Benjamin Franklin was 51 years old in 1757 when he set out for England as a representative of Pennsylvania’s provincial Assembly. He would spend approximately 25 of his final 33 years abroad—first in England and then in France, where he courted and secured an alliance with Louis XVI during the American Revolution. In our cover feature, Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell writes that Franklin felt at home in France, where artists competed to capture his image for posterity.

In this issue of Huntington Frontiers, we encounter stories of people whose ambitions carried them far from home: Scholar Samuel Truett introduces us to Emilio Kosterlitzky, who sought exile not once but twice. The Russian émigré came to Mexico in the late 19th century and served in the Mexican army before arriving in California, where he found unique employment in Los Angeles. American geologist Raphael Pumpelly traveled in the opposite direction, finding himself in pre-Soviet Turkestan in 1903, excavating the ruins of an ancient civilization. Writer Mark Wheeler explores the link between Pumpelly and a modern-day archaeologist named Fredrik Hiebert.

Such international exploits should not be relegated to a bygone era. Botanist Zsolt Debreczy is currently visiting The Huntington, taking a break from his frequent travels documenting conifer trees of the temperate zones of the world. He is putting his finishing touches on his book Conifers Around the World and contemplating his next expedition.

On such journeys of discovery and exploration, The Huntington is both destination and departure point. Archaeologist Fredrik Hiebert’s interest in Raphael Pumpelly brought him to The Huntington, where Pumpelly’s papers are housed. Others, though, can trace the seed of discovery to a moment in the Huntington’s archives, as in the case of Cyndia Clegg (see page 25).

Indeed, The Huntington has long been a place for the comings and goings of scholars, who in turn share with us the adventures and accomplishments of the famous and obscure alike. But it is also a place for contemplation, a place where sixth-grade students from Rockdale Elementary (page 18) can enter the world of history and find a place of their own.

Matt Stevens
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SCHOLAR ELAINE SHOWALTER GIVES VOICE TO LONG-NEGLECTED WOMEN AUTHORS

by Traude Gomez-Rhine

CONSIDER THE CAREERS of these ambitious 19th-century American women writers: Rebecca Harding Davis was a pioneer of realist fiction and a nationally acclaimed journalist. Her groundbreaking novella Life in the Iron Mills, first published in 1861 in The Atlantic Monthly, launched a 50-year career that would produce at least 500 published works.

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps’ most famous book, The Gates Ajar, appeared in 1868, selling almost 200,000 copies. Set during the Civil War, her popular novel was translated into several languages.

Julia Ward Howe is best remembered as having penned the lyrics for “The Battle Hymn of the Republic” but was also famous in her lifetime as a poet, essayist, and lecturer. In 1908 Howe was the first woman elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

Their legacy? Famous during their lives, these women were largely forgotten thereafter.

Elaine Showalter is on a mission to revive their spirit and move them more prominently into the American literary consciousness. The professor emeritus from Princeton University came to The Huntington last year to do research for a book about American women writers from 1650 to 2000. “This is an American legacy that has been neglected and forgotten,” she says.

The topic, of course, is enormous in scope—350 years of American women writers. In one book? Such ambition is usually reserved for multi-volume projects taken on by a committee of academics. Showalter has already carried out a similar mission for British women writers, publishing A Literature of Their Own: British Novelists from Bronte to Lessing in 1977, which highlighted many minor and forgotten women writers from the 1840s through the 1970s. Her work ultimately helped to launch the field of feminist literary history in the United States and Europe, putting her on the academic map and causing much debate within universities around the world.

Showalter had long hoped to do an American version of the British book but for years was as daunted by the prospect as she was intrigued. “For a long time I just didn’t think it was possible,” she says, adding that a typical American woman writer of the 19th century would publish 50 books. Meanwhile in England, “Emily Bronte writes one great novel and dies. That’s kind of sad, but it makes your life as a critic a lot easier,” she says.

Showalter, however, is not one to shy away from big projects, or controversial ones. During her 20 years at Princeton, she wrote more than 20 books, including Elaine Showalter at El Alisal, the Charles Fletcher Lummis House nestled in the Arroyo Seco in Pasadena. In the early 1900s, writers like Mary Austin and Charlotte Perkins Gilman joined an informal literary circle hosted there by Lummis. Photo by Lisa Balckburn.
The New Feminist Criticism (1985), The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture (1986), and Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Media (1997). She also has maintained a fruitful side career as a journalist, writing for British newspapers such as the Evening Standard and Financial Times and American newsstand perennials Vogue and People magazines. Such an eclectic array of publications might seem strange for a powerhouse academic, but Showalter loves dabbling in pop culture. As often as she has been lauded for her ambition, she also has been lambasted, frequently on the Internet, where a Google search can return a long list of retorts and rebuttals to her books and ideas. Even news interviews with a more “objective” tone carry such headlines as “Who’s Afraid of Elaine Showalter?” and “Elaine Showalter: An Anarchist in Academia.”

Such a formidable reputation arises from Showalter’s willingness to express the frank views of a feminist in the public spotlight and to take on controversial topics. (In her book Hystories, for instance, she candidly expresses her hypothesis about chronic fatigue syndrome, which resulted in some furious responses and even hate mail.) She maintains her direct manner with her current project. “There has been a lot of scholarship on individual [American women] writers, but no one has put it all together,” she says. “I am sure my conclusions will make a lot of people angry. So they will argue with me, but that is what scholarship is about. I am not going to mince words in this book.”

Aware of the difficulty of writing a book while maintaining a full academic schedule, Showalter retired from Princeton in 2003; she has since put many of her journalism assignments on hold. The Showalters—her husband is a French professor retired from Rutgers University—had just sold their New Jersey home of 40 years and moved to Maryland when a letter arrived from the Huntington’s Robert C. Ritchie, the W. M. Keck Foundation Director of Research, inviting Elaine for a 10-month residency as the R. Stanton Avery Distinguished Fellow.

Showalter had planned to use the Library of Congress for the book’s primary research, but Ritchie’s letter changed everything. “Getting that invitation to come out here was just the best thing that ever happened to me in my whole life,” she says. “It was like winning the lottery.” So she and her husband packed the car and headed west.

Once the couple settled into an apartment in Pasadena, Showalter delved into her research, focusing primarily on 19th-century women writers, an area of particular strength in the collections here. “I really didn’t know that The Huntington would have virtually everything that I would need,” she says. “Everything. Amazing. The holdings in American literature pre-1900 are astonishing.”

Many of these volumes were unwittingly collected by Henry E. Huntington, who during his lifetime purchased more than 200 complete libraries. In 1936 the Huntington Library accepted a gift from Josephine P. Everett of about 500 titles concerning women and women’s history. These books formed the core of the holdings in women’s studies and provided the impetus toward collecting more in this area.

