



The Texts and Contexts of "Calamus": Did Whitman Censor Himself in 1860?

Robert J. Scholnick

ISSN 0737-0679 (Print)

ISSN 2153-3695 (Online)

Copyright © 2004 Robert J Scholnick

Recommended Citation

Scholnick, Robert J. "The Texts and Contexts of "Calamus": Did Whitman Censor Himself in 1860?." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 21 (Winter 2004), 109-130. <https://doi.org/10.13008/2153-3695.1724>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by Iowa Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* by an authorized administrator of Iowa Research Online. For more information, please contact lib-ir@uiowa.edu.

THE TEXTS AND CONTEXTS OF "CALAMUS": DID WHITMAN CENSOR HIMSELF IN 1860?

ROBERT J. SCHOLNICK

IN A RECENT ESSAY for this journal I explored the extensive presence of Walt Whitman in the short-lived but daring New York humor weekly *Vanity Fair* (1859-1863), which published at least twenty-two references to the poet, including six parodies.¹ Reflecting the high regard in which the magazine's contributors and editors held their fellow denizen of Pfaff's Restaurant and the depth of their understanding of his work, these references helped to keep Whitman's reputation alive during the early 1860s. At Pfaff's and in the pages of *Vanity Fair* and Henry Clapp's *Saturday Press*, Whitman found a congenial and supportive literary community, one that was open to free love, free verse, and unrestrained satire directed at the self-important, the self-righteous, and the repressed. *Vanity Fair* also boosted the fortunes of such writers as Fanny Fern, Ada Clare, and Adah Isaacs Menken—each known for her willingness to challenge the boundaries of sexual propriety—but Whitman was its hero.

In a journalistic spoof, "Our Agricultural Column: Crop Prospects for 1860," published on May 10, 1860, *Vanity Fair* reported on the abundant crop of calamus expected that year. Given the high quality of this "health-giving root," there will be "an unusually active market for Calamus," causing "the rates [to] rule higher. . . . But we shall be well prepared to bear this slight advance, the effects of the Crisis of '57 having entirely passed away."² This was *Vanity Fair*'s way of welcoming Whitman home to New York from Boston, where he had overseen publication of the third edition of *Leaves of Grass*, including the new "Calamus" section celebrating what he named "manly love." The phrase "Crisis of '57" refers to the poet's despondent period following the failure of his second edition in 1856. Now *Vanity Fair* writes confidently of the prospects of a poet willing to walk "In Paths Untrodden," to use the title of the first poem in "Calamus."

I have shown that there is nothing malicious in this or other references in the weekly to Whitman's treatment of homoeroticism in his poetry. On the contrary, *Vanity Fair* worked to create a space for the liberation of sexual expression—wherever that might lead. The weekly's references to this dimension of Whitman's work help to establish a con-

text for our consideration of questions of continuing importance in scholarship on the poet: the textual status of the forty-five poems in the "Calamus" sequence and the poet's sense of his place in his culture. If not exactly accepting of homoeroticism, American culture had not yet become harshly repressive, as would be the case as the century wore on.³

Over the past decade or so a number of scholars, notably Alan Helms and Hershel Parker, have charged that by electing not to publish as a unit the twelve-poem "Live Oak, with Moss," a sequence which tells the story of the speaker's love affair with a man, Whitman censored his work. The poet distributed these individual poems throughout the larger "Calamus," and in the process, this argument runs, blunted their meaning. The realization that he could not publish "Live Oak," Helms wrote in 1992, became a turning point in the poet's career. When Whitman came to treat homoerotic love, he did so "with the growing sense that his project is doomed." Now he must "struggle between the need to express his love and a prohibition against doing so that was so powerful that it finally defeated him."⁴ I will argue that when paired with contextual evidence, an examination of the manuscripts of the "Calamus" poems offers no basis for this charge of self-censorship and defeat. Lacking the narrative unity of "Live Oak, with Moss," the "Calamus" sequence nevertheless extends and deepens its themes in quite surprising ways. Whitman took up the challenge of finding a language "To tell the secret of my nights and days, / To celebrate the need of comrades," as he wrote in "In Paths Untrodden."

"Live Oak": Texts and Interpretations

Part of the Valentine Manuscripts in the C. Waller Barrett Collection at the University of Virginia, the twelve "Live Oak" poems were published for the first time in 1953 by Fredson Bowers in *Studies in Bibliography*.⁵ He used as copy text the poems as Whitman wrote them out in a notebook. In *The Solitary Singer* (1955) Gay Wilson Allen observes that "the fact that Whitman went through his pages and carefully numbered these poems with ornamental Roman numerals (he used Arabic numbers for all other numbering) proves that he considered gathering them into a single cluster. Arranged in this numbered series these twelve poems tell a story and carry a clearer meaning than do the forty-five poems finally printed in 1860 as 'Calamus,' among which Whitman scattered these twelve."⁶ In 1955 Bowers published transcriptions of the poems in *Whitman's Manuscripts: Leaves of Grass*, but not in their original sequence, since he printed them in the order in which they appeared in the 1860 edition.⁷

At the end of his essay, Helms printed the poems in the order in which they appear in the "Live Oak" manuscripts, selecting as copy text their first published versions, from the 1860 "Calamus." In the 1996

“The Real ‘Live Oak, with Moss’: Straight Talk about Whitman’s ‘Gay Manifesto,’” Parker took issue with Helms’s selection of copy text; he based his reading not on the poems as they were published in 1860 but transcriptions of the manuscripts themselves.⁸ Parker had made “Live Oak, with Moss” widely available by publishing a clear text transcription in the *Norton Anthology of American Literature*, beginning with the fourth edition in 1994. In “‘Live Oak, with Moss’ and ‘Calamus’: Textual Inhibitions in Whitman Criticism,” Steven Olsen-Smith and Parker demonstrated that much of the criticism on the “Calamus” sequence up to that point had proceeded without reference to “Live Oak, with Moss.”⁹

Parker argued that the selection of copy text makes all the difference. Where Helms saw “Live Oak” as expressing the poet’s experience of oppression and discouragement, Parker argued that the sequence “is an ultimately triumphant account of the poet’s accepting his homosexuality and surviving a thwarted love affair” (Parker, 157). Different as are their interpretations, both agree that sometime after completing “Live Oak” Whitman realized that he could not publish it. “Perhaps he felt the sequence revealed too much,” Helms wrote, “for it gives us the only sustained treatment of homosexual love in all of his poetry” (186).

