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Abstract

“Cartographers as Critics: Staking Claims in the Mapping of American Literature” recuperates the print culture phenomenon of literary map production, which became popular in North America around 1898. A literary map can be defined as any pictorial map that depicts imaginative worlds or authorial associations across geopolitical space. While notable examples have circulated for centuries in bound books, such as Thomas More’s Utopia and William Faulkner’s Absalom, Absalom!, the majority of twentieth-century literary maps were ephemeral productions that have not survived in great numbers. These discursive documents functioned as compelling expressions of literary taste and cultural values; they circulated in magazines and newspapers, as gas station promotional giveaways and diner placemats, and as classroom “equipment.” Extant literary maps offer new perspectives on turn-of-the-twentieth century U.S. literary nationalism and the Public Library Movement, “fiction debates” and “Great Books” curriculums, the mid-century schism between anthropological folklorists and literary folklorists, and the role of popular cartography in U.S. print culture. Though today’s
critics are generally unaware of the literary maps discussed here, these documents are consequential artifacts that have consistently equated canonized writers with pioneers and conquerors; in doing so, they have formulated literature as an extractable, finite, and controllable resource found on North America’s “literary frontiers.” Importantly, discursive literary maps make claims that are both critical assessments and assertions of territorial title. In doing so, they impose a cartographic framework on Native space that simultaneously evacuates and denies both the presence and possibility of Indigenous literatures. “Cartographers as Critics” seeks to problematize this ideological equation and to explore its critical implications for the recent “spatial turn” in the humanities and social sciences, as well as the burgeoning revitalization of literary map production and circulation now present on the Internet.
Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my committee members, Profs. Daniel Heath Justice, Jeannine DeLombard, and Heather Murray. In many ways, my time in graduate school involved two major journeys. Daniel, in particular, was a trusted and invaluable guide on both. I would like to thank Prof. Nick Mount for first showing me Paul Wilstach’s 1898 map shortly after I arrived in Toronto. I would also like to thank Prof. Matthew Farish for lending a geographer’s insight.

Generously, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has funded my graduate education, and the University of Toronto’s Department of English and Massey College have supported research travel to the Library of Congress. Staff members at the Geography and Map Division, Library of Congress proved especially helpful, as did the Special Collections Research Center at Syracuse University. While I was still in the early stages of this project, Martha Hopkins of the Library of Congress kindly met with me and offered useful advice. I cannot thank Barbara Scheibel and her Local History and Genealogy Department colleagues at the Onondaga County Public Library enough for their support and assistance. Don Soltesz and Sarah Fenn Luth graciously talked to me about their fathers’ maps; Loretta Soltesz was wonderful enough to tell me more about her late husband’s career. Murray Hudson Antiquarian Books, Maps, Prints & Globes in Halls, Tennessee, The Old Map Gallery in Denver, Colorado, and Schein & Schein Antique Maps & Prints in San Francisco, California, were valuable resources as well. Thanks also to Bryan Dickie, who photographed my collection of literary maps in his Toronto studio.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Profs. John Wunder, Joe Starita, and George Wolf of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Thank you, George, for suggesting Canada. I also want to thank Jamison Wyatt for his research savvy, Catherine Schwartz for keeping me motivated and for correcting my makeshift French, and Ellen Kohtz for inspiring me and pointing out my misplaced commas since the sixth grade. Finally, there is Trevor, who made each page possible.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................... iv
Table of Contents ................................................................................................................ v
List of Figures ....................................................................................................................... vi
List of Appendices ............................................................................................................... viii
Introduction ......................................................................................................................... 1
Chapter 1: Mapping a New Method of Conquest ................................................................. 21
Chapter 2: Institutionalizing the Genre: Paul Mayo Paine’s Literary Map Project ........... 59
Chapter 3: “Scholars might complain”: Fakelore Heroes on Maps of American Folklore .............................................................................................................. 102
Chapter 4: Un(-)settling Claims: Toward a Process of Literary Un-Mapping ................... 136
Conclusion ............................................................................................................................. 171
Illustrations .......................................................................................................................... 183
Works Consulted .................................................................................................................. 212
Appendices ........................................................................................................................... 227
Copyright Acknowledgements ............................................................................................. 230
List of Figures

1. A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States (1898)
2. A Map of the United States Which Aims to Show Some Recently Staked Claims (1901)
3. Literary Map of the United States Showing Some Unclaimed Reservations (1902)
4. A Map Showing the Invasion of Europe by American Writers of Fiction (1908)
5. A Map Showing the Literary Invasion of Africa by Anglo-Saxon Authors (1911)
6. The Invasion of Asia by Anglo-Saxon Authors (1912)
7. A Map Showing the Invasion of North America by Foreign Authors (1912)
8. Map of Good Stories (1924)
9. Map of Good Stories (1925)
10. Map of Good Stories (1931)
11. Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls: Stories, Trails, Discoveries, Explorations & Places to Read About (1925)
12. The Northward Map of Truthful Tales (1926)
13. The Booklovers Map of America (1939)
14. The County Library Comes Home to the People (1927)
15. Chattanooga Public Library (Tennessee) Book Display (1926)
16. A Map of the Principal Local Color Regions of the United States (1921)
17. Literary Frontiers and Local-Color Regions (1934)
18. William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore (1946)
19. American Folklore & Legends (1951)
20. A Map of Full of Myths (1959)
22. Detail, Storyteller’s Map of American Myths

24. Verso detail, *Folklore and Legends of Our Country*


26. *Philological and Historical Chart* (1878)

27. Details, *Philological and Historical Chart*

28. *Nebraska Centennial Literary Map and Guide to Nebraska Authors* (1967)
List of Appendices

1. Working List of Literary Maps Designed by Paul Mayo Paine
2. Working List of Paul Mayo Paine’s Literary Maps Revised by Others
Introduction

Maps are texts that tell us important stories. [...] They are narratives with a purpose, stories with an agenda.

—John Rennie Short, The World through Maps

Well, then, that map’s a liar again. I never see such a liar as that map.

—Huckleberry Finn, Tom Sawyer Abroad

In the fall of 1993, the Library of Congress launched “Language of the Land: Journeys into Literary America,” a traveling showcase of seventy-one literary maps and photographs. The Washington Post described the exhibition as “a literary road show” that “transformed” the Library’s Madison Building into “a reader’s road map of the Republic, celebrating our scribes from the Arctic to the Gulf Coast and from sea to shining sea.” Even as the Post questioned some of the curatorial selections as “parochial,” it concluded, “The exhibit is a triumph of magnificent material over pedestrian presentation.”

“Language of the Land” left the Library of Congress in January 1994 and embarked on a 20-city tour across the United States. While newspapers and free weeklies printed notices and brief reviews of the traveling show, none expressed the Post’s tempered enthusiasm for literary maps. Occasionally, a newspaper would note a local connection to the materials on display. For example, the Southeast Missourian commented on William Faulkner’s 1945 hand-drawn map of Yoknapatawpha County, which the Library’s curators had borrowed from Southeast Missouri State University’s Brodsky Collection. When the exhibition passed through Baton Rouge, the city’s Advocate mentioned the inclusion of the 1992 map Louisiana Literature. Publicity for “Language of the Land,” however, was light, and printed notices generally consisted of just a few disinterested lines. It would seem that many Americans cared little about the exhibit, in large part, because people often do not realize what literary maps are.

Depending on whom you ask, the phrase “literary map” might suggest a number of things. For some, such as critic Michiko Kakutani, it is a metaphor for writerly
accomplishment: an exemplary work secures for its author a place on the proverbial literary map. For others, including Alberto Manguel and Malcolm Bradbury, literary maps are cartographic depictions of fictional worlds such as Oz, Never-Never Land, and Middle-earth. If asked, however, most people will give the same perplexed response: “What’s a literary map?” In the companion book to “Language of the Land,” Martha Hopkins and Michael Buscher of the Library of Congress define a literary map as any pictorial map that records the location and identity of geographical places and features associated with authors and their works and serves as a guide to the worlds of novelists, poets, dramatists, and other authors of imaginative literature. [This] definition also includes folklore maps and literary atlases.

With the traveling exhibition and the 1999 publication of Language of the Land: The Library of Congress Book of Literary Maps, Hopkins and Buscher were among the first to identify literary maps as a “distinct genre.” Concurrently, they recognized the general and critical ambivalence toward the genre and sought to “encourage further study and creation of literary maps.”

Considering the timing, it is ironic that “Language of the Land” drew so little attention in popular and academic circles. As the exhibit made its way from Arlington, Virginia, to Sacramento, California, literary critics and scholars throughout the humanities and social sciences were asking an increasing number of questions about the relationship between their work and space, place, and mapping. This renewed geographical interest represented a notable shift from previous generations. Following World War II, scholarship had suffered from what Michel Foucault would come to call a “devaluation of space.” Critical considerations of cartography, landscape, and social-spatial relations had waned outside of geography departments to a point that Harvey Sicherman, president of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, has characterized as “stupefying.” By the time the Library of Congress mounted “Language of the Land” in 1993, however, spatialized questions were once again being asked across the disciplines. This topical resuscitation, what Barney Warf and Santa Arias describe as “a profound conceptual and methodological renaissance,” has since been termed the “spatial turn.” Edward Soja, who has argued extensively that a critical appreciation of the spatial is as important as
time and the social, explained in 1996, “This spatial turn can be seen as a kind of rebalancing of critical thinking, asserting the importance of the spatial or geographical imagination against the long-established monopoly of historical and sociological imaginations on critical thought and practices.”

A decade after Soja commented on its emergence, Martin Brückner and Hsuan L. Hsu observed that the spatial turn “in both literary history and cultural theory has given rise to a number of studies that rethink the static and often metaphorical conception of geography that underlies discourses of American exceptionalism.” Historian Susan Schulten, for example, has examined the role that maps, atlases, and the National Geographic Society played in the popular imagination as the United States transformed itself from a relatively isolationist country after the Civil War into a political, economic, and military superpower in the first half of the twentieth century. Brückner has shown the influence that popular maps and geography textbooks, such as Jedidiah Morse’s bestselling Geography Made Easy (1784), had on creative and non-fiction works published during the Colonial and Early National periods. Anne Baker has explored how average antebellum Americans and “American Renaissance” writers attempted to make sense of the nation’s rapid and often fraught geographic expansion. She argues that bombastic celebrations of Manifest Destiny often subverted national anxieties about slavery, the geographic breaking point of the republic, and U.S. annexations of non-white, Catholic regions. Similarly, Hsu considers how nineteenth-century American writers such as Charles Brockden Brown and Sarah Orne Jewett mediated for their readers the nation’s changing geography, as well as its relationship to domestic and global spaces. Finally, Robert T. Tally has argued that Herman Melville’s “literary cartography” – as seen in Moby-Dick, Pierre, and Benito Cereno – proleptically challenged nineteenth-century U.S. exceptionalism in ways that New Americanists do today.

Despite the reassessed importance of the geographical imagination and recent attention paid to metaphorical conceptions of geography and space, few critics have taken up – or even heard – Hopkins and Buscher’s call for additional literary map scholarship. Eric Bulson is one of only a handful of scholars who has made use of literary maps in his work. In Novels, Maps, Modernity: The Spatial Imagination, 1850–2000, Bulson
explores the relationship between maps of imaginative places and realist fiction. From a Modernist perspective, Bulson is chiefly interested in paratextual cartography that helps “advertise [a] novel’s realism.” This type of literary map “[gives] readers something that novels do not: an image, a structure, a way to visualize form and narrative design.”

Perhaps most notably, Franco Moretti has incorporated literary maps in *Atlas of the European Novel: 1800–1900* and *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary Theory*. In analyzing plot structure, character relations, and other narrative nuances, he designs maps that serve as “artificial” constructs “in which the reality of [a] text undergoes a process of deliberate reduction and abstraction.” For Moretti, geography is not an “inert container” or a “box where cultural history ‘happens.’” Rather, it is an “active force, that pervades the literary field and shapes it in depth.” Though important and relevant works, Bulson’s and Moretti’s projects nonetheless engage a different type of literary map than that showcased in “Language of the Land.”

Indeed, there are various types of literary maps. Keeping in mind the general definition Hopkins and Buscher offer, I would argue that it is useful to divide the genre into four subgenres: imaginative, scholarly, analytical, and discursive. Geographers, cartographic historians, and cultural studies scholars might argue that all maps are discursive documents, and I would agree. Nonetheless, my label “discursive” is useful when distinguishing between literary map subgenres. The first three categories include maps that, to paraphrase celebrated cartographic historian J.B. Harley, simply name, locate, and recount. What I call an imaginative map is the genre’s oldest type. Bulson demonstrates in *Novels, Maps, Modernity* (2007) how this type of literary map enabled Modernist readers, writers, and critics to make “novelistic space intelligible.” In addition to novelistic space, imaginative maps also depict dramatic, poetic, and otherwise fictive locales. Bulson cites maps from the third edition of *Don Quixote* and the fourth edition of *Robinson Crusoe* as notable examples; Abraham Ortelius’s map of Utopia, Jonathan Swift’s four maps in *Gulliver’s Travels*, Mark Twain’s *Map of the Trip Made by Tom Sawyer Erronort, 1850*, and William Faulkner’s maps of Yoknapatawpha County are also imaginative maps of note. Though they have been around nearly as long as the printed book, the production of imaginative literary maps accelerated near the end of the nineteenth century as educators “latched on to literary maps […] to teach students about
literature, geography, and history simultaneously.”21 The production of scholarly literary maps also increased at this time.

Scholarly maps purport to depict verifiable information that is essential to historical, linguistic, or biographical approaches to literary studies. In 1836, Boston’s The Albion explained that such a map allows us to “at once put our finger on any date or fact we want to find” about authors and canonical literature.22 Such information might include the distribution of language groups, the locations of major battles and publishing centres, and sites pertinent to an author’s or monarch’s life. Within the larger academic debates that marked the professionalization of literary studies between roughly 1875 and 1900, scholarly literary maps appealed most often to those who emphasized philological scholarship over Arnoldian humanism, formal training over literary journalism, and specialization over generalization.23 Such maps were presented with all the trappings of scientific cartography. As early as 1887, editors of anthologies and literary histories began including the occasional plate or frontispiece with the words “literary map” in their titles.24 Typically, these self-identifying literary maps depicted spatialized information about canonical writers, major publishers, and the royal households of Europe. Literary maps of Stratford-upon-Avon and London, for example, helped the literary tourist or student locate William Shakespeare’s birthplace and Henry Fielding’s haunts. While not exactly rare, imaginative and scholarly literary maps were also not common at the turn of the twentieth century; when they did appear, they almost always appeared in the context of British literature.

Analytical literary maps make up the newest category. Moretti originated this subgenre of literary map with Atlas of the European Novel and developed it further in Graphs, Maps, Trees. In describing his spatialized methodology, Moretti writes, “Of maps, I mean, not as metaphors, and even less as ornaments of discourse, but as analytical tools: that dissect the text in an unusual way, bringing to light relations that would otherwise remain hidden.”25 For the time being, I am least interested in analytical literary maps, in part, because Moretti has focused his quantitative cartographic analysis on European literature. That said, Moretti’s model might readily apply to future studies in American literature; it
would seem particularly worthwhile to pursue analytical literary mapping in relation to Wright Morris’s mid-twentieth-century novels and phototexts.

The final subgenre, the discursive literary map, is the focus of this study. While the four types occasionally overlap, I am less interested in those literary maps that directly effect readerly or analytical interpretations of fictional narratives – the cartographic designs that Moretti and Bulson associate with “space in literature.” Rather, I am primarily concerned with maps that depict “literature in space” – specifically geopolitical space on the national level. Discursive literary maps, to again borrow from Harley, are those that are “appraisive, evaluative, persuasive, or rhetorical.” Unlike scholarly or analytical maps, discursive literary maps are a print culture phenomenon that is somewhat peculiar to North America. These designs tend to be unabashedly patriotic and do not actively affect a scientific or objective posture from which to consider the literary landscape; moreover, unlike a literary map of the British Isles, discursive literary maps are typically less concerned with biographical or historical associations of authors. Especially in the United States, and to a lesser degree in Canada, discursive maps have functioned as expressions of literary nationalism and have offered popular and accessible alternatives to academic criticism and canonical instruction.

In many ways, then, the maps I label as discursive literary maps are patently the ornaments of discourse that Moretti says his maps are not. As I argue in the chapters that follow, these maps testify to a colonial and settler metanarrative that has figured literature as an extractable, finite, and controllable resource found in a vast wilderness devoid of books. Moreover, the circulation and popular influence of these maps contributed to an evaluative metaphor that warrants critical interrogation. Scholars have not yet identified, nor have they thoroughly examined, discursive literary maps as a distinct category, but it is this subgenre that is especially pertinent and provocative in relation to popular understandings of American literature and to critical discussions influenced by the spatial turn. Though the production and consumption of most discursive literary maps preceded the spatial turn by several decades, the genre remains a significant and underappreciated site of critical inquiry.
As ideological expressions of settler society, discursive maps of American literature merit the attention of literary, cultural, and Native Studies scholars for a three primary reasons. First, as Richard Brodhead has suggested, an over-determined emphasis on differences between high and low cultural productions, as well generic divisions, can cloud the fact that literary works are often produced and read in overlapping social spaces – that seemingly unrelated works are “created and consumed in the same historical world.”28 Similarly, literary maps remind us that distinct genres, styles, and regional voices – local colour, realism, folklore, and so forth – are often spatially united in the minds of many, even as they are critically divided by generic, formalistic, and historical approaches to literature. From a spatial perspective, critical divisions are often less important than geographical relations. This is markedly true for non-specialists who have not actively participated in the esoteric debates of professional literary studies over the past 150 years. Many people – particularly non-specialists and less-than-avid readers – base their opinions about and approaches to literature on critical documents that do not directly advertise themselves as such. For much of the twentieth century, non-specialists likely found themselves pondering literary maps in schools, in bookstores, in popular magazines, and even in the occasional gas station. Literary maps have helped shape popular perceptions of a “national” U.S. literature in which historical and generic approaches play second fiddle to a mythic filling of geographic space. Within the popular imagination, literary maps function as an inviting form of pictorial criticism that appeals to children, everyday readers, and professional scholars alike. Today’s literary and cultural historians should neither underestimate the mass appeal U.S. literary maps have had for the past century nor what has been at stake in that appeal.

Second, discursive literary maps downplay critical divisions and emphasize geographical relations with the deceptive authority and powerful appeal of cartography. For many people, maps are just plain fascinating. They captivate the heart and the mind as they help us understand our place in the world and to make our way in it. People often behold maps with wonder and curiosity – even if they do not fully comprehend them. As novelist and map enthusiast Peter Turchi observes, to look at a map is to say, “Tell me a story.”29 In my own family, nearly all of us are afflicted with mappery, what William Shakespeare knew as the compulsion to look at and consume maps.30 Not a holiday dinner can happen
at my grandparents’ dining room table without a cousin or aunt interrupting the conversation to grab Grandpa’s well-worn atlas. Our collective malady seems to be getting even worse. Ever since my partner bought his iPhone 4, for example, we can seldom finish a pint at our neighbourhood pub without Google Maps making an appearance. And it is not just Rand McNally-style maps that interest people. At home, I have some of the literary maps that I discuss in the following chapters hanging in our hallway. Few people come over without stopping and pondering these maps. Even my Canadian friends, many of whom have little interest in American literature, are enchanted by the colourful maps that hang on our walls.

Cartographic historians and geographers confirm the innate appeal of maps that I have experienced anecdotally. Jeremy Black, for instance, describes cartography as essentially a theatrical genre: “A map is a show, a representation.”31 Though maps were deconstructed by post-structural and postmodern readings in the 1980s and 1990s, they continue to convey for most people an infallible sense of authority.32 Perhaps more than any other printed object, maps circulate with a fallacious objectivity that is difficult to challenge.33 In the case of pictorial maps, a colourfully animated style can exaggerate the theatrics of cartography and lull us into believing that challenges to the mapmaker’s worldview are unnecessary. But, as Harley famously argued, all maps are “thick” iconological texts, and none are “value-free images.” In his seminal essay “Maps, Knowledge, and Power,” Harley observed, “[As] much as guns and warships, maps have been the weapon of imperialism.”34 Like a nautical chart or allotment survey, pictorial maps have the power to create, sustain, and circulate myths that help maintain the settler-determined status quo. This position informs my reading of discursive literary mapping as a pernicious and consequential cultural strategy that has legitimized and normalized acts of conquest throughout the U.S. and Canada. By investigating these seemingly harmless documents, we can uncover cartographic narratives of North America and North American literatures that have been told at the expense of marginalized groups – especially Indigenous peoples.

Finally, and most broadly relevant, the history of discursive literary map production in the U.S. complicates the conceptual grammar that is part of the spatial turn. In their 1993
chapter “Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics,” the geographers Neil Smith and Cindi Katz raised important questions about the “breadth of spatial concepts newly in vogue.” They argued,

“Theoretical spaces” have been “explored,” “mapped, “charted,” “contested,” “colonized,” “decolonized,” and everyone seems to be “traveling.” But, perhaps surprisingly, there has been little, if any, attempt to examine the different implications of material and metaphorical space. Metaphorical concepts and uses of “space” have evolved quite independently from materialist treatments of space, and many of the latter are cast in ways that suggest equal ignorance of the productive entailments of spatial metaphors.

The same year the Library of Congress attempted to revive scholarly interest in printed literary maps, Smith and Katz called for “urgent critical scrutiny” of metaphors and theoretical concepts that “depend overwhelmingly on a very specific and contested conception of space [and] embody often unintended political consequences.” Kakutani’s metaphoric literary map is one such conception.

The untold story of U.S. literary map production unclacks the political and ideological consequences of this common spatialized metaphor. It also demonstrates that the figurative phrases “the literary map” and “on the literary map” differ from most of the “newly in vogue” concepts that Smith and Katz had in mind. Though the spatial turn has invested the metaphoric “literary map” with renewed critical currency, the figurative concept originally developed alongside material literary map production. The growing popularity of U.S. literary maps throughout the twentieth century directly contributed to the circulation and now widespread use of the metaphor. Like other elements of our spatial grammar, the figurative literary map is a loaded concept. A closer look at U.S. literary maps demonstrates that the metaphor is implicated in settler expansion, frontier violence, and the displacement (both figurative and literal) of Native peoples. Evaluative declarations that evoke the now proverbial “literary map” are more than hackneyed figures of speech. Indeed, such expressions tacitly reinforce the “discourses of American exceptionalism” and celebrations of Manifest Destiny that Brückner, Hsu, and others have credited the spatial turn with dismantling.
“Cartographers as Critics: Staking Claims in the Mapping of American Literature” offers an overdue response to Hopkins and Buscher’s call for further literary map study, and, at the same time, it scrutinizes what has become part of our spatialized grammar. As such, “Cartographers as Critics” is both a recuperative print culture project and an attempt to destabilize a common evaluative metaphor. In the first three chapters, I offer a selective history of U.S. literary map production, in which I maintain that literary maps are underappreciated documents, as well as meaningful, influential, and ideologically motivated acts of literary and cultural criticism. Moreover, these documents are literary expressions in their own right. Literary maps are like all maps; they are fundamentally “narratives with a purpose, stories with an agenda.” Approaching literary maps as multifarious documents that tell us stories, I demonstrate how they have been compiled, composed, advertised, and valued alongside U.S. literary nationalism, the increased professionalization of literary studies in the twentieth century, and the emergence of middlebrow culture. I contend that literary maps circulated as one of the most accessible and compelling manifestations of twentieth-century literature, criticism, and cultural nationalism. As printed maps, these documents exuded, and in many cases continue to exude, a degree of detached, objective impunity that belies the subjective perspectives and biased motivations of their makers. The genre, I argue, prompts alternative approaches to how we think about canon and the popular imagination, the teaching of American literature, and transnational literary studies. Rather than encourage the renewed creation and circulation of these documents, as Hopkins and Buscher do, I instead posit that the genre, as well as the metaphor it has inspired, is built around a problematic framework that normalizes acts of cultural erasure and settler attempts to diminish Native sovereignty and land title.

The study of U.S. literary maps has two strikes against it. First, literary maps are a type of pictorial map and, depending on the design, can appear somewhat cartoonish. Second, discursive literary maps are largely ephemeral documents that are not bound in novels and anthologies the way imaginative and scholarly maps typically are. A combination of physical handling and less than ideal storage conditions has contributed to a low survival rate. Those maps that have survived are known primarily to niche map dealers and collectors who have specific interests in pictorial cartography. As a result of their
relative absence, animated style, and idiosyncratic appeal, literary maps might appear to represent little more than an inconsequential or minor twentieth-century phenomenon. Nonetheless, we do ourselves a disservice by simply dismissing these as curious artifacts. While many U.S. literary maps were marketed to schoolchildren, an equal number were not. Ultimately, we should not associate the genre with trivial or dismissible “kids’ stuff.”

In the chapters that follow, I historicize and assess the emergence and development of U.S. literary map production primarily by examining a selection of national maps published between 1898 and 1960. Some of these maps appeared as part of the Library of Congress “Language of the Land” exhibition and companion book, but the majority discussed here were not included in either. Physically, these maps range in size from a few square centimetres to large pull-down maps – the iconic cartographic format found in many twentieth-century classrooms. Stylistically, these maps range from rough, hand-drawn designs to highly polished works of world-renowned artists and professional illustrators. These maps originally appeared in literary journals and Riverside Press anthologies; they were advertised and sold by mail order in the New York Times, Chicago Tribune, and Life; they were reviewed and recommended in College English and the English Journal; and at least one was the subject of a Congressional hearing.40 Literary maps were, indeed, a force in twentieth-century print culture.

In 1898, Americans were introduced to discursive literary mapping, which reflected late nineteenth-century U.S. literary nationalism and a renewed sense of cultural patriotism following the City Beautiful Movement and the World’s Columbian Exposition. Between the turn of the century and World War I, such maps circulated in trade publications and the nation’s newspapers. Inspired by maps that first appeared in Harry Thurston Peck’s Bookman, literary journalists throughout the country discussed, celebrated, and printed discursive literary maps of their own. These widely circulated designs familiarized average Americans with a previously obscure cartographic genre. After World War I, literary maps entered classrooms and libraries as pedagogical aids and guides to “good reading,” which offered self-directed alternatives to adult education programs. Simultaneously, discursive literary maps were displayed in storefronts, were used as
promotional giveaways, and were distributed throughout the world by the U.S. State Department.

Chapter 1 traces the origins of sustained U.S. literary map production to Peck’s Bookman, which published a series of innovative maps between the Spanish-American War and World War I. Paul Wilstach, a minor playwright and former literary editor of the Washington Times, established the stylistic and conceptual framework on which these and future maps were built. Nominally, Wilstach’s model identified the geographic associations of prominent local colourists. I say nominally, because an author’s actual participation in the literary movement was of secondary importance to Wilstach. Instead, “local colour” became a catch-all term for a finite, controllable, and extractable resource that an exceptional race of Anglo-Saxon American men could exploit in the name of progress. As writerly pioneers on the nation’s literary frontier, authors such as James Fenimore Cooper, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Hamlin Garland, Brander Matthews, and Owen Wister represented the vanguard of a peculiarly American literature. Once the nation’s literary frontier closed, authors turned their attention abroad, and “literary invasion” maps charted their conquests in Africa, Asia, and Europe. Heavily influenced by Frederick Jackson Turner’s “frontier thesis” and the cultural nationalism of Theodore Roosevelt, Wilstach reinterpreted a minor cartographic genre, one that was previously associated with European literature, for a specifically American context. In emphasizing claims, settlement, and frontiers, Wilstach and the Bookman collaborated on maps that were Progressive Era celebrations of U.S. literary exceptionalism.