But Showalter was aided in her research by forces that stretched beyond the Huntington’s rarified historical collections to the egalitarian realm of the World Wide Web. Getting her hands on actual books is critical, but access to secondary sources is also crucial. Fortunately, a number of libraries have put their holdings online.

This virtual world—coupled with the range of resources all physically situated at The Huntington—contrasts dramatically with Showalter’s experience in the 1970s, when she would spend an entire year traveling from library to library in England in a quest for women writers’ archives, sitting long hours in chilly reading rooms. She has written of this experience, “I was often rewarded by becoming the first scholar to read a harrowing journal or open a box of letters.” Despite the romantic image she conjures up, Showalter says she would never be able to pull off...
her current project if she had to crisscross the continental United States in the same way. “People don’t think of scholarship as involving physical labor, but if you have to be going all over the place, it can really wear you out. Working at The Huntington really makes it possible to complete this project in a reasonable amount of time.”

Showalter has enjoyed more company in her research on American writers than she had with English ones. A number of American women writers forgotten by history are gaining their due, says Nicolas Witschi, associate professor of English at Western Michigan University and himself a Huntington researcher. Witschi has done significant scholarship on California writer Mary Austin, who had frequented literary salons held at the Charles Lummis home in the Arroyo Seco early in the 20th century, as did the writer Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Gilman’s work has been brought back to life in the last 30 years, says Witschi, and Austin has gained new acclaim in environmental literary circles for her masterpiece, *The Land of Little Rain*.

But Austin wrote widely in many areas and harbored literary ambitions that were just as fierce as those of her male peers who have received more recognition. “Elaine Showalter, throughout her career, has done tremendous work in drawing attention to the accomplishments of women writers,” says Witschi. “She is no doubt crafting another necessary corrective, to help with the continuing effort to recover the voices of women writers on their own terms.”

Other notable writers in Showalter’s new canon include Catherine Maria Sedgwick, Lydia Maria Child, and Fanny Fern, not exactly household names of the same ilk as James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Walt Whitman, Henry David Thoreau, and Samuel Clemens, but true talents nonetheless.

Critics have long acknowledged Cooper and Irving for ushering in an American literary tradition in the 1820s. Showalter is not simply calling for equal recognition of women like Sedgwick and Child, who wrote during the same period. She argues they were better writers than Cooper and Irving.

By the 1850s, best sellers tended to be written by women. In 1855 Nathaniel Hawthorne famously said, “America is now wholly given over to a d—d mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash.”

The sentiment was that women—whose books often sold in the thousands, sometimes hundreds of thousands—were driving more deserving writers out of the literary marketplace with what could only be drivel. Showalter has a strong distaste for a stereotype that has continued to gain acceptance even today: that women novelists of this period were commercial writers while the men were artists. “Their careers and ambitions were much more complicated than that,” says Showalter.

She hopes her scholarship will have an impact on how American literature is taught while also captivating a wide readership that extends beyond academia. Knopf will publish the book, slated for 2007–8, with an accompanying anthology.

“This is a book I would like Laura Bush and Barbra Streisand to read,” Showalter says. “I want to reach Maria Shriver and Oprah Winfrey.” It will be a book of literary opinions, she says, unabashedly told from her point of view, about a tradition of achievement that has been only partially understood.

Experience has taught Showalter to be prepared for a bumpy ride. After *A Literature of Their Own* was published, she was widely praised and attacked for the work, so much so that 20 years later she wrote a summation of her experience in the Brown University publication *Novel: A Forum in Fiction* (1998): “What I did not anticipate was that in feminist literary history and criticism, as in every other...
Mary Hunter Austin (1868–1934) first met Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1860–1935) in Pasadena in the late 1890s. Both women frequented the artists’ colony at El Alisal, Charles Fletcher Lummis’ adobe home along the Arroyo Seco. The two women shared much in common: both had left unhappy marriages to devote themselves to their writing; both were active in feminist causes; both found personal freedom by moving west and developing a deep kinship with the California landscape.

Mary Austin was born in Carlinville, Ill., and moved with her family in 1888 to the San Joaquin Valley. She was keenly affected and inspired by the region and would later write of it profoundly, most notably in *The Land of Little Rain* (1903).

Austin came to Southern California in 1899 and described Pasadena as “a city of residences, beautiful as the dream of a poet, but quite staid and sedate, and proud of its quietness.” Here she taught school and joined the literary circle established by Lummis, the noted author and editor, who became a mentor. In 1905 she moved to Carmel, where she helped establish an artists’ colony that included Jack London and George Sterling. She later moved to New York, participating there in feminist causes with Charlotte Perkins Gilman.

Gilman is perhaps best known for her 1890 short story “The Yellow Wallpaper.” Written while Gilman lived in Pasadena, it narrates a young wife and mother’s descent into madness and is considered her most autobiographical work. Gilman’s major concern during her lifetime was feminism—women’s suffrage as well as women’s economic independence—and she achieved international fame with the 1898 publication of her seminal work, *Women and Economics: The Economic Relation Between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution*.

Gilman was born in New England, a descendant of the prominent and influential Beecher family—she was the great-granddaughter of another writer, Harriet Beecher Stowe. Despite this famous ancestry, her family lived in poverty. In 1888 she left her husband, Charles Walter Stetson, and moved with her daughter to California. She rented a cottage on Orange Grove Boulevard for $10 a month and wrote, “To California, in its natural features, I owe much. Its calm sublimity of contour, richness of color, profusion of flowers, fruit and foliage, and the steady peace of its climate were meat and drink to me.” In 1932 Gilman learned she had breast cancer. She spent the rest of her days completing her autobiography, *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman*. With no hope for recovery, she took her own life on Aug. 17, 1935.

The Huntington holds the Mary Austin Collection, purchased from the Austin estate. Within it are approximately 11,000 items—letters, manuscripts, and research materials such as her extensive documentation on the Indians of the Southwest and Spanish American folklore.

Whatever the reception of this book, Showalter ultimately hopes that her scholarship will help to expand the American literary legacy to include these overshadowed women writers, bringing their rich work to new audiences and keeping their voices alive.

Traude Gomez-Rhine is a staff writer at The Huntington.
Three hundred years after Benjamin Franklin’s birth, Americans are poised to celebrate his multifaceted genius: Franklin the politician, printer, postmaster, writer, scientist, and inventor. Benjamin Franklin, our quintessentially French hero? As historian Gordon S. Wood reminds us in his recent book, *The Americanization of Benjamin Franklin*, “Franklin belonged to France before he belonged to America.” After all, Franklin spent nearly nine years as a diplomat in Paris negotiating and maintaining a political alliance between the United States and France. The popularity of the American cause in France—and the singularity of Franklin’s appearance there—won him unprecedented fame and immortalized his furrowed countenance, graying locks, and balding pate for posterity.

