The Walt Whitman Archive and the Prospects for Social Editing

Kenneth M. Price, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Scholarly editions, once typically encountered in print volumes with uniform binding, are now often found within more expansive intellectual undertakings sometimes referred to as digital archives or thematic research collections. For example, *The Walt Whitman Archive* presents a scholarly edition at its core while also including resources, tools, photographs, biographical information and much else suitable for studying this particular writer. The traits and potential of this capacious new genre—called here a digital archive for convenience—are still being realized.[1] Also still open for debate is who might usefully contribute to a digital archive that aspires to have the standing and reliability if not the limits of a scholarly edition. Analogue archives and scholarly editions had powerful normalizing characteristics: they enabled users to retrieve information by creating classifying systems based on professional conventions and related to assumptions about value and the nature of research. New technical capabilities, along with changing attitudes toward knowledge and information in environments that are increasingly interactive, have created new possibilities. Recently scholars have become more open to the social production of knowledge, including social editing, the theme of this special issue. The moment seems ripe, then, to consider the opportunities and difficulties associated with crowdsourcing and social editing. I will first discuss a broad sampling of initiatives recently undertaken and then will provide a more detailed consideration of how greater audience involvement might enhance the *Walt Whitman*

Archive, assuming that systems could be put in place that are efficient and yield high quality content.

Crowdsourcing holds great promise. Crowdsourcing is most successful when a group of people is motivated because the work connects with a key interest, as can happen in the study of genealogy. The experiment undertaken by the U.S. National Archives in connection with the handwritten 1940 census records is illuminating. Over 200,000 volunteers created a name index for the 1940 census. Projected to take almost seven months, the index was completed several months ahead of schedule.[2] Fields such as astronomy and ornithology have also been successful in mobilizing devoted citizens.[3] A North American Bird Phenology Program, for example, is transcribing ninety years of records with the help of nearly 3,000 volunteers world-wide.[4] In short, amateur contributions hold great promise in domains where there is strong organization and also well-developed systems for vetting content.

Crowdsourcing is especially good for massive, labor-intensive jobs. For the Australian Newspapers Digitization Program, more than 30,000 volunteers have corrected lines of text. Rose Holley, manager of this project, strove to work "with" users rather than "doing things 'to' or 'for' them." She attributes their success to the simplicity of the task; its addictiveness; and the desire of volunteers to help a worthy Australian cause.[5] The knowledge required in this case is the ability to decipher often poorly reproduced page images—microfilm copy of old newspapers often originally produced with imperfect or broken fonts and sometimes further marred by creases, gaps, and other types of damage. Neither advanced training nor extensive knowledge of context is required.

We can also engage users with the more complex documents that attract the attention of literary editors. In "Transcription Maximized; Expense Minimized: Crowdsourcing and Editing *The Collected Works of Jeremy Bentham*," Tim Causer, Justin Tonra, and Valerie Wallace have articulated the advantages and challenges of empowering users to be active contributors to our editions. In this case, a significant side benefit of crowdsourcing has been to raise the profile of the project and to increase interest in Bentham. Tim Causer and Melissa Terras's "'Many hands make light work. Many hands together make merry work': *Transcribe Bentham* and Manuscript Collections" demonstrates a great improvement (following an initial period of experimentation) in the efficiency of the amateur transcribers and in the processing of their work. This project was unusually fortunate in the amount of publicity it received, including a key article in the *New York Times* by Patricia Cohen that brought considerable attention and volunteer transcribers to the project, so it is not clear that these successful results could be easily replicated. The truly massive amount of content they needed to transcribe—60,000 manuscript folios (approximately thirty million words)— and the relatively slow progress of the print edition made this an experiment well worth trying, and it shows signs of succeeding admirably. One interesting insight they have reached is that the concept of "crowd sifting" may be more apt than crowd sourcing. That is, out of a great number of volunteers, most people did not transcribe any documents or transcribed only one or two. The authors report that the "overwhelming bulk of the transcription has been done by fifteen 'Super Transcribers', who comprise the strong core of *Transcribe Bentham*, and whose work generally requires minimal editorial intervention."[6] Overall, *Transcribe Bentham* should bolster those inclined to experiment

with crowd sourcing because of the success achieved even with intrinsically difficult material.