Chapter 2 explores the institutionalization of literary maps and their evolution from curiosities to highly respected objects. When considering the multifaceted role the genre came to play in interwar print culture, Paul Mayo Paine’s literary maps make for a particularly useful case study. The long-time head of the Syracuse Public Library in New York, Paine was an active member of the Public Library Movement and an outspoken critic of middlebrow culture, which he perceived as a gendered and pretentious phenomenon that excluded working-class and rural Americans. Between 1915 and 1939, he designed no fewer than twenty-three maps, which enjoyed a wide and varied circulation throughout the United States and the world. Prior to World War I, Paine used
literary maps to promote the Syracuse Public Library and to advocate on behalf of the American Library Association’s rural extension efforts. After the war, the tone of Paine’s maps changed. Rather than simply publicize the library, his designs began to satirize the lingering “fiction debates” of the Public Library Movement and wryly commented on the emergence of middlebrow adult education programs such as John Erskine’s Great Books. Paine helped to disassociate U.S. literary maps from the local colour movement, but his designs maintained the underlying emphasis on virility, expansion and settlement, and American exceptionalism. English teachers and professors quickly recognized the pedagogical value of Paine’s maps; thus, discursive literary maps entered schools and universities, where they soon became necessary “equipment.” Even as interwar classrooms reflected an increasingly pluralistic society, marked by unprecedented immigration and the rise of American Studies, Paine and his literary maps reinforced the ascendency of Anglo-Saxon heroes transforming the nation’s literary frontier.

Chapter 3 focuses on a number of high-profile literary maps of American folklore. Designed by non-academic artists and illustrators, these maps complicated the mid-century schism between literary and anthropological folklorists such as Benjamin A. Botkin of the Library of Congress and Richard M. Dorson of Indiana University. While scholars were split on what constituted American folklore, literary maps reinforced within the popular imagination a specious cast of folk heroes that included Paul Bunyan, Rip Van Winkle, Febold Feboldson, John Henry, Huck Finn, and a celebrated frog. Though Dorson would come to deride such a cast of heroes as “fakelore,” literary maps cemented its fallacious authenticity for schoolchildren and average Americans looking for homegrown traditions following World War II. Not only did literary maps of American folklore circulate in schools and universities, they served double duty as effective marketing and propaganda tools for Life magazine, Esso Standard, and the State Department. While folklore maps de-emphasized the nativistic chauvinism seen in Wilstach’s and Paine’s designs, they nonetheless perpetuated the conceptual framework of literary settlement in a nation once devoid of books. By examining designs such as William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore (1946), which Senator Joseph McCarthy investigated in a 1953 televised hearing, chapter 3 highlights the often-dramatic critical, cultural, and political repercussions of discursive literary mapping.
In the history of U.S. literary mapping, a number of writers have been marginalized because of their race, ethnicity, gender, religious or political affiliations, or sexual orientation. Many once-excluded authors eventually secured places on the literary map, as societal, cultural, and canonical barriers were dismantled throughout the twentieth century. What has not fundamentally changed, however, is the vexed relationship between discursive literary maps and Indigenous peoples. Mapping is often a precondition of land theft; literary mapping is no different. In spatially asserting a national literature in terms of pioneers, settlement, and claiming – a formulation in which adventurous writers improve and exploit literary wilderness – discursive literary maps augment the diminishment of Indigenous literary traditions, territory, and sovereignty. Indeed, literary maps make claims that are at once critical assertions and declarations of land title. What most powerfully unites the maps I discuss here is their casual disregard for American Indian writers and for textual traditions that pre-date European invasion. While some maps do occasionally reference Native authors, such inclusions amount to little more than literary allotments; discursive literary mapping is the critical equivalent of the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887.

Chapter 4 draws upon the recent work of Native Studies scholars, such as Craig Womack (Muskogee Creek) and Lisa Brooks (Abenaki), to highlight the fraught relationship between literary mapping and Indigenous literatures. Discursive maps impose a cartographic framework on Native lands that privileges settler worldviews and undermines Indigenous land title. Québec’s The Garden at the End of the World (Le Jardin au Bout du Monde) epitomizes the political and cultural damage of this foisted cartography. The 1997 naming project and Canadian literary map is a dramatic marriage of cultural nationalism and cartography, and it puts into relief the ongoing politics and cultural assumptions at work in U.S. literary maps. In her 1988 novel Tracks, Louise Erdrich (Ojibwe) exposes imposed cartographic practices, not unlike The Garden at the End of the World, as fraudulent arbiters of truth. More recently, in her non-fiction travel narrative Books and Islands in Ojibwe Country, she shows what is possible when those practices are un-settled and replaced with Indigenous maps. Erdrich, Womack, Brooks, and others demonstrate the critical possibilities of un-mapping unsettling claims.
Ultimately, chapter 4 attempts to work toward a process of un-mapping that can help undo the discursive claims literary maps have made since 1898.

Two final notes: first, individual literary maps were often issued in multiple formats, states, and editions. Here, I underline all literary map titles, including those that were issued as part of larger publications. I do this for consistency and because of the long tradition of maps being removed from atlases, anthologies, magazines, newspapers, and so forth. Copies of Wilstach’s maps, for example, likely circulated on their own after being cut from the pages of the Bookman. Anecdotal and archival evidence suggests that such practices have been common in the history of U.S. literary map production; thus, maps that were removed from larger publications exist and circulate as autonomous texts.41 Second, I use American Indian, Native, and Indigenous somewhat interchangeably, even as I recognize that these imperfect terms are frequently contested. Throughout, I favour the proper noun Indigenous as a collective and respectful term for the First Peoples of North America when context does not allow me to use a more specific term such as Cree, Ojibwe, or Inuit. My use of Indigenous also acknowledges that, while my project focuses on a U.S. context, the imposition of settler cartography is not a uniquely American or North American issue.42 Indeed, a variety of settler maps have negatively impacted, and continue to impact negatively, First Peoples who have inhabited South America, Africa, New Zealand, Australia, and other places since time immemorial.
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Chapter 1
Mapping a New Method of Conquest

The country is yet un-surveyed and unmapped.
–Theodore Roosevelt, Ranch Life and the Hunting-Trail

[The] tradition of literary mapping is more than a knee-jerk reaction to realist space or an aide-mémoire.
–Eric Bulson, Novels, Maps, Modernity

In August 1898, the Bookman, then a three-year-old literary journal edited by Harry Thurston Peck, printed a simple, black-and-white map designed by Paul Wilstach (fig. 1). Just twenty-eight-years old, Wilstach was the former literary editor and drama critic for the Washington Times, a minor playwright, and the newly hired press agent for the famous actor Richard Mansfield. Issues of the Bookman regularly included illustrations and photographs, and the journal had printed maps before. What this now forgotten literary journalist contributed, however, was different than anything the Bookman had previously published. Peck described it this way:

The accompanying geographical map of American Literature needs no key for its comprehension by the intelligent reader and student of our literature. It shows the geographical relations of accepted and familiar American authors to each other, delimiting the haunts of their “local color.” And marking off territorial rights to which they may be said to lay claim as pioneers and conquerors. It will also serve as a valuable guide to ambitious writers looking for fresh fields and pastures new. Not the least interesting feature is the vast extent of lands that are indicated as still “unclaimed.”

Peck’s comments call attention to the obvious: in surveying the state of American literature, Wilstach’s map boldly identifies “claimed” and “unclaimed” literary territory. Against a basic outline of the contiguous states and territories, A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States spatially asserts the authorial “claims” of thirty-nine American writers who are, nominally, united through their participation in the local colour movement. In addition to forty different claims – Longfellow is distinguished by having two claims, in Minnesota and Louisiana – the map advertises “fresh fields and pastures
new.” The label “unclaimed” appears nine times and presents all or part of thirty-two states and territories as unimproved literary territory.

What Peck’s description does not do is situate Literary Map of the United States within the larger tradition of literary mapping. The connection between literature and cartography, of course, was nothing new in 1898. Printed maps of fictional worlds have existed nearly as long as the printed book, and Peck would likely have been familiar with at least some notable examples, including imaginative literary maps from sixteenth-century editions of Thomas More’s *Utopia*, the third edition of *Don Quixote*, the fourth edition of Daniel Defoe’s *The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, and Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*. As the editor of the New York *Bookman*, which had close editorial ties to the similarly named London publication, Peck would also have known that scholarly literary maps were becoming increasingly popular at the time.

At the turn of the twentieth century, guidebooks tailored for literary sightseeing contributed to what Eric Bulson has described as “the emergence of an autonomous genre of literary maps.” Building upon the commercial success of literary guidebooks, book publishers and tourism companies began to superimpose novelistic space on city and regional maps. Thomas Cook and Son, for example, published *Literary and Historical Map of London* in 1899.4 As increased urbanization threatened many of the London landmarks and streets associated with the novels of Charles Dickens, dozens of other literary maps ensured that readers and tourists could continue locating the fictional worlds of Oliver Twist and Little Nell. Bulson explains,

> The rise of literary maps suggests, among other things, that a new generation of readers, and perhaps an older generation, coming to the nineteenth-century realist novel were finding orientation difficult. The novels they were reading no longer corresponded with the cities they represented. And no matter how much urbanization changed the capital cities of the nineteenth century, orientation in the novel was not something that readers, old and new, were willing to give up on too easily.5

Bulson, as well as Martha Hopkins of the Library of Congress, suggests that the term “literary map” first entered the lexicon around the time the *Bookman* published Wilstach’s design. Hopkins cites William Lyon Phelps’s *A Literary Map of England*.
(1899) as one of the earliest examples to self-identify as a literary map, and Bulson points to Rand McNally’s Literary Wall Map of the British Isles (1898). However, editors of anthologies and literature textbooks were including plates and frontispieces with the words “literary map” in their titles even earlier. These self-identified literary maps tended to depict biographically relevant information about canonical British writers. Literary maps of Stratford-upon-Avon and London, for example, helped students locate where Shakespeare was born and where Fielding lived. In 1893, Henry S. Pancoast’s popular anthology Representative English Literature included a scholarly literary map, which one reviewer guardedly described as “at least interesting.”6 A year later, Pancoast’s An Introduction to English Literature included a map of sixteenth-century London and a literary map of England that identified “the most representative men in English literature” alongside “some literary landmarks.”7 Perhaps the most widely and favourably reviewed scholarly literary map of the period appeared in Reuben Post Halleck’s History of English Literature (1900). The Dial, for example, praised the textbook as “difficult to improve upon” and singled out its literary map as part of an “apparatus [that] is remarkably good. We take pleasure in commending this work to the attention of teachers.”8 In addition to Pancoast and Halleck, a growing number of other editors at the time began including literary maps in their volumes. Paratextual literary maps were not exactly rare by 1898, but reviewers still regarded them with some skepticism. When they did appear, like those maps intended for the literary tourist, scholarly literary maps almost exclusively referenced British literature.9

Something rather different happened when the Bookman published Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United States. First, the map was not intended for the literary tourist, nor was it a pedagogical aid like the scholarly maps that were being published at the time. Second, Wilstach’s map depicts American literature by emphasizing authorial “claims” – not the type of narrative landmark or biographical location associated with British literature. Wilstach’s map spatially asserts these claims in such a way that they are not strictly tied to an author’s biographical history. Furthermore, the simplicity of its design and Peck’s articulated emphasis on the local colour movement belie the much more complicated ideological underpinnings of Wilstach’s map. In fact, Wilstach introduced a new, highly discursive category of literary map that was quite different than previous
examples. His reinterpretation of the cartographic genre presented an expansionist frontier, on which an author’s stylistic or generic associations were of secondary importance to his or her symbolic bravado as a literary trailblazer. This reinterpretation of the literary map and the conversations that surrounded Wilstach’s literary frontier have had important, yet so far unacknowledged, long-term effects on American literature and contemporary literary studies. In this chapter, I first contextualize Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United States vis-à-vis late nineteenth-century print culture, the nation’s frontier myth, and U.S. literary nationalism. Then, I consider the discursive literary map production Wilstach initiated and inspired. At the same time, I attempt to disentangle Literary Map of the United States from its complicated relationship with local colour fiction. Finally, I suggest ways in which Wilstach’s discursive literary map concept remains relevant for today’s spatialized approaches to literature and culture.

On the most basic level, A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States depicts figurative frontiers on which ambitious writers might assert cultural and representative control. The tone of the map is in keeping with the spirited patriotism of many late nineteenth-century Americans. In 1898 alone, the nation had witnessed several dramatic acts of aggressive expansion and global intervention, all in the name of progress. A month before the Bookman printed Wilstach’s design, the United States had formally annexed Hawai’i. It had also fought Spain and taken control of Guam and Puerto Rico; Americans found new frontier adventure in the Philippines as well. Domestically, cities were aggressively extending municipal boundaries in attempts to increase their prestige and national influence. New York City, for example, gobbled up Brooklyn, New York County, Richmond County, and parts of Queens County; Chicago appropriated Hyde Park, Kenwood, Pullman, and Woodlawn. At the same time, John D. Rockefeller’s Standard Oil, the National Biscuit Company, and other trusts were forcefully taking control of weaker companies and growing increasingly powerful.

Indeed, new frontiers and expansion in all forms were part of the national zeitgeist in 1898. Just five years earlier, Frederick Jackson Turner had observed the “closing” of the
American frontier, as determined by the 1890 U.S. Census. Speaking in Chicago at the World’s Columbian Exposition, Turner famously argued, “The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement Westward explain American development.” With the existence of free land gone in the traditional sense, Turner predicted that Americans would “demand a wider field” to exercise “the expansive character of American life.” On the surface, then, Wilstach’s map was merely an accessible and metaphorical guide to one such field.

Published at a time when advances in print technologies were transforming cartography into a mass-production industry, Literary Map of the United States might appear crude and anachronistically unsophisticated. From a technical standpoint, most late nineteenth-century commercial maps were cerographic productions, in which increasingly sophisticated designs were printed using engraved wax plates and the process of electrotyping. Wilstach’s hand-drawn map lacks this level of professional refinement, and its rudimentary design might seem incongruous with the exuberance of contemporary American exceptionalism. However, it is important to emphasize that Literary Map of the United States is of purposefully low quality. Quite consciously, Wilstach’s design ignores stylistic precedent, the availability of more advanced printing technologies, the developing cartographic literacy of the average American, and even the periodical in which it appeared. Since its founding in 1895, the Bookman had printed a growing number of photographs, caricatures, and illustrations; changes to the journal’s tagline affirm the increased emphasis on pictorial matter. What started as “A Literary Journal” soon became a “Review of Books and Life.” By 1900, it changed again: “An Illustrated Journal of Literature and Life.” Though subtle, these changes speak to the expanding importance of illustrations in the Bookman, as well as the increasing quality and prominence of those images. When compared to other pictures in the August 1898 issue, as well as scholarly and imaginative literary map designs of the period, Wilstach’s map appears doubly crude. Yet, the apparent lack of technical sophistication does not undermine the map’s effectiveness. On the contrary, the map’s simplicity evokes a primitive ethos associated with America’s frontier mythology and late nineteenth-century U.S. literary nationalism.
Generations of historians, art historians, and literary and cultural critics have demonstrated how various incarnations of America’s frontier mythology have helped shape U.S. history, politics, and society.¹⁴ In his classic three-volume study, cultural critic Richard Slotkin identifies this mythology as America’s “oldest and most characteristic myth, [which is] expressed in a body of literature, folklore, ritual, historiography, and polemics produced over a period of three centuries.”¹⁵ Broadly speaking, Slotkin identifies two schools of the frontier myth. First, populist interpretations developed in reaction to an increasingly corporate and industrial economy. This school has celebrated a broad diffusion of property, opportunity, and power: “The populist values decentralization, idealizes the small farmer-artisan-financier, and either devalues (or opposes) the assumption of a Great Power role or asserts that the nation derives both moral and political power from its populist character.”¹⁶ Throughout much of the twentieth century, literary scholars, historians, and interdisciplinary Americanists typically affirmed the populist mythology and nuanced its relationship to Turner’s frontier thesis.

Progressive versions of the frontier myth, on the other hand, have been much more celebrated in popular culture. Unlike the populist school, progressives use the frontier myth to “buttress the ideological assumptions and political aims of a corporate and managerial politics.” Progressives downplay agrarian tranquility and melting pot metaphors and instead emphasize “the history of savage warfare and westward expansion as a Social Darwinian parable, [which explains] the emergence of a new managerial ruling class and [justifies] its right to subordinate lesser classes to its purposes.”¹⁷ The presumed necessity to subordinate “lesser classes” for the nation’s advancement distinguishes the guiding principles of the Progressive Era from progressive politics of today. Heavily influenced by Herbert Baxter Adams’s Teutonic germ theory, progressives have historically idealized the supposed exceptionalism and martial superiority of Anglo-Saxon Americans.

In glorifying Anglo-Saxon Americans, progressive narratives typically celebrate violence and rugged individuality. While no single version of the myth exists, a common pattern does emerge. Initially the hero rejects European models of civilization to settle in a new
world. Later, he turns his back on civilized society and makes his way steadily westward. Then the frontier hero – whether Daniel Boone, Leatherstocking, Buffalo Bill Cody, John Wayne, or another incarnation of the Man Who Knows Indians – temporarily regresses to an embryonic state on the frontier, where he faces the challenges of wilderness and savagery. As he emerges from his temporary return to the primitive, the frontier hero paves the way for American progress. He represents the vanguard of the nation’s geographic, political, economic, and cultural expansion – even as that expansion threatens his very existence. Theodore Roosevelt, who helped codify the basic tenets of the progressive myth through his writings and speeches, described the frontier hero as “Brave, hospitable, hardy, and adventurous[,] he is the grim pioneer of our race; he prepares the way for the civilization from before whose face he must disappear.”

Through a cycle of regression, violence, and triumph, a distinct and exceptional American identity emerges. Especially in the progressive version of the frontier myth, Slotkin identifies “the redemption of American spirit or fortune as something to be achieved through a scenario of separation, temporary regression to a more primitive or ‘natural’ state, and regeneration through violence.”

Two of Harry Thurston Peck and Paul Wilstach’s influential contemporaries tacitly recognized the power of this mythic scenario for U.S. literary nationalism. Nearly a century before Slotkin published his influential study about the frontier myth, Hamlin Garland and Brander Matthews argued that the true realization of American cultural independence entailed a violent separation from British ideals, a stylistic regression, and, ultimately, a triumph of American exceptionalism. To be sure, Garland and Matthews were not the first Americans to champion literary nationalism. Calls for cultural independence have been a part of North American literary history since the earliest days of English settlement. During the Colonial Period, for example, Cotton Mather and other New England writers incorporated what they saw as distinctly American ideals in their work, and, throughout the Early National Period, Thomas Paine, Philip Freneau, Hugh Henry Brackenridge, and others championed intellectual and literary emancipation from English traditions. Noah Webster, for example, recognized the incongruity and inevitable “obscurity” of European culture for U.S. cultural production in his four-part essay “Observations on the Revolution of America” (1782). He wrote, “America sees the
absurdities – she sees the kingdoms of Europe [...] She laughs at their folly and shuns their errors.”

Likewise, Charles Brockden Brown argued in his author’s note to *Edgar Huntly* (1799),

> That new springs of action and new motives to curiosity should operate, – that the field of investigation, opened to us by our own country, should differ essentially from those which exist in Europe, – may be readily conceived. The sources of amusement to the fancy and instruction to the heart, that are peculiar to ourselves, are equally numerous and inexhaustible.

To “overlook” distinctly American themes and settings in literature, according to Brown, “would admit of no apology.” For many nineteenth-century Americans, however, Ralph Waldo Emerson best articulated the aims of cultural independence. In “The American Scholar,” his 1837 address to Harvard’s Phi Beta Kappa, Emerson urged his countrymen to stop deferring to the “courtly muses of Europe.” He optimistically observed, “Our day of dependence, our long apprenticeship to learning of other lands, draws to a close.”

The prominent Unitarian preacher William Ellery Channing made a similar pronouncement in 1830. Writing in the *Christian Examiner*, Channing argued, “We believe that a literature, springing up in this new soil, would bear new fruits, and, in some respects, more precious fruits, than are elsewhere produced.”

John L. O’Sullivan echoed Channing’s agricultural theme in the first issue of *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. Observing the “anti-democratic character” of reading material in the United States, O’Sullivan declared, “[We] have no national literature. We depend almost wholly on Europe, and particularly England, to think and write for us, or at least to furnish materials and models after which we should mould our own humble attempts. We have a considerable number of writers; but not in that consists a national literature.”

The United States did, however, offer “uncultivated” fields of promise: “There is an immense field open to us, if we would but enter it boldly and cultivate it as our own.”

Two years later, O’Sullivan described these uncultivated fields as a veritable cornucopia of potential literary material: “the poetical resources of our country are boundless.”

O’Sullivan did not perceive that these ostensibly uncultivated fields were already inhabited spaces ripe with literary fruit.
Matthews and Garland may not have been the first to promote cultural independence, but their writings markedly changed the tenor of such discussions. In their essays, the two men downplayed themes of organic spontaneity and botanical, inexhaustible abundance and, instead, emphasized martial conflict and the physical prowess of American writers. For Matthews and Garland, authorship was not simply a gentle or intellectual pursuit of artistic cultivation. Rather, American writers needed to be what Aviva F. Taubenfeld has recently characterized as “rough writers”; the pursuit of independent literary production was the cultural equivalent to the “strenuous life” that Theodore Roosevelt would champion in 1899.²⁷

Matthews was a particularly influential advocate of late nineteenth-century U.S. literary nationalism. He taught one of the nation’s earliest courses on American literature at Columbia University, where he was also Peck’s colleague. In 1896, he published one of the field’s first textbooks, An Introduction to the Study of American Literature, which sold more than 100,000 copies in its first five years.²⁸ In his attempts to promote and professionalize the study of American literature – efforts publically supported by his friend Roosevelt – Matthews wrote a number of essays that represent what Lawrence J. Oliver calls “a concerted attack on the ‘colonial’ mind as it manifested itself not only in English condescension […] but, even worse, in American deference to British opinion.”²⁹ Oliver’s use of the word “attack” is apt. Through his writings, Matthews infused U.S. literary nationalism with a more aggressive and warring tone compared to the themes of agriculture and cultivation that had previously characterized the movement. In his 1892 essay “The Literary Independence of the United States,” for example, Matthews acknowledged that the Revolutionary War resulted in political autonomy. Yet, the nation’s cultural independence had required another century of martial struggle:

That those who have left a great country, England or France or Germany, should look back to that country as the centre of light, is natural – perhaps inevitable. But that their children should continue to do so, natural enough for a while, is not inevitable. Even though the colonist succeeds in breaking the political tie which binds him to the country whence his fathers came, there is no real independence unless he lays aside also the habit of intellectual deference; and that is as arduous, as difficult, and as long a task as any one ever undertook.³⁰
Until it had passed the Copyright Act of 1891, Matthews continued, Congress had “unwittingly encouraged” America’s “colonial attitude in literature.” With the passage of copyright reform, however, writers had become more “aggressively American, […] devoid of the slightest suggestion of colonialism, all possessing a wholesome mistrust of British traditions, British standards, and British methods.” Matthews distinguished Mark Twain, Edward Eggleston, and George Washington Cable who, like literary Minutemen, were “standing ready” to defend American literature from the foreign influence that he associated with the “enemy.” Six years later, Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United States would recognize the fortifying actions of Twain, Eggleston, Cable, and thirty-five of America’s other brave warrior writers.

Matthews’s celebration of American cultural exceptionalism equated literary success with the deeds of soldiers and rugged men. Whereas Channing suggested “new fruit” would “[spring] up in this new soil,” Matthews emphasized the “arduous” and combative struggles of revolution. This martial emphasis was not confined to Matthews’s “The Literary Independence of the United States.” Years later, at the outbreak of World War I, the New York Times reported, “So eminent an authority as Prof. Brander Matthews of Columbia University is of the opinion that the war will have a general and probably an immediate effect upon literary production. In discussing the situation [Matthews] said: ‘A great war often causes what I may term a stiffening of the public will, and from this spirit springs great literary achievement.’” In addition to his frequent associations of literary achievement with battle, Matthews’s literary nationalism betrayed a cultural jingoism that bordered on a sensationalized, xenophobic mistrust of foreign traditions. Like a general rallying his troops, Matthews declared, “And it cannot be said too often or too emphatically that the British are foreigners, and that their ideals in life, in literature, in politics, in taste, in art, are not our ideals.”

If Matthews framed the separation from British ideals in terms of martial conflict, Garland championed what we might consider the next step in the frontier myth cycle. Like Matthews, Garland believed that the United States had maintained a colonial deference to England well after the Revolutionary War. Once the nation severed cultural ties with “civilized” Europe, it would experience a temporary period of “primitive”
output. Not only was unrefined literary production inevitable, it was a welcome sign that American writers were finally abandoning their subservient provincialism. In *Crumbling Idols*, his 1894 collection of essays on literature, painting, and drama, Garland argued,

> By provincialism I mean dependence upon a mother country for models of art production. [...] [Our] colonial writers from 1800 to 1860, had too little to do with the life of the American people, and too much concern with British critics. Using [provincialism] in its literary sense of dependence upon England and classic models, we have had too much of it. It has kept us timidly imitating the great writers of a nation far separated from us naturally in its social and literary ideals.  

For Garland, local colourists such as Edward Eggleston, Bret Harte, James Russell Lowell, Joaquin Miller, and Octave Thanet had rebelled against “the point of view of a central academy,” which had inhibited American culture. Just like the authors Matthews cited in “The Literary Independence of the United States,” the writers Garland distinguished in *Crumbling Idols* would also secure literary claims on Wilstach’s 1898 map.

Unlike Matthews, who argued in 1892 that New York City had rightfully overtaken Paris as the world’s cultural capital, Garland felt that literary and artistic production controlled by the East would ultimately “threaten and overawe the interior of America” and, by extension, endanger the nation’s cultural independence. For him, truly American centres of literary and cultural production needed to be located far away from the influences of London and Paris. Because Philadelphia, Boston, and New York were physically closer to England than to Chicago, Garland reasoned, the East’s control of the publishing industry would confound efforts toward a truly national literature. America could fully realize its exceptional potential only after it established cultural capitals that were conceptually, stylistically, and geographically separated from the reaches of European influence. Continental landmass would provide the critical and creative insulation – the literary defense – that the Atlantic Ocean alone could not.

As metonyms for European influence, East Coast cities became the targets of Garland’s hawkish criticism. An empowered literary nationalism necessitated the demolition of established publishing centres, which were simply garrisons of British thought and
“strongholds of tradition and classic interest.” Just as Boston had previously been “the literary autocrat of the nation,” New York was now “the great dictator of American literature” and the “trumpet through which the whole nation spoke.” In describing the history of U.S. publishing centres, Garland wrote, “Boston has claimed and held supremacy in American literature for more than half a century.” However,

New York to-day claims to be, and is, the literary centre of America. [...] It was easy for Boston to maintain her literary supremacy while the whole population was less than forty millions, when the whole West was a frontier, and the South was slave-country. It will be hard for New York to retain her present supremacy with a nation of seventy millions of people, with cities containing half a million people springing up in the interior and on the Western sea, – not to mention Chicago, whose shadow already menaces New York.

Garland’s bellicose tone speaks to a more aggressive and masculinist formulation of U.S. literary nationalism. Like Matthews, he emphasized the arduous connections between the nation’s cultural independence and its military past. Whereas writers throughout the Colonial and Early National Periods had associated such independence with social, spiritual, and environmental factors that were uniquely North American – conditions that would organically and abundantly coalesce with time – Garland employed more militant analogies and metaphors.