For all his powerful intellect and shrewd statesmanship, it was Franklin’s Everyman qualities that fascinated the French, who perceived America as a nation of farmer-philosophers. As Wood writes, “America in their eyes came to stand for all that 18th-century France lacked—natural simplicity, social equality, religious freedom, and rustic enlightenment.” Franklin, in turn, came to stand for all that America represented; his plain speech and dress gave him an air of homespun dignity that was lacking in the empty magnificence of the French court.
When he arrived in Paris in the autumn of 1776, Franklin stood out in “the costume of an American farmer: his hair lank and unpowdered, his round hat, his suit of brown wool contrasting with the sequined, embroidered suits, the powdered and scented hair of the courtiers of Versailles,” wrote Madame Campan, lady-in-waiting to Marie-Antoinette.

On a previous visit to France in 1767, Franklin had worn conventional clothing, donning a wig and a fancy French-made suit for an audience with Louis XV. Upon his return nine years later, however, he dressed down, going about town in a plain brown suit and a marten fur cap he had acquired in Canada. Under his cap, Franklin wore his hair unpowdered and loose, rather than tied up in a queue or covered by a wig. Indeed, he suffered from a scalp condition that made wigs uncomfortable; Franklin ordered one for his audience with Louis XVI but abandoned it at the last minute. Instead, he met the king bareheaded and wearing a suit of plain velvet with no sword when swords, wigs, and embroidered suits were dictated by etiquette. This was not just a fashion statement, but a calculated political move; Franklin knew that he was his own best advertisement for his ambitious diplomatic agenda.

Far from being offended, Franklin’s aristocratic hosts were charmed. “No man in Paris was more fashionable, more sought-after than Doctor Franklin,” the royal portrait artist Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun testified. Indeed, coiffures à la Philadelphie and gowns of gris Américan soon adorned the ladies of the court. French artists, too, were fascinated by Franklin’s unconventional appearance. Whether clad in rustic furs or plain cloth and linen, he seemed the living embodiment of the democratic beliefs for which America was fighting—beliefs that were becoming increasingly popular among the French, who would overthrow their own king just a few years later, in 1789. Franklin complained: “I have at the request of Friends sat so much and so often to painters and Statuaries, that I am perfectly sick of it. I know of nothing so tedious as sitting hours in one fix’d posture.” But the demand for portraits of the American patriot was insatiable.

No artist captured Franklin’s physical and psychological likeness as successfully as Joseph-Siffrede Duplessis (1725–1802). His iconic portrait in oils was hailed as a masterpiece when it appeared in the Salon of 1779. One critic commented: “[Franklin’s] large forehead suggests strength of mind and his robust neck the firmness of his character. Evenness of temper is in his eyes and on his lips the smile of an unshakeable serenity.” Copies appeared for sale almost immediately. Franklin encouraged this; the portrait was a personal favorite, and reproductions saved him the trouble of sitting for other artists. More importantly, though, the portrait conveyed the deceptively unsophisticated image Franklin wished to project to the world.

Benjamin Franklin, our quintessentially French hero?

The portrait conveyed the deceptively unsophisticated image Franklin wished to project to the world.

Two portrait medallions of Franklin from the Huntington's French art collection. The first, from 1777, is in terracotta and executed by Giovanni Battista Nini (Italian, 1717–1786). The second is from Sévres, Royal Porcelain Manufactory, ca. 1778. It is a soft-paste porcelain with clear glaze and gilding.
The latter may be the one Franklin described in a letter to his daughter dated June 3, 1779:

The clay medallion of me you say you gave to Mr. Hopkinson was the first of its kind made in France. A variety of others have been made since of different sizes; some to be set in the lids of snuffboxes, and some so small as to be worn in rings; and the numbers sold are incredible. These, with the pictures, busts and prints, (of which copies upon copies are spread everywhere,) have made your father's face as well known as that of the moon, so that he durst not do anything that would oblige him to run away, as his phiz would discover him wherever he should venture to show it. It is said by learned etymologists, that the name doll, for the images children play with, is derived from the word IDOL. From the number of dolls now made of him, he may be truly said, in that sense, to be i-doll-ized in this country.

Franklin’s humble “phiz” (his physiognomy, or face) masked his talent for self-promotion and subtle manipulation. This unlikely American idol wore his democratic credentials on his fur-trimmed sleeve. His diplomatic mission was successful; he obtained France’s financial and military support, which enabled America to win the Revolutionary War. Today, when we picture Benjamin Franklin, we tend to picture him as he looked during his residence in France.

Though his countrymen mistrusted Franklin for his Francophile and Anglophile sympathies, the French never forgot his friendship, or his face. When Franklin died in 1790, the French government declared three days of national mourning in his honor. And it was a French philosophe, A. R. J. Turgot, who best eulogized his friend Franklin, linking his early scientific accomplishments to his mature campaign for democracy: “He seized lightning from the skies and the scepter from tyrants.”

Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell is a Mellon Foundation Curatorial Fellow in French art at The Huntington.

Franklin knew that he was his own best advertisement for his ambitious diplomatic agenda.
Zsolt Debreczy is at home in the world. Well, at least in its temperate zones.

Born in Hungary and raised behind the Iron Curtain, Debreczy is at ease in just about any part of the world with a temperate climate. Take away the polar circles and tropics, and you’re left with vast stretches of geography in the Northern and Southern hemispheres. The botanist spent a total of five years—cobbled together from countless trips over the past 15 years—scouring the woods in Europe, China, Taiwan, Japan, North America, Chile, the Caribbean, New Zealand, and Tasmania. His diligence paid off. He managed to track down and document nearly 500 species of conifers, including pines, spruces, firs, and cypresses.
“No one else has studied so many conifers in their native habitats throughout the world,” says Bill Thomas, former president of the American Conifer Society and co-editor of Growing Conifers: Four-Season Plants. “Debreczy’s study has been of worldwide significance and is an incredible undertaking that may never be matched by anyone else.”

Debreczy recently traded in his hiking boots for a desk in the Huntington’s botanical library, where he has been translating his book on conifers from his native language into English. He used the reference materials there to supplement his field notes. The revised and expanded work will be published by Dendro Press next spring.

His work space is in close proximity to that of Kathy Musial, Huntington curator of living collections, whose wide-ranging responsibilities include managing all acquisitions to the Garden’s permanent collections, as well as verifying the identification and correct nomenclature for all the plants in the collections. Several years ago Debreczy ventured to the outskirts of the Huntington grounds to help Musial identify some conifers whose labels had disappeared years before. Musial is returning the favor by serving as Debreczy’s editor.

