar Letters' of 1894." Noting the contents of the volume, he says:

> We have at the outset a rejection of the too common notion that Thoreau was a deliberate copy, which only succeeded in being a caricature, of Emerson. Their minds were of one family, but of external resemblance there was little beyond that of the handwriting. Still, can Lowell and others have been so much mistaken here as Mr. Sanborn thinks? It is true, as he says, that it is difficult to copy Emerson, but it is less difficult to take on something of his form through vital sympathy.

Sanborn's account of the Thoreau family is "vivid," says the critic, and "has the accent of complete sincerity with its items of Mrs. Thoreau's social tartness and her husband's genial assumption of a worse defect of hearing than he had, in order to escape responsibility for the harsher sallies of her wit." Then he says:

> Mr. Sanborn's earliest note on Thoreau's appearance remarked "a huge Emersonian nose," for which the wags held Thoreau responsible, and "his collar turned over like Emerson's." The character of his walks, which Mr. Sanborn shared, is distinguished from that of Emerson's and Channing's in a delightful manner. He did not trust his memory of natural appearances, but made his notes "with his eye on the object." Thoreau's singing of "Tom Bowline" is, perhaps, the most surprising of Mr. Sanborn's reminiscences. The most pathetic passage is that touching Thoreau's partial alienation from Emerson; the most instructive that on Thoreau's classical scholarship, "better than Emerson's, Channing's, or Hawthorne's," and not inferior to Lowell's, each judged in middle life.

The critic then concludes his review by declaring:

> A book about Thoreau limited to five hundred copies seems a queer paradox, when one thinks of the unsold copies of 'The Week' dumped on the author's hands. This book is beautifully got up in every respect, but it is a pity that its cost will make it the collector's trophy, when it should be widely read. Why should not Mr. Sanborn treat Emerson, Ellery Channing, and Alcott in this concise and personal manner, and put the four

> studies into one democratic book? We do not advise the inclusion of Hawthorne, who, for all his Concord residence, was a spirit of another color.[122]

This enthusiastic review indicates quite well the merit and scope of the volume. Sanborn relied on many of the same sources which he used in his 1882 biography, adding some new quotations and anecdotes. Many anecdotes he merely repeated, some he expanded, and others he retold with variations. Compared to the 1882 biography, this is an improvement in that Sanborn focused his attention on Thoreau and omitted to a surprising degree irrelevant digressions. Its organization is much better, though this does not mean its organization is all it should be. The volume gains importance, too, in its reprinting in facsimile and for the first time Thoreau's poem, "Pray, to what earth does this sweet cold belong," and, also in facsimile, a list Thoreau had made of his reading during The Dial period. As Crawford says, the volume "fills out the picture with additional narrative bits."[123]

To me one of the most interesting items in the volume is Sanborn's editing of the passage from the letter of Thoreau to Horace Greeley of May 19, 1848, which we have already quoted in full. As one looks at the three columns below, one wonders what the implications are of Sanborn's present transcription. Has Sanborn now after seven years re-read his version of the letter in the 1894 volume of Familiar Letters and decided that Thoreau's use of language is better than he thought? Here are Sanborn's two versions of one passage:

---

[122] The Nation, LXXIV (February 6, 1902), 114.

[123] Bartholow V. Crawford, Thoreau, p. lxii.

Scholars are apt to think themselves privileged to complain as if their lot was a peculiarly hard one. How much have we heard about the attainment of knowledge under difficulties of poets starving in garrets — depending on the patronage of the wealthy — and finally dying mad. It is time that men sang another song. There is no reason why the scholar who professes to be a little wiser than the mass of men, should not do his work in the ditch occasionally, and by means of his superior wisdom make much less suffice for him. A wise man will not be unfortunate. How then would you know but he was a fool?

Sanborn's Transcription in Familiar Letters (1894)

Why should the scholar make a constant complaint that his fate is specially hard? We are too often told of "the pursuit of knowledge under difficulties,"—how poets depend on patrons and starve in garrets, or at last go mad and die. Let us hear the other side of the story. Why should not the scholar, if he is really wiser than the multitude, do coarse work now and then? Why not let his greater wisdom enable him to do without things? If you say the wise man is unlucky, how could you distinguish him from the foolishly unfortunate?

Sanborn's Transcription in The Personality of Thoreau (1901)

Scholars are apt to think themselves privileged to complain, as if their lot was a particularly hard one. How much have we heard of knowledge under difficulties,—of poets starving in garrets, depending on the patronage of the wealthy, and finally dying mad! It is time that men sang another song. There is no reason why the scholar, who professes to be a little wiser than the mass of men, should not do his work in the dirt occassionally, and by means of his superior wisdom make much less suffice for him. A wise man will not be unfortunate,—how then would you know but he was a fool?

124

[124] See Harding, "Franklin B. Sanborn and Thoreau's Letters," pp. 289-290 and Sanborn, The Personality of Thoreau (Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed, D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, 1901), p. 29.

Sanborn still can not bring himself to accept Thoreau's "work in the ditch," but he has now decided to go a little farther than his first translation of the phrase into "coarse work" for the Familiar Letters and transcribe it as "work in the dirt." His changing of Thoreau's restrictive clause in "There is no reason why the scholar who professes to be a little wiser than the mass of men" to a non-restrictive clause, presents an entirely different meaning to the sentence, and reflects Sanborn's oft-repeated hatred for college professors rather than the attitude of Thoreau.

To conclude, the seventy-one pages of The Personality of Thoreau do as much as the 1882 biography--and perhaps they do more--to clarify and portray the character of Thoreau.

Sanborn's next five more important projects were the preparation of limited editions of Thoreau's works for the members of the Bibliophile Society of Boston. All of these volumes were beautiful specimens of the printer's art. They were richly bound; they were usually printed on Holland handmade paper or Japanese vellum, which often bore the watermark of the Bibliophile Society; and they usually contained facsimile reprints, photographs, or original etchings especially prepared for these editions. The quality of what was printed on these beautiful pages, was, however, quite another matter.

First, in 1902, Sanborn edited Thoreau's The Service, which was published for members only, in a limited edition of 520 copies.[125] Though this was the first time the essay had been printed in complete form, Sanborn had read aloud extracts from Thoreau's original manuscript at the Concord School of Philosophy August 2, 1882, and a portion of it had been printed in the Riverside Edition of the Miscellanies in 1893, and in the Walden Edition of Cape Cod, and Miscellanies. Then too, as Allen points out, most of its contents could have been found scattered about in the earlier pages of Thoreau's journal.[126]

Thoreau had sent the manuscript to Margaret Fuller when she was editor of The Dial during its first year, its first number having appeared in July, 1840. She held the manuscript until December 1 of that year, says Sanborn, and finally refused it in this note to the author:

> Last night's second reading only confirms my impression from the first. The essay is rich in thoughts, and I should be pained not to meet it again. But then, the thoughts seem to me so out of their natural order, that I cannot read it through without pain. I never once feel myself in a stream of thought, but seem to hear the grating of tools on the mosaic. It is true, as Mr. Emerson says, that essays not to be compared with this have found their way into "The Dial." But then, these are more unassuming in their tone, and have an air of quiet good-breeding, which induces us to permit their presence. Yours is so rugged that it ought to be commanding.

---

[125] The title page bears the imprint of Charles E. Goodspeed, Boston, 1902; verso, this statement: "A limited edition of 500 copies of this book was printed on French hand-made paper, and twenty copies on Japan paper, by D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, Boston, in March, 1902...."

[126] Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 37,78.

First, in 1902, Sanborn edited Thoreau's The Service, which was published for members only, in a limited edition of 250 copies.[128] Though this was the first time the essay had been printed in complete form, Sanborn had read abridgments from Thoreau's original manuscript at the Concord School of Philosophy August 3, 1882, and a portion of it had been printed in the Riverside Edition of the Miscellanies in 1892, and in the Walden Edition of Cape Cod, and Miscellanies. Then too, as Allen points out, most of the contents could have been found scattered about in the earlier pieces of Thoreau's journal.[129]

Thoreau had sent the manuscript to Margaret Fuller when she was editor of The Dial during the first year, the first number having appeared in July, 1840. She held the manuscript until December 1 of that year, says Sanborn, and finally rejected it in this note to the author:

> Last night's second reading only confirms my impression from the first. The essay is rich in thoughts, and I should be pained not to meet it again. But then, the thoughts seem to me so out of their natural order, that I cannot read it through without pain. I never once feel myself in a stream of thought, but seem to bear the grating of tools on the pebbles. It is true, as Mr. Emerson says, that essays not to be compared with this have found their way into "The Dial." But then, these are more unassuming in their tone, and have an air of quiet good-breeding, which induces us to permit their presence. Yours is so rugged that it ought to be commanding.

---

[128] The title page bears the imprint of Charles E. Goodspeed, Boston, 1902: verso, this statement: "A limited edition of 250 copies of this book was printed on French hand-made paper, and twenty copies on Japan paper. by D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, Boston, in March, 1902...."

[129] Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 97,98.

This may imply that Emerson thought it could bear publication; yet he did not publish it when he became sole editor of the paper. Sanborn says the manuscript then came to him around 1882, from Emerson's portfolios of papers written by their various friends. It was "an essay of twenty-two full manuscript pages, in the familiar script of Thoreau, tied together with knots of faded pink ribbon, like his College Commencement 'part,' but with no numbering of the pages."

As for the content of the essay, Sanborn feels that, "more than any of [Thoreau's] published writings, it displays that taste for paradox which often is found in authors of a singular originality, and of such a profound imagery as Thoreau had."

> Its form [says Sanborn] was perhaps suggested by the discourses on Peace and Non-Resistance which in 1840 were so numerous in New England; while the native pugnacity of Thoreau provoked him to take up the cause of war and persist in the apostolic symbolism of the soldier of the Lord, and the Middle-Age crusader. Human life is his topic, and he views it with an Oriental scope of thought, in which distinctions of Time and Space are lost in the wide prospect of Eternity and Immortality.

At variance with this, Sanborn feels, is his play upon words, while "his wonderful glances at outward nature, always interpreted symbolically of the spiritual life, indicate how early and how intense was that perception of the aspects of the universe which first (and perhaps chiefly still) awakened an interest in Thoreau's pages." Characteristic, too, Sanborn feels, are Thoreau's ecstasies over music, "of which he was ever the enthusiastic votary."

In this whole essay, says Sanborn, one feels "the spirit of youth, —its confidence in itself, its haughty scorn for the conventional and

customary,--a singular blending of the aristocratic and the democratic in its tone towards other men,--who are at once the dust of the earth and the superiors of the stars."[127]

Sanborn's effort aroused little notice in the principal critical journals. Though The Critic merely noted its publication in its "Book-Buyer's Guide,"[128] The Nation commented, "Now the stone which the lapidaries rejected has been set in a manner equal to, if not beyond, its just deserts." "It will add nothing to Thoreau's reputation," the critic continued, "but it will furnish the critics of Transcendentalism with one of their most striking illustrations of its occasional extravagance. Here is a kind of writing that makes the most unintelligible passages of the earlier Emerson seem miracles of clarity."[129]

Nevertheless the value of Sanborn's publishing of this work can best be understood when one considers Mark Van Doren's critical comment: "Perhaps more of the essential Thoreau can be seen in 'The Service' than in any other twenty-five pages of him."[130]

Second, in 1905 Sanborn edited for the Society The First and Last Journeys of Thoreau Lately Discovered Among His Unpublished Journals

---

[127] Sanborn, "Introductory Note," The Service, pp. vii-xi.

[128] The Critic, XLI (December, 1902), 578.

[129] The Nation, LXXV (August 7, 1902), 117-118.

[130] Henry David Thoreau: A Critical Study (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), p. 46.

and Manuscripts in an edition limited to 489 copies for members only. The Society printed the manuscript through the courtesy of W. K. Bixby of St. Louis, impressively asserting that it was "a valuable contribution to the literature of our country" and "a work that will arouse a lively interest among collectors of First Editions." Henry H. Harper, the president of the society, declared in his prefatory note:

> When an "unpublished manuscript" of Thoreau was first announced, it created somewhat of a sensation, and many admirers of this great poet-naturalist and philosopher ventured to assume that "it can't be so; it must be a forgery."

But, he stated, there could be no doubt about the genuineness of the originals, "for every line is in the autograph of the author himself." Of the work of Sanborn, the editor, continued Harper, "It is indeed fortunate that the present manuscripts came to light in time to permit us to avail ourselves of the sound scholarship and thorough conversance of one who spent many years in personal contact and close fellowship with their distinguished author."

The two volumes consisted of material from a large collection of unpublished Thoreau manuscripts which had been presented to the society through the "liberality and kindness" of Mr. Bixby. The first journey was the one Thoreau took on the Merrimac and Concord Rivers in September, 1839, which he described in his journal and the Week; the last was his trip to Minnesota with young Horace Mann in 1861. The volumes contained also some fragments of his Staten Island journal of 1843 and a portion of an essay on Conversation; the addendum to Volume I comprised portions of journals and other writings including a number of Thoreau's

poems not previously published. The connective tissue supplied by Sanborn clarified and explained the material and produced a connected narrative.

Though the volume bore the date 1905, it was not actually distributed to the members of the society until 1907.[131] It received no notice from reviewers in the principal critical magazines, but a recent critic, Crawford, feels that it is "particularly valuable because of the detail with which it fills out the sad, lonesome, but characteristically resolute journey to Minnesota."[132]

Also in 1905, along with its First and Last Journeys, the Bibliophile Society published Thoreau's essay entitled Sir Walter Raleigh. This too was "Printed Exclusively for Members of The Bibliophile Society," and this was the first time the essay had been published in complete form.

This manuscript also came to the Society through the courtesy of W. K. Bixby; its title-page stated that it was edited by Henry Aiken Metcalf, and that the introduction and notes were by Sanborn. To Bixby, Metcalf said, the members of the society were "indebted for the privilege of possessing such an exceedingly rare item of Americana," and, he declared with great solemnity, "This is a veritable treasure wherewith still further to enrich the bibliography of the publications of our Society." As this volume was being simultaneously issued with the First

---

[131]Henry H. Harper, "Prefatory Note," and Sanborn, "Introduction," I, ix-x and I, xi-xxxix; Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau, pp. 38-40; Bode, Collected Poems, pp. 273-274 and his notes on each of the poems first published in these volumes.

[132]Crawford, Thoreau, p. ix.

and Last Journeys, he continued, "We are therefore permitted to bring out, as companion pieces, first editions of the first inedited [sic] important manuscript written by Thoreau, and also this narrative of his Western journey." Bowing low to the writer of its introduction and notes, he continued: "We are fortunate, moreover, in having a special introduction to each of them prepared by Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, the greatest living authority on Thoreau, of whom he was a life-long friend and neighbor."[133]

Sanborn in his introduction told the history of the manuscript and of Thoreau's interest in Ralegh. The subject, he said, "lay along the lines of his earlier readings after leaving Harvard College." The essay, though not written so early as The Service and those parts of The Week that first came out in The Dial, belonged to "that active and militant period of his life." It was written for The Dial, Sanborn presumed, and would have been published there "had not fate and the lack of paying subscribers" intervened. Sanborn then discussed Thoreau's sources for his essay, and showed how the finished essay grew from the Ralegh material Thoreau had copied into his scrapbook, material he later adapted for The Week.

Sanborn then voiced the opinion that Thoreau "seems to have been guided in his judgment of Ralegh as the real author of disputed poems, by his inner consciousness of what the knightly courtier ought to have written." This observation gives Sanborn the opportunity to indicate

---

[133] Pages xi-xii.

his own attainments as a scholar in a page that contains unquestionably the most recondite and scholarly passage Sanborn ever wrote. Surprisingly enough, according to one student of Ralegh, Sanborn knew most of the important Ralegh scholarship that had been published up to 1905.[134]

Sanborn's fourth production for the Bibliophile Society may be dismissed with the comment made by Bode on his editing. The volume was the Unpublished Poems by Bryant and Thoreau: "Musings," by William Cullen Bryant, and "Godfrey of Boulogne," by Henry D. Thoreau. Limited to 470 copies, with the introduction to the poem of Thoreau written by Sanborn, it appeared in 1907. "Few other poems cast as unfavorable a light on Sanborn's manner of editing," says Bode.

According to Allen, "The most ambitious, if not the most important, piece of editing that [Sanborn] did on Thoreau--I had almost said perpetrated on Thoreau--was the edition of Walden in two volumes printed for the Bibliophile Society in 1909 but never--perhaps fortunately--regularly published."[135]

Raymond Adams, in his introduction to his edition of Walden, calls this edition a "monument of editorial stupidity," and tells how the books happened to be published:

---

[134] To Dr. Arnold Williams, associate professor of English, Michigan State College, I am indebted for this opinion.

[135] Francis H. Allen, Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence (Monroe, N. C.: The Nocalore Press for The Thoreau Society, 1950), p. 14.

> Thoreau's cullings made during the eight years he spent in polishing Walden were, like many scraps of his manuscript, preserved and came at last to Mr. W. K. Bixby of St. Louis, who gave the Bibliophile Society of Boston permission to print the material, some twelve thousand words, in any way it saw fit. It saw fit to turn the material over to Mr. F. B. Sanborn, an acquaintance of Thoreau during the latter years of his life and a very inaccurate editor of Thoreau's writings.
>
> Mr. Sanborn accepted these obviously inferior passages as an integral part of the original Walden which had been omitted because, as he says, it was "the wish of the publishers not to have the volume of 1854 any longer." Thoreau himself corrected the proof sheets of Walden in 1854. Had twelve thousand words or twelve words been omitted because of any wish of the publishers, Ticknor and Fields would not have published that book. Sanborn, completely losing the spirit of Walden, decided to incorporate the material into the regular text and issue a New and Unabridged Edition of Walden.[136]

Actually, the edition itself contains, as Allen points out, "two quite different stories of its origin and composition."[137] Henry H. Harper, in his "Prefatory Remarks," says:

> Readers will be astonished to learn, however, that the original MS. of Walden, which has but recently come to light, contains upwards of twelve thousand words omitted from the printed editions. It has commonly been supposed that the original MS. was destroyed by the publishers of the first edition at Boston in 1854, and it was not known until lately that Thoreau retained the original draft in his possession. After its discovery among a mass of papers left by Thoreau in an old chest, it passed directly into the hands of Mr. Bixby, who with characteristic generosity turned it over to The Bibliophile Society to print for the members. The authenticity of the MS. is unquestioned, as it is entirely in the author's handwriting.
>
> At the time Walden was first printed, Thoreau was unknown to fame, and the publishers may have "cut" his manuscript deliberately, in order to get it into one convenient-

---

[136] Raymond Adams, ed., Walden: or Life in the Woods (Chicago: The Lakeside Press, 1930), pp. xiii-xiv.

[137] Allen, p. 14.

> sized volume. Whether or not the MS. furnished them was destroyed for the purpose of preventing the author, or future generations, from later comparing and discovering the omissions is left to conjecture. Although the proof-pages were sent to Thoreau to read, it is doubtful if he either compared them with his own MS. or noticed the omissions. Even if he did, he was perhaps no less anxious than the publishers to keep down the cost of composition, for he had lost a considerable sum on his first publishing venture, The Week.[138]

As Allen points out, Harper's main points are three: (1) the manuscript was a complete entity written by Thoreau; (2) it contained some 12,000 words of matter not printed in the original edition; and (3) it may have been cut by the publishers, Harper infers, to fit it into a volume of convenient size.

Sanborn, on the other hand, in his "Introduction to the New and Unabridged Edition of Walden," emphasizes that the collection placed in his hands was a miscellany:

> When Mr. E. H. Russell, of Worcester, inherited from his intimate friend, Mr. Harrison Blake, the Journals and other manuscripts of Thoreau, which Mr. Blake had received from Miss Sophia Thoreau at some time prior to her death in 1876, he held them for some years, with the hope of editing them himself, as Mr. Blake had partially done. Finding this hope not likely to be realized, he began to dispose of the MSS by gift and by sale; and one of his first sales was of a large bulk of manuscript sheets, which apparently had not been very carefully examined either by Miss Thoreau or by Mr. Blake, but remained much as they were packed together in a large box by Thoreau himself.

These manuscript sheets, says Sanborn, included "many pages torn from the original Journals, and others re-written from the Journals which in

---

[138] Henry H. Harper, "Prefatory Remarks," Walden: or Life in the Woods (Boston: The Bibliophile Society, 1909, "Printed for Members Only"), pp. ix-x.

some form or other went into the two volumes published by the author in his lifetime." There were also many pages "evidently intended" for those volumes, or for Thoreau's accounts of Canada, Cape Cod, and the Maine Woods; these pages did not, however, get into those volumes nor into the magazine articles "that preceded the posthumous publication of the books themselves." But, says Sanborn, of particular importance to this edition of Walden was some of this material, which he describes:

> The largest single collection of these sheets, whether brought together by Thoreau himself or by some one of his posthumous editors (Emerson, Sophia Thoreau, Ellery Channing, and Harrison Blake), was of some material evidently intended for the Walden volume,--oftentimes in more than one draft, and all in Thoreau's handwriting,--but very differently arranged from that form given the book at the time of its publication in 1854. Passages that then appeared in the earlier chapters were in the MSS. assigned to a much later position, and vice versa; and there was no systematic division into chapters. Some of the sheets were evidently the beginning or the continuation of lectures in which he had given, before audiences at Concord or elsewhere, portions of his story of Life in the Woods, which, whether as lectures or in the volume, was at once attractive.... There was also a blending to some extent of the MSS. for The Week with those for Walden; and an introduction here and there of verses which were but sparingly admitted into the printed volume, though given in full in the sheets. Altogether, the omitted passages would have made between sixty and eighty additional printed pages. Probably one reason for their omission was the wish of the publishers not to have the volume of 1854 any longer than the 357 pages which it included. Other omissions were the result of re-writing, or advice from others, or of a wish to exclude personalities, dates, etc. Oftentimes no reason can be assigned for the omissions; and it sometimes happened that the omitted form was better, both in style and thought, than the printed one. The remarkable thing was that the author, in this, as in other writings, should have carefully cherished and preserved the original and the amended forms, --sometimes to the number of four or five separate drafts. This must have been his own act, and is in contrast with the complete destruction by him of many of his earlier manuscripts.[139]

---

[139] Walden, Bibliophile Edition, I, xxv-xxvii.

Sanborn then describes the extraordinary editorial method which he pursues in this edition:

> I have gone carefully over the entire collection, and have assigned the various parts to their proper places in the original Walden work, so far as this could be determined. To this remark, however, there are some unimportant and one or two serious exceptions. The last relate to the order of the early chapters, which, as Mr. Fortescue says of the Memoirs of Thibaudeau, a faithful chronicler of Bonaparte's sayings and doings, "in the original seem to be thrown together quite irrespective of chronology." Thus I have made Thoreau's Second Chapter the First, and have replaced in the First those parts of the immoderately long chapter on "Economy" with which all the former editions open. Some parts of the eighty-eight pages of "Economy" have also been transferred to later chapters, in which they find a more fitting place. In this way the length of the eighteen chapters has been more equalized, and the connection of topics made more evident....
>
> The shortest of his chapters in Walden as he left them, was "The Village;" his longest,"Economy;" but much that the inordinately long one contained related to "The Village," and some of it has now been placed there.[140]

Adams' comment on this editorial method is as follows:

> The Bixby manuscript does not suggest these rearrangements. Sanborn thought he knew better than Thoreau how Walden should have been written and proceeded to re-write it. He omitted passages; because he had a predilection for the periodic sentence he made many of Thoreau's sentences periodic; he wrote transitional passages to introduce the scraps from the Bixby manuscript, and finally produced, in 1909, two volumes which he hoped would become the authorized Walden, a book with scarcely an unmutilated page, and the whole no longer Thoreau's Walden. One cannot excuse or condone such editing; one can but be thankful that Thoreau and not Sanborn read the proof sheets in 1854.[141]

The specific details of Sanborn's editorial "method" or "philosophy" in his Bibliophile edition are discussed in an unpublished University of

---

[140] Ibid., I, xxvii xxix.

[141] Raymond Adams, ed., Walden, p. xiv.

Chicago master's thesis by Maud Ethel Cryder.[142] Miss Cryder's work shows considerable labor, but her transcriptions from her sources are so filled with errors,[143] her thesis is so filled with typographical errors, and so much of her writing is so ambiguous that, after spending weeks in an attempt to check her evidence, I find the major portion of her thesis incomprehensible and useless. However, in order to preserve the most important material in her thesis, I have made an effort to plow through her Cryderization of the Sanbornization of Thoreau.

Two heads, it seems, set to work on Thoreau's box of manuscript pages: Sanborn, who is listed on the second preliminary leaf as "the editor," and Henry H. Harper, the president of the Bibliophile Society. Harper's "Prefatory Remarks" occupy the first twenty-three pages of volume one, and he acted--to use Allen's phrase--as the deus ex machina of this literary enterprise.

Harper, after telling how the Bibliophile Society came by the "mass of papers left by Thoreau in an old chest," declares:

> It has not been deemed advisable to interrupt the harmony of the pages by indicating specifically, through the introduction of a different style of type, the words and passages

---

[142] "An Examination of the Bibliophile Edition of Thoreau's Walden," 1920, 56 pp.

[143] For example, on page 18, in two transcriptions from Sanborn, she makes, in her first, three errors in a passage of 22 words; in her second, four errors in a passage of 29 words. On page 21, where she prints parallel columns of Walden from page 3 of the Everyman edition opposite page 5 of Walden in the Bibliophile edition, she makes twelve errors in the transcription of Thoreau and three errors in the transcription of Sanborn. One wonders if Sanborn's editorial habits are epidemic.

> restored from the MS. It is sufficient to say that in order to make a copy of the previously printed edition conform to the text of the original MS. it was necessary to make changes in nearly three hundred pages, and in some places the restored parts extend to from one to four pages.[144]

Such a statement, says Miss Cryder, "would fill with enthusiastic anticipation the mind of any lover of Thoreau or of any student of the art of writing" who believes with Dr. Johnson that "it is pleasant to see great works in their seminal stage pregnant with latent possibilities of excellence; nor could there be any more delightful entertainment than to trace their gradual growth and expansion, and to observe how sometimes they are suddenly improved by accidental hints and sometimes slowly improved by steady meditation." In such a definitive edition of the Walden manuscript--"such as the preface leads the reader to think is coming"--several things, says Miss Cryder, would be expected:

> Every effort would be made to keep clear the differences between the regular edition and this edition of the MS. The older order of arrangement in the MS. would be scrupulously left unchanged so that the author's process of thought in regard to this might be followed. If the work were orginally [sic] without chapter divisions, it would be left so in the new editions, in order that by comparison of eliminated portions and new chapter introductions in the revised work, the rhyme or reason for the final divisions might be determined. In no case would any effort be made to smooth the rougher draft, or make it more interesting, or more intelligible, by the insertions of extraneous matter written indeed by Thoreau but for some other purpose. Such emendation would be both unwise and unnecessary. The completed, perfected product is at hand in the regular editions. No apology or improvement

---

[144] H. H. Harper, Walden, Bibliophile edition, p. x. Harper in a note in I, 149, states, however, that in the text on pages 149-151 only the editors have used italics to indicate the new material that was added by the editors from the original Thoreau manuscripts and small capitals to indicate words that have been changed.

restored from the MS. It is sufficient to say that in order to make a copy of the previously printed edition conform to the text of the original MS. it was necessary to insert [illegible] in nearly three hundred places, and in some places the missing parts extend to from one to four pages.[1]

Such a statement, says Miss Dryden, "would fill with enthusiastic anticipation the mind of any lover of Dorsey or of any student of the art of writing" who believes with Dr. Johnson that "it is pleasant to see great works in their minimal state prepared with latent possibilities of excellence; nor could there be any more delightful entertainment than to trace their gradual growth and expansion, and to observe how ideas they are suddenly improved by accidental hints and sudden efforts improved by steady meditation." In such a tentative edition of the Walden manuscript--"such as the preface leads the reader to think is coming"--several things, says Miss Dryden, would be expected:

Every effort would be made to keep clear the differences between the regular edition and this edition of the MS. The older order of arrangement in the MS. would be scrupulously left unchanged so that the author's process of thought is reared to this might be followed. If the work were originally [sic] without chapter divisions, it would be left so in the new edition, in order that by comparison of alinsleated [illegible] tions and new chapter introductions in the revised work, the figure or reason for the final divisions might be determined. In no case would any effort be made to smooth the rougher draft, or make it more interesting, or more intelligible, by the insertions of extraneous matter written indeed by Thoreau but not for some other purpose. Such emendation would be both useless and unnecessary. The completed, perfected product is at hand in the regular edition. No apology or improvement

---

[1] H. Dorsey, Walden, Nibloskbis edition, p. x. Dorsey is a note in I, 149, states, however, that in the text on pages 149-151 only the editors have used italics to indicate the new material that was added by the editors from the original Thoreau manuscripts and small capitals to indicate words that have been changed.

> is needed. The incomplete, more chaotic, less polished work is of interest for the very reason that it is incomplete, chaotic, unpolished. Likewose [sic] notes of merely biographical interest would seldom find place in a work of this description, though discriminating critical notes would be of great value. It might be added that all statements of matters of fact would necessarily be made with the greatest care and accuracy.
>
> The above is what would be expected, it might be said, demanded.

But such expectations were not met. As Miss Cryder says, Mr. Sanborn did not labor under the fear expressed by J. M. Manly in his introduction to the second volume of his Pre-Shakesperean Drama: "I may plead in general that I feared to overstep the bound separating the functions of an editor of texts from those of literary adviser to the author."

Miss Cryder's criticism of the editing falls under three distinct heads, but I shall present only the two which I understand. The first has to do with "careless, ambiguous, and inaccurate statements of fact as found in the introduction and the critical notes."[145] In this category she includes such an ambiguous statement as this in one of Sanborn's notes:

> We have inserted here from the MS. several quaint passages not found in print, and the paragraphs are divided differently.[146]

"Differently from what?" she asks. "Does he mean he changed the paragraphing? In general, the paragraph division of the Bibliophile edition varies greatly from that of the regular editions."[147] Later Sanborn says:

---

[145] Cryder, p. 6.
[146] Walden, Bibliophile ed., I, 6.
[147] Cryder, p. 6.

> Here the printers omitted this passage in Thoreau's manuscript, copied from some sketch of Mirabeau.[148]

She wonders here whether Sanborn meant the publishers rather than the printers. "Or does he really mean the printers left it out and no note of it was taken when the proof sheets were read? If this last, how does he know this to be the case?"[149] She indicates too how similarly careless notes confuse Sanborn's textual arrangement with Thoreau's arrangement in the printed editions. For example, Sanborn states in a footnote:

> The bulk of Thoreau's peculiar view of Philanthropy has been transferred from the long Chapter II on Economy, where it hardly belonged, to the comments on the poor Irish family at Baker Farm, to which it has much pertinence.[150]

"But," she says, "the long Economy Chapter is Chapter I of the regular editions and only becomes Chapter II under editorial manipulation in the Bibliophile Edition." Hence, she declares:

> This section was certainly not transferred from Chapter II when it had never been part of it. It is possible that Mr. Sanborn placed it in Chapter II at one time and then re-transferred it. If this was the case, the editor here, as above, confuses his own, and the author's arrangement in the printed editions.[151]

Of the famous "hound, bay horse, and turtle-dove" passage of which Van Doren makes so much in his critical study, Sanborn says in a footnote:

---

[148] Walden, Bibliophile ed., II, 244, note.

[149] Cryder, p. 7.

[150] Walden, Bibliophile ed., II, 84, note.

[151] Cryder, p. 8.