The opposed interpretations of Helms and Parker, based as they are on different texts, illustrate a point that has been made recently by textual scholars: it is impossible to separate critical interpretation from textual scholarship. In calling for a rapprochement between textual critics and literary scholars, Michael Groden quoted Thomas Tanselle’s insistence that “textual critics must try to understand the works they are editing . . . in order to make choices among variant readings and decisions about emendations; they inevitably engage in literary criticism. So-called literary critics . . . should recognize—though they rarely do—that they should evaluate the makeup of particular texts in the process of analyzing literary works. . . . If textual criticism . . . is truly ‘criticism,’ literary criticism cannot simply accept its conclusions but must examine them.”¹⁰ This challenge obtains especially for our reading of Whitman, who continually modified and rearranged his poems over the course of his career and from whom we have a great deal of manuscript evidence.

Much recent theoretical work in textual criticism recognizes the need to present and interpret literary works in multiple versions. Scholars have moved away, George Bornstein has written, from the long-standard Greg-Bowers position, which defined the job of the textual editor as to “establish a fixed, definitive text, usually theorized as an ur-text marred by subsequent corruption in transmission. Its procedures were critical or eclectic, producing eventually a new ‘best’ text deemed closest to the author’s final intentions.” Now textual theorists “press

the cause of contingency, in the double sense both of the text itself being historically contingent in its circumstances of production and reception, and in its being contingent in its (re)construction in the present. Such considerations work against conceptualizing the text as an a-historical transcendent monument. . . . [W]e cannot hope through textual scholarship to recover an ideal text . . . but only to increase the self-awareness and internal consistency of the choices that we make.” Accordingly, editorial theory has come to recognize the “validity of multiple versions of an artwork, each possessing its own integrity,” a recognition that “works against a facile imputation of unified authority.”¹¹ Both Parker and Helms tie their respective interpretations to a single text.

Explaining his selection of copy-text, Helms wrote that this was “the form Whitman approved for publication. I’ve simply removed them from ‘Calamus’ and restored them to Whitman’s original order” (186-187). Parker charges that Helms has constructed a spurious version, and one must agree. Although he seeks to honor Whitman’s original intention, Helms prints versions of poems from the 1860 “Calamus,” a sequence that he (Helms) had rejected. To be consistent, he should have based his reading on transcriptions of “Live Oak,” which Bowers had long since made available.

Helms and Parker agree on the primacy of “Live Oak, with Moss,” since only there “do we get a clear story of a love affair with a man, along with a story of a coming out that affects Whitman’s other poetry in this period and even changes the course of his life,” as Helms put it (186). After commenting on the pain caused the speaker when his lover leaves him, Helms emphasizes what he interprets as the silencing of his voice: “What a sad journey the sequence takes us on. . . . The whole weight of his homophobic culture finally descends on Whitman, exacting silence and with it the end of the sequence” (191-192). And it exacts the end of Whitman’s career as a poet willing to write openly of his sexuality: “Perhaps he felt the sequence revealed too much, for it gives us the only sustained treatment of homosexual love in all of his poetry” (186). But Parker argues that “Live Oak, with Moss” is “a coherent, frank, confident and even ebullient poetic narrative (despite the temporary desolation in Poem VIII and unsatisfied yearnings described elsewhere). Anyone who compares that summary with Helms’s account of his ‘sad journey’ might conclude that Helms and I are strangely different travelers. . . . The reason our accounts differ so drastically is that we are describing journeys over radically different terrain, one of us reading the real ‘Live Oak, with Moss,’ the other reading the no-comma text constructed from ‘Calamus’” (155).

Gay Wilson Allen had asserted that Whitman made only “slight revisions” in “Live Oak, with Moss” before arriving at the text of the poems as published in “Calamus.” However, the poet made changes in

the selection and ordering of words and modified punctuation and line length. An important stage in the process of composition for Whitman was having his manuscripts set in type and then revising the typescript in preparing printer's copy. For the third edition, he contracted with the Rome Brothers in New York to set the manuscripts in type, and then, as Bowers explained, "when the unexpected invitation came from Thayer and Eldridge," Whitman's Boston publishers, "it was substantially the revised proofs which served as printer's copy for the added poems in so far as they are preserved in the Valentine collection. . . . It would seem that the ex-printer Whitman had some concern for the visual appearance of his verses on the printed page and therefore wished to make his final revisions in typeset copy" (*WM*, xxv-xxvi). We cannot assume, as does Parker, that any change from manuscript to printed version is necessarily a falling off or a concession to an allegedly homophobic culture. Whitman's practice was to revise from typescript, and there is no evidence that he did not exercise total control over the third edition.

For Parker the most important alteration from manuscript comes in the ninth poem, which in manuscript reads as follows:

I dreamed in a dream of a city where all the men were like brothers,
 O I saw them tenderly love each other—I often saw them, in numbers,
 walking hand in hand;
 I dreamed that was the city of robust friends—Nothing was greater there than
 manly love—it led the rest,
 It was seen every hour in the actions of the men of that city, and in all their looks
 and words.—(*WM*, 114)

In the 1860 "Calamus" the poem grew to five lines; the city has come under attack:

I dreamed in a dream, I saw a city invincible to the attacks of the whole rest of the
 earth,
 I dreamed that was the new City of Friends,
 Nothing was greater there than the quality of robust love—it led the rest,
 It was seen every hour in the actions of the men of that city,
 And in all their looks and words.¹²

Since the phrase "invincible to the attacks of the whole of the rest of the earth" did not appear in the manuscript version, Parker argues that it should not color our reading of "Live Oak," as, he charges, was the case with Helms: "The line in poem IX about the 'attacks of the whole rest of the earth' proved to be the crucial evidence (indeed the only internal evidence) for Helms's reading of the 'Live Oak' sequence as dominated by 'homophobic oppression.' That line, I emphasize, does not occur in 'Live Oak, with Moss'" (156).

Does Whitman introduce in the published version an acknowledgement of oppression not found in the manuscript? Possibly. But I read the manuscript version as implicitly recognizing the reality of oppression in the world, since the poet's ideal city comes to him only in a dream. The trope of the heavenly city is a familiar one, and it is unlikely that Whitman confused that ideal realm with the increasingly violent and fractious antebellum world. Although in the 1860 version the city has come under attack, still "robust love" remains "invincible." Even if one should read the manuscript version as reflecting conflict in the body politic, that would not by itself reveal homophobia. Our reading is enriched by seeing it in both states.