In their own experiments with social editing, Ray Siemens and his team have tackled even more complex material than the *Transcribe Bentham* project. Siemens' group works on the Devonshire manuscript, a miscellaneous collection of poetry from the 1530s and early 1540s that was written by many hands, both men and women, and now is edited by many hands.[7] In a poster presented in Hamburg at the Digital Humanities 2012 conference and in their essay in *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, "Toward Modeling the *Social* Edition: An Approach to Understanding the Electronic Scholarly Edition in the Context of New and Emerging Social Media," they argue for editing across communities and for developing both a fixed and evolving text. The fixed text is, in this case, an "authoritative version of the text, which has undergone a thorough review by an international advisory group of Early Modern and Renaissance scholars."[8] The editorial team has made the same text available in Wikibooks format for discussion and collaboration with traditional and citizen scholars alike. The plan being implemented now is to compare the Wikibooks edition with the "fixed edition." (It is perhaps worth noting that this terminology is unfortunate since they do not mean "fixed" either in the sense of "corrected" or "unchanging.") Keeping the best of the Wikibooks additions, the Devonshire MS Editorial Group will incorporate the advisory group's suggestions, and will present a "truly socially mediated edition of the Devonshire Manuscript for publication." The Devonshire Manuscript Editorial Group is "exploring how social media can be used to change the role of the scholarly editor from the sole authority on the text to a facilitator who brings traditional and citizen scholars into collaboration through an

ongoing editorial process."[9] This conception of the editorial process is intriguing. It would be helpful to learn in more detail what they have gained and how they would assess those gains when measured against the time required to set up the infrastructure and to vet the contributions. For example, specifically, how many of the citizen scholars contributed? What was the quality of their contributions? Were they, as the name "citizen" implies, ordinary members of the public (as was the case in *Transcribe Bentham*), or, for the most part, other scholars, perhaps not affiliated with the project but nonetheless possessing expert training in early modern texts?

Gregory Crane shares with Ray Siemens and the *Transcribe Bentham* project a belief that, as Crane puts it, "digital editing lowers barriers to entry and requires a more democratized and participatory intellectual culture."[10] Crane understands editing in a "very broad sense as making our primary textual sources usable for scholarly work."[11] (This broad view of editing is one I endorse and underpins my remarks throughout this essay.) Crane champions the involvement of students in the editing and annotating of classical texts and believes that intermediate undergraduate students can provide "analyses of individual sentences for the Greek and Latin treebanks—contributions that are then compared against each other and then added to a public database, with the names of each contributing student attached to each sentence." This work can later yield undergraduate and MA theses of genuine value. Crane's approach leads to what he calls a "participatory culture of learning" and "democratization" within the academy.[12]

Like Crane, Martin Mueller promotes engaging students directly in the primary materials of research. Mueller has employed a select group, undergraduate students, to work on AnnoLex. Comprised of 630 Early Modern English plays, pageants, and other

entertainments by non-Shakespearean writers, AnnoLex is a corpus of approximately 15 million words. The encoded texts have been developed by the Text Creation Partnership (TCP) from microfilm images of Early English Books. The TCP transcriptions contain many errors and omissions. Mueller's blog post, "How to Fix 60,000 errors," describes a "systematic effort to harness the energy and imagination of undergraduates as editors and explorers of old plays in new forms." Mueller, like Crane, believes there is much be to be gained by having students understand texts first at the granular level, building knowledge up from a narrow focus to a more encompassing view. Mueller outlines what he calls a "Young Scholar Edition" and sets out the requirements of a project suitable for an undergraduate honors thesis. The work involves both lapidarian tasks—such as proofreading, checking part-of-speech tagging, and correcting or creating a cast list—and also larger analytical undertakings including writing an account of the reception history of a play, reviewing the scholarly literature, comparing different versions of a play if more than one exists, and writing an analytical summary.[13]

Mueller and Crane both see themselves as operating within the orbit of Jerome McGann's claim that the "entirety of our inherited archive of cultural works" will need to be re-edited in keeping with the new affordances of a digital environment.[14] If McGann is correct, we have an enormous amount of labor ahead of us. In a best-case scenario, scholars will serve as guiding coordinators, helping to decide what tasks can engage the public broadly, what tasks can motivate undergraduate students, and what tasks requires highly specialized knowledge. In my view, specialists are less critical in transcription than in project conceptualization, annotation of texts, and contextualization.