"The following note by Thoreau, omitted from the printed editions, appears in the MS."[152] Miss Cryder points out that "it is true this passage was omitted from the printed editions as a note, but Mr. Sanborn fails to make any statement of the fact that it was incorporated in the text of another chapter, nor does he introduce it there as is his usual custom."[153]

The above serve as examples of Miss Cryder's findings in this category; others of her complaints are equally justified, though still others, one of which she calls "the most amusing and surprising of all," are not justifiable in the light of subsequent research.

In discussing her second main point, "that relating to liberties taken with the text in the way of rearrangement," several things "of much more serious moment," she says, "must be considered." Here she presents a table which shows how Sanborn rearranged Thoreau's original text for his Bibliophile edition. In the first column of the table she presents the page numbers of the Bibliophile edition in their regular order. Opposite, in the second column, are "those pages in the Everyman's Library edition from which all material (except that introduced from the MS.) was drawn." She uses the letters t, m, and b, I presume, to refer to the top, middle, and bottom of the page.

---

[152] Walden, Bibliophile ed., II, 182.

[153] Cryder, p. 9.

Bibliophile		Everyman's
Chapter I		
First paragraph	found	pp. ?
pp. 1, 2, 3, 4	"	pp. 1 t to 2 t
" 5 [m] to 11	"	" 13 to 17
" 11m to 12m	"	" 78 b to 79 t
" 12 to 19	"	" 34 to 39
" 19 to 20	"	" 41 b to 42 m
" 20 to 22 b	"	" 46 b to 48 b
" 22b to 26 t	"	" 56 m to 58 b
" 26 m to 31 m	"	" 50 b to 55 t
" 31 m to 56	"	Chapter II except one paragraph.
Chapter II		
pp. 56 t to 57 b	Found	pp. 2 t to 3
" 57 b to 73 t	"	" 3 b to 13 m
" 73 t to 74 t	"	p. 15
" 74 t to 92 b	"	pp. 17 m to 28 b
" 94 t to 102 m	"	" 28 b to 34 b
" 102 to 112 b	"	" 39 to 46 b
" 113 b to 117 t	"	" 48 m to 50 b
" 117 t to 119 t	"	" 55 t to 56 m
" 119 b to 127 t	"	" 58 b to 63 m
" 127 m to 129 b	"	p. 68

[154]

As Miss Cryder indicates in her table, "Mr.Sanborn took every liberty with the arrangement of old material." But as Miss Cryder takes liberties with her own table in her explanation of it which follows, I shall not confuse confusion by presenting her statements.

Just as Sanborn "took every liberty with the arrangement of old material," there is no reason to assume, says Miss Cryder, "that he was more particular with regard to the new."

---

[154] Ibid., p. 14.

> His trying to assign "the various parts to their proper places" [she continues] means no more than the placing of them in logical connections, never, necessarily the placing of them where Thoreau meant to have them. That he often attains a better arrangement than that of Thoreau cannot well be denied, yet there is no point in this. To a student of Thoreau what is the value of Mr. Sanborn's logic? The disastrous result is that for study so far as basis of organization and arrangement is concerned--an important point in this technique of an author--this work becomes of practically no value.

His use of this new material is "inconsistent and confusing," she feels:

> Part of this new matter is to be found in the main text, some of it in notes, and some of it the editor seems to have omitted altogether. That the intention was to put the new matter in the main text rather than anywhere else seems evident not only from the fact that much of it finds place there but also from statments [sic] made in the preface and elsewhere.[155]

Actually, says Miss Cryder, two-thirds of the new material which Sanborn found in Thoreau's original manuscripts are put into the footnotes. Sanborn does not indicate that such a procedure is to be part of his editorial method, though Harper does:

> In a few instances omitted or changed parts have been subjoined in footnotes, either because they would seem to disturb the continuity of the text (which is perhaps one reason why they were originally left out), or for the reason that they were printed in a changed form.

To speak of these instances as "few" is to misrepresent, says Miss Cryder, what Sanborn actually did. For, she declares, "by careful computation it is easily established that over 4,000 of the 12,000 words of new material is [sic] introduced thus in notes." Other material, as she points out, is placed, for example, at the end of volume one, where Sanborn has tacked on several paragraphs in a footnote without any

---

[155] Ibid., p. 18.

indication of where these paragraphs should appear in his edition. Miss Cryder finally suspects that "there is evidence that matter from the MS. has been omitted altogether,"[156] a suspicion verified as fact by Odell Shepard, who says:

> Take, for example [Sanborn's] "Bibliophile Edition of Walden," in which he asserts that he includes all the material of the original MSS not finally printed in the first edition. Well, in reading through the five manuscripts some years ago I found many thousands of words which F. B. S. had silently left out![157]

Sanborn's edition, it must be said in conclusion, is indeed "a monument of editorial stupidity," and deserves this closing comment by Allen:

> I confess that I have never been tempted to read this Sanbornized Walden, and so can form no opinion of it as a tour de force. Perhaps I am prejudiced, but I have the impression that there has been little demand for its substitution for the book that Thoreau himself fathered. But it was a characteristic performance for Frank Sanborn. What delight he must have taken in improving on so great an author as Thoreau![158]

---

[156] Cryder, p. 18.

[157] Personal letter to me from Odell Shepard, Jordan's Cove, Waterford, Conn., February 9, 1951.

[158] Allen, Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence, pp. 14-15.

If Sanborn can be said to have written "a masterpiece," it is perhaps The Life of Henry David Thoreau published by Houghton Mifflin in May, 1917.[159] In his own eyes and in the eyes of his publisher, the book was to be the definitive volume on Thoreau, and it received for the most part fairly good reviews. Sanborn's hope that the work would prove definitive is suggested by such statements as these which he wrote for the preface:

> Other letters and fragments may come to light; but so careful has been the search (and the price paid for his manuscripts so high, though he was much neglected in his lifetime), that few can be now in existence, outside of well-known collections. Their stores have mostly passed through my hands for editing or for examination.... Almost every page of his manuscript of which he left enough to fill at least twenty-five volumes, has now been searched out and printed.

Sanborn seemed to anticipate that the public might wonder at his writing still another biography of Thoreau, for he felt called on to explain:

> A FINAL Life of Thoreau from my hand has this peculiar claim on the reader's attention, that it includes memoirs of his ancestors not before given to the public; and also, in their complete form, many essays written in his early youth,--all that the care of his kindred had preserved,--besides what escaped from their research, verses, letters, and memoranda.[160]

Then he stated his purpose in the last chapter of the volume:

> My purpose in this volume has been to show how he coöperated in his own posthumous fame; how he built himself up in literature from boyhood, and that without becoming a pedant, or trying to form a school, or even a class.[161]

---

[159] The Life of Henry David Thoreau Including Many Essays Hitherto Unpublished and Some Account of His Family and Friends.

[160] Pages v and ix.

[161] Page 498.

Recounting at length in the preface Thoreau's "constant growth" toward literary fame, Sanborn said that this growth "has finally called forth from my portfolios his earlier writings (chiefly college essays)," where he had kept them since writing his first biography in 1882. Sanborn considered these essays so important that they occupy with his notes one-fourth of the 533 pages of text. But the book contains other chapters narrating his careers as schoolteacher and pencil-maker, his journeys on the rivers and to Minnesota, and his relation to John Brown and slavery. Other more general chapters contain, as one reviewer felt, "interesting discussions" of Thoreau in literature, of his symbolism and paradox, of Thoreau as friend, neighbor, citizen, man of letters, and man of affairs. "Particularly rewarding," said the reviewer, was the chapter of "Village Sketches, chiefly from the Journals."[162] In the appendix Sanborn added a list of the books in Thoreau's library, a list of authors "read or to be read by H. D. Thoreau," three sections on family genealogy, and a letter from one of Sanborn's colleagues in prison reform commenting on the philosophic insight which Thoreau displayed in a college forensic on "The Comparative Moral Policy of Severe and Mild Punishments."

Francis H. Allen, who had the "not unmixed pleasure of seeing this book through the press," was faced with the problem of what to do with Sanborn's textual liberties. He wrote to Sanborn asking him if he would make a statement in his preface "which would explain why his versions of

---

[162] "New Books Reviewed," North American Review, CCVI (August, 1917), 308-311.

matter already printed differed from previous forms." Sanborn "consented, apparently without reluctance and in writing," says Allen, but he never sent the statement to Allen, and he died on the day when Houghton Mifflin mailed him the galley proof of his preface. "The preface," says Allen, is "always the last of a book that the author sees in proof and now his last chance of keeping his promise." This, Allen explains, left the company in a hole:

> My loyalty to Thoreau and my conscience as an editor wouldn't allow me to let things go as they stood, but it was Mr. Sanborn's book and it seemed to me that his publishers owed it to him to carry out his expressed intentions in regard to this statement in such a way as to present the matter entirely from his point of view.

So Allen added below Sanborn's signature a statement of this situation and the long paragraph which we have quoted on page 279 of this study which stated in part:

> Mr. Sanborn was not a slavish quoter.... If, therefore, the reader finds occasional discrepancies between the extracts from Thoreau's Journals as here given and the forms in which the same passages appear in the scrupulously exact transcript contained in the published Journal, he is rather to thank Mr. Sanborn for making these passages more orderly and more readable.

And in telling of this incident many years later, Allen added: "Poppycock, you say, and I quite agree with you. In fact, I consider it my masterpiece in that field."[163]

---

[163] Allen, Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence, pp. 15-16.
In an essay chosen at random--"Characteristics of Milton's Poesy," which Sanborn prints on pp. 93-97, I have compared the part of Sanborn's transcription that lies between the beginning of the essay and the bottom of page 95 with the original Thoreau manuscript now in the Houghton Library, Harvard University. In this passage of about 820 words, Sanborn

The volume for the most part received fairly good reviews. For example, the North American Review summarized its opinions in these words:

> As compared with earlier memoirs--with Salt's Life of Thoreau with Channing's The Poet-Naturalist, and even with Mr. Sanborn's first biography, published in 1882--this new Life...justifies itself as a needed and definitive work....
>
> It is a little to be regretted, perhaps, that the Life as a whole is not more consecutively interesting; yet the materials contained in it, if presented rather dryly and with many digressions, are handled with skill and uniform good taste. Though one craves occasionally a little more illumination--a little more sense of reality as distinct from facts--the knowledge that the work as a whole is substantially complete, and that every statement and allusion has been understandingly weighed by a friend and contemporary of Thoreau compensates for any slight literary defects.[164]

The Outlook, not as fine critically as some of its contemporary literary journals, felt that "Mr Sanborn's posthumous contribution to the world's knowledge of his friend will probably furnish his own surest claim to remembrance in the future," and added that "it will certainly be

---

made about 80 changes in punctuation, 3 changes in capital letters; he changed 7 words, omitted a portion of one sentence, transferred a phrase to precede rather than follow an adjective, and removed or added italics in 4 words. As a sample of Sanborn's editing, I print here Thoreau's original text for the paragraph which begins at the bottom of p. 94 in Sanborn:

> Next rose Belial, second to none in dissimulation, 'nor yet behind in hate.' With a fair outside all is false and hollow within. As is often the case, his faint heart suggests a wise and prudent course; but he is none the less a devil, though a timid one. Difficulties and dangers innumerable beset his path, he deals in hypotheses and conjectures, counts what is lost, and thanks his stars that so much yet remains,--dwells upon the evils to be apprehended from obstinately persevering in a bad cause, and closing, touches upon the effect of submission to appease the victor.

[164]Volume CCVI (August, 1917), 308-311.

indispensable to the student and lover of the rarely individual man of genius whom it seeks to portray."[165]

Norman Foerster in the Yale Review began with an interesting reminiscence and personal portrait of Sanborn:

> It is not easy to view Sanborn's new Life of Thoreau with the detachment that is as essential, in criticism, as sympathy. The last follower of the "practical-mystical philosophy miscalled Transcendentalism" died while the book was in press, and more vivid than the book itself is the memory of the man himself, even the physical man--tall, almost towering, and thin, yet surprisingly erect; gray, yet with the gray of youth rather than of age; and with those sparkling, comprehending eyes that one who met him could never forget. One thinks of him as the genial host of the riverside house in Concord amid all the relics and memories of a day that is gone, and refuses to judge his book impersonally.

Yet, Foerster had to confess, "It is not a wholly satisfactory piece of writing--it is by no means the 'final and definitive biography' that the publishers proclaim it to be." And he continued:

> Authority it has, of course, and the mellow charm of a vigorous individualist in his old age. On the other hand, it is full of digression and prosy circumstantiality; more full of them than Sanborn's smaller biography of thirty-five years ago.

As for its organization and its focus on Thoreau, Foerster felt:

> The new matter has been wedged in, in great blocks, rather than incorporated. Thoreau does not get born till page 35, and all of these first pages are given to his ancestors, who are dealt with again in a later chapter, and once again in the appendix.

Foerster felt too that a disproportionate amount of space was given to reprinting--though "with very readable running comment"--the themes

---

[165] "A New Life of Thoreau," Outlook, CXVI (June 20, 1917), 301.

Thoreau wrote at Harvard. Serious too is the fact that Sanborn spends so much time on the youth of Thoreau yet fails to present a "clearly-focussed picture of the kind of boy he was and the home life in which he found himself, or of a clear account of his education."

As Thoreau's chief purpose in life was to "observe the outward and experience the inward," Foerster considers Sanborn's success in picturing this:

> Of the outward, there is an adequate description in its human aspect (the friends and the former acquaintances), but outward nature is virtually ignored, doubtless on the assumption that on this topic nothing new was to be said.... Of the inward, there is a good deal that is valuable and interesting --fresh insight into Thoreau the author, much detail regarding his intellectual life such as lists of books read, a stirring relation of how his moral constitution was revealed by the slavery problem and John Brown's death; yet nowhere is there a critical analysis of his "philosophy," either of man or of nature.

For these reasons, said Foerster, "Sanborn's Life is less satisfactory than Henry Salt's, which has the virtue of proportion, emphasis, focus, definite purpose; is less satisfactory, in some respects, than the earlier book by Sanborn." Yet Foerster conceded that the book had merit. "Of little use to one who does not know Thoreau," he said, "it is a treasury of Thoreauisms to those who already know him well," and he felt that the book "deserves pre-eminence among the books about Thoreau in this centenary year." Concluding his review, Foerster wrote a paragraph that might sum up--with obvious modifications--Sanborn's importance to the world of literature:

> No one else, save perhaps Dr. Emerson, can write about Thoreau and the old Concord with so constant a sense of reality. Frank Sanborn has for many years had a way of giving out parenthetically precise information of a reminiscent kind; letting it, so to speak, utter itself in whispers while he was engaged elsewhere. This habit manifests itself in his last book charmingly. We do not feel that we are reading a book, we are holding a conversation, or rather listening to a diverse monologue, embroidered with images and events of a bygone civilization, enriched with wise comment and application, very much as if we sat, once more, before the peering eyes of the author himself in his house by the silent Concord.[166]

Though Sanborn knew Alcott, Emerson, and Ellery Channing much longer than he knew Thoreau, he did far less to perpetuate their fame. The product of his combined literary efforts in their behalf appear, therefore, as a sort of postscript to the great body of work which he produced as Thoreau's editor and biographer.

It was Alcott's hope for many years that Sanborn would be his biographer, and he expressed his wish in an entry in his journal for October 29, 1873:

> Evening... I have thought it might fall to Sanborn, when events may call for it, to write my biography, and remember that, some years since, I intimated the like and made a minute to that effect in my Diary at the time. The other evening Emerson intimated his intention of doing the same, since none but himself, he said, could do it fit justice.

---

[166] "Thoreau and Old Concord," Yale Review, VII, n.s. (January, 1918), 430.

> Yes, Emerson for the ideas, and Sanborn for the facts. But one must ascend for one friend or other to tell the whole story fully.[167]

When he was 80, it was made clear to him at a birthday party at Sanborn's that the latter had begun taking notes on his life, and Alcott wrote of the event:

> A new surprise awaits me. I am invited to meet my friends and neighbors, and members of the Fortnightly Club at Mr. Sanborn's. I am greeted as I enter the room on having reached my 80 years, with powers of body and mind unimpaired and the prospect before me of future years of service; asked, moreover, to give some sketch of my life, as a proper use of the occasion. Mr. Sanborn reads, by way of introduction, some notes of sayings of mine taken some years since, and after my sketch, which occupies the evening till a late hour, requests in the name of the Club the favor of sitting for a head of myself to our young artist, Mr. [Daniel Chester] French, whose head of Emerson is pronounced an admirable likeness. At all of which I am too happy to be silent.[168]

Nine years later, on March 4, 1888, Alcott died, and within three years Sanborn was writing to William Torrey Harris about his proposed Life of their friend.[169] However, six months later he told Harris he was having difficulties with the Pratt family, who did not want him to write it.[170]

---

[167] Journals of Amos Bronson Alcott, p. 441. Alcott was nearly seventy-four, Sanborn nearly forty-two at this time. Shepard says in a footnote to this page: "According to F. B. Sanborn, Emerson kept for years a special notebook of memoranda for the biography of Alcott he expected to write after his friend's death." Emerson, however, died six years before Alcott, though he was four years his junior.

[168] Ibid., p. 514, entry for November 29, 1879.

[169] Sanborn to Harris, Concord, July 23, 1891 (Concord Library, 11: S-83).

[170] Sanborn to Harris, Concord, January 9, 1892 (Concord Library, 11: S-84); Sanborn to Harris, Concord, February 27, 1892 (Concord Library, 11: S-87); and Sanborn to Harris, Concord, July 18, 1892 (Concord Library, 11: S-85).

But the book appeared, with Sanborn as author of twelve chapters of "facts" and Harris author of the "ideas" in Chapter XIII, "The Philosophy of Bronson Alcott and the Transcendentalists."[171]

One of the most interesting contemporary reviews of the work appeared in the London Spectator, for it displays not only an attitude toward Sanborn's work but an attitude toward American philosophy and philosophers:

> It is difficult for English minds to grasp the importance that America attaches to her latter-day philosophies. It has partly, no doubt, to do with the age of a nation and its history. America is young in somewhat the same sense that an undergraduate is young. America has the youthfulness of speculation, the youthfulness of aspiration, and a certain youthful absence of balance and want of proportion in dealing with the things of the present in relation to those of the past.

The Memoirs of Bronson Alcott, the critic avers, shows this to a remarkable extent:

> At times we are tempted to ask if the book is written in good faith for busy men and women of to-day. It reminds us of what might have been the outcome of provincial intellectual life fifty years ago. That it could be written by hard-headed Americans in a time when the best literature is in every one's hands, and when the questions of the day are burningly practical, shows such a touching ingenuousness that it can only be explained by a certain youthfulness of outlook on the part of its authors.

However, continues the reviewer, the book has in general "far graver faults than ingenuous youthfulness. It is, unfortunately, supremely dull. It is neither one thing, nor the other. It is not religious, it is not practical, it is not literary."

---

[171] A. Bronson Alcott: His Life and Philosophy (London: T. Fisher Unwin; Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1893), 2 vols., 679 pp.

> If ever there were priggishness in thought and expression, we have it in Alcott's doings and sayings. Wisdom is justified of her children, but wisdom is not justified by Mr. F. B. Sanborn writing a book which it is almost impossible to read. Perhaps a certain amount of amusement, which is aroused by the naïveté of the writing, does something to condone the book. Mr. Sanborn gives himself away with delightful simplicity. After inflicting endless letters of Alcott on the much-enduring reader, he quotes the following remark of Emersons:-- "When Alcott sits down to write, all his genius leaves him; he gives you the shells and throws away the kernel of his thought.

And yet, complains the critic, Mr. Sanborn compares Alcott to Milton and Socrates. "Can youthfulness," he asks rhetorically, "go further even in an American author?"

> It is just this want of proportion in judging their philosophical writers which makes it so difficult to read American critics with seriousness or sympathy. That Emerson, Thoreau, and others, including Alcott, have a place among thinkers, we may grant, though Emerson stands far and away first in a not very great community; but their sole merit is a certain freedom of thought and expression. What they write--and this is specially true of Alcott--is new neither in matter nor in method. Its merit--small at best--is that it is allied to a sturdy independence of word and action; and of the extraordinary want of both humour and proportion in this school of American philosophy reaches a climax, when we find Emerson gravely comparing his clever old aunt, Mrs. Mary Emerson, to Dante.

The critic nevertheless admires the "complete absence of conventionality which gives a realistic note to American theory."

> As thinkers they [the Americans] are neither deep nor wide, but they had the remarkable merit of being willing to act out their own philosophy. And this is hardly true of any philosopher since Diogenes. Otherwise, Alcott's life was commonplace enough.[172] Simple-minded and enthusiastic, but not wise, Alcott played his part among the Transcendentalists of Concord,--a fairly united coterie of friends imbued with a strange unfailing appreciation of their own importance.

---

[172]Speaking of naïveté, I note the critic referes to Alcott's debts which he contracted "at home and at college" (p. 275).

As for the Transcendentalists, furthermore, "A little wider vision, an ounce of self-distrustful humility, and the work of the American Transcendentalists would have left a very different result."

> That they have left some mark upon American literature may be granted,--the same quality of mark that a very intelligent childhood or youth leaves upon a grown man, but it is such a mark that no one but an American would think of comparing to that made by the mighty sages of European thought. Anyhow, they were honest men after their own fashion, and if their philosophy is vague and self-conscious, it is at least genuine in the simplicity of its ignorance. And in a certain childlike spirit that we find in Alcott we have the germ of the freshness and geniality that delights us in the writings of his daughter Louisa.[173]

The Nation and The Critic paid little attention to Sanborn's work.[174] The Atlantic Monthly, however, devoted six full pages to its review, which states that "It was the ambition of Mr. Alcott's life to be taken seriously, and his two biographers, both of whom were his disciples while he was on earth, have taken him very seriously and at considerable length." And the review continued:

> The editors do indeed present the raw material from which a correct view of Mr. Alcott is to be gathered, and their work is done with much literary skill and with a becoming modesty on their own part; but nevertheless it is not easy to discover what manner of man Mr. Alcott was, nor to explain the glaring contradiction between Mr. Alcott as he appeared to the select few and Mr. Alcott as he appeared to the many, more especially as it is the latter appearance which seems to be confirmed by his published works.

The critic then attempts to determine Mr. Alcott's merit, indicating how Alcott was the "single subject upon which Emerson permitted himself to be extravagant."

---

[173] The Spectator, (London) LXXII (February 24, 1894), 274-275.

[174] The Critic, Nr. 588 (May 27, 1893), pp. 348-349.

"Moreover," continues the critic," we have a singular and weighty piece of testimony concerning the slightness of the contribution made by Mr. Alcott to the world of ideas." He then tears apart Alcott's "inventory of his spiritual real estate," an inventory, says the reviewer, which "even under Professor Harris's own analysis . . . shrinks into small space."

> The only ideas which Mr. Alcott ever had...were first, the Platonic notion that knowledge is mainly reminiscence; and secondly, the related idea (of "lapse"), expressed in Wordsworth's Intimations of Immortality, that man is a being who existed in some anterior state of perfection.

Margaret Fuller, continues the critic, soon noted "the paucity—we do not say poverty" of Alcott's ideas.

But to Alcott's credit was his "wonderful, childlike faith in the omnipotence and omnipresence of good, in a stream of tendency not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." Perhaps, continues the critic, Emerson's faith was as strong as Alcott's, "but it was cold and intellectual, whereas Alcott had a fervor in his belief at which Emerson warmed himself as a half-frozen man might warm himself at a fire." And the critic paraphrases a remark by Henry James, Sr., to the effect "that Mr. Emerson treated his friends like lemons--he sucked them dry of what information they had, and then put them aside." Then the critic concludes:

> Was there, then, no element of greatness in the man? ... Was there no such Alcott as Emerson imagined? To believe that would be to make a worse mistake than is made by putting him upon the false pedestal which Messrs. Sanborn and Harris have constructed. Mr. Alcott's character was in some important aspects so good as to make him great. None but a pure and single-minded man could have loved truth so passionately and pursued it so unceasingly as Mr. Alcott did.... He possessed the three cardinal virtues of courage, sincerity, and charity....

> But how many...clever, successful men [the finished product of school and university] could have endured with cheerful serenity what Mr. Alcott endured; could have retained inviolate their faith in God and man despite personal failure and humiliation?... After all, if the true object of philosophy be to possess the philosophic spirit, then indeed we can assert that Bronson Alcott was a great philosopher.
>
> He was not, as Mr. Sanborn seems to think, a second Plato; nor need we fondly linger with Professor Harris upon "the insights which he had at the time of his illumination." Mr. Alcott's true epitaph and epitome will be found in those burning words of his famous daughter: "His dress was neat and poor. He looked cold and thin as an icicle, but serene as God."[175]

Sanborn's second book, a modest little volume of 103 pages, came out in 1908, and as none of the nation's leading critics considered it worthy of review, I do not need to occupy the reader's time except to say that it rounded out the portrait.[176]

Doubtless the soundest criticism of Sanborn's work on Alcott is presented by Odell Shepard in his forward to his biography of Alcott which appeared in 1937. Shepard refers to the sources which he used for his biography and says:

> My main authority will be the private Journals of Bronson Alcott himself.... I believe that I am the first person who has read them thoughtfully through since Alcott laid them down. Franklin B. Sanborn had access to them when he wrote his Memoir of Alcott over forty years since, but he did not use his opportunities to the full. Having the advantage of a long and intimate personal acquaintance with his subject, Sanborn wrote a good book, but the impatience, not to say the arrogance, of his brilliant and overcrowded mind is as evident in this book as in the rest of his always valuable,

---

[175] Atlantic Monthly, LXXIII (April, 1894), 549-555.

[176] Bronson Alcott at Alcott House, England, and Fruitlands, New England (1842-1844), (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press, 1908). Sanborn also edited Alcott's autobiographical poem, New Connecticut (Boston, 1887); his Sonnets and Canzonets (Boston, 1882); and introduced Clara Dowing's The Alcotts as I Knew Them (Boston: C. M. Clark, 1909).

> never quite dependable work. A man of many keen interests and large activities, he did not take time to master the Journals. When he quoted from them he often altered the text, silently, to suit himself. Moreover, he addressed a public different from that of to-day. I have used his book, therefore, with gratitude and with caution, correcting and extending and deepening his estimates, whenever possible, by recourse to the manuscripts that should have been, but were not, his constant source and guide.[177]

Though Sanborn knew Emerson intimately for twenty-nine years--from July, 1853, till the 25th of May, 1882, the day Emerson died--he did relatively little to immortalize him, when we consider the number of volumes on Thoreau which poured from Sanborn's pen. That Sanborn knew Emerson intimately there can be little doubt. Though Rusk's monumental volumes of Emerson letters show a few letters which passed between the two men, and though Sanborn mentions Emerson in some thirty letters written while Emerson lived, nothing is proved except the fact that the two men knew each other very well, that Sanborn admired Emerson, and that Emerson admired Sanborn during the early days of Sanborn's school. He did not, as we have seen, admire him enough to allow him to marry his daughter.

Of those letters I have collected in which Sanborn speaks of Emerson while the latter was still alive, one is about the same as another in flavor, character, and importance. Perhaps this statement epitomizes all of them:

---

[177] Pedlar's Progress: the Life of Bronson Alcott (Boston: Little, Brown, 1937), p. xiii.

> Mr Emerson in running down Wachusett a few days ago, with his nephew Charles, sprained his foot badly, and is now confined to the house, and walks with a crutch,- but I believe it is nothing very serious- The whole family go to Waterford, Me, in about a week- to remain there until the early part of September; where the girls are to do the family work - cooking and so forth, Edward, who is today 15 years old, is to pick berries, bring water and so on; and Mr Emerson free from social cares and "devestators of the day" is to read and write unmolested.[178]

From the material in Rusk's edition of the Emerson letters, we learn little that has not already been discussed in this study. Of chief interest is Emerson's expression of admiration for Sanborn is a letter to William Emerson:

> I am not quite sure that you have ever met Mr Sanborn, who is quite too important a person to old as well as young Concord, than that you should have missed him if you were both here at the same time.[179]

In another letter which Emerson wrote a week after Sanborn was kidnapped, Emerson said: "Sanborn seems quite clear headed, & to be also well advised."[180] In the Rusk volume and in those letters I have collected so far, the general tone is one of intimacy; however, I find no indication of what Emerson thought of Sanborn after the latter's early years in the school.

Sanborn's first material on Emerson was his essay written for <u>The Homes and Haunts of Our Elder Poets</u>, published in 1881, which contained two other essays by Sanborn on Holmes and Lowell, an essay by H. N. Powers

---

[178] Sanborn to Parker, Concord, July 10, 1859 (Concord Library, 5: S-43.

[179] Ralph Waldo Emerson to William Emerson, Concord, March 18, 1836, in Ralph L. Rusk, ed., <u>The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson</u> (New York: Columbia UP, 1939), V, 14.

[180] <u>Ibid.</u>, V, 120.

on Bryant, and two by R. H. Stoddard on Longfellow and Whittier.[181] Next he contributed an ode, "The Poet's Countersign," to Bronson Alcott's little volume, Ralph Waldo Emerson: an Estimate of His Genius in Prose and Verse,[182] in which appeared Alcott's "Ion: a Monody." Three years later appeared Sanborn's edition of all the essays and poems which were read in the special course entitled "The Genius and Character of Emerson" held at the Concord School of Philosophy the summer of 1884. Besides acting as editor of this large volume, Sanborn contributed a long ode and his lecture, "Emerson among the Poets." The volume contained the lectures and poems of several distinguished figures of the time, including Julia Ward Howe, Bronson Alcott, Ednah Littlehale Cheney, Julian Hawthorne, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, Emma Lazarus, Ellery Channing, George Willis Cooke, and William Torrey Harris.[183]

But Sanborn's two chief contributions to the Emerson literature were his modest little books, Ralph Waldo Emerson,[184] which appeared in 1901 as one of the Beacon Biographies, and The Personality of Emerson,[185] which matched Sanborn's The Personality of Thoreau in format and purpose.

The Beacon volume was, for its editor, M. A. DeWolfe Howe, a "disappointing performance," and he says further:

---

[181] New York: D. Appleton.

[182] Boston: A. Williams, 1882.

[183] Sanborn, "Ode of 1882," pp. 224-231, and "Emerson among the Poets," pp. 173-214, The Genius and Character of Emerson: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy (Boston, 1885).

[184] Boston: Small, Maynard.

[185] Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed, 1903; a limited edition of 500 copies by D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press.

> I comforted myself with the thought that the publishers of the series, and not I, asked Sanborn to write it--the single instance of its kind in the production of the thirty-one volumes in the series. The publishers, let me add, had every reason to expect something better. A re-reading of the book to-day might show me that I underrated its value at the time of its appearance.[186]

The Nation's criticisms of the volume should suffice to indicate the value of the book:

> [This volume] differs from nearly all the other "Beacon Biographies"...in being deeply colored by the personal intimacy of the writer with his subject. Hence less of vague generalization, more of remembered incident and speech. There is the usual over-emphasis on the earlier life, as if Mr. Sanborn were not conscious of his restricted space until his book was half written and the story of Emerson's literary career hardly begun, with the beginning of his own acquaintance with Emerson far in the future. But, happily, there are many reflections back from this upon the earlier years. These and the later recollections give the sketch its principal importance.[187]

Of the second work, The Personality of Emerson, The Nation felt that it was equally a revelation of Sanborn's own personality and personal history, "which supplies the chronological progression of an otherwise rambling discourse, with some repetitiousness." But, it added, "The lights and sidelights on Emerson, however, are numerous, and the essay will be prized."[188] The Critic added the final note in its one-paragraph review:

---

[186]Personal letter to me from M. A. DeWolfe Howe, 6 Union Street, Bristol, R. I., August 11, 1951.