Helms argued that it is in the final three poems that the speaker internalizes the culture's alleged "prohibition against speaking of homosexual love." Poem XI is central to this argument. Here is the version as given by Parker:

Earth! Though you look so impassive, ample and spheric there—I now suspect
that is not all,
I now suspect there is something terrible in you, ready to break forth,
For an athlete loves me,—and I him—But toward him there is something fierce
and terrible in me,
I dare not tell it in words—not even in these songs.¹³

Here is the "Calamus" version:

Earth! my likeness!
Though you look so impassive, ample and spheric there,
I now suspect that is not all;
I now suspect there is something fierce in you, eligible to burst forth;
For an athlete is enamoured of me—and I of him,
But toward him there is something fierce and terrible in me, eligible to burst forth,
I dare not tell it in words—not even in these songs. (*LG*, 1860, 374)

When the speaker says that he "dare not tell it in words," Helms writes, he is acknowledging oppression, "since the prohibition against speaking of homosexual love has triumphed. . . . In his earlier poetry Whitman has said that he won't speak because he chooses not to or that he chooses not to because words fail him, but never has he said that he *dare* not speak" (191).

Alternatively, when the poet recognizes something so "fierce and terrible in me" and in the earth that he "dare not tell it in words," he is instead employing a powerful means of communicating the intensity of something that otherwise is incommunicable. The addition of the phrase "my likeness!" to the first line makes explicit the connection between the speaker's inner life and the explosive power of the natural world. He "dare" not speak of the "fierce and terrible" emotion, so potentially explosive has that emotion become. Nevertheless, in the act of identify-

ing what he cannot say, he summons it forth. Similarly, Wordsworth concludes “Afterthought” by stating that “We feel that we are greater than we know,” in the process communicating something that cannot be articulated directly in words.¹⁴ In the 1855 preface, Whitman spoke of the “expression of the American poet” as “indirect and not direct.”¹⁵ His challenge, as I mentioned, was to create a poetic language capable of opening a space within the culture for the avowal of “manly” or “adhesive” love.

Both Helms and Parker agree that by distributing the twelve poems throughout the larger 1860 “Calamus” Whitman blunted the force of his avowal of homoerotic love. One way to test this hypothesis is to examine the poems that Whitman wrote immediately after completing “Live Oak, with Moss.”

Evolving Texts and Authorial Intentions

In the introduction to *The Continuing Presence of Walt Whitman*, Robert K. Martin also asserts that Whitman censored himself: “The process of revision that has worked to make Whitman ‘safe’ for the classroom . . . began with Whitman himself, as Alan Helms shows in his moving commentary on ‘Live Oak with Moss,’ a sequence that was later dismembered to become part of ‘Calamus.’ Whitman was always crafty, playing with the limits of the sayable, retreating when he was found out . . . and he worked hard to construct a public image for himself that was based on both his role as the American national poet and his role as the ‘secret’ gay poet” (xx-xxi). The closest we come to evidence from the poet himself about his intentions is a note, quoted by Helms, written on the reverse side of a variant of number II of “Live Oak”:

Poems

A Cluster of Poems, Sonnets expressing
the thoughts, pictures, aspirations &c
Fit to be perused during the days of the
approach of Death.
(that I have prepared myself for that purpose.—
Remember now—
Remember then (*WM*, lxvii, n. 8)

That note does not touch on the question of why Whitman elected not to publish the grouping, although it may reflect what Bowers called the “special nature” of these poems for Whitman (*WM*, lxvi-ii, n. 8).

According to Bowers, Whitman copied the twelve “Live Oak, with Moss” poems on the first seventeen pages of a notebook. Bowers printed transcriptions of three additional poems that, he claims, Whitman wrote on pages 18 and 19 of the notebook. These “are inscribed on white wove paper of the same stock as that utilized for the twelve in the ro-

man-numbered series. Of these, no. 39 . . . represents the conjugate half of leaf 2 of the notebook and thus must have been blank leaf 19; and nos. 44 and 38 . . . were written on the conjugate half of leaf 3 and represent notebook leaf 18" (*WM*, lxvii). The titles that Whitman would use for these three are "Here the Frailest Leaves of Me" (44), "Fast Anchor'd Eternal O Love" (38), and "Sometimes with One I Love" (39). I will discuss these three pivotal poems and then consider five additional "Calamus" poems from the Valentine Manuscripts. What do all these tell us about the poet's state of mind after completing "Live Oak"?

"Here the Frailest Leaves of Me" raises precisely the issue with which we have been concerned: the poet's awareness of the self-revelatory potential of love poetry:

Here the frailest leaves of me, and yet the strongest-lasting,—the last to be fully understood,
Here I shade down and hide my thoughts—I do not expose them,
And yet they expose me more than all my other poems. (*WM*, 112)

Through antithesis, the poet registers the paradox that such intimate poetry is at once frail and yet strong and permanent. Try as he might to "hide," these words "expose" him "more than all my other poems." To write openly about love and sexuality is to leave one's self vulnerable. Yet there is compensation of the sort that matters most to the poet: these are his "strongest-lasting" works. Through indirection, the poem identifies and calls the reader's attention to that which ostensibly its author would like to keep hidden.

Whitman's use of the suggestive word "here" may refer only to this poem, or it may encompass the "Live Oak" experience, or still yet it may include all of "Leaves of Grass." At the same time, "here" functions as a term of presentation, as when one says, "here, take this." Using an ostensibly definitive term to refer to something that he doesn't specify, Whitman thereby invites the reader to uncover what ostensibly is being concealed.

For the 1860 "Calamus" Whitman added a new first line, which also begins with the word "here":

Here my last words, and the most baffling,
Here the frailest leaves of me, and yet my strongest-lasting,
Here I shade down and hide my thoughts—I do not expose them,
And yet they expose me more than all my other poems. (*LG*, 1860, 377)

Does Whitman imply that he would write no more poetry because he must confront an oppressive world? Or does he suggest that these are

the “last words” from this particular grouping? Again, in the very act of raising the question, the speaker involves the reader in the most intimate of matters. In 1867 he removed the first line:

Here the frailest leaves of me and yet my strongest lasting,
Here I shade and hide my thoughts, I myself do not expose them,
And yet they expose me more than all my other poems. (*LG*, 131)

The several versions of the poem nicely dramatize the dilemma of personal revelation. If Whitman felt that the “Live Oak” sequence in fact revealed too much, he would not have published a work reminding the reader of the preceding revelations.