Admittedly, Garland argued, late nineteenth-century American literature lacked the sophistication of British literature, and that lack of sophistication would become even more pronounced as an increasing number of writers stopped imitating European models. However, a break with those models would “free [authors] to use new forms.” These new, undeveloped forms represented a temporary cultural regression, which evoked the nation’s intuitively understood frontier mythology. For Garland, the American author “who has no knowledge of accepted forms” – the momentarily primitive writer – “refers every work of art back to nature.” Alone in the wilderness, this self-reliant artist would produce “a literature of life,” which Garland considered a vital component of cultural independence. Initially of a low quality, independent American literature would quickly develop a sophistication and superiority of its own. Unencumbered by European models, and implicitly devoid of pre-existing Indigenous traditions, America’s literary frontier would move, shift, and disappear “with great rapidity.”
Though they differed in particulars – mainly where America’s publishing industry should be located – Matthews and Garland’s writings emphasized the importance of separation, regression, and renewal for late nineteenth-century literary nationalism. Moreover, the two men described this mythic cycle in a register that was noticeably more aggressive than that of previous writers such as Webster, Emerson, and O’Sullivan. When framed by Matthews and Garland’s jingoistic and pugnacious campaigns for cultural independence, Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United States becomes a more complicated document than simply a crude, hand-drawn map.

First, Wilstach’s map asserts the claims of those authors previously distinguished by Garland and Matthews; it also awards claims to Garland and Matthews for their own fictional works. Second, Wilstach’s deceptively raw and unsophisticated design evokes the temporary return to “primitive” conditions that Garland had predicted. The vast stretches of “unclaimed” literary territory suggest a symbolic vacuum caused by both the abandonment of established forms and the perceived absence of literary culture throughout much of North America. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the map’s technical simplicity facilitated and encouraged its duplication by newspapers and magazines throughout the United States. In this way, the tone of literary nationalism expressed in Wilstach’s map was disseminated to a large and varied audience – an audience that included significantly more readers than the Bookman’s 15,000 subscribers. Ultimately, the historical and critical significance of Literary Map of the United States comes from its multiple and varied circulations in popular American print culture.42

Martha Hopkins has pointed out that literary maps generally “presuppose some knowledge on the part of the viewer.”43 Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United States is no exception. Among the thirty-nine authors who possess claims, one finds popular, well-known, and often syndicated writers affiliated with the Atlanta Constitution, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Record, Indianapolis Journal, New York Sun, New York Times, and New York Tribune. Editors of Atlantic Monthly, Harper’s Weekly, Hearth and Home, North American Review, Overland Monthly, and St. Nicholas also appear. Regular contributors to these and other periodicals – such as Appleton’s, Century, Harper’s Monthly, Lippincott’s, and The Nation – have claims as well. Of the thirty-nine
authors, only seven are women, two of whom published under male pseudonyms. In its three years of publication, the Bookman had reviewed the fiction, poetry, and drama of many of these writers. With few notable exceptions – such as Alice French who “claims” Iowa under her nom de plume Octave Thanet – the majority lived in New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and San Francisco. The authors on Wilstach’s map were well connected socially, economically, and politically.

Mirroring the popularity and influence of these writers, Wilstach identifies the majority by surname only. While some names, such as Twain or Harte, leave little room for doubt, other names are more ambiguous for today’s readers who might not be acquainted with the literary landscape the way the Bookman presumes its audience would be. The reference to Smith in Virginia has the potential to be especially misleading. For those unfamiliar with the novels and short stories of Francis Hopkinson Smith, the surname might instead suggest Sol Smith, Charles Henry Smith, or Captain John Smith – all three associated with the state. The reference to H.H. in California is also less than obvious to those who have not come across Helen Hunt Jackson’s early pen name.\textsuperscript{44}

When Peck introduced Wilstach’s map in the August 1898 Bookman, he wrote, “It shows the geographical relations of accepted and familiar American authors to each other, delimiting the haunts of their ‘local colour.’” Nominally, this emphasis on local colour places limits on the potential field of literary settlers and should help resolve any claimant ambiguities for today’s critic. But the literary movement does not really work as a panacean cipher; while emphasized, local colour fiction is not a strictly or tidily enforced criterion in Literary Map of the United States. For example, even though Washington Irving is often considered a progenitor of American regionalism, his writings – along with those of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Harriet Beecher Stowe – are not conventionally associated with distinctly regional dialects and customs in the same way as the post-Civil War short stories of Bret Harte, James Whitcomb Riley, and Dan Quin.\textsuperscript{45} What the purported emphasis on local colour does do, however, is allow the map to underwrite a jingoistic and aggressively assertive literary nationalism that plays upon the frontier mythology and the expansionist mood of 1898 – all under the guise of a popular style.
Along with William Dean Howells, Hamlin Garland was one of the nineteenth century’s most staunch champions of local colour. For him, the genre included those texts that “could not have been written in any other place or by any one else than a native.” This straightforward definition (much simpler than today’s critical attempts to characterize the style), along with Garland and Matthews’s renditions of literary nationalism, complicates the relationship between Literary Map of the United States and local colour fiction. Within the framework established by Wilstach’s map, foreign associations negate – or at least frustrate – an author’s ability to hold a literary claim within the United States. Indeed, the map betrays a notable mistrust of foreign cultural traditions. Each of the map’s thirty-nine authors was white and was born a U.S. citizen. Moreover, many of the authors one might expect to find on a literary map of the United States – had such a map replicated existing scholarly models of European literature – lack claims. John Winthrop, Cotton Mather, William Byrd, and all of the Founding Fathers, for example, are absent. True, such writers preceded the local colour movement, but so did Longfellow and Hawthorne. More importantly, however, writers from the Colonial and Early National Periods lack claims on Wilstach’s map because they were not “native” enough. As I will argue below, the Bookman plays upon the vogue of local colour to contextualize Wilstach’s selections, but the inconsistently employed standard more powerfully precludes any author born prior to the Revolutionary War from possessing a claim. The generic emphasis conveniently casts the nation’s literary frontier as the purview of Anglo-Saxon Americans – Americans born after 1776. The dominance of male authors on the map suggests further that America’s literary frontier is a physically demanding and masculinist environment. As with other frontiers, women did play essential roles in the realization of cultural independence and local colour fiction. However, the landscape presented by Wilstach’s map suggests that the winning of the literary West would be the work of hearty, Anglo-Saxon American men.

In depicting the emergence of a national literary meritocracy from a cultural wilderness, Literary Map of the United States is in temporal and ideological dialogue with Matthews and Garland, as well as Theodore Roosevelt and his views on masculinity. Previously, Roosevelt had logrolled Matthews’s Introduction to the Study of American Literature in the pages of the Bookman and had recommended Matthews’s Americanisms and
Briticisms to Henry Cabot Lodge. Then, just weeks before the map’s publication, the future president had secured his status as a national hero when he and his Rough Riders charged the San Juan Hills in Cuba. Three of the map’s authors accompanied that charge as military journalists; shortly before appearing in the Bookman as literary “conquerors,” Frederic Remington, John Fox Jr., and Richard Harding Davis had used their pens and typewriters to prove their mettle as nascent American imperialists. Connected to the Rough Riders in this way, these men possessed the “qualities of personal bravery, hardihood, and self-reliance” that Roosevelt associated with frontier types: cattlemen, cowboys, stockmen, and, to a lesser extent, miners and hunters. For Roosevelt, such men epitomized the progressive spirit of Anglo-Saxon America. Through cartographic association, Roosevelt’s idealized qualities were extended to Wilstach’s other literary claimants.

In prefacing Literary Map of the United States, Peck did not explicate how Wilstach’s design reinterpreted the literary map genre through a discursive application of America’s frontier ideology. Instead of depicting imaginative places or biographical information, as previous literary maps had done, Literary Map of the United States depicts claims. Rather than an author’s biography, and even more than one’s participation in a specific literary style, the map emphasizes frontier fortitude of writerly pioneers. Peck did not dwell on this newness in the pages of the Bookman, nor did he belabour the connection between Wilstach’s mapped authors and Roosevelt’s frontier types. Newspapers and magazines throughout the country, however, did.

The week Literary Map of the United States first appeared in the Bookman, the Washington Times praised it as an “original feature.” While Wilstach’s former newspaper did question some of the selections and omissions, it commended the map as a worthwhile innovation: “The idea is an interesting one […] and it would be a good thing for the various literary societies in this land to provide themselves with a blank map and spend an evening pleasantly and profitably filling it out.” In Syracuse, New York, the Herald also recognized Wilstach’s originality: “The Bookman has a new idea in maps. It is the production of a literary map of the United States, and upon it the country is pretty well classified, excepting that considerable portions are marked as ‘unclaimed.’” While
not commenting directly on the map’s newness, the Kansas City Journal did accept Wilstach’s singular agency in codifying the nation’s literary claims: “Paul Wilstach, who is Mr. Richard Mansfield’s press agent, gives up all of Arizona to Dan Quin in his literary map of the United States.” Even when the Bookman reprinted Wilstach’s map in 1902, Outlook magazine commented, “The August number of ‘The Bookman’ contains what the editor calls a literary map of the United States, prepared for the purpose of showing the different sections of the country which have been, in a sense pre-empted by certain novelists.” Here, the writer’s tone anachronistically suggests that the Bookman had just recently coined the idea of a literary map. Even four years after its initial publication, Literary Map of the United States was still associated with authoritative originality.

When the map first appeared in August 1898, the Omaha Daily Bee sardonically commented, “Since everybody engages in map making or map studying nowadays, the Bookman presents a literary map of the United States designed by Paul Wilstach.” Cynicism aside, the Bee conceded, “[The map] is interesting, chiefly as a novelty.” In describing Wilstach’s design for its readers, the newspaper chose language similar to that of Peck’s editorial comments:

The map shows the geographical range of accepted and familiar authors to each other, delimiting the haunts of their ‘local color’ and marking off the territorial rights to which they may be said to lay claim as pioneers and conquerors. These territorial claims of various authors overlap each other in confusion, but they do not cover the whole territory.

The mapped authors were literary conquerors, forging “a permanent place on the shelves” of a new type of American frontier. Aware that frontiers of any kind close, the Bee exhibited a healthy dose of exceptionalism and faith in literary Manifest Destiny, predicting that the vast stretches of unclaimed territory would soon give way to progress: “American life is the most picturesque, the most varied, the most interesting in the world. Fifty years hence the literary map of the United States ought not to have so much unclaimed territory upon it.”

Other publications also called attention to Literary Map of the United States and the newly opened literary frontier. However, it was updated versions of Wilstach’s design that truly caught the attention of literary journalists and helped ensure the map’s lasting
significance. Variant editions of the original 1898 design “aroused much congratulatory comment,” according to one writer in *The Critic*. The updated maps showed “that in the future when an author discovers a rich vein of local color he will stake out his literary claim which the laws of this country will protect from later comers.” Through the mapping of these claims, “The public has been made to feel that American authors are a patriotic race of men, content to write about their own homely firesides.”

Published in 1901 and 1902, two variant designs functioned like overlaid transparencies on the original map; they superimposed new claims but did not subsume existing ones. As the publishing agent and book reviewer F.M. Holly explained in 1902, “The literary map is being rapidly filled in. Every now and then a new author puts forth a claim which is quickly recognised and noted, that is, if that claim is a worthy one.” In this spirit, updates to *Literary Map of the United States* cartographically authenticated a potential claimant’s worth; the mapmaker assumed the role of speculator, promoter, and arbiter of critical merit. Published by the *Bookman* in January 1901, Wilstach’s *A Map of the United States Which Aims to Show Some Recently Staked Claims* more or less maintained the exact geographic outline as his 1898 design (fig. 2). No doubt in part because of the striking visual similarities, the 1901 map was discussed as an addendum to the original. For Peck, the differences between the two designs illustrated “[one] of the most cheerful features […] the fact that [the] growth of Americanism to which we laid occasion to refer last winter is becoming steadily more apparent.”

Newspapers across the country also pointed to the 1901 map as evidence of progress. The *Fort Wayne Evening Sentinel*, for example, explained that the latest map showed only those “literary claims that were staked in 1900.” Despite the 1901 map’s altered title, Peck and others nonetheless referred to it by the original 1898 name. The combined effect was to reinforce the authority of a singular *Literary Map of the United States*, rather than that of two competing surveys of American literature. It also spoke to the accepted permanence of a successfully staked claim, which the *Bee* had previously discerned.

On August 9, 1902, the *Chicago Daily Tribune* published the second variant, titled *Literary Map of the United States Showing Some Unclaimed Reservations* (fig. 3). It does not appear that Wilstach compiled or designed this map, but it is in keeping with the
style of his 1898 and 1901 designs. The *Tribune*’s map shows where “novelists have already seized, settled upon, bought, jumped, or preempted the choicest territory within the borders of the United States.” The use of “reservations” in the map’s title might bring to mind American Indian reservations – an odd juxtaposition considering the progressive spirit of the literary frontier and the contemporary detribalization efforts of allotment policies. Like physical space, conceptual literary space was divided into private parcels of land and made available to settler society. Approached this way, “reservations” reinforces the rights, privileges, and entitlements of a select group of frontier heroes rather than the Indigenous collective. The *Tribune* described these unclaimed reservations as “fallow land [that] lies waiting [for] the trenchant typewriter.” As soon as “the unclaimed reservations are thrown open, what a rush there will be! What a staking of claims, what disputes and what wrangling among the ‘sooners.’”61 Once an author had wrangled a fallow literary reservation from the apparent wilderness, he would pre-empt other writers from ever again imaginatively representing that territory.

Just as they had conflated Wilstach’s 1898 and 1901 maps, literary journalists discussed the *Tribune*’s map as “the literary map of the United States.” On September 14, for example, David Graham Philips reprinted the 1902 design in his weekly *New York Times* column, “The Looker-On.” Under the subheading “Where Novelists Find Local Color,” Philips wrote, “An examination of the ‘literary map of the United States’ shows that novelists in choosing the backgrounds for their stories have in a remarkable degree followed the lines of densest population […] while many of the choicest localities have been ‘staked out’ there are many yet remaining for the coming writers.”62 The St. Louis *Republic* also reprinted the map and explained, “The accompanying illustration [is] the result of the Chicago Tribune’s attempt to bring The Bookman’s Literary Map of the United States […] down to the present day.”63 The consistent use of the definite article in discussions such as these further cemented the links between the emerging literary map concept and Paul Wilstach’s 1898 design.

In October 1902, the *Bookman* reprinted the *Tribune*’s map as an update to Wilstach’s original, in effect endorsing and collapsing all three variations of *Literary Map of the United States*. By 1912, the *Bookman* had printed the original map four times, the 1901
variant once, and the Tribune’s addendum twice. With each printing, the Bookman’s editors publicized and reinforced the singular authority of Wilstach’s discursive reinterpretation of the literary map genre. As I have noted, newspapers throughout the United States also reprinted the maps. More frequently, however, literary journalists simply described the maps for their readers. Even when Literary Map of the United States did not circulate as an illustration, it was still read as an increasingly accepted and popular concept. Though the original design, its two addenda, and various descriptions differed in particulars, they entered American print culture as a single, conflated idea.

In fact, focusing on the spirit of discussions that surrounded Wilstach’s literary map helps us overcome some of the complications posed by the individual designs themselves. An author’s participation in the local colour movement is not a strictly or tidily enforced criterion for inclusion – especially when we account for the presence of pre-1860 authors such as Longfellow, Hawthorne, and Cooper. The 1901 and 1902 maps further dilute the purported emphasis on local colour fiction. In all three maps, the style is a porous category that is at once broadly, narrowly, and inconsistently applied. “Local colour” becomes a catch-all term for controllable and extractable literary resources.

Local colour fiction occupied a malleable position in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literary culture, and its larger significance has been read and interpreted in a number of ways. Take, for example, A Glossary of Literary Terms in which M.H. Abrams defines local colour as the “detailed representation in prose fiction of the setting, dialect, customs, dress, and ways of thinking and feeling which are distinctive of a particular region”:

After the Civil War a number of American writers exploited the literary possibilities of local color in various parts of America […]. The term ‘local color fiction’ is often applied to works which […] rely for their interest mainly on a sentimental or comic representation of the surface particularities of a region; the term ‘regional fiction’ is then used to distinguish those works which deal with more deep-seated, complex, and general human characteristics and problems.64

An increasing number of critics agree that the local colour movement eludes the type of neat and tidy definition Abrams presents above. Indeed, it is a literary style marked by complexities and contradictions that a simplified distinction between sentimental or
comedic, on the one hand, and seriousness and intellectual depth, on the other, fails to encompass. As Abrams’s definition does suggest, however, many once popular local colour writers have been considered of secondary importance since World War I. Whereas those authors deemed serious and canonical, such as Henry James and Mark Twain, have been classified as “realists,” more marginalized and less studied voices have often been categorized as local colourists or altogether dismissed.65 (Such writers have included, for example, those who did not publish in New York, immigrants, people of color, and women.) In the 1970s and 1980s, feminist critics attempted to recover local colour fiction as a serious “women’s genre” that was predominantly concerned with changing gender roles and issues of domesticity. In the 1990s, Richard Brodhead related regional writing to a developing tourist economy, where urban readers could collect new and nostalgic experiences. More recently, Leigh Ann Litwiller Berte has made a similar argument, suggesting that local colour and travel writing helped “[popularize] an essentialized view of American geography as a patchwork of authentic destinations.” Influenced by Mary Louise Pratt’s concept of “autoethnography,” other scholars have considered local colour fiction as an ethnographic genre – a line of thinking that Brad Evans has lately pursued and complicated in Before Cultures: The Ethnographic Imagination in American Literature, 1865–1920.66

As Evans and a growing body of critics agree, local colour and regionalist traditions spoke to the different, and not always reconcilable, concerns of the movements’ participants – the writers, readers, and reviewers. With all of these differences and contradictions, the most recognizable formal characteristic of local colour, according to Stephanie Foote, is the frequent “use of dialect to render the speech of regional speakers.”67 Though anticipated by earlier writers such as Irving and Stowe, and influenced by European realism, the American local colour movement typically has been associated with the roughly four decades that followed the publication of Bret Harte’s “The Luck of the Roaring Camp” (1868). Considering the, at times, derisive definitions and varying readings of the movement, and independent of any stylistic or critical rigidness, the true and lasting significance of Wilstach and the Bookman’s literary map concept is not its tenuous relationship to local colour but the progressive discourse that surrounded the maps in American print culture.
Consider, for example, the occasionally incongruous roles of women, nationality, and genre in the 1901 and 1902 designs. First, compared to Wilstach’s 1898 map, both variants identify significantly more female claimants. In A Map of the United States Which Aims to Show Some Recently Staked Literary Claims, for example, Gertrude Atherton, Ellen Glasgow, and Mary Jane Goodwin make appearances in Virginia, while Frances Hodgson Burnett appears in Tennessee. Literary Map of the United States of America Showing Unclaimed Reservations also recognizes Atherton and Glasgow; includes Mary Catherwood, Kate Chopin, Mary Hallock Foote, and Sarah Orne Jewett; and identifies Helen Hunt Jackson, previously H.H. on the 1898 map, by last name. Despite the increased presence of women writers, however, the tenor of the maps continues to be that of manly virtues. The near exclusive use of surnames downplays any female authorship by glossing over the first names of most women. Moreover, contemporary commentators, like The Critic writer quoted above, continued using male pronouns to discuss the maps in terms of virility and patriotic frontier exploits.

Second, nationalized Americans appear on both maps. Burnett, for example, was born in Manchester, England, and did not immigrate to Tennessee until she was sixteen. Lafcadio Hearn was born in the Ionian Islands to Greek and Irish parents, yet his Louisiana claim appears on the 1902 map. The 1902 design also includes Robert Louis Stevenson and William Thackeray – British authors who did not nationalize. Paul Wilstach’s 1911 literary map The Trail of the Lower South, which accompanied an essay about the claims of Southern local colour writers, complicates matters even further.68 William Byrd, who does not appear on any of Wilstach’s earlier maps, finally secures a claim for (the not obviously local colour work) History of the Dividing Line. Such exceptions notwithstanding, literary journalists consistently celebrated the patriotic and Anglo-Saxon qualities of Wilstach’s literary mapping.

Third, as the eventual inclusion of Byrd suggests, the professed emphasis on local colour fiction is muddled by authors who were not primarily known as novelists or for their participation in the popular style. Mary Goodwin, for example, was best known for her children’s books, romances, and Pilgrim narratives such as Standish of Standish. Burnett, who had authored Little Lord Fauntleroy and would go on to write The Little Princess
and *The Secret Garden*, is also not generally remembered as an important local colourist. There is also the appearance, on the 1902 map, of Henry David Thoreau, whose works reflect a degree of regional inspiration that is nonetheless different from Garland’s definition of local colour. These examples, as well as others, blur the generic fidelity of the maps and undermine Peck’s earlier reference to literary style. Again, this is not to say that such writers did not influence, anticipate, or even participate in the local colour movement; rather it is to say that their associations are not altogether obvious or of primary importance. Rather than suggest ways local colour sheds light on modern-nostalgic, region-nation, or urban-rural dialectics, these literary maps most dramatically speak to literary culture’s predestined march toward the future. Local colour becomes a loosely applied term, where the American writer is transformed into a frontier hero and represents the vanguard of cultural progress. The writer’s existence becomes more important than the content of their work.

Rather than negate the critical relevance of these designs, however, their somewhat fickle relationship to women, nationality, and literary style intensifies the spirit with which the maps were discussed. Ignoring the inconsistent criterion and, at times, contradictory selections, the *Omaha Daily Bee*, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, *New York Times*, *Syracuse Post-Standard*, and dozens of other newspapers continued to make explicit the maps’ parallels to the progressively stylized, patriotic, and masculinist frontier myth. In addition to the inevitable close of the literary frontier, numerous other similarities were drawn. Originally, Peck’s description of Wilstach’s map had invited authors to find “fresh fields and pastures new.” The agrarian scale suggested by “fields” and “pastures” was quickly overwhelmed by the “vast extent” of “unclaimed” lands. This vastness – and the prominent display of “unclaimed” throughout the western United States – invited a comparison between authorship and the large physical size of ranches and mines. Writers occupied the various roles of progressive types – miners, cowboys, neo-aristocrats, and imperialists – and literary subject matter was cast as a finite natural resource. In its “Among New Books” column, for example, the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* described how, according to *Literary Map of the United States*, authors had already “pre-empted certain sections of the country”:
For instance, Paul Leicester Ford has taken New Jersey, while Philadelphia falls under the dominion of S. Wier Mitchell; Churchill has appropriated Maryland, Gertrude Atherton [has appropriated] Washington; Miss Wilkins, Mary Johnston, Ellen Glasgow, Gage and Goodwin have “staked claims” in Virginia; James Lane Allen and John Uri Lloyd have divided Kentucky between them, while north of the Ohio [River,] Goss and Dunbar have sliced up Ohio; in Southern Indiana[,] Maurice Thompson is monarch of all he surveys, while Booth Tarkington has taken the northern part of the Hoosier state for a literary principality. Dunne and Ade have divided Chicago, while the whole Northwest beyond the Mississippi is captive to the bow and spear of Hamlin Garland. The Rocky Mountain Region is in fief to Ernest Seton Thompson.69

The Eagle went on to remind would-be literary claimants that regional themes and local colour fiction were like any other finite mineral resource. Only so many authors could secure a claim on the nation’s literary frontier; such claims represented a source of economic potential and cultural influence. The resulting effect was that of an authorial meritocracy, which controlled literary riches in the interest of national progress. In language reminiscent of Roosevelt’s views on frontier bravado, the Eagle wrote, “All that is required in this new method of conquest is the requisite nerve and genius to enter upon and possess the land.”

With “The American Scholar,” Emerson had urged the nation’s philosophers and intellectuals to stop deferring to the “courtly muses of Europe.” In the discussions surrounding Wilstach’s map and its revisions, American literary claimants were no longer guilty of critical deference. In fact, they were the court. Authors on the map now possessed fiefdoms and principalities of their own. Like a duke’s relationship to his king, these self-reliant writers were accountable only to New York City, which the Bookman described as the “Throne of Editorial Approbation.”70 While literary claims spoke to the advancement of American literature, they were far from collective, decentralized resources. Indeed, any sense of communal ownership, which Peck’s use of “our” might have suggested in the first sentence of his 1898 description, was undercut by the following sentence: “[The map] shows the geographical relations of accepted and familiar American authors to each other, delimiting the haunts of their ‘local color.’”71 The use of the individual possessive, in contrast to the general possessive, reminds us that these are solitary claims, rather than shared possessions. (It is worth noting, that the conceit of individual authorial control found in Wilstach’s Literary Map of the United
States, not to mention stylistic similarities, anticipates Faulkner’s famous inscription on his 1935 map of Yoknapatawpha County: “William Faulkner, Sole Owner & Proprietor.”) Like the estates of Europe’s landed gentry, and the ranches of the American West, a familiar and recognized last name alone serves to identify the perpetual and permanent claims of this authorial, almost primogenital, meritocracy. Furthermore, like feudal estates and baron cattle ranches, progressive literary claims are rooted in the violence of conquest, subjugation, and exploitation.

Early on it seemed inevitable that American authors were destined to write up the entire continent. When A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States appeared in August 1898, the Omaha Daily Bee made the rather Turnerian prediction that the literary frontier would cease to exist within fifty years. Four years later, the Chicago Daily Tribune commented that the frontier was disappearing faster than expected – so quickly, in fact, that “literary settlers [were now] being counted among the pioneers” of Alaska, Hawai‘i, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico. Soon after, ambitious writers were forced to set their sights on Asia, Africa, and even Europe. Simply put, no more unclaimed literary territory existed at home. In keeping with the changing conditions, the Bookman began publishing maps that charted the adventurous exploits of American authors and their Anglo-Saxon allies throughout the world.

Nearly a decade after the Bookman first published Literary Map of the United States, Wilstach contributed a new design, A Map Showing the Invasion of Europe by American Writers of Fiction, which accompanied Arthur Bartlett Maurice’s essay “The American Invasion” in the May 1908 issue (fig. 4). Maurice, who had assumed editorial control of the Bookman the year before, historicized the relationship between American writers and Europe. He explained that Washington Irving had initiated a slow but gradual literary invasion in the early nineteenth century. By the first decade of the twentieth century, that invasion had quickened and intensified. Maurice acknowledged, “Mr. Wilstach’s map is frankly open to amendment, and even if it contained the name of every American who had made use of a European background in fiction, it would be final only for the moment.
The tide of American invasion is rising with every publishing season.” Wilstach’s latest map was but a snapshot of the literary invasion. It identified the current successes and depicted the inevitable, practically immediate, sites of continued expansion. By 1908, American writers had already taken control of Europe’s political and cultural centres, including London, Paris, and Rome. Other claims, which were scattered across the continent, would surely spearhead even more conquests. Southwest Europe, in particular, “[offered] the opportunity for the blazing [...] American trail” to continue.

Wilstach’s invasion map illustrates what Peck would claim two years later. In commemorating the Bookman’s fifteenth anniversary, the journal’s founding editor celebrated American economics, politics, and literary culture. He talked of the “bold action which [had] ran like an electric spark through all Americans, and [had] sent a thrill through Europe also.” Since 1895, Peck explained, the United States had exerted itself and taken “its rightful place as a leader in the immediate future of the world.” The nation had fought and defeated Spain, matured culturally, and embarked on imperial projects of its own. Perhaps blinded by his trust in American exceptionalism, Peck explained that U.S. imperialism was different – indeed, better – than nineteenth-century European colonialism. To help illustrate the “germination” of American originality and genius, Peck reprinted Wilstach’s original 1898 map and the Tribune’s 1902 variant. These maps underscored the progress of “literature of democracy,” which had the ability to actively influence world affairs. Since the Spanish-American War, the United States had increasingly flexed its burgeoning literary influence; yet, implicitly, that influence was backed by military might. Peck concluded, “Now it is in fiction that the battles of the people are fought out […] the last fifteen years have been a time of literary revolution.”

In the years before World War I, the Bookman printed three additional invasion maps, including A Map Showing the Literary Invasion of Africa by Anglo-Saxon Authors (fig. 5) and The Invasion of Asia by Anglo-Saxon Authors (fig. 6). These two maps affirm Wilstach’s early influence on discursive literary map production in the United States. While not drawn by Wilstach himself, the designs do reflect his general aesthetic and maintain his use of surnames for the identification of literary claimants. Though the maps depict both American and British writers, the emphasis on Anglo-Saxon cooperation
maintains a powerful link to the progressively stylized frontier myth and the racialized ideological principles of Theodore Roosevelt. In some parts of the world, it seemed okay for American and British authors to serve as literary allies in the promotion of Anglo-Saxon progress. The collaborative tone of conquest tests American exceptionalism to a degree, but it does not fully undermine the ability of the United States to assert itself as an imperial power. In fact, Anglo-Saxon invasions enable U.S. literary conquest of places already politically colonized by European nations.

