American History in Image and Text

JOHN BIDWELL

This sixth Wiggins Lecture in the History of the Book in American Culture will be wholly American but not very bookish. Books will partake only indirectly in the adventures of a print, a government document in manuscript, two engravings that purport to copy it, and their progeny, a quantity of broadsides suitable for framing, though not necessarily for reading. Prints and illustrated broadsides operate differently than books. Word for word, they can reveal as much about American culture, but they do require a trained eye ready to look elsewhere than the text and an abiding regard for technical matters such as design, manufacture, and economics.

John Trumbull’s historical print The Declaration of Independence could be yours for only twenty dollars, provided that you subscribed in advance and paid ten dollars down, ten dollars on delivery. It was a bargain, Trumbull claimed, since it included nearly
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fifty portraits of American founding fathers, which lowered the unit price down to less than forty-three cents per head. And besides, he guaranteed the historical accuracy of his work, based on interviews with Thomas Jefferson and others present on that fateful day. He had painted as many heads as possible from life and scrupulously omitted those whose likeness could not be found. Prospective purchasers could view this stirring scene painted on an enormous canvas that Trumbull exhibited en route to Washington, where it would hang in the Capitol Rotunda.

In New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, more than twenty thousand came to see Trumbull’s masterpiece, yet of that number less than seventy subscribed for the engraving. Even the congressmen who had commissioned the painting at a cost of eight thousand dollars spurned the engraving priced at twenty dollars. Peeved and disappointed, Trumbull economized on his print and published it anyway, having just barely broken even with fewer than three hundred names on his subscription list.¹

The engraved Declaration fared poorly in the marketplace of its day. True, its price was high and cash was scarce in the years 1818 to 1823. But consider the fascination of the image, reproduced so many times, faithfully and not, on plates, souvenirs, stamps, and banknotes, not to mention the Bicentennial two-dollar bill.²


Americans recognize it almost as readily as Emanuel Leutze's *Washington Crossing the Delaware* (1849–51), which is, after all, a far less forbidding composition and far easier on the eye. Yet at first they resisted Trumbull's proposals not just because of tight money or poor taste but because of two competing prints that depicted not the image of this great moment in American history but the text—and some of the text not merely transcribed but copied in facsimile—a genuine, authenticated, absolutely accurate image of the text, embellished, furthermore, with decorative touches inside and out to express its worth and explain its meaning. These two prints inspired countless imitations despite this paradox, and because of it they influenced the way Americans viewed, evoked, and read their most important national document. It is with a librarian's relish for minute detail that I hope to show in one significant instance how printing, generally not in book form, encouraged Americans to recover and preserve their past, and how printing techniques afforded them the means to interpret it.

Trumbull bitterly resented the competition of a lower-priced print, a lavishly decorated engraving of the text of the Declaration published by John Binns (5)."""" """"How is it, my dear sir," the artist complained, 'that an Irish emigrant can obtain patronage for such a work, Gothic at best—when an old officer cannot obtain it for a work, which I will proudly say will do honor to the nation in the eyes of the civilized world?"""" The answer was publicity, a tactic well

---


4. Numbers in parentheses refer to the checklist of broadside editions at the end of this essay.

known to John Binns from a long career in newspapers and on the podium. Born in Dublin, Binns enlisted at an early age in the republican cause, which landed him in and out of English jails until he emigrated to America in 1801. He founded *The Democratic Press* of Philadelphia, a stridently Republican newspaper influential in party, state, and national politics. When Jackson rose to power, Binns lost his influence and his newspaper but continued to write and to hold minor public office for many years.\(^6\)

Just as bitterly, John Binns reviled a Declaration published by Benjamin Owen Tyler, similarly ornate but even cheaper than his and first on the market by more than a year (2). Like Binns, Tyler courted publicity, dabbled in politics, and made his living from the pen. He was a writing master. How a country boy of western Massachusetts learned this art and how he expected to make it pay remains a mystery. Nevertheless he offered a three-week crash course in penmanship in Bennington, Vermont, before moving on to New York, where he advertised instruction in ‘all the Ancient and Modern hands Taught on an improved System (entirely his own.)’ By 1818 he had reached Washington and perfected an even faster system that could endow an average student with a ‘handsome hand’ in only forty-eight hours.\(^7\)

English and American writing masters attracted students and displayed their talents with elaborate specimens of calligraphy, engraved and printed for sale or self-promotion. These specimens usually took the form of sententious phrases or flowery sentiments

---


Fig. 2. The Declaration of Independence in ornamental lettering by Benjamin Owen Tyler (entry no. 2), American Philosophical Society Library.
Fig. 3. Eulogium Sacred to the Memory of the Illustrious George Washington, a specimen of calligraphy by Benjamin Owen Tyler first published in 1815, here in its third state of 1817. Reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

liberally adorned with pen flourishes and other tricks of the trade. Tyler produced and marketed his Eulogium Sacred to the Memory of the Illustrious George Washington (1815) in this tradition but with a patriotic twist to broaden its appeal. As if anticipating the Declaration, the facsimile signature of George Washington in the lower right-hand corner of the plate was added in its third state of 1817. Tyler mimicked the signatures of the Declaration and beautified its text just as he had glorified Washington, as a bravura demonstration of professional skill. In later years he published several
other prints on political and patriotic topics, a portrait of Henry Clay, inspirational letters of Jefferson and Jackson in facsimile, and maybe more. He planned to reproduce in facsimile the letters of thirteen 'distinguished public men' along with the Constitution in miniature, framed in a portal and accompanied with yet more facsimiles of signatures. If that project should succeed, he would publish letters of other famous Americans written in an elegant round hand that he hoped to introduce in schools. Some years later he announced a lithographed campaign biography of William Henry Harrison, ornamented with battle scenes, portraits, an allegory of Liberty and Justice, and the names of nearly one hundred celebrated military men inscribed on columns. This grandiose creation I know only from his correspondence, which threatens to turn the print against Harrison and the Whigs unless they helped to pay some of his expenses. His last known printmaking endeavor is an engraving of First Lady Julia Tyler with, by her request, somewhat more décolletage than the official painting.8

Tyler enjoyed so much the fame and income his Declaration had earned him that he eventually abandoned penmanship and tried his hand at politics. He intended his later prints not just to sell but to please high officials who might further his career. To both Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams he boasted of his wide acquaintance and the political savvy he had gained while selling his prints. Unimpressed, Clay denied him a job in his department, but Adams listened to his flattery and once even loaned him money.

While waiting for the big break that never came, Tyler sold lottery tickets, liquor, and confections, then drifted to New York, where he varnished iron sidings for a living.⁹

The more I learn about Binns and Tyler, the more I am convinced that their personalities, professions, and ambitions enabled them to huckster their Declarations as few others could. Details bibliographical as well as biographical show how these Declarations captured the American imagination and how they remained in the public eye. The book trade and the print market responded to the Binns and Tyler Declarations with a flood of imitations, which reached a crest during the Centennial year of 1876 and then subsided when a more accurate facsimile superseded them. Some copied the design (6), others the iconography (9, 20, etc.), but most reproduced the signatures, an essential feature of any facsimile, honest or not.

Binns had not even finished with his print when it was pirated by a journeyman engraver named William Woodruff, who apparently copied it on the sly while employed by one of Binns's artists (4). Binns sued him and would have won but for a legal technicality. At first Woodruff wrote all the names but Hancock's in a uniform, ornamental hand. Why I cannot tell, unless he feared prosecution or had seen Binns's design only in an early proof state before it included the facsimile signatures. Whatever his reasons, he soon realized that his print could not sell without them and so accompanied it with a second print that displayed the all-important autographs. Woodruff's plate worked long and hard in later years and in other hands. Somewhere along the line, somebody took the next logical step and copied Binns's signatures on the plate itself.

Any handwriting expert will testify how hard it is to copy somebody else's name. These facsimile signatures, whether legitimate

⁹. The Papers of Henry Clay, ed. James F. Hopkins and Mary W. M. Hargreaves (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1959–), 3: 241–42; 5: 370; Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, 5: 330; 7: 540; John Quincy Adams, Diary, September 4, 1823, Adams Papers, reel 37; Benjamin Owen Tyler to John Quincy Adams, June 10, 1827, Letters Received and Other Loose Papers, Adams Papers, reel 481; and John Quincy Adams to Benjamin Owen Tyler, March 1, 1836, Letterbook, Adams Papers, reel 152; Benjamin Owen Tyler to Luther Bradish, March 27, 1851, New-York Historical Society.
Fig. 4. A letterpress edition of the Declaration imitating the calligraphy, decorations, and facsimile signatures of the early engraved editions (entry no. 13), Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations.
or pirated, will always betray the craftsman's hand. Once the eye can recognize their characteristic traits—an added lilt here, an extra flourish there—it can detect their origins and descendants and sometimes trace their ancestry through several generations, each adding an identifiable quirk or two.

Binns, for example, confined his signatures in a design so cramped and cluttered that his engraver had to squeeze some names in the center and prune others in the periphery. A few signers graced their names with a last flick of the pen, with flourishes that had to be trimmed because they interfered with the ornamental border. Tyler, on the other hand, retained every stroke and every nuance of his models, preserving their proportions, stress, and weight far more faithfully than his competitor. So convincing are his signatures that they masquerade as the originals in a recent book on American autographs, despite its avowed purpose to protect collectors from fakes and fabrications. They are almost too good, deceptive as they are, for Tyler could not subdue the writing master's urge to correct and improve. When Jefferson told him, 'no hand trembled on affixing its signature to that paper,' he was speaking only metaphorically. Sometimes a slip of the pen left the mark of tremulous old age, carelessness, or haste, little infelicities that Tyler unconsciously concealed.

Facsimile signatures truncated by Binns or prettified by Tyler proliferated during the 1820s. A contemporary key to John Trumbull's engraving identified the portraits with numbered signatures derived from Tyler's version; incongruously, it also rendered in facsimile the signatures of those who participated in Congress but did not sign the document. Trumbull or his engraver committed


this solecism, I believe, not just for visual effect but for commercial reasons, here seizing an opportunity to exploit the current craze for facsimiles. With this key, text and image begin to converge. In 1838 a miniature reproduction of Trumbull’s Declaration (16) incorporated the key as well as the text within a richly symbolic ornamental border that helped to unify these three pictorial elements, disparate in function and in scale. And it succeeded, it would seem, from how hard the plate was worked and how often it went back to press in different states or with different imprints. This is what the public wanted. Trumbull’s Declaration illustrates the text in later years with and without the facsimile signatures but usually in a decorative border or an architectural frame (25, 35, etc.). Overzealous artists taxed this composition with more and more portraits, emblems, allegorical figures, and scenes of historic sites and monuments until the original ingredients—image, text, and facsimiles—are barely to be seen.