[187]"Notes," The Nation, LXXIII (July 18, 1901), 52.

[188]"Notes," The Nation, LXXVI (June 11, 1903), 474.

> The seer as here seen is not otherwise than as we have long known him; but it is well that those who knew him best should record their impressions of him, and readers of to-day as well as the future historians of Transcendentalism in New England will find substantial value in these intimate yet reverent pencillings. The book--a small one--does credit to the Merrymount Press.[189]

Of Sanborn's work on the rest of the Concord worthies, there is little to tell. He took care of Louisa May Alcott, doubtless Concord's most popular literary figure, in one or two articles in current magazines, and he wrote of Margaret Fuller and the other "Women of Concord" in a series of articles in The Critic and in his Recollections of Seventy Years. He did more for his intimate friend, Ellery Channing. In 1902 he brought out a new, enlarged edition of Channing's Thoreau, the Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses, which Goodspeed published in Boston; the same year he selected and edited a large quantity of Channing's verse in the volume entitled Poems of Sixty-five Years published by Bentley in Philadelphia. In this Sanborn included a critical biographical introduction. Three years later he wrote four articles about Channing for The Critic. However, none of these received attention from the reviewers in the nation's critical journals of first rank.

For the one remaining Concord resident, Nathaniel Hawthorne--who was of course not a true member of the Concord group--Sanborn wrote the volume entitled Hawthorne and His Friends, a book in its appearance and

---

[189] The Critic, XLVI (January, 1905), 93. (Sanborn's only other contribution to the Emerson literature was his edition of Emerson's Tantalus, published in 1908 at Canton, Pennsylvania, by the Kirgate Press, for which Sanborn supplied a memorial note.)

purpose similar to his Personalities of Thoreau and Emerson but published by The Torch Press of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The work was of importance in filling in the details of the portrait of Hawthorne, but since Sanborn knew Hawthorne for only four years--after Hawthorne returned from his consulship in Liverpool--Sanborn cannot be said to have been at all intimate with the noted author.

Though Theodore Parker did not live in Concord, he was spiritually a part of the group there. It may seem strange that Sanborn did so little to perpetuate the memory of his beloved friend. But there is a reason for Sanborn's silence. When Parker made his will on the 25th of May, 1857, he appointed Sanborn one of his three executors, and in a codicil which he appended January 31st, 1859, he bequeathed to Sanborn his gold watch.[190] Furthermore, he informed Sanborn "privately" that the latter was "to take charge as literary executor, of the publication of his MSS. after his death." "And so I was ready to do," says Sanborn, in May, 1860, when he got word that Parker had died in Florence. But Mrs. Parker had different ideas, and as the matter had been left up to her, she chose Joseph Lyman, who had become intimate with Parker in his last years, to undertake the work. From that moment a battle ensued:

> A controversy had sprung up in the last year of his invalid life [writes Sanborn] between the Apthorps and some other friends of Parker, who objected to Mr. Lyman's choice of John Weiss as his biographer, and refused to allow him the use of their letters from Parker, very numerous and intimate.

---

[190] John Weiss, ed., Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker (New York, 1864), II, 446-447.

> These friends were earnest that I should assert my claim as executor, against the choice of Mrs. Parker.... I could not endure the thought of a public quarrel over the gresh grave of Parker, and declined to be any party to it,--hoping better from the work of Lyman and Weiss than others did.[191]

In Sanborn's eyes, Lyman had no talent for editing and he produced relatively nothing. Mrs. Parker, though a woman of intelligence, took leave of her senses, worked industriously and spent "thousands of dollars" to have her husband's correspondence copied. "But," says Sanborn, "with a singular lack of foresight, she destroyed most of the originals in Parker's difficult handwriting." As a result, Weiss's Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, which appeared in 1864, was, in Sanborn's opinion, filled with "countless errors of the press, which could not all be corrected, because the text had been lost." Mrs. Parker was so dissatisfied with Weiss's work that she quarreled with him and employed Octavius B. Frothingham to write a new biography. This, says Sanborn, "will be the standard for Parker's life and opinions," a judgment sustained by the Literary History of the United States.[192]

Mrs. Parker, without notifying Sanborn, in her will left all the manuscripts, printed papers, and extant copyrights to him. But it was too late, says Sanborn, to "bring the matter before the world," and there was "no fund to meet the cost of so doing." He therefore granted permission freely to editors and biographers and to a committee of the American

---

[191] Recollections, II, 556-557.

[192] Volume III, 679.

Unitarian Association, which brought forth in fifteen volumes The Works of Theodore Parker between 1907 and 1913. This Centenary edition "is not complete, but it is well edited," each volume being supplied by a preface and notes.[193] Sanborn supplied a preface to the volume containing Parker's "The Rights of Man in America," and other volumes were edited by such persons as Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Samuel A. Eliot, George W. Cooke, Samuel B. Stewart, Charles W. Wendte, and James Kendall Hosmer.

Aside from this Sanborn did, therefore, relatively little for Parker. And this relatively little consisted of a new 1882 edition of Parker's Prayers, for which he wrote a memoir, and for which Louisa Alcott wrote the preface.

Only one more book needs to be mentioned and that is Sanborn's second volume of his autobiographical Recollections of Seventy Years, published in 1909. It is appropriately mentioned here because it was a conglomeration that included many odds and ends of fact about his illustrious friends that he had not used before as well as some other material about them he had hashed over previously. The critic in The Nation hit the nail on the head when he said, "Considering the number of times that [Sanborn] has raked and reraked this field, it is surprising that he has still some fresh gleanings to offer." The real interest of Sanborn's reminiscences, as the critic said, was not so much in his own achievements "as in his contact with one tremendous historic episode and in his intimacy with two or three great American writers."

---

[193] Ibid., III, 678.

And the critic summed up the importance of his second volume by declaring that "it is when he is Boswellizing about Concord that we listen to him most gladly." He then summarized the importance of the volume in remarks that may stand as one of the best estimates of the merit of the man and his work:

> Mr. Sanborn says somewhere that he had a passion for knowing men; that he gratified this passion appears on every page. His interest in his fellow-beings is as insatiate as a savant's curiosity. He knows all about the humblest dweller in Concord...not less than about the celebrities. And he knows equally well what flowers or birds are to be found in the Carlisle Woods,...or along the shores of Walden Pond.
>
> He produces the effect of a glorified gossip, or garrulous town-pump. To him no item comes amiss; by him nothing is forgotten. There is a lack of perspective, a temperamental inability to coördinate and to generalize. Mention the name Hosmer, or Bartlett, or Barrett or Buttrick, and he reels off the proper genealogy, with some anecdote of every member of the family whom he mentions. This results in a sort of Pepysian disconnectedness, but it has also the Pepysian charm of real life....
>
> Despite its formlessness, and the rather too frequent resort to scissors and paste, the book is very readable. It will be one of the permanent sources of information for those who study John Brown and the Concord Group. To the student of social manners and customs, it will be scarcely less valuable, because it gives a hundred short-range glimpses of Yankee village life during the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century--that life which is as obsolete to-day as is the Boston of Cotton Mather. It is plain enough that some of the Concord egoists, who thought themselves geniuses, and absolved from the duties common to civilized men, were thinly disguised, or undisguised cranks. Their verses and their lucubrations, and their diaries filled with anaemic introspection, will impose on nobody to-day. But the true Concord community--with Emerson, and Hawthorne, and with Thoreau, too --can no more lose its significance for Americans than Weimar can for Germans. These recollections by Mr. Sanborn contain much authentic news of it.[195]

---

[195] "Frank Sanborn's Reminiscences," The Nation, LXXXIX, (July 22, 1909), 76-77.

And now to close this long chapter on Sanborn's literary career only three things should be mentioned further: his writing of verse in the years after he graduated from Harvard, his efforts to publish the work of important literary figures in The Commonwealth, and his long career as a literary columnist for the Springfield Daily Republican.

"Indeed," said the writer of Sanborn's obituary in the Republican, he was "never a literary artist like Thoreau and Emerson." "But there was one field of literature where he might have achieved a finer artistry," he continued. This was in the writing of verse, "for the few verses he wrote showed a grace of expression with a spiritual significance which give him a place with the poets of transcendentalism. Sometimes a fragmentary record of feeling among these would be fit to set beside those of the Greek anthology."[196] Charles Wagner in his Harvard: Four Centuries and Freedoms speaks of him as a poet but places him within a group of writers that does not do great credit to Sanborn:

> Poets like B. F. Sanborn [sic], Trumbull Stickney, Cabot Lodge, Edwin Ford Piper and Hugh McCulloch could not long take the harsh turn of lyric affairs. There was no longer a Julia Ward Howe to run to in Boston and, for the more robust, there was always resentment that poetry was now the darling of women's delight. Santayana himself had to run off every few years and renew his ardors on the Continent.

---

196 "Death of F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Sunday Republican, February 25, 1917, p. 1, col 3 and p. 13, cols. 1-4.

And he then speaks of the "stronger voices": Robert Frost, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Bliss Carman, Wallace Stevens, and many more who passed across the Harvard poetic panorama.[197] An unknown assailant hurled the cruelest phrase at him in a letter printed in the Boston Herald. Whoever it was called him "one of the women in breeches poets of Massachusetts."[198]

Yet Sanborn continued to write verse from the time he left Harvard till his last days, and he was often called upon to deliver an ode or a sonnet or a few stanzas at public commemorations, patriotic exercises, and services, or at private anniversaries, celebrations, or parties. Two of his earliest attempts at occasional verse were his Hymn to be Sung at the Music Hall, printed as a broadside in Boston, and his dirge intoned at the memorial exercises in Concord, both in honor of John Brown. Typical of his writing for dedicatory exercises is the long "Soldier's Monument" in the Sanborn Papers in the Forbes Library at Northampton, Mass. In 1859, the Fraternity, the young men's group of Parker's Twenty-eighth Congregational Society in Boston, published his "America," which he had read at the opening of their lectures. Representative of his writing which honored the great or famous is his "Ode of 1882," reprinted in The Genius and Character of Emerson published by the Concord School of

---

[197] Charles A. Wagner, Harvard: Four Centuries and Freedoms (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1950), pp. 183-187.

[198] This comment appears on a notecard probably written by Oswald Garrison Villard in the John Brown Papers (folder II), Special Collections, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York. But the card gives the source as "Boston letter in Herald--Nov. 20—p 1- col 4." The year is omitted.

Philosophy in 1885. Typical of his verse written in honor of his friends and acquaintances are his Lines Written for the Silver Wedding of Hon. Henry Wilson, which he privately printed in Concord.

Curious, however, is the collection of his manuscript verses among his papers at the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester. In this box of papers there are about fifty-two poems including two contained in an envelope addressed to Ariana Walker, six in an envelope marked "Miscellaneous Poems," a poem entitled "Apollo" in an envelope labelled "Concord Verses," and an envelope containing six verses by Ariana, Ednah Cheney, and Sanborn, and a small sheaf of probably twenty-nine poems, including a prologue of approximately 175 lines entitled "Ovid's Metamorphosis: The Abode of Envy (Translated in verse by T[homas P[arker] Sanborn 1878)." But most curious is an envelope marked "Cat Poems," which contains four odd creations perhaps inspired by the to-the-louse-and-mouse poetry of Robert Burns. Though none of them can bear reprinting, they present a side of Sanborn that is rather interesting. One of them begins:

The Humble Cry and Purrtition
of
Biddy Muffin
to
Her Gracious Mistress

And another is inscribed:

In Memoriam
Brigittae Muffinis,
Felis Infelicis, Post Caras Multas
Nunc, Eheu! In Pace!

This group seems to describe the frustrated love of one Toughynne de Boots, who dwells at the Hotel des Sciences, for Bridget Muffin of the Hotel des Chats, and one of the poems contains these melancholy lines:

> Ah, Bridget! how can I,
> Of lineage so high,
> Sixtieth in blood from famous Puss in Boots,--
> Keep company with thee, whose roots
> Spring from some cat that littered in a sty?

But at the opposite extreme of Sanborn's poetic endeavors were those verses which were honored when Edmund Clarence Stedman printed them in his An American Anthology (1787-1900), a work today criticized however for "too great catholicity."[199] One of these two poems, "Ariana," was based on two lines which Alcott gave him while he was composing his own Sonnets and Canzonets, which Sanborn was editing. Sanborn was now fifty, had been married to Louisa Leavitt just twenty years, and had three sons, Thomas Parker, seventeen, Victor Channing, fifteen, and Francis Bachiler, ten:

> SWEET saint! whose rising dawned upon the sight
> Like fair Aurora chasing mists away,
> Our ocean billows, and thy western height
> Gave back reflections of the tender ray,
> Sparkling and smiling as night turned to day:--
> Ah! whither vanished that celestial light?
> Suns rise and set, Monadnoc's amethyst
> Year-long above the sullen cloud appears,
> Daily the waves our summer strand have kissed,
> But thou returnest not with days and years:
> Or is it thine, yon clear and beckoning star,
> Seen o'er the hills that guarded once thy home?
> Dost guide thy friend's free steps that widely roam
> Toward that far country where his wishes are?[200]

---

[199] "Edmund Clarence Stedman," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXV, 561.

[200] Edmund Clarence Stedman, An American Anthology (1787-1900): Selections Illustrating the Editor's Critical Review of American Poetry in the Nineteenth Century (Boston, 1900), p. 326. This version of the poem differs from the later version in Sanborn's Recollections, II, 294 in these details: In the later version he changed two capital letters, eight marks of punctuation, the italicizing of one word, and "kissed" to "kist."

The other poem in the anthology was written in honor of Samuel Hoar, who was a famous lawyer and Senator who had challenged the constitutionality of certain laws in South Carolina which allowed the imprisonment of free negroes:

A YEAR ago how often did I meet
Under these elms, once more in sober bloom,
Thy tall, sad figure pacing down the street,--
But now the robin sings above thy tomb.
Thy name on other shores may ne'er be known,
Though austere Rome no graver Consul knew;
But Massachusetts her true son doth own:
Out of her soil thy hardy virtues grew.
She loves the man who chose the conquered cause,
The upright soul that bowed to God alone,
The clean hand that upheld her equal laws,
The old religion, never yet outgrown,
The cold demeanor and warm hear beneath,
The simple grandeur of thy life and death.[201]

In spite of the fact that Sanborn wrote considerable verse during his life, and in spite of the fact that he seemed to write his verse with greater care than he did his prose, in my opinion he cannot be said to have been a poet. Even these two selections, which I presume Sanborn submitted to Stedman as his best work, are, I feel, third rate, and rank with the rather pale, washed-out verse of the minor poets of the Romantic and Victorian periods.

---

[201] "Samuel Hoar," p. 326. Since Sanborn speaks of Hoar as having died a year before, and since he died in 1856, this poem was presumably written in 1857.

Little further space need be given to Sanborn's work as editor of The Commonwealth. We have already viewed his political theories as they were expressed in his editorial columns and we have seen the type of political material he printed. But he also raised the literary tone of the paper by his printing of the work of some of the best writers in New England. Besides the work of Thoreau which he published for the first time from the original manuscripts, and besides his printing of Louisa May Alcott's "Hospital Sketches," which established her as a writer worthy of consideration, he published the work of many other writers--embryonic and established. A brief catalog of the pieces he published during his seven and a half months as editor will exemplify what he did during the rest of his four years as literary editor. In his first issue he printed Ellery Channing's "Epithalamium," William Dean Howells' "A Poet," chapter four of "M. L.," a novel by Louisa May Alcott, a literary review of the Atlantic Monthly for February, and a "Chorus," from the Ajax of Sophocles, which I suspect was his own verse translation. In later issues he printed or reprinted Thoreau's "The Landlord," Harriet Beecher Stowe's "The Old Meeting House," Julia Ward Howe's "The Slave at New Orleans," Channing's "Vernon," and "Quatrains" by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Bronson Alcott's Conversations on great reformers were presented in minute detail, and there were Moncure Conway's letters from Europe. There were, too, discussions of such subjects as the "Philosophy of the Absolute," reprints of such verse as Tennyson's "The Laureate's Ode on the Royal Marriage," Robert Herrick's "The White Island," and David Wasson's "A Letter to Thomas Carlyle." Translated especially for the paper was

"Quintin Messis," from the German of Caroline Pichler. The paper seemed to make a point of indicating that many of its contributions were written "For the Commonwealth." Sanborn himself, I suspect, contributed several of the anonymous verses and probably most of the verse translations from Uhland and Heine. Though principally a political sheet, the paper owed much to Sanborn for the encouragement, hospitality, and publicity he gave to so many important literary figures.

When one is foolish enough to attempt to indicate what Sanborn wrote as a literary columnist on the Springfield Daily Republican, he finds his task of sampling the material overwhelming--to put it mildly. As I have said, Sanborn wrote two columns a week, one political and the other literary. Though in "Our Boston Literary Letter" he theoretically set about writing on literary topics, his column usually contained some material on politics or social reform. His political column, "Our Weekly Boston Letter," in like manner sometimes contained literary news, comment, and criticism. Therefore, the person who describes Sanborn's work as a literary commentator must sample two columns written each week of the year for forty-nine years, and he contemplates the task with the same emotions that filled the mosquito in the children's story who promised his mother he would drink the sea.

First, I would like to say that if one is to do a thorough job of digesting all that Sanborn says in his bi-weekly columns, he should read the columns in such a library as that of Harvard. There he may surround himself with encyclopedias, readers' guides, biographical dictionaries,

literary histories, atlases, cumulative indexes, Harvard class notes, New England town records, annual reports of state institutions, almanacs, boxes of original manuscripts, card catalogs, and bibliographies of bibliographies. He may then hope to keep himself oriented to the swift-moving Sanborn mind. For Sanborn not only observed the passing scene for material--as I indicated in my comments on his political column--but he added to this an unbelievably vast knowledge of books. When George H. Sargent, a reporter for the Boston Evening Transcript, attended the sale of the American portion of Sanborn's private library which was dispersed at the auction rooms of C. F. Libbie and Company of Boston in October, 1917, he wrote, "Anyone who has been a constant or occasional reader of the multitudinous books, pamphlets and articles written by the late F. B. Sanborn, the last of the 'Concord School,' can realize what a hodge-podge of literature is to be found in the catalogue of the sale." The Sanborn library, he continued, only a part of which was to be sold at that time, "will furnish interest and some amusement for book collectors. For the library was like one of Mr. Sanborn's articles in the Springfield Republican."

> The late Mr. Sanborn [the reporter continued] was not a book collector in the ordinary sense of the word. He had, indeed, a remarkable collection of books, relating to American history. But apart from a few notable exceptions, the catalogue does not contain the titles of the great "nuggets" which are so eagerly sought by collectors. Mr. Sanborn bought books to use them, not to show to other bibliophiles.

Then Sargent reported some of the books he found. There were volumes on crime, Indian literature, trials, witchcraft; there were early engraved music books, more than a hundred chapbooks, prints and lithographic views,

Lincolniana (including fifty-four newspapers relating to Lincoln's assassination, funeral, and the trial of the assassins), social science documents and monographs, antislavery pamphlets, and a great mass of material by and about Concord worthies. None of this was surprising.

But there was a great bundle of rare books and early pamphlets on shorthand and phonetic spelling; the Pirate's Own Book, considerably worn; the Phallic publication of Sha Rocco, The Masculine Cross and Ancient Sex Worship, the Matrimonial Preceptor, or, instructive hints to those who are and who are likely to be married, and Payne's unexpurgated edition of the Decameron. There were 138 lots of genealogies, some of which were extremely rare, and the Confessions, Trials and Biographical Sketches of the Most Cold Blooded Murderers who have been executed in this Country from its First Settlement, published in 1844. Sargent also found books on angling, bees, birds, California, Christian Science, Masonry, naval affairs, Quakers, railroads (including rare Massachusetts pamphlets), the White Mountains, Yale College (including the scarce Yale College Scrapes), and more than 700 almanacs.

But the nuggets in the Sanborn sale included the only perfect copy ever offered by auction of Jonathan Mitchel's Propositions concerning the Subject of Baptism and Consociation of Churches Collected and Confirmed out of the Word of God . . . . Printed in 1662 by Samuel Green, with the same border that was used for the Eliot Indian Bible, the copy had belonged to both Increase Mather and James Russell Lowell. Also for sale was an exceedingly rare copy of Edward Johnson's The Wonder-Working Providence, another copy of which had brought $315 in 1914. And Sanborn

had collected copies of the extremely rare Peters' General History of Connecticut; Jonathan Dickenson's Remarkable Deliverance of Robert Barrow (printed in 1792); Wigglesworth's Meat Out of the Eater, in the fifth edition of 1717; a first edition of the first book of poetry printed in Connecticut, Robert Walcott's Poetical Meditations; and several editions of the New England Primer.[202] All of these sundry volumes, I repeat, formed only a part of the American portion of Sanborn's private library in his home in Concord by the Sudbury.

The mind that assimilated such quantities of miscellaneous information was the mind of the man whom Charles Francis Adams, Jr., referred to as "The Walking Encyclopedia." This was the mind that wrote the Boston literary letters, which, says Van Wyck Brooks, "with their news and gossip of the literary world, were a staple of conversation in the Berkshires."[203]

What does Sanborn talk about in his columns in the Springfield Daily Republican? I have sampled approximately 325 columns written between 1873 and 1917 and have been permitted to use the notes taken by Mrs. Kathryn Whitford on about eighty columns written in 1878-79.[204] I do

---

[202] George H. Sargent, "Frank B. Sanborn's Jewels and Junk," Boston Evening Transcript, September 19, 1917, part two, p. 4, cols. 1-7.

[203] New England: Indian Summer (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1940), p.60.

[204] Kathryn Whitford (Mrs. Philip J. Whitford), 4657 North 117th Street, Milwaukee 26, Wisconsin, took these notes for what she terms her own "aborted effort" toward a critical study of Sanborn. She has very generously permitted me to use them together with her bibliography and a thirty-two-page biographical paper. However, I did not have this material until the week of January 19, 1953, so that I have not introduced any of her other evidence into the part of my thesis written before these pages which concern the literary columns.

not find in his literary columns a pervading philosophy or point of view, though Mrs. Whitford found the following statements in which Sanborn presents two criteria for book-reviewing:

> The ideal of book-reviewing of course is that it shall be done by a competent person, in all cases,--that he shall read the book, and then clearly, fully and fairly tell the public about it.
>
> Much criticism, in fact, is mere advertising and serves to keep a book before the people,--in this case praise or blame can be quite indifferent.[205]

As Sanborn commented on every conceivable subject--even if one limits the definition of literature to belles lettres--it is difficult to make any valid generalizations. However, a few statements may be made.

First, I can say that probably few new books escaped his notice. Often these served as a basis for his articles. The reader of his column often begins a long essay--recondite, scholarly, of varying degrees of interest--on Lady Mary Wortley Montagu; Gilbert White and Henry Thoreau; the rainbow in verse and art; John Bunyan and his contemporaries; Aaron Burr and Fenimore Cooper; fiction in France and America; the Old Testament writers; the Latin play at Harvard; Wellington, Walter Scott, and the Shelleys; General Meade as a man of letters; Plutarch, Du Bosc, and Ridgway; the library at St. Johnsbury, Vermont; late Latin poetry; capricious modern verse; England in the eighteenth century; the wit of Savile, Marquis of Halifax; masters and disciples in Roman verse; Lowell and Emerson in Paris. The reader then may discover that this disquisition is in fact a long resumé of a book Sanborn has just read. Usually Sanborn

---

[205] July 23, 1878.

then proceeds to render judgment on the volume and attempt to foretell its probable place in letters, and often he continues at length to correct the author's facts--though the author might be considered a leading specialist in his subject.

Second, that Sanborn was considered capable in his criticisms can be inferred from statements made about his critical remarks. For example, Horace Traubel reported a conversation Whitman had with Sanborn the one time he traveled to Concord. Whitman told Traubel:

> "I asked Sanborn that time at Concord who of all men of Concord was most likely to last into the future. Sanborn took his time in replying. I thought he was going to say Emerson, but he didn't. He said Thoreau. I was surprised--looked at him--asked: 'Is that your deliberate judgment?' and he said very emphatically: 'Yes!' I thought that very significant. Considering who Emerson was, Thoreau was, Sanborn was, very, very significant."

It is significant too that Sanborn thought well of Whitman; in fact, during Whitman's one visit to Concord he stayed at Sanborn's house. At a time when to admire Whitman was for many literate people madness or perversion, Whitman said: "I always hold Sanborn, Frank Sanborn, to be a true friend--to stand with those who wish me well. He has always treated me royally when I have been up his way. I believe Sanborn was instrumental in having the Whitman head established at Concord."[206] Edmund Clarence Stedman points out that Sanborn joined such British critics as Swinburne, Dowden, Symonds, and Clive in their praise of Whitman and that such American critics as Sanborn, Conway, Linton, Whiting, Benton, and

---

[206]Horace Traubel, With Walt Whitman in Camden (Boston: Small, Maynard, 1906), I, 213, 285.

Burroughs "guarded [Whitman's] rights or ministered to him," and that some of these critics had done so "with a loyalty unprecedented in our literary annals."[207]

Stedman also thought Sanborn's early judgment of Emerson's poetry was later justified. "Common opinion," wrote Stedman, "justified Mr. Sanborn's fine paradox that, instead of its being settled that Emerson could not write poetry, it was settled that he could write nothing else."[208]

Though in my opinion Sanborn wrote third-rate verse, I imagine he was considered a fairly astute critic of the verse of others. For example, it is Odell Shepard's opinion that Alcott's Sonnets and Canzonets and New Connecticut, which Sanborn edited, "show [his] smoothing and capable hand."[209]

To be specific, Sanborn wrote about everything. First, he talked a great deal about his Concord friends. Already I have turned up many interesting details, and the careful search which I must make of the rest of his columns should yield innumerable details about the Concord group. For example, in his column of May 28, 1873, he tells of the honors paid to Ralph Waldo Emerson and Julia Ward Howe the day before. It was Mrs. Howe's fifty-fourth birthday and it was Emerson's triumphal return from Europe. Docking at the Boston wharf at 10:00, Emerson and his daughter

---

[207] Edmund Clarence Stedman, Poets of America (Boston, 1885), p. 360.

[208] Ibid., p. 136.

[209] Pedlar's Progress, p. 505.

took the afternoon train out to Concord. Emerson knew nothing of the reception awaiting him, and was surprised to find some 200 school children and as many adults, with the village band and carriages and flowers, drawn up in front of the railroad station to cheer him.

> Accompanied by Miss Emerson [Sanborn reports], he was led through the lines of children to a barouche, drawn by a pair of handsome black horses, in which he took his seat, and, without tedious delay, preceded by the Concord band of music and followed by a long line of carriages and pedestrians, he slowly rode through the main street of the village to his home....Across the turnpike, and under the trees in front of the house, an arch decorated with flowers was thrown for the returning traveler to pass under as he drove into his own gate. The children were drawn up along the road on both sides of the arch, and sang the familiar stanza of Payne's song,--
>
> "Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam..."

No one made any speeches, Sanborn reports, but "with much delicacy" left Emerson alone with his family, unburdened by the duties of a public reception. But, as a pleasant surprise, the house itself had been completely rehabilitated since the fire of the year before:

> When he left home in October little had been done toward rebuilding it, and his library, pictures and furniture were scattered about in various places, where they had found shelter at the time of the fire. All these have been brought together in the new house, and Mr Emerson's study was waiting for him exactly as he left it the night before the fire. The book-shelves were in their place, the Fates of Michael Angelo being over the fire-place; the portrait of Carlyle on the opposite wall, the round table, for books and papers and the ink-stand, stood in the center, and all the furniture was placed as it was wont to stand. The rest of the house had been restored in like manner,...but the study was identically the same except the mantel-piece, the wall-paper and the carpet. Mrs Emerson with her children and grandchildren were at the door to receive him, and the rooms were gay with flowers and cheerful tokens of welcome.[210]

---

[210] May 28, 1873, p. 8, col. 1.

Though this sort of reporting may not add to the world's ideas, it is a picture that adds to our pleasant appreciation of Emerson and of a world and a time that could have a parade for a thinking man.

Sanborn did a great deal to raise the standards of taste and to stimulate interest in American literature. Of some of the more important writers of his day, he gave opinions which subsequent critics have justified and some which they have not. For example, of Poe he writes:

> His genius was morbid, and a little too quizzical; his taste was by no means faultless, and there was much provincialism mingled with the broader qualities of his intellect. He may easily appear greater than he was; but he will always pass, probably, for a man of peculiar genius, whose story is worth telling and whose books contain some grains of gold amongst much chaff and dross.[211]

Speaking of William Dean Howells' latest novel, Sanborn discusses first the difference between fiction and what he calls "Fictition." Fiction, Sanborn says, is "the image of nature," a definition which sets it apart from "Fictition," which is "a kind a writing in which all resemblance to nature is lost." Then he says:

> In Mr Howells' "The Lady of Aroostook" one scarcely notices the resemblance to Hawthorne's style of writing which once was observable in Howells'. He has developed fully his own manner, which is at once more minute in detail and more dramatic than Hawthorne's, without that broad sweep and deep grope of imagination which is peculiar to Hawthorne among modern authors. It is hard to say whether Hawthorne's books are fiction or "Fictition,"--but with Howells there is so much realism that neither term can be applied to his stories. His characters actually walk about in the picture diminished in size but clear as life itself.... This power of condensing the <u>multum</u> into the <u>parro</u> is an enviable one, and Mr Howells possesses it in great perfection.[212]

---

[211] Whitford notes. July 30, 1878.

[212] <u>Ibid</u>., January 21, 1879.

In another column Sanborn says that he has been looking through some old copies of an annual, the Token, and has come across some early verses of Holmes and two stories of Hawthorne. This leads him into digressions on Elizabeth Palmer Peabody (whom someone, he says, selected to marry Emerson), to a discussion of Walt Whitman, Emerson, and Leaves of Grass, which leads him to speak of Taine on La Fontaine. Then winding back to Hawthorne's two contributions to the Token, he says that "The Haunted Quack" and "Lord Vaporcourt" have escaped the attention of all of Hawthorne's biographers, and he wonders why, as they formed the first rough and satirical sketches for two later stories of importance.[213]

Future biographers of Whittier should also take note of the fact, he says, that an Amesbury painter has "lately revealed to the people of California, where he is living, that he once shot Whittier, by accident, through the fence that separated his father's garden from Whittier's at Amesbury." This leads Sanborn to report also that somebody has been questioning the descent of Whittier from one of the early New England magistrates, Christopher Hussey. This remark sends Sanborn off into a dozen of his 138 lots of genealogies, which bring him to wade knee-deep in the antiquarian salt marshes of Hampton Falls, and he completes the circle by dating the shot that hit Whittier and pointing out that "the authentic biography of Whittier will doubtless take note of all these things, and is soon to be published."[214]

---

[213] March 10, 1894, p. 9, cols. 1-3.

[214] March 17, 1894, p. 9, cols. 1-3.