Debreczy has labored a lifetime over how to capture the essence of a tree in words and images, and Musial admits to putting in many sleepless nights getting at the essence of Debreczy’s translations.

Debreczy published his original book in 2000 and called it Fenyök a föld Körül, a title that translates literally into “Conifers Around the Earth.” Translation is often an inelegant business, and though Debreczy is fluent in English, he benefits greatly from someone who might suggest the more palatable Conifers Around the World. Debreczy first met Zsolt—pronounced “jolt”—on an Earthwatch expedition to Chile in 1996. She is quick to explain that she is not a conifer expert: “Flowering plants are my gig.” Musial is comfortable with geography, however, and is a stickler for the accurate spelling of place names. (It’s not surprising that she is the ultimate arbiter for all labels in the Huntington gardens.)
photographs over the years, many of which were taken for documentation purposes. The two collaborators frequently showed some of the images in slide presentations and lectures, including several talks at Harvard’s Arnold Arboretum in the late 1980s and early 1990s when they both served as Mercer Fellows there. Both had begun their careers at the Natural History Museum in Budapest, now the Hungarian Natural History Museum—Debreczy in 1965, and Rácz in 1976. They interspersed their images with anecdotes from the field and research from their scholarship: the pair had published 12 books and 250 articles in Hungary before coming to Harvard.

While the plan for the atlas had always entailed black-and-white photographs accompanied by drawings, they realized that the color pictures could comprise a stand-alone book on conifers. Both works will appeal to nature lovers and professionals in the fields of botany, forestry, and horticulture, but *Conifers* is probably more accessible to the casual enthusiast.

Debreczy’s earliest inspiration was Alfred Rehder’s *Manual of Cultivated Trees and Shrubs Hardy in North America: Exclusive of the Subtropical and Warmer Temperate Regions*, first published in 1927 and revised in 1940. The subtitle might have given Debreczy an early inkling of how to set the parameters of his own future study. Rehder’s work was published only in English and forced Debreczy to expand his descriptive vocabulary. And the lack of any photographs or drawings did not discourage Debreczy as much as it fueled his imagination. How might he illustrate such a work?

From early childhood, Debreczy liked making sketches of insects and flowers and frequently exhibited his drawings in grade school. In college, he found success when he organized his information visually. He could take a 500-page botany textbook and convert it to 50 richly illustrated pages. He would then read the more manageable “guide” several times to absorb the material. “When I followed my method,” he says modestly, “I would earn the best grade.”

Producing a book requires a similar process—taking a wide base of knowledge and reducing it to its essence. In 1971 he had published a book on temperate-zone evergreens, relying heavily on the artistic talents of Vera Csapody. The botanical illustrator was already a legend in Hungary when Debreczy met her in the late 1960s. She had contributed 4,250 plant drawings to Sándor Jívorka’s ambitious *Hungarian Flora in Pictures* (1934). In the early stages of the atlas project, Debreczy didn’t have the resources to travel extensively and instead relied on Csapody’s renderings of dried and pressed specimens from the herbarium. Even though Csapody’s drawings were well crafted and precise, Debreczy noticed that they looked different from the trees he encountered in nature. “Plants, particularly woody plants,” he explained, “are not like butterflies, which can be rendered in flat drawings that are useful for viewing specimens in display cases or in the wild.” Branches, cones, needles, and leaves are very different in three dimensions. Thus, around 1973, he abandoned an expanding treasure trove of two-dimensional drawings and set out to capture specimens in three dimensions.

Debreczy abandoned an expanding treasure trove of two-dimensional drawings and set out to capture specimens in three dimensions.
move on without his mentor and dear friend.

Debreczy loves talking about trees and relies on body language as much as any other form of communication. All of us have seen children “acting” like trees by standing still and spreading their arms in an effort to maximize their span. Debreczy has his own method of tree impersonation to convey the essence of a tree in its natural surrounding. To emphasize the protective “instincts” of a tree, Debreczy hunches over in a crouch, adopting the position of a school child in a classroom earthquake drill. Trees in nature are susceptible to a variety of forces: scarce resources, weather and soil variability, harsh climate, burrowing animals, and hungry insects, to name a few. Depending on circumstances, trees of the same species in the wild, therefore, might grow at different rates and exhibit variations in structure or size. Furthermore, one specimen or the other might be indistinguishable from a tree of a related—but distinct—species.

An unlikely example of a vulnerable conifer can be found on the outskirts of Oaxaca, Mexico. On a trip in the 1990s, Debreczy and Rácz gloried in the majesty of El Arbor del Tule and later wrote about it in an article in Harvard’s Arnoldia magazine. The tree, known to botanists as Taxodium mucronatum, is more commonly called the Mexican bald cypress or the Montezuma cypress. But nothing is common about this particular tree—more than 1,500 years old, its circumference is in excess of 200 feet. That means it takes nearly 20 people—joining hands and with arms fully extended—to encircle the massive trunk. The name of the town, Tule, derives from the word for “marsh” in the local Zapotec dialect. The small town has become threatened by the nearby city of Oaxaca, whose half million inhabitants vie for water and other resources.

At the time of Debreczy’s visit, the tree had lost some of its light-green foliage, and some of its branches had become brittle and dry. Today, thanks to local intervention, the tree is getting the irrigation it needs to survive for future generations.

What might that conifer look like if it took root in a cultivated botanical garden or arboretum? In 1912, Mr. Huntington’s landscape gardener and ranch superintendent, William Hertrich, traveled to Chapultepec Park in Mexico City and brought back seeds of the same species. Three specimens now occupy the center of the Huntington’s Rose Garden, with several more gracing the Lily Ponds. At 93 years of age, they tower over the property but are mere saplings compared to the ancient giant. The Huntington specimens will not likely experience the dramatic explosion of growth—or the endangerment—of El Arbor De Tule. They lack the large, knotty “cypress knees” at their bases, which are common in swamp environments, where roots are submerged in water, as opposed to the soil found in the Huntington’s Rose Garden or even adjacent to the Lily Ponds.

Debreczy can point out dozens of distinctions among trees of the same species depending on their locations.

His commitment to thoroughness requires exhaustive fieldwork, a challenge that does not come easy for someone who cut his teeth in a Soviet state. Ironically, his scramble for resources might have been more challenging after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Before then, Hungarian citizens were
more likely to have the leisure time to support gardens and clubs, and the government provided more resources in support of the sciences. But Debreczy’s adaptive traits rival those of the trees he finds in nature. He splits his time between the Massachusetts-based International Dendrological Research Institute, where he is research director, and the International Dendrological Foundation in Hungary. On trips he continues to rely on collaboration with people like Musial, who helped Debreczy document the vegetation surrounding conifer specimens in Chile, Taiwan, and Japan; she also organized the fieldwork on trips to New Zealand and Australia. Debreczy has long practiced synecology, or the science of how plants live together in a habitat—a term that might just as easily apply to the interdependence of botanists and other professionals in the field.

