

James Mill's Common Place Books
Robert A. Fenn

CPB Editing Principles

When I began to work on Mill's notebooks as a graduate student in the very early 1960's, my major problem was reading his crabbed, occasionally gouty, late 18th. century hand. This, combined with the difficulty of his references and allusions to material, meant that, in order to read the material at all, I had to transcribe it in large sections, rather than take random notes. In some part, this explains the path I took when I decided to transcribe the five volumes as a whole. I began (very gradually I regret to say) to appreciate the fact that these notebooks revealed a somewhat different, if no more amiable, Mill from that of the textbook (even Halévy's magistral work). Hence I decided that, if (or when) these were ever published, I would produce an edition that would be immediately readable. This, combined with my rustiness in Latin, and my lack of knowledge of Greek, meant that I would produce an edition that was basically unilingual. Hence, even in the beginning, I translated all lengthy passages in foreign languages, and left in only those short phrases that were 'tags' or there for stylistic reasons. I do not regret this decision, for the most part, as I have provided considerable reference to the original source in each case, and I have left in the shorter quotations (with translation following or in footnotes). I begin with this autographical note to indicate the reason behind what will surely be the most controversial feature of my edition of the notebooks. Although I admire greatly the path taken by Colburn in her edition of Coleridge's Notebooks where all the editorial matter is in a second accompanying volume (identifications, translations, allusions to & use in other works of Coleridge etc.), or the similar treatment of Marx's work in the new Gesamtausgabe (known as Mega2), where despite the abundant detail of the accompanying volume of notes for each volume of text one must still turn to the Marx-Engels Jahrbücher for further information (one wonders if the central committee of the Socialist Unity Party has discussions on the socialist norm in footnotes); my conviction is that the course I took is the right one in essence. Despite its rather rarified nature, this text will not have any impact unless it can be rather straightforwardly read--some of the pages have texts in four different languages after all. Hence my discussion will centre on the various areas of editing, what I have done in those areas, and what changes might/should be made in the final editing.

1. Punctuation.

I have tried to reproduce Mill's own punctuation with the following additions.

- i) Mill hardly ever provided the final full stop in a paragraph or sentence--I have tacitly added all of these.
- ii) Nearly all the quotations were without quotation marks--I have tacitly added all of these.
- iii) Mill's use of the dash was most variable. I have reduced them to two sizes:— or -. In longer quotations, if one compares the quotation to the original text, it becomes clear that the short dash was often, (but not always) used by Mill to indicate the paragraph break. I have not introduced a new paragraph at these points, but merely left the dash in.
- iv) When he did indicate that he was making an ellipsis anywhere from a few dots or dashes were used to some ten or twelve. I have standardized this to ...
- v) Mill's use of the colon was excessive--I have retained most of these, but where they could plausibly be read as semi-colons I have done so (I probably have not done this

enough). I would note that Mill's published work is not dominated by overuse of colons except during part of 1805 when there was a printer's strike in London, and *The Literary Journal* used scab (i.e. inexperienced) labour. There may have been conventions about reading these marks that we have lost.

- vi) The occasional sentence needed the judicious addition of a comma here and there to make sense.
- vii) Mill hardly ever indicated the possessive case by the apostrophe s. Most of these were added by me or by my first typist who had a very sturdy sense of what was correct.

With a Macintosh (or for that matter, any good computer programme) I can indicate all added punctuation by putting it into boldface, i.e., . ““ ‘ : ; , . I propose not to do this for {i} & {ii}, here it would have been easier to emphasize the ones he put in. I am not perfectly satisfied by my choice in {iii}. I find the long dash — too long visually (and, as well, by a quirk of programming, it requires a space before and after it, or it clings to the word at each end to create one long, unbreakable word). Here I am tempted to replace it with a double (--) dash. I also intend to retain the standardized form of ellipsis. I find perfectly silly the contortions that Mega2 have gone to in order to indicate every variation of ink, hand, spacing, and emphasis in which Marx indulged himself. In addition, I think it appropriate to read what look like colons as semi-colons where it makes sense to do so. If Mill's printers could do this, I do not know why the same bit of common sense cannot be allowed us. I would use boldface commas and apostrophe s's [, s's] where they have been added.