In his review of Louisa Alcott's Under the Lilacs, he says that in this as in her other works he sees her father's transcendentalism despite the fact that they seem to have none of it. This novel he finds to be moral, but the story, he feels, moves freely and without the strait-laced moralizing of Maria Edgeworth. In his reading, too, of the recent Poganuc People of Harriet Beecher Stowe he finds a faithful, vivid reproduction of life in Connecticut fifty years before.[215]

A recent trip West--probably to a national conference of charities and correction--brings him to speak of the merit of Edward Eggleston:

> Mr Eggleston's novels come out as fast as Bulwer's used to; but do not resemble them in the least, except that they are good. His third one, "The Mystery of Metropolisville," just concluded in Hearth and Home,...is finished better than either of the former ones, and has less of the preacher and more of the novelist in it. Like them, it is a humble western story, with a slender plot, and characters, that do not take us through a wide range of human experience. There is little incident, and such as we have is rather tamely managed; but the persons are all natural and well drawn, the conversations are probable and not stiff, and no doubt the book will have great popularity. I found, the other day, that the two preceding stories are sold extensively to railroad travelers; and passing through the region where the "Hoosier Schoolmaster" is supposed to have lived, it was easy to see persons who might have sat for the characters in these novels. Even in March the "Shaker bonnet" made its appearance on the train where I was, and the manners and dialect were recognizable, also. It is delightful to find that the prairies have at last found their novelist, and that the life of the western farmers is to be extended in fiction beyond its own era. Mr Eggleston is perhaps to be warned against writing too much; though he does not yet show any signs of repeating himself; indeed, one great merit of his books is the delicacy with which the different types of character are so drawn that they do not repeat each other, and yet belong to the same class.[216]

---

[215] Whitford notes. October 17, 1878, and June 26, 1878.

[216] April 15, 1873, p. 5, col. 6. In saying that this work "is finished better than either of the former ones," Sanborn perhaps forgot this novel was Eggleston's fifth publication.

Sanborn considered Henry James' Pension Beaurepas "an entertaining cageful of fools" and said that "possibly this may explain why Mr James' fiction does not leave us with the most agreeable sensations--charming as it is. We like to think well of some fellow creatures."[217]

And he gave some concluding general criticisms of America's younger novelists when he said:

> What is lacking...in most of our younger American novelists, is a serious conception, either through the reason or the imagination, of what human life and its possibilities are. Everything with them is light and transitory, capable of amusing...but incapable of stirring the sources of thought and emotion, which the great masters of fiction reach without effort. Mr Aldrich, Mr Howells and even Henry James have this [transitory] turn of mind, which is becoming crystallized into a school of minor novelists. The women who write novels in this country avoid this fault, though they have their own shortcomings.[218]

Commenting on George Santayana's Sonnets and Other Verses he feels that none of the recent Harvard graduates who have attempted verse--not even George Woodberry--shows "such an easy mastery of poetic numbers as this Spaniard, to whom English rhythm is so native, and at the same time so expressive of high thought." Sanborn then illustrates from "a trite theme":

> Columbus found a world, and had no chart,
> Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
> To trust the soul's invincible surmise
> Was all his science and his only art.

He then says: "There are finer and more obscure things in the little volume, but this will prove how fluent and perceptive the poet is. He

---

[217] Whitford notes, March 12, 1879.

[218] Ibid., July 9, 1878.

has some touches of that affectation which is the bane of poets and artists in this age of the world,--but less than most, and is not too old to outgrow it."[219]

These brief quotations may be concluded by adding that sometimes Sanborn reviewed his own books, as for example in his notice of his eleventh volume of the Familiar Letters which Houghton, Mifflin was adding to its ten-volume edition of Thoreau's works. But his notice merely repeated what he had said of the letters in his preface to the volume, that they would exhibit Thoreau "in more sportive and trivial moods," adding that many of Thoreau's letters he knew were still uncollected and that he would be glad to receive copies of any of them that had never been printed.[220]

Sanborn took equally extended notice of British literature, and his knowledge of the most minute details of major and minor persons, places, and things in the literature is amazing.

In a review of the Life of Dean Stanley, he compares its recounting of petty bigotries of the Pusey and Hampden period with the work of the Hindu Mozoomdar--the same gentleman whom Sanborn had invited to lecture at the Concord School of Philosophy. In his The Spirit of God Mozoomdar, Sanborn felt, had written "the most religious work that has been printed in this city for many a long year."

---

[219] April 21, 1894.

[220] February 10, 1894, p. 2, col 6, p. 3, col. 1.

> Here is no question of bishops or creeds [he continues], no squabble about where the altar shall stand, and what petticoats the priest shall wear, or how often he shall change them; but from beginning to end one warm, high strain of religious truth and charity.[221]

Another current biography, The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort, he found to contain "many tiresome commonplace comments of Queen Victoria and Louis Napoleon and other great personages upon each other," though he admitted the author's account of the Crimean War was well worth reading.[222]

Since Sanborn considered biography second to poetry as a "delight of the mind,"[223] he spent much time reviewing the latter. Of Chaucer he said in one column:

> [He was the] first great comic poet of England, and none who came after him--Shakespeare always excepted, have come near him in their wit and good nature, while most of them have exceeded him in coarseness and the political turn of their satire. This is the blemish on that famous comic poem, "Hudibras."[224]

In two other columns he castigates the poetry of Swift and presents an astute evaluation of the work of Thomas Moore:

> [Moore's] best verses are, of course, his songs, some of which will live forever, I suppose; although if I were asked about the immortality of his large poems--even of "Lalla Rookh," which is the best, I should...answer no."[225]

---

[221] February 24, 1894, p. 9, cols. 1-3.

[222] Whitford notes. March 17, 1878.

[223] Ibid., January 29, 1878.

[224] Ibid., February 17, 1879.

[225] Ibid., March 27, 1878.

In a voluminous review of William Morris' Sigurd the Volsung and the Fall of the Niblungs, Sanborn declares that Morris is "certainly an industrious poet":

> He thinks no more of throwing off a trifle 10,000 lines long—that is to say a poem as long as the AEneid of Virgil,—than other men do of writing an occasional poem to be read after dinner.... And this new book...runs to nearly 10,000 long lines. One feels like crying out, with the shepherd in Virgil:—
>
> "Claudite jam rivos, pueri! sat prata biberunt,"
>
> which, being interpreted with the freedom that Mr Morris uses, would read:—
>
> "O dam your water-courses, boys! shut up!
> Too much the meadows tipple at your cup."

Sanborn then quotes Carlyle's remark that the writer of the German lay was "a true old singer, and taught of Nature herself!" Morris, says Sanborn, has marred this simple strength and unconscious beauty by his pedantries and mannerisms, but he has added a grace and tenderness which was not in the original:

> In the best passages he has risen above his usual vein of cloying sweetness, and struck a more manly chord, as he could not well fail to do in following such a masculine author as the singer of the old Saga.

"Sun-myths" and "moon-myths", history and legend, and a host of other elements, says Sanborn, are hopelessly entangled in the work:

> To these also Mr Morris has added his own individuality—giving a sort of reproduction, in literary wall-papers, of the same aesthetic effect which the wall-papers that go by his name have in house-furnishing. The grand result is something that never can have the effect of reality but may be much in fashion for a time—as the poems of Ossian and the classical fancies of the French painter David were. This prettiness of Morris often relives the ghastliness of the old legends, which in their antique form could never win general

> attention again; while his diligence in "restoring" the old pictures, though he adds his own coloring, is indicative of great intellectual talent and industry. The trouble seems to be that nobody can possibly read the whole that he writes, except as a special task,--any more than he can now read the volumes of verse that were written in continuation of the old poems of Homer and Hesiod. Those poems remain, and always will, though it is more difficult to read them with interest than it was formerly,--but the continuations are forgotten. Who knows or cares about Nounus or Quintus Smyruaeus, or Apollonius of Rhodes?[226]

From biography and poetry Sanborn passed at times to history, and his remarks on Froude may indicate the quality of his criticism:

> Mr Froude remarks,... "I have called this work a 'sketch' because the materials do not exist for a portrait." What necessity Mr Froude has for authentic "materials" when he has shown such eminent ability in manufacturing History out of nothing, I do not quite understand.[227]

More often, however, Sanborn commented on English novels. In one review, in which he praised The Return of the Native at some length, he spoke particularly of Hardy's "power of description," his "intimate knowledge of feminine character," and he concluded:

> Hardy has little incident, but much invention and by-play--so that the reader's interest is constantly kept up without the devices of high rank or desperate misfortune or thrilling adventure to which William Black resorts.[228]

And his general attitude toward the novel seems to be summed up in this comment on Jane Austen:

---

[226] January 18, 1877, p. 2, col. 6.

[227] Whitford notes. May 28, 1879.

[228] Ibid., March 21, 1878.

> If ambitious novelists would carefully study Jane Austen or Miss Charlotte M. Yonge, and see with how few ingredients a really good story can be made, and how little what Scott called the "big bow-wow" style is needed, when an author has the gift of putting together a few strong instincts by a few plain rules, and of managing conversation so that all characters will not talk alike,--they would learn something greatly to their advantage.[229]

In general I feel that Sanborn's criticisms were eminently fair and that his loyalty to the cause of the new literature springing up in America was important and merits our admiration. Particularly admirable was his encouragement of the American writers when we know what he felt. This we know from a comment which he made after reading several anthologies of English verse: "So much wealth [in England] and so much poverty here is depressing to think of. But then the length of time must be taken into account, and the fact that we do not hear much about the worthless verse that was written in England from Chaucer's time to Milton's."[230]

---

[229] Whitford notes. June 10, 1879.

[230] Ibid., December 18, 1879.

CHAPTER VI

HIS PERSONALITY

When Julian Hawthorne was nearly seventy, he met Sanborn again "after what an interval!" The time must have been about 1916, and the place was Sanborn's library--"those book-covered walls rich and inexhaustible"--in his red brick house on the bend in the Sudbury. "That great cordial hand went out in greeting," says Hawthorne, "and the smile flashed out and the eyes sparkled with the old brilliance under the wavy mass of hair, abundant as ever though now grayed by time."

The room became crowded with the figures which Sanborn called back from the dead. "They moved upon a current of comment and reminiscence which was radiant with insight, sympathy, wit, and often a gleam of kindly satire." But the satire had changed in quality and quantity between the days of the youthful schoolteacher and these last days of the sage of eighty-four:

> It was a gift in him, [says Hawthorne] and he had used it with the skill of a master swordsman. It was mellowed now, and rather caressed than cut. Men who reach wisdom are not harsh, but gentle. Sanborn had never ceased to grow and had therefore kept his youth. Like the noble elms which give native grandeur to Concord streets, his roots penetrated deeper, his branches spread wider, and bore fuller foliage than of yore.

The two men sat in their life's afternoon while Sanborn "opened many a door in the rich recesses of his mind, from which stepped the figures

of the vanished worthies in their habit as they lived." Even to have jotted down the highlights of this conversation, says Hawthorne, would have required unlimited space, for the conversation for four hours "flowed upon its way like a careless and sun-flecked river." "Several volumes," says Hawthorne,"upon the life, activities, and thoughts of this remarkable man would hardly encompass them."[1]

Apparently, to Hawthorne Sanborn spoke the volumes that were warm, nostalgic, pleasant. Indeed there was much of Sanborn's public and private world that was filled with the sensations of the pleasurable, but half of his volumes contained other matter, if not bitterly remembered by him, by those with whom he had been associated for eighty-four years. Though indeed, as Hawthorne says, volumes can scarcely encompass Sanborn's thoughts and activities, this chapter must attempt to summarize his personal traits and to try to indicate Sanborn's importance to the world.

I took my first trip to Concord in March, 1951, to work in the Concord Free Public Library. "I understand from Mr. Odell Shepard," I said to Miss Bartlett, the librarian, "that Sanborn was not popular in Concord. I'd like to know why."

"The sewer case," she said. "That made people mad."

If you go to Concord today, you will find that Sanborn--if his name is recognized at all--is remembered for his activities in the sewer

---

[1] Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne, pp. 90-93.

case. Even his son Francis told me, "The most revealing event was the sewer case--because it showed up his peculiarities."

The court action brought by the People versus Sanborn and his sewer in itself symbolized the hatred and the meanness of four of the town autocrats but it also carried with it the implications of the people's anger at his other activities on his property, namely his land reclamation project. In a few words the people's action against his philosophy of the use of sewage is summed up in the contemporary account of the trial reported in the Boston Transcript:

> Frank B. Sanborn, historian, essayist and last of the Concord school of philosophers, was fined $50 yesterday in the Concord District Court for failing to connect his house drain with the State sewer. He appealed from the sentence, which was imposed by Judge Keyes, and was held in $200. Bail was furnished.
>
> Mr. Sanborn was his own counsel, but he did not begin his defence: "I, Frank B. Sanborn, pro se," in accordance with the Dewey formula. Instead, he referred to himself as "my client."
>
> The defendant did not deny the facts in the case, but relied on his contention that the statute which the State seeks to enforce is unconstitutional.
>
> "I appear here as counsel for the defendant, of the same name," said Mr. Sanborn, "in accordance with Section 12 of the bill of rights of the constitution of Massachusetts, which declares that 'every subject shall have a right to be fully heard in his defence, by himself, or his counsel, at his election.'"
>
> Continuing, the defendant maintained that the statute, under which the prosecution was brought "in the usurped name of the Commonwealth," was in violation of fundamental law, which reads: "Whenever the public exigencies require that the property of any individual should be appropriated to public uses he shall receive a reasonable compensation therefor."
>
> "This suit has been inadvertantly brought to compel my client to expend the sum of $80 or thereabout, as testified by an expert in such work, in order to connect his private sewer, a part of his estate, with the public sewer; and by

> that connection to lose the profit which he has for thirty-four years derived from the sewage therein, used by him to fertilize his garden and improve his estate. To this suit we demur, and ask to have the question of constitutionality decided by this court, or some superior court, before further proceedings are had."[2]

Sanborn's argument, reported the Boston Herald, was "elaborate," its early portions being enlivened with "characteristic and quiet humor."[3]

One understands this legal action better when he knows that it was instituted against Sanborn by his bitterest enemies in Concord, Judge Hoar and Judge Prescott Keyes--men, in the judgment of some, as arrogant, vindictive, and prejudiced as he, though less capable. Judge Keyes' vindictive mind operated in such a way, for example, that he attended a meeting of the Concord Social Circle one evening, while his wife lay at home in her coffin, to blackball a candidate for membership. At another meeting of the Social Circle, Judge Hoar approached Sanborn and said: "Let's let bygones be bygones." "Very well," said Sanborn, "but for this night only." And they shook hands. Whereupon Judge Hoar asked for a basin of water, soap, and a towel, and proceeded to wash the hand that had shaken Sanborn's.[4]

---

[2]"Frank Sanborn Fined: Concord Philosopher Denies Constitutionality of Statute Requiring Him to Connect with State Sewer...," Boston Transcript, November 17, 1914. (Sanborn within a month was to be eighty-three.)

[3]"Philosopher Pleads His Own Case; Fined $50," Boston Herald, November 17, 1914.

[4]Conversation with Mrs. Charles K. Darling, Concord, Mass., March 10, 1951. (All the Darling material used in the remainder of this chapter was taken down during this conversation and further references to it will not be footnoted when the source seems clear.)

But Sanborn had reasons for doing everything he did and a week after his court appearance he wrote to a sympathizer in Salem the precise details which motivated his defense in the sewer case:

> Now as to my sewer and the stupidity of the Concord people and the rest of the Americans, which you sarcastically set forth. It was and is a sin of ignorance and thoughtlessness; and I doubt if there are four persons in Massachusetts more ignorant and thoughtless on the utilization of sewage than the four who are pestering me with prosecutions.... They are not farmers, who know the value of fertilzers [sic]; they are leisure or professional men, who give a languid attention to public health problems a few days in a year, agree on a report of some sort, and for the rest attend to their own private business or pleasure. You and I have had our attention directed to this subject, and for more than 50 years I have been observing and studying it.

His theories of the use of sewage on his own property, he said, stemmed from his study of the problem while on the Board of State Charities:

> I looked after and in some degree directed the use of the sewage of the state hospitals, almshouses, etc. The old theories about poisonous sewage had to be modified or given up, and it is now recognized on all the state farms that to lose the sewage, without fertilizing with it, is a serious loss to the state. I suppose the sewage beds on the state farms now save to the treasury $20,000 a year, at least.

Then he told his correspondent of his work in reclaiming the land from the Sudbury and of his theories which he was now applying at home:

> I bought my land here in 1879, when it had been for a century a waste morass, partly filled in with sand near the street for building purposes. In the price I paid for what was but little more than an acre of upland, I secured 400 loads of sand with which to fill in around the heavy stone walls my house was to stand on. Since 1880, when I moved into it, I have purchased probably 1500 loads of sand and loam; my neighbors have given me 3000 more loads of ashes, sand, bricks, broken stone and mortar, which they had to get rid of; and with this and $1,000 worth of paid labor, and another thousand of my own labor for 35 years, I have trenched and filled in the morass; and now have nearly three acres of upland, planted with trees, sown with grass, and cultivated as a garden, in spots, every year.

His theories of his use of sewage he then explained:

> To fertize [sic] this I have also bought much manure; but I so constructed my private sewer, which has now cost me $150, that I could utilize it to the value of $5 [sic] a year or more, in raising vegetables, -chiefly tomatoes, beans, beets, carrots and sweet corn.

As for the attitude of the town officials and his Concord neighbors, he testified:

> No drop of [sewage] has ever reached the river, on whose banks I built, and no neighbor or town official has ever complained of my sewer as a nuisance. For more than ten years no public sewer existed; and long after it was built I was allowed to use my own sewer without interference by the board of health, meeting a mile away, half a dozen times a year. Meantime my land, which if taxed at all before I bought it, could not have been valued at $500, now pays a tax on $6,000, and a water-rate of $25 a year, from which, in the last 20 years, I suppose $400 has gone to help pay for the building of the public sewer; which simply wastes the public sewage, to the value, I suppose, of some thousands of dollars yearly. My land, which was a huisance before I bought it, has been brought by my labor and cost into rather an ornamental state.

Sanborn then tried to indicate why he thought he was being persecuted in court by Judge Keyes:

> I am not conscious of having injured any fellow-citizen in body, soul or estate, in the half-century I have lived here; have paid my debts [,] given entertainments, and in my small way contributed to the good name of the town. Why I am selected, after such a record, for this persecution by petty suits, I have never been told. I suspect it may have something to do with the indictment of a public thief, (a tax-collector) who some years ago stole $15,000 or more from the tax-payers, rich and poor, and ran away. He came back, and the question was what to do with him. Knowing the facts from information that came to me without my seeking it, I went to the town-meeting and obtained on my motion a vote, all but unanimous, that he should be indicted and brought to justice. This was done, and he went to prison. The judge who sentenced me the other day, and his cousin-german, the chief prosecutor, were active advocates for a milder sentence for this offender than he got,-but I allowed justice to take

> its course without further intervention. Since then, I believe these two cousins have looked on me with enmity. What that should have to do with the care of my garden I fail to see.[5]

For years, I am told, Sanborn was periodically placed under arrest and hauled in before the Concord District Court until District Attorney Corcoran nol prossed the case against him, accompanying his action with a scathing denunciation of the Concord Board of Health and other officials of the town:

> After having received numerous complaints...that Dr. [sic] Sanborn was being persecuted for political reasons and not in good faith by the Board of Health, I went to Concord with a sanitary engineer and was fully satisfied with conditions as we found them, and I so notified the Board of Health.
>
> This prosecution should never have been begun against him. Mr. Sanborn was the only survivor of a distinguished group of men that made the town of Concord what we like to think it is, and the authorities of that town might be engaged in far better business than in the prosecution of a citizen who has brought a great deal more distinction to the town than most of its present inhabitants.[6]

To have a theory is one thing; to put that theory into everyday practice is quite another, particularly when that theory concerns the use of sewage. The practical aspects of this theory, as Francis Sanborn

---

[5]Sanborn to W. S. Nevins, Concord, November 23, 1914, from the Sanborn Papers in the Essex Institute, Salem, Mass., to whom I am indebted for permission to use it.

[6]"Nol Pros Case Against 'Sage of Concord,'--Dist. Atty. Corcoran Denounces Board of Health That Brought Sanborn Charges." (This clipping, dated Cambridge, March 29 [no year], is in the Quinquennial File of the class of 1855, Harvard Archives. The paper from which the clipping is taken is not indicated.)

According to another clipping in the same file, Sanborn was summoned seven times in eleven months. Though no year is indicated on the clipping, nor the newspaper from which it is cut, the clipping is entitled "'Sage of Concord' in Court Today--Sanborn, for Seventh Time, Is Summoned in Drain Case."

told me, devolved upon him and his brothers. "The Indian grave we called it--two brick, horizontal vaults into which the sewage was discharged. My pleasant task and my brothers' was to pump the sewage onto the garden." As for the prosecution, he added, "We had a lot of fun about it."

As Francis Sanborn said, the sewer case revealed much about his father's personality. It revealed, for one thing, his attitude toward his principles. "Whenever his principles were concerned," said Francis, "he'd stand up for them, even if he were burned at the stake, I think." His attitude toward Judge Prescott Keyes was also typical. "The highly placed and the arbitrary," said Francis, "he detested. The more modest he never quarreled with."

But the case symbolized his love of controversy. According to Mrs. Hosmer, he was the one person in Concord ever to have been kicked out of the Social Circle, chiefly because he was everlastingly promoting his opinions and insisting that no one else should be permitted another point of view.[7] He carried over this attitude, as we have seen, in his defense of John Brown against all comers. And he maintained this same attitude toward his famous friends in Concord. He became the self-appointed guardian of the New England hierarchy, and to those who

---

[7] Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer, 22 Elm Street, Concord, in a letter to me dated November 18, 1952, in which she states the fact was supplied to her by Dr. William B. Bartlett, who has been secretary of the organization for twenty-seven years. There is, however, nothing in the records of the society regarding the circumstances.

had the temerity to differ with him, he indicated that his opinions on all matters which concerned them was final. For example, when Mark Van Doren published his important study of Thoreau in 1916, Francis H. Allen evidently wrote Sanborn asking him to review it. Sanborn, in a bitter and impertinent reply to Allen, said in part:

> I have never had the least intention of reviewing Va[n] Doren's skit on Thoreau; it is such as college professors used sometimes to write, but 50 years ago. Lowell, who had at least as much knowledge of Thoreau as this man, tried the experiment of demolishing Thoreau soon after his death; and I cannot see that he had any success with sensible readers. I consider it time wasted to write such books, to read them, or to do anything with them, at the present high price of white paper, than to grind them right over again in the mill that first turned them from pulp. The author should keep a copy to remind him how foolish a young American when Roosevelt, with equal va[n]ity was reelecting Wilson, could be, in the contemporary field of literature.
>
> A time may come, after he has read my book, when he will have some conception of the man a[n]d the school he is chattering about. I do not despair of his conversion; but have written all I shall to contribute to it. "They have Moses and the prophets; nor would they be converted though one rose from the dead."[8]

To those who sent him their books for review he oftentimes returned equally caustic and sneering letters. For example, when Albert Mordell published his pamphlet, The Shifting of Literary Values, he received praise from Sir Arthur Wing Pinero, Bliss Perry, George Woodberry, and Arnold Bennet. But when he sent Sanborn a copy of his work he received the following:

---

[8]Sanborn to Francis H. Allen, dated Westfield, New Jersey, January 16, 1917.

> I received your brochure some days ago, glanced at it, and to night [sic] have read some parts of it more carefully....It...adopts a positive tone in regard to many subjects and authors concerning which the enlightened part of mankind are by no means unanimous....
>
> Mr. Emerson, (a very wise man, and a greater admirer, and I suspect, reader of Plato than you seem to be,-) once said to me in conversation,
>
> > "Immoral conclusions spare us a great deal of trouble in exami[n]ing the argument."
>
> I suspect that in later and more mature years, and perhaps with a humility that the mortifications of life are apt to teach, you will find moral objections to some of the conclusions you now put forward more confidently than I, at 80, could venture to do. All wisdom is seldom granted to one person, or one age; the changes you notice (by no means for the first time in the long history of the world) are apt to be slight corrections in the overweening consciousness of men reputed brilliant or experienced....
>
> Instead of broad, sweeping general statements, such as the young are fond of making, often without having collected instances enough to generalize from; it would be well to take some special, even trivial topic, and expand on that the research and reflection that real thinking requires.[9]

Sanborn at times carried this same spirit into his professional duties. For example, when Dr. Allen of the board of state charities in Boston was being questioned by Senator Stedman, the chairman of the committee which was carrying on the investigation of the Tewksbury Almshouse scandal, Sanborn interrupted Stedman's cross-examination to correct some statements and to ask the witness further explanatory questions. Senator Stedman, according to the reporter of the scene, several

---

[9]Sanborn to Mordell, Concord, September 5, 1912. I am indebted to Mr. Mordell, now of 16 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Penna., for drawing this letter to my attention and for providing the photostat copy.

times reminded Sanborn that he wished he would not interfere and told him to sit down. Finally, Senator Stedman became so exasperated that when Sanborn again attempted to make a statement, the following took place:

> Mr. Sanborn--Mr. Chairman.
> Mr. Stedman--I don't wish you to interfere.
> Mr. Sanborn--Mr. Chairman.
> Mr. Stedman-- [rising excitedly from the chairman's seat]--You'd better take this chair and manage the investigation yourself. I do not think another man could be found in the Commonwealth so impudent, impertinent and overbearing as you.[10]

The effect of all this controversy is perhaps best summed up by Sanborn's class secretary, Edwin H. Abbot. Sanborn's habit of using harsh epithets, he said, stirred up a "curious ecstasy of detestation for [him] among some even of his classmates." Afterwards, "his persistence in it aroused like emotions in not a few of the best and kindliest and most excellent citizens of Boston." The proper Bostonians, epitomized by Howells' Mr. Arbuton, "simply abhorred Sanborn and all his ways during the first twenty years of his activity."

Yet, in spite of the fact that a host of people loathed Sanborn he was loved and admired by an equal number. This is shown by Abbot, for example, in his completion of the above statement:

> [Those traditional Bostonians] never were, then, and their successors still are, quite unable to acknowledge the real service Sanborn rendered to the blind, to the insane, and to the prisoner, and to the great army of desolate and oppressed.

---

[10] "The Tewksbury Almshouse Investigation--Senator Stedman and Frank Sanborn," Boston Daily Advertiser, March 14, 1876, p. 4, col. 2. (The square brackets appear in the original news item.)

> They seem quite ignorant of the extensive regions in this country where Sanborn's name will long live in grateful remembrance for the good he did, and for the seeds of charity and good-will he has sown. Mr. Arbuton never went West .... Yet, if [he] ever should explore these unknown regions of his country, he will find Sanborn more admired there than even the Good Samaritan. Sanborn's kindness of heart and readiness to lend a helping hand never failed; and it grew with time.[11]

Mr. Clarence Brigham of the American Antiquarian Society seemed to add further light when he told me: "Everyone would like him who met him socially, but in a dispute, boy! you'd have to watch out!" And Brigham remembered that Sanborn spoke in an "easy cultured voice"--his impression was that it was deep--and that he possessed great charm of manner.[12]

Apparently, he spoke much better than he wrote, "with a racy touch of humor, a quick glancing from topic to topic, a warm and human quality that are somehow less striking without the voice and gesture of the man to give them life." Musing over this opinion, the critic who delivered it continued:

> Most of his literary labors were confined to editing other men's work, or relating other men's lives, and he had a strong faculty for putting a personality into words; but original work was not his gift except when talking. Then, listening, you wondered why he, too, had not made his name known wherever Concord was spoken of, an equal to any in the group.[13]

---

[11] Edwin H. Abbot, "News from the Classes," p. 557.

[12] Conversation of July 3, 1951.

[13] "Last of Concord Group Depicts Thoreau," New York Times, May 27, 1917, Section 7, p. 1. (This is a full-page feature review of Sanborn's 1917 biography of Thoreau.)

One, I feel, would have to accept on faith that he possessed a "charming . . . irresistible humor"[14] if one looked for it in his writing. For, excepting his political columns in the Springfield Republican and an exceptional strain of humor in some of his letters to Charles Dudley Warner, there does not seem to be much carry-over of this humorous tendency from his speech to his writing. As it is important to see Sanborn when he was charming and pleasant, it is interesting to watch his special effort to be amusing when he wrote to Warner. I offer no explanation of the presence of humor in these letters except the obvious one, that he was stimulated by the humorous character of his addressee. Typical is this penny postcard:

> Dec 27
> Thanks to our admirable P. O. arrangements I have just received yours of Nov 13, which has been only 44 days in coming 120 miles, or at the rate of a mile every 8 1/2 hours. You may expect a reply about Valentine's day.[15]

On another occasion, after Warner had sent him a copy of his latest book, Sanborn replied:

> Thanks for your "Winter on the Nile," which has given me much entertainment and instruction. Mrs Sanborn agrees with me that the portrait of the author (full length) is by no means a flattering likeness. How are your poor feet? In this engraving they look frost-bitten--yet this could hardly have happened in the mildness of an Egyptian winter. Perhaps

---

[14] Alexander Johnson, "An Appreciation of Frank B. Sanborn," The Survey, XXXVII (March 10, 1917), 657.

[15] Sanborn to Warner, [Concord?], December 27, [1873?] in the Watkinson Library of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

> a hippopotamus trod on your instep before you stood for this photograph. Or am I mistaken? A glance at the rotund countenance (ore rotundo) makes me misgive that it is not you, but a revised statute of Chops the inventor of the pyramids.[16]

Humor is ephemeral and what is humorous to one age is often not to another. There is nothing in these two examples which would compare with the humor of Warner's neighbor, Sam Clemens, but the difference between Sanborn's humor in these letters and Clemens' humor is as great perhaps as the difference between the humor in this bundle of letters and the lack of it in Sanborn's other correspondence. But that Sanborn was "full of jokes" and that he "was very witty and always laughed very heartily at his own amusing stories"[17] are opinions submitted by those who knew him most intimately and attested to by many others.

Most surprising in Sanborn's letters to Warner is the fact that he mentions his wife, Louisa Leavitt Sanborn, three times during the thirteen-year period covered by these letters. This is surprising because, except for the letters he wrote Parker describing their wedding and honeymoon, these are the only references Sanborn makes to her in the large number of letters I have collected which he wrote during the fifty-five years of their marriage. I presume he wrote her frequently, though

---

[16]Sanborn to Warner, Concord, October 16, 1876, also in the Watkinson Library.

[17]Conversation with Francis B. Sanborn and a personal letter to me from Sanborn's niece, Mrs. William Cram, Hampton Falls, May 21, 1952. (All of the material from Francis B. Sanborn was written down during my conversation with him at his home, 10 New York Boulevard, Sea Girt, N.J., August 28, 1951, and further references to it will not be footnoted when the source seems clear.)

only four letters addressed to her have turned up so far. Considering the fact that Sanborn does not mention her once in his two volumes of autobiography except in the caption of a photograph nor in all the millions of words which he published during his lifetime--though he published forty-four pages about Ariana Walker in his autobiography alone; and considering that one cannot find one statement in anything he wrote disclosing the fact that he married a second time and had three sons by this marriage, one finds it necessary to inquire into Sanborn's home life and domestic arrangements.

As we already know, Sanborn had three sons: Thomas Parker, born February 23, 1865 in Concord, Victor Channing, born in Concord April 24, 1867, and Francis Bachiler, born in Springfield February 5, 1872, during the four years Sanborn was a resident editor of the Republican.

George Santayana has provided us with a vivid portrait of Tom, for the two knew each other intimately for four years as members of the Lampoon board at Harvard and as companions in this closed little circle of four or five who ate their meals together. Through the phenomenon of the alphabet, they sat next to each other in several classes including Natural History 4, where Professor Shaler set forth "all the geology necessary to a gentleman." The two had separate chairs but shared one long desk, which allowed them to look at each other's notebooks and amuse themselves matching triolets.