The second work from the same sheet is as follows:

Primeval my love for the woman I love!
O bride! O wife! more resistless, more enduring than I can tell, the thought of you,
Then, separate as disembodied, ethereal, a further-born reality, my consolation,
I ascend to the regions of your love, O man, O friend. (*WM*, 112)

Dramatizing a conflict between two forms of intimate attachment, between love for a woman and love for a man, this poem, far from retreating from homoeroticism, affirms it. Whitman places himself in the position of responding to a perceived need to justify his decision not to marry. In an essay on Whitman’s adaptation of the language of phrenology to name what yet had no name, Michael Lynch explained that “Whitman was . . . eager to set Adhesiveness—the manly love of comrades—over against Amativeness—marriage and the family—as a basis of social organization. Whereas Spurzheim, Arago, and Moir [among other writers in the tradition of phrenology] felt marriage personally necessary, [Robert] Macnish and Whitman did not. We are justified in seeing in this choice a key factor in the emergence of the modern homosexual role: the social pattern of choosing same-sex companionship rather than choosing an opposite-sex spouse as a basis for personal life” (92). In modifying the poem for publication in 1860, Whitman enriched it by adding the concept of the poet and his lover sharing a “roving life”:

Primeval my love for the woman I love,
O bride! O wife! More resistless, more enduring than I can tell, the thought of you!
Then separate, as disembodied, the purest born,
The ethereal, the last athletic reality, my consolation,
I ascend—I float in the regions of your love, O man,
O sharer of my roving life. (*LG*, 1860, 375)

The last of this group of three poems reflects on still another question raised in the sequence, the discouragement and pain that follow rejection in love:

Sometimes, with one I love I fill myself with rage for fear I effuse unreturned love;
But now I think there is no unreturned love,—the pay is certain, one way or another,
Doubtless I could not have perceived the universe or written one of my songs,
if I had not freely given myself to comrades, to love.— (*WM*, 116-118)

Art itself brings compensation through enhanced perceptual powers, a central theme of Romantic poetry. With the exception of the insertion of commas after “love” and “rage” in line one and after “universe” in the last line and the removal of the comma after “love” in line two, there were no changes from manuscript to first printing. In 1867, Whitman substituted the following two lines for the concluding line: “(I loved a certain person ardently and my love was not return’d, / Yet out of that I have written these songs)” (*LG*, 134). Reflecting on love and rejection, passion and vulnerability, and the artistic and philosophical growth that romantic love makes possible, these poems prepare the speaker to move on.

As I mentioned, Bowers identifies five additional poems in the Valentine collection “which are inscribed on white wove paper of the same stock as that utilized for the twelve in the roman numbered series.” Again using the numbers from the 1860 “Calamus,” these are number 1 (“In Paths Untrodden”), number 2 (“Scented Herbage of My Breast”), number 4 (“These I Singing in Spring”), number 12 (“Are You the New Person Drawn Toward Me”), and number 18 (“City of Orgies”) (*WM*, lxvii).

“In Paths Untrodden” unapologetically announces the poet’s break with conventional life. The Barrett Collection contains six lines of a work that would grow to nineteen. There is nothing tentative about the way that the speaker announces his “concealed but substantial life.” Here is Bowers’ transcription of that manuscript:

Long I was held by the life that exhibits itself,
By what is done in the houses or streets, or in company,
The usual adjustments and pleasures—the things which all conform to and which
the writers celebrate;
But now I know a life which does not exhibit itself, yet contains all the rest,
And now, escaping, I celebrate that concealed but substantial life,
I celebrate the need of the love of comrades.— (*WM*, 66-68)

Other manuscript sources are to be found in Bucke’s *Notes and Fragments* and the Trent Collection at Duke University (*LG*, 113). Whitman unabashedly introduces the concept of the pond-side as a place of liberation from social constraints, promising to “sing no songs to-day but those of manly attachment.”

In paths untrodden,
In the growth by margins of pond-waters,
Escaped from the life that exhibits itself,

From all the standards hitherto published—from the pleasures, profits, conformities,
 Which too long I was offering to feed my Soul;
 Clear to me now, standards not yet published—clear to me that my Soul,
 That the Soul of the man I speak for, feeds, rejoices only in comrades;
 Here, by myself, away from the clank of the world,
 Tallying and talked to here by tongues aromatic,
 No longer abashed—for in this secluded spot I can respond as I would not dare
 elsewhere,
 Strong upon me the life that does not exhibit itself, yet contains all the rest,
 Resolved to sing no songs to-day but those of manly attachment,
 Projecting them along that substantial life,
 Bequeathing, hence, types of athletic love,
 Afternoon, this delicious Ninth Month, in my forty-first year,
 I proceed, for all who are, or have been, young men,
 To tell the secret of my nights and days,
 To celebrate the need of comrades. (LG, 1860, 341-342)

In the act of calling attention to “the secret of my nights and days,” the “Calamus” poet invites the reader to share that secret with him. As Peter Coviello observed, “By deploying the rhetorical mechanisms of secrecy, Whitman simply gives a sweet taste of accomplishment to the reader’s discovery of what was never hidden.”¹⁶

At this point Bowers reproduced a five-line poem that apparently Whitman did not publish. It is taken from the same folder of the Valentine Manuscripts. Bradley and Blodgett did not include it either in the “Unpublished Poems” or “Unpublished Manuscripts” sections of the *Reader’s Comprehensive Edition*. The poet repudiates his formerly self-sufficient identity and declares his need of romantic love. Perhaps he chose not to publish it because it repeats the theme of “I Saw in Louisiana a Live-Oak Growing.” Here is that unpublished work:

Was it I who walked the earth disclaiming all except what I had in myself?
 Was it I boasting how complete I was in myself?
 O little I counted the comrade indispensable to me!
 O how my soul—How the soul of man feeds, rejoices in its lovers, its dear friends!
 And now I care not to walk the earth unless a lover, a dear friend, walk by my
 side. (WM, 68)

The long, enigmatic second poem of the “Calamus” sequence, “Scented Herbage of My Breast,” explores the mysterious connection between love and death. The speaker is determined “to unbare my breast—I have stifled and choked too long / I will escape from the costume, the play which was proposed to me / I will sound myself and love” (WM, 72).