2. Abbreviations.

This is a much thornier area. Mill used a vast multitude (as one would expect in a set of working notebooks), and he was completely inconsistent in his use of many of them. I have converted all the ampersands into and, filled out most of the unusual or unfamiliar ones (I do not expect that many readers will read LCJ as Lord Chief Justice for example--I was dull enough to think they were the chap's initials at first). Although I know that there is a breed of English scholar that would revel in the eight to ten different ways Mill used to abbreviate Attorney General, the average reader will not (is there such a creature as an average reader with 1.784 children, etc.?). I have left the ordinarily used ones alone (Ib., l. for book, s. for section, etc.), and I will provide a table of abbreviations (both Mill's and mine) at the beginning of the text. I believe that it is sufficient here to alert the reader to what has been done in a prefatory editing note, rather than try to find various means of indicating each expansion (Att[orney] [G]en[eral], or Attorney [G]eneral, etc.).

3. Ellipses.

Apart from standardizing the punctuation of Mill's own to the usual three dots, I have indicated the unnoted ellipses by the usual [...]. In those cases where what was left out was essential to the meaning of the quotation I have included the necessary material in square brackets. Where Mill's omission reveals conscious or unconscious bias (such as the excision of de Staël's praise of Pitt in a passage on the need for continuous reform in government), I have, as well, added in a footnote some comment on the significance of this. I do not believe that in this area I need to make many changes to the text.

4. Sic.

I have avoided much use of this. Mill lived in an age of unstandardized spelling (particularly with regard to family and given names), and sic is more of a hindrance, if not an

affectation, than a service to scholarship. Further, Mill used editions of texts I have not had access to, or been able to figure out--in many cases what seems wrong in his citations clarifies itself when the proper edition is found. For example, most of Mill's Aristotle quotations refer to divisions of the text that modern editions do not follow or make. Where there is an utterly scrambled sentence (as there is bound to be in a text which was for the most part unrevised) I preferred the route of cleaning up the sentence in the text, while noting the original mess in a footnote. I have done the same with incorrect words. I follow here the splendid footnote of Knox, the Hegelian, to paragraph 133 of his translation of the Philosophy of Right. "I have assumed," he most amiably remarked between clenched teeth, "following the Italian translator, that Hegel left out the verb 'to be' in this passage."

5. Capitalization.

I have tried to render consistent what Mill was utterly inconsistent in using--but not overall. It does not seem useful to change back and forth between 'House of Commons' and 'house of commons' in the same paragraph; but it does seem significant that he rarely puts the 'king' in upper case (however, see below my remarks on emphasis). The lesser Strauss (not Edgar, Johann, Josef, or Richard, but Leo) once made a great noise in his review of Von Leyden's Locke, as to whether Locke or the amanuensis put 'god/deus' in lower case--it is indeed an important point, but there are very few instances of such embodied meaning in the rest of the manuscript. Here I am not inclined to make any changes to the present text, but in my final revision I will try to be more consistent, at least, in sections.

6. Deletions.

Here some major changes should be made. From my first draft, right up to my most recent recension, I have endeavoured to include every deletion that could be partially or wholly read. This sort of editorial work is equivalent to the scaffolding needed on large construction projects, and it ought to be removed when the project is finished (though given the work involved in reading or deciphering, editors become inordinately attached to them). Some of these are of great interest--such as those in his non-published obituary of Canning at V 191, where the original, but deleted remark is stronger in tone than the replacement. However, most of them are what one would expect in an unrevised, hastily, and often, I suspect, tiredly written set of notes. The wrong tense, case or subject has been replaced by the correct one; where a translation is being done at sight (Plato's Gorgias at V 4-6 or Voltaire's The Princess of Babylone at V 94r) one expects false starts and new beginnings-- but are all these worth immortalising in footnotes? I see two potential solutions.