After all these years, one might expect that Debreczy is ready to set down more permanent roots in one place, either in New England or Hungary. But as he explains, “The forests, rocky slopes, deserts, temperate rainforests, herbaria, and libraries of the world are my actual home—be they in Chile, China, or Mexico.” And now, as he spends more time in the library than in nature, he takes stock of his inventory of materials—photos, drawings, descriptions—and settles back to work with the same passion he exhibits in the field.

Matt Stevens is editor of Huntington Frontiers magazine.

Unless otherwise noted, images are courtesy of the Dendrological Atlas Project. Copyright DAP.
A MEXICAN COSSACK IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Fame, notoriety, and anonymity in the borderlands

by Samuel Truett

In August 1913, San Diego witnessed a strange sight. Trains bearing Mexican prisoners of war rolled into town, depositing their human cargo near the government barracks on Market Street. “Leather-lunged soldiers shouted weird military orders, and bewildered Mexican men and women chattered excitedly,” wrote a reporter for the San Diego Sun. It was as if “some little Mexican town had been picked up with all its inhabitants and transplanted right here in San Diego.”

It was a strange sight because the United States was not at war with Mexico. These men, women, and children were refugees from border battles of the Mexican Revolution, raging since 1910. International law stipulated that the United States—a neutral neighbor—had to hold them as prisoners of war until they could safely be returned to Mexico. They were bound for an internment camp at Fort Rosecrans, just across San Diego Bay.

Stranger still was the bronzed man in a white sun helmet and a linen suit who towered over the other Mexicans. More than six feet tall, with thick glasses, he looked “more like a college professor or a scientist than a soldier,” another reporter wrote. The man before him was Emilio Kosterlitzky, a legendary warrior whose career extended from the Apache wars to the Mexican Revolution. Some called him a soldier of fortune, a world traveler in search of a good fight. Others said he was a Cossack who had traded the Russian steppes for the Mexican countryside. Like the enigmatic border hero of pulp fiction, Kosterlitzky was a man without a history.
What larger twist of fate brought this notorious warrior to California? His passage from Mexican battlefield to U.S. internment camp evoked a familiar western plotline: a wild warrior caged, a lone rider unhorsed, the transformation of the wide-open frontier into a patrolled space between nations. Riding west into the sunset, Kosterlitzky prepared to vanish. “I have nothing to say that would make interesting reading,” he told spectators. “I have been talked about enough in the papers. I want to be left out of them as much as possible from now on.”

Border crossings were not new for Kosterlitzky. He was born in Moscow in 1853 as Emil Kosterlitzky, the child of a German mother and Russian father. His father was said to be a Cossack, a member of a military caste, usually composed of ethnic outsiders from Russia’s frontiers who served as soldiers of the Tsarist state. Emil hoped to follow in his father’s footsteps, but instead ended up in the navy. At 18, as a midshipman on a training vessel, he deserted off the Venezuela coast. “Still clinging to his love for horses and his boyhood ambition to become a leader of cavalry,” a journalist later embellished, he sailed to the border state of Sonora, Mexico, and joined the Mexican army. Changing his name to Emilio, he set out to make a fresh start.

The borderlands offered expansive vistas for Kosterlitzky. He became Mexican by marrying into a Mexican family, but he also became part of a frontier military fraternity that gained status by fighting Indians. In the 1880s, in the wars against Apache and Yaqui Indians, Kosterlitzky became a defender of the nation’s front lines. By brutally repressing one group, he earned his place as a citizen of another.

The Apache wars also opened doors north of the border. In 1882, Mexico and the United States signed a reciprocal crossing treaty, allowing troops to pursue Indians across borders. In the 1880s, Kosterlitzky helped U.S. soldiers in the Geronimo campaigns, and he later assisted in the suppression of such “bandits” as the Apache Kid. He was once described as “a favorite with all the boys in blue.”

Americans equated Kosterlitzky with the free and wild Cossack, a mythical icon not unlike the U.S. cowboy. The fact that he rode the Mexican countryside, not the Russian steppe, made him only more romantic. If the violence of the frontier made Kosterlitzky a citizen of a foreign land, the fantasy of the frontier ensured his rise as a local hero. His white skin—and white horse—set him apart from his brown-skinned neighbors, whom white Americans equated with banditry, not heroism. In popular accounts, he was a picturesque leader, whereas his colleagues were considered rough characters.

Kosterlitzky also opened doors as a master linguist. He not only spoke Spanish, but also English, French, German, Russian, Italian, Polish, Danish, and Swedish. Americans with poor Spanish-language skills turned to him as a cultural broker. In 1885,
he moved to the center of a new transnational world as an officer in the *gendarmería fiscal*, or customs guard, where he managed the migration of people, goods, and capital across borders. U.S. investment in Sonora was booming by 1900, and Kosterlitzky served as a policeman and gatekeeper. He distinguished between legitimate and illegitimate border crossings and kept law and order to increase investor confidence.

In this capacity, he was often anything but heroic. He patrolled the border together with such groups as the Arizona Rangers to combat smuggling, fight “bandits,” and suppress labor strikes. Like the Cossacks of Russia, he epitomized the police power of the state—but also of corporate elites, who relied on Kosterlitzky to police the borderlands to their advantage. He thus evoked what was unfree—and not just free—about the frontier.

The Mexican Revolution was fought in part to redress the inequalities of this transnational world. Many rebels sought to open doors that had been closed to ordinary people and political outsiders. But they also shut other doors. Violence drove out foreign entrepreneurs, and fears of revolutionary bandits and U.S. intervention encouraged both sides to see the border as a dividing line, not a crossroads.

And so it was in 1913, when Kosterlitzky—now almost 60—lost a battle for the border town of Nogales, Sonora. Outnumbered by rebels, he and his troops sought refuge in Arizona. He remained in Nogales, Arizona, for several months before being sent to Fort Rosencrans.

Upon his release in 1914, Kosterlitzky and his Mexican family moved

**Kosterlitzky evoked what was unfree—and not just free—about the frontier.**
Mexican exiles in Los Angeles, questioned the deeper loyalties of this “soldier of fortune,” who shifted from one nation to the next, offering his services, like the Cossacks of old, to those in power. But Kosterlitzky rarely strayed far from Mexico, at least in the way he perceived his own identity. He never gave up his Mexican citizenship, and when he died in 1928, he was buried at Calvary Cemetery, near East Los Angeles. “We consider Kosterlitzky as a soldier of the Republic,” wept his Mexican pallbearers.