To what extent do the approaches and ideas sampled above hold promise for the *Walt Whitman Archive*? At the broadest level, we try to engage scholars, students, and the interested public by being open with our data, making downloads of our files available for creative repurposing, and by publishing our encoding guidelines and other documentation for anyone who may find them useful.[15] We also recognize the importance of various kinds of partnerships. We have worked collaboratively with many groups, including archivists and other creators of finding guides in developing an award-winning integrated guide to Whitman's manuscripts. And we are nurturing a user-contributor community of translators (more on that below). We also continue to engage undergraduates and many graduate students in the work of the project. For example, Volume 4 of Horace Traubel's *With Walt Whitman in Camden* was produced with all of the transcription and initial encoding done by undergraduate students in a class taught by Matt Cohen at Duke University.[16] Additional contributions by students are to be found throughout the site and are documented in our changelog, on our staff page, and in the metadata associated with our documents.

In addition to working with students, we are partnering with a growing group of user-collaborators (one person with a day job *and* Whitman expertise along with professors and graduate students).[17] In particular, we have the good fortune to work with those interested in translation, aiding these users in the process of becoming co-creators. In a print environment, the work of translators was rarely part of a scholarly edition. We include translations, however, as part of the expansive research environment of our digital archive: in this setting, translations help document the reception of a text while also serving as interpretations of it. We started with the first full-length Spanish

translation, Armando Vasseur's *Poemas* of 1912, with an introduction and with a literal

back translation of "Song of Myself" into English so that readers with little or no

knowledge of Spanish could gain some idea of how Whitman was first absorbed into the

hispanophone world. We have subsequently added translations in German, Russian, and

Portuguese, with Italian and Ukrainian in the pipeline. We have also undertaken more

intensive work with individual poems, presenting thirty different translations, in five

languages, of Whitman's poem "Poets to Come," and we have comparable work

underway on one of Whitman's most famous poems, "Song of Myself": presently in

progress is a week-by-week—presentation of each of the 52 sections of the 1881 version

of that poem in ten different languages, including some in which the poem had never

previously been translated. Our work on translation has developed concurrently with the

birth and development of the Transatlantic Walt Whitman Association, a user-contributor

group we have helped foster since 2007.[18] We are both promoting translation work, and,

as it were, building the next generation of students, teachers, admirers, and no doubt

editors of Whitman. In the future, the *Whitman Archive* should consider a less tightly

controlled space—a sandbox—for experimentation in translation, so that both novice and

experienced translators could compare notes as they work through a crux or as they

debate various approaches to the art of translation itself. Some aspects of the debate and

experimentation might ultimately be regarded as permanently valuable contributions to

the *Archive*. For example, recent work was done across many languages at once to

consider how to translate Whitman's famous line about his "barbaric yawp" words that

are invoked immediately after his claim to be "untranslatable": "I too am not a bit tamed,

I too am untranslatable, / I sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world." The

variety and ingenuity of translators in coming to terms with the curious yoking together of "yawp" and "barbaric" is instructive and returns the native speaker to the text with a deepened understanding, in part because of the different possible meanings various translators have chosen to emphasize as they remake Whitman in their own tongue.[19]

As we consider social editing in connection with the *Whitman Archive*, it is useful to ponder a key question: who are we building this project for? When we started we thought our audience would be fellow scholars in the U.S. Now, with more experience, we see that we have users in every inhabited continent and at all age levels. (I've received mail from an elementary school student who addressed me, rather charmingly, as "Dear Whitman poetry person"—she wanted me to sort out a disagreement she was having with her teacher about a Whitman poem.) With 30,000 unique visitors a month, should we aim to please the imagined "ordinary user," an idealized mid-level reader number 15,000? The question deserves thought because we have limited time, money, and energy, and thus have to make choices.