In March 1912, the Bookman once again reprinted Wilstach’s original 1898 design and the invasion maps of Europe, Africa, and Asia. The issue also included Wilstach’s A Map Showing the Invasion of North America by Foreign Authors (fig. 7). If the invasion maps of Africa and Asia consented to a degree of Anglo-Saxon cooperation, Wilstach’s final design reinforced once more America’s literary exceptionalism. Indeed, A Map Showing the Invasion of North America outlines a type of literary Monroe Doctrine – a hawkishness later replicated by Paul Mayo Paine, likely the twentieth century’s most prolific literary mapmaker and the subject of chapter 2. Wilstach’s doctrine firmly asserts North America – which is defined rather liberally to include Greenland and Iceland – as the established domain of U.S. authors. European writers such as Robert Louis Stevenson, William Thackeray, Rudyard Kipling, and Charles Dickens had successfully staked claims in the United States. However, these European efforts had comparatively less braggadocio than American invasions of Europe. Whereas American authors had encircled political and cultural centres in A Map Showing the Invasion of Europe, major cities such as Boston, Chicago, and Washington remain relatively untouched in A Map Showing the Invasion of North America. Additionally, New York City, the self-proclaimed capital of literary culture, has rebuffed all foreign attacks. American writers have infiltrated the interior of Europe, yet foreign writers have been largely incapable of moving beyond the North American coast. The map emasculates foreign authors, who seem to lack the pioneering fortitude necessary to occupy the North American interior. In cases where European writers have penetrated the continent, their efforts appear to have been facilitated by American ingenuity in the form of the trans-continental railroad, which crosses the United States as a dotted line. Charles Dickens, for example, may have secured his claim with American Notes for General Circulation (1842) prior to the
railroad’s construction, but the map’s flag-waving ethos implies the assistance of U.S. infrastructure. Even in their successes, European writers are cast as passive agents, and the majority of North America remains unmarked by foreign influence.

In 1898, the Bee predicted the literary frontier would close by 1948. Fourteen years later, Outlook magazine revised that prediction, suggesting instead that settlement opportunities for adventurous writers would disappear by the early 1930s. Whereas the Bee envisioned a national literary frontier, Outlook predicted a global end to unclaimed literary territory. Outlook described the Bookman’s literary invasion maps as “all in the interests of peace”; nevertheless, the expansionist aggression and exceptional zeal of America’s writerly conquerors meant that literary frontiers worldwide all but closed as soon as they were conceived. Fallow lands were too tempting, too valuable to let sit unclaimed for long. Using their “trenchant typewriters,” authors had aggressively written up the whole of the United States and picked over the choicest territory throughout the world. What was left, based upon the standards the Chicago Daily Tribune outlined in 1902, was “coextensive with that which is considered valueless for farming, mining, manufacturing, or residence purposes.”

The frequent associations that Harry Thurston Peck and literary journalists made between authors, conquerors, and invasions should remind us that Wilstach’s “unclaimed” lands are not simply vast tracts of uninhabited space. “Conqueror” necessitates the subjugation of a people. Wilstach’s literary map concept encouraged authors to discover and settle “empty” territory, and, at the same time, it promoted acts of cultural occupation. Though Literary Map of the United States and the designs it inspired do not reference directly American Indians, they assert representational power over Native space. The maps lend cartographic weight to the popular perception that American Indians and other Indigenous peoples lack literary traditions; by doing so, they normalize ideological policies and encroachment of settler societies.

With A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States, Paul Wilstach established a vexed relationship between U.S. literary map production and Indigenous literatures that
continues to resonate today. While I explore this relationship further in chapter 4, it is worth pausing to note some of the ways in which the map undermines Native title through cartographic expressions of literary worth. Anishinaabeg writer and activist Winona LaDuke has argued, “There is a direct relationship between the price of real estate, the diminishment of Native title, and subsequent complications in legal redress.”

In 1898 terms, frontier real estate of all sorts was seen as increasingly scarce and, thus, valuable. In conceiving of a literary frontier, Wilstach and the Bookman dramatically increased the symbolic value of “mapped” authors and implicitly derogated all non-mapped literatures – especially those literary traditions rooted in Indigenous North America. At the same time Literary Map of the United States celebrates writerly conquest, it scorns Native peoples as culturally irrelevant if not non-existent.

As J. Edward Chamberlin has demonstrated, a people’s literary culture and storytelling traditions “give meaning and value to the places we call home.” Such traditions can document an Indigenous people’s tenure on the land; they can also justify and buttress the settlement of newcomers. Wilstach’s map valuates a narrow selection of literature and storytelling traditions, but, in a broader sense, it functions as a land survey, where cartographic expressions of literary criticism determine and validate possession of territory. Reinforced by the profound power of mapping, recognized literary claims acquire emblematic purchase on lands otherwise deemed to be fallow. When Literary Map of the United States – and the literary map production it inspired – ignores Indigenous literatures, oral traditions, and non-book texts, it does not simply fail to account for American Indians. It does not just fail to hear Native voices. Indeed, it symbolically strips away title to the lands that Indigenous peoples have occupied and incorporated into their storytelling for thousands of years.

Literary Map of the United States at once casts Indigenous peoples as passive or absent cultural players in the proving grounds of American literary nationalism and summarily dismisses all Native literatures. Figured as culturally non-productive populations, American Indians possess no formidable claims to the continent’s literary resources. By extension, Indians are rendered title-less peoples. Authorial claims represent more than just critical evaluations; they also obfuscate, confuse, and void Native rights to sacred
sites, mineral deposits, and home. In its non-recognition of Indigenous literary traditions, Wilstach’s map models a type of cultural violence that has remained a consistent, subtle, and consequential motif of the genre throughout the twentieth century and up to the present day.

Soon after its publication in 1898, literary journalists and critics began to evoke Paul Wilstach’s *A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States* in popular book reviews and essays. While critics had occasionally used the phrase “literary map” as early as the 1820s, this appears to be the first time the expression assumed a connotation of individual accomplishment. In 1901, for example, the *Washington Times* reviewed Florence Finch Kelly’s *With Hoops of Steel*. The reviewer remarked, “The author is evidently thoroughly familiar with the scenes which she describes and the desert wastes of New Mexico may, when the next literary map of the United States is made, be considered as staked out by her.” The reference was both a metaphor and an anticipation of yet another update to Wilstach’s map. A year later, the newspaper was more explicit. In reviewing Ella Higginson’s *Mariella of Out West*, the *Times* reviewer wrote, “[The novel] should secure for its author a staked-out claim on Mr. Wilstach’s literary map of the United States, in the Puget Sound country, for that is where the scene of the novel is laid.”

As the literary map concept gained critical currency – as printed matter and evaluative expressions rooted in the progressive frontier myth – Wilstach carefully differentiated his discursive reinterpretation from previous literary maps of British and European literatures. In 1916, for example, the *Bookman* published his article “Literary Landmarks of the National Capital.” Wilstach described the various destinations of the literary tourist by highlighting author homes and publishing hotspots in Washington. Not once, however, did he use the phrase “literary map.” Moreover, he did not include a printed map of Washington – despite the appearance of numerous other illustrations in the article. Arguably, Wilstach was best known in 1916 for his literary map designs. It is telling, then, that he withheld one from an essay about literary tourism. In doing so, Wilstach
emphasized that U.S. literary maps served different, ideological purposes than those that had come before. While a map intended for the literary tourist was appropriate for London or the Lake District, such a map was inconsistent with the uniquely American application of the genre. In the United States, literary maps were to depict claims and cultural progress – not biographical or imaginative sites. Even when an earlier use of genre made contextual sense, Wilstach avoided it in order to reinforce the frontier connotations of the discursive school of literary mapping he initiated in 1898.
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Chapter 2
Institutionalizing the Genre: Paul Mayo Paine's Literary Map Project

Many people like to look at maps and study them. But the best way to learn about any particular place is to start making a map of it. It is the nearest thing to actually visiting in person when it comes to gaining knowledge.

–Paul Mayo Paine, April 4, 1932

This is the substance of my dream: that laying aside all petty considerations and rivalries, all who know books and believe in them, all who use them for public education, all who publish them and sell them, and all who lend them, should join in a great common purpose, to increase the number of those who read them. And this should be done in the spirit of service to mankind.


Shortly after Paul Wilstach’s A Map of the United States Which Aims to Show Some Recently Staked Claims (fig. 2) appeared in the January 1901 Bookman, an aspiring literary journalist from Syracuse, New York, observed in the local Post-Standard:

In a map recently published in The Bookman[,] the United States is divided up, as far as the facts seem to warrant, among the recently staked claims of the American writers who deal in character and locality. It is an interesting map and shows that there is plenty of territory on the right bank of the Mississippi and beyond awaiting the development of the explorer.

The writer commented further on the paucity of “recent literary squatters” beyond the Mississippi. Of the twenty-eight authors who had secured claims in 1900, only four had staked theirs in the West. One of these claimants was Hamlin Garland, who epitomized the admirable qualities of America’s writerly conquerors. The unattributed review celebrated Garland as a “barbaric boy” who disdained “intellectual refinement [and] gentlemanliness.” Garland’s fiction, in particular his recent novel The Eagle’s Heart, paid tribute to the “triumph of a man whose whole glory is in conquering the physical
obstacles that confront the plainsman. […] He wants a fellow who can’t be killed by the meanest bronco, who can fight like a demon and isn’t afraid of the devil himself.”

The Post-Standard’s literary and drama critic was one of many to comment on the frontier sensibilities of Wilstach’s 1901 map, but more than most he recognized the newly refashioned genre’s potential and popular appeal. The writer was Paul Mayo Paine – a thirty-two-year-old civil engineer by training, veteran of the Spanish-American War, and future director of the Syracuse Public Library. Paine would later embark on a literary map project of his own, becoming twentieth-century America’s most prolific literary mapmaker. Martha Hopkins of the Library of Congress has recognized Paine’s designs as “visually among the finest in their use of color and illustrations.” His maps are very much the products of his time, as if he had quickly scanned then-current book titles and listed his favorites. Consequently, many of the titles are obscure to modern readers. Moreover, he shows little familiarity with writers outside the British and American traditions: even on his world maps, he lists authors writing in English rather than writers using the native languages of the countries.

Hopkins does not fully account for Paine’s impact on the literary map genre, and her brief sketch flattens his designs, as well as their multifunctional role in twentieth-century print culture. In his cartographic expressions of U.S. literary nationalism, Paine did tend to emphasize English-language fiction, but his maps also reference works written in French, German, Spanish, Hebrew, Arabic, and other languages. More importantly, Paine did not reflexively scan book titles or bestseller lists. Indeed, a closer look at his maps reveals a set of more complicated, and at times contradictory, values that went into the compilation and design of his maps.

Paul Mayo Paine helped institutionalize U.S. literary maps as something more than a print culture curiosity. Between 1915 and 1939, Paine designed no fewer than twenty-three maps, which enjoyed a wide and varied circulation throughout the United States and the world. Over a twenty-four year period, Paine revised and updated his popular maps multiple times (see appendix 1). Because subsequent editions of different designs often overlapped each other – and because Paine’s maps addressed multiple audiences at once – a chronological approach to them is somewhat unwieldy. This chapter, then, is organized thematically and first characterizes the general spirit and tone of Paine’s
literary maps. Following a short publication and circulation overview, I turn to Paine and his oeuvre in relation to the Public Library Movement and the emergence of middlebrow culture after World War I. Finally, I consider the legacy of Paine’s maps in U.S. classrooms and literary studies.

As a whole, Paul Mayo Paine’s literary maps replicate and nuance the expansionist spirit of Paul Wilstach’s Bookman designs by celebrating the “barbaric” qualities of literary settlers like Hamlin Garland. Consider, for a moment, the three editions of Map of Good Stories published between 1924 and 1931. In addition to Garland’s Main-Travelled Roads, the 1924 edition of Map of Good Stories (fig. 8) makes reference to forty-three authors and fictional characters who are “bounded” together by Gilbert Parker’s Pierre and His People to the north, Mary Johnston’s 1492 to the east, Thomas Allibone’s The Aztec Treasure-House to the south, and Richard Henry Dana’s Two Years before the Mast to the west. While the use of “stories” in the map’s title might suggest an open definition of literature, the design’s four sides are definitively bound – the margins preclude non-book texts and oral traditions by reinforcing the connection between literary culture and the codex. Gathered in this metaphoric binding are quires of short stories and popular novels published by the leading houses of the day, including Arena, Bobbs-Merrill, Doubleday, Harpers, Houghton Mifflin, Macmillan, and Scribner’s. The map offers a view of American literature that, while not exclusively male, is gendered masculine and overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon. Of the forty-three references, all but six identify white male authors or characters derived from their works. Exceptions include Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, which appears in both Kentucky and Texas, and her novel Old Town, which is shown in central Massachusetts. The map also includes Mary Shipman Andrew’s Bob and the Guides near Montreal and Johnston’s 1492 in the right margin. Only once, though, does the map explicitly reference a woman’s name: the caption “Ruth McEnery Stuart’s Cullu’d Folks live here” places the novel Napoleon Jackson in Oklahoma, just north of the Red River.
The 1925 edition of Map of Good Stories (fig. 9) replicates the previous year’s outline and speaks to a prospering literary landscape. With ninety-six references, the second edition presents an increasingly crowded scene, full of authorial homesteads such as William Allen White’s “discovery” of Kansas and Upton Sinclair’s “claim” in southern California. More references to female-authored works appear in the second edition, but the map, nonetheless, maintains the established tenor of masculine grit. The general conceit of rugged writers asserting their names and protecting their properties on the literary frontier underpins the design and speaks to Wilstach’s enduring influence. The prominence of Bret Harte’s “The Luck of the Roaring Camp” and Emerson Hough’s The Covered Wagon – along with Zane Grey’s Riders of the Purple Sage, Owen Wister’s The Virginian, Edward L. Wheeler’s Deadwood Dick’s Dozen, and Rex Beach’s Flowing Gold – helps to link all of the map’s authors to settlers, frontiersmen, miners, and otherwise self-reliant heroes. Like Wilstach’s 1898 A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States, the 1924 and 1925 editions of Map of Good Stories preclude writers who fail a basic litmus test of Americanness. Paine often associated the birth of American literature with James Fenimore Cooper’s The Spy and Leatherstocking novels; consequently, his early maps do not recognize authors born prior to the Revolutionary War. Writings by the Founding Fathers and other Americans who were born British subjects – not to mention American Indians, immigrants, and other writers of color – are simply not recognized. Both versions do, however, acknowledge the literary claims of Robert Louis Stevenson, Joseph Conrad, and Gilbert Parker – incongruous inclusions considering the designs’ patriotic spirit. However, for Paine, the fiction of Stevenson, Conrad, Parker, and, especially, Rudyard Kipling betrays the “unmistakable trace of American influence,” which justifies their claims.4

With 176 references, the final edition of Map of Good Stories (fig. 10) is visually crowded and testifies to an even more developed, and somewhat more pluralistic, literary America. While the map’s metaphoric binding maintains the connection between stories and the codex, the 1931 edition includes references drawn from a wider range of genres and authors. Especially compared to the 1924 map, the third design recognizes significantly more women and additional literary styles. Local colour fiction, Westerns, and historical novels are complemented by plays, verse, and non-fiction. The map also
includes foreign-born authors, albeit Western European ones. For example, O.E. Rølvaag’s *Giants in the Earth* appears in South Dakota, and the metaphoric binding is sewn with works such as Ralph Connor’s *The Sky Pilot*, Charles Dickens’s *David Copperfield*, and Cervantes’s *Don Quixote*. The hyper-nationalism of previous editions is somewhat subdued in the 1931 design, but evidence of American patriotism, Anglo-Saxon virility, and westward expansion remains.

Taken together, the three editions of *Map of Good Stories* are stylistically and conceptually representative of Paine’s corpus. Across a common outline of the contiguous states and an inset of Alaska, the maps indicate a growing number of literary associations, derived primarily from local colour short stories and historical novels published after the Civil War. As they do on nearly all of his designs, illustrations of tall ships, Conestoga wagons, log cabins, oil derricks, and mountain ranges pepper the landscape and symbolize what Paine revered as the “romance” of discovery and frontier adventure. In each subsequent edition, blanks in the figurative landscape are successively filled with the patriotic heroics of writerly cowboys, miners, pioneers, and squatters. Thus, when viewed in chronological sequence, the three maps visually animate the inevitable closing of the literary frontier and the civilizing effect of a woman’s touch.

Paine’s world maps and maps of other countries also make room for the pioneering spirit and expansionist energy of American writers. Across a modified Mercator projection, for example, *Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls: Stories, Trails, Voyages, Discoveries, Explorations & Places to Read About* (fig 11) presents a seemingly encyclopedic selection of non-fiction travel narratives, novels, epics, and poetry written in Greek, Latin, and the world’s modern languages. Insets in the lower left and right corners enumerate the overabundance of literature from the British Isles and the thirteen original United States, but national differences are otherwise downplayed through the absence of geopolitical boundaries and labels. Because of its international and stylistic scope, the map seems well suited for a variety of contexts and audiences. According to a 1925 interview with the *Syracuse Herald*, the map is the result of “painstaking research and careful consideration” and embodies “the spirit of romance and adventure.” Paine explained,
Books that appeal to young people are not confined to national limits, they come from every part of the world. […] Boys are impatient with mere stories, they like things that have in them the strong fibre of reality and fact. So I have endeavored to aid them in their longing for books of real adventure by putting on my map the things that have actually been worth while in the history of the world and adventures that have actually happened.6

Of course, Paine’s comments unmask the map’s ideological and gender bias. Far from an impartial depiction of world literature, Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls celebrates on a global scale the type of Anglo-Saxon masculinity and frontier mythology previously seen in Map of Good Stories. The United States is visually and symbolically centred, and the world’s oceans are filled with the exploits of American and, to a lesser extent, British adventurers. While “this Map cannot contain” the many Anglo-Saxon writers that have put their “deeds […] in print for our profit and delight,” it nonetheless suggests that Russia, Africa, Greenland, and much of Asia altogether lack heroic men and history. The conspicuously blank spaces ensure that Americans will have plenty of room in which to continue their writerly exploits.

Even Paine’s depiction of Canadian literature can be read as a pronouncement of U.S. literary nationalism. Published in 1926, The Northward Map of Truthful Tales (fig. 12) presents an outline of North America, north of the fortieth parallel. Paine designed the monotone map in collaboration with the Toronto Public Library. He explained, “[Fiction] has been excellently handled by writers representing the great nation lying just across the undefended frontier and stories they have written of the Dominion are clearly a part of the romance and history of North America.”7 Considering Paine’s fervent patriotism and sentimentality, the map’s publication might seem oddly timed with the sesquicentennial of U.S. independence. Yet, The Northward Map of Truthful Tales is not simply an affable depiction of Canadian literature. Instead, it recalls the literary Monroe Doctrine advanced in 1912 by Wilstach’s A Map Showing the Invasion of North America by Foreign Authors (fig. 7). By commenting on North America’s “romance and history,” Paine uses the continent as a metonym of U.S. interests. His singular use of “this romantic region” – opposed to “these romantic regions” – collapses national differences, and his reminder that only an “undefended frontier” separates the two countries underscores the ease with which ambitious American writers could act upon their expansionist impulses. On the
map itself, international borders seem to disappear entirely. Implicitly, The Northward Map of Truthful Tales suggests that Canada either is, or will soon be, the literary dominion of the United States.

Despite their jingoistic overtones, Paine’s literary maps did not want for worldwide circulation. While his earliest designs were produced in limited quantities, most were issued in large print runs by one of two publishers: the Syracuse Public Library and the R.R. Bowker Company of New York. The three editions of Map of Good Stories and The Northward Map of Truthful Tales were published by the Syracuse Public Library (SPL) and printed by Lyman Brothers, a local firm that claimed to have the best monotype equipment and most advanced printing capabilities in central New York. Individual copies of the monotone wall maps sold by mail order for $0.50–$3.00, depending on size, and a limited number of hand-coloured copies were available and advertised as “for more.” Even though SPL owned and operated its own press, Paine hired out the production of his literary maps for the good reason that they generated a profit. The 1924 edition of Map of Good Stories, for example, sold throughout the United States and Canada, and SPL received orders from as far away as Paris and London. Within two months of its publication in February 1924, the library had sold 59 copies of the map. By year’s end, the library had sold enough copies to fund eight other SPL publications. Just four months after the second edition was published in 1925, the Syracuse Herald boasted that Map of Good Stories was “now in use in more than 700 places in all parts of the country.”

Paine featured six of his literary maps on seven different covers of Gold Star List, a popular pamphlet that SPL published between 1919 and 1966. In percentage terms of SPL’s overall printing budget, the annual production costs of Gold Star List accounted for a low of 19% in 1924 and a high of 40% in 1922. In terms of dollars spent, costs ranged from $48 in 1936 to $957 in 1928. Recorded print runs were no smaller than 700 in 1921 and as large as 3,000 in 1922. Even during the Great Depression, the annual publication more than paid for itself and helped fund other SPL publications, such as Library Window and the library’s annual report. Trustees’ minutes and other evidence confirm that Gold Star List not only sold, but sold fast. It was not unusual for an annual
print run to sell 1,000 or more mail-order copies within the first week, and remaining copies generally sold out within a month or two. So quickly did print runs sell out, in fact, SPL soon began receiving advance orders from librarians and teachers who wanted to ensure they received a year’s edition. In 1922, for example, the public library in Buffalo, New York, placed an advanced order for 2,000 copies at a discounted rate. In 1924 Paine accepted nearly 200 advanced copies from twenty-eight different states. The next year, SPL received an advance order of 500 copies from South Bend, Indiana, and in 1931 some 300 advance orders arrived from as far away as Hawai’i. In his annual reports and in the Gold Star List itself, Paine noted with satisfaction that libraries in England, Ireland, France, India, Russia, and other countries purchased the list. Unfortunately, surviving circulation data does not account for the likely sizeable number of free copies distributed to local patrons.

As cover images, Paine’s maps enjoyed a wide circulation. Paine used the three editions of Map of Good Stories on the respective year’s Gold Star List, and he reused the third edition in 1932. Paine designed Twenty-Two Good Stories of 1926 for that year’s pamphlet, and he featured A World of Good Stories in 1934. SPL did not issue these two latter designs as wall maps, so their circulation corresponded primarily with the pamphlets’. Initially, Lyman Brothers printed the maps separately and then pasted them on the wrappers; consequently, maps could separate from the pamphlet over time or could easily be removed. Lyman Brothers printed the 1932 and 1934 cover images directly on the wrappers, further linking the maps’ survival to that of Gold Star List.

Paine’s largest, most colourful, and best reviewed literary maps were published by R.R. Bowker, the company behind Publishers’ Weekly, Library Journal, and Annual American Catalogue, the predecessor of Books in Print. Between 1925 and 1939, Bowker published no fewer than ten of Paine’s maps, which were marketed to librarians, schoolteachers, and university professors. Even after Paine’s retirement in 1942, the company continued updating his popular designs (see appendix 2). Bowker published its first Paine map, Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls, as part of Children’s Book Week in 1925. The four-color map sold for $2.50 by mail order, and its resounding popularity warranted a second edition, with the altered title Map of Great Adventures, in 1928 and a
third edition in 1946. Bowker also published four editions of Booklovers Map of America, which was a larger, more technologically sophisticated adaptation of Map of Good Stories. Published in 1926, 1933, 1939, and 1949, editions of this map were issued as posters and spring-loaded roller maps intended for classroom display. For the 1939 edition, Paine collaborated with F. Haase, who then designed the final edition in 1949. This collaboration reflects Paine’s desire to keep his maps up to date, even after his retirement. Bowker also published two editions of Paine’s Map of America’s Making, in 1926 and 1929, and two editions of Booklovers’ Map of the British Isles, in 1927 and 1935. With the royalties from his successful Bowker publications, Paine and his wife, Maud, paid for at least one European vacation – at the height of the Great Depression.

Whether published by SPL or Bowker, Paine’s literary maps were widely reviewed and were often reprinted by newspapers and journals, which extended their already sizeable distribution potential. Perhaps the most intriguing evidence of their circulation comes from the very writers Paine mapped. Many of the authors included in the first edition of Map of Good Stories, for example, sent Paine notes of appreciation and praise. Joseph Lincoln wrote from New Jersey, “I was highly flattered to find that I owned a location upon ‘The Map of Good Stories.’ Incidentally, I judge that in most respects – and I am now ignoring my own novels altogether – your idea of what constitutes a good story is mine.” Zane Grey sent a letter from California that read, “I feel honored to find a geographical place on your clever and interesting chart of American fiction.” Steward Edward White also wrote from California, calling the map a “most ingenious and intriguing piece of work.” New York writer Gertrude Atherton said, “[I am] delighted to have a place on the map.” Gilbert Parker, Booth Tarkington, William Allen White, E.W. Howe, Herbert Quick, Mary L. Watts, and Hamlin Garland sent notes of admiration and gratitude as well.

Phrases such as “clever and interesting” and “ingenious and intriguing” point to the still alluring newness of the literary map genre in the United States – a newness that reviewers and advertisements mentioned with some regularity. The authors who wrote Paine recognized the potential economic benefits of securing a place on the literary map, and in so doing they actively participated in rhetorical acts of claiming that were reminiscent of
Wilstach’s *Bookman* designs. Most powerfully, Upton Sinclair wrote Paine from Pasadena: “I notice that the district known as Southern California is not mapped and I hereby lay claim to it, and send you my novel, ‘100 Per Cent,’ for your library.”

Sinclair might have meant his claim in jest, but his letter also suggests that the Pulitzer Prize-winner placed a measure of symbolic and economic value in literary mapping. When Paine published the second edition of *Map of Good Stories* in 1925, he acknowledged Sinclair’s stake in southern California: “Upton Sinclair claims land about here.”

Despite the similarities between his maps and Wilstach’s *Bookman* designs – the recognition of authorial claims and the animation of literary progress, for example – Paine was not merely a nationalistic drum major wielding a cartographic mace. In fact, his literary map project emerged from a long and varied career, in which publicity, cartography, and books intersected in a number of ways. Paine began developing his general design aesthetic as an undergraduate civil engineering student at Lehigh University, who worked part-time as a “semi-professional sign writer for retail stores.”

After he graduated in 1891, he surveyed trackage and designed technical maps for the Pennsylvania Railroad. He left railroad work three years later to pursue a writing and journalism career, eventually making his way to Syracuse, New York, and the city’s *Post-Standard* in 1895. At the newspaper, Paine wrote on a range of cultural and literary topics in his weekly columns, “Monday Sermons” and “Side Issues.” Then in 1909, Ezekiel Mundy, director of the Syracuse Public Library, hired Paine as his part-time assistant. Over the next six years, Mundy groomed Paine under the traditional apprenticeship model that predated the introduction of professional library schools in 1887. When Mundy retired in 1915, Paine resigned his beat with the *Post-Standard* and assumed the SPL directorship – a position he held until his own retirement in 1942.

Paine’s tenure as SPL director bridged the second half of the Public Library Movement and the emergence of middlebrow culture after World War I, and his literary maps responded to both. On the most basic level, Paine called upon his sign-making and
railroad experiences to design maps that publicized library services and promoted extension – what scholars today often call library outreach. In a more complex way, Paine infused his designs with a critical philosophy that championed common taste and, in doing so, he deftly commented on popular fiction’s place in U.S. print culture. Throughout his career, Paine believed in the truism that almost everyone likes to look at and study maps.