The next, “These I Singing in Spring,” introduces the powerful, suggestive image of the calamus root, which would come to displace the live-oak as the dominant symbol in this body of work. I quote the concluding lines from the manuscript version:

Here, out of my pocket, some moss which I pulled off a live-oak in Florida
 as it hung trailing down,
 Here, some pinks and laurel-leaves, and a handful of sage,
 And here what I drew from the water where I waded in the pond-side,
 (O there I saw him that tenderly loves me, and never separates from me
 Therefore this shall be the special token of comrades—this calamus-root shall,
 Interchange it, youths, with each other—Let none render it back,)
 And twigs of maple, and a bunch of wild orange, and chestnut,
 And stems of currants, and plum-blows, and the aromatic cedar,
 These I, singing, compassed round by a thick cloud of spirits,
 Wandering, point to or touch as I pass, or throw them loosely from me,
 Indicating to each one what he shall have—giving something to each,
 But that I drew from the pond-side, that I reserve,
 I will give of it but only to those comrades who love as I myself am capable of
 loving.— (*WM*, 76, 78)

Whitman would make only minor changes from the manuscript to the published version.

Refusing to conform to social norms, the defiant speaker charts his own way, as he asserts in number 12:

Be careful—I am perhaps different from what you suppose;
 Do you suppose you will find in me your ideal?
 Do you suppose you can easily be my lover, and I yours?
 Do you suppose I am trusty and faithful?
 Do you trust this pliant and tolerant manner of mine?
 Do you suppose yourself advancing on real ground toward a real heroic person?
 Have you no thought, O dreamer, that it is all maya, illusion?
 O let some wise serpent hiss in your ears how many have trusted the same as you,
 How many have fondly supposed what you do now—only to be disappointed.—¹⁷

In 1867 Whitman dropped the concluding two lines.

The last of the poems written on the same paper stock, number 18 of the 1860 “Calamus,” celebrates the city, not for its usual attractions, its “shifting tableaux,” but rather as a place of passion, of the “frequent and swift flash of eyes offering me love—offering me the response and equal of my own, / These repay me—Lovers, continual Lovers only repay me.—” (*WM*, 98-100). In 1867 Whitman titled the poem “City of Orgies,” and the first line, which in 1860 read “City of my walks and joys!” became “City of orgies, walks and joys” (*LG*, 125-126). Some of Whitman’s contemporary readers would have associated the poem with well-known Pfaff’s, a place where “the overwhelmingly male bonhomie provided a congenial setting for men’s attractions to each other,” as Christine Stansell has observed.¹⁸ But in not referring specifically to this or any other location, he celebrates the entire city, all of Manhattan, as a place of erotic encounters. In the words of Robert K. Martin, “Whitman’s scene of cruising begins the process of creating the modern urban homosexual as an identity. While many of the poems follow a tradition of love poetry that seeks the perfect partner, this poem cel-

embrates a tradition of multiple partners and desires,” practices and networks that could be found in early eighteenth-century London.¹⁹

The eight poems that we have just reviewed (nine if we include the unpublished “Was It I?”) show no evidence of retreat from the open avowal of same-sex love in the “Live Oak” sequence. Significantly, the calamus plant, with its powerful phallic associations, has come to displace the live oak as the dominant symbol. As Bowers put it, “Whitman did not have these two associations simultaneously in his mind; but that instead the live oak preceded the calamus and was later engulfed by it.” As a result, he “subsequently . . . decided upon the calamus as his basic symbol, altered the heading ‘Live Oak with Moss’ to read ‘Calamus-Leaves,’ and in the same ink wrote two ‘heading’ poems—no. 1 and the prefixed leaves to no. 2—which performed for the calamus what poems I and II had done for the live oak as an association” (*WM*, lxx). This shifting of dominant symbols along with the addition of poems that do not directly develop the narrative of the previous twelve works brought with it the practical problem of finding an organizing principle capable of bringing together a narrative sequence along with works that reflect on that experience and still others that extend those themes and locate new settings, both in the city and by the pond-side. The resulting “Calamus” sequence lacks the unity that one finds in “Live Oak, with Moss,” but that does not indicate self-censorship.

On the contrary, as Martin wrote of “City of Orgies,” such was the poet’s “challenge to dominant views of love and sexuality,” that even now “the poem has not often been discussed in detail.”²⁰ In that context, I want to analyze another urban poem from “Calamus,” number 29, “A Glimpse.” The speaker makes no attempt to disguise the gender of his lover or the setting where he meets him:

One fitting glimpse, caught through an interstice,
Of a crowd of workmen and drivers in a bar-room, around the stove, late of a
winter night—And I unremarked, seated in a corner;
Of a youth who loves me, and whom I love, silently approaching, and seating
himself near, that he may hold me by the hand;
A long while, amid the noises of coming and going—of drinking and oath and
smutty jest,
There we two, content, happy in being together, speaking little, perhaps not a
word. (*LG*, 1860, 371)

No longer can the speaker be “unremarked,” since the poem itself provides a frame from which to view him seated in a bar room holding hands with his male lover. If in 1860 Whitman had been concerned about making too explicit an avowal of same-sex love, he would not have added either this poem or “City of Orgies.” The urban setting of “A Glimpse” may have brought to certain readers associations with Pfaff’s, where, we know, Whitman met his “working-class lover Fred

Vaughan and consorted regularly with the young men of the 'Fred Gray Association'" (Stansell, 111). Again, by not specifying a location, Whitman suggests a wider urban culture where such meetings were commonplace and could pass unremarked.

Same-Sex Love in 1860

Introducing the Whitman section of the *Norton Anthology* Parker states flatly that "facing the impossibility of printing and distributing so direct a sexual statement of 'adhesiveness' or 'the passion of friendship' of man for man, Whitman chose a more covert way of expressing himself," by writing the "Enfans d'Adam" and distributing the "Live Oak, with Moss" poems throughout the "Calamus" sequence (*Norton*, 2129). Precisely what risks did Whitman face? Would he have ruined his career by publishing "Live Oak, with Moss"?

In *The Construction of Homosexuality*, David F. Greenberg describes the emergence in New York during the 1830s of "male homosexual networks" along with "cruising grounds" and "all-male social clubs." Even so, "the public showed no panic over homosexuality in these years. On the few occasions when New York City newspapers tried to sensationalize an arrest on homosexuality-related charges, their efforts fell flat." Moralists who tried to reform city life apparently were more concerned about "saloons, gambling halls, brothels, obscenity in the theater, and irreligiosity, not about homosexuality." It would not be until after 1879 that "states amended their sodomy statutes or passed new legislation for the first time criminalizing oral sex and, in some cases mutual masturbation," at which time physicians would take the lead in pathologizing and criminalizing what came to be labeled homosexuality (355-356, 400-401). But that is not to say that in 1860 the climate was entirely open and tolerant, that there was no stigma.