Frankly, it is hard to know what an average user wants or needs. Arguably, that fact points to a need for more user studies. I could guess that some people would want access to poems treating questions about sex and race, and others might wish to find Whitman's "best" poem or the "right" edition of *Leaves of Grass*. But if we did know what reader 15,000 wanted, I doubt that he or she should be our target. We have always aimed to make a scholarly contribution, and the broad audience we have attracted results, I think, from the *scholarly* nature of our work—from the accuracy of our texts and metadata, usefulness of our introductions, annotations, and other commentary, and the clarity of our presentation. The size of our audience is a pleasant surprise but not

absolutely necessary for the project in terms of its own goals. Trying to maximize our audience could be counterproductive, especially if users felt patronized or awash in a mass of information that was not adequately organized or discoverable. A goal of making the *Whitman Archive* all things to all people would probably result in a site that was functional for no one, because of the difficulties of organizing and presenting in meaningful ways such a mass of information, given resource constraints. To some extent—even as the digital archive remakes the scope and content of the scholarly edition—we retain familiar categorizations that are grounded in ideas of singularity, with roots in now-unfashionable notions of authorial "genius" that are in tension with, if not at odds with, crowd knowledge.

If we don't cater to an "average" reader, we do need to think hard about what will have the most scholarly value. This point can be clarified by taking an example from one of our current grant-funded projects titled "Whitman as an Author before *Leaves of Grass*." In this undertaking, we will gather, edit, and annotate nearly all of Whitman's writings from the "foreground" period: his novel *Franklin Evans* (1842); his short fiction; his unpublished prose manuscripts; and the early notebooks and his journalism. The key point here is with regard to the fiction: in the short time since the funding of our grant application, this initiative has become more complicated thanks to the work of a recent PhD, Stephanie Blalock. Prior to Blalock's work it was known that Whitman's story "Death in the School Room," to take one example, had been reprinted six times. The widespread digitization of newspapers and magazines in recent decades has enabled her to discover an additional ninety-eight reprintings for a total of 104—making it far more popular—or at least widespread!—than anyone has thought. Other stories had

international visibility. "The Legend of Life and Love," once also thought to have been reprinted only six times, was actually reprinted at least seventy-one times, including on the front page of the *Stanstead Journal* in Canada. What should we be editing here? Should we privilege the first printing in the hope that that was closest to authorial intent? Do we track variants across all printings? Or do we track only interesting variants, and if so who decides what counts as interesting? There is no right answer to these questions: for some readers getting as close as possible to what an author must have wanted to produce is crucial; for others it is a particular documentary instance; and for still others the key to meaning is the social life of the text, how it circulated in the culture, getting remade and refashioned by design or happenstance, and appearing differently in various places. As an experiment in editorial theory and reception, it might be more fascinating for us to give a thoroughgoing treatment of all versions of a story in its different incarnations than to give a half-inch deep treatment of how all the short stories evolved and spread through a culture of reprinting. But the number of people in the world who would care about an exhaustive treatment of "Death in the Schoolroom" is quite limited, whereas many would be pleased to have all of Whitman's fiction introduced, annotated, and placed in the context of all of the rest of his writings. We do not have time with current staff to undertake both deep and wide treatments, so perhaps a way forward is to work with our users to document and explore known versions, establish the significance of the various contexts for the stories, and promote new analyses of Whitman and the distribution of his texts within a culture of reprinting. If we attempt to address this labor problem through crowd sourcing, the open question is whether it is worth the cost of establishing the infrastructure and maintaining it, especially given that we can barely

fulfill our grant obligations as it stands. Perhaps funding agencies will one day wish to fund the social mediation of major digital archives.