Samuel Truett is assistant professor of history at the University of New Mexico. While at The Huntington as a Mellon Postdoctoral Research Fellow in 2004–5, he conducted research on a biography of Emilio Kosterlitzky as well as on a history of ruins and empire in America.
Weighing In

STUDENTS CONTEMPLATE A BOXING MATCH

by Susan Alderson Hoffmann

WHAT EXCITES A YOUNG MIND?
For a group of sixth-graders, it was the opportunity to visit the Huntington’s Scott Gallery of American Art and weigh in on the meaning of Boxing Match (1910) by George Benjamin Luks (1867–1933). Like the crowd at ringside, the students drew near to wonder about the boxers, the audience, and the reasons Luks chose to depict this scene.

Their interest in the painting began at school, in the classrooms of Jim Mayhew and Doris Riley. Both are teachers at Rockdale Elementary, a school in Eagle Rock that is part of the Los Angeles Unified School District. For the past two years, the entire Rockdale faculty has worked with members of the Huntington’s education staff to develop an in-depth art program inspired by works in the Huntington art collections. Each grade studies a single work of art over the course of the year.

Mayhew and Riley chose Luks’ Boxing Match for their sixth-graders. This gritty view of urban life inspired classroom discussions on the history of New York around 1910. Students discovered that former slaves and their families—as well as recent immigrants—were moving to American cities at this time; some of the newcomers entered the world of sports to earn a living. Private clubs, perhaps like the one shown in the painting, hosted fights for wealthy fans (in ringside seats) and members of the lower classes, whose faces disappear into the background.

The teachers addressed the sensitive issue of racism that accompanied many of the famous boxing and wrestling matches of this time. In 1910, the African American boxer Jack Johnson defeated his white opponent, Jim Jeffries. That victory set off race riots across the United States. Luks didn’t identify the fighters in his painting, nor the location of the match. Like George Bellows, another realist painter who depicted brutal fights and wrestling matches, Luks generalized his scenes. But common to the work of both was the suggestion that the African American would overwhelm his white opponent, fueling racist notions of ethnic superiority.

Armed with this background information, students turned their attention to the aesthetic qualities of the paintings. Which art elements did Luks use? And why did he use them? In the classroom, Mayhew and Riley reviewed the elements of art as detailed in the state’s guidelines for primary education. Line, shape, texture, color, and space became the language of the Rockdale students, important tools they would use during their visit to The Huntington.

The in-depth classroom study helped the students achieve an important goal of the program: to develop the skills needed to view a work of art in a museum setting and make informed opinions on its meaning. When the students approached the Luks painting at The Huntington, they led the discussion, with teachers and docents joining in. “They were contemplative,” Mayhew noted, “very thoughtful and focused.” Riley agreed. “They felt they had something to say.”

Back at school, in written essays, students interpreted the work. Some focused on the elements of art and how they contributed to the subject. Recalling the surface of the painting as “very thick and rich,” one student concluded that the “texture makes it very real.”

The dramatic encounter of the boxers, one nearly falling from a punch, caught the attention of many students, who described the scene in terms of what they called “unbalance”: “George unbalances the picture…[making] it look like something is really happening.”

In their own way, these young students recognized the realism of the scene and appreciated how the artist directed the viewer’s attention. Luks depicted a shallow space, one student hypothesized, “because he wanted people to focus on the boxers.”

Other students brought the subject of the match, with its racial overtones, into the context of their lives today. “The racism problem is still in the air that we breathe” was the conclusion drawn by one student. Another formed a different view, writing, “Luks made this painting…to show the racism and segregation against blacks back then…. This is very different than how it is now.” The audience depicted in the painting drew as much attention as the fight. “We can see the faces of the upper-class people but not the lower-class people. Why is it that people think white people are so superior?”

Such reflection on art brought these students into the community of museum visitors—children, adults, and scholars—who study art and interpret its meaning. The success of the program depended upon the determination of teachers, school administrators, and Huntington educators.
to bridge the divide between the classroom and the art museum, a place foreign to many students from Rockdale.

Partnerships like the one forged between The Huntington and Rockdale Elementary School belong to a program developed by the LAUSD in 1998. That year, the district began a 10-year plan to reintegrate arts education into the curriculum—at every grade and for every student attending Los Angeles schools. District leaders recognized the need to include local arts providers in the program, appreciating how the combined resources of the classroom and arts institutions would enhance the programs offered to their students. Rockdale Elementary was one of the first schools in LAUSD to receive funds for arts education. Today, the goal of arts for all has been achieved at Rockdale, with all students receiving instruction in art, dance, music, and theater. The Huntington is now using the Rockdale model to build a partnership with schools in the Pasadena Unified School District.

Bringing schoolchildren into a direct experience with art, via school tours, has been a tradition at The Huntington since 1937, as has the preparation of “pre-visit” materials for teachers. The new model, with collaboration at its core, combines the best of the classroom experience, where the foundation for learning is laid, and the magic of viewing art in person. The benefits of this model can be seen—and heard—in the responses of students. They have entered into the world of history, learned the language of art, and developed the confidence to make informed opinions. More than looking, they are now “weighing in” on what art means to them.

Susan Alderson Hoffmann is the Art Educator at The Huntington.
Back to the Source

A MODERN-DAY ARCHAEOLOGIST DIGS DEEP IN CENTRAL ASIA AND EXCAVATES A HERO

by Mark Wheeler

When archaeologist Fredrik Hiebert returned from a 1988 dig in the Kara Kum Desert in Turkmenistan, he thought he had it made. He was, he believed, the first American archaeologist to dig in the Soviet-controlled country, and he was convinced that what he had found there would rewrite history.

Hiebert, then a graduate student at Harvard, was interested in the origins of the Silk Road, the legendary trade route that connected China with countries to the west. Digging alongside his Russian colleagues at a now dried-up desert oasis in the Murghab River delta, Hiebert expected to find artifacts from the 2,000-year-old classical era. Instead, the group found a much older civilization that they thought to be unknown to the West. Dating back 4,000 years, it was comparable in age to the great civilizations of ancient Mesopotamia, India, and China.

Pumpelly was one of those larger-than-life figures who lived a life of adventure.

“I was starry eyed, thinking we’d found this great, 4,000-year-old civilization!” says Hiebert, an archaeologist with the National Geographic Society and formerly a professor of anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. Then he found out from his doctoral adviser at Harvard that he wasn’t the first American to excavate a site in Turkmenistan after all, nor was his party the first to note the existence of a previously unacknowledged civilization. That honor went to, of all things, a geologist, who beat him to Turkmenistan by some 84 years.