These prints influenced books as well. Binns’s signatures illustrated such diverse publications of the 1820s as biographies of the signers,13 speeches of the presidents,14 and remaindered copies of Joel Barlow’s epic poem The Columbiad.15 In the 1850s they provide a model for both prints and books, for the wood engravings in a

13. John Sanderson, ed., Biography of the Signers to the Declaration of Independence, 9 vols. (Philadelphia: Published by Joseph M. Sanderson for the Proprietor, J. Maxwell, Printer, 1820–27). Sanderson originally intended to sell it by subscription in five volumes delivered in ten installments, a scheme described in Proposals by Joseph M. Sanderson, for Publishing by Subscription a Biography of the Signers to the Declaration of Independence. Accompanied with Plates, and the Declaration Itself with Fac-Simile Engravings of the Signatures, by John Sanderson (Philadelphia, 1819). Volumes three through nine were published by R. W. Pomeroy, who also seems to have reissued the first two volumes over his own name. The facsimile signatures reappear in the second edition of 1828 and probably in several others.

14. The Speeches, Addresses and Messages, of the Several Presidents of the United States ... Also, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and Washington’s Farewell Address to His Fellow-Citizens ... Embellished with Miniature Likenesses of the Presidents, and Fac Similies of the Sages of the Revolution, Signers to the Declaration of Independence (Philadelphia: Published by Robert Desilver, Thomas Town, Printer, 1825).

Fig. 5. John Trumbull's Declaration of Independence above the text engraved in a minute script. Asher B. Durand's key is at the bottom, with facsimile signatures after Tyler (entry no. 16). American Antiquarian Society.
best-selling pictorial history of the Revolution, and for the engraved frontispiece to a collection of documents on slavery.

Souvenir pamphlets printed for the Centennial print them after a reproduction of Jefferson’s rough draft, as if he had just dashed off the Declaration and an impulsive Congress rushed up to sign it before a fair copy could be prepared. An advertisement for one of these facsimiles boasted that thirty-five thousand copies had been sold.

Of course, the Declaration had appeared in book form long before Binns and Tyler and continued long after to be printed plainly and soberly without illustrations. It often accompanies the Constitution in compilations of state laws and in civics manuals, containing essential documents every good citizen should know. Titles like *The Elector’s Guide* and *The American’s Political Manual* promise instruction more than inspiration. One publisher urged


17. *Echoes from the Cabinet, Comprising the Constitution of the United States; Declaration of Independence; Fugitive Slave Bills of 1793 & 1850; Missouri Compromise; the Kansas and Nebraska Bill of 1854. Also, the Fac-Simile Autograph Names of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence* (Boston: Wentworth and Company, 1857). This is the only edition I have seen, although OCLC calls for editions published in New York by Dayton and Wentworth in 1855 and in Boston by Thayer & Eldridge in 1860. The frontispiece of the 1857 edition was probably derived from a popular print of the period (26).

18. *Fac-Simile of the Original Document in the Handwriting of Thomas Jefferson, 1776, 1786. The Declaration of Independence . . . with Biographical Sketches of the Signers; Also, A Chronological Table of the Principal Events from 1776 to 1876* (New York: Hibson Bros., Publishers, 1876); *The Declaration of Independence: By the Representatives of the U.S. of America, in General Congress Assembled, July 4th, 1776. Fac-Simile of the Original Document in the Handwriting of Th Jefferson* (Troy, N.Y.: Empire Publishing Company, [1876]). The American Antiquarian Society has in its graphic arts department an advertisement for the Empire Publishing Company edition, which states how many copies have been sold and sets trade prices at twenty cents each in lots of twenty-five or sixteen dollars per hundred.

his fellow countrymen to read and abide by these texts for the salvation of the country. The more we get to know them, he advised, the less we have to fear from sectional strife and troublesome politicians. To better circulate his edition, he offered a special bonus to those who bought in quantity, a small arsenal of firearms. After enough copies had been sold, he proposed to give away, absolutely free, single- and double-barrel fowling pieces and more than a thousand pairs of dueling pistols—presumably useful to patriots for settling their differences when state documents failed to give satisfaction. If immune to irony, he meant serious business with an edition of forty thousand copies, printed cheaply and expeditiously from stereotype plates.

Here, the book differs from prints not just in format, function, and content but in price and size of the edition. If a less subtle or expressive medium, letterpress printing far exceeds copperplate engraving in sheer reproductive power, a distinction most obvious in another kind of printed matter, the newspaper. On May 3, 1876, a New York photoengraving firm announced that it could supply electrotype blocks of a special Centennial facsimile in two sizes ready for press. The big day fast approaches, it warned, and subscribers might be disappointed not to see the Declaration in their daily papers. Cheap lithographic reproductions of Trumbull’s print, with a key, were also available, as were prints of the facsimile in bulk for those whose presses could not accommodate a block in such a large size. Power presses, electrotyping, lithography, and photography had lowered the wholesale price of the text to a nickel, the image to a dime (42).

Copperplate engravers could never aspire to mass production on this scale. Compared to the Centennial editions, Trumbull’s original print seems like a luxury at twenty dollars, and so it was, but such were the limitations of an engraving that cost over three thousand dollars to produce and could have cost seven thousand

if engraved abroad. Tyler sold his at five dollars on paper and seven dollars on parchment, typical prices for his day. In his case the limitations of the medium arose less from the expense of the copperplate than from its fragility, which restricted the number of good impressions to less than one thousand. Tyler claimed to have orders for more than three thousand, a figure difficult to believe given his fondness for hyperbole. Even one third that number would have tried his printmaking capabilities, yet that much is sure: his subscription book survives with more than one thousand names inscribed to certify the success of his publication.

Tyler's marketing strategy brilliantly exploited the rivalry of Binns and another inconvenience of printmaking, the time involved. In June 1816, Binns circulated proposals announcing the terms of his subscription and describing his print, its historical importance, and its ambitious design, so rich in detail, portraits, emblems, and ornament that it had been assigned to five different artists. Although he promised delivery in less than a year, the public waited more than three. Binns appeased his subscribers with progress reports, apologies, and explanations. Portraits had to be borrowed, models for the state seals had to be collected, and there were delays even in minor details like the American eagle, which soared all the more loftily after being painted from life. Meanwhile some artists quit the project and others joined. When the plate seemed almost ready, Binns distributed proofs to news-

---

papers and magazines and obtained glowing reviews to entice the public and reassure it that the print would in fact be published.²³

Tyler then pounced on the market that Binns had so carefully prepared, with his print offered at a lower price and at just the right moment to profit from all this prior publicity.²⁴ Indignantly, Binns denounced the intruder for stealing his idea, plagiarizing his prospectus, and violating the custom of the trade, which clearly sustained his rights to the Declaration since he had announced it first.²⁵ Tyler, of course, replied in kind, and both invited newspapers to tell their sides of the story.²⁶ The furor inspired a third party to print yet another Declaration on satin, priced even cheaper than Tyler’s (3).

The opponents were evenly matched. If the newspaperman deployed better lines of communication, the writing master wielded a formidable poisoned pen. He impugned his rival’s honesty, smeared his politics, and alluded nastily to his foreign origins. Binns, he charged, had actually purloined his Declaration from a government employee who had first conceived the idea of publishing an ornamental edition but unwisely confided in his engraver. The perfidious engraver defected to Binns and brought the project with him. Tyler exposed their treachery in print, with correspondence that the victim, a William Gardner, had given him to publish along with a disgruntled commentary. Gardner’s recriminations reached a peak of fury when describing how Binns had debased his


²⁵. Philadelphia Democratic Press, April 9 and 18, 1818.

²⁶. The American Watchman of Wilmington, for example, obligingly excerpted portions of Tyler’s Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts on July 15, 1818.
original design: ‘Ingratitude! fell monster! this is not thy native soil—take, oh! take thy flight for ever from the American shores!’”

This foreigner’s ingratitude rankled most because he had omitted a portrait of John Adams, that ‘enlightened patriot and Statesman’ who had done so much on behalf of American independence. Anyone who knew the hotheaded editor of The Democratic Press and his diatribes against the policies of Adams might conclude that he was to blame for a deliberate political affront. Although spoken by Gardner, these reproaches could have been dictated by Tyler, so neatly they suit his purposes: to stir up nativist resentment, to politicize the debate, and to gain the support and sympathy of the Adams family.

Tyler introduced himself to John Adams with an ingratiating letter, exquisitely written of course and also cunningly inscribed with Adams’s name, just as he had written it on the document in question forty-two years earlier. On Independence Day, he wrote again to assure Adams that his opponent’s rancorous partisan misuse of the Declaration had been deplored in both political parties. Tyler’s unswerving loyalty, on the other hand, rested on a distant but cherished family connection through a grandmother, a cousin of Adams’s and, it would seem, his nursemaid. Often he had heard her say how proud she was to have nursed ‘one of the fathers of American Liberty’ and to have rocked ‘in the cradle the President of the United States.”

Tyler championed the cause of Adams so effectively that when William Woodruff pirated Binns’s print he took the side of justice and restored the portrait to its rightful place. There is no evidence that Binns had wished to slight Adams in any way. Far to the contrary, he fished for endorsements both from him and from Jefferson, the two most revered signers of the five still living. But

28. Benjamin Owen Tyler to John Adams, May 16, 1818, and July 4, 1818, Letters Received and Other Loose Papers, Adams Papers, reel 443; Brigham, Tyler Genealogy, 1: 101.
29. John Binns to Thomas Jefferson, July 27, 1819, Jefferson Papers, series 1, reel 51; John Binns to John Adams, September 2, 1819, Letters Received and Other Loose Papers, Adams Papers, reel 448.
to complement the damage he had done with Adams, Tyler preempted Jefferson as well. He had already dedicated his print to Jefferson, who accepted the honor with a typically gracious letter, which Tyler promptly published. Binns, in rejoinder, dedicated his publication to the 'People of the United States.' Outmaneuvered on the personal and historical front, he sought support and sanction from the institutional side, from the government. He spread the rumor that his version would hang at the front of both houses of Congress and lobbied for a bill that would authorize the purchase of two hundred copies.