Thus far we have done little with more popular forms of crowdsourcing. Along with praise, we have received some criticism for our approach: Meredith McGill, in her contribution to a *PMLA* issue discussing our editorial work, observes that "[d]espite the revolutionary capacities of the new technologies, pioneering digital projects such as The Walt Whitman Archive hew surprisingly closely to normative ideas of the author and the work…keep[ing] such projects from functioning in the radical ways that [Ed] Folsom describes."[20] She discusses our focus on a single author; our privileging of Whitman's poetry (and *Leaves of Grass* specifically) over his prose; the emphasis on the biography of Whitman; and the lack of reader-generated data. Some of her assertions could be challenged, but it is true that we have been slow to gather reader-generated contributions. Another user, "reillyreads," noted that "I expect to be able to interact with other users, to be exposed to and benefit from their knowledge and opinions about the site and about Whitman. The Whitman Archive doesn't have even a basic 'guest book' feature where users can enter comments."[21] In the time since these comments were made we have been more engaged with social media both through a *Whitman Archive* Facebook page and Twitter account. Although the *Whitman Archive* no doubt orients editorial and interpretive attention, we don't insist on our own analyses but acknowledge every known critical voice on Whitman through a comprehensive bibliography of published criticism on the poet from 1839 to the present, some 15,000 entries, most of them annotated. Whenever possible, we provide links to full text of the commentary. Of course that is very different from providing a platform for conversation and for the generation and

propagation of new voices. That may be what some people want—perhaps what many people want—at least in the current moment. But is that goal important to realizing the full potential of the *Whitman Archive*?

We have been cautious thus far about crowdsourcing for various reasons, including that Whitman was (and remains) controversial. The nature of his work complicates any entirely open approach because of the possibility of sabotage. In his own time Whitman had what he called several "official buffetings": his book was censored, literally banned in Boston, and he was fired from his job with the federal government because of *Leaves of Grass*. He can still make headlines: in the spring of 2013, a Northwestern University graduate student in music gained widespread media attention when he refused to perform the work of Whitman, a poet he considers racist and offensive.[22] Others see Whitman as an imperialist poet, prophet of new age spiritualism, a free lover, a homosexual icon, a straight and patriotic poet, a spokesman for comrades and Marxists. He has been regarded as hopelessly shallow and optimistic and as a significant political theorist. He has been used to sell jeans in Tokyo, and Marilyn Monroe made sure to be photographed reading *Leaves of Grass*. In short, the response to Whitman has been wild, fascinating, and often unpredictable. Whitman's self-styled role as poet of democracy and the national poet of the U.S. raises the temperature if not always the level of insight and civility in discussion.

The evolution of the Walt Whitman article in Wikipedia illustrates this idea. Wikipedia is often a more reliable source than critics of this resource assume, and its realization of a new means of producing and publishing scholarship is of historic importance. Nonetheless, Wikipedia is not without its problems. In scholarly circles, a

great deal is written each year on Whitman and sexuality, but his own sexual orientation, to use the phrasing of our era, is settled—he loved men and there is little or no evidence of his romantic attraction to women. On Wikipedia, old debates can flare up anew. The article on Whitman was one of the early pages to appear on Wikipedia, and it is one of the site's most visited pages. Discussion of Whitman and sexuality began in restrained fashion—so restrained, in fact, that in November 2001 it said nothing about his sexuality. It was not until August 2003 that a user named "Morn" added a section discussing homosexual themes in Whitman's poetry as possibly connected to his personal life. That section kept the question of Whitman's sexuality ambiguous while also acknowledging that, in the 1970s, he became a "poster child" for gay liberation.

Later, a contributor whose screen name, for better or worse, is Hoponpop69, asserted that Whitman had a pedophilic relationship with Bill Duckett, a teenager who boarded with the poet in Camden, New Jersey. It was removed, reinserted, and removed again in the next day. Hoponpop69, a longtime presence on Wikipedia, most often works on music-related articles, usually punk or rock. Soon, another commentator added that "Walt Whitman was an old bastard," a claim that was removed after two minutes. These incidents and others like them point to a larger question about how to harness volunteer energy while avoiding vitriol.[23]