The first would be to delete the deletions with the exception of the few significant ones which would be retained in footnotes. I would, as well, note that Mill's Gorgias translation was done at sight because the 27 or 28 deletions strongly indicated that--but nothing more would be done. The other route would be to put significant deletions in footnotes as I have just suggested, and to put all the others into a textual appendix for the morbidly curious. My own preference is to take the first path. However, in the short Bentham fragment in II the some 80+ deletions will be left in, as they have a very different role in his work. I will be putting the original drafts of this into the University of Toronto Archives, and into possibly one English library also.

7. Editing in Text.

A cumbersome expression to indicate that throughout I have preferred to put Mill's sources, the sources for the translations used, quotations from works alluded to, identifications of Mill's articles that the passage concerned reveals, and other related matter into square brackets []

at the end of each paragraph, rather than into footnotes or into a separate volume of editorial notes--though I have, in some very long passages, put some illustrative material into footnotes. In volumes II and V this is completely defensible in that they are composed of very small scraps (sometimes in II there are 14 to 18 pieces a page). In I and III my procedure rests on the conviction that they are topically, but not structurally, organised; i.e., they do not form in each section ('Liberty of the Press' or 'Parliamentary Reform') a coherently arranged and argued whole. Hence, I am not breaking up an argument by putting the illustrative material where I have--Mill had yet to put the final argument into place. If you compare his Britannica article "Liberty of the Press" with the material in the various sections in I and II on the same topic you would be struck by what he did not use, and by what is not to be found in the sections of the relevant manuscripts. What is also striking is that the order of argument of the article is not to be found in the manuscripts. With few exceptions, the manuscripts must be seen as quarries, not as ancient temples slowly being uncovered by Fenn's patient archeological work. These are not akin to Bentham's manuscripts, where large bodies of material in nearly complete form await the scholar's hand and editorial judgement as to what to do with the many quasi-repetitions of sections in order to be brought into the light. [I am not implying that editing Bentham is easier--but it is different]. Only in volume IV is there anything akin to a regular journal, and even here the sections are so short that I do not feel that any major problem arises by using the same approach. My conclusion here is that I do not need to make any major alterations to the form I have followed--if any change were to be made, it surely would be to put the entirety of the editorial matter into a separate volume (on a computer, no more than a problem of tedious manipulation).

In response to some of Mill's more baffling bits I have probably over-annotated the text. In the final revision I intend to use more condensed titles of frequently used items, noting in the source box at the first instance the full title, putting there as well the subsequently used short title, and giving in the bibliography both titles. I will, as well use a more condensed citation scheme, dropping the abbreviations for page, volume and tome except where I am citing both the original in French, and the translation in English (thus Swift, Works, v.III, p.268 will become Works, III 268; whereas de Staël, French Revolution, will be cited t.III 236; v.III 234, in order to indicate the sources in the respective editions). I must introduce consistency in my use of names as well--fortunately my draft name index of the whole has revealed a vast number of problems here and simultaneously given me the material for correcting them.

8. Unilingualism.

Mindful as I am of Engels's injunction that 'leaning languages is a weapon in the class struggle', I am afraid that I have not been able to live up to it in this case. The reason becomes immediately apparent upon any survey of the manuscripts. This may not be the same sort of editor's nightmare that Marx's correspondence represents, where, in a single sentence, he was capable of using four or five languages (and Engels was able to read them all!); but, at times, it comes very close. Consider the problem of Mill's French. The passages are many, and often extensive, particularly of de Staël's *Considérations sur ... la Révolution Française* (since Mill's publisher Baldwin, Cradock & Joy did both the French first edition, and the anonymous English translation, I have often wondered if Mill had a hand in it). Were these quotations, along with all others, restored, I would most definitely have to opt for the editorial matter being put into separate volume(s). Not only would the French have to be in the text volume, it would have to be in the editorial volume as well, since Mill rarely put in any accents (just as French writers of the period did not in their personal correspondence--at least there none in Jean-Baptiste Say's letters to Mill). Then I would have to add a translation! Similar remarks could be made about Mill's

Greek. Further, as I want these to be editions that will be usable by the average scholarly reader, I really question the utility of presenting a text that implies that the reader knows all four languages (or is strong enough to juggle several volumes at a time). Surely the rare reader who wants to look up the original source can do so given the notes, the others will be satisfied with what is there. I will restore, however, many of the short phrases in Latin, French, and Greek that Mill may have wanted to use for stylistic reasons.