> Sanborn [says Santayana] was a poet of lyric and modest flights but genuine feeling, not naturally in harmony with the over-intellectualized transcendentalism of Concord, Massachusetts.... There was more of Chaucer in him than of

> Emerson or Wordsworth: even Shakespeare--except in the songs--he found too heavy and rhetorical. These exclusions were involuntary; he was not in the least conceited about them, but on the contrary felt that he was a misfit, shy, ungainly in appearance, and at a disadvantage in the give and take of conversation or action. These maladjustments, a few years later, led to a tragic end. His father had found him a place in the office of The Springfield Republican. That town offered little to keep up his spirits. He fell into rather undesirable company, as at College he had sometimes succumbed to drink--not often, yet ungracefully. I think I understand the secret of these failings, gross as they seem for a man of such delicate sensibility. He was unhappy, he was poor, he was helpless. The sparkle of a glass, the glitter of a smile, the magic of a touch could suddenly transport him out of this world, with all its stubborn hindrances and dreary conventions, into the Auberge Verte, the green paradise, of his dreams. Yet this escape from reality was necessarily short-lived, and the awakening bitter and remorseful. The strain was too much for Sanborn. His discouragement became melancholia and began to breed hallucinations. He knew only too much about madness, as everybody did in old New England, and he feared it. He cut his throat in his bath with a razor, and we buried him in Concord, in sight of the optimistic Emerson's grave, after a parlor funeral, with the corpse visible, at which his father read a few not very pertinent passages from the Upanishads and the Psalms.[18]

Santayana composed a "gracefully touching obituary notice"[19] for the Harvard Monthly, and saw him laid to rest beneath a tablet of Pentelic marble, carved in Athens and inscribed with its "emblems of aspiration and genius" and a line of Greek verse copied from an ancient tomb in Thebes.[20]

---

[18] George Santayana, Persons and Places: the Background of My Life (New York: Scribner's, 1944), pp. 195-197.

[19] George W. Howgate, George Santayana (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938), p. 41.

[20] Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 578-579.

Various theories are presented today in Concord to explain Tom's suicide. Mrs. Darling believes that "one of the causes of Tom Sanborn's death is that the girl that he wanted wouldn't have him." But his brother Francis says:

> He was different from other boys--he was left-handed, awkward, didn't know how to play. He was not exactly antisocial, but he didn't amalgamate. His desire was to pursue literature, but not in a way I should think that would lead to very much. As a reporter he wasn't much of a success. Bowles terminated his work with the Springfield Republican. I think he felt that everything seemed to conspire against his success and I think he thought he was better to be out of it. I played with a very different set of little boys, got a very good health out of it, and learned to get along with other people. I imagine he wanted to get married but couldn't interest the girls. No, I don't think he was homosexual.
>
> But he was simply not gaited for this world. If he could have been a librarian or a scholar I think he would have been a very useful member of society.
>
> Then too he had a bitter disappointment in not being elected class poet at Harvard. Instead he was elected class odist, a rather insignificant role, and I think this bit into him deeply.

The other two sons were more practical. Victor, though he intended to enter Harvard, in 1885 went to Cornell with his father, who was lecturing there on practical social science and taking his classes to the prisons, insane asylums, and reform schools near Ithaca. But after staying at Cornell only one term as an unmatriculated student, he began office work in Omaha for the Burlington and Missouri River Railroad under the auditor of freight and passenger accounts. After serving six years as assistant or chief clerk in the passenger department of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy Railroad, he left it in 1898 and pursued a highly lucrative position as a developer of the real estate and renting business in the booming suburb of Kenilworth, Illinois, where he died in

1922. He is survived by two daughters, one of whom is married to an architect who--it would not have pleased Sanborn to know--is at present an intimate of Colonel McCormick of the Chicago Tribune.

He inherited from his father a lust for genealogy, at an age as early as seventeen searched the Hampton and Exeter records for his family history, pursued his investigations of the English Samborne in a trip to that country, and was the author of the family genealogy. This The Nation referred to as a "stupendous volume" which it could "conscientiously place . . . in the front rank" of American genealogies.[21]

Francis too was of a practical turn of mind. Though he wanted to go to Harvard, his father would not hear of it: "Harvard is a sinkhole of vice," he declared. "No other son of mine shall go there. You can go to Cornell and take any course you choose." Francis rode to Cornell with his father to look the place over, then told him he still wanted to go to Harvard. But as his father was adamant, Francis went nowhere. "I wouldn't have gone to Harvard," said Francis, "unless there'd been money enough to go through--and I think there would not have been. My mother wanted me to go to Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but I did not relish the four years I would have had to go through before I could get going in something."

---

[21] [Review of] Victor Channing Sanborn, Genealogy of the Family of Samborne or Sanborn in The Nation, LXIX (October 12, 1899), 284-285.

At seventeen, therefore, he moved West to enter the passenger service of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy. After two years of this, he returned to Concord at his father's request to help him with the typing of the Alcott biography. A year later he entered the employment of the Crane Company, manufacturer of plumbing fixtures, where he rose to the position of assistant superintendent of branches. He resigned from Crane, and after a brief period in which he worked with Chicago, Baltimore, and New York manufacturers of piping, tube-boilers, and fire riveted plate, he spent the remainder of his business career with Crane.[22] Francis married Mary De Courcy of Bangor, Maine, and they have one son, who lives in Oak Park, Illinois, and works for Sears Roebuck.

When I asked Francis why he did not pursue a literary career he replied: "Poverty. When I was a boy, when I wanted a bicycle, I had to buy it myself, earn the money for it. It was a horribly slow process for a little boy. I determined to make money and have the things my father could never provide."

Sanborn, his son averred, was "indifferent to affairs of money," and, except for some shares in the Springfield Republican, he never made any investments. He was, however, "by no means lacking in acumen, although many of his parallels were drawn from the Classics." He displayed

---

[22] Sanborn Genealogy, pp. 580-581 and my conversation with him August 28, 1951.

this acumen while he was President of the Board of Corporators of the Clarke School for the Deaf when the elder Morgan was pursuing his campaign to merge into the New Haven Railroad the packages of railroads, steamships, and utilities, a campaign which proved a disaster.

> There was vigorous opposition in New England [said Francis], and as New Haven stock was an important part of the Clarke endowment fund the investment was many times considered by the Board of Trustees. My father told me that while the stock was quoted around 200 he continually urged that it be eliminated from the portfolio, but was unable to carry his point. My impression is that it was finally disposed of for a few dollars per share, resulting in an impairment of the school's funds.[23]

One can speak of Sanborn's financial condition by repeating the phrase of his class secretary at Harvard: "He never yearned at any time for large wealth."[24] But since Sanborn was never supported as were many of his contemporaries by family riches, he doubtless always felt the need to make money. During those years when he was Secretary of the Board of State Charities and Inspector of Charities he was of course supposed to receive a stipulated salary. But when General Butler, his mortal enemy, was finally elected to the Governorship of the state on the Democratic ticket, one of his first acts was to attempt to remove Sanborn from public office. To do this he withheld his salary for several months. When the boys in Francis' school got wind of this they would holler in chorus, "All I want is my salary!"

---

[23] Personal letter to me from Mr. Francis Sanborn, 10 New York Boulevard, Sea Girt, New Jersey, September 1, 1951.

[24] Edwin H. Abbot, "News from the Classes," p. 556.

He was therefore always on the lookout for some literary gold mine. His two weekly letters to the Republican, says Francis, "brought him in a modest sum," and his innumerable books and his articles for the paying magazines added to his income from time to time. But, says Mrs. Darling, he was "an inveterate book borrower, and when he got his hands on something, he often did not bring it back. After Mr. Sanborn died, Dr. Emerson wanted to get in, I think, to get back some of the books Sanborn had borrowed, but he couldn't get in. One day, however, I found a note on the window-sill, and it said: 'Beware! The cord is broken. Your arm will be hurt!' I know that Mrs. Pratt, Mr. Alcott's daughter, wouldn't allow Mr. Sanborn alone in the house, for she always said he'd take anything of value. So she always made someone stay in the room with him, for she feared he'd find some Alcott memento or record and run off with it." His friends in Concord believed too that he was moved to invite the aged Ellery Channing in to live with him and his family in the hope that Channing might prove to be a major American poet whose papers would be left to him as literary executor. In 1908 he was offering C. E. Goodspeed, the Boston book-dealer and publisher, six of Thoreau's earliest college themes at $20 apiece, five later essays--"in respect to character somewhat superior to the $20 essays, but less rare"--for $15 each, and the longest of the essays, Thoreau's ten-page review of Henry Nelson Coleridge's book, The Study of the Greek Classic Poets. "At the rate you sometimes charge," he wrote Goodspeed, this would be worth $120;

but I mark it only $30."[25] Francis' comment on this was, "My father's relationship to some book dealers was that of the sucker to the professional. My father believed everything some of them told him and got good and trimmed." On the other hand, Sanborn could be shrewd. On one of his trips to Italy he picked up a brochure on the cover of which was written "Galileo Galilei." He paid a quarter for it. This he sold to a man in St. Louis for $200.

Mrs. Sanborn, however, according to Francis, was "financially minded, and through Ellen Emerson was able to get advice from Will Forbes and through that means was able to invest her household money in AT&T and such things in which the Forbes had made considerable money." Sanborn was invited, says Francis, to become one of the directors of Bell Telephone and one of the stockholders, but he turned it down. "Had I expended my talents on making money," Sanborn told Francis, "I would have been a rich man." "I was not able to agree," said Francis. "Money he thought was a useful tool but nothing to concentrate on. We always felt that had he piled up some competence it would have been better for us."[26]

It is rather difficult to discover exactly the relationship between Sanborn and his wife. The portraits we have of her are few. "She was affectionate, sympathetic, adaptable," says Francis. "She saw the good points in everybody, and she was fortunate in her friends: Elizabeth

---

[25] Sanborn to Charles Eliot Goodspeed, Concord, September 11, 1908, in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library.

[26] Mr. Sanborn then added: "Of course, I think prosperity is more important than anything else. Of course, this is a materialistic doctrine."

Ripley, Mrs. Forbes [Edith Emerson], and Mrs. Edward Hoar. My mother was practical; my father was not. They thoroughly admired each other, but I don't think they understood each other. My mother made friends easily, my father not so easily. The family is a very good institution and harmony a very great thing, and it upset mother when these families with whom he had feuds were upset. She wanted harmony and she didn't enjoy it when he attacked the families of those with whom she was intimate and whom she loved. Mother used to take me down to Judge Hoar's to play whist with him, and I think Father thought this a bit disrespectful to him. The New England character is very rugged and peculiar but has many virtues."

She was, according to one reporter, not a beautiful woman--as Ariana was. As there seem to be no photographs of her except in a dismally foggy group snapshot in the Recollections, we have only the verbal picture of her given us by Mrs. Francis Sanborn. She was forced to substitute for Sanborn one evening in one of the homes in Concord where he had agreed to lecture, and we see her sitting there in her lavender dress and sweet peas talking intimately about the famous people of Concord. "She hadn't any looks," says Miss Clara Endicott Sears. "Ariana was beautiful. I remember one of the pictures of her that was piled up on the trash after Mr. Sanborn died--a picture of a beautiful, beautiful girl. He wasn't in love with [Mrs. Sanborn]. She was charming, but not one to be in love with."[27]

---

[27] Conversation with Miss Clara Endicott Sears, Hotel Vendome, Boston, March 11, 1951.

The rumor persists today in Concord that Sanborn and his wife did not speak to each other during the last ten years of their life but communicated by writing notes. Yet when I reported this to Mrs. Darling, who knew them both intimately as friends and neighbors, she said, "Why, that seems incredible. I never would have suspected it, though it may have been so." As for their compatibility, she declared that they got along very well. "They were devoted to each other. She kept to the house a lot. I think she rather enjoyed poor health. I think most women did in those days." Francis says that their relationship was "about what you'd expect in those last years. They both had specific talents but very different talents. My mother inspired affection and my father didn't. He was strictly an individualist. He didn't care about inspiring affection."

Of course, one can only speculate on what must have gone through Mrs. Sanborn's mind when Sanborn named their new house "Ariana," and placed the stone inscribed to her memory in the gable and, supposedly, filled it with their love letters and intimate papers. "It was like throwing a bucket of water in her face," says Francis, "to put that stone in the house. . . . He would have done very well to have forgotten all about that, to have cherished the memory but kept his mouth shut." Yet Mrs. Sanborn had the most remarkable gift of forbearance, for she always spoke of Ariana, says Miss Sears, as "our <u>dear</u> Ariana." "I don't think she relished all this," says Francis. "Yet she would say, 'Miss Walker was a beautiful woman.'" As for the Ariana stone and all it must have symbolized to Sanborn's wife and three sons, "We never alluded to it in our family at all," says Francis, "because none of us approved of it."

Though Mrs. Sanborn bore more than her share of crosses, she also had to put up with the invalid Ellery Channing, who spent the last ten years of his life living in a room on the third floor. Sanborn, in a curious document entitled "Dates and Circumstances in Regard to the Coming of W. E. Channing to Live with F. B. Sanborn,"[28] declares that "Mrs. F. B. Sanborn invited him to come to her husband's house to be cared for." If she did--and the fact is extremely doubtful--she should have been canonized, for Channing, says Francis, "proved an awful curse." He came to them old and sick, but refusing the aid of a nurse, and Sanborn moved him in, books, bags, and baggage. "He would have starved to death," says Francis, "if my father had not yanked him in to live with us. He was completely ill-mannered and whimsical; frustrated, bitter, and utterly unreasonable. He had no business living on this planet." And the rumor persists that Sanborn and his wife never spoke to each other after Channing moved in.

Channing lived in a room that was fitted off for him in the third floor in the gable that housed the Ariana stone. The room was furnished with a fireplace, walls of bookshelves, walnut paneling and a cast-iron safe recessed into the chimney which ran up through the clothes closet. This, the Hosmers presume, was to contain the treasures of Channing's pen which Sanborn hoped would prove a gold mine.

But the most interesting object in Channing's apartment was an "earth closet," a great wooden toilet that stood in the center of the

---

[28] In the Sanborn Papers, Concord Library.

room. The seat was about five feet long and two feet wide and was constructed of alternating stripes of white birch and dark oak with an arched back of similar design five feet high. When Channing wished to sit down, he raised the cover of this great seat, at each side of which were lockers of sand. When he urinated, he opened up the door at the back of the throne and, when he had finished, dumped in more sand. As Sanborn is referred to as an "inventor" in one of the obituary notices,[29] and as the objects of his invention are not mentioned, I wonder if the writer of the comment believed, as the Hosmers do, that Sanborn invented this utilitarian objet d'art and whether he considered this Sanborn's chief claim to the title.

The house Sanborn built in memory of his first love to shelter himself and his family was, however, most pleasant, and had about it an air of elegant spaciousness. Though classifiable as "Early McKinley" in its architecture, it was relatively simple in design and free of gingerbread. The windows and ceilings were high, and as the river could be seen on three sides from its spacious living rooms and the large upstairs bedrooms, the family may have felt as though they were living in a modestly luxurious Victorian houseboat.

This house was the scene of much quiet hospitality. Julia Ward Howe was a frequent visitor and always carried with her a copy of her "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Harriet Tubman, the Negro "Moses of Her People," was a frequent caller, and one evening a handful of Negroes

---

[29] "Death of F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Sunday Republican, February 25, 1917, p. 13, cols. 1-4.

came out to the house to serenade Sanborn under his window. The Alcotts too called often. "What I couldn't understand," says Francis, "was my father's respect for Bronson Alcott. He was just a doddering old fool, with a large round head and face, long white whiskers, and a gloomy and boring way of talking. And he talked about things I didn't understand and wouldn't have cared about had I understood. We boys in Concord were eminently practical and detested Alcott because he allowed his daughter to support him and his wife to work like a slave. And he would sit in our parlor and propound great philosophic truths. 'Cheese,' Mr. Alcott would say, 'Cheese will digest everything but itself.'"

One day when Louisa Alcott came to the house, she said to Mrs. Sanborn, "I have white gloves for the first time in my life. And you and Mr. Sanborn are the only people in Concord on whom I might call." For friends such as these Sanborn would bring forth the Marsala from the small cupboard in the chimney of the dining-room fireplace. Then on the horsehair sofa by the dining-room windows they would sit to converse. Once in a while, on a Sunday afternoon, Mr. Channing was helped down from the attic, and the two men would heat a kettle of mulled wine over the glowing logs and reminisce over the spirits of the past.[30]

Sanborn took no interest whatsoever in food. In fact, says Francis, he had no idea what he was eating. "I never eat cheese," he said to Mrs. Darling. "But I've been fixing it for you for years between crackers with your beer." "Oh?" said Sanborn. "Well, it's awfully good," he said,

---

[30] Conversation with Mrs. Charles K. Darling and Mr. Francis B. Sanborn.

and laughed. Francis became much disturbed while his father lived with them in Westfield. "For heaven's sake, why don't you eat?" he would ask him. "At my age," he replied, "you don't need much." "I think he ate when he felt like it," said Francis, "and when he didn't, he didn't indulge himself."

Miss Morris of the Clarke School for the Deaf tells how he used to sit in the dining-room with Miss Yale--the principal--and her staff. "He would hold people spellbound, taking a piece of bread and just holding it. He wouldn't talk about himself, but he would ask someone, 'Well, what part of the country are you from?' They'd reply, and then he'd be off. You never, however, got the feeling he was trying to show off, but he held the stage. He knew so many people and he brought into his conversation the names of the great. But he would sit there holding the piece of bread while the principal, the staff, the teachers in training, and the children waited for him to finish. Eating was not his chief interest."

Sanborn had to come up to Northampton twice a year for the meetings of the Board of Corporators, and he always stayed in the guest room in Rogers Hall the night before the meeting. On one such occasion one of the teachers down the hall from the guest room had been very ill and Miss Yale had employed a night nurse for her. In the middle of the night the nurse awoke to discover Mr. Sanborn in his long white nightgown and his long white hair towering above her. She jumped out of bed, guided him back to the guest room, and tucked him in. "He awoke next day," says Miss Morris, "in all his dignity--he never was one to joke about mundane things--and he never knew."

"The children at the school thought he was a wonderful person, a wonderful man," says Miss Morris. But his attitude toward them was different, for example, from that of Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, who was crazy about every child. "Sanborn liked them more ideologically, and he didn't seem particularly interested in them."[31]

As Francis says, "He had very little play in him." He would take the three of them for a walk every Sunday afternoon. "Now," he would say on the way home, "we will all guess the time for a penny." And they would guess what time it was. That was the nearest he ever got to play --except that he used to play whist. "But he was an atrocious player," both Francis and Mrs. Darling declare with feeling. "He violated all the rules."

So Sanborn continued to live his many lives into a vigorous old age. Old he was only in years, however, for he still had "great muscular strength and great bodily health," says Francis, and at seventy-three he was still walking to Walden Pond as often as he could for a swim.[32]

"Though he was always talking of things of the past," says Mrs. Darling, "he worked hard in the present." He spent his brief hours at home writing his books, articles, and columns and filling in the back of

---

[31] Conversation with Miss Dorothy Morris, Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., July, 1951.

[32] [J. H. Atkinson], "The Nomad," Boston Evening Transcript, June 25, 1917, in the Sanborn Papers, Perkins Institution.

his property--justifiably so, say the Hosmers, "for it was an awful mess, half in and half out of the water." "I'm going till I get two acres," Sanborn told Mrs. Darling. "I have a right--a legal right--to go to the middle of the stream."

But his thoughts were not confined by Concord. When the question of woman suffrage became a hot issue, Mrs. Darling told him it was ridiculous for women to be given the vote. "It will mean that elections cost the government twice as much and that the expense will only bring about a show of additional ignorance and twice over." "No," said Sanborn, "every living person of intelligence ought to have an opportunity to run the government."

The attitude of the people toward him never seemed to change. "I think many people admired him," says Francis, "but I don't think there was much affection for him. And I doubt whether he expected much. He was too uncompromising to expect much affection."

Explaining this, Francis says, "My father was not thoroughly humanized. He had no toleration for the mistakes of the weak. I wish he had had a few vices in his youth; they would have humanized him. When he spoke in town meeting the concensus was generally against him. But he had a slant on everything and he intended to pursue that slant. He lived up to his principles and you can't help respecting anybody who does that."

Though Sanborn was vigorous and, for the most part, probably quite optimistic in his outlook, there were occasional premonitions of death,

particularly in his letters to William Bromley. In one letter, after discussing the health of two old friends who had been battling heart trouble, he said:

> This limit of threescore years and ten, or some shorter time, is indeed a sad break-off in our earthly career, especially when it brings ill health, failure of mind and the other woes that wait on age. But we believe the spirit to be finally victor over these trials of the body; and what may await us in the boundless age of the universe, who can say?[33]

However, he little anticipated what finally occurred. In November, 1916, when he was eighty-four, he went to Westfield with Mrs. Sanborn to spend the winter with Francis and Molly. On January 18th he was injured in an accident, which, typically, he reported some weeks later in his literary letter for the Republican:

> On this particular day, I no more wished to fall or to avoid falling than on every other day of the present winter. I have thought of this casualty every day on setting foot upon the soil of New York or New Jersey, in which I have walked many miles without accident. I went through the street difficulties of New York, got upon a swift-moving express train in the subway, and went up to East Twenty-third street. There my object was to pass an hour or two with my friend, Hastings Hart, from whom I get much good information and sound advice on our old questions of public and private charity. I now went up to the Grand Central hotel for luncheon, after which I pushed out among the dangers of Forty-second street and Fifth avenue, which were considerable on account of crowds. I found my way to the art shop of Lawrence & Simmonds, who have for sale five Van Dyke portraits not before offered in this country. Two of them are good bust portraits--Charles I and his Queen Henrietta, fit for any gallery in America. The third is a full-length portrait of James Stuart, duke of Richmond, who holds his place in history from his devotion to his two sovereigns. There are two other Van Dykes, noticeable but not important.

---

[33] Sanborn to Bromley, Concord, September 6, 1908, in the Thoreau Library of Walter Harding, University of Virginia.

Having done all this, besides one or two calls in the morning, I said, ["] It is time to go back to Westfield and be taken care of." I left New York soon after 4 and reached Westfield at 5.15 p. m., but was asleep at the time, and did not discover my arrival in time to leave the train. I got off at Plainfield, where I had been before, and bought a return ticket for a train leaving Plainfield at 5.40 p. m. for New York, which would leave me at Westfield. The train for New York came in, and I moved along slowly to get on board at the door nearest to Philadelphia, that is, the rear of the train. A heavy baggage truck seemed to be moving a little before me toward a door in the train where I supposed baggage was to be taken off, or put on board. It did not seem to interfere with my course of action; but when I got near the rear door this heavy truck rolled forward, struck me in the hip or side, and laid me flat on the stone platform near the train.

I saw at once that my hip was probably broken, and I cried out to be picked up and put on board the train which would leave me at Westfield. But it was not possible to do this, and after considerable delay and talking, the ambulance of the Plainfield hospital came up, took me on board with more or less discomfort and carried me in about 25 minutes to my son's house,...where I was unloaded into my own bed by my two ambulance attendants and by my own doctor,... who has taken good care of me ever since.

There has been but little severe pain, and that little has diminished considerably within the past week. There seems every reason to hope that the knitting of the broken bone has gone quietly forward and that I may find that the severe lameness which I anticipated will not occur. My sleep and my digestion has been fairly good for a fortnight and my recovery has proceeded quite as fast as I could have expected. My doctor and my visiting friends are confident of my recovery, and I must believe with them until there comes some proof to the contrary.[34]

This account Sanborn wrote February 8th and its cheerful, breezy tone suggests nothing but confidence in his recovery. What was really on his mind, however, may have appeared four days previously in a letter

---

[34] Sanborn, "Will and Responsibility," Springfield Daily Republican, February 10, 1917, p. 9, col. 2.

to Zebulon Brockway: "The doctor is hopeful, almost confident, for he has seldom seen an old man so vigorous, but I know my possibilities better."[35]

Though it was said later by a reporter for the Republican that the "effects of the shock began to exhaust his vitality" around the 11th, one could never detect it in his columns. While nature took her course, he was writing his two columns a week with undiminished zeal and dictating the last pages of his final biography of Thoreau to Molly. According to her, "He was partly unconscious when he was writing the last biography of Thoreau. I was typing it for him. He would lapse into drowsiness for five minutes, then rouse himself. Then he would continue precisely where he left off."

But the public never knew this, for, in fact, on the day he died, February 24th, the Republican carried his column as always, dated from Westfield February 22nd. In it he discussed George Washington's military difficulties, Frederick the Great, and the share which World War Germany had had in its own afflictions. He concluded his last column with these paragraphs:

> Comparatively a few years ago, everybody seemed to be in favor of a high class peace,--that is to say, everybody was ready to see Austria give way to France, and France to Russia and Russia to Poland. The theory seemed to be that when one of these countries moved upon another, it was in good faith and that each would assist the other in its diplomacy. But how unlike this was to the actual fact! The

---

[35]Sanborn to Brockway, Westfield, N. J., February 4, 1917, in the Sanborn Papers, the Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton. I am indebted to the principal, Mr. George T. Pratt, for his transcription of this letter.

object of the great nations really was to get each other caught by the leg in these endless battlefields of Europe, and employ them there until they had exhausted the fighting force of their respective nations. Practically this has been done; and while there is much fighting machinery left in Europe, I can see nowhere much of the fighting spirit,--still less of the food and other materials that is to carry Germany through even a six-months' campaign.

We are beginning a little on the spring battles, but with a singular omission of all fighting in Thessaly, Greece and Macedonia. Something must have been happening in these regions to excuse so much lack of fighting; but I see no explanation of it in the newspapers. We all hope it is a great gain on the side of peace, the only good cause in the field just now.

What has become of the old advices from Greece? And especially from Thessaly, that most interesting country of all the big provinces? Where are the Greek reporters, who should be in Thessaly, either about the seaports, at Volo and Salonica or up among the mountains, where everything is so majestic, and I hope the people are not starving to death. There is a Journal of the Near East, established at Athens within a year past, which could give us a good deal of information if it would. What is the British legation in Greece doing? What are the British and American schools doing? A few words from them every week would be of great value. The absence of them may indicate a whole string of miseries.[36]

And with his thoughts on two of the topics he loved best--Thoreau and Greece--Sanborn died.

General and Mrs. Darling in Concord were immediately notified and they began to arrange funeral services for February 26th at 3:00 in the First Parish (Unitarian) Church in Concord. "He was officially a member," says Mrs. Darling, "but I had never seen him there once." Sanborn's wife, who had broken her hip two years before, could not make the long journey to Concord, but she asked Mrs. Darling to take care of the flowers.

---

[36] "Literary and Practical," Springfield Daily Republican, February 24, 1917, p. 9, cols. 2-4.

These duties the day of the funeral, says Mrs. Darling, provided "one of the wierdest experiences. There was a kind of parlor upstairs in the church, and he had been placed up there, and the coffin opened. I suddenly heard a dreadful groan. I am not superstitious, but I stood still, terrified. I didn't know what to do. But I climbed the stairs, the groaning continuing. When I got up to the parlor, I saw--after looking about--that a blind on rusty hinges had got loose and was groaning back and forth."

She then went downstairs to the cellar to get some baskets for flowers. As she was searching for the baskets, she suddenly saw two great eyes peering in through the cellar window. "I screamed, and then realized it was human eyes of a living person. It was Mr. Trotter, the literary secretary for the colored in Boston, and he wanted to know where I'd placed a wreath of red roses the society had sent so that he could tell them. The colored people adored Mr. Sanborn."

It is not necessary to catalog the names of those who attended the funeral nor to present the numerous eulogies of those ministers who were called on to say a few kind words. Considering the accuracy of what was said by some of these well-meaning clergymen, it is indeed surprising that Sanborn did not rise from the dead to correct them.

The town of Concord and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts acted at once to honor him, and Sanborn would have been pleased to read in the columns of his old paper the order adopted by the House of Representatives:

> Ordered, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses the sense of loss felt by the commonwealth in the death of this great man who, conscious of the voice of duty, asked only to be guided aright and courageously undertook all risks in the great cause of emancipation. Philosopher, philanthropist, sociologist and man of letters, in the service of the state and in private life, by reason of his fealty to the truth, the strength of his intellect, his interest in the diseased, the unfortunate and the despised, he lent distinction to every cause which he championed; and a grateful commonwealth hereby pays its tribute of respect; be it further
>
> Ordered, That the sergeant-at-arms be requested to maintain the flags of the state-house at half-staff for the next three days; and be it further
>
> Ordered, That the foregoing be made part of the records of the House and that a copy be sent to the bereaved family.[37]

He would have been pleased too that the flags of Concord were at half-staff and that, at his request, the church bell was not tolled while the funeral procession was passing to Sleepy Hollow cemetery. There in the warm days of the spring he was buried beneath a small boulder which an admiring Concord farmer had asked the privilege of providing.[38] Sanborn had picked a plot a little above the graves of Emerson, Thoreau, and Hawthorne, so that he could have a good view of his beloved friends.

The services for Sanborn were not concluded, however, with the funeral, for a memorial service, in which the churches and the people of Concord united, was held in the Trinitarian Congregational Church on Sunday evening, March 16th. The lengthy address, delivered by Butler

---

[37] "In Honor of Mr Sanborn," Ibid., February 27, 1917, p. 11, col. 4.

[38] Personal letter to me from Mary D. Sanborn (Mrs. Francis B.), 10 New York Boulevard, Sea Girt, August 29, 1951.

R. Wilson, a Boston Negro lawyer, was both a tribute to Sanborn and a rather curious and vehement defense of Negroes. In speaking of his debt to Sanborn, Wilson said:

> Mr Sanborn was never a pacifist. He was a radical—a radical in thought and method. His love for freedom--physical freedom, freedom of mind and conscience--was deep-seated and intense....
>
> It is a world custom to erect monuments to heroes and great men, and I presume that at some time, and very fittingly, the people of Concord will erect a monument to this chief man of the village. There may be some difference of opinion over the kind of memorial--some will incline to stone, some to bronze and some to a memorial building....
>
> In choosing your memorial to Mr Sanborn you have it ready at hand. He gave the best years of his life to the cause of the colored people, and he never failed them....
>
> The Negroes idealized him, and their progress vindicates him....
>
> "If ye love me, keep my commandments." If we seek to honor Mr Sanborn and perpetuate his memory, we can do it in no better way than by carrying on his work until every man in America, regardless of race and color, shall be judged by his merit, and every child be given the opportunity to develop to his best possibilities.[39]

But no monument--stone, bronze, or building--has ever been erected to his memory in Concord, and the citizens of the town scarcely remember his name. It seems to me a sad fact that no epitaph could be found that is more applicable to Sanborn than the words pronounced over the corpse of Caesar:

> The evil that men do lives after them;
> The good is oft interred with their bones.

I do not believe Concord knew the good the man did for the world outside Concord, more good, actually, to the people of the middle or

---

[39]"To F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Weekly Republican, March 22, 1917.

poorer classes than Emerson, Thoreau, or Alcott ever did. For while they were busy philosophizing on the nature of God and man, Sanborn was healing the sick and afflicted, and though Emerson's and Thoreau's mission was everlasting, Sanborn's efforts in prison and insane asylum reform alone may make him immortal. There are, I presume, various grades and levels of immortality, but I am sure the wretched souls in Tewksbury Almshouse got more good from Sanborn's efforts there than they did from Emerson's essay on the Over-Soul, though the memory of Sanborn's efforts died with them, and Sanborn today is remembered in Concord because of his trouble over the sewer.