The Public Library Movement refers to the roughly fifty-year period that followed the formation of the American Library Association in 1876. During this period, ALA members led by Melvil Dewey worked to systematize, centralize, and promote the public library as a leading cultural agent. Librarian historians Dee Garrison and Wayne A. Wiegand have shown how the introduction of Dewey’s famous decimal classification system, the development of library schools, the proliferation of open stacks, and other innovations paralleled the emergence of the librarian as an increasingly professionalized and respected authority in American print culture. Fuelled by Andrew Carnegie’s philanthropic efforts, the Public Library Movement witnessed the rapid growth of the nation’s library network and an increase of outreach efforts that connected underserved populations to books and services. Typically, the “target groups” of library outreach, according to Robert S. Freeman and David M. Hovde, included the housebound, ethnic minorities, and the poor. Throughout the period, librarians were especially committed to immigrant outreach and to “Americanization” efforts. Plummer Alston Jones has suggested that librarians by and large “defined Americanization simply as teaching English to immigrants and preparing them for naturalization. They viewed immigrants as Americans-in the-making and themselves as active agents in the process.”

Like many of his professional colleagues, Paine was committed to library extension and championed Americanization efforts. Within days of becoming SPL director, Paine gave the system a new motto – “Take Books to the People” – and he worked to do just that. Over the next twenty-seven years, Paine grew the annual circulation from 460,770 to over 1.5 million. He opened new branches, lengthened hours, kept the system open on holidays, and implemented lending “stations” in factories, industrial bakeries, drug stores, public schools, and at Syracuse University. He also instituted “traveling libraries” and
“motor delivery services,” which extended the system’s reach to Onondaga County’s 57,000 rural residents, and developed Americanization programs for the city’s growing immigrant populations.\textsuperscript{30} To complement the efforts he spearheaded, Paine built large collections of African American literature, purchased Braille materials and early audio book technologies for blinded World War I veterans and the elderly, and added “information for Aliens” – fiction, non-fiction, and settlement brochures written in German, Polish, Hungarian, French, Russian, and Swedish. Despite Syracuse’s Protestantism, as well as his own, Paine believed “every form of religion should have its able defender in the public library,” and he shelved Socialist periodicals, such as \textit{Daily Worker} and \textit{New Masses}, in the face of widespread opposition. To attract what he saw as Onondaga County’s most underrepresented group of readers – poor and working-class white men – Paine permitted smoking in the Central Library and added vocational books, scientific texts, automobile repair manuals, and “business topics [from] salesmanship to management and ownership of large or small concerns.” These practical books were in addition to titles on “feminism, housekeeping, women’s clubs, care and feeding of children.”\textsuperscript{31}

Early on, Paine recognized that no matter how comprehensive, democratic, or responsive to popular preference he was, unpublicized outreach would not attract a significant number of new patrons. In 1919, he speculated that approximately 40 percent of America’s urban population “is made up of persons who can read and should be library users but are never seen at the library.”\textsuperscript{32} Locally, Paine observed that many potential patrons entered the library with a “dazed, helpless feeling” and never returned. To put the disoriented “would-be patron […] at ease,” and to ensure that he or she would become a lifelong library user, Paine combined his knowledge of books, maps, and publicity to design a pictorial map of the Central Library’s departments and collections. In 1916, with the help of the city’s engineering office, he produced a “large” map, which he then displayed in a “conspicuous place for the benefit of all who may wish to straighten themselves out.”\textsuperscript{33} Paine later designed what he called a “library map” that furnished a “free trip around the world for every person in Syracuse.” He posted this map “on a bulletin board in the Library lobby, with a fascinating arrangement of red string and little
pins showing the progress of the trip. [...] Enough books [were] given for each point on the trip to keep the average reader busy all winter."^{34}

Like other circulation innovations of the time, such as book displays and two-book lending, Paine’s early maps were intended to foster stronger connections between patrons and the public library. As his maps became increasingly sophisticated, Paine began to circulate them throughout Syracuse and Onondaga County with the hopes of attracting even more new patrons. Local newspapers reported on these maps and, by the early 1920s, began reprinting them for their subscribers. Even those residents who did not visit the library or subscribe to a local paper likely encountered Paine’s literary maps. In 1922, for example, Paine co-founded Friends of Reading, a volunteer organization that promoted the public library with an arsenal of posters, movie theatre slides, streetcar advertisements, and interactive storefront displays that frequently included literary maps.\textsuperscript{35} As a result, a moviegoer might encounter one of Paine’s maps while checking show times in the newspaper, on the streetcar ride to the theatre, and again in his or her seat while waiting for \textit{The Phantom of the Opera} or \textit{King Kong} to start. Paine and other members of Friends of Reading also made use of literary maps in fundraising and outreach presentations to community leaders and business groups.\textsuperscript{36} Archival references are generally brief, but \textit{The County Library Comes Home to the People} is the type of map Friends of Reading likely used to generate awareness of and support for SPL extension.

While not strictly a literary map, \textit{The County Library Comes Home to the People} (fig. 14) includes a cartouche subtitle that succinctly summarizes Paine’s commitment to outreach: “Equal Book Privileges for the Farm and the City.” Inset across an abstraction of Onondaga County, a network of nine images is annotated with captions such as “Why Should the Farm House be denied the same books which are free to all in the city?” and “The County Librarian comes bringing with her fresh supplies of good books for the Branch Library and the School and offering expert advice and assistance to the librarians on her route.” The map at once advertises the range of services that are available to rural residents and makes the argument for continued library extension efforts. Though modelled on SPL’s relationship to greater Onondaga County, Paine’s design had national relevance. The American Library Association (ALA) published and distributed two
versions of the black and red map in 1927. The larger “poster-map” was printed “on a pleasant light India ground” and was meant for public display. Sets of 5, 25, and 100 sold for $1, $4, and $13, respectively. A smaller pamphlet-sized version, with lengthier descriptions of typical extension services printed on the verso, was intended for household distribution. A public librarian could mail folded copies of the map, which was designed to fit a standard business-size envelope, to prospective patrons. The smaller map sold in sets of 100, 500, 1,000, and 5,000 for $2, $8, $14, and $62, respectively.37

In his attempts to publicize the Syracuse Public Library and its various services, Paine demonstrated the functional and meaningful uses of U.S. literary maps. As a prominent member of the ALA and the New York Library Association, Paine was something of a literary map booster. Whether in association meetings, invited talks, or letters to the editor, he peddled the usefulness of literary maps for publicizing library collections and for promoting outreach.38 In April 1922, for example, Paine traveled to Toronto, where he addressed the Ontario Library Association on rural extension. Each year, the association’s conference included an “exhibit of books and library supplies,” and the display featured “several new forms” in 1922.39 It would have been out of character for Paine to not contribute a literary map to the annual exhibit, and it seems likely that he found literary map converts in the likes of George Herbert Locke and Lillian H. Smith of the Toronto Public Library. Inspired by Paine’s example, the Toronto library “surprised” delegates three months later at the ALA annual convention in Detroit with “a map known as a ‘literary map’ of the Dominion of Canada.”40 Then in 1925, Locke attended a library institute at Syracuse University, where he and Paine again talked about maps. Months later, Paine acknowledged the “aid of the Toronto Public Library” in compiling the references found on The Northward Map of Truthful Tales.41

By the mid-1920s, Paine had convinced librarians in New York and Ontario, as well as cities throughout the United States, of the genre’s value. As already mentioned, the Syracuse Herald boasted that Paine’s designs were displayed “in more than 700 places in all parts of the country,” and the Christian Science Monitor noted that Paine’s maps “[appear] on the bulletin in many a library.” In 1926, the Library Journal reported that a library in Chattanooga, Tennessee, had begun promoting its American West collection
with the help of Paine’s *A Map of America’s Making*, which Bowker had published the previous year. The newsworthy display included a combination of red string and pushpins that recalled the physical composition of Paine’s “library map” project in Syracuse (fig. 15). Librarians were not the only ones to embrace Paine’s maps, and *Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls* seems an especially noteworthy design. Robert Cortes Holliday, editor of the *Bookman*, described it as “fascinating” and praised its “practical value”: “I envy the fortunate children of today for whom history is being made a living, glowing wonder.”\(^\text{42}\) The *New York Times* called it “a beautifully drawn map of the world on which have been indicated some of the great adventures of history and fiction,” and a bookstore in San Jose, California, featured the map in a window display of nautical literature. *Publishers’ Weekly* noted, “Setting off this effective display is Paul Paine’s ‘Map of Adventure’ which hangs over it all, showing the location of all the famous adventures in fiction.”\(^\text{43}\) The San Jose shop was one of over 250 booksellers nationwide that displayed the map following its publication the year before.\(^\text{44}\)

The next year, a local newspaper in Eldora, Iowa, admired the revised *Map of Great Adventures* as a “feature which [children] will undoubtedly be attracted to.” The paper noted that Paine’s maps were “being used by many organizations for many different purposes and the libraries have shown their wisdom by adopting them in their system.”\(^\text{45}\) South of Eldora in Missouri, every branch of the Kansas City Public Library had put Paine’s adventure map on display. In describing Kansas City’s “collection of new and colorful picture maps that stir the imagination of everyone who looks at them,” the *Christian Science Monitor* explained,

> High points in the world’s geography and history are marked and, in addition, the name of some good book is suggested concerning the place or event, so that any idea of romance that catches a child’s eye can be further studied; he can, in fact, walk out of the library with the very book under his arm that will take him at once to the place he has mentally marked on the map.

Even a “careless examination” of *Map of Great Adventures* or *Booklovers Map of America* “would give helpful information to any child.”\(^\text{46}\) Indeed, from New York to California, and beyond, Paine’s literary maps were seen as engaging and edifying tools with which one could promote the library, advertise books, and encourage reading.
Ironically, the type of reading that Paine’s maps encouraged contradicted prevailing professional attitudes toward fiction. A recurring dilemma throughout the Public Library Movement was the public’s seemingly insatiable desire to borrow and read popular fiction – the very books endorsed by Paine’s maps. When the ALA adopted its motto in 1879, the membership selected one drafted by Dewey: “The best reading for the greatest number at the least cost.” According to Wiegand, this motto reflected the profession’s overarching goal, as well as its defining challenge. What united ALA members most powerfully was an “ideology of shared reading with other middle-class professionals who believed that good reading led to good social behavior.” Put another way, the Public Library Movement was dogged by what Janice Radway characterizes as “largely conservative arguments about the moral respectability of fiction and therefore its proper place in the library.” Equipped with a cache of lists and catalogues, librarians sought to win the “fiction debates” by identifying for their patrons what constituted “best reading.”

In 1893, the ALA unveiled its Modern Library at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The supposedly exemplary collection contained 5,000 “best books,” which had been identified by a consortium of librarians, library school students, and interdisciplinary faculty members from the University of the State of New York. Even as Buffalo Bill Cody’s titillating Wild West brought to life dime novel adventures down the street, the ALA bowdlerized its ideal collection. At a time when fiction accounted for three out of every four circulating books in the United States, fiction titles accounted for a mere fifteen percent of the Model Library. Three years later, the ALA published its supplementary Catalog, which continued to slight popular titles that authorities deemed poorly written or offensive. Then in 1905 the ALA began publishing Booklist, a monthly compilation that was again light on fiction.

Catalog, Booklist, and other lists of “best reading” were intended to help professionals identify “quality” titles that would both strengthen democracy and legitimate the public library as a purveyor of culture. While Dee Garrison has suggested that librarians more or less abandoned their paternalistic impulses by the turn of the twentieth century,
Wiegand, Radway, and Christine Pawley have more recently demonstrated that the desire to root out fiction continued well into the 1930s and beyond. Such efforts were especially strong in New York. According to Wiegand, “To wean public libraries away from the popular fiction their patrons really wanted, the State Library offered matching grants up to $200 for titles selected only from its ‘Best Books’ lists.” Yet, a handful of local librarians “chafed at this heavy hand.” Paine was one such librarian.

When Paine became SPL director in 1915, the fiction debates of the Public Library Movement were slowly coming to a close, but they remained a part of the professional zeitgeist. Though many librarians and their allied professionals still wanted America to kick its fiction habit, many came to realize that popular literature was an integral part of any public library collection that was actually used. The proliferation of middlebrow culture in the decades following World War I, then, offered an acceptable compromise. Historian Joan Shelley Rubin has linked the emergence of middlebrow culture with the “unprecedented range of activities aimed at making literature and other forms of ‘high’ culture available to a wide reading public.” Such activities included new forms of book reviewing, literary radio programs, the Modern Library publication series, the Book-of-the-Month Club, and other initiatives that were sponsored by public libraries. One of the most notable forms of what Radway calls “social pedagogy” was the Great Books Program.

“Great Books” courses have been taught in American colleges and universities since at least 1901, but it was John Erskine’s General Honors curriculum that helped popularize the concept. Erskine discouraged his Columbia University students from “fearing that the immortal thing of art must be approached through special studies and disciplines” and instead urged them to read the classics of the Western World – from Homer to Freud – as if they were modern-day bestsellers. Building upon the success of Erskine’s model, Great Books courses were adopted elsewhere, including Cooper Union, the University of Chicago, and St. John’s College, Annapolis. By the 1940s, similar courses were taught on a large scale throughout the United States.
Erskine first proposed his Great Books course in 1916, but he did not have a chance to teach it at Columbia until 1919. During World War I, however, he had the opportunity to develop his curriculum with American soldiers stationed in France, and it was as an adult education program that Great Books became truly popular. Shortly after Erskine’s former student Mortimer J. Adler introduced a generalhonours course at the University of Chicago, he and university president Robert Maynard Hutchins developed a version of the program geared toward “ordinary men and women.” What eventually became known as the Great Books Foundation, Adler and Hutchins’s model encouraged a presentist approach to Western classics in discussion groups that were based in community centres, factories, and, especially, public libraries. Guided by Erskine’s Classics of the Western World, Adler's Manual for Discussion Groups, William Utterback’s Decision through Discussion: A Manual for Group Leaders, and similar publications, teams of qualified “specialists” shepherded Great Books participants in Detroit, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Washington, and other cities. Studied texts ranged from Plato’s Apology and Sophocles’ Oedipus Rex to Machiavelli’s The Prince and Hitler’s Mein Kampf. With rare exception, like that of the Federalist Papers and the Declaration of Independence, readings were light on American texts – and even lighter on fiction.

Unlike many of his colleagues who had trained at professional library schools, Paine objected to the fiction debates and the type of affected middlebrow taste epitomized by Great Books. As a young journalist interested in literary and cultural topics, he had observed with skepticism the ALA’s efforts to change America’s reading habits. Rather than find popular fiction offensive or alarming, Paine affirmed the edifying potential of nearly all forms of print. In 1900, he self-published his views in Monday Sermons, a favourably reviewed collection of twenty essays taken from his weekly newspaper column of the same name. Throughout Monday Sermons, Paine satirized attempts to identify “best reading” and demonstrated his faith in unaffected taste. Particularly in the essay “On Too Much Culture,” Paine mocked critical “condescension, intolerance and lack of sympathy,” by offering “a few tempered remarks to persons who are so liberal that they are intolerant, so cultured that they are condescending, so perfectly sure of their own altitude of thought and behavior that they madden others by their serenity.” Such snobs may have been “far removed from commiseration and […] generally envied by
other worthy people,” but average Americans were “content with our own simple joys.” Paine did not identify these self-assured antagonists by name or group in *Monday Sermons*, but he was more explicit elsewhere. In a 1912 letter to the editor published in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, for instance, Paine grumbled,

> It would almost seem to read the library reports that the main point of ethics in library work is to erect scarecrows and wire fences about the field of fiction. […] Why should it be thought that the speculations of some of our most earnest muckrakers, engaged in destroying confidence in the success of this republic, is better reading for the public than any one of the dozens of sound, wise and generous books of modern fiction?

He concluded by ridiculing the “thinkers” whose brains were “clogged with serious reading which they have not the education to digest, [who are] sprouting with devices for the reform of the solar system.”

Paine viewed middlebrow pomposity, and especially Great Books discussion groups, as yet another cultural scarecrow. In some respects, Paine had much in common with Erskine, and he sympathized with Erskine’s Socratic approach to literature. Both men associated an engaged and self-directed reading public with a strong citizenry, and both were committed to adult education. Moreover, their views had been informed by their experiences working with soldiers during World War I – Erskine in France and Paine at Parris Island, South Carolina. Despite their similarities, however, Paine felt that the middlebrow activity Erskine helped popularize put the classics cart before the reading horse.

Joan Shelley Rubin and Gerald Graff have discussed the origins and the spread of Great Books, and Alex Beam has more recently considered the publication series it eventually inspired. While theirs are important accounts of Great Books that detail the cultural forces and individuals behind the movement, they pay little attention to the demographics of actual discussion groups. Based on contemporary case studies, however, Great Books was an overwhelmingly gendered phenomenon of educated women. In the District of Columbia, for example, roughly 70 percent of participants were women, and two-thirds had attended college or graduate school. In Chicago, half of all participants had attended college, and one-fourth had a bachelor’s degree. Housewives represented the single
largest group and were followed by teachers, librarians, social workers, secretaries, and stenographers. Combined, women outnumbered men two-to-one in the Windy City’s groups.\textsuperscript{62} The proportion of women may have varied in other cities, but Great Books participants necessarily enjoyed the social interconnectedness of urban areas, were able to maintain regular or predictable hours, and could financially afford program charges that ranged from $15 to $32.

From Paine’s perspective, programs like Great Books pretentiously elevated the reading materials of urban adults who were already readers. The public librarian’s most important job was to engage a different group altogether – those who were not yet readers and those who lacked access to enjoyable texts. Paine desired to “go forth and broaden the field of readers, to open the door of literature to those who by accident of race or position in life have never learned what good reading is, and finally, to provide for those who do read material on both sides of great questions.”\textsuperscript{63} Paine was moved by his work with soldiers. He noted, “In a large number of cases the first contact of the service man with thought by means of the printed page was in the camp library. […] The same influence continued in time of peace will be to his advantage and the advantage of the country.”\textsuperscript{64} The librarian’s patriotic duty, then, was to help men “feel they are missing something important if they stay away” from books.\textsuperscript{65} And such “impatient” men were not going to be participating in Great Books discussions anytime soon.

Paine was particularly committed to rural extension, where he sought to reach poor and working-class men who lacked ready access to urban centres, did not have the luxury of regular leisure time, and could not have afforded Great Books fees anyway. Indeed, the program and other middlebrow activities did not, and in many cases could not, serve millions of rural American men. The lingering fiction debates only compounded the problem. A literary map, however, had the potential to engage and empower these rural non-readers, particularly labourers and farmers. A recipe of America’s frontier myth, patriotic bravado, and contemporary fiction combined to form a common denominator that Paine incorporated in a loosely structured alternative to more socially respectable adult education programs. Simply put, his program valued reading habits over reading
Paine conceived of his literary maps in such a way that they functioned as affordable, accessible, and efficiently packaged courses for individual study.

Paine designed many of his maps as part of Gold Star List, SPL’s enduringly popular annual pamphlet, and the publications are grounded in a common philosophy. Soon after becoming SPL director, Paine began observing patron lending practices in order to set aside the most popular novels. He arranged these titles in thematic displays of “Gold Star books,” which he credited with “bringing the public back [to the library] to give more attention to first class books of American fiction.” Based on these collections, Paine began publishing his own lists in the Syracuse Public Library’s monthly bulletin. The October 1915 issue, for example, catalogued “twenty current novels of superior value, with brief comments by the Librarian.” The November-December bulletin listed 160 “Good American Novels” that had been identified and

set aside for the use of borrowers not knowing quite what to ask for. The list begins with Cooper and comes down to the present […] We reprint the list in this issue of the Bulletin, not pretending that we believe it to be the best possible list, but recommending it as a good deal of excellent reading.

“Good American Novels” established the editorial tone and nationalistic scope that Paine would soon replicate in Gold Star List. Under Paine’s direction, the subtitle of the pamphlet varied slightly each year, but the motif remained consistent: “Some Good Books of Fiction by American Authors.”

On one hand, Gold Star List simply guided undecided and open-minded patrons. On the other hand, Paine’s plainspoken editorial asides betray the satiric tone previously found in Monday Sermons. His juxtaposition of “superior value” and “excellent reading” with “current novels” underscores the scarcity of popular American fiction found on ALA lists and in Great Books discussion groups. He acknowledges that his lists are not the “best,” but he continues to characterize the selections as “gold star” books. The pamphlet’s value reflects its compilation – patron preference over elevated taste, American novels over the canonical classics of Western civilization. In addition to his own observations, Paine surveyed department heads and branch librarians on the borrowing trends they had observed each year, and he incorporated suggestions and criticism offered by the
The validating emphasis on popular preference and ordinary habits ironically elevated Gold Star List above the affected opinions of rarefied experts.

Each year, Paine contributed a paragraph or two that reminded readers of the pamphlet’s purpose. In his prefatory remarks to the inaugural 1919 issue, Paine explained, “[This list] does not pretend to include all the good fiction of American authors, but it will in successive editions aim to include all American authors of superior merit, and to see that they are represented by worthy specimens of their work.” In 1925, he wrote, “[The list] retains its former peculiarities, confining itself to interesting books by American authors, specializing in historical backgrounds and local color, and endeavoring, in these trying times, to be rather prudish than daring in its recommendations.” Paine echoed this sentiment in 1929, writing, “Fashions in fiction have changed, but the purpose of this publication remains fixed.” Then, in 1933, he explained, “Any book which has survived the weeding out process for ten years is worthy of attention. There must be something in it.” In the 1942 edition, the last Gold Star List he edited, Paine maintained, “If we have erred it has been on the side of prudishness, and we aren’t a bit ashamed of it.”

Paine’s reference to “trying times” might suggest economic uncertainty and instability, but the 1920s were generally a period of vigorous economic growth. Instead, Paine characterizes the fiction debates and the emergence of middlebrow culture as trying, with a connotation of pedantic and annoying, rather than difficult. When Paine reminds his reader that “fashions in fiction have changed,” he alludes to society’s tempered acceptance of fiction, as long as it was perceived as artful. Yet, the “fixed” purpose of Gold Star List is to affirm the enduring, unpretentious preferences of “unfashionable” and average library patrons. Indeed, even in its own time, the annual list included novels that were out of print and out of fashion but that remained popular among readers in Onondaga County. Finally, Paine’s frequent confession of “prudishness” might engender a correlation between Gold Star List and parochial sexual propriety. However, Paine chooses the word for its self-mocking irony. Just as “perceived merit” wryly characterizes and elevates the unassuming reading preferences of the average library
patron, so too does “prudish,” with its secondary meaning, affirm the modest, plain, and unpretentious opinions expressed in Gold Star List.

Linked to the Gold Star List, Paine’s literary maps were cartographic summaries of his reading philosophy and commitment to unaffected taste. In a single and accessible document, Paine compiled appealing stories that were full of violence, adventure, and intrigue. As an alternative to middlebrow “social pedagogy,” a literary map could convey a reading program in a single, affordable document that encouraged a self-directed and spatialized approach to popular fiction. Unlike more expensive, linear, and regularly taught Great Books curricula, facilitated by qualified group leaders armed with Adler’s 130-page Manual for Discussion Groups, Paine’s maps were perfect for the farmer or labourer who might make occasional time for some “good reading.” The hyper-masculine tone and frontier sensibilities were there to engage proud American men who would not otherwise stick with a book. It was not so much unchecked cultural chauvinism that led Paine to marginalize the literary contributions of women, minorities, and immigrants on his maps. It was not so much out-of-hand bellicosity that led him to celebrate American literature in terms of frontier violence and aggressive expansion. Rather, Paine believed that such selections and themes would encourage poor and working-class men to read more than Aristotle or Shakespeare ever could. If Great Books was the Masterpiece Theatre of middlebrow culture, a literary map was Gunsmoke.

As Paine’s maps became common sights in public libraries and storefronts, educators began to incorporate them in their classrooms. Remember that a small number of literary maps circulated in anthologies prior to the publication of Wilstach’s Bookman designs. Such maps typically depicted biographical or historical information relevant to British literature. Even after Wilstach introduced a more discursive category of literary map – one particularly suited for American literature – few anthologies included the genre prior to World War I. But as historian Susan Schulten has demonstrated, the use of maps and cartographic concepts in disciplines other than geography increased after the war. Geography as an independent course of study steadily disappeared from interwar
curricula, as social studies absorbed human geography and general science absorbed physical geography. Literary map production increased alongside the erosion of geography as a standalone discipline, in part because teachers found that their students had a waning geographic vocabulary with which to contextualize imaginative literature and literary history. Yet, the modest increase of literary map production immediately after the war continued to emphasize British texts and authors.

The Riverside Press’s *Short Stories of America* (1921) is one of the first anthologies to include a U.S. literary map. Edited by Robert L. Ramsay, an English professor at the University of Missouri, the volume featured *A Map of the Principal Local Color Regions of the United States* (fig. 16) as its frontispiece. As the map’s title suggests, the anthology sought to familiarize high school and university students with “the movement known variously as American regionalism, Local Color, or the Spirit of Home.” A map that identified local colour regions, then, seemed especially useful. Ramsay explained in the volume’s introduction, “To understand the regionalistic movement in America, the study of American literature and American geography must go hand in hand. Only upon a map may the peculiar character and the interrelations of diverse districts which have been chosen as backgrounds be adequately appreciated.”

The unprecedented inclusion of a U.S. literary map in an anthology drew the attention of John C. French, a librarian and English professor at Johns Hopkins University. When French reviewed *Short Stories of America* in *Modern Language Notes*, he distinguished the book as “an example of good workmanship” and commended Ramsay for the literary map, which “made concrete […] the regions already exploited by the local colorist.” The now familiar reference to exploitation continued the claiming rhetoric that had previously surrounded Wilstach’s *Bookman* designs. Like Ramsay had in his introduction, French reinforced the perceived connection between U.S. literary maps and local colour fiction. Linked to the style in this way, the long-term usefulness and relevance of literary maps seemed tenuous, as unclaimed regions inevitably disappeared and as local colour writing declined in popularity.

Although softened, the connection between literary maps and local colour continued in Norman Foerster’s *American Poetry and Prose*, which was also published by the
Riverside Press. When Foerster revised his popular university anthology in 1934, he asked one of his doctoral students at the University of Iowa to contribute two maps: Boston and Vicinity and Literary Frontiers and Local-Color Regions.\textsuperscript{78} The latter is the larger and more interesting of the two designs (fig. 17). Printed on the anthology’s front endpapers, the map illustrates the successive movement of America’s “literary frontier” and identifies eight remaining local colour regions west of the Mississippi River. Unlike Ramsay’s map, which divides the entire United States into local colour districts, Literary Frontiers and Local-Color Regions links the waning style to western provincialism. East of the Missouri River, the map demarcates state lines and labels major cities. The suggestion is that the eastern half of the country, where local colour regions no longer exist, now subscribes to a more sophisticated, developed literary style. The map also identifies traditional territories of eleven American Indian nations east of the Missouri River. These labels do not so much validate or recognize Native literatures; indeed, Foerster reminds students that “American literature has no prehistoric period. It has no dim past: it merely began.”\textsuperscript{79} Rather, references to the Choctaw, Creek, and Cherokee nations help readers geographically locate anthologized selections, such as William Byrd’s The History of the Dividing Line, that reference Indians. The labels speak to a more settled and secure East, which can recall fondly the Native peoples who were forcibly pushed westward by pioneers and settlers. Harvard professor Howard Mumford Jones called Foerster’s revised anthology “remarkably successful,” and part of that success came from the map of “the physical frontier and literary ‘frontiers.’”\textsuperscript{80} When the local colour movement finally ended, American Poetry and Prose no longer needed a map of the literary frontier, and Foerster removed it from subsequent editions of his anthology.