Despite the dangers I have mentioned, I am optimistic about one particular type of content—annotations—that the *Whitman Archive* might develop through social editing. It is worth considering the massive amount of material we need to annotate; what we have and have not annotated thus far; and how our users might be able to help with the pleasures and pains of annotation. Thus far, we have annotated Whitman's

correspondence, his poetry manuscripts, periodical printings of his poetry, and his

journalism, but we have not annotated the various editions of *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman's

prose volumes, or his scribal documents. Why have we not annotated his poetry as

appearing in *Leaves of Grass*? Various answers could be offered, all containing some

truth. We have had other goals that have been more pressing; reasonable annotations can

be readily accessed via print editions; annotations of a certain sort—those that point to

current critical understandings or debates—age quickly. Finally, Whitman is not a poet

like, say, Milton with a richly allusive style. Annotations identifying sources and echoes

are rarely needed. But one might want other types of annotations: on the composition

history of a poem prior to first printing, for example; or on a poem's revision history

through various editions of *Leaves of Grass* and its shifting meaning through changing

contexts in various clusters. Ultimately, if our edition reaches the goals it has set for

itself, the need for some types of annotation may diminish because connections between

instances of a work, the various ways the poem ultimately called "Song of Myself"

manifested itself in early draft versions and in various printed states under other titles,

can be drawn together through the use of a work ID, keyed to a uniform final title. And of

course there are puzzling passages that could be glossed: what is meant after all by a "jet-

black sunrise"; or an "overstaid fraction" "the circle of obis" or, as Whitman says near the

end of "Song of Myself": "I effuse my flesh in eddies and drift it in lacy jags"?

Clarifications could also be offered of Whitman's position on phrenology and on Alfred

Jacob Miller and his popular painting "The Trapper's Bride," the apparent source of a key

passage in "Song of Myself."

Is annotation of the poetry in *Leaves of Grass* something the crowd could do effectively? Possibly so, and if time allows we may conduct such an experiment. If annotating lines were to continue over a matter of decades, it could become a rich source of information about shifting tastes and perceptions, differing critical paradigms, and changing cultural preoccupations. If readers had been registering their reactions to, say, the "Calamus" poems in every year since the 1860s, we could have a fascinating view of the evolution of understanding of these poems and the ability to trace how and when shifts occurred from viewing the poems as accounts of intense male friendship to accounts of erotic attachment. Interestingly, a start-up called Rap Genius, originally a community dedicated to annotating rap lyrics, has expanded to treat legal decisions and poetry, including Whitman's "Song of Myself." The level of commentary is not high with regard to Whitman, but the model they have developed has potential. The simple and intuitive up/down voting on the quality of an annotation could easily lead to a group-based rating of annotations allowing those regarded as most informative to rise to the top. Significantly, Rap Genius received a $15 million investment from Marc Andreesen's venture capital firm Andreesen Horowitz (Andreesen was one of the creators of Mosaic, the first truly successful web browser).

Looking back on the recent history of the *Walt Whitman Archive*, I can see that we may have missed a prime crowdsourcing or social editing opportunity with Whitman's scribal documents. These approximately 3,000 documents, recently identified in the U.S. National Archives, were inscribed (if not authored) by Whitman when he worked in the Attorney General's office from 1865-1873. The extraordinary amount of media attention this discovery generated—including pieces in *Die Welt*, the *Arab Times Online*, the *India*

Times, and the *Guardian*, and in newspapers throughout the U.S.—perhaps could have led to active involvement of our audience in the help of transcribing and annotating these documents. But that approach was not practical then because we did not have an infrastructure in place for crowdsourcing. In contrast, we *did* have students in place ready to work hard on transcription and proofreading. Massive as the job was, it was more manageable than creating infrastructure for an untested crowdsourcing system. The scribal documents might still offer us a different opportunity for annotation than the poetry (we wished to unveil this discovery at the earliest possible time, and thus we made the documents available even before they were annotated, releasing, in effect, work-in-progress that we expect to enrich over time). The historical nature of the scribal documents might also lend themselves to crowdsourcing of annotations. Annotating historical documents can be challenging, but it is less fraught than annotating poetry.