Speak well of the dead, says the old proverb, but many of Sanborn's eulogists displayed feelings that were mixed. "Franklin B. Sanborn played many parts," said the Boston Herald, "—too many to play them all well, perhaps. But long after he has been forgotten as a journalist, as a philosopher, as an historian, perhaps even as an administrator of state charities, he will be remembered as the last surviving reporter of the great Concord group, and as one of the most interesting of all its reporters. There is someting a little saddening in the thought that with him goes the last living link with the most distinguished circle of our literature and thought."

The paper then spoke about the fact that in the biography of Julia Ward Howe it is told how she wrote Sanborn for the source of a classical quotation, remarking that she always sought of him the answer to difficult questions. "We all do!" remarked Wentworth Higginson.[40]

---

[40] "Concord's Minor Prophet," New York Evening Post, quoted in the Boston Herald, February 28, 1917.

An editorial in the Boston Transcript said:

> It is wonderful enough, of course, that one man, even in so long a life, could play so many parts, and play them well; but that he could play them so long with undiminished, indeed with increasing distinction, is the special wonder of Frank Sanborn's life-record....
>
> More than half of the nineteenth century, with all its revolutions in government, social and religious thought, discovery and invention and material expansion, he was commenting on, and helping or opposing, as to him seemed right, all of the great movements, as a man of the highest moral ideals, that have ushered in and established the modern world's institutions as we inherit them today.[41]

Perhaps most illuminating is the eulogy by a man who said, "I do not even pretend to have liked him," but who spoke out forthrightly and honestly in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin:

> [His] death gives a chance, not only to pay the respects unquestionably due a graduate of such unblemished character and scholarly attainment, but to say something long on my mind in regard to the various claims which the reputations of our own alumni have in our esteem. Thousands of us are spread the whole world over, acquiring honor and wealth, reflecting credit on the college, and adding each year to personal reputations. This is all as it should be. Institutions and national life must be worthily upheld by those who have the will and the power to succeed in the terrestrial meaning of the world....
>
> But there is another type of graduate of which not so much is said. Dr. Samuel E. Morison has recently pointed out that one of them has been wholly ignored by the college that bred him. Not only is the memory of Wendell Phillips sedulously ignored by Harvard College, but there are others of her sons, of whom possibly we are not quite so proud as we are of the more solid and robustious sort.
>
> The venerable mother patiently toils from year to year to replenish the earth with successful graduates, and grandly does she succeed. But once in a while from her mighty loins comes forth an individual of a different type. Such a man was Henry Thoreau, another was William Ellery Channing, the poet, and greatest of all was Emerson. To this class of rarified personalities Frank Sanborn belonged.

---

[41] "Frank B. Sanborn," Boston Transcript, February 24, 1917, p. 8, Sanborn Papers, Perkins Institution.

They may have failed to make money or to get "elected" to higher positions of trust and honor. Possibly what they may have said or written during their lives offended the sensibilities of the well-established, the comfortable, and the secure. Bringers of the sword rather than of peace, these disturbers of complacency have flamed through life and gone their way. And yet, my dear Alumnus, long after you and I have done our little bit, made our little pile, written our little books or earned a few soon-dried laurels, these strong and unaccommodating individualities are somehow remembered. Humanity, itself a wayward thing, has a way of forgetting us who seem to have achieved, and of keeping alive in its heart the memory of these radicals. Harvard then, I have long been thinking, is therefore doubly blessed. She has an abundant progeny of the prosperous, and can also lay claim to a glorious company of the apostles of plain living and high thinking, fearless opponents of all evils, not always beloved in their own generation, but immortal through all generations.

To this band most certainly belonged Frank Sanborn. I do not even pretend to have liked him, but as he passes I desire to salute him as almost the last of the individualists.

The armor of his radicalism was strong, for he was the equal in learning, birth, personal appearance and bearing, of the most favored of those who may fairly be said to have despised him, however courteously they did it. He asked for no consideration; nor did he get it. If there was wrong to attack, he did not show much consideration in return, and tender were the skins he pricked with that poignant and sole weapon of his--the pen. Panoplied with an eminently justifiable pride, but having no self-conceit, equipped with a most useful learning, a respect for accuracy, and a prodigious memory, Sanborn was a far more shining example of what Harvard College can do for a man than he would have liked to admit.

How seldom it is that we are compelled to face about on the street to gaze at some striking figure, as it recedes from us. Such a figure was Frank Sanborn.... As he passed, one realized that here indeed was one who had helped make American history and had played an uncompromising part therein, unloved it may be, but stainless.[42]

These are contemporary accounts. What may be said by our own age? Though little has been said, it is perhaps best said by Odell Shepard:

---

[42] Lindsay Swift, "Frank B. Sanborn, the Individualist," Harvard Alumni Bulletin, March 8, 1917, pp. 449-450.

> He was a positively bad writer, an untrustworthy editor, and a second rate journalist, yet there was in him a power of steadfast devotion and admiration which atoned for many defects. He served as a reflector--flawed and cracked though it was--for men and women and events that might well, without him, have been forgotten or less well understood. I can't pretend to know the man well, and most of my experience with his work has bred a sort of irritation.... His memoir of Bronson Alcott is inexcusably inaccurate, wretchedly planned, crudely composed. And yet I do think we should have a good book about him--a book that would explain how these crudities and gross errors could be committed by an honest, well-intentioned, well-trained man.[43]

This thesis is not the book; it is a preliminary sketch. It does not have all the answers or all the explanations, for the person who attempts to explain Sanborn has set himself a rather overwhelming task. When I asked Francis to "explain" his father he answered: "I'd call him a romanticist." Then, later, he said, "I think he had a great many talents. I think men with fewer talents and great adaptability might have made greater progress than he made." When I asked him to define adaptability, he continued, "I think he was a little too fond of his own view of things. He had intelligence enough to knuckle down to it when he saw he was losing the argument. But anyone who opposed his view, if not wicked, was ill-judged. He was psychologically unable to see the other man's view of the object. He could be convinced but not easily."

I do not know whether his friends tried to explain him, but a classmate of his at Harvard, Henry Lee Higginson, tried to interpret him to his cousin Wentworth. Whether his criticisms were justified is a matter

---

[43] Personal letter to me from Odell Shepard, Jordan Cove, Waterford, Conn., February 9, 1951.

for debate. But here is a private comment that to me at least would seem to explain in part the curious personality of Sanborn and the motivation for some of his actions:

Sunset Hill
Manchester by the Sea
May 21st - 1909

Dear Wentworth-

About Sanborn-some of us & especially Charles Lowell prized Sanborn very highly & in 54 - 55 - 56 - --- expected much of him & were on affectionate & intimate terms with him --- not I so much as others. He was most insistent on the Kansas troubles & so were we....

Then came the years -- 56 - 57 - 58 - 59 into 60, during which I was away. I saw Sanborn in '60 -- & it was pleasant. He preferred to stay at home in '61-- Very good, but he could not blame those who went. In 18[68?] he did censure Charles L. for his loyalty to Mc Clellan on whose staff he served -- & Sanborn added that he had not gone to see Charley, while rousing [?] and drilling his regiment here -- & did n't wish to see him -- because of his loyalty to McC. I thought this conduct mean & arrogant, for he did not know that Charley objected strongly to a certain part of McC's views & conduct. But I did. Sanborn was spoiled in college & afterwards by his mates [?] & older men. He soon became a common scold, who attributes to honest, good men low motives. He has been a most difficult State officer -- & his fame [?] tells the tale distinctly. I refused to vote for him as overseer, but I never asked any one else to do so. I do think he'd been bad in that capacity. Self-worship & selfishness ruin anybody & he abounds in both. A friend is a sacred possession,... We meet at our frequent class-dinners, & he is entertaining -- but he is not true & loyal. I've differed with you & you with me, but no harsh word or thought has existed. And it is not on [account?] of blood alone. The stock is mostly clean & honest. We have our [crises?] also, but-- I am yours

affectionately,

H. L. Higginson[44]

---

[44] Henry Lee Higginson to Thomas Wentworth Higginson, in the H. L. Higginson Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard College (6 MS Am 1162.10 No. 402).

Now that these six chapters are written, it is difficult for me to believe that the dynamo in this human powerhouse is still. It is difficult to believe, for he seemed to be the source of his own energy, a phenomenon of nature. Others have experienced this sensation, particularly one other person, a resident of Boston. She was a spiritualist medium in Back Bay, and she wrote Francis after his father's death that she had been in contact with Franklin Benjamin Sanborn. And if she is reporting what I sincerely hope is a fact, Sanborn must indeed be pleased with immortality, for she wrote to Francis: "He is going on from world to world."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION I. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

As I have said previously, the Sanborn papers are fantastically scattered about the United States in the libraries of educational institutions, historical and antiquarian societies, museums, and public libraries. Some have been found in the files of his correspondents and in private collections. Doubtless some holdings of letters and manuscripts are yet to be discovered.

The Concord Free Public Library holds one of the three largest collections of Sanborn papers, and its collection of Sanborn letters is, in my opinion, the most valuable. Of the 70 letters among the Sanborn papers in letter file 5, the 28 to Theodore Parker are the most important, for in them Sanborn reveals himself most vividly and tells most specifically about his activities and ideas. The remainder of the 70 letters are to Gamaliel Bradford, Samuel Eliot, Hamilton A. Hill, Francis and Molly Sanborn, Henry Villard, George Luther Stearns, one of the Channings, and unknown addressees. Also in letter file 5 are letters from the following people to Sanborn: John Brown, Charles Francis Adams, William Ellery Channing, William Henry Channing, Jeannette Gilder, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Samuel Gridley Howe, William Dean Howells, Wendell Phillips, and William B. Rogers. Also in this file are such items as a prologue spoken at the Anti-Slavery Festival in Concord, January 28, 1858, a program of an entertainment in aid of

John Brown's widow and other John Brown memorabilia together with other material that will be listed elsewhere in this bibliography. Last autumn, Miss Edith Davidson Harris presented to the library Sanborn's valuable letters to her father, William Torrey Harris. There are also in the library two boxes (Numbers 20 and 21) which contain mostly off-prints of Sanborn's articles for magazines, copies of several of his pamphlets on social reform, and a few original typed manuscripts such as an essay by Ellery Channing on the "Mystery of Shakespeare," to which is appended a biographical sketch of Channing by Sanborn, a typed original manuscript entitled "Dates and Circumstances in Regard to the Coming of W. E. Channing to Live with F. B. Sanborn," clippings of Sanborn's columns for the Springfield Republican, notes on Ellery Channing, and copies made by Sanborn of Channing's marginal notes in his copies of Thoreau's Walden and The Week. Besides such papers is the library's particularly rare collection of town reports and other local publications which contain considerable material by and about Sanborn and the other Concord worthies.

The American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Mass., contains one of the three largest collections of Sanborn material, comprising an odd assortment of unclassified papers which indicate dramatically the diversity of Sanborn's activities. The collection consists of two letter files containing the following types of material: autograph and typed letters to such people as Theodore Parker, Louisa Leavitt Sanborn, Dr. W. F. Drewry, Fred C. Wines, Mr. Harland, the President of the University of Texas, Stephen O. Sherman, John M. Glenn, Molly Osgood, and Kate Sanborn,

the last prefacing a manuscript entitled "A Baltimore Boy in Old Boston," which appears to be written by Sanborn; manuscript letters from such people as William E. Connelley, Daniel Ricketson, Alfred Dolge, William H. Samson, Sarah D. Walker, and Fred C. Wines; manuscript verses by Sanborn and copies of verses of a few major English poets; originals and carbons of "Our Boston Literary Letter" and "Our Weekly Boston Letter," written for the Springfield Daily Republican; two class registers for Sanborn's school and a register of names of those attending the Concord Summer School of Philosophy for the years 1879-1882; a manuscript notebook entitled "Receipts and Expenditures of the Concord Society for Educating the refugees of Port Royal and Elsewhere: an Account Kept by F. B. Sanborn, Treasurer"; originals and typed copies of speeches on Emerson, John Brown, Howe, Whittier, and Longfellow, the Concord authors, Lincoln, and modern Greece given before such groups as the Long Island Historical Society, the Greenacre School, the faculty and students of Brown and Cornell University, the Harvard Dental Alumni, the veterans and citizens of Weston, Mass., and a Sunday meeting in Concord. Also in the collection are portions of the original manuscripts of his Recollections of Seventy Years and his 1917 Life of Thoreau; the typed manuscript of his "Reverend Doctor Wines and Prison Reform"; typed letters to various editors for their columns; the typed original of an "Index to a Lost Journal of Thoreau"; manuscripts on such topics as "The Pottawatomie Executions of May, 1856 as related by Salmon Brown, a Participant," "Kansas in 1856 (T. W. Higginson)," and "The Kansas Territorial Election of October, 1857"; newspaper clippings about the Sanborn bust presented to

the University of Kansas; "Record of the Greek Committee, of Brown University, Wednesday, February 26, 1908"; and a large quantity of typed material copied from the letters and journals of Sanborn, Ariana Smith Walker, and Ednah Dow Cheney.

The Houghton Library of Harvard College contains one of the three largest collections of material including Sanborn letters to the following people: 25 letters to Thomas Wentworth Higginson, 30 to Charles Eliot Norton, 17 to Charles Sumner, 6 to the Howe family, 10 to Ralph Waldo Emerson, 4 to Anna and Walton Ricketson, 2 or 3 to S. T. Pickard, 4 to Oliver Wendell Holmes, 2 to James Freeman Clarke, and 1 each to John Jay Chapman, John Greenleaf Whittier, A. H. Dooley, William H. Kinsley, R. H. Mackey, Charles Marseilles, Mrs. Theodore Parker, Mr. Thompson, Col. Hinton, William Dean Howells, James Russell Lowell, Henry Richards, Lindsay Swift, and the Librarian of Harvard College. There is also a fairly large corrugated cardboard box of uncataloged material, the contents of which I have not as yet identified, though the librarian has labeled them a "miscellaneous collection of manuscript papers, including material on John Brown, Emerson, transcripts from Theodore Parker's journal, etc. (not analyzed)." There is also in the library a "Circular for the Concord School, 1857," a broadside with 24 lines of a draft of a poem in Sanborn's autograph on verso. Though I have made a fairly thorough search of the papers of Sanborn's friends and acquaintances in the Houghton collections, letters to and from him and references to him may still remain undiscovered. The Harvard Archives contain his parts and exhibition speeches, the Quinquennial File of clippings

kept on the class of 1855, faculty records, and other interesting Sanborn material. The Widener Library, of course, contains most of the volumes which Sanborn wrote and many autographed offprints of his articles and pamphlets [cataloged under various--and thereby confusing--cover titles.

The Library of Congress owns 72 Sanborn letters and pieces of printed matter sent to Sanborn. They concern chiefly the controversy which followed O. B. Frothingham's first edition of his biography of Gerrit Smith. There are 20 letters to Sanborn from Gerrit Smith, 13 from O. B. Frothingham, 7 from George Haven Putnam, 7 from John Cochrane, 4 from Ann C. Smith (Mrs. Gerrit Smith), 3 from Elizabeth S. Miller, and 1 each from Greene Smith, Charles D. Miller, George Cary Eggleston, G. G. Walker, Henry L. Hinton, Helen Morton, J. Miller McKim, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and an unknown author. The printed matter comprises a discourse, a speech or two, and printed letters by Gerrit Smith to various persons together with printed matter written by others. In the Benjamin Holt Ticknor Papers are 9 letters from Sanborn, of which 7 are to Ticknor, and the other 2 to J. R. Osgood and an unknown addressee. The library also holds 4 letters from Sanborn to Ralph Waldo Emerson, and its Union Catalog Division reports approximately 120 entries for works by Sanborn.

In the Special Collections of the Butler Library of Columbia University are four collections containing Sanborn material. The General Manuscript Collection contains 4 letters from Sanborn to Mr. Adams, Mr. Hawley, Charles Eliot Norton, and Mr. Whiting. The Edmund Clarence Stedman Collection contains 8 letters to Stedman, 2 manuscript poems by Sanborn, and 1 letter to Mrs. Kinney, and the Moncure Daniel Conway

Collection contains 25 letters from Sanborn to Conway. In the John Brown Collection are 2 folders of correspondence and other Sanborn material which belonged to his rival biographer, Oswald Garrison Villard. This collection contains approximately 60 letters to and from Sanborn, chiefly between him, Villard, and Miss Katherine Mayo, Villard's secretary, but also between Sanborn and William Lloyd Garrison, William E. Connelley, Henry Villard, and Richard J. Hinton. Included in it also are copies of correspondence between Sanborn, George Luther Stearns, Salmon Brown, and Mr. Tyndale; offprints or clippings of Sanborn articles on John Brown; and notes by Villard or Miss Mayo on Sanborn material or on interviews of Sanborn concerning John Brown.

The Rare Book Room of the Boston Public Library contains the very important Thomas Wentworth Higginson Collection of John Brown letters and records, including 42 letters from Sanborn to Higginson, several of which caused Sanborn such anger and grief when Higginson permitted them to be opened to the general public. The library also has 7 Sanborn letters in its William Lloyd Garrison Collection, 3 in the Samuel J. May Papers, and 1 other.

The library of the Kansas State Historical Society at Topeka contains 60 or more letters by Sanborn in the Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Richard J. Hinton, and other collections of papers. Seventeen of these are photostat copies of letters by Sanborn to John Brown for 1857-1858, the originals of which are in the Atlanta University library. There are in the society a great many papers relating to John Brown, and the librarian says that "it is possible there are references to Sanborn in some of these papers that have not been brought out in our catalog."

One of the largest collections of Sanborn papers is owned by Dr. Walter Harding of the Schools of English, University of Virginia. The material includes clippings reviewing Sanborn's books and speeches or reporting his activities; the 65 letters in the collection include 55 to W. F. Bromley, many of which are written on copies of Sanborn's letters to the Springfield Republican. The other 10 are to Mrs. Elizabeth B. Davenport, Francis and Molly Sanborn, Francis H. Allen, Professor Manatt, Thomas M. Johnson, William M. Trotter, the editor of the Springfield Republican, and an unknown addressee.

Another important private collection is that of Mr. Boyd B. Stutler, 530 Fifth Avenue, New York 19, New York, whose biography of John Brown is to appear soon. He has not less than 50 letters from John Brown and members of his family to Sanborn. Approximately 20 of these were written by John Brown, Jr., to Sanborn submitting data for the Life and Letters of John Brown or offering criticisms and corrections. Included in Stutler's collection are some of the books from Sanborn's library. But most important is Oswald Garrison Villard's copy of Sanborn's Life and Letters on which he spent many hours restoring the John Brown letters to their original form. Stutler also owns some unpublished manuscripts of Sanborn's lectures on John Brown, clippings of newspaper articles about Sanborn, and some other miscellaneous items.

The Watkinson Library, now a part of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., contains 41 letters to Charles Dudley Warner which are unique for their humor and their evidence of Sanborn's charming personality.

The special Negro Collection of the Trevor Arnett Library of Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga., contains 16 letters and 1 postcard written by Sanborn to John Brown between January 28, 1857 and August 25, 1858, 1 letter to "Col." Hugh Forbes, and a letter and a card to C. W. Ernest (or Ernst).

The Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston contains 62 Sanborn letters for the period from 1858 through 1908 addressed to these people: 48 to Caroline Healey Dall, 3 to John D. Long, 2 to John Forrester Andrew, 3 to Edward Atkinson, and 1 each to George Bancroft, Amos Adams Lawrence, the Hon. Otis Norcross, Samuel Gridley Howe, and the editor of The Outlook. In the Amos Adams Lawrence Papers are letters to Sanborn and many references to him. There are, in the Proceedings of the Society, many papers, remarks, and exhibitions of curios by Sanborn, most of which will be noted elsewhere in this bibliography. The bulk of the letters in the collection of this Society are of little interest, most of the 48 to Mrs. Dall having been written to inform her of the time, the place, and the agenda of the next meeting of the American Social Science Association.

The library of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts School for the Blind at Watertown contains valuable material in its envelopes of clippings provided by at least three professional clipping services over a long period of years. Though these items concern those who were in any way connected with the school, they report all the activities of these persons, not merely their work at Perkins.

The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery of San Marino, Cal., contains the following letters written by Sanborn: 15 to Horatio Nelson Rust, 2 to Mary E. Thompson, 1 to John Brown, Jr., and a copy of a letter from Sanborn to Brown. The library also owns 8 letters addressed to Sanborn from various people: 6 from John Brown, 1 from Horatio Nelson Rust, and 1 from Ralph Waldo Emerson. The library also has the corrected page-proof of the Addendum to his First and Last Journeys of Thoreau.

In the Gerrit Smith Miller Collection of the Syracuse University library are 21 letters from Sanborn to Gerrit Smith.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania owns 25 letters of Sanborn to Benjamin Lyman, 1 letter to him from Ralph Waldo Emerson and another from John Brown.

The Essex Institute at Salem, Mass., has 3 letters from Sanborn to W. S. Nevins, 3 to the Hon. R. S. Rantoul, 2 to John J. Currier, 2 to Miss Adéline Roberts, and 1 to the Rev. E. B. Willson.

In the Yale Collection of American Literature in the Yale University Library are the following letters written by Sanborn: 2 to Thomas Lounsbury, 1 to the Rev. L. M. Powers, and 1 copy of a letter to William P. Trent, which contains a four-page typewritten article entitled Fanny St. John and Gustavus Fellowes. The library also owns a letter to Sanborn from John Fiske (a negative photostat) and a letter to him from Edmund Clarence Stedman.

Holdings by other institutions are minor. The Illinois State Historical Library at Springfield has in its Ricks Collection a manuscript

of a speech on John Brown which Sanborn delivered at the Concord Lyceum February 28, 1866, and in its George Washington Brown manuscripts two letters to Brown about Sanborn written by William E. Connelley. The Chicago Historical Society holds the unpublished manuscript of Sanborn's lecture to his Concord school, delivered early in 1857. The Boston Athenaeum owns a letter to Horace Scudder and a song with words by Sanborn—the dirge for John Brown; the library of Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., owns 3 letters by Sanborn. The Pierpont Morgan Library in New York City owns a volume of the speeches delivered at the John Brown Memorial Meetings held at Salem and Concord in 1859 and 1860 written in the hands of Emerson, Thoreau, Sanborn, and others. Sanborn's particular contribution appears to have been a kind of record of the meeting appended to which is a note by him concerning the volume. The New York Public Library has a few stray Sanborn pieces in its Anthony Collection, an item in its David A. Wells Papers, and 2 letters in its Berg Collection. The Library of Brown University contains a manuscript poem of Edwin Morton appended to which is an identifying note by Sanborn. The William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan contains some material in its Weld-Grimké Papers.

Mr. William Henry Harrison, director of the Fruitlands Museum, Harvard, Mass., was, during the spring of 1951, in the process of sorting and cataloging several boxes of manuscripts collected over a long period by Miss Clara Endicott Sears, the owner of the museum. At that time Mr. Harrison had unearthed a few Sanborn manuscripts, mementos and photographs and he was to notify me if he discovered further manuscripts or papers.

As the result of an "author's query" in the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, and the Antiquarian Bookman, a few persons have written me concerning their Sanborn letters in their personal collections or files: Dr. O. O. Fisher, 2475 Iroquois Ave., Detroit, 14, Mich.; Mr. William M. Cummings, 2276 Youngman Ave., St. Paul 2, Minn.; Mr. Albert Mordell, 16 South Broad St., Philadelphia 2, Pa.; Dr. Edward Spencer Cowles, 591 Park Ave., New York 21, N. Y.; and Mrs. Frederick Burroughs Smith, Bristol Road, Clinton, N. Y. Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer, 22 Elm St., Concord, Mass., has a scrapbook containing many interesting clippings about Sanborn's activities, reviews of his works, and articles from the Springfield Republican.

Other Sanborn material undoubtedly may exist, although I have searched all major and minor sources available to me. Since the establishment of a complete bibliography of Sanborn's writings is mandatory for a definitive study of the man and his careers, I shall be grateful for any suggestions for further search.

SECTION II. THE PUBLISHED WRITINGS OF FRANKLIN BENJAMIN SANBORN

Although this bibliography has been carefully prepared, the reader is warned that it may contain errors. Sanborn's idiosyncrasies as a publisher of his own works make the preparation of a bibliography difficult. For example, "John Brown and His Friends" appeared as an unsigned article in the Atlantic Monthly in July, 1872 (volume XXX, 50-61). It then appeared signed and with the same title, in the Granite Monthly in 1905. Sanborn then put a paper cover on it, gave it the same title (but omitted the place of publication and the date), and sent it off to the Librarian of Congress, who copyrighted it and entered it in the Library of Congress Catalog as "John Brown and his friends, . . . [n.p., 190-?]." Then Sanborn included with an offprint of this article--as it appeared in the Granite Monthly--three autobiographical articles written for the Granite Monthly under the general title of "History and Poetry from the Life of F. B. Sanborn of Concord, Massachusetts," which had appeared in three installments in 1904 (XXVII, 19-36, 77-87, 111-132). The combined product he covered, called it New Hampshire Biography and Autobiography (Concord, N. H., privately printed, 1905), and shipped it off to librarians and friends. These reprints often appear in card catalogs as separate books. Apparently this sort of activity was a habit, and the reader can readily see how the possibilities for bibliographical error are multiplied. I have tried, therefore, whenever possible, to indicate by cross-reference instances similar to this, but I presume that I have not caught all of them.

As the preparation of an accurate and complete bibliography is necessary for a definitive study of Sanborn and his writings, I shall appreciate knowing about errors and omissions. I would also like to remind the reader that this thesis is concerned with Sanborn's political and literary careers and that I may not have discovered all of the writings of his career as a social reformer. These I would also appreciate knowing about.

A. Books and Pamphlets by Sanborn

With William Torrey Harris. A. Bronson Alcott: His Life and Philosophy. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1893. 2v.

An Address Delivered Before the Golden Branch Society of Phillips Exeter Academy, June 20, 1883. Exeter, N. H.: W. B. Morrill, 1883.

Bronson Alcott at Alcott House, England, and Fruitlands, New England, (1842-1844). Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Torch Press, 1908.

Dartmouth College: Its Founders and Hinderers. Concord, Mass., 1908. (A paper given before the New Hampshire Historical Society at Dartmouth Hall, Oct. 16, 1906; first printed in Proceedings of the New Hampshire Historical Society, V, [1901] 73.)

The Development of Reformatory Discipline: A Lecture Given in Boston February 10, 1900 Before the Educational Branch of the Twentieth Century Club.... Papers in Penology, 5th Ser. Elmira, N. Y.: New York State Reformatory, 1900.

Dr. S. G. Howe, the Philanthropist. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1891.

Emancipation in the West Indies. Concord, Mass., 1862.

Hawthorne and His Friends: Reminiscence and Tribute. Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Torch Press, 1908.

Henry D. Thoreau. American Men of Letters Series. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1882.

Henry D. Thoreau. London: Sampson Low, 1882.

Henry D. Thoreau; rev. ed. Riverside Popular Biographies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1910.

Hymn To Be Sung at the Music Hall, Boston, December 4, 1859. Boston, 1859. (On the execution of John Brown. Broadside, 8 x 5 in., unsigned. Boston Public Library.)

With Charles S. Hoyt, and others. Interstate Migration: Read at the Conference of Charities, Denver, June 28, 1892. [Boston?] [1892?] (This also appeared in the Journal of Social Science [1892, no. 29]. It was reprinted from the Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction.)

John Brown and His Friends. [Boston?] [1905?] (First printed unsigned in the Atlantic Monthly, XXX [July, 1872], 50-61; next printed, signed, in the Granite Monthly, XXXVIII [1905]).

John Brown, Liberator of Kansas and Martyr of Virginia, Life and Letters; 4th ed. Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Torch Press, 1910. (A reprint, with changes in the front matter only, of Life and Letters of John Brown, Liberator of Kansas, and Martyr of Virginia. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1885)

The Life and Letters of John Brown, Liberator of Kansas, and Martyr of Virginia; 1st ed., Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1885. (Though Sanborn listed himself as editor, he is the author.)

The Life and Letters of John Brown, Liberator of Kansas, and Martyr of Virginia; 2nd ed., Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1891.

The Life of Henry David Thoreau, Including Many Essays Hitherto Unpublished and Some Account of His Family and Friends, with Illustrations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1917.

Lines Written for the Silver Wedding of Hon. Henry Wilson. Concord, Mass., 1865.

Massachusetts Board of State Charities: Special Report on Prisons and Prison Discipline Made Under Authority of the Board of State Charities. Boston: Wright and Potter, 1865.

Memoirs of Pliny Earle, M. D., with Extracts from His Diary and Letters (1830-1892) and Selections from His Professional Writings (1839-1891), edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Damrell & Upham, 1898. (Though Sanborn listed himself as editor, he is the author.)

Memorandum on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States of America, Drawn up at the Request of the National Committee of the United States on the International Penitentiary Congress. London: Head, Hole & Co., 1872 (Backtitled Prisons and Reformatories).

Memorial Verses on John Brown. Concord, 1878.

Michael Anagnos, 1837-1906. Boston: Wright and Potter, 1907. (Reprinted and revised from "Michael Anagnos, 1837-1906," Seventy-fifth Annual Report of Perkins Institution and Massachusetts School for the Blind. Boston: Wright and Potter, 1907, pp. 7-19.)

Mrs. Horatio Wood, of Lowell. [Boston?] 1906.

New Hampshire: An Epitome of Popular Government. American Commonwealths Series. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1904.

New Hampshire Biography and Autobiography. Concord, N. H.: privately printed, 1905. (Made up of "John Brown and His Friends," Granite Monthly, XXXVIII [1905] and "History and Poetry of F. B. Sanborn of Concord, Massachusetts," XXXVII [1904], 19-36, 77-87, 111-132.)

New Hampshire Men at the Concord Fight: An Address Delivered Before the New Hampshire Society of Sons of the American Revolution at Concord, N. H., June 14, 1902. Concord, N. H., 1903.

The Personality of Emerson. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1903.

The Personality of Emerson; limited ed. Boston: D. B. Updike, 1903.

The Personality of Thoreau. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1901.

The Personality of Thoreau; limited ed. Boston: D. B. Updike, 1901.

A Plan for Reorganizing the State Department of Charity and Lunacy, Submitted to the Legislative Committee on State Boards and Commissions, in Nov. 1891. Concord, Mass., 1892.

Poems Read at the Opening of the Fraternity Lectures, 1858-59: "America" by F. B. Sanborn, "Character" by R[ufus] Leighton, Jr. Boston: Printed for the Fraternity [of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society], 1859.

President Langdon: A Biographical Tribute. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1904. (Rewritten from "Dr. Langdon [1723-1797], of Boston, Portsmouth, Harvard College and Hampton Falls: A Biographical Tribute," Granite Monthly, XXXVI [April, 1904], 209-228 and [May, 1904], 267-287 or from "Samuel Langdon, S. T. D., Scholar, Patriot, and President of Harvard University," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society; n.s. [1903, 1904], 192-232.)

Ralph Waldo Emerson. Beacon Biographies of Eminent Americans. Boston: Small, Maynard, 1901.

Recollections of Seventy Years. Boston: Badger, 1909. 2v.

The Smiths and Walkers of Peterborough, Exeter, and Springfield. [Concord, N. H., 1899]. (Cover title: The Walkers of Peterborough in New Hampshire. Concord, [N. H.?]: Oct. 1899.) This is a reprint of "The Smiths and Walkers of Peterborough, Exeter, and Springfield," Granite Monthly, XXVII (Oct., 1899), 223-248.

State Care of the Insane: True and False Care: A Remonstrance in the Name of the Insane Poor Against Crowding Them Into Hospital Palaces or Asylum Prisons. Boston, 1898.