9. Paragraph Spacing.

At present there is a rather cumbersome style feature in the text. I have put a doublespace between the paragraphs, and those paragraphs that are part of a continuous passage have an inset first line after the first paragraph. As I intend to try to present a camera ready copy in the final recension, using 10/12 spacing; I will space new paragraphs, which I consider to be a break in the argument from the preceding one, with an extra two points (hence 14 points instead of 12 for these) at the break.

10. Mill's Sources.

I have made a considerable attempt to find and use the editions that Mill consulted when he made up these notes (no easy task for some of the authors). I will continue this search while doing the final revision, but the policy of referring some authors to readily accessible, good, contemporary editions will be retained (Loebs for the classics, Spedding for Bacon, etc.) Mill had, by the way, an access to books far in excess of the average writer for this period--his contacts in publishing, his work with Bentham (who had an excellent personal library--and Mill lived next door to him for twenty years), his reviewing, and his own personal library combined to provide a very wide-ranging body of material to draw upon.

11. Emphasis.

The various titles put at the head of paragraphs in italics or boldface type have come from my reading of the emphasis in Mill's hand. At the beginning of paragraphs in I and III, and many scraps in II, Mill often enlarged and broadened his hand in order to provide a form of title which his eye could easily catch. This trait I have indicated by italics. Where he underlined (single or double) a passage at the beginning of a paragraph or scrap I have used boldface type. In II there are title summary lists which I have used to add titles to material in I. Mill's own references to material in these volumes has often indicated titles for sections as a whole. There is, by the way, at least one volume of notes missing--Political Things A (or I).

There is one visual problem with Mill's emphasis that should be mentioned. In his enlarged, broadened hand it is sometimes very difficult to tell if he is writing King or king. This is true for only a few letters and given my eyesight some might question my readings in places.

I have throughout emphasized the titles of books Mill cites, used quotation marks for titles where it is appropriate to do so, and added emphasis to words or short phrases in foreign languages where it is now customary so to do. Unless otherwise persuaded, I shall retain this in the final revision.

12. Re-arrangement of Material.

There is a clear need to do this. In I, Mill obviously has three sections on "Political (or Parliamentary) Reform" because he was using bound ledger volumes for his notes, hence he had to open up new, spatially separated sections in these when he accumulated more material. I see no reason why these cannot be put together into a continuous sequence. I have not closely analysed these for their temporal order, but I believe that it can be revealed by exact dating of

new works cited which come from the 1820's (after 1825-1826 Mill's handwriting changes quite noticeably). In V the material should be completely resorted following the hints of the title lists at 8r and 30r of V (Mill did not put this volume together--rather it consists of the type of raw material he poured into II, or copied out with extra comment in I and III). In II some of the lost vellum title tags for sections can be restored from the title lists in V. In addition, some of the material should be brought together under one heading. There surely is little need for four scattered bits on religion in this volume.

There is a radically different kind of re-arrangement required as well. In all the volumes there is deleted material which does not belong to the section concerned. It now sits there rather rudely out of place, indeed, seemingly irrelevant. Also, Mill often wrote his notes on the backs of letters. I have made an enormous effort to re-construct these because they often contain nugats about his or Bentham's publishing activities. I believe that this material should be removed to sections or appendices in V. The same remarks apply to notes that I have been able to read on the reverse of pasted down material (time and heavy breathing has caused much of this to work loose). These notes rarely fit in the sections in which they are found.

13. Material Outside the Notebooks.

In an edition as large as this one will be when finished, it may seem excessive to propose adding more, but there is a small body of material outside of the Notebooks which one should consider adding to the proposed re-arrangement of V. I refer to the endleaf notes in books at the J. S. Mill collection in Somerville College Library, Oxford. These contain notes in some 25 books in James Mill's hand, very much like those to be found in V about Paley's Principles or volume VI of Hume's History. They add to our knowledge of Mill's mind and breadth of interests, and they are the only body of written material by him, apart from his correspondence, outside the notebooks. I propose adding these to V, if I can obtain permission to publish them. Would one have guessed that he had read Cudworth, Wolff or Pascal, not to mention minor French essayists of the eighteenth century?