The man was Raphael Pumpelly, the first professor of mining at Harvard University (1866–75), the head of the New England section of the U.S. Geological Survey from 1884 to 1889, and a man who brought a geologist’s eye and the now-standard scientific method—hypotheses, followed by fact collecting and testing—to the study of prehistoric sites in Asia. A collection of Pumpelly papers is housed at The Huntington.

“Raphael Pumpelly was part of an intellectual community that was pushing science forward in the 19th century, following Darwin and the theory of evolution,” says Dan Lewis, curator of the history of science and technology at The Huntington. And he had an advantage over scientists
today, says Lewis. “It was a tight-knit group. He could write a letter to the very best people in a field and not only receive a reply, but develop a long-term correspondence with the best minds of his day.” These correspondents included such colleagues as Louis Janin, one of the country’s most active and important mining engineers; Bailey Willis, an old friend and colleague of Pumpelly who was renowned for his work on seismology during the early 20th century (and whose papers are also held by The Huntington); and William Morris Davis, among others. Davis, often called the father of American geology, accompanied Pumpelly to Asia in 1903 and created the field of geomorphology, the study of the earth’s landforms.

The Pumpelly collection comprises letters, field notebooks, and diaries—more than 15 boxes of material—all donated to The Huntington in 1960 by Pumpelly’s grandson, Raphael Pumpelly III. These include the diaries of his wife, Eliza Shepard Pumpelly, who accompanied her husband to Asia in 1904. Fred Hiebert used Pumpelly’s field notes and Eliza’s diaries to deepen his own understanding of the day-to-day archaeological experience of that time. In 2003 he published A Central Asian Village at the Dawn of Civilization: Excavations at Anau, Turkmenistan. “I was able to use these notes, written by Pumpelly in 1904, as if they were modern field notes written by one of my graduate students working today,” he says.

“Notebooks from this fieldwork are chock-full of drawings, measurements, and Pumpelly’s characteristically tiny, crabbed penmanship,” says Dan Lewis. Hiebert’s research at The Huntington continues to inform his fieldwork; in 2004 and 2005 Hiebert again traveled to Turkmenistan to attend a conference commemorating the 100th anniversary of Pumpelly’s excavations. Both the conference and the subsequent field season focused on learning more about the ancient culture in Turkmenistan that so fascinated Pumpelly. Scholars from around the world placed the ancient cultures of Turkmenistan in the context of other world civilizations. The recent excavations continue the tradition of sieving for seeds, bones, and shards of pottery. Anau, it turns out, was something of a trade post 4,000 years ago, a small, fortified settlement guarding an important pass that gave central Asians access to the goods and wealth of the civilizations to the south.

Born in 1837 in New York and educated in Germany, the six-foot, three-inch Pumpelly, who had a fondness for cigars and wore a long, flowing beard, was one of those larger-than-life figures who lived a life of adventure. He “dodged Apache arrows,” as his biographer Margaret Champlin described it, while in Arizona developing a silver mine; taught Japanese miners to use gunpowder to clear rock before he was kicked out of that country after being accused of being a spy; and traveled by camel and cart from China across Mongolia, Siberia, Russia, and on to central Asia. He crossed huge, dried inland seas, where he could see the ruins of cities on the ancient shorelines. It was during this trip that, by studying the geology of the area, he became one of the first individuals to investigate how environmental conditions could influence human settlement and culture.

Forty years after his first trip from China into central Asia, Pumpelly, now 65 in 1903 and at a time in life when
many people begin to slow, reinvented himself as an archaeologist by applying for and receiving a grant from the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C. The institution, newly founded in 1902, had just announced its intent to fund scientific research. Pumpelly was an early applicant (heartily endorsed by prominent historian Brooks Adams); his goal was to return to central Asia to study the prehistoric archaeology he had seen years before and to study the geological and climatic factors that affected these early civilizations. Pumpelly speculated that a large inland sea in central Asia might have once supported a sizeable population. He knew from his travels and study that the climate in central Asia had become drier and drier since the time of the last ice age. As the sea began to shrink, could it have forced these people to move west, bringing along their skills, especially agriculture and an early proto-language, to the primitive Stone Age people of Europe?

This is a scenario that modern archaeologists still debate today, especially concerning the origin of language. In 1903 and again in 1904, Pumpelly traveled to what was then called Turkestan to conduct a geological survey and to excavate a site named Anau, near the border of Iran. His findings convinced him that an ancient civilization had indeed existed in central Asia.

At Anau, Pumpelly carefully excavated two 50-foot mounds—called *kurgans*—by digging a series of terraces and shafts. He carefully labeled the position of each found item, using methods that are now utilized by modern archaeologists. For example, he practiced fine-scale archaeology, using sieves to capture seeds and tiny bones, and employed specialists, such as botanists and anatomists, to analyze his finds. The pioneering methods, says Hiebert, would only develop incrementally in his field over the next 50 years or so. And in the absence of modern methods like radiocarbon dating, Pumpelly used his training as a geologist, keeping careful stratigraphic records to date sites. His findings would come close to matching data collected years later using modern technology and, as Hiebert puts it, “spending a lot of money.” Pumpelly’s early interest in how humans respond to environmental change, he notes, is still a keynote feature of archaeology. The *kurgan* digs unearthed pottery, objects of stone and metal, hearths and cooking utensils, even the remains of skeletons of children found near hearths. He discovered evidence of domesticated animals and cultivated wheat—sure signs of civilization.

But his work was stopped abruptly by, of all things, an infestation of grasshoppers. Eliza wrote in her diary in early May 1904: “The grasshoppers have invaded our camp. They come at noon almost as suddenly as a thunder shower but have not disappeared as quickly. Raphael went down in the well yesterday and he said they rained upon him in swarms and for a little while he had a horrid time fighting them…. These grasshoppers are not enchanting companions.” A week later she had had enough: “The grasshoppers are still here and the air still smells of them—we are hurrying to get off and hope to be gone by the end of the
week.” Raphael and his excavation party were forced to abandon the site. Pumpelly was never to return.

Hiebert’s initial disappointment to learn that he wasn’t the first American to excavate in central Asia quickly turned to admiration for the man and his farsightedness. Hiebert now calls Pumpelly his hero, a “mythic figure” in archaeology.

“So why isn’t he heralded as the founder of modern archaeology instead of being relegated to a footnote in history?” Hiebert asks. “Most people in my field have never even heard of him. I’m bugged by that.”

The reasons, he says, are varied. One was a defense of conventional wisdom. In 1904 Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Mediterranean were the accepted great centers of civilization. “So why in the world would Pumpelly have gone to Turkmenistan to look for civilization? To his peers, it made no sense; people couldn’t comprehend it.” Second, using sedimentation rates to date the site, Pumpelly originally estimated Anau to be about 10,000 years old. Some 12 years later, after other research in nearby areas had been published, Pumpelly reevaluated his data and revised his date, saying it was closer to 6,500 years old, dating to around 4500 B.C. But in the interim, Hiebert says, the extended date may have hurt Pumpelly’s credibility.