Indeed, the critic and editor Rufus Griswold, in an anonymous review of the 1855 *Leaves of Grass* in the *Criterion*, published November 10, 1855, condemning the book for its sexual immorality, its "vilest imaginings and shamefullest license," urged action "to suppress such gross obscenity." Griswold, however, found himself in something of a bind, since he could not write explicitly of the book's obscenities without running the risk of offending "polite" readers. He could not name the actions he found objectionable for fear that he would thereby instruct his readers in immoral behaviors. Nevertheless, he used the Latin phrase that was frequently deployed to condemn sodomy: "*Peccatum illud horribile, inter Christianos non nominandum*" or "that horrible sin not to be mentioned among Christians."²¹ Griswold, however, was the only reviewer to comment in this way on Whitman's book. Most importantly for our consideration of the question of self-censorship, his remarks did not lead Whitman to modify or censor his work.

In fact, in the second edition of 1856, Whitman added “Bunch Poem” (later titled “Spontaneous Me”), which in 1856 begins, “The friend I am happy with, / The arm of my friend hanging idly over my shoulder.”²² Jonathan Ned Katz claims that in this poem, “Whitman spoke more directly than ever before about an erotic encounter between its male narrator (‘Walt Whitman’) and a young man” (106). Further, as if in response to Griswold and any others who might condemn the sexual explicitness of *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman, in the open letter addressed to Emerson as “dear Friend and Master” that he used as the postscript to the 1856 edition, went on the offensive by calling for a new openness in the treatment of sexuality in American literature. Griswold might urge that he be prosecuted, but Whitman countered that it was time to repeal what he called those “filthy law[s]” that prohibited the frank discussion of sex in literature: “The courageous soul, for a year or two to come, may be proved by faith in sex, and by disdaining concessions” (*LG*, 739-740).

Whitman criticized not only the timidity of American writers, but also the underlying cultural assumption that labeled all sexual contact as animalistic and bad—with the exception, of course, of that undertaken for purposes of procreation by married couples. Paradoxically, that blanket condemnation may have brought with it an unintended consequence, as Vern L. Bullough and Martha Voght have noted: for “most of the nineteenth century homosexuality was often classified under the term *onanism* or *masturbation*. . . . Since the sin of Onan . . . was interpreted as the spilling of his seed without the possibility of procreation, almost all forms of sexual activity not resulting in pregnancy could be classed with Onan’s sin, and it became a convenient medical handle partly because its Biblical sanction made it less likely to offend sensibilities. Inevitably, however, classifying all ‘deviant’ sex practices as onanism caused confusion.”²³ The lack of ready terminology—what Katz has called a “verbal void” (32)—reflects the fact that in 1860 American culture had not yet mobilized to condemn same-sex relationships (even as it made all the more urgent Whitman’s project of developing a positive language). Michael Lynch found in reviewing court records from the years 1830-1880 in New York City that “there are no suggestions that sodomy is a threat to state or family, no appeals to an unnameable horror; not a phrase hints that the impulse to sodomy is a medical matter or has to do with instinct, personality type, or any psychic disorder or anomaly, as would be true in some circles later in the century.”²⁴

On March 17, 1860, the day that Whitman and Emerson had their conversation in Boston on the sexual explicitness of *Leaves of Grass*, *Vanity Fair* published a parody of the poet, “Counter-Jumps: A Poemettina.—After Walt Whitman.” In this poem, which I reproduce in full in my essay on Whitman’s presence in *Vanity Fair*, the poet is portrayed—or rather portrays himself—as a “counter-jumper,” the term

the weekly used to identify effete males employed as retail clerks in fashionable stores—a code word, evidently, for those who participated in same-sex encounters. The poem's speaker opens by proclaiming: "I am the Counter-jumper, weak and effeminate. / I love to loaf and lie about dry-goods." He goes on to proclaim that "I am the creature of weak depravities; / I am the Counter-jumper; / I sound my feeble yelp over the woofs of the World."²⁵ If those associated with *Vanity Fair* suspected that this portrayal would cause the poet such harm as to blow a heterosexual cover that had to be maintained at all costs, they would not have published it. Just two months later they would welcome him back to New York by referring to the excellent prospects for that year's Calamus crop.

The parodist for *Vanity Fair* pokes fun at Whitman by reversing the positive language that Whitman was using to speak of "manly attachment." The parody does point to a tension or rift that would widen in succeeding decades. But in 1860, Whitman spoke of his own needs and those of other men like him without fear that his career would be ruined.

External Pressures

In considering the question of self-censorship, it is essential to examine both general attitudes within the culture and also what we know of how a writer responded to specific clues and directives from patrons, publishers, and friends. I begin with Whitman's interactions with Emerson. We have seen that in his open letter to Emerson in 1856, Whitman asserted that above all American literature had to free itself from the reluctance to write explicitly about human sexuality. It is understandable, then, that when the two got together in Boston in 1860, the subject of sexuality and censorship would arise.

Whitman recalled that when the two took their famous walk together, he adamantly refused to tone down or soften the sexually explicit portions of *Leaves of Grass*, particularly the "Enfans d'Adam" section. Emerson forcefully developed his arguments, but Whitman recalls replying, "Only that while I can't answer at all, I feel more settled than ever in my theory, and exemplify it."²⁶ Whitman's "theory" was that the full expression of "the sex element" was essential to his poetic project. He told Horace Traubel that "If there was any weakness in [Emerson's] position it was in his idea that the particular poems could be dropped and the Leaves remain the Leaves still: he did not see the significance of the sex element as I had put it into the book and resolutely there stuck to it—he did not see that if I cut sex out I might just as well have cut everything out—the full scheme would no longer exist—it would have been violated in its most sensitive spot."²⁷ This is not the statement of someone who had engaged in an act of self-censorship; rather, it is en-

tirely consistent with the defiant assertions of the 1856 open letter.