Here, too, he was frustrated, not by Tyler but by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, who sponsored an official facsimile, partly intended, I believe, to thwart Binns's schemes for government patronage. Instead of buying two hundred copies from Binns, Congress had at its disposal two hundred of its own, courtesy of the State Department. Adams heartily disliked Binns and no doubt loathed him more for his squabbles with Tyler, which demeaned a document that the secretary treasured and had often handled in his official capacity: Adams actually read from it aloud during the Fourth of July celebrations of 1821. His was a true facsimile of the entire manuscript, expertly engraved by William J. Stone, probably with the assistance of a transfer process, whether chemical or mechanical is still a matter of debate. Printed on parchment, with only a discreet imprint to betray its origins, it was a magnificent replica, suitable for presentation to the president, Congress, the Supreme Court, and other governmental bodies, as well as to Lafayette and the surviving signers of the original.


Thus a scuffle in the marketplace reached the highest levels of the government and culminated in a third even more sumptuous facsimile. This is where the history of printing and the book trade gingerly approaches other historical concerns. It has been argued that this controversy excited an onrush of patriotic enthusiasm for the Declaration. And so it did, but there were other underlying factors, less tumultuous though equally important. First, it took time before Americans discovered the noble sentiments in the Declaration, before they viewed it not as a mere instrument of diplomacy but rather as the birthright of a nation, as a manifesto of human dignity and personal rights. Secondly, it was a radical document. It advocated revolution, condoned disobedience, and rekindled animosities towards England in language disagreeable to Federalists. Republicans, on the other hand, flaunted its principles as their own, as a Jeffersonian political testament. While the two parties fought it out, partisan interpretations of the Declaration obscured its greater significance. After the War of 1812, however, political passions subsided and a spirit of nationalism surged, leaving Americans better disposed to read the charter of their liberty with feeling but without acrimonious intent.

Thirdly, Americans realized that the Revolution was not so long ago, that historical documents of all kinds remained readily at hand and easily collected. They gathered and preserved the records of their past all the more urgently because it had already begun to slip away. The more they looked back at the summer of 1776, the more myth and confusion they discovered. Even the participants contradicted themselves and jumbled the sequence of facsimile. I am very grateful to Thomas V. Lange for bringing Rapport's article to my attention.

events. Verifiable facts and reliable evidence were needed to buttress their fading memories, to ascertain once and for all what happened when.

The Declaration evolved gradually. To say so diminishes its thrill, but it will help to clarify matters to remember that it was proposed, promulgated, and signed on four different dates. On June 28, a special committee reported Jefferson’s draft to Congress, which tabled the document until July 2, when it formally passed a resolution for independence; next, it adopted the text of the Declaration on July 4 and sent it to the shop of John Dunlap to be printed; and then on August 2 such members as were present on that day signed a retitled version engrossed on parchment.36 Too often we forget this chronology on Independence Day, when we should properly celebrate not the act of independence but the word.

Thomas Jefferson had already forgotten on what day he had signed the instrument and in what surroundings when he advised John Trumbull on how to paint the Declaration. He obligingly sketched a floor plan, which was wrong. Although Trumbull thought he was depicting the events of July 4, his painting actually represents the moment when Jefferson’s draft was submitted on June 28. Trumbull and Jefferson agreed that the signatures should be consulted for deciding which portraits to include in the background. But when the painting was exhibited, an anonymous critic pointed out that the document was signed nearly a month after it was adopted and that some members had joined Congress and others departed in the interval. This is not history painting, the critic fumed, but ‘a sorry, motley, mongrel picture, where truth and fiction mingle.’ Trumbull replied that he and Jefferson knew the correct date all along, that the signatures were only a ‘general

guide,’ but his protests are unconvincing. Jefferson clearly believed from early on that he had signed the Declaration on the Fourth. Buffeted by criticisms like these, Trumbull repeatedly substituted heads in his personal copy of the painting and eventually added one before he sent it to be engraved, so, to add to the confusion, the engraving represents a slightly different and larger Congress than the official painting in the Capitol Rotunda.

The text was even harder to pin down. Binns and Tyler were distressed to learn that contemporary editions had been appearing under the wrong title. An intolerable error, it deprived the Declaration of its true impact, since, among other changes, the significant word ‘unanimous’ had been omitted. Their engravings, of course, would remedy this negligence. Neither realized that the suspect title originated in a perfectly respectable source, John Dunlap’s broadside edition, commissioned by Congress, printed under its supervision, and duly inserted in its Rough Journal. In fact, there are three official texts to choose from, the Dunlap edition, a transcription in the Corrected Journal of Congress, and the engrossed version on parchment. After perplexed deliberations, the historian Carl L. Becker decided that the Dunlap edition is most authoritative. Edward Dumbauld agreed, and so did Julian Boyd until he edited The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, which followed


the engrossed version instead. Also perplexed, a blue-ribbon committee charged with abridging the text for the Jefferson Memorial selected key phrases and toyed with them so indecisively that it garbled the few words that were finally carved on stone. Only our statute books seem secure in the choice of a copy text: codified in 1845, the parchment remains the law of the land.

Documents and the document itself could prevent confusion and dispel nagging doubts about the text, its date, history, and authorship. One contemporary review suggested that Binns’s print might help to settle arguments. To take an extreme example, a Philadelphia merchant of loyalist convictions believed that the Declaration was a fraud. He knew for a fact that Congress had first rejected independence but voted again on July 4, while a mob gathered outside, and even then consented by only a single vote. But John Hancock went out to address the crowd, ‘the People shouted,’ and thereupon the Declaration was printed with his name and the secretary’s. This he knew because he owned one of the early broadside editions, which he meant to compare with Binns’s facsimile as soon as it was published. If he was correct in his suspicions, the documentary evidence would reveal that the

44. The Analectic Magazine 14 (1819): 496.
Declaration had been ‘fabricated’ and that the delegates had not signed it until nearly a year later, when victory seemed in sight.\textsuperscript{45}

Whether one agreed with them or not, it was reassuring to view the exact words just as they were written. Americans have collected historical manuscripts in facsimile—letters of famous statesmen, mementos of the presidents, relics of the Civil War—not just to idolize a hero, glorify an event, or satisfy curiosity but to relieve uncertainties about the past. Photographic reproductions have won the confidence of the public just as they have lulled the critical faculties of librarians and literary scholars, whose business is to question the documents they handle.\textsuperscript{46}

Although hardly controversial nowadays, the Declaration is still a potent talisman and is still eagerly collected for another, simpler reason. The original exists but is not to be seen. Over the years it has been displayed and stored in such harrowing circumstances that the ink has flaked and faded and the parchment has creased and darkened. It has suffered so much that history books rarely reproduce the original but rather the Stone facsimile; that is what it must have looked like, a caption explains, when it was legible in 1823.\textsuperscript{47}

As early as 1817 the acting secretary of state noticed the ‘hand of time’ when he compared it to Tyler’s facsimile. More than a year later, John Quincy Adams detected damage and thought that Binns’s engraver was to blame. Posterity has also blamed William Stone and his facsimile techniques, perhaps unjustly. Although Stone’s facsimile was to make ‘further exposure . . . unnecessary,’\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{45} Miers Fisher, Diary, January 29, 1817, Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College; Anna Wharton Smith, Genealogy of the Fisher Family, 1652 to 1896 (Philadelphia, 1896), pp. 49–52.
\textsuperscript{48} Richard Rush’s remark about the ‘hand of time’ is quoted on Tyler’s facsimile and
visitors to Washington still insisted on seeing the original at the State Department, where it had to be rolled and unrolled for their inspection, and then at the Patent Office, where from 1841 until the Centennial it wilted, hung up on a wall opposite a window. The question where to exhibit it during the Centennial pitted Philadelphia’s leading citizens against federal bureaucrats determined to make it the centerpiece of their pavilion in the Exposition grounds. The Philadelphians argued triumphantly that it would be more appropriate, evocative, and authentic to return it to the very room where it was signed in Independence Hall. By this time, it wasn’t just fading, it was crumbling. Fairgoers could go into town to see what was left of it or accept a substitute, facsimiles, which were at least easier to read. They could take home with them souvenirs of the Declaration, printed abominably on a venerable handpress (40). Several companies passed out Centennial keepsakes, a facsimile printed on cheap imitation parchment with space set aside for their advertisements. The enterprising printers inserted a message offering to sell copies without the advertising for fifty cents to one dollar (36 & 38).

Facsimiles have had to take the place of the original whenever conservation concerns made it inaccessible. On the advice of experts, the State Department kept the document in the dark and out of view from 1894 until 1921. The publisher of one reproduction lamented this ‘great misfortune’ that banished it to a vault in Washington not to emerge for twenty years, and then only long enough for scientists to examine it (48). Before then, however, the State Department gladly relinquished its responsibility to the Library of Congress, which put the Declaration back on display in an elaborate marble shrine, designed to shield it from excessive light. Still exposed in other ways, the parchment endured drastic changes in humidity and some unfortunate repairs. The Declaration and Constitution now reside in another shrine at the National
Archives, displayed by day in helium-filled glass containers and sheltered at night in a vault twenty-two feet below ground level. Not even the Bicentennial was allowed to disturb these protective measures. Denied the original, Philadelphians had to settle for a restrike of the Stone facsimile, ceremoniously unveiled by First Lady Betty Ford.49

For over two centuries, Americans have watched over this beleaguered parchment and the text it carries not just with solicitude and reverence but with obsessive vigilance. The National Archives now monitors its physical condition with state-of-the-art technology developed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology. Once a year, conservation scientists scan the Declaration and the Constitution with an electronic camera and a computerized image-processing system capable of detecting the slightest signs of visible decay.50 Our Founding Fathers guarded the text just as zealously. The *Journals of Congress* record that they sent an 'authenticated' text to be printed on July 4 and that they signed the parchment only after it was first 'compared at the table'; certainly somebody read it over carefully enough to make two interlinear corrections.51 After the victories of Trenton and Princeton, Congress again ordered that an 'authenticated' text should be printed, although this time based on the engrossed version, bearing its 'unanimous' title and listing the signers at the end. In his capacity as president of Congress, John Hancock authenticated at least four copies with his manuscript signature.