Then, notes Hiebert, by 1919–20 Turkmenistan had been absorbed into the Soviet empire, and scholars “just stopped thinking about it.” Soviet archaeologists did conduct work throughout the Kara Kum Desert, he says. Their method was to mount large-scale excavations (often of entire settlements), revealing the existence of numerous heavily fortified, large urban centers. That work, though, was only published in obscure Russian journals, mostly ignored by western archaeologists. And things stayed that way, says Hiebert, until Turkmenistan began to “defrost,” finally declaring its independence from Russia in 1991.

Beginning in 1993, following Turkmenistan’s independence from Russia, Hiebert returned to excavate, this time choosing to work at Anau. In 1996 he and his colleagues

Fredrik Hiebert now calls Raphael Pumpelly his hero, a “mythic figure” in archaeology.

Fredrik Hiebert on the south kurgan in Anau, October 2004. Photo by Lisa Pompelli.
were digging in the same kurgan Pumpelly had dug in 1904. “We dug further down than Pumpelly had been able to do, and what we found was a confirmation of everything he believed.” There was early evidence of civilization in the form of farming—specifically, tiny grains of white wheat. Proof, says Hiebert, that the Turkmen people were engaged in agricultural production as early as 6,500 years ago. Hiebert’s wife, a zooarchaeologist (who joined the dig just as Eliza had 95 years earlier), discovered bones of domesticated animals. “So here we were, almost 100 years after Raphael Pumpelly had been here, confirming that he was right.”

In 2004, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Pumpelly’s 1904 Anau dig, Raphael’s great-granddaughter Lisa Pompelli (who uses the original spelling of her family’s Italian surname) accompanied Hiebert and his archaeological team to Turkmenistan to attend the international conference and celebrate the opening of that country’s museum devoted entirely to wheat and its early cultivation.

While it might seem odd to devote an entire museum to the celebration of wheat, Hiebert notes that the Turkmen have become very interested in their own history. “It’s a history that was repressed for some 70 years by the Soviets,” he says. “So they are just now, in the 21st century, exploring their own lost past and their heritage. And now they’ve discovered this western scientist.” So excited are they about Pumpelly, he says, that they’ve even republished all of Pumpelly’s original work. “Of course,” says Hiebert, with a smile, “none of us can read it because it’s written in Turkmen!” Despite the language barrier, the enthusiasm and excitement for Raphael Pumpelly is not lost on Hiebert.

Mark Wheeler is a freelance science writer whose work has appeared in Smithsonian and Discover magazines.
ART IN A SEASON OF REVOLUTION: PAINTERS, ARTISANS, AND PATRONS IN EARLY AMERICA
Margaretta Lovell
University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005
Lovell positions both well-known painters and unknown artisans within the framework of their economic lives and families. Highlighting maritime settlements such as Salem, Newport, and Boston, Lovell considers the ways in which 18th-century New England experience was conditioned by its markets and the cataclysm of revolution.

MUSICAL METROPOLIS: LOS ANGELES AND THE CREATION OF A MUSIC CULTURE, 1880-1940
Kenneth Marcus
Palgrave Macmillan, 2004
Marcus argues that the study of music in Los Angeles reveals the development of the city itself. Performers and audiences came from a variety of different backgrounds, but the notion of diversity went well beyond ethnicity. A “media diversity”—recordings, radio, and film—impacted the music culture of Los Angeles, which in turn influenced America at large.

NARRATING SCOTLAND: THE IMAGINATION OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON
Barry Menikoff
University of South Carolina Press, 2005
Narrating Scotland reveals that Stevenson’s goal was nothing less than the reconstitution in fictional form of his country’s history in the period just after the collapse of the Jacobite rebellion. Menikoff contends that in Kidnapped and David Balfour Stevenson imaginatively reconstructed that culture, in part for the sake of his nation, and for its posterity.

SUNSET LIMITED: THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN WEST, 1850-1930
Richard J. Orsi
University of California Press, 2005
The Southern Pacific was the only major U.S. railroad to be operated by westerners and the only railroad built from west to east. Sunset Limited explores the railroad’s development and influence—especially as it affected land settlement, agriculture, water policy, and the environment—and offers a new perspective on the company’s role in shaping the American West.

THE PEACEABLE AND PROSPEROUS REGIMENT OF BLESSED QUEENE ELISABETH: A FACSIMILE FROM HOLINSHED’S CHRONICLES (1587)
Edited by Cyndia Susan Clegg, with textual commentary by Randall McLeod
Huntington Library Press, 2005

Cyndia Clegg knew something was odd when she sat down to look closely at two copies of the 1587 edition of Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland at The Huntington back in the early 1990s. Shakespeare had consulted the Chronicles, which surveys the history of the British Isles from the earliest times well into the reign of Elizabeth I, and Clegg was working on an article on Richard II. She thought to herself, “These copies are quite different!”

Clegg began exploring copies in the British Library, the Cambridge University Library, and several more in private hands. The result is this facsimile of Holinshed’s history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Clegg has used the Huntington’s “Melton Holinshed” (pictured above)—named after the previous owner of the book—as the primary text. It comprises a complete set of 16th-century page proofs—that is, original pages with proofreading corrections. She supplements it with variants from a total of eight other copies (three of which are also from The Huntington).

Randall McLeod uses the Melton Holinshed to analyze 16th-century printing practices. Clegg’s essay explains how so many substantially different copies could have entered the marketplace, detailing the three stages of censorship by Her Majesty’s Most Honourable Privy Council. “Censorship is always going to exist in one form or another,” Clegg concedes. “We learn more if we ask, ‘Who has the power to censor?’” Far from mere propaganda, the variant copies reveal subtle concerns about the depiction of Mary Queen of Scots’ trial and execution, anti-Catholicism, and justice.

– Matt Stevens
On the Cover

The face has long been familiar to Americans, from school children to anyone lucky enough to have had a $100 bill in his or her wallet. The Huntington’s late-18th-century pastel portrait of Benjamin Franklin is attributed to the French artist Jean Valade, who copied it from a well-known portrait by another French artist, Joseph-SIFFREDE Duplessis. (In fact, it was a Duplessis image that served as the inspiration for the rendering on the $100 bill.) To commemorate the 300th anniversary of Franklin’s birth, we explore the French lineage of a uniquely American icon. Valade’s pastel (front cover) and the medallion (on the left) from the Royal Porcelain Manufactory in Sèvres are two of the nearly 300 items from the Huntington’s collection of 18th-century French art. A four-year research project of the collection will culminate in a forthcoming catalog.