There is absolutely no evidence that Whitman's publisher, Thayer and Eldridge, echoed Emerson's arguments for prudence. As he explained to his Brooklyn friend Abbey Price, writing from Boston on March 3: "They have treated me first rate—have not asked me at all what I was going to put into the book—just took me to the stereotype foundry, and given order to follow my directions."²⁸ Since their own capital and the reputation of the firm were at risk, Thayer and Eldridge, one would assume, would caution Whitman if there were subjects that simply could not be treated. Price—a feminist who had been "publicly reprimanded" while a member of the Hopewell Community in Massachusetts for "counseling a married couple and single woman in what turned out to be an adulterous relationship"—provided Whitman with a supportive ear.²⁹

Although Emerson urged caution, Whitman's New York friend Henry Clapp, editor of the *Saturday Press* and a vociferous champion of free love, evidently supported him in his insistence on sexual explicitness. What if Whitman should draw the ire of critics such as Griswold? Clapp taught him not to worry, since "scandalous erotic poetry was an asset not a liability."³⁰ As Whitman told Traubel, "Henry was right: better to have people stirred against you if they can't be stirred for you—better that than not to stir them at all."³¹ In this context, Whitman may well have thought of the new edition as expressing not only his own commitment to sexual liberation, but that of his friends at Pfaff's. They too had "escaped," as he wrote "In Paths Untrodden," "From all the standards hitherto published—from the pleasures, profits, conformities, / Which too long I was offering to feed my Soul, / . . . That the Soul of the man I speak for, feeds, rejoices only in comrades" (*LG*, 1860, 341).

Is "Children of Adam" a "Smokescreen" for "Calamus"?

I want briefly to consider the relationship between the "Calamus" section and "Enfans d'Adam," also added in 1860. Was this shorter section—later called "Children of Adam"—simply a "smokescreen" for the more revealing "Calamus"? Whitman wrote the following directive to himself while working on "Enfans": "A string of Poems (short, etc.), embodying the amative love of woman—the same as Live Oak Leaves do the passion of friendship for man."³² Evidently he thought of the new sequence not as a means of deflecting attention from "Live Oak," but as complementary to it. Both units fit into the thematic organization introduced in 1860.

At some point, Whitman made a significant change in one of the love poems originally addressed to a man, "Once I Pass'd through a Populous City," the ninth poem in the "Enfans" grouping. In the manuscript, the poet speaks of his love for "the man who wandered with me,

there, for love of me.” It concludes, “I remember, I say, only one rude and ignorant man who, when I departed, long and long held me by the hand, with silent lip, sad and tremulous” (*WM*, 64). In the published version, that man has become “a woman I casually met there.” It now concludes:

I remember I say only that woman who passionately clung to me,
Again we wander—we love—we separate again,
Again she holds me by the hand—I must not go!
I see her close beside me, with silent lips, sad and tremulous. (*LG*, 1860, 311)

Is it possible that Whitman changed the gender of the lover to disguise his identity? On the other hand, it may be that he needed a long poem to balance the “Calamus” grouping.

But in “Enfans d’Adam” the Whitman persona seems not to have been fastidious in identifying the gender of his lovers. In the eighth poem in the section, later known as “Native Moments,” the speaker chooses a male lover, identified as “some low person for my dearest friend”:

He shall be lawless, rude, illiterate—he shall be condemned by others for deeds done;
I will play a part no longer—Why should I exile myself from my companions?
O you shunned persons! I at least do not shun you,
I come forthwith in your midst—I will be your poet,
I will be more to you than any of the rest. (*LG*, 1860, 311)

If Whitman were particularly concerned not to reveal an exclusive “adhesive” identity, he would not have included this poem. As James E. Miller, Jr., has observed, “Native Moments” would seem to be “more adhesive than amative in sentiment.” Miller suggests reading “Children of Adam” for what it “purports to be, not a paean to heterosexual love, but a celebration of sexuality in all its varied forms—auto-, homo-, hetero-, cosmo-eroticism.”³³ Whitman’s treatment of sexuality in all its diversity would seem to be entirely consistent with his own statements and the ideas of the bohemians from Pfaff’s, a community that offered essential support, and one that, we might assume, came to constitute his ideal readership.

Is “Calamus” a Flawed Text?

Parker has argued that there are times when to honor the author’s intent the textual critic must intervene to undo that author’s alterations, since, he asserts in *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (1984), “At any point during the process of composition the writer’s control may be imperfectly asserted, despite all the talk of achieved perfection which writers as well as critics may indulge in.” Parker cautions that “Writers can fail to achieve coherence between sentences, between paragraphs, between

larger sections of a work. They can relinquish a thought when it is too complicated to follow out, just at the moment, through all its sinuosities." The writer may cause damage to his own text by making compromises to get it published. Parker insists that "Once we realize that the creative process, like any other process, has bounds, beyond which no author, however fine a craftsman, is apt to intervene with impunity, we can cheerfully give up the superstition that an author is infallible and that the literary work is necessarily a perfect verbal icon."³⁴

Paradoxically, Parker's editorial theory allows the critic to substitute his own judgment of authorial intent for that of the author himself: to realize the author's intention, the author's own decisions may be disregarded. But as Thomas Tanselle put it, "Parker's main thesis is built on a patent inconsistency. He repeatedly insists that the only meaning we should be interested in is what the author put into the text. . . . Nevertheless we are also told that authors frequently do not know when to stop revising their work and that what some of their revisions produce is nonsense rather than valid meaning."³⁵ Where and when can we confidently say that the author surrenders creative control? For Parker, it would appear, it is after the manuscript is completed (although even that is not certain). But we have seen that, for Whitman, having his poems set in type and then revising from typescript was very much part of the continuing creative process. He cared about the look of the poem on the page; from this perspective, the poem was not finished until he had approved its appearance in print and even then, of course, he continued to make changes. We cannot say, then, that for Whitman changes from manuscript to printed text justify an intervention on the part of the textual critic.

Parker and Helms both make textual judgments on the basis of their assumption that Whitman faced such widespread homophobia that he was forced to engage in self-censorship. But as we have seen, historians of sexuality have called attention to the considerable ambiguity in the labeling of sexual behaviors during this period. Yet Parker claims to be rescuing "Live Oak, with Moss" as a "gay manifesto," imposing terminology from our own time on Whitman. And our examination of the manuscripts of poems written after "Live Oak" reveals no evidence that he sought to pull back from some boundary of self-revelation that he had passed. If he had been motivated by the need to conceal behaviors or attitudes that would immediately destroy his career, he would not have published—among others—such explicit works as "City of Orgies" and "A Glimpse," both of which call attention to an emerging urban culture of same-sex love.

The once-neglected "Live Oak, with Moss" now stands on its own as a moving narrative. Current practices in textual scholarship open a space for it within the Whitman canon. But to recognize the integrity of that sequence does not lead to the conclusion that the larger "Calamus"

became for Whitman a means of concealing its primary revelations. Our examination of the manuscripts of the poems written after "Live Oak, with Moss" as well as our consideration of the poems' context turns up no evidence that Whitman came to the sad recognition that he must censor himself. "Live Oak, with Moss" may contain a painful account of love and loss, but, as we have seen, Whitman expressed no regrets, writing in poem 39 of "Calamus": "Doubtless I could not have perceived the universe, or written one of my poems, if I had not freely given myself to comrades, to love." These are not the words of a writer forced into self-censorship by an oppressive culture.