14. Other Author's Material.

In both II and V there is work by other authors. Both Bentham and J. S. Mill have made their contribution. With the exception of some JSM in V, I assume that this material is where it is, with intent. There are also a variety of hands in II and V. Several are those of Bentham's amanuenses; some, I suspect, are those of family members used as Mill's amanuensis (the Hobbes's notes in II for example) as Mill after 1810 increasingly suffered from crippling attacks of gout. Apart from giving in footnotes or in the source box at the end of the paragraph the fact of the different hand, I do not propose to treat this in any different manner from other material. There is the clearest evidence that Mill organized II (he used one of JSM's nature books in which he had originally pressed flowers by the way--I wonder if young tad Mill ever forgave him), and hence this material represents his interests, and, very importantly, matter that he may have been working up for Bentham (as I shall argue in my introduction).

15. Bibliography.

I have divided it into the constituent sources of his thought: [i] Classical (Latin and Greek to the fifth century), [ii] Post-Classical to Modern Latin Writers, [iii] French, and [iv] English. I propose to provide a breakdown of the last category into types (plays, newspapers, novels, etc.).

16. Manuscript Description.

During the course of producing the text as a whole I have carefully indicated all the folio breaks thus /12r/ in the text itself (and the next page is therefore /12v/ etc.) I intend to retain these in the final revision using a double stroke to indicate the end of one page, and a single stroke to indicate the beginning of another thus //12r/. As I will be doing the final revision myself, I will be moving some of these around to make them as unobtrusive as possible (I do not want them to start paragraphs for example). If I can find a page-setter programme that permits me to do it, I will also be putting the folio numbers in the margin (about 18 points out from the edge of the text in the left margin). However, my careful noting of blank pages at the end of each section should be removed--the technical note at the head of each volume of the CPB should contain these details as well as other physical matters such as size, number of pages torn out, watermarks, previous use if any, etc.

17. Long Quotations.

Normally, these would be handled by indenting and reducing the spacing (and/or the type size as well), but as these volumes have a very high proportion of quotation to comment this did not strike me as the appropriate way to do the text. There are, however, three newspaper clippings (in I and II) where it might be better to do them with slightly reduced spacing (say 10/11), and where Mill's emphasis in them by underlining be reproduced by underlining rather than italics.

18. Dating of Material.

Mill's handwriting changed quite noticeably over the three and a half decades of his career. The earliest letter extant that I can positively date comes from the spring of 1803. The last material that I have seen comes from late December 1835 or early 1836. His eyesight evidently suffered from strain after 1825-1826 (his hand became much larger). Much of the material in volumes II and V is written on scraps of letters, some of which can be dated from postmarks or written dates, watermarks, or comments in the letter. These dates determine the earliest possible time the scraps were scribbled on, but little else (given the high cost of linen paper, Mill clearly hoarded letters as a form of notepad). As I have gone through 36 years of newspapers in this period, I can date some material to the week of issue where I need to determine the earliest possible time he could have used the book. It would be helpful, if two or three pages of plates could be added in the edition to illustrate his changing hand, as well as the form of the notebooks in several respects.

19. Biographical Identification.

In the course of making my draft name index I put a great amount of information in it. I believe that it would be sensible to refer the reader to it, rather than constantly adding to the text at various places.

Summary of proposed changes

Overall Revision.

Although I will be starting with V first because it needs to be completely re-arranged, I will thereafter be doing the volumes in the order they will appear in the printed edition (I, III, IV, II, V). As I go through each I will be checking the original manuscript on microfilm (or xerox run of same--there is only so much torture that my eyes can stand) so that the errors of transcription, typing, re-drafting, and revising can be cleared up and cleaned out. This will be both a duty and a necessity if the revisions suggested in the punctuation and other sections are to be achieved.