State Care Versus State Custody. Boston, 1900. (Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Twenty-seventh Annual Conference of Charities and Correction, held in Topeka, Kan., May 18-24, 1900.)

Successors in Success: A Memorial Address in Honor of Michael Anagnos, Given at Tremont Temple, Oct. 24, 1906. Philadelphia, 1906.

Supplement to the Twelfth Annual Report: The Public Charities of Massachusetts During the Century ending Jan. 1, 1876: A Report Made to the Massachusetts Centennial Commission, Feb. 1, 1876, Under the Direction of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities. Boston: Wright and Potter, 1876.

B. Works Edited, Prefaced, or Introduced by Sanborn or Containing Memoirs or Notes by Him

Alcott, Amos Bronson. New Connecticut: edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1887.

Bryant, William Cullen, and Henry David Thoreau. Unpublished Poems by Bryant and Thoreau: "Musings" by William Cullen Bryant and "Godfrey of Boulogne" by Henry D. Thoreau; limited ed., the latter poem introduced by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1907. ("Musings" is introduced by Curtis Hidden Page.)

Channing, William Ellery. Poems of Sixty-five Years; selected and edited by F. B. Sanborn. Philadelphia and Concord: J. H. Bentley, 1902.

_____. Poems of Sixty-five Years; selected and edited by F. B. Sanborn; limited ed. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1902.

_____. Thoreau the Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses; new ed., enlarged, edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1902.

_____. Thoreau The Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses; limited ed., enlarged, edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: D. B. Updike, The Merrymount Press, 1902. (With engravings and etchings by Sidney L. Smith.)

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Tantalus; limited ed., with a memorial note by F. B. Sanborn. Canton, Pa.: Kirgate Press, 1903. (Reprinted from The Dial, IV [Jan., 1844], 357-363.)

Fogg, George Gilman. A Memorial of George Gilman Fogg: The Address of Rev. Augustus Woodbury at the Funeral Services, Oct. 8, 1881, and a Tribute by F. B. Sanborn. Concord, N. H.: Republican Press Association, 1882.

Gowing, Clara. The Alcotts As I Knew Them; introduced by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: C. M. Clark, 1909.

Jones, John Paul. Letters of John Paul Jones, Printed from the Unpublished Originals in W. K. Bixby's Collection; with introductory remarks by Horace Porter and Franklin B. Sanborn. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1905.

Lowell, Maria White. Letter of Maria White (Mrs. James Russell) Lowell to Sophia (Mrs. Nathaniel) Hawthorne; with remarks by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1912. (This formed a section of the Eleventh Yearbook of the Bibliophile Society and, followed by a letter from William Black to Osgood, the publisher, was issued separately.)

Mahoney, Nellie M., compiler. James Mahoney, 1862-1915: Biographical Sketch, Letters of Appreciation, Literary Productions; introduction by F. B. Sanborn, with a prefatory note by Cardinal Gibbons. Concord, N. H.: privately printed, 1920.

Newton, Joseph Fort. Lincoln and Herndon; introduced by F. B. Sanborn. Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Torch Press, 1910.

Parker, Theodore. Prayers; a new edition, with a preface by Louisa M. Alcott, and a memoir by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1882 (copyright, 1861).

_____. The Rights of Man in America; edited, with a preface, by F. B. Sanborn. Centenary Edition. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1911.

Richards, Laura. Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe; edited by his daughter, with notes and an introduction to vol. I only by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Dana Estes, 1909. 2v.

Robinson, Edwin Arlington. Thoreau's Last Letter, with a Note on His Correspondent, Myron B. Benton; limited ed., reprinted from F. B. Sanborn's ed. of Thoreau's Familiar Letters, with a note by E. A. Robinson. Amenia, N. Y.: Troutbeck Leaflets, No. 5, 1925. (Printed for friends of Joel and Amy Spingarn.)

Robinson, Mrs. William Stevens. "Warrington" Pen-Portraits: A Collection of Personal and Political Reminiscences from 1848 to 1876; with a memoir by Mrs. Robinson and an introduction by F. B. Sanborn. Boston, 1877.

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft. The Romance of Mary W. Shelley, John Howard Payne and Washington Irving; limited ed., with remarks by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1907.

Thoreau, Henry David. The First and Last Journeys of Thoreau, Lately Discovered Among His Unpublished Journals and Manuscripts; limited ed., edited by Franklin Benjamin Sanborn. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1905. 2v.

_____. Poems of Nature; selected and edited by Henry S. Salt and Frank B. Sanborn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1895.

_____. Poems of Nature; selected and edited by Henry S. Salt and Frank B. Sanborn. London: John Lane, 1895.

_____. The Service; limited ed., edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, D. B. Updike, 1902.

_____. Sir Walter Raleigh; Lately Discovered Among His Unpublished Journals and Manuscripts; limited ed., introduced by Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, ed. by Henry Aiken Metcalf. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1905.

_____. Walden; or Life in the Woods; limited ed., edited by F. B. Sanborn, with prefatory remarks by Henry H. Harper. Boston: Bibliophile Society, 1909.

_____. Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau, with an introduction and notes by F. B. Sanborn. Riverside Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1894. (Upon its appearance in 1894, this volume was added to the Riverside Edition as Volume XI, having been brought out in uniform style, although it lacked the half-title with the volume number.)

_____. Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau, with an introduction and notes by F. B. Sanborn. Large-Paper Edition, limited to 150 copies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1894. (Printed from the plates of the Riverside Edition above but published four months earlier.)

_____. The Writings of Henry David Thoreau: Familiar Letters; edited by F. B. Sanborn. Enlarged Edition (Manuscript Edition, limited to 600 copies). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906. (This edition was enlarged from the 1894 Riverside Edition by the addition of some 30 pages. These Letters formed Vol. VI.)

Thoreau, Henry David. The Writings of Henry David Thoreau: Familiar Letters; edited by F. B. Sanborn. Enlarged Edition (Walden Edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906. (This volume was Vol. VI of the Walden Edition, which was printed from the plates of the Manuscript Edition above and had the same illustrations.)

Watson, Edward Winslow. Verses of Edward Winslow Watson, of Clark's Island: a Parting Gift to His Friends; with a memoir by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: privately printed by Walker, 1877.

C. Writings by Sanborn in Periodicals or Collective Works

American Academy of Political and Social Science. Publications

"Sociel Science Congress," VI, 531-533.

American Journal of Nursing

"Origin and Dignity of Trained Nursing," XI (1911), 1011.

American Journal of Sociology

"History of the American Social Science Association, in a Letter to Its Present Secretary, I. F. Russell, New York," XV (March, 1910), 592-595.

Arena

"Bryant, the Poet-Politician," a section of an article entitled "Personal Recollections of America's Seven Great Poets," XVI (Feb., 1896), 384-390. (Whitford notes.[1])

"Emerson in His Home," a section of an article entitled "America's Seven Great Poets," XV (Dec., 1895), 16-21. (Whitford notes.)

[1] I am indebted to Mrs. Whitford for items thus identified. However, I have used no items from her bibliography without first checking them.

The Atlantic Monthly

Editorial contributions and articles:

(Those items preceded by a star were unsigned. The titles given here in square brackets are those which were supplied in the Index published by the editors of the magazine. "Politics" and "Recent Literature" were editorial departments which appeared, along with "Art" and "Music" in each issue.)

"The Emerson-Thoreau Correspondence: Emerson in Europe," LXIX (June, 1892), 736-753.

*["The Great Convention and Platform"], in the Politics section, XXX (August, 1872), 254.

"John Brown and His Friends," XXX (July, 1872), 50-61.

* *"John Brown in Massachusetts," XXIX (April, 1872), 420-433.

"Journalism and Journalists," XXXIV (July, 1874), 55-66.

"The Maintenance of a Poet," LXXXVI (Dec., 1900), 819-825.

*["Mr. Sumner's Speech"], in the Politics section, XXX (August, 1872), 253-254.

*["The Opposing Candidates and their Characteristics"], in the Politics section, XXX (August, 1872), 255.

"Thoreau and His English Friend Thomas Cholmondeley," LXXII (Dec., 1893), 741-756.

"The Virginia Campaign of John Brown," in six parts:

I. "His Years of Preparation," XXXV (Jan., 1875), 16-24.
II. "His Reconnoissance in Kansas," XXXV (Feb., 1875), 224-233.
III. "The Disclosure of His Plans in 1858," XXXV (March, 1875), 323-331.
IV. "The True Nature of His Plans," XXXV (April, 1875), 453-465.
V. "Before the Outbreak," XXXV (May, 1875), 591-600.
VI. "At Harper's Ferry," XXXVI (Dec., 1875), 704-721.

*["The Washington Treaty"], in the Politics section, XXX (Sept., 1872), 382-383.

*["A Year of Surprises and Anamolies"], in the Politics section, XXX (Sept., 1872), 383-384.

The Atlantic Monthly (cont'd.)

Reviews:

*Review of Nahum Capen, The History of Democracy; or, Political Progress, Historically Illustrated, From the Earliest to the Latest Periods, in the Recent Literature section. XXXV (May, 1875), 624-625.

*Review of William Ellery Channing, D. D., The Perfect Life, in the Recent Literature section, XXXII (July, 1873), 102-104.

*Review of Ellery Channing, Thoreau: The Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses, in the Recent Literature section, XXXIII (Feb., 1874), 230-231.

*Review of Octavius Brooks Frothingham, Theodore Parker: A Biography, in the Recent Literature section, XXXIV (July, 1874), 109-110.

*Review of Octavius B. Frothingham, Gerrit Smith: A Biography, in the Recent Literature section, XLI (May, 1878), 671-672.

*Review of Charles Ingersoll, Fears for Democracy, regarded from the American Point of View, in the Recent Literature section, XXXVI (July, 1875), 107-109.

*Review of Edwin Pears, ed., Prisons and Reformatories at Home and Abroad; being the Transactions of the International Penitentiary Congress (1872), in the Recent Literature section, XXXII (Sept., 1873), 374-375.

*Review of E. Robin, La Question Penitentiaire, in the Recent Literature section, XXXII (Sept., 1873), 374-375. (Reviewed with the item above.)

*Review of Mrs. William S. Robinson, ed., "Warrington" Pen-Portraits: A Collection of Personal and Political Reminiscences from 1848 to 1876, in the Recent Literature section, XL (Sept., 1877), 379-380.

*Review of Nathan Sargent, Public Men and Events, from the Commencement of Mr. Monroe's Administration, in 1817, to the Close of Mr. Fillmore's Administration, in 1853, in the Recent Literature section, XXXVII (March, 1876), 379.

*Review of Orrin Skinner, The Issues of American Politics, in the Recent Literature section, XXXI (March, 1873), 365-366.

The Atlantic Monthly (cont'd.)

*Review of Enoch C. Wines, Report on the International Penitentiary Congress of London (1872), in the Recent Literature section, XXXII (Sept., 1873), 374-375. (Reviewed with the Pears and Robin items above.)

*Review of Enoch C. Wines, Transactions of the Third National Prison Reform Congress held at St. Louis, Missouri, May 13-16, 1874, in the Recent Literature section, XXXV (May, 1875), 625-626.

*Review of Mrs. O. J. Wister and Agnes Irwin, Worthy Women of our First Century, in the Recent Literature section, XL (Oct., 1877), 502-504.

Boston Daily Advertiser

"Mr. Allen's Retort Courteous," (May 3, 1894).

"Mr. Sanborn Corrects Mr. Allen," (April 25, 1894).

[On some of Thoreau's poems], "At the Breakfast Table," (March 8, 1892).

[On Thoreau's reading], "At the Breakfast Table," (March 18, 1892).

[Review of Thoreau's Autumn], "At the Breakfast Table," (Sept. 14, 1892).

Boston Daily Bee

[Ode], Picnic of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, July 14, 1857. (Boston Public Library.)

Boston Herald

"Relation of Thoreau and Emerson," (April 24, 1912).

"Thoreau and the Walden Woods," (May 26, 1896).

Boston Evening Transcript

"The Religion of Thoreau," (Aug. 22, 1908).

Charities Review

"The Belgian System of Family Care," IX (June, 1899), 180-185.

"Children of the State in Massachusetts," V (Dec., 1895), 89-93.

"Curability of the Insane," VIII (Sept., 1898), 328-336.

"A Cyclopedia of Charities," V (Jan., 1896), 134-139.

"Lunacy Commissions," VI (March, 1897), 36-40.

"Progress in the Care of the Insane," IX (August, 1899), 255-263.

Christian Science Monitor

"Our American Hermit," (Jan. 25, 1947). (An article on Thoreau which includes portions of three paragraphs from Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau.)

The Commonwealth

March 13, 1863. Editorial in regard to reprinting certain of Thoreau's writings, with a list of Thoreau's periodical publications "prepared by himself shortly before his death."

Conservative Review

"The West Indian Archipelago," II (August, 1899), 134-148.

The Critic (Arranged chronologically)

"Thoreau's Unpublished Poetry," I (March 26, 1881), 75-76.

"Authors and Publishers on Arbitration," .... (Feb. 6, 1877), 87-90. [Includes a statement by Sanborn invoking public opinion to assure the ratification of the treaty for the friendly arbitration of disputes between the United States and England.]

"Emerson and Contemporary Poets," XLII (May, 1903), 413-416.

"A Concord Note-Book: Ellery Channing and his Table-Talk (First Paper)," XLVII (July, 1905), 76-81.

"A Concord Note-Book: Ellery Channing and his Table-Talk (Second Paper)," XLVII (August, 1905), 121-128.

The Critic (cont'd.)

"A Concord Note-Book: Ellery Channing and his Table-Talk (Third Paper)," XLVII (Sept., 1905), 267-272.

"A Concord Note-Book: Gerrit Smith and John Brown (Fourth Paper)," XLVII (Oct., 1905), 349-356.

"A Concord Note-Book: Thoreau and Ellery Channing (Fifth Paper)," XLVII (Nov., 1905), 444-451.

"A Concord Note-Book: The Women of Concord--I, (Sixth Paper)," XLVII (Feb., 1906), 154-160.

"A Concord Note-Book: The Women of Concord--Margaret Fuller and Her Friends--II, (Seventh Paper)," XLVIII (March, 1906), 251-257.

"A Concord Note-Book: The Women of Concord--III. Louisa Alcott and her Circle (Eighth Paper)," XLVIII (April, 1906), 338-350.

"A Concord Note-Book: The Women of Concord--IV. Mrs. Mary Brooks and the Anti-Slavery Movement (Ninth Paper)," XLVIII (May, 1906), 409-413.

"A Concord Note-Book: Theodore Parker and R. W. Emerson (Tenth Paper)," XLIX (Sept., 1906), 273-281.

The Dial (Chicago)

"Thoreau in his Journals," XLII (Feb. 16, 1907), 107-110.

"Thoreau in Twenty Volumes," XLI (Oct. 16, 1906), 232-235. (Whitford notes.)

The Forum

"Thoreau and Emerson," XXIII (April, 1897), 218-227.

The Granite Monthly

"Barca and the Philippines," XXV (Dec., 1898), 321-324.

"The Charities of New Hampshire," XIX (Nov., 1895), 376-389. (An address before the Daughters of New Hampshire, in Boston, Mass., October 12, 1895.)

The Granite Monthly (cont'd.)

"Doctor Langdon (1723-1797), of Boston, Portsmouth, Harvard College, and Hampton Falls: A Biographical Tribute," XXXVI (April, 1904), 209-228; (May, 1904), 267-287.

"Dr. Charles Henry Sanborn of Hampton Falls," XXVII (July, 1899), 35-39.

"Ellery Channing in New Hampshire," XXXII (March, 1902), 157-164.

"The Hard Case of the Founder of Old Hampton: Wrongs of Rev. Stephen Bachiler," XXIX (Sept., 1900), 215-229.

"History and Poetry from the Life of F. B. Sanborn of Concord, Massachusetts," XXXVII, in three parts:

I. "Childhood," (July), 19-36.
II. "Hereditary Influences: Sanborns, Towles and Leavitts," (Aug.-Sept.), 77-87.
III. "Youthful Love and Marriage," (Oct.-Dec.), 111-132.

"A Macedonian Christian Greek," XLV (Jan., 1913), 17-21.

"Maj. Brian Pendleton in New Hampshire and Maine," XXXIV (Feb., 1903), 119-135.

"Memories of Ancient and Modern Greece," XLIV (August, 1912), 241-248.

"Missouri and New Hampshire," XLIV (April, 1912), 107-116.

"The Nathaniel Weares," XLI (May, 1909), 157-166.

"Old Concord and Monadnock," XLIV (Nov., 1912), 337-341.

"Prison Science versus Prison Discipline: Reminiscences of Six-and-Thirty Years," XXIX (Dec., 1900), 417-424.

"The Sanborn or Samborne Family: Early Opposition to Arbitrary Government in Hampton," XXIII (Dec., 1897), 321-325.

"The Smiths and Walkers of Peterborough, Exeter, and Springfield," XXVII (Oct., 1899), 223-248.

"The So-Called Rebellion of 1683: A Curious Chapter of New Hampshire History," XXXII (Jan., 1902), 39-56; (Feb., 1902), 85-111.

The Granite Monthly (cont'd.)

"Thomas Leavitt and His Artist Friend, James Akin," XXV (Oct., 1898), 225-234.

"The Weare Papers and Gen. Moulton," XLI (Jan., 1909), 27-34.

Harvard Graduates' Magazine

"A Harvard Ascetic--Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles," X (Dec., 1901), 207-211.

The Harvard Magazine

(All the following are to be found in Vol. I unless otherwise indicated.)

Essays and articles:

"The Dial," (April, 1855), 154-159.

" 'Lilian,'" (March, 1855), 128-133.

"King Arthur," (July, 1855), 297-310.

"Poetry," (Jan., 1855), 49-54.

"Scheffer's Dante and Beatrice," (April, 1855), 195-197 (Art review).

"Womanly Ethics," (June, 1855), 259-262.

"The Writings of Sylvester Judd," (Sept., 1855), 345-356; II (Oct., 1855), 393-402.

Reviews:

Flower Fables by Louisa May Alcott (March, 1855), 150.

Ida May (Dec., 1854), 46.

Life and Character of Rev. Sylvester Judd (Dec., 1854), 44-45.

Life of Horace Greeley by James Parton (March, 1855), 149-150.

Poems by Thomas William Parsons (Dec., 1854), 44.

Sermons by Thomas T. Stone (Jan., 1855), 100-101.

Women's Rights Tracts by Theodore Parker and others (Jan., 1855), 100-101.

The Harvard Magazine (cont'd.)

Verse:

"From Faust," (Dec., 1854), 43. (A translation)

"Freshman Translations":
"The Ninth Ode of Horace," (Jan., 1855), 55.
"The Thirty-first Ode," (Jan., 1855), 55-56.

"John Huss," (Dec., 1854), 8-9.

"Memories," (March, 1855), 160-161.

"Patience," (March, 1855), 159-160.

"The Pilgrim," (Jan., 1855), 65-66.

"The Return of Summer," (Dec., 1854), 21.

Editorials:

"Editor's Table," (Jan., 1855), 103-104.

"To the Public," (Dec., 1854), 1-3.

The Independent

"The Two Thoreaus," XLVII (Dec. 31, 1896), 48.

Journal of Mental Science

"Is American Insanity Increasing? A Study," (April, 1894).

Journal of Social Science: Containing the Transactions of the American Association

"Aids in the Study of Social Science: Report of the General Secretary," XXIX (August, 1892), 49-56.

"Circular of the Association," XXVII (Oct., 1890), 125-127.

"The Commonwealth of Social Science: Annual Report of the General Secretary, F. B. Sanborn," XIX (Dec., 1884), 1-10.

"Co-operative Banking in the United States (1873-1898)," XXXV (Dec., 1898), 128-133.

Journal of Social Science (cont'd.)

"Co-operative Building Associations: A Report from the Special Committee on Provident Institutions," XXV (1888), 112-124.

"Dr. Pliny Earle," XXIX (August, 1892), ix-xvi.

"Frances Power Cobbe: a Life Devoted to the Promotion of Social Science," XLII (Sept., 1904), 63-68.

"From the Report of the General Secretary [F. B. Sanborn]," XI (May, 1880), vi-x.

"George William Curtis," XXX (Oct., 1892), xx-xxiv.

"Henry Villard," XXVIII (Dec., 1900), 1-li.

"History of the American Social Science Association in a Letter to Its Present Secretary, I. F. Russell, New York," XLVI (Dec., 1909), 2-6.

"Industrial Education for the Defective Classes," XXVI (Feb., 1890), 94.

"Land-Owning and Home-Building by the Industrious Classes," XXXIX (Nov., 1901), 158-168.

"The Late Professor [Benjamin] Peirce," XII (Dec., 1880), ix-xi.

"The Late Rufus King," XXVIII (Oct., 1891), xxv-xxviii.

"Meeting of the Social Economy Department: Opening Address of the Chairman of the Department," XVI (Dec., 1882), 98-100.

"The Opportunities of America: A Report by the General Secretary," XXIV (1888), 57-62.

"Papers of the Finance and Social Economy Departments: Address of the Chairman," XXV (1888), 98-99.

"Papers of the Social Economy Department: Address of the Chairman," XXII (June, 1887), 98-106.

"Papers of the Social Economy Department: Address of the Chairman of the Department, F. B. Sanborn," XXIII (Nov., 1887), 21-24.

"Past and Present in Social Science," XLIII (Sept., 1905), 1-21.

Journal of Social Science (cont'd.)

"Past and Present Requirements of Prison Science: Remarks in Opening a Debate," XX (Dec., 1899), 123-131. (Sanborn took part prominently in the discussion which followed this and other questions, 132-135, 227-228.)

"The Pleasures of Social Science: Annual Report of the General Secretary," XVIII (May, 1884), 19-28.

"A Prison for Women," VII (1874), 373-374. (Written with John Ayres and others.)

"Report of the Department of Social Economy," XI (May, 1880), 86-92.

"Report of the General Secretary," XII (Dec., 1880), 1-5.

"Report of the General Secretary," XVI (Dec., 1882), 6-16.

"Report of the Treasurer and Publication Committee," XII (Dec., 1880), 5-7.

"Report on Co-operative Building and Loan Associations," XXVI (Feb., 1890), 118-125.

"Social Changes in the United States in the Half-Century, 1850-1900," XXXVIII (Dec., 1900), 134-146. (Followed by a discussion involving Sanborn, 189-193.)

"Social Relations in the United States," XX (Dec., 1899), 69-74. (Followed by a discussion involving Sanborn, 75-77.)

"Social Science in the Nineteenth Century: A Report Made to the Science Association," XXX (Oct., 1892), 1-11.

"Social Science in Theory and in Practice," IX (1878), 1-13.

"The Social Sciences: Their Growth and Future," XXI (1886), 1-12.

"The Supervision of Public Charities," I (1869), 72-87.

"The Three-Fold Aspect of Social Science in America," XIV (Nov., 1881), 26-35.

"The Work of Social Science in the United States," VI (1874), 36-45.

"The Work of Social Science, Past and Present," VIII (1876), 23-39. (Reprinted for the Special Papers of the Social Science Association by G. P. Putnams Sons, New York; Porter and Coates, Philadelphia; Robert Clarke and Co., Cincinnati.)

Journal of Social Science (cont'd.)

** "The Work of Twenty-five Years: A Report of the General Secretary," XXVII (Oct., 1890), xliii-xlix.

Kansas State Historical Society, Transactions or Collections (title varies)

"Autobiography of F. B. Sanborn (Published by resolution of the twenty-seventh annual meeting of the State Historical Society, upon the occasion of the receipt of a bronze bust of Mr. Sanborn, December 2, 1902)," VIII (1903-1904), 415-423.

[Letter] "From Frank B. Sanborn, To the Quarter-Centennial Celebration Committee, Topeka, Kansas," III (1883-1885), 467-468. (The letter was dated Concord, Mass., January 25, 1886.)

"Some Notes on the Territorial History of Kansas," XIII (1914-1915), 249-265.

Kansas Magazine

"Birthday Sonnets," I (1872), 138.

"Oliver Brown," I (1872), 68.

The Liberator

"Henry David Thoreau," (May 23, 1862). (This sonnet was reprinted in the Concord Monitor May 24, 1862.)

Literary World

"Emerson and His Friends," XI (May 22, 1880), 179. (Whitford notes.)

[Emerson's] "Position in Literature as Defined by Himself," XIII (May 20, 1882), 161-162. (Whitford notes.)

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings

(As the volumes are somewhat erratically numbered, they are referred to here by dates only. This bibliography does not include Sanborn's many miscellaneous remarks or his statements upon presentation of gifts or curios to the Society. These may be found by referring to the index in individual volumes. Square brackets indicate a title that I have supplied, usually from the running head or the index to the volume.)

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings (cont'd.)

"Boston and New York after the Revolution," (1913-1914), 231-240.

[Captain Nathaniel Folsom's Fight], (1903, 1904), 317-325.

"Churchmen on the Pascataqua, 1650-1690," (1911-1912), 211-243.

"Colonel Weare of Hampton Falls (1713-1786)," (1913-1914), 61-66.

"The Conversion of a Loyalist to a Patriot: of a St.John to St. Jean de Crevecoeur," (1916-1917), 94-109.

[Dr. Barefoot and Dr. Greenland], (1905), 228-294.

"The Early History of Kansas, 1854-1861," in three parts, (1907, 1908), 219-229, 331-359, 452-498.

"Edward Gove and his Confiscated Estate," (1911-1912), 628-640.

[Metabolism and Metathesis of Slavery], (1911-1912), 508. (The paper, though given, was not printed.)

"A Mystery in the Early Life of Hector St. John," (1915-1916), 412-416.

[Paper relating to Sanborn's recent discovery of a collection of Meschech Weare papers], (1908, 1909), 17-22.

"Papers relating to the Thompsons and Cogswells of New England (1858-61)," (1903), 77-87.

[Remarks on Joseph Willard], (1911-1912), 583-586.

[Remarks upon exhibiting a copy of Dr. Langdon's map of New Hampshire], (1903, 1904), 399.

"Samuel Langdon, S. T. D., Scholar, Patriot, and President of Harvard University," (1903, 1904), 192-232.

"St. John de Crevecoeur and the Revolution," (1906, 1907), 582-586.

"St. John de Crevecoeur, the American Farmer (1735-1813)," (1906, 1907), 32-83.

[Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson, a paper written "to disprove the charges made against them of being unbelievers and atheists" and to discuss "Gouverneur Morris's conduct toward Paine in France"], (1909, 1910), 423. (Only extracts of this were read; none of it was printed.)

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings (cont'd.)

"Tribute of Mr. Sanborn" (at the time of the death of Charles Francis Adams, Jr., President of the Society), (1914-1915), 407-409.

[Tribute to George H. Monroe, at the time of his death], (1903, 1904), 5-10.

"Two New Hampshire Libraries in Hampton Falls, 1785," (1909-1910), 33-45. (Appended to his discussion is a partial list of Dr. Langdon's library.)

"William Ellery Channing and John Brown," (1909-1910), 687-690.

Massachusetts State Board of Health, Annual Report

"American leaders after Rust and Wyman," VII, 349.

The Nation

"Thoreau and Confucius," XC (May 12, 1910), 481.

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings

(Only Sanborn's addresses, papers, and important or extended remarks appear in this bibliography. Several score of less important remarks which he made during discussion periods, which do not appear here, may be found by referring to the index of each volume. Square brackets indicate a title that I have supplied, usually from the running head or the index to the volume.)

July 25-30, 1881:

"Opening Address," 4-19.

"Report from the States [Massachusetts]," 55-57.

August 7-12, 1882:

"Remarks by F. B. Sanborn," 16-18.

[Female Criminals], 185-186.

"Report for Massachusetts," 52-58.

"Discussion of Insanity Resumed," 82-83.

[County Care of Insane Paupers], 102-104.

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings (cont'd.)

August 7-12, 1882 (cont'd):

[Children's Aid Society], 154-155.

[Treatment of Infants], 204-207.

[Discussion of Insane Paupers], 236-239.

[Separation of Chronic Insane from Those More Recently Insane], 102.

[Inadequacy of Mr. Brace and the Children's Aid Society to Meet the Need], 154-155.

Sept. 24-30, 1883:

[Remarks on the death of Dr. Harvey B. Wilbur], xxx.

[Acceptance of the Mayor's Speech of Welcome], 6-8.

June 4-10, 1885:

With Charles S. Hoyt, Hastings H. Hart, A. G. Byers, Cadwalader Biddle, and A. O. Wright, "A Report on the Statistics of Pauperism and Insanity," 383-387.

"The Prevention of Pauperism: Report of the Standing Committee," 402-406.

[Tribute to the Memory of Prof. George I. Chace], 491.

July 15-22, 1886:

"Response of F. B. Sanborn" [to the Introductory Address], 10-11.

"Migration and Immigration," 253-259.

"Care of the Chronic Insane in Families," 260-267.

[Report from Massachusetts], 321-322.

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings (cont'd.)

August 25-31, 1887:

"Address of F. B. Sanborn," 12-13.

"Work Accomplished by the State Boards: Report of the Standing Committee on State Boards of Charities," 75-105.

"Education of the African Race," 170-172.

"Regulation of Emigration," 212-214.

[An amusing impromptu speech], 276-277.

[Tribute to the Memory of Miss Dorothea Dix], 308-309.

July 5-11, 1888:

[Informal Report for the State of New Hampshire], 355.

Sept. 11-18, 1889:

[Treasurer's Report], 342-345.

May 14-21, 1890:

"Indoor and Outdoor Relief," 73-80.

"Outdoor Relief in Greece and Italy: A Letter to the Conference," 94-99. (Written during one of two trips to Europe.)

May 13-20, 1891:

"Response [to the Opening Addresses by the Governor and Mayor] of Mr. F. B. Sanborn," 7-8.

"Public Charities in Europe: An Address Given Before the Conference on Sunday Night, May 17," 167-186. (Bound in with the Harvard College copy of A Memorandum on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and A Plan for Reorganizing the State Department of Charity and Lunacy.)

"Discussion on Hospitals," 356.

[Prohibition of Immigration], 388.

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings (cont'd.)

June 23-29, 1892:

"Immigration and Interstate Migration: Report of the Standing Committee," 76-89.

"Report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure," 337-338.

June 8-11, 1893:

[Reaction Against Extravagant Buildings for the Insane], 27.

May 23-30, 1895:

"The Increase of Insanity," 186-194.

"Supplementary Report," 366.

[Remarks on the Death of the Hon. George S. Robinson], 484-485.

[Remarks on the Death of the Hon. H. H. Giles], 486-487.

[Remarks on Interstate Migration], 488-489.

July 7-14, 1897:

[Reports from States:] "Western States," 373.

May 18-25, 1898:

[Introduction edited by F. B. Sanborn], xxxix-liv.

"The Advantages of Strict Settlement Laws," 231-236.

"Insanity and Immigration," 268-275.

May 18-24, 1900:

"State Care Versus State Custody," 93-105.

"Response of Mr. Sanborn [to the speech of welcome], 392.

June 3, 1902:

"Discussion on Almshouse Hospitals," 524-526.

[Quotation of an unpublished address of Sanborn's in a speech by Julia C. Lathrop, Hull House], 196-197.

"Discussion on the Care of the Insane," 509-510.

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings (cont'd.)

May 6-12, 1903:

[On the Percent of Colored Criminals], 590-591.

June 15-22, 1904:

[The Difference Between Manual Training and the Teaching of a Trade], 513-514.

[Discussion on Defectives], 549-550.

[Concerning Mrs. Hayman's Progressive Methods], 592.