College of William and Mary

NOTES

I am grateful to John Bryant for helpful comments on a much earlier version of this essay. Michael Robertson offered acute and detailed suggestions on a later version, as did the anonymous readers of *WWQR*. I appreciate the suggestions of my colleague Thomas Haecox.

1 "An Unusually Active Market for Calamus': Whitman, *Vanity Fair*, and the Fate of Humor in a Time of War," *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 19 (Winter/Spring 2002), 148-181.

2 *Vanity Fair* 1 (May 10, 1860), 326.

3 I have found the following works particularly helpful: David F. Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 355-356; Jonathan Ned Katz, *Love Stories* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Bert Hansen, "American Physicians' Discovery of Homosexuals, 1880-1990: A New Diagnosis in a Changing Society," in Judith Walzer Leavitt and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *Sickness and Health in America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 13-31. The article appeared first in Charles E. Rosenberg and Janet Golden, eds., *Framing Disease: Studies in American Cultural History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 134-154; and Michael Lynch, "'Here Is Adhesiveness': From Friendship to Homosexuality," *Victorian Studies* 29 (Autumn 1985), 67-96; Vern L. Bullough and Martha Voght, "Homosexuality and Its Confusion with the 'Secret Sin' in Pre-Freudian America," in Charles O. Jackson, ed., *The Other Americans: Sexual Variations in the National Past* (Westport, CT: 1996), 84 (originally published in *Journal of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 28 [1973], 143-155).

4 Alan Helms, "Live Oak with Moss," in Robert K. Martin, ed., *The Continuing Presence of Walt Whitman* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), 191-192.

5 Fredson Bowers, "Whitman's Manuscripts for the Original 'Calamus' Poems," *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia* 6 (1953-1954), 257-265.

6 Gay Wilson Allen, *The Solitary Singer* (New York: New York University Press, 1955; rev. ed., 1967), 222.

7 *Whitman's Manuscripts: Leaves of Grass (1860): A Parallel Text* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955); hereafter cited as *WM*.

- 8 Hershel Parker, "The Real 'Live Oak, with Moss': Straight Talk about Whitman's 'Gay Manifesto,'" *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 51 (1996), 145-160.
- 9 "'Live Oak, with Moss' and 'Calamus': Textual Inhibitions in Whitman Criticism," *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 14 (1997), 153-165.
- 10 Michael Groden, "Contemporary Textual and Literary Theory," in George Bornstein, ed., *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 281; Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Criticism and Bibliography," *Studies in Bibliography* 43 (1990), 1, 9.
- 11 Bornstein, "Introduction," in Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams, eds., *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 2-3.
- 12 I have used Roy Harvey Pearce's facsimile edition of the 1860 text of *Leaves of Grass* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961), 373. The poem is number 34 in the 1860 "Calamus." A facsimile of the 1860 edition is also available in the first volume of *Walt Whitman's Blue Book*, 2 vols., ed. Arthur Golden (New York: New York Public Library, 1968).
- 13 *Norton Anthology of American Literature* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2003), 2204; hereafter cited as *Norton*. Also in *WM*, 114.
- 14 William Wordsworth, *The Major Works*, ed. Stephen Gill (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 351.
- 15 *Leaves of Grass: Comprehensive Reader's Edition* (New York: New York University Press, 1965), 714; hereafter cited as *LG*.
- 16 "Intimate Nationality: Anonymity and Attachment in Whitman," *American Literature* 73 (2001), 106.
- 17 *WM*, 90. I have removed an obviously redundant "and" in line 5.
- 18 Stansell, "Whitman at Pfaff's: Commercial Culture, Literary Life, and New York Bohemia at Mid-Century," *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 10 (1993), 111.
- 19 "'City of Orgies,'" in J. R. McMaster and Donald D. Kummings, eds., *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland, 1998), 121; Greenberg, 355.
- 20 *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*, 121.
- 21 Griswold, *New York Criterion*, November 10, 1855, in Milton Hindus, ed., *Walt Whitman: The Critical Heritage* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971), 31-33.
- 22 Whitman, *Facsimile of the 1856 Edition* (N.p.: Norwood, 1976), 309.
- 23 Vern L. Bullough and Martha Voght, "Homosexuality and Its Confusion with the 'Secret Sin' in Pre-Freudian America," in *The Other Americans: Sexual Variations in the National Past*, ed. Charles O. Jackson (Westport, Conn.: 1996), 84. Originally published in *Journal of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 28 (1973), 143-55.
- 24 Quoted in David S. Reynolds, *Walt Whitman's America: A Cultural Biography* (New York: Knopf, 1995), 394-395.
- 25 Reprinted in Scholnick, "'An Unusually Active Market for Calamus,'" 160-161.
- 26 Whitman, *Prose Works, 1892*, ed. Floyd Stovall (New York: New York University Press, 1963), 1:191.

- 27 Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden* (Boston: Small, Maynard, 1906), 1:51; hereafter *WWWC*.
- 28 Whitman, *The Correspondence*, ed. Edwin Haviland Miller (New York: New York University Press, 1961), 1:49.
- 29 Sherry Ceniza, "Price, Abby Hills (1814-1878)," in *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*, 549.
- 30 On March 27, 1860, Clapp wrote from New York to Whitman in Boston, "I need not say, we all are anxious to see you back at Pfaff's, and are eagerly looking forward to your proposed letter to the crowd"; *WWWC*, 1:237. Christine Stansell remarks that "Clapp seems to have developed his reform attachments in relation to free-love doctrine. Free love was a politics associated with Fourierism which upheld the sanctity of sexual love outside of marriage and spurned the coerciveness of unions legitimated by church and state" ("Clapp, Henry (1814-1875)," in *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*, 129).
- 31 *WWWC*, 1:237.
- 32 Richard Maurice Bucke, Thomas B. Harned, and Horace L. Traubel, eds., *The Complete Writings of Walt Whitman* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902), 7:18, no. 63.
- 33 James E. Miller, Jr. "'Children of Adam' (1860)," in *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*, 117.
- 34 Hershel Parker, *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1984), 26; 26-27, 51.
- 35 G. Thomas Tanselle, "Historicism and Textual Editing." *Studies in Bibliography* 39 (1986), 33.