Furthermore, this edition prints beneath the Declaration the text of the congressional order authorizing it for official distribution.\textsuperscript{52}

The first facsimiles also required written proof of authenticity. How else were they to be trusted when the original could not be seen? An early American could no more judge their accuracy than an early European could criticize a woodcut of an elephant. Binns assured his customers that he would transcribe the text ‘word for word, letter for letter and point for point,’ while Tyler promised as much in his advance publicity. Neither respected the accidentals of their text, not that it mattered. Both had obtained signed certificates from secretaries of state, who declared the texts to be ‘correct’ and the signatures to be ‘exact imitations.’ Both printed these statements in a prominent place and in turn authenticated the authentication by printing the secretary’s signature in facsimile. Their credentials resemble one another so closely that Binns must have copied Tyler’s.\textsuperscript{53}

These trappings of authority impressed fellow members of the trade no less than their discerning customers. Printers copied the facsimile signatures of one or the other far more often than those of Stone, even though his were far more accurate, and far better entitled to official approval. But while his facsimile was hard to come by, first published in a strictly limited edition, theirs were readily available and certifiably just as good. Publishers of important state documents often obtained signed certificates on the Binns and Tyler model. Compilers of an 1846 edition of the Constitution inserted a lithographed plate to prove that they had obtained the written sanction of the State Department.\textsuperscript{54}


\textsuperscript{53} Niles' Weekly Register, July 6, 1816, p. 311; Tyler, Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts, pp. 6, 18. Richard Rush signed Tyler's certificate on September 10, 1817, more than a year before John Quincy Adams signed Binns's on April 19, 1819.

\textsuperscript{54} [William Hickey, ed.], \textit{The Constitution of the United States of America; The Proximate Causes of Its Adoption and Ratification; The Declaration of Independence; The Prominent Political Acts of George Washington; and Other Interesting Matter: with an Alphabetical Analysis of the
Once photography was invented, publishers could freely appropriate facsimiles from one another as well as the signatures and departmental seals that supposedly guaranteed their accuracy. Secretary of State John Hay probably never knew that his signature and seal had ended up on a garishly decorated lithograph, calling itself an *Officially Certified Facsimile* (47). During the Centennial, a photolithographer in Washington circulated a facsimile Declaration that either suffered an accident in the darkroom or else the handiwork of an artist with a reckless disregard for the truth (34). Somebody retouched it, supplying penmanship of his own while omitting little details such as punctuation and even an entire word. Nevertheless, it bore official signatures impressive enough to fool a photoengraving firm, which copied this travesty of the Declaration and sold plates of it to newspapers and publishers. Not incongruously perhaps, one plate was used to advertise the adventures of P. T. Barnum, forthcoming in one of Frank Leslie’s pulp magazines for children (42).

Earlier publishers would have accused Leslie and his ilk of sacrilege. They intended their facsimiles to be devotional objects, to be kept in a place of honor and revered as the true image of the Declaration. They implied that patriots would want a personal copy to venerate like the Bible. Just as the invention of printing helped to make the religious image available for personal devotion, so facsimiles brought the cult of the Declaration into the home. Binns predicted that his engraving would help to decorate an ‘apartment’ where it would keep its precious message ‘continually under the eye of man, woman and child.’ Tyler imagined a similar domestic scene in the ‘parlour’ or ‘drawing-room,’ where the father of the house delivers a stirring civics lesson. Standing his children before the print, he points to it and says, ‘There hangs the pledge which secured your liberty and rescued you from the jaws of tyranny.’


55. *Niles’ Weekly Register*, July 6, 1816, p. 310; *Tyler, Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts*, p. 6. Binns was proud to have published that document ‘which the friends
Garret Sickels, a prosperous shoemaker of New York, adorned his walls just as prescribed by Binns and Tyler. When his executors drew up the inventory of his estate in 1822, they found only four works of art worth noting along with the furniture, the tea service, and the pots and pans: a large map, his membership certificate in the Tammany Society, and, framed in gilt, two pictures appraised at ten dollars, the Declaration of Independence and the ‘Signers thereto.’ By ‘Signers,’ his executors probably meant facsimiles of their signatures rather than their portraits since Trumbull’s engraving wasn’t published until a year later.\(^5^6\)

The Declaration was enshrined in its richest and most intimate setting not in America but in France, on the bedroom wall of the Marquis de Lafayette. Trumbull had sent him a copy of his print and so had Binns, and similarly Congress directed John Quincy Adams to send him two copies of the Stone facsimile. His collection also included a framed Declaration of the Rights of Man and an engraving of the death of General Warren, probably Trumbull’s. A biography of Lafayette features a detailed catalogue keyed to an illustration showing exactly how he displayed his American memorabilia—the Stone facsimile to the right of his dressing closet door, Trumbull’s engraving above, and, to the left, an engraving of George Washington’s Farewell Address.\(^5^7\)

of human rights, religious and civil, look [to] with reverence and hope, only inferior to that which the Christian world bends the knee and bows the head to the symbols of their holy religion’ (Recollections, p. 356). Tyler’s publicity makes the analogy even more explicit: ‘The bible and the declaration have both been published in various forms; and the Declaration of Independence is considered as sacred by the political world, as the Bible is by the religious’ (Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts, p. 9).

\(^5^6\). Inventory of Garret Sickels, December 18, 1822, Probate Inventory, S-134, Historical Documents Collection, History Department, Queens College, City University of New York; Sean Wilentz, Chants Democratic: New York City & the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 43. Sickels may have owned an early state of Woodruff’s pirated edition of the Declaration with the facsimile signatures engraved separately (4). For the date of Trumbull’s print, see Jaffe, John Trumbull, p. 241; Trumbull sent a copy to be deposited for copyright on October 20, 1823, Letters Received and Other Loose Papers, Adams Papers, reel 463.

John Binns had a hand in this engraving too. In his first flurry of enthusiasm, Binns intended it to accompany his *Declaration* and to match it; hung next to one another, they would harmonize perfectly, being printed on paper of the same size and executed by many of the same artists. Binns dropped out of the project by the time it was published in 1821, perhaps having wearied of Tyler and the printmaking business. Nevertheless it retained some of Binns’s influence in the dedication, which is addressed to the ‘People of the United States’ in the same words as his *Declaration*.

Like Binns, many publishers recognized an affinity between the Farewell Address and the Declaration, both best sellers during the nineteenth century. The Huntington Library has almost three hundred editions of the Farewell Address, often combined with the Declaration, the Constitution, and other state papers. Americans revered the father of their country as much as they esteemed the Declaration and venerated most in him virtues epitomized in the Farewell Address. These two documents are, I believe, closely related in sentimental significance and political symbolism. A recent book on George Washington suggests how he came to be a charismatic figure despite his own inclinations and personality. Once America disowned its king, it looked for other unifying symbols, other ways to foster a sense of national identity. Washington presented a public figure that attracted adulation but tempered it acceptably, as befits the figurehead of a republic. Americans adored him all the more because of his humility, selflessness, and self-denial. Trumbull celebrated these virtues in his painting of the victorious Washington submissively resigning his military commission to Congress. Significantly, Trumbull’s scheme for the Capitol Rotunda linked this scene with his *Declaration*, as two

disagree with it in one particular. I doubt that Lafayette would have displayed his two copies of the Stone facsimile next to each other, as the catalogue suggests. The proportions of one print in the illustration and its title in Cloquet’s catalogue make, to my mind, Trumbull’s *Declaration* a far better candidate.

§8. Proposals by Gideon Fairman, John Binns, and Charles H. Parker were printed in the *Daily National Intelligencer*, July 29, 1818, p. 1, and the *Kentucky Gazette*, October 2, 1818, p. 1, and were also excerpted in *The Port Folio*, 4th ser., 6 (1818): 320. The Huntington Library has an untrimmed copy measuring forty by twenty-seven inches.
'civil subjects' to balance his other two paintings of military victories.59

Of course, the same theme of resignation runs through the Farewell Address. Washington renounces power, returns to private life, and leaves a legacy of good advice to a grateful nation. The individual defers to abstract national ideals in both the Declaration and in these poignant, self-effacing, parting words. The Declaration could be just as vivid and captivating a symbol of nationhood and of national unity as Washington the man, especially when a facsimile evoked the real presence of the document and illustrated its symbolic content. The Declaration diffused power and responsibility, just as the Farewell Address relinquished it. The portraits, state seals, and facsimile signatures emphasized the collaboration on the text, its corporate authorship.

In this respect, the cult of the signers complements the cult of Washington. Close on the heels of Binns and Tyler, Joseph Sanderson published, in parts, a Biography of the Signers, which in other hands amounted to nine octavo volumes in 1827, complete with portraits and facsimile signatures.60 Other editions followed, as well as less ambitious publications on the same model, all designed to satisfy American curiosity about the Founding Fathers, what they looked like and how and where they lived.61 Many experi-


60. See note 13, above.

enced this fascination with the signers and their signatures, but none responded more obsessively than autograph collectors. In their hands, the political symbolism of the Declaration is even more explicit, since they value it so highly, but not for its text so much as for the signatures below. Not the importance of the signer, but the rarity of the signature, its date and circumstances arouse the passion of a collector. The challenge of assembling a complete set distributes the glory of the Declaration into fifty-six component parts.

Collectors turned their attention to the Declaration just as the first facsimiles came on the market, and as the last signers were dying off. One autograph hound begged John Adams to indulge this ‘eccentricity’ with a letter in his hand, which would be kept until Adams died and then framed in his honor. After a few impatient weeks, he wrote again to renew his plea and to quote an inspirational text that Jefferson had kindly sent him. To this, Adams replied fretfully, ‘I can no more write a line than I can work a Miracle,’ but he did have his secretary transcribe a text to match Jefferson’s, after which he signed his name as best he could with a trembling hand. Instead of framing his signatures, one collector inserted them in extra-illustrated copies of Sanderson’s Biography, a perfect setting for relics of the signers, next to their portraits and the stories of their lives. A librarian contrived an even more ingenious setting: a full-size facsimile of the Declaration, on which he pasted genuine clipped signatures. With scissors and determination, he achieved the ultimate in verisimilitude.

Printmaking techniques allowed devotees of the Declaration to play with the past as they recaptured it. A banknote engraver fit the entire text on a business card, a virtuoso display of skill and

---


utterly useless, save as a novelty to be passed around and thrown away (19). Equally unreadable, two large lithographs proffer a text with its letterforms cleverly distorted, so that when viewed from far away they form huge portraits of George Washington—a surreal exercise in penmanship that puts, literally, some words in his ears and others in his mouth (32 & 33). The text could also take the shape of the Liberty Bell (39). Inspired by the Centennial, advertisers devised ingenious ways of working a message into a corner of the document (36), behind it (48), over it (45), and, brazenly, in the midst of it (38).