1. Punctuation.

- i) I will accept advice on whether to replace the long dash (—) with two short dashes (--). I lean towards the latter solution myself.
- ii) All added commas will be indicated as additions by being put into boldface (,).
- iii) All added apostrophe s's will be put into boldface ('s).
- iv) Those colons that can be plausibly read as semi-colons will be.
- v) No attempt will be made to indicate the number of full stops and quotation marks I have added.

2. Abbreviations.

Apart from indicating in a technical note at the start of the edition what I am doing, I intend to fill out all the odd ones, the ampersands, and the irregularly used ones.

3. Ellipses. My standardization of these into ... and [...] should not enrage too many.

4. Sic.

My decision to use this but rarely should stand. As I have now completed a draft name index I find that it probably is more profitable to print the correct names in square brackets following some of his more egregious mistranscriptions. Some of his better mistakes are in the originals (including Hansard).

5. Capitalization. I will standardize it both within and between sections. Should I keep an appendix of the changes here?

6. Deletions. I will retain important variants in footnotes and remove all the trivial deletions from the text. Should I create an appendix for these?

7. Editing in Text.

- i) I will retain the present system of giving sources, citations, cross-references, allusions to or use in published work of Mill, quotations from work mentioned but not cited in the text in [] at the end of the paragraph concerned.
- ii) I will increase the number of brief titles used for source citations, standardize them, and render consistent the use of names (the present draft reflects only too faithfully the scholarly chaos that is engendered when one works on a large manuscript over a 15 year period).

8. Unilingualism. I will maintain what I have done for the most part, but restore short phrases in Greek, Latin and French (this particularly affects V).

9. Paragraph Spacing.

In those areas that are continuous, I will follow normal printing practice (10 point type, 12 point spacing, 12 point first line indent); in those that are not (the major part of the text) I will add 2 points to the paragraph spacing. The eye should catch these breaks fairly easily--in many cases the new paragraph also has a short, italicised title or heading. I would consider putting a number on the paragraph breaks were it not for the fact that in some parts of sections Mill has put numbers or letters on a sequence.

10. Mill's Sources.

I will continue the attempt to find the editions he used and altering some of my citations accordingly; I will also retain (usually in short title) reference to easily available modern editions for the convenience of the reader who may want to look up what Mill is doing to the original. In the bibliography, by using an asterik * or a dagger †, I will be indicating those editions that Mill is known to have used or possessed.

11. Emphasis.

During the course of the revision I mentioned above I will be scanning the use of emphasis. For Mill's broadened, enlarged hand I will use italics, for his broadened, enlarged, extra heavy hand I will use boldface; for his broadened, enlarged, underlined, hand I will use underlined italics;, and for his underlining in the text I will use underlining. I will simply note in the textual introduction that the near entirety of the emphasis in titles of books, foreign words or phrases is editorial.

12.-13. Re-arrangement of, and Additional, Material.

As volume V will receive the most radical re-editing, and be the recipient of some odds and ends now in volumes I to IV, I will begin with it first. Following the title lists to be found at 8r and 30r some fourteen sections might be created into which a good part of the material in V fits. Another eleven section headings might be proposed which will absorb the rest (some closely resembling headings in I and III). In addition I will add the notes Mill scribbled in some 25 books now in Somerville College.

Volumes I and III will be slightly re-arranged so that the various sections on the same topic will follow each other in temporal sequence. Volume II will be somewhat more re-arranged (it is a bit of a mess actually), but the clues for the new order (and section headings where Mill's vellum tags have fallen out) come from the title lists I have already mentioned above.

14. Other Author's Material.

This will be left in with appropriate notes as to the nature of the hand and its possible significance. The material that looks like it comes from one or another of Bentham's amanuenses can only be noted as such; unfortunately the Bentham edition have never brought in a graphologist to identify and distinguish the various hands in the 180+ boxes of mss. The new Marx-Engels edition hired a retired German police inspector to do exactly that, and write a handbook for researchers on the peculiarities of Marx's hand (German scholarship is thorough). I regret to say that I have never seen any samples of the hands of Mill's family except for JSM's.