A Map of the Principal Local Color Regions of the United States and Literary Frontiers and Local-Color Regions both link the cartographic genre to local colour and the existence of undeveloped literary regions. Despite favourable reviews, the stylistic emphasis of the two designs undermined the prolonged classroom use of discursive literary maps. Paine’s designs, on the other hand, incorporated local colour fiction in in a more tempered way, and they helped to institutionalize literary maps as necessary “equipment” for English teachers.
Through newspapers and journal reviews, advertisements, and window displays, English teachers and professors learned more and more about Paine’s literary maps. While some educators had slowly begun to incorporate literary maps in their classrooms after World War I, Paine’s designs quickly popularized school use of the genre. Public Schools of Cleveland was one of the first to comment on the pedagogical value of Paine’s maps. In December 1924, the board’s magazine, School Topics, reprinted Map of Good Stories on its front page. The editors wrote, “[Maps] and rabbit holes exercise an irresistible fascination, a map always, and a rabbit hole when associated with a white rabbit. But if the ordinary latitude and longitude has its attractions, the Map of Good Stories prepared by the Syracuse Public Library is doubly interesting.” When the map was hung in a high school library, the magazine reported, “Joy in the discovery of the familiar vied with the interest in the names of characters and scenes unknown to the observers.”

In turn, School Review, the predecessor of the American Journal of Education, commended Cleveland’s school board for acquiring, displaying, and then reprinting Paine’s map. It noted, “Teachers of English would do well to secure this map and make their pupils acquainted with it.” Likewise, the English Journal recommended Map of Good Stories, along with The Northward Map of Truthful Tales, as a “valuable adjunct for the literature classroom, the library, or equipment of the English teacher” that could “stimulate and unify subject work.”

The following year, the English Journal reviewed three more of Paine’s literary maps. The Map of America’s Making marked “both an innovation and a return to the fine old art of map-making,” while Booklovers Map of America finally allowed “all real teachers of literature” to “take the child up on a great and high mountain and let him look down upon the kingdom of good books of America.” The “distinctive, finely made wall-map done in beautifully blended colors […] would be an ornament to a private library and will be a rallying point and constant stimulus in any schoolroom or school library.” The writer said of Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls:

The sum of human adventure – stories, trails, voyages, explorations, and places to read about – how can they be lumped together, related and unified for boys and girls, for fathers, mothers, and grandparents, and all those who still feel the thrill and fascinations of Moby Dick, Paul Bunyan, Ulysses, Kim, and Wrangel Island?
The answer is this alluring, illustrated wall-map done in colors and furnished with a book list.83

The favourable reception of Paine’s maps – and the material formats in which Bowker issued them – normalized the genre’s place in the nation’s classrooms. Enthusiastic reviewers and literary map advertisements encouraged schoolteachers and university professors to acquire copies, and even somewhat reserved commentators acknowledged their pedagogical value. The Peabody Journal of Education, for one, questioned the prices of Paine’s maps as “somewhat too high,” but it nonetheless found them to be “Most attractive and stimulating wall maps, locating the scenes of books pupils will want to read. Whimsical; provoking; teasing. When they are posted (one by one), there should be a shelf or window-ledge of books close by.”84 While it is difficult to generalize how whimsical, provoking, or teasing schoolchildren actually found Paine’s literary maps to be, we can consider how teachers featured them in the classroom, as well as the material evidence left on the documents themselves.

In 1930, a high school English teacher named Carrie Belle Parks contributed a lesson plan to English Journal. Designed for a freshman class, Parks’s “literature of exploration and aviation” unit consisted of now-forgotten travel narratives such as David Binney Putnam’s David Goes Voyaging (1925); Deric Nusbaum’s Deric in Mesa Verde (1928); and William Beebe’s Jungle Peace (1918), Galápagos: World’s End (1924), and The Arcturus Adventure (1926). The focal point of the lesson plan was Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls: “[The map] should be posted for several days in advance of the lesson. […] Begin the lesson itself by pointing to certain routes on the map and asking pupils to identify these adventures without being near enough to read the names: Columbus, Odysseus, the Pilgrims.”85 Paine’s map was, perhaps, an obvious choice for the unit. Putnam, Nusbaum, and Beebe were twentieth-century adventurers who epitomized the romantic and sentimental qualities that Paine had long celebrated. Putnam’s aviation mentor and future stepmother, for example, was Amelia Earhart, and Beebe was a close friend of Paine’s hero, Theodore Roosevelt. On his popular map, Paine juxtaposed their contemporary exploits with Melville’s Moby-Dick, Wister’s The Virginian, Grey’s Riders of the Purple Sage, and other imaginative adventures.
Parks received her master’s degree from Columbia University and later taught at Indiana State Teacher’s College. She may have learned about Paine’s literary maps by reading a review or seeing an advertisement in a journal or magazine. She may have also been familiar with Paine’s maps from her time at Syracuse University, where she earned her bachelor’s degree. Either way, the lesson plan suggests how other teachers might have already been using, or would soon use, Paine’s maps. Parks affirmed for English teachers the benefits of Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls and showed that teachers of other subjects could incorporate it in their classrooms as well. Social studies teachers, for instance, might “[add] to Paul Paine’s map new routes of adventures, such as Lindbergh’s flights, Beebe’s trip to the Sargasso Sea, Byrd’s and other expeditions.” Parks invited teachers, and by extension students, to interact physically with the literary map – to use and amend it rather than fetishize it as a museum piece.

By 1934 – a decade after Paine first published A Map of Good Stories – literary maps had been accepted as necessary “equipment” for the “English laboratory.” On one hand, the link between the cartographic genre and equipment reflects professional anxieties and the scientific posturing of many English teachers and literary scholars throughout the twentieth century. On the other hand, access to such “equipment,” according to one English teacher, would “greatly advance the essential object of our work in literature.” Along with the phonograph, radio, and film projector, Paine’s “brightly colored and challenging” literary maps could “[stir] the imagination of the stodgiest student.” The writer concluded, “English is an important subject: it is accorded more time than any other school subject. […] In view of the amount of time given to English, does it seem unfair to ask that its classroom be at least as well equipped as are those for such subjects as physics, chemistry, home economics, general science, and manual training?”

Journals, publishers, and teachers continued making the association between literary maps and equipment until the 1960s – when the genre began to lose its lustre. In a 1956 advertisement, for example, the National Council of Teachers of English claimed, “A literary map brings the reality of literature into the classroom – helps the all-important visualization of literary and historical locales.” In another advertisement, the NCTE asked rhetorically, “Does Literature Need a Crutch? No, of course not. Any literary
selection can and should stand or fall on its own merits. The literature doesn’t need help, but undergraduates do.”

At the end of 1959, the Christian Science Monitor’s education editor noted that literary maps are “especially attractive to young people” and recalled, “When I was teaching high-school English I fairly pounced on any such maps that I discovered. I lined the walls with them. Students loved to stand before them in my classroom, searching out the history of folklore, or the voyages of Ulysses, or the locale of historical novels on their outside reading list.” In addition to making an “exciting decoration for the family playroom or the teen-ager’s bedroom,” a literary map could be used by teachers to “inspire student-initiated reading excursions, to improve reading skills, to encourage reluctant readers, to improve library skills, to develop [one’s] ability to express ideas orally, to stimulate creative writing, to introduce a unit of study, to extend the geographical concept.”

Paine’s designs were pivotal in establishing an educational market for U.S. literary maps, and thinking of his maps as “equipment” or “crutches” – as opposed to posters or even wall maps – helps us contextualize their circulation in interwar classrooms. This approach helps us interpret what appear to be low survival rates as evidence of print culture significance rather than unimportance. Martha Hopkins has commented on the general dearth of literary maps in today’s libraries and archives: “[Because] they were often displayed on classroom walls, then discarded when they became tattered, many [literary maps] have become scarce. Moreover, because they were printed in limited editions, not always formally copyrighted, and distributed locally for only a short time, they may not have come into library collections.” Paine’s maps were formally copyrighted, widely circulated, and kept in print for decades. Yet, they are as rare as more obscure designs.

As published lesson plans and contemporary advertisements suggest, Paine’s maps were not simply hung on classroom walls. Indeed, they invited tactile engagement, the type of marginal interaction and physical handling that accelerates even the most valued document’s deterioration or destruction. On copies that do survive, it is not uncommon to see pencil or crayon marks, where a student, teacher, or librarian corrected Paine’s inconsistent spelling, added or crossed out a reference, or annotated a section of the map.
Surviving copies typically have pushpin holes, and many have irregular creases – both suggestive of classroom display, desktop use, and summer storage. And while Paine’s Bowker maps were advertised with accompanying indexes, these supplementary book lists survive at an even lower rate than the maps themselves. Literary maps and their indexes were not kept in a drawer; they were used in actual classroom environments where documents are separated, misplaced, and destroyed.\(^9^3\)

Today, surviving literary maps offer clues about what teachers were teaching and what students were reading at a particular moment in time – or at least what they were perceived to be teaching and wanting to read. A literary map can help scholars illustrate or complicate accepted reception histories of canonical and forgotten texts. For example, the labels “In these waters Captain Ahab pursued ‘Moby Dick’ the White Whale” and “Where Paul Bunyan Comes From” on Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls – as well as the English Journal’s reference to “the thrill and fascination” of these specific references – says much about Ahab and Bunyan’s relationship to interwar schoolchildren. Published in 1925, Paine’s map exposed students to Moby-Dick at roughly the same time that Carl Van Doren, Vernon L. Parrington, and D.H. Lawrence were re-exposing scholars to the novel.\(^9^4\) Paine mapped Paul Bunyan shortly after W.B. Laughead began introducing mainstream America to the lumberjack and two years before the publication of James Cloyd Bowman’s The Adventures of Paul Bunyan, which has been cited as the first children’s book about the folk hero. Paine’s map informed students of Bunyan four years before the Encyclopedia Britannica did and thirty-four years before Walt Disney’s animated short supposedly made him a household name.\(^9^5\) As artifacts, then, literary maps offer evidence that can help us track the critical and schoolroom ascendency or decline of individual texts. But how did Paine’s contemporaries use his literary maps as equipment? What did they supply the classroom technician? One could argue that literary maps are simply passive objects that help students and teachers spatially contextualize narrative action or the relationship between multiple texts. Like an inert crutch, literary maps are functional only through the energy of the user. They are not so much interpretive devices for individual pieces of literature; rather they are aids to a user’s existing curiosity, imagination, and analytical perspective, or prior knowledge of literary history.
Despite the scientific metaphors, however, literary maps are not unbiased instruments, objective charts, or passive documents. Like any other cartographic representation of space, the genre is a highly subjective epistemological category that gives undue authority and influence to the mapmaker’s worldview or intention. In discussing the power and politics of cartography, the political scientist Arthur Jay Klinghoffer has recently noted, “Maps appear to be definitive because they do not provide caveats or indicate speculation as do written texts.” It is, in part, through his or her omission of caveats that a mapmaker exerts a different type of social influence than an imaginative writer or traditional scholar. Presented in cartographic form, Paine’s rendition of and contribution to the literary and cultural landscape was perceived and discussed by many as definitive, needing amendment only as future adventures and historical events dictated. His maps circulated in classrooms without the proviso that they were also designed with a non-reading adult demographic in mind – poor and working-class white American men with limited leisure time and patience. And through this unqualified cloak of objectivity, Paine’s maps quietly re-inscribed for students many of the literary and cultural assumptions that were simultaneously being challenged by unprecedented immigration, the Great Migration, the aftermath of World War I, and the rise of American Studies.

Inspired by Paine’s outreach efforts – and backed by the deceptive authority of cartography – the numerous editions of Map of Good Stories, Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls, and Booklovers Map of America highlighted for students and English teachers the primacy of Anglo-Saxon men, not just in the United States but also the world. Female characters who do appear on Paine’s maps, like Willa Cather’s Ántonia Shimerda, typically occupy stereotypically masculine roles in their respective fictional, and often rural, milieus. Even as literary trends changed and traditional gender roles were challenged after World War I, Paine’s maps preserved the centrality of masculinity, local colour, Westerns, and romantic fiction.

Published in 1939 on the eve of World War II, Paine’s last map offers a literary landscape that is rather different from the one depicted in Map of Good Stories. For one thing, the third edition of Booklovers Map of America (fig. 13) acknowledges colonial print culture, with references to the 1640 Cambridge printing press, Benjamin Franklin,
Thomas Paine, and the Declaration of Independence. Immigrants, such as O.E. Rølvaag, and African Americans, such as Booker T. Washington and Paul Laurence Dunbar, also dilute the primacy of white authors born in the United States. And, despite the map’s title, the emphasis on the codex is softened: the metaphoric binding is gone and the literary landscape now encompasses books, songs, film, and folklore. In his final map, Paine offered a tempered acknowledgement of an increasingly pluralistic society. Nonetheless, Booklovers Map of America continues to reinforce the connection between U.S. literature and literary settlement – the connection Wilstach had established with his Bookman designs. Massachusetts Bay, for example, is labelled as the “Birthplace of American Literature,” a label that suggests seventeenth-century Pilgrims transplanted books and literary culture to a blank New World. The conceit of Booklovers Map of America – the common conceit that has distinguished U.S. literary maps since 1898 – remains that of a literary and cultural terra nullis. In his last map, Paine enlarged the cast of literary settlers, but, in popularizing the genre for classroom use, he did not alter Wilstach’s fundamental equation.

In spite of their biased depictions of America’s literary landscape, and continued effacement of Indigenous literary contributions, Paine’s designs did ensure the genre’s place in interwar classrooms, and, as shown in the next chapter, they anticipated the pivotal role literary maps played in at least one critical debate of the twentieth-century. Even as that mid-century debate unfolded between literary folklorists and their anthropological counterparts, Paine remembered fondly the maps that had helped set the stage. In the spring of 1947, Paine hosted a dinner party at his “modest brick mansion” on Frontier Avenue in Syracuse for a group of journalists. One of his guests brought with her two kittens named Willie and Mona Lisa. The playful pair stole the attention of Paine’s guests: “I tried to entertain them by reading “Alice in Wonderland,” but they were more interested in this mad pursuit [of the kittens]. Who can blame them.”

Try as he might, Paine could not regain the attention of his guests. That is until he showed them his maps – the same maps he had shown business leaders and library patrons throughout Syracuse, the same maps librarians and teachers had used around the world. “I got out some copies of the colored maps I used to make, and they were
specially pleased with the Map of Adventures.” Ultimately, Willie and Mona Lisa could not compete with Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls because, as Paine once reminded us, “There may be romance in such a map, if you look closely enough.”
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Chapter 3
“Scholars might complain”: Fakelore Heroes on Maps of American Folklore

The people, the bookless people, they made Paul Bunyan and had him alive long before he got into books for those who read.

–William Gropper, “Paul Bunyan”

Lumberjacks did not tell Paul Bunyan stories.

–Richard M. Dorson, Bloodstoppers & Bearwalkers

Paul Bunyan was put on the map, quite literally, in 1925. That year Paul Mayo Paine placed the label “Where Paul Bunyan Came From” on Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls, just south of Hudson Strait and Ungava Bay. In the years that followed, Paine included the larger-than-life lumberjack on The Northward Map of Truthful Tales, Map of Good Stories, World of Stories, and all three editions of Booklovers Map of America. In fact, Paul Bunyan became a fixture of Paine’s literary maps, gradually moving westward with each subsequent design. On the 1939 edition of Booklovers Map of America – Paine’s last map – the simple label “Paul Bunyan” appears near Puget Sound. Seemingly, over the course of fourteen years, the folk hero had axed his way from northeastern Québec to the Pacific Ocean.

More than three decades after Paine made the first reference to the legendary lumberjack on a U.S. literary map, Walt Disney Pictures released its animated Paul Bunyan. The 1959 Academy Award-nominated featurette opens in a library, with a globe turned to North America in the foreground. The camera pans past a wall of books and zooms to American Folk Lore, a large folio propped against the shelves. As the volume comes into view, the narrator explains,

These are the books about America – its history, its geography, and its heroes. But it takes a big book like this one to tell the story of American folklore – the tall tales about men doing big things in a big country. Men like Captain Stormalong, Joe Magarac, John Henry, Pecos Bill, and the fellow who towers above them all – Paul Bunyan.¹
With the first mention of Paul Bunyan, *American Folk Lore* opens itself to a blank map of North America, save for the Alleghenies, the Rockies, and vast tracts of boreal forest. To the sound of a call-and-response choir and a saloon-style piano, the looming shadow of the woodcutter and his giant axe rises in the East and moves steadily westward. Upon reaching the Pacific Ocean, the metonymic silhouette fills the continent and symbolically closes America’s mythic frontier.

In their respective depictions of Paul Bunyan’s lumbering progress, Paine and Disney conflated books, folklore, and the frontier myth. Of course, such a conflation was hardly new in the twentieth century – Washington Irving’s Geoffrey Crayon had done something similar with his accounts of Rip Van Winkle and Ichabod Crane a century earlier. But Paine’s literary maps and Disney’s animated film added to this mix a cartographic ingredient that tacitly asserted the colloquial sameness of literature and folklore. Their assertions bookended, roughly, a period of U.S. literary map production in which a series of high-profile designs likewise blended books and folk traditions in a generic blurring of the written and spoken word. These widely circulated literary maps reinforced within the popular imagination a critically contested cast of folk heroes who symbolized the “common man” and his settlement of the now-closed frontier.

In this chapter, I focus on four literary maps: William Gropper’s *America: Its Folklore*, published by Associated American Artists in 1946; John Dukes McKee’s *American Folklore & Legends*, designed for a popular history textbook in 1951; James Lewicki’s *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths*, printed in *Life* magazine in 1960; and Frank Soltesz’s *Folklore and Legends of Our Country*, commissioned by Esso Standard in 1960. The publication and circulation of these maps coincided with the American public’s increased appetite for and commodification of homegrown folk traditions in the decades following the Great Depression and World War II. Particularly after witnessing wartime atrocities, many Americans grew disillusioned with Europe and European traditions and sought homespun legends and tall tales instead. As the public became increasingly interested in American folklore, scholars were sharply divided over the nature, scope, and definition of the field. Folklorists trained in literary studies emphasized all unlettered traditions within literate communities of European and Euro-American settler societies,
while folklorists trained as anthropologists and historians studied the oral traditions of non-Western, supposedly bookless people. In the absence of scholarly agreement, non-academic literary mapmakers wielded considerable influence when they employed the newly popularized cartographic genre. Through their colourful designs, William Gropper, John Dukes McKee, James Lewicki, and Frank Soltesz obfuscated scholarly debate and bolstered within the collective consciousness a national folklore drawn from both the oral tradition and popular print culture. Their maps treated literature and folklore as synonymous resources once found on the mythic frontier. While individual claims were replaced with collective ones, the genre’s conceptual framework of exploration, settlement, and conquest of Native space remained largely in place.

Perhaps more than any other literary map in history, William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore reminds us that cartographic depictions of literature are anything but neutral acts. Printed in bright Gelatone colors on heavy stock paper, the 86 x 59 cm map presents sixty-one legends, tall tales, and literary heroes across a traditional projection of the United States (fig. 18). The vibrant figures range from Longfellow’s Evangeline in Maine to con man Death Valley Scotty in eastern California, from Idaho’s Famous Potato to Edward Everett Hale’s Philip Nolan. Ornamental wildlife, of the sylvan and desert varieties, cover neighbouring Canada and Mexico, respectively, and a dark red bald eagle serves as a patriotic cartouche in the lower left. While international borders are clearly demarcated, regional differences are not emphasized. State boundaries appear as understated dotted lines, and there is little space left between individual figures. Rather than depict an open literary frontier, which the local colourist might exploit and control, America: Its Folklore presents the resulting traditions of concluded settlement. Glancing at the map, it appears as if America will burst with all of the exaggerated stories and unique traditions it accumulated in the process of nation building.

America: Its Folklore is based on a painting William Gropper completed in 1945. At the time, Gropper was a renowned social realist cartoonist, muralist, and painter at the height of his career. The following year, Associated American Artists (AAA) reproduced his
painting as part of a middlebrow lithograph series that also included Aaron Bohrod’s America: Its History and Paul Sample’s America: Its Soil. Since 1937, AAA had sold affordable lithographs and etchings by social realist and regionalist artists, including Gropper, Thomas Hart Benton, John S. Curry, and Grant Wood. These signed limited editions, most of which sold by mail order for $5, were marketed toward middle-class Americans in newspapers and magazines such as the New York Times and Life. In 1942, AAA began selling unsigned prints of pictorial maps, which were quite large compared to the lithographs and etchings that were already available. These “breath-taking panoramas” of American geography, history, and culture were marketed as “stunning addition[s] to any home, office, library or school.”

According to at least one English teacher, William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore was, in fact, the valuable classroom addition that AAA advertisements claimed it to be. In describing a newly developed folklore unit, this teacher wrote in English Journal that high school juniors needed to “realize that America has a background of tradition which is the source of pride and inspiration to her people.” By studying folklore at the beginning of the school year, students could learn about the “peculiarly American characteristics that all Americans can enjoy and claim as their own.” Indeed, a folklore unit was essential “preparation for later work” that would help students “become aware of and understand somewhat the characteristics of the main regions which have influenced American life and writing.” Echoing those who had reviewed Paine’s literary maps prior to World War II, the English Journal contributor celebrated Gropper’s “fine wall map” as “an attractive center of interest” for student learning.

Perhaps more teachers would have commented publicly on the usefulness of Gropper’s map had not someone at the U.S. State Department also recognized the design’s patriotic spirit and edifying value – a recognition that would ultimately lead to the map’s disrepute. Shortly after the map’s publication, the State Department began purchasing copies of America: Its Folklore for its Overseas Library Program. Established in 1942, the propaganda initiative sought to “provide foreign communities throughout the world with facts and solidly documented explanations of the United States, its people, geography, culture, science, government, institutions and thinking; in short, the American
scene.”⁴ Over the course of a decade, the State Department gathered over two million volumes that helped “protect the good name of the American people, no less than their vital interests.”⁵ U.S. literary maps had already proved popular around the world, and America: Its Folklore was an attractive showcase of the nation’s unique cultural heritage and rousing sense of humour. Between 1946 and 1952, the Overseas Library Program placed 1,744 copies of the map in “some 100 information centers throughout the world.”⁶

Then, in the summer of 1953, State Department librarians began to systematically destroy copies of William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore, along with 30,000 other items that had been written, painted, and designed by roughly 300 “Communists or fellow travelers.”⁷ The items had been identified when Roy Cohn made a highly publicized tour of State Department libraries that spring. Cohn, chief counsel to Senator Joseph McCarthy’s Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, labelled Gropper one of the many “fringe supporters and sympathizers” whose supposedly Communist-directed works had infiltrated the Overseas Library Program.⁸ Based on Cohn’s report, McCarthy subpoenaed the artist to appear on Capitol Hill, and on May 6, 1953, William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore became the most notorious literary map in history.

Over the course of fifteen public hearings and many more closed executive sessions in Washington, New York, Boston, Los Angeles, Albany, and Houston, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations examined 546 witnesses as part of its investigation of the Overseas Library Program. Of the 215 witnesses questioned in televised public sessions, seventy-one refused to answer questions about their political affiliations, under the protection of the Fifth Amendment. When witnesses refused to answer questions, McCarthy promptly blacklisted them. Gropper’s experience was like that of many others. His interrogation began simply: “Are you a member of the Communist Party?”⁹

Between 1921 and 1923, Gropper had drawn a series of elongated caricatures of bestselling authors for the Bookman, and in 1935 his irreverent depiction of Emperor Hirohito in Vanity Fair aggravated a diplomatic crisis between the U.S. and Japan. In the 1930s, Gropper produced a number of widely exhibited paintings and lithographs that depicted the hypocrisy and nonsensicality of McCarthy’s Senate colleagues. Gropper’s murals even decorated the Department of the Interior building just west of the Capitol. But it was Gropper’s affiliation with the Yiddish newspaper Morning Freiheit and his unpaid work for the left-wing leaning magazines New Masses and Daily Worker that alarmed the Subcommittee. Though Gropper never joined the Communist Party, his connections with New Masses and Daily Worker were indictment enough. As far as McCarthy and Cohn were concerned, they already knew the answer to their opening question.

Mr. Gropper. I refuse to answer under the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment [sic], on the grounds that I might bear witness against myself.

The Chairman. The answer might tend to incriminate you; is that right?

Mr. Gropper. Yes.

Mr. Cohn. Are you the William Gropper who has prepared various maps?

Mr. Gropper. I don’t understand that question. Prepared various maps?

Mr. Cohn. Did you prepare a map entitled “America, Its Folklore”?

Mr. Gropper. Have you got the map here?

Mr. Cohn. No; I don’t have the map here. Did you prepare a map entitled “America, Its Folklore”?

Mr. Gropper. I painted a map on American folklore, yes.

The back-and-forth continued. Gropper testified that he had not received money directly or indirectly from the State Department for copies of his map. He explained that a “publishing firm” – Associated American Artists – had paid him an advance, but “no royalties came in.” When asked by Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri if an individual “could be a member of the Communist party and at the same time be a good, loyal American,” Gropper demurred, “You see, I am an artist. I am primarily an artist. I am not in with this political business that you people are involved in. I would rather talk about my field, where I am equipped. I don’t understand these things.”
McCarthy attempted to bait Gropper further, by acknowledging that “people in your field, writers, authors, and I assume even mapmakers” had often joined the Community Party out of necessity – in order to secure favourable reviews in the left-leaning press.

MR. GROPPER. But, Senator, I do not think you understand. I do not write books. I am not an author. I don’t even make maps. I am a painter.

THE CHAIRMAN. But when you draw folklore maps, that is to a certain extent being an author. You are authoring the map.

MR. GROPPER. No, sir.

Gropper’s affected coyness about the map and his reluctance to discuss “political business” belie his reputation as an adept and biting political satirist. His blunt response to McCarthy’s assertion that drawing a map is at the same time authoring a map contradicts the keen appreciation for pictorial narrative that had made Gropper famous in the first place. Though he attempted to distance himself from his map, Gropper was undoubtedly aware that, as a social realist artist, he was simultaneously authoring political narratives. And in the case of America: Its Folklore, he occupied the multifarious position of artist, mapmaker, and anthologizer.

Art historians have questioned McCarthy’s motives regarding William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore, arguing that the map is anything but offensive, subversive, or contentious. Norman Steinberg, for example, has suggested that “only John Brown,” who appears in eastern Kansas, “might be a controversial choice because of the civil rights implications.” August L. Freundlich has explained, “Apparently the Senator or his staff felt that anyone who had published cartoons in so many liberal and left-wing publications should not be allowed to make pictures for the government.” And Louis Lozowick has claimed, “There was nothing ‘subversive’ in the map itself; the suspicious feature seemed to be that the government was distributing a picture by an artist with left-wing associations.”

Lozowick and Freundlich are partially right. As the historian David M. Oshinsky has demonstrated, private citizens with radical sympathies made for “natural villains ideally suited to the chairman’s immediate needs.” Gropper’s association with socialist periodicals and his left-leaning political views were serious liabilities that got him into hot water with a powerful adversary. Steinberg’s suggestion that the map itself was hardly controversial, however, is less accurate. Approached from a literary or
folkloric perspective, the map is not the neutral or inconsequential document that art historians and Gropper have made it out to be.

Well before Gropper’s career and reputation were destroyed by what he called the “American Inquisition” – years before librarians and teachers burned and shredded copies of the controversial map – a high school English teacher from Pennsylvania foresaw contention.12 In an article published in Holiday magazine, Robert J. Cadigan described an accompanying two-page reproduction of Gropper’s map as a “two-fisted cartograph of American folklore.”13 He urged Holiday’s readers to acquire copies of the map and to “go along with Gropper and include some of the stories that came not from unknowns but from the name writers of their time.” Gropper was himself a “legend” and “crusader,” who had “let his fancy run as wild as the stories themselves and [had thrown] in a few good characters from literature and history for good measure – all on a map of America.” Cadigan acknowledged that the inclusion of literary figures would be, at least in some circles, at odds with the purported emphasis on folklore. He predicted, “Scholars might complain about [Gropper’s] cast of characters and where he placed them, but folklore, like spring, is always bustin’ out all over, anyway.”14 Even before McCarthy and Cohn had gotten around to it, America: Its Folklore was a charged document. Its contentiousness was not the result of Gropper’s politics, so much as his colloquial definition of folklore.