At the *Whitman Archive*, where we treat the self-styled poet of democracy, we are sympathetic to democratic outreach. From my perspective, it makes sense to allow readers to create or improve texts and to let others—a general editor or editorial board—approve (or not) what users have contributed. In other words, it is possible to co-develop content without relinquishing quality control. We could also have users contribute to a database of Whitman appearances in films and television programs, in advertisements and in other aspects of popular culture, including music. This is material that would be out of bounds for a traditional print-based scholarly edition, though it is key—perhaps every bit as important or more than understanding the history of reprintings of "Death in the Schoolroom"—for understanding Whitman's afterlife, how he has been absorbed and remade and revitalized. To examine Whitman's reception and the remaking of him is to

engage his legacy and to promote understanding of the controversies it continues to provoke. Without doubt there are some disadvantages in being open with our scholarship, but those disadvantages do not mean that we should shun more participatory models without at least exploring if, through careful management and oversight, we can build both a community and a better and deeper digital archive.

---

[1] For a discussion of these terminological issues, see my "Edition, Project, Database, Archive, Thematic Research Collection: What's in a Name?" *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3.3 (2009), available at http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/3/3/

[2] https://familysearch.org/blog/en/ceo-corner-farewell-1940-census-indexing-project-what

Accessed July 3, 2013.

[3] It is estimated that more than 15 million people watch and record birds.

[4] www.birds.cornell.edu/citscitoolkit/projects/pwrc/nabirdphenologyprogram/

[5] http://eprints.rclis.org/16385/1/Crowdsourcing%20State%20of%20Play%20June%202011.pdf

Accessed July 3, 2013.

[6] Tim Causer and Melissa Terras, "'Many hands make light work. Many hands together make merry work': *Transcribe Bentham* and Manuscript Collections," forthcoming in *The International Journal of Humanities and Arts Computing*.

[7] " The Social Edition: Scholarly Editing Across Communities," http://www.dh2012.uni-hamburg.de/conference/programme/abstracts/the-social-edition-scholarly-editing-across-communities/

8 "The Social Edition: Scholarly Editing Across Communities" available at

http://www.dh2012.uni-hamburg.de/conference/programme/abstracts/the-

social-edition-scholarly-editing-across-communities/

9

http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/The_Devonshire_Manuscript/A_Note_on_this_Edition

10 Gregory Crane, "Give us Editors! Re-inventing the Edition and Re-thinking the

Humanities," in *Online Humanities Scholarship: The Shape of Things to Come*, ed.

Jerome McGann et al.(Houston: Rice University Press, 2010), 153.

11 Crane, "Give us Editors!", 138.

12 Crane, "Give us Editors!", 153-54.

13 See Martin Mueller's blog post of 23 June 2013, "What is a Young Scholar

Edition?" available at https://scalablereading.northwestern.edu/

14 Jerome McGann, "The Future is Digital," *Journal of Victorian Culture* 13 (Spring

2008), 80.

15 Currently we have downloads available of only certain types of documents, but we

intend to make downloads of all of our content eventually.

16 http://whitmanarchive.org/criticism/disciples/traubel/disciples_credits_4.html

17 The person with a day job is Martin Murray, who works for the U.S. Commodity

Futures Trading Commission and is the President of the Washington Friends of Walt

Whitman.

18 The group was founded to encourage cross-Atlantic dialogue on Whitman. So far

the organization has hosted annual seminars and symposiums in Germany, France;

Italy; Poland; Brazil; and the U.S. We see promoting the work of translation as entirely

consistent with the research and teaching goals of the *Whitman Archive* since it requires

an unparalleled intimacy with the text itself.

[19] See an entire section on Whitman's "barbaric yawp" in *Rocznik Komparatystyczny*

Comparative Yearbook 4 (2013), 255-343.

[20] Meredith McGill, "Remediating Whitman," *PMLA* 122 (October 2007), 1593.

[21] See the 19 December 2011 blog post "The Walt Whitman Archive: Database,

Arsenal, Community" at http://michellenlevy.wordpress.com/

[22] Stacey Patton, "Northwestern U. Student Jeopardizes Degree by Refusing to

Perform Whitman," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 25 July 2013.

[23] My comments on the Walt Whitman page in Wikipedia are deeply indebted to an

unpublished essay by Cory Blad, Jason Stacy, and Rob Velella, "Morbid Inferences:

Whitman, Wikipedia, and the Debate over the Poet's Sexuality."