15. Bibliography.

I believe that the present four part breakdown of the bibliography into its constituent intellectual elements is satisfactory as a guide to the influences on Mill's thought (rather than a straight-forward alphabetical listing that is). I will add an indicator (*) before all titles where the exact edition Mill used is known, and a † where the book is in the JSM collection at Somerville College. I also intend to provide a breakdown of the English material at the end of § IV (i.e., Poetry: See Dryden, Prior, Shakespeare, Swift, etc.).

16. Manuscript Description.

- i) The various page numbers will be retained in the text thus: //12r/ with the double stroke // indicating that the previous page 11r has just ended and the single stroke / that the next is about to begin. I will attempt to reset them so they will not sit obtrusively at the beginning of paragraphs.
- ii) In volumes II and V I will make two large scale changes
 - a. In II where I tried to indicate not only what page each piece was on, but, as well, in which column and how many scraps there were on each page (thus 12a5 meant the fifth, separately, pasted-in scrap in column a of that page, and 12b19 the nineteenth scrap on that page, but in column b, etc.) I will put this information first in the source box at the end of the item, and I will only indicate the page breaks in the regular manner.
 - b. As volume V will be completely re-arranged, I will also remove the scrap number from the front of the paragraph to the source box.
- iii) I will put the page numbers in the margin as well if I can get a page setter programme that will do this (I am exploring two such programmes right now).
- iv) I will remove all physical description of blank pages, volume size, and watermarks, to a textual note at the beginning of each volume.

17. Long Quotations. With the exception of a few pasted in newspaper clippings, they will be treated as normal text. The clippings will be set at 10/11.

18. Dating of Material. A detailed note will be put in the editorial introduction.

19. Biographical Information. The reader will be referred to the name index.

Proposed Arrangement of Text

Printed Volume One (CPB I, III & IV)

Volume I

1. LIBERTY OF THE PRESS I (3r-19v).
2. LIBERTY OF THE PRESS II (81r-105r).
3. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM I (27r-42v).
4. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM II (43r-61v).
5. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM III (160r-i83r).
6. JURY TRIAL (62r-62v).
7. JUDGES-LAW (137r-147v).
8. ARISTOCRACY (119r-121r).
9. SPECULATION & PRACTICE (106r-115r).

10. UTILITY (108r).
11. DEMOCRACY & ARISTOCRACY (1r).

Volume III

1. LOGIC (16r-17r).
2. EDUCATION (33r-37r).
3. RELIGION & BELIEF (73r).
4. RELIGION (198r-217r)
5. POPULAR ERRORS I (94r-114r).
6. POPULAR ERRORS II (138r-149r).
7. WIT-EXPRESSIONS (158r).
8. LITERATURE (177r-179r).
9. INTEREST: ITS INFLUENCE ON WHAT MEN SAY AND THINK (220r-223r).

Volume IV

1. A REFUTATION OF SHERIDAN (1r-2v).
2. HIRELING SCRIBBLERS (3r).
3. A DIALOGUE ON THE THEATRE (3r-8r).
4. ANECDOTES ON HUMAN MOTIVATION (8v-12v).
5. BLACKGUARD REPORTERS (12r).
6. JOURNAL (13r).
7. PROGRESS OF KNOWLEDGE (15r).
8. IMAGINATION & FEELING (32r).
9. INNOVATION IN POLITICS (41r-45r).
10. POPULAR IMPRESSIONS & SUPERSTITION (60r-60v).
11. JOTTINGS (68r-68v).
12. NATIONAL CHARACTERS (76r).
13. IDOLA POLITICA (82r-82v).
14. WAR (87r-87v).
15. THE RATIONALE, IN FRENCH PRINCIPES (99r-99v).
16. COLLECTIONS ON ANCESTRY & BIRTH (117r-117v).
17. WIT (119r).
18. LITERATURE (131r-131v).
19. NOBILITY (139r-139v).
20. ON POLITICS (144r-145v).
21. ARTIFICES (147r).
22. LIBERTY (160r-163v).
23. MISCELLANEOUS (168r-169v).
24. LITERARY ANECDOTES (172r).
25. ON ATTENTION -- EDINBURGH COLLEGE 179? (173v).
26. ADDENDA (99rv, 162rv).