Folklore has been the subject of scholarly debate for generations. Between the founding of the American Folklore Society in 1888 and the establishment of folklore doctoral programs in the middle of the twentieth century, the field was especially divided. Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt has described this period as one marked by “complex struggle” between “those in anthropology and those in literature” who sought to “carve up and claim intellectual domains.”15 The most contentious issue during this period was the definition of “folk.” Scholars trained in anthropology and history advocated rigorous fieldwork and the collection of oral traditions found among non-Western populations, especially American Indians. Those trained in literature departments, on the other hand, typically studied unlettered traditions of otherwise literate Western society. For anthropologists and historians, folklore was a narrowly defined concept found among
broadly defined and often marginalized groups. For literary scholars, it was a broadly defined concept found among the masses of the dominant group. The two schools of thought did, however, share a common interest in African American traditions. The once “stark division” that existed between the literary and anthropological folklorists steadily diminished with the professionalization of folklore studies and the founding of autonomous graduate programs beginning around 1960.16

While Zumwalt has chronicled a moment of “dissent” among folklorists, Simon J. Bronner has more recently characterized the same period as one marked by “acrimonious debates between academic Richard Dorson and various artists, editors, and public officials” over the definition of folklore.17 Following the travails of the Great Depression and disillusionment with Europe after World War II, Americans attempted to locate a unique cultural heritage in tall tales and legends about the nation’s transition from frontier wilderness to industrialized state. Through homespun demigods, popular culture celebrated U.S. exceptionalism and the “common man.” Concurrently, scholars in the emerging field of American Studies looked to folklore as a consequential expression of “cultural as well as political democracy – built on the consensus of pluralism among common people – in a new troubled age corrupted by abuses of capitalism, racism, and technology.”18 To Dorson’s eyes, however, interdisciplinary Americanists and the general public were confusing ersatz pulp for authentic folklore.

Dorson was a commanding and witty writer who bemoaned what he saw as the adulteration and commercialization of American folklore. After earning his degree from Harvard in 1943 – one of the first to complete the school’s History of American Civilization doctoral program – Dorson taught at Michigan State University and later directed Indiana University’s Folklore Institute. Throughout his long and influential career, Dorson dismissed the authenticity and relevance of newly discovered folk heroes whose popularity blossomed as the twentieth century unfolded. He first drew scholarly attention in 1941, with an essay that tried to make sense of “America’s unique contribution to the world’s store of folklore.” Dorson stated, “From a nation lean in folk annals and too short-lived to boast an heroic age there has suddenly sprung a knavish breed of blustering superheroes.” While these demigods displayed “distinctively
American humor and local color,” Dorson questioned the roles a “standardizing literary mill” and “literary manufacture” had played in their creation. For too many Americans, Dorson argued, Paul Bunyan was the archetypal folk hero. Yet, the stories Americans read and retold about the lumberjack had been fabricated in print – they were not authentic tales or yarns collected in the field. Dorson debunked Bunyan as a “literary tale” and a “recent ludicrous episode” – an accusation he would repeat throughout his career.19

Contrary to Dorson’s insistence that folklore could only be collected and studied through rigorous fieldwork, Benjamin A. Botkin, who directed the Archive of American Folk Song at the Library of Congress, developed a more humanist concept of “applied folklore” that was meant to inspire artists, musicians, playwrights, authors, poets, and average Americans. In 1944, Botkin published A Treasury of American Folklore, an accessible compilation of previously circulated materials. The thick tome sold over 500,000 copies in its first year, was made a Book-of-the-Month selection, and inspired several collections of regional folklore. Communications scholar Susan G. Davis describes Botkin’s Treasury and its regional variations as “source[s] of much controversy among folklorists” that were nonetheless “strongly influential as popular presentations of folklore.”20 Dorson was alarmed by Botkin’s popular influence and attacked Botkin’s methods for decades. At a precarious moment when folklore studies was “barely lifting its head,” Botkin’s treasuries were “essentially packages of literary confections” that presented “spurious and synthetic writings under the claim that they are genuine folklore.” Dorson objected, “These productions are not collected in the field but are rewritten from earlier literary and journalistic sources in an endless regurgitation.”21

Six years after Botkin published his first treasury, Dorson repudiated it as “a chauvinist and fascist conception of folklore.” Rather than foster a true appreciation for folk traditions, Botkin was simply trying to make money with “large albums [that] stretch the term folklore out of all meaning and shrink the definition of American to old stock Anglo-Saxons.” In Dorson’s eyes, Botkin was simply peddling nationalistic propaganda. The use of A Treasury of American Folklore in schools represented a “social and cultural injustice,” that gave students a fallacious sense of a national folk tradition when “no such
thing as the lore of the nation” actually exists. For Dorson, Eastern European and Asian immigrant communities had suffered from “sugar-coating” nativism, but American Indians had “fared the worst.” The circulation of specious folklore evacuated American space of the Indigenous folk traditions that Dorson himself studied. In direct response to Botkin’s *Treasury* and its imitators, Dorson coined the term “fakelore,” which referred to all the “alleged regional demigods” that commercializing invaders and contriving publicists had fixed within the collective imagination. In addition to Paul Bunyan, Dorson spurned Old Stormalong, Joe Magarac, Tony Beaver, Bowleg Bill, and Febold Feboldson as troubling “distortions of a serious subject.”

Cadigan was correct when he suggested in the pages of *Holiday* that “scholars might complain” about *William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore*. If Botkin had anthologized manufactured stories about dubious heroes, then Gropper put them on the map. With the limited exception of African American traditions – John Henry, Old Black Joe, Frankie and Johnny, and Br’er Rabbit – the map similarly excludes non-Western sources. Hiawatha appears in northern Minnesota, but the map’s accompanying pamphlet credits Longfellow’s epic poem rather than rigorous fieldwork or Native composition. The map confines, primarily, Americaanness to Anglo-Saxon and northern European communities; it defines literary creations such as Huck Finn, the Jumping Frog of Calaveras County, Philip Nolan, Rip Van Winkle, Febold Feboldson, and Old Stormalong as legitimate folk heroes. Most prominent, however, is Paul Bunyan. The legendary lumberjack and his gang appear a total of five times – in Minnesota, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

Like many others in the 1930s and 1940s, Gropper yearned for a peculiarly American tradition that was linked to the common man. And Paul Bunyan epitomized just that:

> Who made Paul Bunyan, who gave him birth as a myth, who joked him into life as the master Lumberjack, who fashioned him forth as an apparition easing the hours of men amid axes and trees, saws and lumber? The people, the bookless people, they made Paul Bunyan and had him alive long before he got into the books for those who read. He grew up in shanties, around the hot stoves of winter, among socks and mittens drying in the smell of tobacco smoke and the roar of laughter mocking the outside of the weather. And some of Paul came overseas in
wooden bunks below decks in sailing vessels. And some of Paul is old as the hills, young as the alphabet.

For Gropper, Paul Bunyan was at once homegrown and shaped by immigrants. He was the result of communal composition and an unpretentious, unwritten past. Paul Bunyan was America, and Gropper did not understand why his cartographic celebration of that America was in any way controversial. As might be expected, Gropper was rattled after his questioning on Capitol Hill. In the sketchbook that he had brought with him that day, he hastily wrote, “When the artist pleaded that he was not a map maker and had received no royalties and invoked the Fifth Amendment on all incriminating questions… What is wrong with Amer. Folklore, why should it be banned[?]”

If not formally, America: Its Folklore was at least de facto banned. After Gropper testified, he was blacklisted, and State Department copies of his map were destroyed. On national television, Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn had challenged Gropper and his motivations to celebrate American folklore because of his political views and affiliations. In less dramatic fashion, anthropological folklorists hotly contested and dismissed the controversial scene Gropper had depicted. Consequently, William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore is most significant for its notoriety and not its sustained circulation or lasting influence on folklore studies. Nonetheless, a number of similar maps, designed by Gropper’s less politically radical contemporaries, affirmed for the American public an understanding of folklore that no amount of Congressional or scholarly debate could disallow. While pundits dismissed literary maps of tall tales and comic demigods as erroneous, commercial, and nativistic, their circulation was not without value or influence in popular print culture.

In 1951, Scott, Foresman and Company published the first edition of its perennially successful high school history textbook Living in Our America. In the “Geographical Foreword,” the editors included a number of “cartoons,” because “Americans have a sense of humor. Liking jokes and enjoying a good time have become a part of American life.” Along with these various cartoons, the foreword included two pictorial maps of
U.S. history and literature. The editors selected Aaron Bohrod’s America: Its History, which was part of the same AAA series as America: Its Folklore, but even before McCarthy had blacklisted Gropper, Scott, Foresman commissioned a less radical artist, John Dukes McKee, to design a similar but less politically charged literary map. According to the editors, McKee’s American Folklore & Legends offered “proof” that “almost every part of our country has some famous legend or story connected to it. History can lead to some exciting reading.”27 Excitement and light-hearted humour aside, McKee’s map was no less open to scholarly debate than Gropper’s.

American Folklore & Legends (fig. 19) is stylistically and conceptually similar to America: Its Folklore. Across a familiar projection of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, McKee’s map depicts ninety animated figures drawn from a number of sources. Those that Dorson considered authentic folk heroes – Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone, Mike Fink – are joined by “manufactured” characters, such as Tom Sawyer and Johnny Inkslinger. Historical figures, such as Samuel Mudd and George Armstrong Custer, complement the map’s folklore and fakelore references. Like Gropper’s map, American Folklore & Legends celebrates collective national identity over regional or state affiliations. The design plays down state boundaries, and its appealing figures seem to shift from one state to another – appearing to be at home just about anywhere in the United States. Pecos Bill, for example, rides a mountain lion from the Texas Panhandle to New Mexico, and Tar Baby saunters across the Alabama-Georgia state line.

Scott, Foresman included McKee’s map in the 1956 revision of Living in Our America, but the publisher removed it from the 1961 and 1964 editions. Prefaced with an introductory essay by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., the latter editions affected a more sombre, scholarly tone than before. The editors replaced the textbook’s cartoons with patriotic photographs, for instance, and they substituted Bohrod’s and McKee’s designs with NASA-inspired views of the globe. The decision to remove the pictorial maps speaks to the declining currency of U.S. literary maps in the 1960s and a shift in the geographical imagination. Furthermore, the debates between literary and anthropological folklorists were calming, and commercialized fakelore had largely been discredited in
academic circles. In a history textbook with a more serious affect, then, a folksy celebration of manufactured heroes was no longer appropriate.

Even after *American Folklore & Legends* had been removed from the history textbook, it remained a common sight in English classrooms. As soon as Scott, Foresman included McKee’s map in the 1951 edition of *Living in America*, English teachers sought a poster-sized version to complement literary studies. In 1954, the National Conference of American Folklore for Youth – a newly formed organization advised by the likes of Benjamin Botkin and Thomas Hart Benton – began selling a 64 x 91 cm version of the map by mail order for $0.50. The *English Journal* noted that “Scott, Foresman did not wish to continue” publishing the map, but English teachers “kept asking for [it].” McKee’s wonderful *American Folklore & Legends* was “crowded with figures and symbols drawn in the modern unrealistic fashion, not always in proportion to their literary importance,” but the map was nonetheless “[well] designed for adolescents.”

Whether hung on classroom walls or handled by students, McKee’s inviting design continued to circulate and to instill a colloquial understanding of folklore – one that incorporated printed sources and minimized, or altogether ignored, non-European traditions.

In their attempts to locate a unique collective heritage, *America: Its Folklore* and *American Folklore & Legends* similarly marginalize minority groups and overwhelmingly associate national heroes with Anglo-Saxon and northern European settlement. Reflecting the general consensus that African American communities did possess folklore, both maps recognize John Henry, Br’er Rabbit and Br’er Fox, and Frankie and Johnny; they also nod toward Spanish and French exploration and settlement. But gesture is really all they do. Perhaps most significantly, and echoing Dorson’s concerns about the treatment of American Indians, the two maps make qualified allusions to Indigenous peoples, who are depicted as stereotyped relics of the past that nonetheless depend upon European presence.

American Indians appear three times on *America: Its Folklore*, part of a menagerie of tall tales and frontier adventures: loinclothed braves surround George Armstrong Custer in
Montana, a shirtless scout stands next to Hiawatha’s teepee on the shores of Lake Superior, and a smitten Pocahontas joins hands with John Smith in Virginia. Native presence is tidily bracketed by the founding of Jamestown in 1607 and the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876. The map drains the Indigenousness out of these traditions, which are simply romanticized accounts of Anglo-Saxon settlement. White heroes witness and validate the historical existence of Indians, who appear absent from the twentieth century. The closest suggestion of Indigenous literature and cultural longevity takes the form of a totem pole on Puget Sound. Yet, a felled forest surrounds this non-book text, which conveniently appears to be the final target of Paul Bunyan’s double-headed axe. The totem pole is not labelled on the map, nor is it mentioned in the accompanying pamphlet because it is not perceived as a permanent or meaningful fixture of American literary culture.

McKee’s map makes comparable references to American Indians. In Montana, a group of whooping warriors surround a defiant Lt. Colonel Custer; a brave says “how” in front of Hiawatha’s teepee near Lake Superior; and Sacajawea guides Lewis and Clark through Oregon. In Virginia, a topless Pocahontas throws herself on John Smith and entreats her father to put down his axe. South of the border, three Indigenous captives have been enslaved in the “Conquest of Mexico,” and Coronado narrows in on the “Seven Cities of Cibola,” which are guarded by a lone man wearing only a loincloth and a terrified expression. An Indian Princess leaps to her death in Iowa, and an invisible windigo, revealed only through its footprints, crosses the St. Lawrence River. Each of these references anticipates the imminent death, destruction, or insignificance of Native cultures. To some extent, *American Folklore & Legends* makes room for the “Indian Drum” of Michigan and the “Indian Totem” of Washington. But the spirit of McKee’s design undermines these qualified inclusions. A group of men canoe toward the totem pole, which is no longer in the immediate path of Bunyan’s menacing axe. Nonetheless, it leans precariously over the Pacific Ocean. While traditional totem poles are designed to fall and decay with time, the suggestion here is that of a collapsing cultural relic which will likely take with it the four Indians paddling nearby. Again, certain death opposes any suggestion of a relevant, and thriving, storytelling and literary tradition. Largely
tokenistic Native traditions have been collected and mapped – just in time for otherwise invisible Indians to make way for American progress.

The influence of anthropological folklorists is more noticeable on two literary maps that appeared in 1960. Dorson still objected to these maps as cartographic distortions of authentic folklore, but they were noticeably different than previous designs. While James Lewicki’s Storyteller’s Map of American Myths and Frank Soltesz’s Folklore and Legends of Our Country continued to blend oral and written sources, and continued to propagate fakelore, they nonetheless conflated such traditions within the context of an increasingly pluralistic America. Their amalgamation of literary and anthropological approaches to folklore – now a more unified and professionalized academic field – presented a less nativistic landscape to millions of mid-century Americans. In fact, Storyteller’s Map of American Myths and Folklore and Legends of Our Country are likely the most circulated discursive literary maps of the twentieth century.

Storyteller’s Map of American Myths originally appeared in James Lewicki’s five-part “Folklore of America” series, which Life magazine commissioned in 1955. Lewicki, an illustrator and art professor from Long Island, was a regular contributor of illustrations to Life and the New York Times. Near the end of World War II, he began designing Christmas cards for the American Artists’ Group and Artists for Victory. While researching holiday traditions from around the world, Lewicki was struck by a neighbour’s off-handed remark that “it was a pity that a country as big and powerful as ours had so little to offer in the way of tradition, folklore and cultural heritage […] [Even] our Christmas customs and legends have their roots in European cultures.”

Lewicki set out to discover and celebrate America’s unique heritage, and he did what many interdisciplinary Americanists had done since the Great Depression: he turned to folklore.

After four years of research – consulting literary compilations such as Botkin’s Sidewalks of America, Langston Hughes’s The Book of Negro Folklore, Frank Dobie’s I’ll Tell You a Tale, and Louise Pound’s Nebraska Folklore – Lewicki embarked on what he later
described as “the largest illustration project ever commissioned by one of the largest magazines in the world.” Ultimately, he divided the project into five instalments, which represented various communities and the successive stages of frontier settlement: “Legends and Explorations in a New World,” “The Lively Legends of the Indians,” “Eerie Tales Told by the Colonists,” “The Legendary Feats of the Pioneers,” and “Ballads and Tales of the Frontier.” Life called attention to the “remarkable new series” on August 31, 1959, when it featured Lewicki’s painting of Rip Van Winkle on a special foldout cover – just one week after Jackie Kennedy had graced the magazine as “A Front Runner’s Appealing Wife.” Over the next twelve months, Life complemented Lewicki’s paintings of heroes, legends, and tall tales with abridged selections of previously anthologized folklore.

Life readers celebrated Lewicki’s “Folklore of America” series as “beautiful, forceful and dynamic.” Many did not realize American culture boasted such a “special flavor [that is] entirely different from legends of other countries.” One woman from Dallas, Texas, said of the Rip Van Winkle foldout, “A more superb cover […] I have never seen! What an enchanting picture it will make for my daughter’s room. I am going to keep your ‘Folklore of America’ series, not only for my children but for myself.” An educator from the San Francisco area wrote, “Before we can appreciate other cultures, we must know and understand our own. Your series is a valuable addition to those of us who are teachers.” And a reader from just outside Columbia, South Carolina, promised to “treasure” copies of Lewicki’s series, which she had “enjoyed reading over and over again.”

Readers endorsed what Lewicki and Life had suspected – pictures of folklore held a measure of enduring fascination for young and old audiences alike.

Even more compelling than Lewicki’s sixty-four paintings were the two literary maps he prepared for “Folklore of America.” The first instalment of the series featured A Map Full of Myths, which stretches from Western Europe and Africa to the Pacific Coast of North and South America (fig. 20). The map locates “most of the major myths of nearly 2,000 years of exploration,” but it is unlike most of Lewicki’s inviting illustrations. The mustard colour scheme makes it difficult to read the crowded design, and differences between land and sea are not immediately apparent. The somewhat irksome map
contrasts sharply with the rest of the series, largely because of its content. *A Map Full of Myths* is primarily a depiction of European stories about the Americas, rather than stories from the Americas. By juxtaposing the almost illegible map with more appealing and visually stunning examples of American folklore, Lewicki highlights the exceptionalism of America’s homegrown cultural heritage.

These homespun traditions gather in *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths* – the tour de force of “Folklore of America” (fig. 21). The three-page foldout map, which appeared in the final instalment of the series, locates each of the legends and folk heroes that Lewicki had previously illustrated, as well as a number of additional tales. A cartouche – framed by Uncle Sam, Lady Liberty, and patriotic bunting – throws the map and the entire series into sharp relief (fig. 22):

Populated with heroes and scoundrels, miracles and mirages, this map shows the wealth of American folklore from the witches of Salem to the Swallows of Capistrano. The selected legends, most of them old and well-told, have been placed in their most familiar locales. Some can rightfully be claimed by more than one area or one state. Others belong less to a place than to a period in the development of America. All are entertaining products of the American imagination.

The map’s cultural nationalism is reinforced by the exclusion of Canada and Mexico, and the horizontally elongated projection helps exaggerate the entertaining landscape. Unlike the somewhat confusing *A Map Full of Myths*, Lewicki’s captivating *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths* engenders at a glance a sense of national pride – a flawed sense of pride, according to Dorson. For average readers, though, the map invites contemplation, it almost begs to be freed from the pages of *Life* and hung on the refrigerator. One reader praised the map as “completely fascinating” and promised to “treasure [it] among my keepsakes.” Such praise elevated the map from ephemeral document to preserved artifact.

Bronner has critiqued Lewicki for excluding Hawai’i and Alaska, arguing that the widely circulated map “continued to cling […] to the continental forty-eight states and to the historical legacy of the frontier” even after the forty-ninth and fiftieth states had entered the Union. In compiling *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths*, Lewicki did consider
the mythic frontier a “treasury of home-grown folk tales as broad and as varied as the land itself.” Yet, unlike Gropper or McKee, Lewicki peppered his map with a number of non-Western traditions – traditions that challenged the mythic ascendancy of Anglo-Saxon Americans on the frontier. Cast alongside Molly Pitcher and George Washington, figures such as the Headless Vaquero and Little Pete (Fung Jing Toy) make meaningful contributions to what the cartouche explains is “the development of America.” In addition to stories drawn from Chinese American, African American, Mexican American, and other minority communities, Storyteller’s Map of American Myths acknowledges Indigenous presence and literary traditions. The Mandan Ark is shown in North Dakota, for example, and Geronimo’s resistance to European settlement is acknowledged in Arizona. “Stone Indians” in Southern Utah testify to Coyote’s ability to shape the world, and Tenskwatawa resists U.S. encroachment outside of Prophetstown, Indiana. The presence of Jean-Baptiste Charbonneau, who accompanies Sacajawea as she guides Lewis and Clark through Washington, speaks to future generations and not simply the death of Native cultures. Such references are in addition to numerous creation stories that Lewicki illustrated throughout “Folklore of America.” Lewicki may have failed to include Hawai’i and Alaska, but he did not romanticize the continental states and ethnocentric frontier the way Bronner suggests. Rather, the absence of Hawai’i and Alaska reflects the project’s lengthy production timeline; though the map appeared in 1960, Lewicki began compiling it years before the states’ admissions to the U.S.

Time Incorporated, the publisher of Life, made it easy for those readers who treasured Lewicki’s illustrations to save them. Following a favourable response to “Folklore of America,” Time hired Botkin as the editorial consultant of The Life Treasury of American Folklore – a more colourful and less dense version of Botkin’s own treasuries. The volume gathered Lewicki’s original maps and illustrations, plus eleven new ones, and abridged versions of tall tales and legends. Time began advertising the 350-page “chronicle of enchanting tales that form a part of the American tradition” in October 1961 – just in time for the holidays. It sold by mail order, complete with a ten-day trial period, for $9.95 in the United States and $10.95 in Canada. For an extra $2.00, buyers received “an original 12-inch record of American Folk Music, especially recorded for the Deluxe Edition.” Those who preferred to buy Lewicki’s Treasury in bookstores could
do so, for the higher retail price of $12.50.\textsuperscript{41} Time continued to sell the volume under its Life imprint for at least four years.

In book form, Lewicki’s maps are printed with altered titles. A Map Full of Myths is renamed A Map of Myths of Early America, and Storyteller’s Map of American Myths is changed to A Regional Guide to American Folklore. Other than slightly altered cartouches, the Treasury variants are otherwise identical to those originally published in Life. Though slight, the revisions do change the tone of the maps somewhat. Most notably, A Regional Guide to American Folklore explicitly links Indigenous traditions to European settlement in a way that did not exist in the original map. The note explains, “In the four and a half centuries that have passed since the New World was discovered, America has accumulated many strata of anecdotes and legends.”\textsuperscript{42} The note echoes Norman Foerster’s claim in his 1931 anthology that “American literature has no prehistoric period. It has no dim past: it merely began.”\textsuperscript{43} While Lewicki’s map works to expand the definition of “folk” to include American Indians, such efforts are tempered by Botkin’s editorial influence on The Life Treasury. Thus, the mythic frontier of European settlement once again plays the defining role in U.S. literary culture, even for the Native traditions that are included.

Many newspapers recommended The Life Treasury of American Folklore as “a joyous book [that is] brilliantly illustrated,” and at least one writer wished it had included even more maps.\textsuperscript{44} However, academic folklorists severely panned the book. MacEdward Leach, the president of the American Folklore Society, dismissed it as “a hodge-podge of the cute, sentimental, the chauvinistic, and the anecdotal. […] It makes no distinction between mass culture, popular culture and folk culture.”\textsuperscript{45} Edward D. Ives, who studied under Dorson at Indiana University, grumbled that Lewicki’s illustrations offered “absolutely nothing […] of any importance to the folklorist.” He acknowledged the volume’s success among popular readers, asking rhetorically, “If the book is no use to the folklorist, how about it as a sort of folkloristic Venus Fly Trap for the general public?” But Ives answered his own question: “All I can say is that if the folklore-fakelore picture was confused before, this book will perpetuate, solidify, and compound the confusion for at least another generation. If it gets people to say they ‘just love folklore,’ it will also
give a lot of folklorists a busy time helping these same people sort out the real article from the bogus.” Dorson was similarly critical, describing *The Life Treasury* as the “ultimate in fakelore.” Botkin and Lewicki’s work was a “gimmick” of “tasteless journalism” and “a compost of all kinds of uneven materials.” Dorson reported in 1963,

Once I managed to speak with James Lewicki on the project which consumed four solid years of his time, and pointed out that such figures as Paul Bunyan had never existed in any vigorous oral tradition, but were known primarily through literary writings, and so could not be justified as American folk-heroes. “Well, if the American public thinks Paul Bunyan is a folk hero, then we have to treat him as one,” he replied, and this of course is the point of view of the mass media.47

Leach, Ives, and Dorson criticized *Life*’s “treasury of mass lore” as something that would only “delight tots and reinforce the stereotypes of their elders.” It would also make future collection of authentic folklore in the field that much more difficult. By dismissing Lewicki’s work out of hand as a collection of simplistic “caricatures,” however, critics failed to recognize the potential of the volume’s most distinguishing feature – its foldout literary map.

Whether as *A Regional Guide to American Folklore* or *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths*, Lewicki’s map challenged the chauvinistic stereotypes that alarmed folklorists trained as anthropologists and historians – as well as those trained in newly established folklore doctoral programs. Yet, even within the context of a large commercial venture, the map worked to diversify the cast of folk heroes that previous maps, including Gropper’s and McKee’s, had helped establish in the collective imagination. True, *Storyteller’s Map of American Myths* further cemented Paul Bunyan’s status as a legitimate folk hero, but Dorson and others failed to acknowledge how it might also complement their school of thought. The map appealed to both young and old, and it subtly prompted both to rethink the ethnic and cultural composition of America’s heritage.

*Folklore and Legends of Our Country*, which Esso Standard commissioned in 1960, was another highly commercialized “folklore-fakelore picture” that had the potential to “confuse” the general public.49 The large four-color map depicts sixty-five national “treasures” mined from both literary and folk veins (fig. 23). Jack London’s *Call of the*
Wild and Herman Melville’s Moby-Dick, for example, appear alongside creation stories of the Menehunes of Hawai‘i and the Kwakiutl Indians of the Pacific Northwest. The General Drafting Company of New Jersey produced Folklore and Legends of Our Country in two variant states, which were distributed for free in schools, filling stations, and bureaus of the Esso Touring Service.\(^5\) While Esso had given away road maps for decades, literary mapping was new territory for the oil company.\(^6\)

A year before printing the Esso map, General Drafting published Of Maps and Mapping – a promotional portfolio that advertised the company’s range of cartographic services. While filling stations were “the largest users of free maps as aides to product sales,” other types of businesses could “profitably use this friendly form of publicity.” Maps were an especially attractive promotion, because people “just don’t throw away maps. Not even free maps.” By printing a company’s logo on a road or pictorial map, General Drafting promised, that logo would become a permanent fixture in consumer homes. Of Maps and Mapping also encouraged companies to consider free distribution of maps in schools, because classrooms “never have enough maps.” Indeed, “[any] progressive firm can plant its name and trade-mark in the minds of the coming generation with colorful educational maps. The choice of appropriate subjects is unlimited.”\(^7\)

Despite the marketing pitch, promotional maps had become a nuisance for General Drafting’s primary customer – the oil industry. Since 1923, when Standard Oil first began distributing road maps, motorists had come to expect and demand the giveaway. By 1960, the nation’s largest oil companies were investing nearly $15 million annually on some 200 million maps, with Esso alone handing out roughly 13 million. Nearly all of these maps were state-level maps that were updated each year, as the nation’s network of roads and highways expanded. Consequently, oil companies found themselves giving motorists who traveled from state to state multiple maps a year. Data collection and collation for a single state map cost between $30,000 and $40,000, and the entire process could take between nine months and a year.\(^8\) Printing and distribution costs – which averaged between $0.05 and $0.10 per copy – further increased the financial burden. Contrary to General Drafting’s assurances that people “just don’t throw away maps,” oil company officials complained that most Americans “just throw them away after a trip or
two.” In 1968, a Standard Oil executive explained to the New York Times, “It would be impossible to charge for the maps, because everyone gives them away.” His counterpart at Mobil Oil agreed: “We would charge for them tomorrow if someone else would do it, too.” To offset costs, oil companies increasingly attempted to “whet the motorist’s appetite” with fewer designs that would nonetheless “stimulate people to travel more, thus drive their cars more and use more gasoline.”