Tyler’s and Binns’s obligations to the exact image stopped at the facsimiles of the signatures. They, too, played visual tricks with the Declaration, not to exploit, diminish, or distort it but to guide the reader and enhance the act of reading. Should their interpretations seem trivial and pretentious at first glance, it is because they and their artists obeyed the conventions of an unfamiliar medium. Both relied on a printing technique better known to art historians than to historians of the book, and, when used for printing text, not very well known at all. Engraving, despite its expense and all the other disadvantages I have mentioned, is inherently a more versatile and expressive medium than letterpress printing. It can make bold statements and fine distinctions; it can delineate the precise details of a scientific drawing or tease the viewer with wisps of cloud and curls of hair, with the subtleties of light and shade and contour. A typographer, on the other hand, must cope with the constraints of leaden type, the limitations of wood blocks and cast ornaments locked up within a chase. With only these two technologies to choose from, Binns and Tyler turned to engraving for the visual effects they wished to achieve.

Whatever strange or fantastic alphabet Tyler could coax from his pen, an engraver could execute on copper. His engraved Declaration rendered the ‘emphatical words,’ as he called them, in gothic, shaded, and flowered styles that the letter founders of his day were only beginning to translate into cast type. Such a profusion, such a concatenation of ornamental script was rarely seen
outside of writing manuals. Phrases like 'General Congress' and 'Supreme Judge' must have leapt to the eye of Tyler's customers, who were as yet unaccustomed to reading decorative letter in quantity. The contrasting background of his perfectly regular, evenly flowing, round hand also heightened the effect.

Tyler did not simply choose a word here and there to display his skill; he sought to express the rhythm, stress, and dynamics of a spoken document, fully deserving the art and might of an orator on the Fourth of July. The ornament in the last paragraph grows larger and more insistent, as if reaching a thunderous and joyful conclusion to the creation of a free people. Bombastic as it may be, Tyler's use of decoration derives some precedent from the original. The scribe of the engrossed version changed writing styles to add a rhetorical flourish here and there, and, likewise, Dunlap's compositor emphasized some of the final phrases in letterspaced caps and small caps. Following this precedent and Tyler's example, the text in many later editions raises its voice, figuratively, in decorative letter. Even the staid Journals of Congress signaled the key words of the last paragraph in caps, small caps, italic caps, and blackletter caps. As decorative faces became commercially available, letterpress printers often employed them with script types and stock cuts to emulate the engraved facsimiles (13, 14, 17, 18, 21).

Several engraved facsimiles copied but none matched the exuberance of Tyler's ornamental lettering (6 & 15). Binns's hired penman proclaimed 'All Men Are Created Equal' in shaded caps and invoked 'the Protection of Divine Providence' in German text. Except to highlight these and a few other phrases, he was content to let his fellow artists carry the decorative burden, which was considerable.

With ornament and illustration, Binns built an elaborate symbolic structure around the text, an iconography just as influential as Tyler's calligraphy. This iconography tended to celebrate the benefits of independence in peace and prosperity and to downplay its cost in strife and combat. Although military insignia accompany
Washington's portrait, they seem more like tokens of glory than of martial prowess, and twin cornucopias take such a prominent place in their midst as to relegate them to the past. Typically American agricultural commodities sprout at the bottom of the design, to balance the spears and banners that bristle at the top.

In between, the composition symbolizes a peaceful, powerful, and unified nation. Binns probably borrowed his motif of state seals from an earlier print, Amos Doolittle's *Display of the United States of America*. State seals set within ringlets form an interlocking chain around a portrait of Washington, the visual and symbolic centerpiece of Doolittle's *Display*; Washington stands at the heart of his country and of Doolittle's composition. Binns invites a similar interpretation with his 'cordon of honor,' a massive border bearing the state arms in elaborate medallions. All of America joins together in the border to strengthen a union built around the Declaration and its imperishable truths. Binns's design, like Doolittle's, binds the state seals together around a symbol of national unity. Later editions copied his design (9 & 13) or adapted it with other emblems, more portraits, or larger borders (20, 25, 29, 41, etc.).

Binns's iconography reflects an ambiguity in American attitudes towards the Revolution. Michael Kammen has revealed how persistently we have imposed a conservative interpretation on our Revolutionary past, how we have contrived to overlook its radical roots and destabilizing effects. Even while we glorify this heroic act of nation building, we often view it as safely over and done with, accomplished, and concluded. The meaning of the Declaration has also responded to changes in our political and social temperament, and just as often to mitigate its unsettling, radical implications.

64. Doolittle's *Display* is described and reproduced in E. McSherry Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1689-1880: A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection* (Charlottesville: Published for The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum by the University Press of Virginia, 1987), item 212; see also Schwartz's interpretation in *George Washington*, p. 81. Binns's prospectus in *Niles' Weekly Register*, July 6, 1816, pp. 310–11, contains an explication of his design.

If he had his way, William Gardner claimed, he would have topped his Declaration with an allegory of Liberty in action, vanquishing the demon of Tyranny, while trampling underfoot the emblems of Royalty. Why Binns should steal so many of his ideas yet reject this one ‘very appropriate’ illustration, Gardner confessed he could not understand. Such an allegory might have delighted an artist like Fuseli but not Binns and his successors, who preferred a less bellicose interpretation of independence. I know of only one or two prints that depict it in the making, with relics, monuments, and battle scenes of the Revolutionary War; and one includes so much symbolic content that it complicates its message and dilutes the overall effect (35). A rather more engaging and typical print, a facsimile of the signatures based on Binns’s, state seals and all, features a comely Justice and a winsome Liberty in voluptuous repose (27).

Too often, we dismiss these allegories because they offend our artistic sensibilities and violate our expectations. We know what a facsimile should look like, the illusion of age and historicity it should foster. American eagles, liberty bells, and titulary personages do not belong. Allegory is out of fashion and so is history depicted in paintings and in prints. The more information an artist tries to convey, the less scope he has for painterly effects, for suggesting the unseen, for evoking depth, movement, and perspective such as we have been taught to value in a work of art. In a museum, we step back to admire form and composition, to test our subjectivity, whereas Trumbull’s painting and the facsimiles shun ambiguities and demand to be scrutinized up close. Trumbull packed so much detail in his painting that he stifled it. Banknote engravers excelled at the fine workmanship, the minute lettering and intricate ornament these facsimiles required. Of all artists,

66. Tyler, Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts, p. 37. Around 1842 the Independence Fire Company of Baltimore engaged a local painter to decorate a hose carriage with an allegory fully as vigorous as Gardner’s. The figure of Independence stands over a crown, a broken spear, and a broken chain, with one hand aloft and the other brandishing a sword that points to the Declaration on a scroll; see Elinor Lander Horwitz, The Bird, the Banner, and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1976), pp. 80–81.
they knew best what was genuine and what was not from having to contend against counterfeits and forgeries. Yet, judged aesthetically, they have been ranked among the most conventional and least inspired of the printmaking profession.  

These artistic considerations would not matter but for the evidence they conceal. I have tried to demonstrate what might be learned about the Declaration from an early broadside edition, whether from an allegorical illustration, the expressive power of its letterforms, the cult significance of its signatures, or the reassurance of its authenticity. Broadsides, particularly illustrated broadsides can be a rich resource for the study of popular attitudes towards historical events and of popular culture in general. French historians of the book have frequently bypassed the book to examine broadsides published as propaganda, news, or for pious contemplation. French political prints juxtapose image and text in complex ways that provoke interpretations far more elaborate than what I have ventured here. The Declaration, as much as it promoted national unity, can hardly rival the explosive effect of an early French broadside, which was so heretical, inflammatory, and irrepressible that it goaded the king to outlaw printing altogether. Yet even French historians have had to overcome a  

67. E. H. Gombrich, Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation, 2d ed., rev., Bollingen Series 35, 5 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 215–16, 228; William M. Ivins, Jr., Prints and Visual Communication, Da Capo Press Series in Graphic Art, 10 (New York: Da Capo Press, 1969), pp. 81, 101. It should be noted that banknote engraving flourished during the banking boom that preceded the Panic of 1819. Trumbull himself praised American achievements in this kind of printmaking, although he felt it was not appropriate for the portraiture that he had in mind. Nevertheless, he finally hired Asher Durand, who had been trained in banknote engraving, continued to practice it, and even helped to invent one of the mechanical shortcuts that art historians deplore (Hendricks, ‘Durand, Maverick and the Declaration,’ p. 62; Stephens, The Mavericks, pp. 51, 64n). Of the artists whose names are mentioned in the broadside editions of the Declaration listed below, the following are known to have had some background in banknote engraving: Peter Maverick (2); William Momberger (19); George Murray (5); George G. Smith (20); Charles Toppan (19); and John Vallance (5).  

prejudice against this crude, cheap, and lowly form of printed matter.  

American librarians discriminate between two kinds of printed matter, between prints and broadsides. We store them in different departments, catalogue them for different purposes, and direct them to a different clientele. Prints—usually engravings or lithographs with only a minimum of text—we consider works of art, however bad, which already makes them suspect for serious, scholarly inquiry. Perhaps we unwittingly reinforce that distrust of the image that D. F. McKenzie detects in recent scholarship; if a ‘visual intermediary’ can be thought to falsify a concept, then to make value judgments about it or raise questions of aesthetics will raise even greater obstacles to objectivity.  

Broadsides, on the other hand, we treat like flimsy books, preserved in a special place but catalogued much the same. Like books they are printed letterpress, with titles to transcribe, imprints to record, and, maybe, illustrations to be noted in a word or two—but rarely more. Nevertheless, once a cataloguing system registers the existence of pictorial content, it can tell a researcher where to find it. The National Union Catalog, the RLIN database, and the OCLC Online Union Catalog alerted me to several important broadsides that I would have never discovered otherwise. But far more broadside editions, letterpress and engraved, are completely unrecorded and are only to be found in a prints department, in a bulging portfolio devoted to the Declaration. Researchers deserve an easier route than traveling from door to door, from one library to the next in search of fugitive printed matter, whether Declarations

broadsides to a bookish audience, and none very persuasively, with the significant exception of Georgia Barnhill, whose ‘Vignettes of the Past: American Historical Broadsides through the War of 1812,’ Printing History 7/8 (1982): 37–48, surveys several important genres.


or proclamations, political caricatures, patriotic songs, or news sheets.