I have left to one side the question of whether IV ought not to be placed first as it contains the oldest material.

THE ABOVE WOULD CONSTITUTE VOLUME ONE OF THE PRINTED EDITION

THE MATERIAL BELOW CONSTITUTES VOLUME TWO OF THE PRINTED EDITION

Printed Volume Two (CPB II & V)

Volume II

1. LIBERTY OF THE PRESS (1r-11v).
2. POLITICAL REFORM (13v-31v).
3. LAW & LAW REFORM (32v-37v).
4. FALLACIES (38v-41v).
5. RELIGION (42v-45r)
-ON CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS (54v-55r)
-BENTHAM ON CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS (61r-67r)
-BEAUCHAMP ON NATURAL RELIGION (74v, 77v-78r)
-JUGGERNAUTICAL UTILITY (80v-84r).
6. PHILOSOPHY (48r-48v).
7. DEMOCRACY & ARISTOCRACY (49v-51v, 53v-55r, 69r-69v, 57r-60v).
8. EXPRESSIONS [PROVERBS & ENGLISH USAGE] (67v-68v).
9. REASON & EDUCATION (71v).
10. J. S. MILL ON GROTE ON MORAL EDUCATION (79v-80r).
11. J. S. MILL'S NOTES ON BERKELEY'S QUERIST (84v-85r).

Volume V

1. MISCELLANEOUS POLITICS.
2. LITERATURE.
3. INN'S.
4. OUT'S.
5. EDUCATION.
6. LOGIC.
7. EXPRESSIONS (PROVERBS & ENGLISH USAGE).
8. LIBEL.
9. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.
10. FALLACIES.
11. VULGAR ERRORS.
12. RELIGION.
13. DEMOCRACY & ARISTOCRACY.
14. LAW.
15. NOTES ON BOOKS (Including Somerville College, Oxford material).
16. OTHER MATERIAL.
17. ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.
18. LETTERS & FRAGMENTS (Including material from Vol. II).
19. INDICES & SCRAP TITLE LISTS.
20. PHILOSOPHY.
21. ORATORY & RHETORIC.

- 22. HISTORY & INNOVATION.
- 23. HUMAN NATURE.
- 24. INTEREST.
- 25. ECONOMICS.

I have already listed the contents of each of the above sections in my accompanying letter with Vol. V.

To the above will be added an editorial preface in printed Vol. I of ca. 75-100 pp., and a bibliography (30 pp.), name index (30 pp.), place index (?10-15 pp.), and subject index (?40-50 pp.) in printed Vol. II.

Sigla

*	Passage marked by an asterik in margin.
-	Ink sidelined passage, in whole or in part.
⌋	Ink side and underlined passage, in whole or in part.
=	Ink underlined passage.
< >	Surround a word that was in the margin next to a passage.
.	Pencil sidelined passage, in whole or in part.
⌋	Pencil side and underlined passage, in whole or in part.
⌋	Pencil underlined passage.
. —	Pencil noted with a —.
⊗	Passage marked by an X in margin.
@	Passage marked by an @ in margin.
¶	Paragraph[s].
§	Section[s].
ss.	Subsection[s].
↑ ↑	Surround a word, phrase or number above the line.

Camera Ready Copy

I will set the copy with the following dimensions for laser printing.

1. Page Size. 4.5" x 6.875".
2. Running Head. Small Caps. (Section title on odd pages, Volume title on even).
3. Type Size. 10 points with 12 point spacing in text, 9 over 10 in footnotes.
4. Type. Times Roman.
5. Laser Printer. LaserWriter Plus unless I can get access to one of the professional quality printers at a reasonable price.
6. Page Number. As a footer--either centered or on the outside edge.

7. Paragraph Breaks. 12 points with a 12 point inset first line. Where new argument begins, 14 points with a 12 point inset first line.

Miscellaneous

Revised/formatted KCG 2009-07-22