[Concerning Zebulon Brockway], 594-597.

[Discussion on State Supervision], 599.

[About the Province to Be Served by the National Conference of Charities and Correction], 613-614.

May 9-16, 1906:

[Resolution on the Deaths of Four Officers], 558.

June 12-19, 1907:

"Past and Present Care of the Insane in Private Families," 448-452.

May 6-13, 1908:

[Report on the Insane], 22.

June 9-16, 1909:

"The Progress in the Treatment of Insanity During the Past Half-Century," 67-77.

[On Life Insurance], 381.

June 7-14, 1911:

[Sanborn Speaks upon Being Introduced as the Oldest Living Ex-President of the Organization], 472.

[Discussion:] "The Recreant Husband and Father," 494.

National Prison Association, Reports

(From the Index)

"District Prisons: Resolution," (1870), 470.

"Indeterminate Sentence," (1883), 47-59.

Irish Convict System:
"Answers to Questions," (1870), 476, 479.
"How Far Is the Irish Prison System Applicable to American Prisons?" (1870), 406.

Johnson, Mrs. E. C., memorial remarks on, (1899), 120.

"Juvenile Reformatories," (1870), 474, 494.

"Massachusetts Penal Institutions," (1873), 400.

Mrs. Johnson's Success in Reforming Criminal Women, (1899), 62.

"Pardons," (1884), 51.

"Prison Discipline: Report of Standing Committee," (1874), 59.

"Prison labor," (1883), 41-42.

"Reformation of Prisons, Historically Stated," (1898), 395.

Remarks on Zebulon Brockway at His Memorial Service, (1899), 121.

Remarks on Fred H. Wines at His Memorial Service, (1899), 116.

"Reminiscences of Prison Reform in America," (1898), 72.

"Requirements of Prison Science," (1899), 58.

"Visits to Prisons," (1896), 341.

"Three Main Classes of Offenders," (1898), 396.

The New England Magazine

"General John Sullivan and the Rebellion in New Hampshire," n.s., XXIII (Nov., 1900), 323-336. (Whitford notes.)

"The Home and Haunts of Lowell," V (Nov., 1891), 275-302.

"The Portraits of Emerson," n.s. XV (Dec., 1896), 449-468.

New Hampshire Historical Society, Proceedings

"General John Stark: His Genius and Achievements as Factors in the Accomplishment of American Independence," III (March 8, 1893), 391-414.

Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications

"Ohio Researches into Archaeology," XI (1903), 151-152. (First printed in the Springfield Daily Republican.)

Scribner's Monthly

"The Homes and Haunts of Emerson," XVII (Feb., 1879), 496-511.

Springfield Daily Republican

(To present a complete bibliography of the articles which Sanborn wrote for this newspaper would require listing the title and the date of publication of two articles a week for forty-nine years, almost without interruption. As such a task is impossible within the limits of time needed for this dissertation, I list here only the dates of those articles which appear in the footnotes of my main text.)

March 28, 1873
April 10, 1873
April 15, 1873
May 23, 1873
Jan. 11, 1877
Jan. 18, 1877
Feb. 1, 1877
Jan. 29, 1878
March 17, 1878
March 21, 1878
March 27, 1878
June 26, 1878
July 9, 1878
July 30, 1878
Oct. 17, 1878
Jan. 21, 1879
Feb. 17, 1879
March 12, 1879
May 28, 1879
June 10, 1879
Dec. 18, 1879
Sept. 30, 1893
Feb. 10, 1894
Feb. 24, 1894
March 10, 1894
March 17, 1894
April 21, 1894
March 5, 1898
March 19, 1898
August 3, 1901
Feb. 10, 1917
Feb. 24, 1917

Sunday Magazine

"The Real John Brown, By His Friend, Frank B. Sanborn," (July 29, 1906).

SECTION III. SECONDARY SOURCES

(In this section of the bibliography I am particularly indebted to Francis H. Allen, A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau. I am also indebted to Mrs. Herbert Buttrick Hosmer, 22 Elm St., Concord, Mass., for permitting me to use her Scrapbook of Sanborn clippings. Though I am indebted to her for many of the articles given here, I list the Scrapbook as a reference only when bibliographical data on an item are incomplete.)

Abbot, Edwin H. Apocrypha Concerning the Class of 1855 of Harvard College, and Their Deeds and Misdeeds During the Fifteen Years Between July, 1865, and July, 1880. Boston: Alfred Mudge, 1880.

_____. "News from the Classes," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, (June, 1917), pp. 555-559.

Adams, James T. New England in the Republic, 1776-1850. Boston: Little, Brown, 1926.

Adams, Oscar Fay. Some Famous American Schools. Boston: Dana Estes, 1903.

Adams, Raymond. Review of Carl Bode, Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau, NEQ, XVII (March, 1944), 116.

Adams, Raymond, ed. Walden: or Life in the Woods. Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1930.

Albee, John. "Channing's Life of Thoreau," Springfield Republican, (Feb. 1, 1903). (Review of Sanborn's edition of Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist.)

Allen, Francis H. A Bibliography of Henry David Thoreau. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908.

_____. Thoreau's Editors: History and Reminiscence. The Thoreau Society, Booklet No. 7. Monroe, N. C.: Nocalore Press, 1950.

"Arrest of F. A. [sic] Sanborn of Concord, Mass.," [Publication unknown]. Hosmer Scrapbook.

"Arrival of Sanborn. A Meeting Held," [Publication unknown], Concord, Mass. (April 5, 1860). Hosmer Scrapbook.

[Atkinson, J. H.] "The Nomad" [Regular column], Boston Evening Transcript (June 25, 1917).

Bacon, Leonard Woolsey. Review of Life and Letters of John Brown, New Englander and Yale Review; complete series, XLV (April, 1886), 289-302.

Bartlett, George B., ed. The Concord Guide Book. Boston: Lothrop, 1880. (Contains a brief biography of Sanborn and material on the Concord School of Philosophy.)

Beard, Charles A., and Mary R. Beard. The Rise of American Civilization. New York: Macmillan, 1933. 2v. in 1.

Bell, Charles H. History of the Town of Exeter, New Hampshire. Exeter, 1888.

"Bitter Words," Boston Daily Globe (April 9, 1895). (Concerns Sanborn's fight against Sanford, the Concord embezzler.)

Block, Louis J. "Thoreau's Letters," The Dial, xvii (Oct. 16, 1894), 228-230.

Bode, Carl, ed. The Collected Poems of Henry Thoreau. Chicago: Packard, 1943.

_____, ed. The Portable Thoreau. New York: Viking, 1947.

_____. "Rejoinder," American Literature, XVII (1945-46), 268.

"The Book-Buyer's Guide," The Critic, XLV (Sept., 1904), 285. (Review of Sanborn's New Hampshire: an Epitome of Popular Government.)

Boynton, H. W. "Mr. Torrey's Thoreau," New York Times (Oct. 20, 1906). (Review of the first ten volumes of the Walden Edition of the Writings of Henry David Thoreau.)

Bradley, William Aspenwall. "Reminiscences of Seventy Years: Mr. F. B. Sanborn of Concord Tells Many Anecdotes of His Old Friends and Associates in His Notable Two-Volume Valedictory," [Publication and date unknown]. (Newspaper clipping in Sanborn Papers, American Antiquarian Society.)

Bridgman, Raymond L., ed. Concord Lectures on Philosophy: Comprising Outlines of All the Lectures at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy in 1882, with an Historical Sketch. Cambridge, Mass.: Moses King, 1883.

Brooks, Van Wyck. The Flowering of New England. New York: Modern Library, 1936.

_____. The Life of Emerson. New York: Dutton, 1932.

_____. New England: Indian Summer. New York: Dutton, 1940.

Brown, Warren. History of the Town of Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, From the Time of the First Settlement Within Its Borders: 1640 until 1900. Manchester, N. H., 1900.

Burke, W. J. and Will D. Howe. American Authors and Books. New York: Gramercy Publishing Company, 1943.

Burtis, Mary Elizabeth. Moncure Conway (1832-1907). New Brunswick. N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1952.

"Bust of F. B. Sanborn for Kansas," Boston Transcript (Dec. 3, 1902). (Describes the details of the Elwell bust of Sanborn which Sanborn presented to the Kansas State Historical Society in Topeka.)

Canby, Henry Seidel. Thoreau. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1939.

Carew, Harold D. "Frank B. Sanborn," Boston Transcript (Feb. 28, 1917). (Verse in honor of Sanborn after his death.)

Carpenter, Frederic I., ed. Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. American Writers Series. New York: American Book, 1934.

Chamberlin, Joseph Edgar. John Brown. Boston: Small, Maynard, 1899.

Channing, William Ellery. Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, with Memorial Verses. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1873.

Cheney, Ednah Dow. Reminiscences of Ednah Dow Cheney (Born Littlehale). Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1902.

Clark, Harry Hayden, and Norman Foerster, ed. James Russell Lowell: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. American Writers Series. New York: American Book, 1947.

Clement, E. H. "An Appreciation of Sanborn....," Boston Evening Transcript (Feb. 24, 1917). (An appreciation of Sanborn at the time of his death.)

Colby, James Fairbanks. "New Hampshire," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XX, 123-134.

Coolidge, Louis A. "Republican Party," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXIII, 391-399.

Commager, Henry Steele. Theodore Parker. Boston: Little, Brown, 1936.

"The Complete Thoreau," Chicago Evening Post (Jan. 19, 1907). (Review of the Walden Edition of the Writings of Henry David Thoreau.)

Conant, Wallace B. Paper on Franklin Benjamin Sanborn Written and Read by Wallace B. Conant Before the Concordia Group, Concord, Massachusetts, February 25, 1945. (Concord Free Public Library.)

"Concord and Thoreau," Boston Literary World, XIII (July 15, 1882), 227-228. (Review of Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau.)

"A Concord Arrest in 1860," Middlesex Patriot (March 29, 1901), p. 1.

"The Concord Excitement," [Publication and date unknown]. (Concerns Sanborn's kidnapping.) Hosmer Scrapbook.

"A Concord Fight," Boston Herald (April 5, 1860). Hosmer Scrapbook.

"Concord Flags Drop as Sage Goes to Grave," Boston Herald (Feb. 27, 1917).

"Concord Pays Tribute to Sanborn's Memory," Boston Herald (March 19, 1917.)

"Concord Sage Talks Frankly About Authors,--Frank B. Sanborn Gives Twentieth Century Club Snappy Personal Impressions of Famous Men," Boston Herald (Jan. 5, 1916).

"The Concord School Recalled. Mr Sanborn Speaks at Greenacre on Thoreau and William T. Harris," Springfield Daily Republican (Aug. 31, 1905).

"Concord's Minor Prophet," Boston Herald (Feb. 28, 1917).

Connelley, William Elsey. John Brown. Topeka, Kans.: Crane, 1900.

_____. "Personal Reminiscences of F. B. Sanborn," Kansas Historical Collections, XIV, 63-70.

Crawford, Bartholow V., ed. Henry David Thoreau: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. American Writers Series. New York: American Book, 1934.

Cryder, Maude Ethel. "An Examination of the Bibliophile Edition of Thoreau's Walden." University of Chicago: unpublished master's thesis, 1930.

[Curtis, George William] Review of Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau, Harper's Monthly, LXV (Sept., 1882), 631-632.

"The Death of Dr. Franklin B. Sanborn," The Institution Quarterly [Official Organ of the Public Charity Service of Illinois], VIII (June 30, 1917), 44-46.

"Death of F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Sunday Republican (Feb. 25, 1917), 1, 13.

Dubois, William E. B. John Brown. Philadelphia: G. W. Jacobs, 1909.

Dunton, Edith Kellogg. "An Old and a New Estimate of Thoreau," The Dial, (Chicago), XXXIII (Dec. 16, 1902), 464-466. (Review of Sanborn's edition of Channing's Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist.)

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, ed. Letters to Various Persons. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1865.

"Examination of U. S. Officers," Boston Herald (April 7, 1860). (Concerns the Sanborn kidnapping.)

L. F. "The Concord Embezzlement," Boston Advertiser. (Written Feb. 20, 1895, its date of publication is unknown.) Hosmer Scrapbook.

"F. B. Sanborn's Funeral Services Held in Concord," Springfield Daily Republican (Feb. 27, 1917), 11.

"F. B. Sanborn's Reminiscences on Friendships of Hawthorne," Boston Advertiser (July 8, 1904).

Flower, Milton E. James Parton: the Father of Modern Biography. Durham, N. C.: Duke UP, 1951.

Foerster, Norman. "Thoreau and Old Concord," Yale Review; n.s., VII (Jan., 1918), 430-431.

"Frank B. Sanborn," Boston Transcript (Feb. 24, 1917), 8. (An obituary.)

"Frank B. Sanborn Dead," Boston Transcript (Feb. 25, 1917).

"Frank B. Sanborn Funeral Today," Boston Advertiser (Feb. 26, 1917).

"Frank B. Sanborn Is Eighty," Boston Transcript (Dec. 16, 1911).

"Frank Sanborn Fined: Concord Philosopher Denies Constitutionality of Statute Requiring Him to Connect with State Sewer--He Appeals Fine and Is Held in $200," Boston Transcript (Nov. 17, 1914).

"Frank Sanborn to Be Buried at Concord Today," Boston Herald (Feb. 26, 1917).

"Frank Sanborn's Reminiscences," The Nation, LXXXIX (July 22, 1909), 76-77. (Review of Recollections of Seventy Years.)

Frothingham, Octavius Brooks. Gerrit Smith; 1st ed. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1878.

[Garrison, Wendell Phillips and Francis Jackson Garrison]. William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879; the Story of His Life Told by His Children. New York: Century, 1885-1889.

Genzmer, George Harvey. "Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin," DAB, XVI, 326.

Gilmer, Albert H. "To F. B. S.," Boston Transcript (Feb. 28, 1917). (Verses in his honor written at the time of his death.)

"Great Excitement at Concord, Mass.," Boston Journal (April [4?], 1860). (The article is dated from Concord, April 3, 1860.)

"The Greenacre Lectures. A Reunion of the Concord School of Philosophy," Boston Transcript (August 14, 1897). (Contains the report of Sanborn's address on "Walks and Talks with Emerson and Thoreau.")

"The Greenacre School: Emerson Day," Boston Transcript (August 15, 1896). (The report of an address by Sanborn.)

"John Parker Hale," Encyclopedia Americana; 1947 ed., XII, 633.

Hamer, Philip M. Review of James C. Malin, John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six, Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXX (1944), 581-582.

Harding, Walter. "Franklin B. Sanborn and Thoreau's Letters," Boston Public Library Quarterly, III (Oct., 1951), 288-293.

Harlow, Ralph Volney. Gerrit Smith: Philanthropist and Reformer. New York: Holt, 1939.

Harvard College. Exhibition and Commencement Performances (1853-1854), (1845-1855). (Harvard Archives.)

_____. Records of the College Faculty (1850-1855), XIV. (Harvard Archives.)

_____. The Harvard Magazine Index. (Harvard Archives.)

Haskell, Daniel C., compiler. A Check List of Cumulative Indexes to Individual Periodicals in the New York Public Library. New York, 1942.

Hawkins, Walter. Old John Brown. London: Charles H. Kelley, 1913.

[Hawthorne, Julian]. The Memoirs of Julian Hawthorne; ed. Edith Garrigues Hawthorne. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Hawthorne, Julian. Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1889. 2v.

"He Dwelt with Emerson," Boston Sunday Globe (Dec. 27, 1896).

Higginson, Mary Thacher, ed. Letters and Journals of Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921.

Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. Cheerful Yesterdays. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1898.

Hill, Edwin B. "Thoreau's Biographer," The Friendly Quill, VI (June, 1940), [3-6]. (Reprint in part of a bitter attack by Mrs. Jean Munroe LeBrun against Sanborn for maligning Mrs. Thoreau. This appeared originally in the Boston Advertiser [Feb. 14, 1883] and was reprinted in the Concord Freeman [Feb. 23, 1883].)

Hinton, Richard. John Brown and His Men: with Some Account of the Roads They Traveled to Reach Harper's Ferry. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1894.

"Hoar, Samuel," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XIV, 301.

Hosmer, James Kendall, ed. Winthrop's Journal. New York: Scribner's, 1908. 2v.

Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, ed. New Letters of James Russell Lowell. New York: Harper, 1932.

Howgate, George W. George Santayana. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938.

"In 40 Years--Harvard '55 Has Done Some Handsome Things.--A Splendid List of Men Headed by the Late Bishop Brooks," Boston Daily Advertiser (Sept. 20, 1895).

"In Honor of Mr Sanborn: Resolution Adopted in House--State House Flags at Half-Mast," Springfield Daily Republican (Feb. 27, 1917).

"In Sanborn's Memory--Union Service Will Be Held in Concord Church Sunday Evening," Boston Transcript (March 16, 1917).

J[anvier], T. A. Review of Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau, American, IV (July 15, 1882), 218.

Jernegan, Marcus W. "Andrew Jackson," Encyclopedia Americana; 1947 ed., XV, 574-577.

Johnson, Alexander. "An Appreciation of Frank B. Sanborn," The Survey, XXXVII (March 10, 1917), 656-657.

Jones, S. A. "A Notable New Book," Detroit Journal (May 22, 1902). (Review of The Service.)

_____. "Thoreau and His Works," The Inlander [Ann Arbor, Mich.] IV (1894), 234-240.

G. S. K. "Mr. Sanborn's Courage," Boston Advertiser (Feb. 19, 1895).

Karsner, David. John Brown: Terrible "Saint." New York: Dodd, Mead, 1934.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. Henry David Thoreau. American Men of Letters Series. New York: Sloane, 1948.

"The Last Concord Fight. The Recusant Witness, Sanborn, Before the Supreme Court," [Publication unknown], (April 7, 1860). Hosmer Scrapbook.

"Last of Concord Group Depicts Thoreau: A Comprehensive Biography by the Late Frank Sanborn Celebrates the Centenary of the Famous 'Sage of Walden.'" New York Times (May 27, 1917), Section 7, p. 1.

"The Late Mr. Sanborn," Boston Transcript (Feb. 27, 1917). (From the Springfield Republican.) Sanborn Papers, Perkins Institution.

LeBrun, Jean Munroe. Henry Thoreau's Mother. Ysleta, Texas: Edwin B. Hill, 1940.

Le Gallienne, Richard. Review of Poems of Nature, London Star (Jan. 23, 1896).

Leidecker, Kurt F. Yankee Teacher: the Life of William Torrey Harris. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946.

Lewin, Walter. Review of Salt's Selections from Thoreau, Academy, (May 4, 1895), 377.

Leypoldt, F., ed. The American Catalogue. New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1880--.

"The Listener." Review of The Life of Henry David Thoreau (1917), Boston Transcript (March 7, 1917).

"The Listener." [On the death of Sanborn], Boston Transcript (July 3, 1917).

Lowell, James Russell. The Poems of James Russell Lowell Containing The Vision of Sir Launfal, A Fable for Critics, Under the Willows, The Bigelow Papers, and Other Poems. London: Oxford UP, 1926.

Malin, James C. John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1942.

Matthiessen, F. O. American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. New York: Oxford UP, 1941.

"Memorial of F. B. Sanborn to the Senate of the United States," Boston Traveller (April 11, 1860).

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Development of Harvard University Since the Inauguration of President Eliot (1869-1929). Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1930.

_____. Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1936.

[Morse, J. T.] Review of Sanborn's Life and Letters of John Brown, Atlantic Monthly, LVII (February, 1886), 272-275.

Mott, Frank Luther. American Journalism: a History of Newspapers in the United States Through 260 Years: 1690 to 1950. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

_____. A History of American Magazines (1865-1885). Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1938.

"Mr. Sanborn's Case," Boston Journal, (April 5, 1860).

"Mr. Sanborn's 'Thoreau,'" The Critic, II (July 29, 1882), 197-198.

Mumford, Lewis. The Golden Day: a Study in American Experience and Culture. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

Nevins, Allan and Henry Steele Commager. The Pocket History of the United States, rev. ed. New York: Pocket Books, 1951.

"New Books Reviewed," North American Review, CCVI (August, 1917), 308-311.

Newton, John. Captain John Brown of Harper's Ferry. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1902.

"Nol Pros Case Against 'Sage of Concord,' Dist. Atty. Corcoran Denounces Board of Health That Brought Sanborn Charges," [Publication unknown] (March 29, [?]). (Quinquennial File, Class of 1855, Harvard Archives.)

Norton, Charles Eliot. Review of James Redpath, The Public Life of Captain John Brown, Atlantic Monthly, V (March, 1860), 378-381.

Notice of The Service, New York Evening Post (May 16, 1902).

"Notes," The Critic, n.s., XI (March 9, 1889), 123. (An account of the death of Thomas Parker Sanborn.)

"Notes," The Nation, LXXIII (July 18, 1901), 52.

"Notes," The Nation, LXXVI (June 11, 1903), 474.

Nye, Russel Blaine. George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel. New York: Knopf, 1944.

"Passing of Frank B. Sanborn ...," Boston Evening Transcript (Feb. 24, 1917).

"Pay Tribute to Frank B. Sanborn: Simplicity Marks Funeral Service," Boston Advertiser (Feb. 27, 1917).

"Philosopher Pleads His Own Case; Fined $50," Boston Herald (Nov. 17, 1914).

[Picture of] F. B. Sanborn. Boston Evening Record (Feb. 24, 1917) or Boston Transcript (April 15, 1915). (Quinquennial File, Class of 1855, Harvard Archives.)

[Picture of] F. B. Sanborn "from a bas-relief by Victor D. Brenner," from the cover of The Survey (June 16, 1917).

[Picture of] "The House Where the U. S. Officers Were Concealed Previous to Proceeding to Arrest F. A. [sic] Sanborn," Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper (April 21, 1860).

Powers, H. N. Review of The Life of Henry David Thoreau (1917), The Dial (Chicago), III (August, 1882), 70-71.

Purves, James. Review of Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau, Academy, XXII (Oct. 14, 1882), 271-272.

Randall, James G. Review of James C. Malin, John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six, American Historical Review, XLVIII (1943), 819-820.

Redpath, James. The Public Life of Capt. John Brown, with an Auto-biography of His Childhood and Youth. Boston: Thayer and Eldridge, 1860.

"Report of the School Committee of Concord for the Year Ending April 2, 1860," Reports of the Selectmen (Year Ending April 2, 1860). Concord Library.

Review of Sanborn's A. Bronson Alcott, The Academy, XXIX (Feb. 20, 1886), 122-124.

Review of A. Bronson Alcott, Atlantic Monthly, LXXIII (April, 1894), 549-555.

Review of A. Bronson Alcott, Boston Herald, (May 22, 1863).

Review of A. Bronson Alcott, The Critic (May 27, 1893), 348-349.

Review of A. Bronson Alcott, The Spectator [London], LXXII (Feb. 24, 1894), 274-275.

Review of A. Bronson Alcott, Unity (August 3, 1893). Hosmer Scrapbook.

Review of Sanborn's Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau, The Nation, LIX (Oct. 18, 1894), 291-292.

Review of Sanborn's Familiar Letters, The Truth Seeker (June 24, 1893).

Review of Henry D. Thoreau, Harper's Magazine, in the Editor's Easy Chair, LXV (Sept., 1882), 631-632.

Review of Henry D. Thoreau, The Truth Seeker, XX (June 24, 1893), 398.

Review of The Personality of Emerson, The Critic, XLVI (Jan., 1905), 93.

Review of The Personality of Thoreau, The Nation, LXXIV (Feb. 6, 1902), 114.

Review of Poems of Nature, Athenaeum (Oct. 17, 1896), 517-518.

Review of The Service, The Critic, XLI (Dec., 1902), 578.

Review of The Service, The Nation, LXXV (August 7, 1902), 117-118.

Review of The Service, Boston Transcript (May 21, 1902).

Review of Sanborn's edition of Channing, Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, Athenaeum (Jan. 17, 1903).

Review of Sanborn's edition of Channing, Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist, The Nation, LXXV (Nov. 20, 1902), 403.

Review of Victor C. Sanborn, Genealogy of the Family of Sanborne or Sanborn, The Nation, LXIX (Oct. 12, 1899), 284-285.

Rusk, Ralph L., ed. The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson. New York: Columbia UP, 1939. 6v.

"'Sage of Concord' in Court Today--Sanborn, for Seventh Time, is Summoned in Drain Case." [Publication unknown], (June 25, [?]). (Quinquennial File, Class of 1855) Harvard Archives.)

"Sage of Concord is Fined $10--Sanborn Appeals Court Decision in Sewer Case," [Publication unknown] (July 9, [?]). (Quinquennial File, Class of 1855, Harvard Archives.)

Salt, Henry S. "Thoreau and the Simple Life," Humane Review (London), (Jan. 1907), 202-208.

_____. "Thoreau in Twenty Volumes," Fortnightly Review, n.s. LXXXIII (June, 1908), 994-1004.

"The Sanborn Case," Boston Weekly Journal (April 5, 1860).

"Sanborn Defends Himself: an Episode in the Charities Conference at Louisville, Ky.," Boston Herald (Sept. 30, 1883).

"Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXIV, 247.

"Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin," National Cyclopedia of American Biography, VIII, 466-467.

"Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin," Who Was Who in America, (1897-1942), I, 1075-1076.

"Sanborn Subject of Paper Read at Meeting of Local Study Group," Concord Herald (March 1, 1945).

Sanborn, Victor Channing. English Ancestry of the American Sanborns; a Supplement to the Samborne-Sanborn Genealogy. Kenilworth, Ill., 1916.

_____. "Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, A. B.," The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, LXXI (Oct., 1917), 291-295. (Contains most of the material appearing in Sanborn, V. C., Genealogy.) (Reprinted as Memoir of Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, A. B. Boston: F. H. Gilson, 1917.)

"Sanborn's John Brown," The Nation, XLI (Oct. 15, 1885), 324-325.

"Sanborn's Thoreau," The Nation, XXXV (July 13, 1882), 34-35.

Santayana, George. Persons and Places: the Background of My Life. New York: Scribner's, 1944.

Sargent, George H. "Frank B. Sanborn's Jewels and Junk," Boston Evening Transcript (Sept. 19, 1917), part 2, p. 4.

_____. "Thoreau's Personality," Boston Transcript (Dec. 14, 1901). (A review of The Personality of Thoreau.)

Schiller, Frederick. The Works of Frederick Schiller: Historic and Dramatic. London: Bell and Daldy, 1869.

Shepard, Odell, ed. The Journals of Amos Bronson Alcott. Boston: Little, Brown, 1938. 2v.

_____. Pedlar's Progress: the Life of Bronson Alcott. Boston: Little, Brown, 1937.

Spiller, Robert, and others. Literary History of the United States. New York: Macmillan, 1948. 3v.

"Sophocles, Evangelinus Apostolides," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXV, 262.

Stanwood, Edward. "Memoir of Franklin Benjamin Sanborn," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society (1917-1918), LI, 307-311.

"State Honor for Mr Sanborn," Springfield Daily Republican (March 1, 1917). (An editorial reprinted from the Boston Transcript.)

"Stedman, Edmund Clarence," Encyclopedia Americana, 1947 ed., XXV, 561.

Stedman, Edmund Clarence, ed. An American Anthology (1787-1900): Selections Illustrating the Editor's Critical Review of American Poetry in the Nineteenth Century. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1900.

_____. Poets of America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.

Stern, Madeleine B. Louisa May Alcott. Norman: Oklahoma UP, 1950.

Strandness, Theodore Benson. "Emerson's Sensory Relations with Nature." University of Minnesota: unpublished master's thesis, 1942.

Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts. In the Matter of F. B. Sanborn, on Habeas Corpus. Brief of Counsel for Silas Carleton. n.t.p. (In the Widener Library.)

Swayne, Josephine Latham. The Story of Concord; 2nd ed., rev. Boston: Meador, 1939.

Swift, Lindsay. "Frank B. Sanborn, the Individualist," Harvard Alumni Bulletin (March 8, 1917), 449-450.

T [Horace Traubel] "Thoreau," The Conservator (Philadelphia) (Jan., 1903), 171.

"The Tewksbury Almshouse," Boston Daily Advertiser (March 3, 1876), 2.

"The Tewksbury Almshouse Investigation--Senator Stedman and Frank Sanborn," Boston Daily Advertiser (March 14, 1876), 4.

Tharp, Louise Hall. The Peabody Sisters of Salem. Boston: Little, Brown, 1950.

"Thirty-Sixth Congress ... First Session. Mr. Sanborn's Case Before the Senate," Washington [Publication unknown] (April 10, 1860). Hosmer Scrapbook.

"Thoreau," Independent, LIV (Dec. 11, 1902), 2959-2960. (A review of Sanborn's ed. of Channing's Thoreau: the Poet-Naturalist.)

"Thoreau as a Poet," London Daily Chronicle (Nov. 9, 1895). (A review of Poems of Nature.)

"Thoreau: His Personality as Mr. Sanborn Remembers it," New York Times (Jan. 11, 1902).

"Thoreau the Poet-Naturalist," Boston Transcript (Nov. 12, 1902). (A review of Sanborn's ed. of the Channing work.)

"Thoreau's Bright World," Boston Transcript (March 16, 1907). (A review of the Walden Edition of Thoreau's Writings.)

"Thoreau's Example," Spectator, LVI (Feb. 17, 1883), 239-240. (A review of Sanborn's Henry D. Thoreau.)

"Thoreau's Verses," Saturday Review, LXXXI (Jan. 18, 1896), 55. (A review of Poems of Nature.)

Traubel, Horace. With Walt Whitman in Camden. Boston: Small, Maynard, 1906-1914. 3v.

"An Unpublished Essay by Thoreau," New York Times Saturday Review, (May 31, 1902). (A review of The Service.)

Van Doren, Mark. Henry David Thoreau: a Critical Study. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

Villard, Oswald Garrison. John Brown (1800-1859): a Biography Fifty Years After; rev. ed. New York: Knopf, 1943.

_____. Review of James C. Malin, John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six, Saturday Review of Literature, XXVI (June 26, 1943).

Wagner, Charles A. Harvard: Four Centuries and Freedoms. New York: Dutton, 1950.

Warren, Austen. "Lowell on Thoreau," SP, XXVII (1930), 442-461.

Warren, Robert Penn. John Brown: the Making of a Martyr. New York: Payson and Clarke, 1929.

Webb, Richard D., ed. Life and Letters of Capt. John Brown Who Was Executed at Charlestown, Virginia, Dec. 2, 1859, for an Armed Attack upon American Slavery; with Notices of Some of His Confederates. London: Smith, Elder, 1864.

Weiss, John. Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, Minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, Boston. New York: D. Appleton, 1864. 2v.

White, William. A Henry David Thoreau Bibliography (1908-1937). Boston: Faxon, 1939.

"Widow of Frank B. Sanborn," Boston Transcript (Feb. 27, 1918). (On the death of Mrs. Sanborn.)

Wilson, Butler R. "To F. B. Sanborn," Springfield Weekly Republican (March 22, 1917). (A tribute given at the Concord Memorial Meeting.)

Wade, J. S. A Contribution to a Bibliography from 1909 to 1936 of Henry David Thoreau. Reprinted from Journal of the New York Entomological Society, XLVII (June, 1939), 163-203.

[Watts, Theodore] Review of Henry D. Thoreau, Athenaeum, II (Oct. 28, 1882), 558-560.

Wilson, Hill Peebles. John Brown: Soldier of Fortune: a Critique. Boston: Cornhill Company, 1918.

Wingate, Charles E. L. "Boston Letter," The Critic (Sept. 22, 1894), 106. (A review of The Writings of Henry David Thoreau.)

"Wrath and Fun," Boston Journal (August 6, 1894).