Here of all places I do not have to plead for more and better cataloguing, for the American Antiquarian Society has already shown the way with its twin projects, the 'Catalogue of American Printed Broadsides' and the 'Catalogue of American Engravings.' Nor do I have to defend ephemera in a library that collects trade cards, billheads, railroad tickets, stock certificates, and valentines. But I would like to urge a closer look at them from a cataloguer's point of view, as distinct, independently produced printed objects, each worthy of analysis and interpretation. If we are to study them as cultural artifacts, we must get to know them individually. Admittedly, they are great in number and often dauntingly the same, far easier to classify than itemize. They seem to fit naturally into categories of format, medium, and genre, criteria useful in libraries and statistics. However practical, these labels either lump prints and broadsides all together, like a residue picked off the edges of the book trade, or separate them artificially, from one another and from their origins, purpose, and context. Better to consider each one in a class by itself. Given our undivided attention, they can tell us about printing technologies, publishing strategies, and illustration techniques rarely seen in books. They can communicate, not just with pictures and text, but with depictions of a text and around it. They can speak in several visible languages at once, which we can learn after first learning how they were designed and made.
SOME BROADSIDE EDITIONS
OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

This list includes the best known and most influential of the editions published during the nineteenth century as well as some obscure examples to show how iconography and design could be copied, adapted, and embellished. Despite the guesswork involved, I have arranged the list in chronological order and tried to retrace the route that certain popular motifs took from one publication to the next. I have based most of my descriptions on the holdings of the American Antiquarian Society (MWA); the American Philosophical Society (PPAmP); the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (PHi); the Huntington Library (CSmH); the Independence National Historical Park (PPIn); the Library Company of Philadelphia (PPL); the Massachusetts Historical Society (MHi); the New-York Historical Society (NHi); and the New York Public Library (NN). Location symbols in italics denote items that I have seen only as photographs or photocopies. I have also indicated where I have seen photostats of broadsides that I have not found in the original. Measurements are to the nearest quarter of an inch, in the order of height and width of the largest copy found. I have followed Fowble’s *Two Centuries of Prints in America* in using the § symbol to denote different sections of engraved or lithographed text. Like Fowble, I have transcribed the title and publication information first and then those sections that are most prominent visually, leaving the text that appears within the image area for last. However, I have supplied or abstracted the publication information in brackets after the title, for ease of reference. Following library practice, I have prefaced publication dates derived from a copyright statement with a c, which should serve as a warning that actual publication may have occurred somewhat later.

Those cheaply printed editions that lack imprints and fail to name the artists involved have proved nearly impossible to date and localize. External evidence or a partial imprint mentioning a name and address can at least narrow down the possibilities.
times I have been able to guess at a date by finding a topical reference, an address in city directories, or other, datable examples of a publisher's work in library catalogues. I have also relied on standard reference sources cited as follows:


**Note:** Letterpress, text in two columns within a border of type ornaments, with a relief cut of an American eagle. Signatures in type arranged by state.

MWA

2 *In Congress, July 4th 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America.* [Washington: Benjamin Owen Tyler, 1818]. 31" x 27"

§ Copied from the original Declaration of Independence in the Department of State, and Published by Benjamin Owen Tyler Professor of Penmanship, City of Washington 1818. The publisher designed and executed the ornamental writing, and has been particular to copy the Facsimilies exact, and has also observed
the same punctuation, and copied every Capital as in the original. Engraved by Peter Maverick Newark N.J. § Department of State September 10, 1817. The foregoing copy of the declaration of Independence, has been collated with the original instrument and found correct. I have, myself, examined the signatures to each. Those executed by Mr Tyler are curiously exact imitations; so much so that it would be difficult if not impossible for the closest scrutiny to distinguish them, were it not for the hand of time, from the originals. [signed in facsimile:] Richard Rush Acting Secretary of State [with the seal of the Secretary of State's office] § To Thomas Jefferson, Patron of the Arts, the firm supporter of American Independence, and the Rights of Man, this Charter of our Freedom is, with the highest esteem, most Respectfully Inscribed by his much Obliged and very Humble Servant Benjamin Owen Tyler.

NOTE: Engraved, title and text in various ornamental scripts, the signatures in facsimile.

I have seen copies printed on vellum (MWA & MHi) and silk (NN) as well as on paper, possibly manufactured by Joshua and Thomas Gilpin on the first papermaking machine in America. Tyler boasted that he had paid $200 a ream for the paper and $600 a ream for the parchment (Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts, p. 11). Many years later he recalled that the copperplate had cost him $1,500 (Tyler to Luther Bradish, March 27, 1851, NHi).

LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS: ca. 1864 MHi has a photostat of an elaborately illustrated lithograph incorporating Tyler's lettering along with the state seals, a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration, and a key, with the imprint: Printed by Lang & Cooper, 117 Fulton St New York § Published by Horace Thayer. No 36 Beekman St New York. ca. 1887-90 Lithographic facsimile of Tyler's engraving printed on imitation parchment, with the imprint: Engraved and Printed by the Giles Lithographic and Liberty Printing Co N.Y. for M[ess.?] W. Duke Sons & Co. Durham, N.C. and New York. (NN, photostat at MWA).

3 In Congress, July 4th. 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [N.p., 1818?]. 21 1/2" x 16"

NOTE: Letterpress, printed on satin in two columns within a folding ribbon ornamental border, the title in shaded and fat faces, the signatures in italics. The title partly imitates Tyler's layout with the addition of a stock cut depicting the national seal, the flag, and other patriotic emblems.

Tyler remarked in passing that a broadside like this, a 'handsome edition' on satin, had been published within a few weeks of his and was selling for less than half the price (Declaration of Independence. A Candid Statement of Facts, p. 14). I am very grateful to Stephen O. Saxe, who has examined a photograph and compared the types and ornaments with the early American type specimens in his collection. He confirms that it could have been printed in 1818, both from evidence of the types, which are consistent with this date, and of the stock cut, which he found in an 1820 specimen of the Bruce typefoundry.

Nd

§ Philad: Published Feb 20th 1819, by William Woodruff. § Engraved by Wm. Woodruff § Copy Right secured § Printed by C. P. Harrison § [Dedication:] To the People of the United States ... [signed:] Wm. Woodruff.

NOTE: Engraved, title in ornamental script and text in a uniform round hand, within an ornamental border bearing the state seals in medallions and portraits of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams.

The publishing history of this close imitation of Binns's engraving is long and complicated. According to Binns, Woodruff pirated his design while employed in the shop of George Murray, whom Binns had engaged to execute the 'ornamental part' of his engraving. Binns sued Woodruff in a federal court, which decided that the case was outside its jurisdiction (Daily National Intelligencer, Nov. 30, 1818, p. 3 & Dec. 7, 1818, p. 3). Woodruff then went ahead and published his print in February, 1819, several months before Binns's. At first Woodruff wrote out the signatures in a flourished round hand rather than in facsimile, either because he feared to copy that portion of Binns's print or because Binns's artists had not yet completed it. (John Quincy Adams didn't authenticate Binns's autographs until April 1819.) Woodruff eventually accompanied his print with a separately published facsimile of the signatures.

Hart 595; Stauffer 3406; not seen

LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS: ca. 1820s? Omitting Harrison's imprint (NN). ca. 1820s? Adding the imprint: Printed by E. Valentine N. York. (ScElM). ca. 1830s-40s? A crude copy, printed in red on a yellow fabric with a border of military insignia and vignettes of the Boston Tea Party and the surrender of General Burgoyne at Saratoga. Facsimile signatures after Tyler (NN). ca. 1830s-40s? Lithograph printed in Lyons by H. Brunet, based on Woodruff's print in an early state, without facsimile signatures (NN). ca. 1830s-40s? Lithograph printed by Brunet on silk or satin, with the text slightly rearranged and the dedication signed simply 'Woodruff' (PPhn). ca. 1837-43 Printed from the original plate with the signatures reengraved in facsimile (after Binns) and with Woodruff's imprint changed to: Philad: Published by O. Rogers, N° 67 South 2nd St Philad; (Hart 596; Stauffer 3407; NHi). At about this time the state seals were entirely redesigned and reengraved. ca. 1841-43 As the Rogers edition but with a different portrait of Washington, signed 'Gimber Sc. § Trumbull Pintx,' and different imprints: Published by Phelps & Ensign 7½ Bowery N.Y. § Story & Atwood Engravers 151 Fulton St N.Y. (Hart 117; NN). ca. 1841-43 Washington's portrait unsigned (Hart 117a; MWA NHi).


Portrait of Thomas Jefferson, Painted in 1816 by Otis. Portrait of John Hancock, Painted in 1765 by Copley. Ornamental part, Arms of the United States, and the Thirteen States, engraved by Geo. Murray. The Writing designed and engraved by C. H. Parker. Portraits engraved by J. B. Longacre. Printed by James Porter. § [Dedication:] To the People of the United States... [signed in facsimile:] John Binns § "Department of State, 19th April 1819. I certify, that this is a Correct copy of the original Declaration of Independence, deposited at this Department; and that I have compared all the signatures with those of the original, and have found them Exact Imitations.' [signed in facsimile:] John Quincy Adams § [Copyright statement of John Binns, dated Nov. 4, 1818] § Fac-similes by Tanner, Vallance, Kearny & Co. Engraved in the office of the Secretary of State, from the Original Signatures.

NOTE: Engraved, title and text in ornamental script with the signatures in facsimile, within an ornamental border bearing state seals in medallions and portraits of Washington, Jefferson, and Hancock.

Publication probably took place in October or November 1819 (Daily National Intelligencer, Oct. 23, 1819, p. 2; Niles’ Weekly Register, Nov. 20, 1819, p. 192). Binns later claimed that the publication costs amounted to nine thousand dollars (Recollections, p. 235).

Hart 594; MHi PHi PPAmP


6 In Congress July 4th 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [Hartford:] Engraved by E. Huntington [ca. 1820–24]. 25" x 21½"

NOTE: Engraved, closely imitating Tyler’s title and design, although skimping on some of the ornamental hands in the text, and with facsimile signatures after Binns, transmitted through Sanderson’s Biography of the Signers to the Declaration of Independence.

For Eleazer Huntington, engraver and author of The American Penman (first published 1824), see Groce & Wallace, p. 335 and Nash, pp. 23–24.

CSmH MHi MWA

7 In Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [Washington: Department of State, 1823]. 33½" x 27½"

§ Engraved by W. I. Stone, for the Dep’ of State, by order of J. Q. Adams Sec’ of State, July 4th 1823
**NOTE:** Engraved facsimile of the entire document in actual size, printed on parchment. Stauffer 3045; MHi.

**LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS:** ca. 1823-48? Printed on paper (MWA). 1848 Printed on imitation parchment and inserted as a folding plate in Peter Force's *American Archives*, 5th ser., vol. 1. The platemark is perceptibly smaller, and the imprint has been changed to 'W. J. STONE SC. WASH.' This imprint also appears on a number of copies on paper, possibly because Stone sold them on his own account. It would seem likely that he had to make another plate, if, as has been suggested, he printed as many as 4,000 copies altogether (CSmH MHi; Rapport, 'Fakes and Facsimiles,' p. 26). 1895 The State Department distributed to historical societies a facsimile with the revised imprint but with a platemark slightly larger than the 1823 edition (MHi). 1895 Electrotype plates were made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey (Rapport, 'Fakes and Facsimiles,' p. 26). 1976 Six impressions were taken from the plate at the National Archives, bearing the revised imprint (PPIn; Rapport, 'Fakes and Facsimiles,' p. 13). Whether the National Archives holds the plate that was engraved by Stone in 1823 or a copy of it has not been determined, although it is known that the original plate belonged to the Department of State (*National Intelligence*, June 7, 1823, p. 1) and so could have passed into the National Archives as government property. To complicate matters further, some copies bear an imprint lettered in italics: *W. J. Stone Sc. Wash.* (NHi NN).


**NOTE:** Letterpress, text within an elaborate border of type ornaments. The names of the signers are in type, after which is noted, 'The Honorable John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Charles Carroll, are the only surviving signers of the above Declaration.' MHi

**VARIANTS:** 1. Printed on silk. Same border, same setting of type, but with different text beneath the names of the signers: 'To their Excellencies John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, and the Honorable Charles Carroll, the only surviving signers of the Declaration of Independence, this Print is respectfully inscribed, by their most obedient fellow citizen, Francis Ingraham. August, 1, 1823.' (DLC).

9 In Congress, July 4th, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. Reading, Pa.: Published by Charles M'Williams, George Getz, Printer, 1826. 22½" x 17¼"

**NOTE:** Letterpress, text in italics and signatures in type arranged by state, within a border of state seals in medallions closely imitating the Binns edition. However, instead of Binns's three portraits at the top it substitutes vignettes of (1) agricultural implements, (2) Liberty seated next to a cornucopia, and (3) emblems of shipping and commerce. NHi
10  *In Congress, July 4th. 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America.* Carlisle, Penn.: Printed and Published by Moser & Peters, 1826. 24 1/4" x 18 1/2"

**Note:** Letterpress, text and signatures in type, within a border of state seals copied from Woodruff's edition (no. 4).

PHi


**Note:** Letterpress, printed on silk or linen, signatures in type. Includes a note on the 'singular coincidence' that Presidents Adams, Jefferson, and Monroe died on the Fourth of July.

In 1824 Bowen printed tickets on a similar fabric to commemorate a Fourth of July celebration at Faneuil Hall (Letters Received and Other Loose Papers, *Adams Papers*, reel 465).

NN


**Note:** Letterpress, text and signatures in type above a wood engraving of the Capitol, within an elaborate border of type ornaments, which encloses several tables listing the governors of the states, presidents of the United States, reigning sovereigns of Europe, etc. Framed in a portal, the text is in two columns, with some phrases emphasized in caps, bold caps, and blackletter. Copyright statement dated October 1832.

For other editions published by Phelps, see nos. 4, 14, 21.

NHi

13  *In Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America.* [Boston:] Stereotyped by the Boston Bewick Company. Published by Prentiss Whitney, 30, Washington Street [ca. 1834–36?]. 28 1/4" x 23"

**Note:** Letterpress, text in script type with phrases emphasized in a variety of ornamental types, within an intertwining vine and oak-leaf border enclosing the state seals and the national seal. Facsimile signatures after Tyler.

The Boston Bewick Company was founded in 1834 'for the purpose of employing, improving, and extending the art of engraving, polytyping, embossing, and printing' (Groce & Wallace, p. 66).

NN
In Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [New York:] Published by H. Phelps, 140 Broadway, & B. S. Squire, 15 Bowery [ca. 1835–36]. 201/4" x 155/4"

Note: Letterpress, text in script type with phrases emphasized in a variety of ornamental types, within the same (stereotyped?) border as no. 13 but with a portrait of Washington substituted for the national seal. Facsimile signatures after Tyler, transmitted through Asher B. Durand’s key to the Trumbull engraving, therefore omitting some signatures and including others incorrectly (see Jaffe, ‘Trumbull’s The Declaration of Independence: Keys and Dates,’ p. 47).

Later editions and adaptations: 1839 In the Continental Congress, of 1776, on the 4th of July. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [Boston:] Published by N. Dearborn & Son —55 Washington St. Boston, & 164 Broad Way, New York, 1839. Same text but parts of the border reworked to accommodate the new title and to substitute a miniature reproduction of Trumbull’s Declaration to Washington’s portrait (NH).
whole within an ornamental border enclosing the state seals, the national seal, and portraits of the presidents, all engraved in outline. The national seal is in the center of the upper border, the title and imprint in a cartouche at the bottom.

Hart 589; MWA NN PPIn

Later editions and adaptations: ca. 1841 Redating the copyright statement of Franklin Print Co. to 1841, in a different border although similar in style, with the portraits engraved in more detail and rearranged to accommodate a portrait of William Henry Harrison in the place of the national seal (CSmH MWA NN). ca. 1841 Same border and copyright statement, but with the additional imprint 'Pr. by Chas. Thomas & Co.' and with the imprint in the cartouche changed to 'Published by James Fisher 71, Court St. Boston.' (Hart 580a; MWA NH NN). ca. 1841 As the James Fisher edition but without the Thomas imprint (Hart 580b; NN).

17 In Congress Assembled. July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [N.p., n.d.]. 27½" x 22½"/4"

Note: Letterpress, text in script type with some passages emphasized in ornamental types. Facsimile signatures rather freely based on the Tyler version. Includes the state seals and a border composed of stock cuts with a pyramid and scales at the bottom and the motto 'Legum Defensor.'

MWA NN

18 In Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. Boston: Published at Stationer's Hall [N.d.]. 28" x 22½/4"

Note: Letterpress, text in script type with phrases emphasized in a variety of ornamental types. Border with state seals; portraits of Hancock, Jefferson, and Franklin; and what seem to be stock cuts of the Battle of Lexington and the Boston Tea Party. Facsimile signatures after Tyler.

MWA

19 Declaration of Independence. July 4 1776. [Philadelphia: Charles Toppan, 1840]. 2" x 3"

§ Engraved by C. Toppan Phila July 4 1840

Note: Engraved card on coated stock, text in a minute script within an oval border composed of state seals, the national seal, and portraits of Washington and Jefferson in medallions, the whole set in a rectangular frame with scroll work on the four sides.

MWA PPIn

Later editions and adaptations: ca. 1856? With an advertisement for 'W. L. Germon, late of the firm of McClees & Germon, Photographers No 168 Chestnut St. S.W.'
Cor. of 7th. (MWA). ca. 1858–63? With larger, more elaborate scroll work and an advertisement for the American Bank Note Company (Hart 591; NN).

20 Declaration of Independence. In Congress July 4th. 1776. [Boston: Charles Root, ca. 1845]. 13¼" x 10½"

§ Published by Chaâ Root, 186, Washington, corner of Franklin St. Boston. § Engraved by Geo. G. Smith.

NOTE: Engraved, text in a border closely imitating the Binns edition, composed of state seals, portraits of eleven presidents, and a view of the Capitol. Facsimile signatures after Binns. Hart 590; NN.

LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS: ca. 1849 View of the Capitol replaced by a portrait of Zachary Taylor (Hart 590a; MWA NN).

21 In Congress July 4th. 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. New York: Published and for Sale by Humphrey Phelps No. 4 Spruce-St. [c1845]. 30¼" x 21¾"

NOTE: Letterpress, text in script type with many passages emphasized in ornamental types, within a crudely colored border of state seals, including the names of generals in cartouches. In the style of the Binns edition, two cornucopias support a portrait of Washington at the top of the border. Facsimile signatures after Tyler. NN

LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS: ca. 1846–47 As above but Phelps's address changed to No. 144 Fulton-St. (NHi). ca. 1847–51 Imprint changed to 'New York: Published and for Sale by Ensigns & Thayer' and, beneath the design, 'Rufus Blanchard ... Cincinnati. D. Needham ... Buffalo, N.Y. Jos. Ward ... Boston.' (NN; for Ensigns & Thayer, see Peters, pp. 181 & 325). ca. 1861 The Declaration of Independence. 1776. New York: Published by Ensign, Bridgman & Fanning [n.d.], with the same setting of type, but with more state seals and a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration at the top of the border (MWA; for Ensign, Bridgman & Fanning, see Peters, p. 181).

22 The Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, In Congress, at Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. With the Fac-Similes of the Signers Taken from the Original Document. [N.p., after 1845?]. 24¼" x 14½"

NOTE: Letterpress, title in a condensed antique and a wiry blackletter, text in two columns, facsimile signatures similar to no. 21. MWA NN
23 Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776. [Boston, 1850-60]. 13 1/2" x 9 3/4"

NOTE: Letterpress, text in three columns with no signatures. In the center column a wood engraving by John Andrew, advertising 'Oak Hall Cloths and Clothing.'

For John Andrew, an engraver active in Boston by 1851, see Groce & Wallace, p. 10.

MHi MWA

24 The Declaration of Independence. [Evansville, Ind.?] Presented by the Evansville Typographical Association [1850-60]. 16" x 12"

NOTE: Letterpress, title in bold antique extended and Tuscan outline, text in two columns within an ornamental border, signatures in type.

MWA


NOTE: Letterpress, text in two columns, signatures in type, within an elaborate, crudely colored architectural frame signed 'T. Nesle. del. § H. Sebald. sc. 168 Chesn. Ph.' The American eagle, a portrait of Washington, and the figure of Liberty occupy the pediment of the frame. The state seals run along the frieze at the top and along the bottom edge. Franklin and Jefferson stand at either side, and a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration is set within a cartouche at the bottom, symbols of peace and prosperity to the left, the implements of war to the right.

MWA PPL

26 Fac-Similes of the Signatures to the Declaration of Independence July 4. 1776. From Binns' Celebrated Engraving. [N.p., ca. 1855?]. 13 3/4" x 10 1/2"

§ [Certification statement of John Quincy Adams dated April 19, 1819, copied verbatim from the Binns edition along with Adams's signature in facsimile]

NOTE: Engraved, facsimile signatures only, after Binns.

MWA

VARIANTS: 1. India paper proof mounted on heavier stock (MWA). 2. Retitled Fac-Similes of the Signatures to the Declaration of Independence July 4 1776, the title and certification statement reworked, possibly reengraved altogether (MWA PPL). 3. Same title as variant 2 but with the note 'to face page 244. Vol. 1.' in upper left-hand corner. Apparently re-engraved and intended to be inserted in a publication, which I have not been able to identify (MHi MWA).
Fac Simile of the Signatures to the Declaration of Independence. [New York?, ca. 1855?]. 13⅜" x 10"

§ Ornament by A. H. Wray. & Eng'd by E. McCabe. § Engraved by J. W. Allen. § [Certification statement of John Quincy Adams copied verbatim from no. 26].

NOTE: Engraved (on steel?), facsimile signatures only, copied from no. 26, but with the addition of an ornamental border composed of state seals, an allegory of Liberty and Justice at the top, and a view of the Capitol in a cartouche at the bottom.

For the engraver E. McCabe, possibly active in New York about 1855, see Stauffer 1:166. NN PPln PPL


§ Published by Wm Fisk Manchester, N.H. § The Original of this was designed & executed entirely with a pen by Gilman R. Russell, Teacher of Practical, Plain & Ornamental, Writing and Drawing § [Copyright statement of Gilman Russell, dated 1856] § J. H. Bufford's Lith.

NOTE: Lithograph, title with some pen flourishes copied from no. 4, text in a uniform round hand. Russell has written the text around a standing portrait of Washington and enclosed it in a grapevine border. No signatures.

Nash, p. 266; NHi

Later Editions and Adaptations: ca. 1876 Retitled Great Centennial Memorial, Bufford's and Fisk's imprints omitted, Russell's imprint rephrased, and with a new copyright statement, dated 1866 (NN).


§ Engraved and Published by J. C. Buttre, 48 Franklin St. N.Y. § Border drawn by W. Momberger. Lettering by C. Craske. § [Copyright statement dated 1856]

NOTE: Engraved, text within a border composed of state seals, a view of Independence Hall, and a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration. Facsimile signatures after Binns.

NN

Variants: 1. With the Washington Monument instead of Independence Hall (NHi).

The Declaration of Independence, and Portraits of the Presidents. [Philadelphia: Illman & Sons, ca. 1859]. 25½" x 20"
§ Engraved & Printed by Illman & Sons, 603 Arch St. Philad.

NOTE: Engraved, the text in a minute script within an elaborate vine and floral border including portraits of the presidents from Washington to Buchanan, flags, the American eagle in a cartouche, a vignette of the Washington family burial vault, and a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration. Facsimile signatures after Binns.

Hart 597; NHi

LATER EDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS: ca. 1859 'Ledger Carrier's Annual Greeting to their Subscribers, 1859.' added in lower margin (Hart 597a; NHi PPln) ca. 1861 Adding a portrait of Lincoln (Hart 597b).

31 Declaration of Independence. [Philadelphia?: n.p., after 1860?]. 18¼" x 23¼"


MWA

32 The Declaration of Independence. [Philadelphia: Art Publishing Association, Swander Bishop & Cos., c. 1865]. 24" x 17¼"

§ This Allegorical Portrait of Washington Respectfully dedicated to the Christian Commission's of the United States by the Publishers. § Published by the Art Publishing Association of Philadelphia, Swander Bishop & Cos. § [Copyright statement of Swander Bishop & Co., dated 1865] § Drawn with a steel pen by R. Morris Swander, and engraved (fac simile) by P. S. Duval & Son. Philad. § Stuart § Swander. '65

NOTE: Lithograph, the text in a script expanded, compressed, and modified in various ways to form a portrait of George Washington after Stuart. A reproduction of Durand's key is above the text, and around it are facsimile signatures after Tyler, the whole within a small ornamental border.

MHi PPln

VARIANTS: 1. 'Commission's' corrected to 'Commission' (NHi).

33 Declaration of Independence. [Davenport, Iowa: W. H. Pratt, c. 1865]. 28" x 21½"

§ Designed and written by W. H. Pratt § Lith. and print. by A. Hageboeck § [Copyright statement of W. H. Pratt, dated 1865]

NOTE: Lithograph, the text forming a portrait of Washington as no. 32, within an oval border of state seals and pen flourishes beneath the American eagle.

MWA NHi
34  In Congress, July 4, 1776.] The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. [Washington: Norris Peters, c1873]. 24" x 19"


NOTE: Lithograph, purporting to be a facsimile of the entire document. Despite whatever photolithographic techniques Peters may have used, the text has been rewritten or retouched so carelessly as to create several variant readings. I have listed some of the major alterations below, after the corresponding passages in the original and their line numbers:

1 1776.] 1776
4 Nature's] Natures
24 us,] as,
31 Lives] lives
36 answered only by repeated injury.] omit. only

CSmH


35  Centennial Memorial of American Independence. [Philadelphia: Joseph Leeds, c1873]. 35½" x 28"

§ [Copyright statement of Joseph Leeds, dated 1873] § American Bank Note Company New York and Boston

NOTE: Engraved (on steel?), the text in a uniform script, facsimile signatures after Tyler, within a massive architectural frame bearing mottoes; state seals; allegorical figures of Piety, Prosperity, and Justice; portraits of signers and other Revolutionary War heroes; views of Independence Hall, the Capitol, and Carpenters’ Hall; Jefferson’s writing table and the Liberty Bell in medallions; and vignettes of battle scenes and of the Continental Congress in session, including a reproduction of Trumbull’s Declaration.

NHi PPl In PPL


American History in Image and Text


§ Declaration 1776 § Centennial 1876 § Published by the Centennial Portrait and Autograph Co. Philad. § [Copyright statement of J. H. Hobart, Jr., dated 1874] § Thos. Hunter. lith. Philad.

NOTE: Lithograph, facsimile signatures after Tyler with miniature portraits, the Liberty Bell and military gear in roundels, and views of Carpenters' Hall and Independence Hall.

PPL

38 Declaration of Independence. Guaranteed Correct Copy. [Chicago: Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, 1876?]. 20¼" by 15"

§ [Printed in red between the text and the facsimile signatures:] It is beyond doubt that had the gentlemen whose names are hereto attached been gifted with prophetic ken, they would have included in this Declaration an unanimous recommendation for the people of the United States, and their Territories, to travel via the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, and thus vindicate their claim of being most intelligent, upright and appreciative of the inhabitants of the world. § [Advertisement of Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, offering to sell copies at 50¢ without advertising.]

NOTE: Lithograph, a facsimile of the entire document printed on imitation parchment in a style similar to no. 36, with the departmental seal (but no certification statement) and with views of Independence Hall and Faneuil Hall in an ornamental border.

MWA
39 Memorial of 100 Years a Republic. [Philadelphia: T. J. Berry, c1876]. 25 1/2" x 19 1/2"

§ Loag, Printer, Philadelphia. § [Copyright statement of T. J. Berry, dated 1876]

NOTE: Lithograph, text in the shape of the Liberty Bell, within a border of state seals and with portraits of soldiers standing at either side, signed 'C. H.' Views of Independence Hall and Carpenters' Hall at the top and of the Exposition grounds at the bottom. No signatures. NHi


NOTE: Letterpress, 'Printed on the old Ephrata Press at the Centennial Exposition, 1876.' Facsimile signatures after Binns, probably transmitted through no. 26.

MHi MWA NN

41 Declaration of Independence. [N.p., ca. 1876?]. 20 1/2" x 16 1/2"

NOTE: Letterpress, some text emphasized in ornamental types, with the state seals, portraits of presidents from Washington to Grant, and a reproduction of Trumbull's Declaration. Facsimile signatures after Tyler.

NN (photostat)


NOTE: Letterpress, purporting to be a facsimile of the entire document, but derived from the defective reproduction published by Norris Peters, no. 34.

Includes an advertisement dated May 3, 1876, offering electrotype blocks of this facsimile in two sizes as well as prints made from the blocks in bulk quantities and reproductions of Trumbull's Declaration accompanied with a key. Blocks sold by Leggo Bros. & Co. are probably responsible for the mangled Declarations displayed in advertisements of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company (MWA) and of Frank Leslie's Boys' and Girls' Weekly (MHi).

MiU-C


NOTE: Lithograph in gilt, red, blue, and brown, text in a calligraphic script with illuminated initials and the signatures in a uniform round hand.

MHi
Facsimile of the Declaration of Independence. Brooklyn: Compliments of the United States Printing Company [1890s?]. 26" x 19 1/2"

**NOTE:** Lithograph, the title in an ornamental script of the 1890s era. The text is a facsimile of Jefferson's rough draft, followed by facsimile signatures after Binns.

**VARIANTS:** 1. Without the imprint of the United States Printing Company (NHi).

In Congress July Fourth 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. Yonkers, N.Y.: The Palisade Manuf'g Co. [ca. 1896]. 11" x 26"

[Printed in red over a vignette of the parchment Declaration:] Compliments of Hemaboloids [Advertisement on verso:] Hemaboloids—Arseniated (with Strychnia) is especially indicated in the more pernicious forms of blood destruction, such as Chlorosis, Secondary Anemia, General Constitutional Poverty, etc. . . .

**NOTE:** Lithograph in color, the text in a flourished blackletter, the signatures in facsimile, within a border composed of patriotic scenes including a view of the battleship Kentucky (laid down in 1896). A promotional keepsake intended for doctors, featuring biographies of signers who were 'Physicians in Attendance at the Birth of the Nation.'

**VARIANTS:** 1. Without the imprint of the United States Printing Company (NHi).

Officially Certified Facsimile of the Declaration of Independence Illuminated by the Coats of Arms of the United States and of the Original States. New York: The Holland Studio, c1902. 30" x 25"

[Departmental seal and certification statement of Secretary of State John Hay, dated Nov. 8, 1902]

**NOTE:** Lithograph (?), facsimile of the entire document, printed on imitation parchment.

**VARIANTS:** 1. Without the departmental seal, measuring 18" x 14" (NHi).
"Reduced Copy of a Fac Simile of the Declaration of Independence. In Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America. Boston: Dr. A. C. Daniels, Inc. [ca. 1911?]. 17 3/4" "

NOTE: Letterpress, the text, signatures, and certification statement probably derived from a folding plate in The Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, 1776; and Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States, 1796 (Boston: Printed by Order of the City Council, 1876).

Attached to the verso is an advertisement of Dr. A. C. Daniels (pseudonym for Charles Crosby Rogers), 'The Largest Manufacturer of Medicine for Horses and Cattle in the World.'

MHi