Folklore and Legends of Our Country was one such design. With it, Esso attempted to balance the public’s ceaseless demand for free maps with a comparably modest financial investment. When Esso commissioned the map, it gave General Drafting a list of folklore references and a penciled sketch of what it had in mind. General Drafting then sent these preliminary materials to Frank Soltesz, an artist from Westchester County, New York, who regularly illustrated cover images for Esso road maps. Unlike Gropper or Lewicki, Soltesz had little editorial and stylistic leeway in designing Folklore and Legends of Our Country. Initially, he drew each of the sixty-five figures on separate sheets of tracing paper, which were returned to General Drafting and Esso for approval. Once approved, Soltesz coloured the figures and then pasted them on an outline of the continental United States, with insets of Hawai’i and Alaska in the lower left. By commissioning a pictorial map of a well-documented subject, rather than a traditional road map that would require constant data collection and revision, Esso saved both time and money. Rather than $30,000 or $40,000, the compilation and design of Folklore and Legends of Our Country only cost several thousand. Instead of stretching out for nine months or a year, the entire process was done in a matter of weeks. Moreover, a single map could remain in print for years, and the widespread popularity of American folklore at the time enabled Esso to distribute a single design throughout its national network of filling stations.

Teachers could request free copies of Folklore and Legends of Our Country, which measured 60 x 90 cm and could be stored in the attractive envelope that was included. The map’s verso contains lengthy explanatory notes about “the major depositories of Americana” and a reading list of secondary sources that references three of Botkin’s
treasuries. A separate foldout key encourages students to “use the tools of library exploration to add to [your] knowledge of our great heritage”:

The next step is the school or public library where some of the thousands of tales, ballads, customs and legends that have been published may be available. Many more are not in print; thousands remain to be discovered by the alert explorer. At least one example can be found in every home, every school, every community and state. To find them requires skills worth learning: interviewing techniques, accurate notations, intelligent listening, keen observation and the ability to present findings orally and in writing.

**Folklore and Legends of Our Country** and its supplementary materials display the parallel influences of literary and anthropological folklorists. Esso directs students to the library and to the type of anthologized folklore compilations that anthropological folklorists criticized, but it also promotes fieldwork and implicitly validates the traditions of all communities within the U.S. **Folklore and Legends of Our Country** might include multiple examples of fakelore, like Paul Bunyan, but it also encourages average Americans to respect and value traditions that are both familiar and different.

**Folklore and Legends of Our Country** is especially unique among U.S. literary maps for its treatment of Indigenous texts, history, and folklore traditions. Osceola, for example, appears near southern Florida. Not only does the foldout key comment on the leader’s dishonourable capture at Fort Payton in 1837, it recognizes the continued sovereignty of the Seminole Nation over the Everglades. The presence of ceremonial dancers in Montana represents the Mandan Nation, and Raven and Water Spider’s attempts to capture fire symbolize creation stories of the Cherokee Nation. Māui’s discovery of the Hawai’ian archipelago reminds students that Indigenous traditions pre-date European settlement. The key explains, “Polynesians tell of Maui who fished the islands from the sea. He raised the sky and snared the sun to make the day last longer.” Unlike many literary maps, **Folklore and Legends of Our Country** does not simply relegate Native traditions to the period between the founding of Jamestown and the Battle of the Little Big Horn. Moreover, the map’s references are described in the present tense; the key recognizes continued Indigenous presence and relevance in twentieth-century America.
General Drafting designed a slightly smaller version of the map with the family station wagon in mind. The 56 x 84 cm variant that gas stations distributed has a slightly larger Esso logo than the one sent to schools, but the recto images are otherwise the same. Motorists did not, however, receive additional information about folklore or the supplementary reading list. The commercial verso is instead divided in half. The right side contains the map’s key, and the left side features a national roadway map – one of the first in history to indicate the U.S. Federal Interstate Highway System that was then under construction. The commercial map also lacks the classroom version’s attractive envelope. Instead, it folds like a traditional road map and could easily fit in a car’s glove compartment.

Distributed for free at Esso service stations, Folklore and Legends of Our Country wished Americans “Happy Motoring!” and urged families to “Take Time to Visit Yesterday” (fig. 24). Esso encouraged its customers to use the map to plan memorable trips to interesting collections of Americana where you may learn the origins of some of our exciting folk tales. […] Several places may be within easy reach on a day’s trip from your home. Others may be visited on a week-end or vacation trip. Look for folklore background wherever you travel! Your trip will be more fun, the tales of our forefathers more meaningful.

For those drivers who took advantage of Esso’s complimentary Touring Service, routes were mapped on Folklore and Legends of Our Country that would bring families to John Henry’s Big Bend Tunnel, Mark Twain’s boyhood home, or the Black Hills of Deadwood Dick. Drawing upon the vogue, Esso both celebrated and exploited American folklore – nudging drivers to take circuitous trips that burned additional gasoline.

In its attempts to save money by producing a map with popular appeal and national relevance – in its attempts to sell gasoline to the American motorist – Esso employed the literary map genre in a commercialization of folklore. Yet, Folklore and Legends of Our Country is not an uncomplicated example of corporate manipulation. In many ways, Esso was a socially progressive company. Under Jim Crow and throughout the Civil Rights Movement, Esso not only sold gas to African Americans when many companies would not, it sold franchise rights to black entrepreneurs. The company was also instrumental
in launching the National Association of Marketing Developers to support minorities working in advertising and public relations.\textsuperscript{61} Esso’s simple and forgotten literary map is yet another way the company helped break color barriers, by quietly fostering racial, ethnic, and cultural equality.\textsuperscript{62}

Whether in the classroom or the family car, Esso’s map had the potential to inculcate on a massive scale the anti-chauvinistic approach to American folklore that scholars like Dorson modelled in less-read journal articles and critical monographs. While \textit{Folklore and Legends of Our Country} is an inviting pictorial map, schoolchildren and teachers were by no means its only users. A child in the backseat might entertain him or herself by tracing the car’s route on the map, mentioning aloud the local associations the family was passing. A parent might explain the map’s references to his or her children, who might be old enough to enjoy the pictures but too young to read the key. In such scenarios, \textit{Folklore and Legends of Our Country} would passively and actively instill values in everyone in the car. Even without children in the scenario, the map, like Lewicki’s “Folklore of America” series, invited adult contemplation. Avid readers, history buffs, map collectors, and patriotic Americans of all stripes found much to ponder in Soltesz’s design, and, with their fuelled cars, they could literally explore the literary landscape they held in their hands.

Non-academic literary mapping of American folklore followed the genre’s institutionalization by Paul Mayo Paine and paralleled the popular celebration of folk heroes following the Great Depression and World War II. This period also coincided with the professionalization of folklore studies – a time when folklorists trained in literature departments and those trained as historians and anthropologists disagreed on the definition and scope of the emerging field. Within the vacuum of disciplinary consensus, literary maps subtly reinforced a colloquial understanding of American folklore that incorporated both authored texts and oral traditions. By the end of the period, these maps began to challenge the primacy of white settlement by reminding Americans that the frontier was a site of inter-cultural contact and exchange.
Even though Joseph McCarthy’s concerns with *William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore* were politically motivated, the Senator aptly suggested that literary mapmakers “author” texts. The widely circulated maps that Gropper, McKee, Lewicki, and Soltesz authored successively enlarged what it meant to be American. The frontier, however, stayed a consistent motif. Even as the cast of settlers was diversified, folklore remained largely the product of frontier settlement. Rather than cowboy heroes and self-reliant local colourists, maps of folklore celebrated the collective legacy of the “common man.” While that common man became less racialized between 1946 and 1960, his presence with few exceptions continued to normalize and downplay acts of Native displacement, marginalization, and silencing. Like Paul Bunyan’s shadow filling the continent in Disney’s animated film, these maps remind us of the genre’s conceptual foundation – the literary improvement and control of previously blank spaces.
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Bronner, Folk Nation, 20.


Of the books published under the Life imprint, The Life Treasury of American Folklore was uniquely advertised with a Canadian price. For example, a two-page advertisement in the October 13, 1961, issue of Life included photographs, blurbs, and prices for sixteen books – from The Second World War to The Epic of Man and The Wonders of Life on Earth. Only Lewicki’s treasury, however, listed dual prices. Time advertised The Life Treasury of American Folklore in other magazines and newspapers across the country.

Golden Press, the publisher of Betty Crocker cookbooks, distributed The Life Treasury of American Folklore in bookstores.


Foerster, American Poetry and Prose, 7 (see chap. 2, n. 79).


49 Ives, review of The Life Treasury of American Folklore.

50 In Folk Nation, Bronner claims that Folklore and Legends of Our Country was “copyrighted in 1940 and updated through the 1960s” (20). While the map was published in two variant states, I have found no evidence of multiple editions. Moreover, Frank Soltesz’s son, Ken, remembers his father illustrating the map; Ken was fourteen in 1960. Neither Bronner nor Hopkins has previously identified two variant states of the map.

51 In 1911, the John D. Rockefeller’s Standard Oil was broken into seven regional companies. One of these was Standard Oil of New Jersey – what became the largest oil company in the world and the predecessor of today’s ExxonMobil. Standard Oil of New Jersey, or “Jersey Standard,” maintained rights to the Standard name in New Jersey, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Washington, DC. By 1960, it had acquired Standard naming rights in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Louisiana. In those states where it owned the Standard rights, the company marketed itself as “Esso,” a phonetic combination of S and O. Though Jersey Standard did not own the naming rights in New York or the New England states, it nonetheless used the Esso brand in those states. In other states, Jersey Standard branded its product as “Enco” and “Humble,” the latter derived from the Humble Oil and Refining Company, which Jersey Standard controlled through a majority stake. In 1971, Standard Oil of New Jersey renamed itself again as the Exxon Corporation, but it continued using the Esso brand in some places. Technically, Folklore and Legends of Our Country was commissioned by the Humble Oil & Refining Company division of Esso Standard.

52 Of Maps and Mapping (Convent Station, NJ: General Drafting, 1959), 24–27.

53 Because of the regional nature of filling station networks, oil companies generally produced maps only for those states where they operated. When networks did overlap, competition kept oil companies from sharing the cost of collecting and compiling data. General Drafting president, Otto Lindberg, argued that there should be only one “best”
map for each state, so his company did not produce maps for competing clients. Rand McNally, on the other hand, did make maps for competitors, differentiating their competing clients’ maps with unique color schemes. Because Esso Standard was General Drafting’s only client from the oil industry, Esso’s maps featured a wider spectrum of colors, which set them apart from Rand McNally maps.


55 Ken Soltesz (son of Frank Soltesz), in telephone interview with author, March 2009.

56 Ken Soltesz, in telephone interview with author, May 2010; and Loretta Soltesz (widow of Frank Soltesz), in telephone interview with author, May 2010. The short period of time in which Soltesz illustrated Folklore and Legends of Our Country is what allowed him to include Alaska and Hawai’i, unlike Lewicki who spent years on his map.

57 Teachers in New Jersey, New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Washington, D.C., Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Arkansas were invited to request copies of Folklore and Legends of Our Country, as well as send Esso feedback on its usefulness in the classroom.

58 The commercial variant’s verso includes the Road Map of the United States, which does not include Alaska or Hawai’i. It does, however, show highways in southern Canada. In 1960, Esso and the American Automobile Association were the first to include the distinctive shield of the U.S. Interstate Highway system, which was still under construction, on their maps. See “News and Notes from the Field of Travel,” New York Times, February 28, 1960.

59 Don Shorock (former Esso Touring Service employee), in telephone interview with author, March 2009.


It seems possible that James Avery was involved with Esso’s map. Before eventually becoming a senior vice president, Avery was an African-American marketing executive in charge of fostering relationships with minorities. Avery earned his bachelors and masters degrees at Columbia and taught high school history before the father of a former student recruited him to Esso. Avery placed the previously underground Green Book, which listed gas stations and restaurants that would serve blacks under Jim Crow, in Esso filling stations. In a 2008 interview with Incentive magazine, Avery noted, “My proudest accomplishment [at Esso] was not a singular effort but one with pluralistic factors that took place during pre-Civil Rights years. By focusing on corporate public imagery and the return-on-investment, I successfully counseled company management to initiate a broad-based effort to employ minorities in sales and marketing positions, to increase black entrepreneurship in Esso service station dealerships, and to initiate advertising in black magazine and newspaper media.”

Gropper, McKee, Lewicki, and Soltesz were not the only ones who designed folklore maps during the period. For example, the Associated Press distributed Myths, Men and Legends Help Weave the American Dream in 1951. The map, which was printed in newspapers throughout the United States, similarly blurred the generic lines between literature and folklore.
Chapter 4
Un(-)settling Claims: Toward a Process of Literary Un-Mapping

Would it be better to confront an ill-motivated intruder who was well read, or one indifferent to literature?
– Louise Erdrich (Ojibwe), Books and Islands in Ojibwe Country

The instinct of the dominant culture, facing evidence of its own uncontained mutability, is to rewrite the stories, eradicate the witness, and break the mirror. This long project of erasure is what the mixedblood reader sees when he or she looks into the pages of American literature: images of otherness and doom.
– Louis Owens (Choctaw-Cherokee), Mixedblood Messages

Intent on distributing a single map of national relevance that would not require costly annual revisions, Esso Standard commissioned Folklore and Legends of Our Country in 1960. Illustrator Frank Soltesz’s colourful design, which combined the vogues of literary mapping and American folklore, simultaneously affirmed a more pluralistic cultural landscape than previous examples and allowed Esso to quietly scale back its complimentary map program. Commercial motives notwithstanding, Folklore and Legends of Our Country was in many ways the stylistic and conceptual culmination of six decades’ worth of U.S. literary mapping.

Since Paul Wilstach’s Bookman designs introduced Americans to discursive literary maps at the turn of the twentieth century, the genre has been linked to nativistic expressions of literary nationalism – indeed, of literary exceptionalism. After 1960, however, an increasing number of Americans questioned such nationalistic expressions, especially as the United States slid deeper into the Cold War and became more embroiled in the Vietnam War. The rise of counterculture, the Civil Rights Movement, and critical challenges to the established canon further contributed to the genre’s declining popularity. Commenting on the dearth of national literary maps published in the 1960s and 1970s, Martha Hopkins reasons, “Rising costs and the social turmoil of the time may have caused fewer literary maps to be produced than in the preceding decades.” Yet, as
Hopkins also notes, the genre did not simply vanish from U.S. print culture. Though few national maps appeared after *Folklore and Legends of Our Country*, local literary map production flourished as many states and cities celebrated centennials, bicentennials, and other milestones in the second half of the twentieth century.

In some respects, local literary maps display more diverse landscapes than national designs. Stylistically, state and city maps often reflect a broad interpretation of literature and juxtapose novelists, poets, and dramatists with legislators, jurists, scientists, journalists, screenwriters, and other celebrities. For example, *Nebraska Centennial Literary Map* (1967) locates the hometowns of Willa Cather, Mari Sandoz, and Wright Morris, as well as the homes of arborist J. Sterling Morton, politician George W. Norris, and geneticist George W. Beadle. Similarly, *A Literary Map of Missouri* (1955) recognizes Mark Twain, T.S. Eliot, and Theodore Dreiser along with Walt Disney, U.S. Senator Thomas Hart Benton, the social realist artist Thomas Hart Benton, and General John J. Pershing. Missouri’s 1988 map of the same title also includes Harry S. Truman and Charles Lindbergh. In addition to literary style, state and city maps, especially those produced in the last three decades of the twentieth century, usually depict a larger number of women and minority writers than Wilstach’s and Paul Mayo Paine’s designs. In terms of genre and author demographics, then, local maps often challenge the ascendancy of Anglo-Saxon male novelists who have traditionally been credited with transforming the nation’s literary frontier.

Despite such differences, local maps maintain the genre’s underlying framework of once blank literary landscapes made productive by authorial settlers. Consider *Literary Utah*, designed for the state’s 1996 centennial. When the Utah Council of Teachers of English (UCTE) began compiling author names in 1988, it sought to “create a map that is visually attractive and can be used in schools, libraries, media centers, and bookstores.” Ideally, the map would “make Utah students more aware of the state’s rich literary history [and] include ‘literature’ from the first discovery, including Native American stories as well as exploration and travel narratives.”

In retrospect, the stated goals of *Literary Utah*’s compilers read as politically correct platitudes. While the UCTE initially nodded to Indigenous traditions, it did so by condescendingly quoting the word literature and
linking “Native American stories” to the presence of, presumably, European explorers and travelers. Ultimately, Literary Utah makes no reference to Ute, Diné, Paiute, Goshute, or Shoshoni storytelling traditions, nor does it reference Native authors associated with the state, such as Zitkala-Ša (Yankton Sioux). In fact, the oldest work acknowledged on the map is Zane Grey’s The Riders of the Purple Sage (1912). Seemingly, it was only with the arrival of cowboy heroes that Utah’s previously blank literary landscape began to fill.

Few literary maps recognize Indigenous literatures, but stereotypical Native iconography often adorns state-level designs, particularly those of Western states. The Oklahoma State Department of Education’s Oklahoma: Celebration of Literature (1983) is one design that does more than simply add exotic flavour to the landscape with a headdress or teepee. It honours a total of twenty-five authors, including three Native writers: N. Scott Momaday (Kiowa), Jim Thorpe (Sauk), and Will Rogers (Cherokee). Minnesota Writers, which the state’s Council of Teachers of English published in 1994, includes Gerald Vizenor (Ojibwe), Diane Glancy (Cherokee), and Charles A. Eastman (Santee Sioux) alongside the likes of F. Scott Fitzgerald and Garrison Keillor. Eastman also appears on North Dakota Literary Trails (1932) and on A Literary Map of Minnesota (1954) – just below Paul Bunyan. These maps do recognize Native authorship, but they continue to suggest that Indigenous literary traditions began with a state’s discovery and settlement by non-Indigenous groups. Idaho by the Book (1996) typifies this specious and commonplace formulation. The map divides authors temporally into three groups: “Pioneers,” “Statehood,” and “Contemporary.” More explicitly than other local maps, Idaho by the Book implies that the state lacked literary history prior to the arrival of white trailblazing pioneers.

This chapter represents a critical intervention based upon the consequences of literary mapping for Indigenous literatures, a recurring issue throughout “Cartographers as Critics.” Certainly, some state, city, and even national literary maps acknowledge Native writers, but such acknowledgement is not without consequence. By mapping over centuries’ worth of storytelling traditions, books, and non-book texts, U.S. literary maps first ignore, violate, desecrate, erase, or drown literary forms deemed incompatible with
or unrecognized by imposed assumptions and yardsticks of worth. Then, with critical carte blanche, the genre offers the mapmaker leeway to include an Indian reference here and there for good measure if that tickles his or her fancy. What emerges is an irregular smattering of individual literary claims that ultimately comes at a steep price for the Indigenous collective.

As shown in chapter 1, Wilstach introduced U.S. literary mapping in the wake of the Spanish-American War and increased U.S. cultural and literary nationalism at the end of the nineteenth century. The publication of Wilstach’s maps also coincided with allotment-era policies that opened millions of acres of Native lands to non-Natives, for settlement, farming, ranching, and resource extraction. The General Allotment Act of 1887, or the Dawes Severalty Act, authorized the U.S. president to shatter tribal lands into privately owned parcels; it authorized him to render huge swaths of land “unclaimed.” The legislation sought to impose geographic order on what many portrayed as unproductive, excess land – land stuck in a perpetual state of economic and cultural blankness. An American Indian registered on the tribal rolls could secure an allotment, usually between 80 and 160 acres, and “excess” land was thrown open to progress. The resulting effect was a checkerboard pattern of Native and non-Native property throughout the West. Privatization of tribal lands was accompanied by allotment fees, tax foreclosures, and, often, corporate corruption. Most significantly, allotment-era policies undermined Native title and carved away tribal land bases. Between the passage of the Dawes Severalty Act and the end of allotment in 1934, Native-controlled lands plummeted from 138 million acres to just 48 million, and nearly half of the remaining territory was in arid or semiarid regions.4

Nominally, allotment was designed to detribalize American Indians and to assimilate them into settler society. Unlike previous federal policies, which focused on removal, reservations, and armed conflict, allotment would supposedly codify the possession of Native land in a peaceful, mutually beneficial way. In practice, by forcefully imposing private ownership, the legislation violently wrest territory, tribal sovereignty, and ways of life from those who could not afford or chose not to pay allotment fees and from those not recognized on the tribal rolls. While not part of federal Indian policy, and not legally
binding in the same way as a government survey map, U.S. literary maps replicate the spirit of allotment. The genre similarly places a restricted sense of cartographic order onto the landscape and validates individual possession of territory. In doing so, the genre accentuates the ever-dwindling supply of blank – “unclaimed” – spaces and normalizes settler appropriation of Native lands. Literary maps grant territory to those Indians who qualify under a set of imposed critical standards; the excess is awarded to the outsider interests that stacked the deck in the first place.

In effect, U.S. literary maps treat Indigenous writers and textual practices in a way that is analogous to allotment-era surveys. The recognition of three Native claimants on Oklahoma: Celebration of Literature, for instance, is the critical equivalent of three literary allotments. In a space where once only Native literatures existed, an unbalanced checkerboard pattern that privileges outside voices now appears. Settler writers encroach, claim, and fill land that non-Native literary mapmakers such as Wilstach have previously identified as culturally idle. True, Momaday, Thorpe, and Rogers possess claims on the Oklahoma map. But they appear at the capricious whim of a critical framework that tacitly excludes the majority of Indigenous writers and textual traditions.

In 1994, as the spatial turn began spinning in English Studies, Carolyn Porter observed in American Literary History that African Americanists, feminists, and emerging scholars of Asian American, Chicano/a, and Native American literatures had “remapped” the field of American literature. These scholars had

begun to undermine the fundamental terms by which American literary history must be comprehended and taught. Both the historical and geographical frames once dictated by the national, and nationalist, narrative of the US are collapsing, no longer propped up by either the synecdoche of a US read as “America” or the metanarrative by which “American” served to predicate human history’s manifest/millennial destiny.\(^5\)

While the accuracy of Porter’s optimistic observation may or may not be contested by those working in the fields of minority literatures today, one thing is true: the on-going production and circulation of literary maps continues to perpetuate in the popular imagination the geographic metanarrative that Porter suggests had collapsed by the mid-1990s.
What I offer here is a series of sketches that highlight the need to not remap the field further but to un-map it – especially in regard to Indigenous literatures. Literary maps have denied and continue to deny the existence and cultural vitality of Native peoples throughout North America; they have consistently framed Native literatures as a branch of American literature – not what Muskogee Creek critic Craig Womack insists is more properly the trunk. By un-mapping and thus un-settling the literary map, we can further dismantle the unsettling claims the genre has instilled in schools, universities, and popular print culture – claims that are both critical assessments and assertions of territorial title.

Before addressing scholarship like Womack’s, which has begun the figurative process of un-mapping U.S. literary studies, it is worth considering the most dramatic marriage yet of literary nationalism and cartography. Québec’s The Garden at the End of the World may be north of the U.S. border, but it illustrates plainly the charged relationship between discursive literary map production and Indigenous literatures that exists throughout North America. Moreover, it demonstrates the continuation and adaptation of literary map strategies that Wilstach introduced over a century years ago. Native Studies scholars have not yet taken on the challenge of un-settling printed literary maps, but some have shown what is possible when Indigenous cartographic frameworks are restored and settler maps are no longer privileged arbiters of truth. Finally, Ojibwe writer Louise Erdrich cautions us to view imposed cartographic practices with a guarded eye and to foresee the day when those practices are undone.

In August 1997, the Québec Toponymy Commission (Commission de toponymie du Québec) announced new names for 101 “deserted islands” in the province’s Caniapiscau Reservoir. The islands had formed between 1981 and 1984 – the result of a James Bay hydroelectric project that impounded the former Lake Caniapiscau and a number of neighbouring lakes. What were formerly mountains and hilltops became “new” islands and the ideal location for The Garden at the End of the World (Le Jardin au Bout du Monde), an ambitious naming project that commemorates the twentieth anniversary of
the Charter of the French Language, commonly known as Bill 101. Ninety-nine years to the month after the Bookman first published Wilstach’s A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States, the Toponymy Commission wrestled from the purported wilderness a massive literary map of Québec. Despite the obvious differences – historical moment, national and political complexities, and conceptual scale – the spirited conversations that surrounded the announcement of The Garden at the End of the World echoed those that surrounded Wilstach’s map a century before. Moreover, the details of the Québec project highlight the fundamental incompatibility of Indigenous literatures and the literary map genre, influenced as it still is by Wilstach’s model.

In christening 101 islands in the Caniapiscau Reservoir, the Québec Toponymy Commission literally, figuratively, and officially put authors on the map (fig. 25). The Garden at the End of the World was conceived as a “geographic poem” that commemorates “the most prestigious manifestations of Québécois language and literature” and gives cultural dimension to “public lands in a landscape remodelled by human acts.” Symbolically, the “islands constellate […] 101 flowers that escaped from the garden of the imagination and tumbled into The Garden at the End of the World, animating the anonymous.” The majority of island names originated from creative works by francophone writers born in Québec. For example, La Fleur de Lyse comes from a line in Félix Leclerc’s song “Tour de l’Île,” and Le Nid du Silence is taken from Gilles Vigneault’s poem “L’Immigrant.” A smaller number of islands honour immigrants, such as Haitian-born Dany Laferrière, whose works are published in French. Three islands celebrate anglophone writers – Stephen Morrisey, D.G. Jones, and Neil Bissoondath – and those toponyms are derived from French translations instead of the English originals. Only one island recognizes a First Nations author; La Lune-Où-Il-Gèle was derived from Cree writer Bernard Assiniwi’s novel La Saga des Béothuks.

A committee of nine began compiling island names by consulting anthologies, textbooks, and lists of recent literary prizewinners. Based upon their initial search, committee members identified 140 authors who had created fictional worlds after World War II that might merit geographic immortalization. Some 300 potential toponyms emerged from these distinguished œuvres; to whittle the list down to 101 names, the Toponymy
Commission consulted authors, their estates, or their publishers. Thus, authors (or their posthumous interests) played active roles in staking provincially codified literary claims in northern Québec – at least to the extent that they conferred with officials and consented to the naming of their respective islands. To finalize the rechristened islands, the Toponymy Commission’s nine-member board approved the new names in the summer of 1997.  

The announcement of *The Garden at the End of the World* in August proved immediately controversial. The American geographer Mark Monmonier notes, “The commission’s clever ‘poème géographique’ drew fire from English speakers annoyed by the blatant omission of prominent Anglophone writers who were lifetime Quebec residents as well as from Crees disgusted by the blatant rejection of aboriginal toponymy.” Newspapers throughout North America covered the unusual naming project and commented on its general lack of English-language writers. Reader response was initially strong. In Montreal, the English daily *The Gazette* printed dozens of letters that criticized the Toponymy Commission for snubbing the likes of Leonard Cohen, Mavis Gallant, and Hugh MacLennan. In a sarcastic op-ed that was reprinted across Canada, Mordecai Richler feigned humiliation:

> Seemingly, on Thursday, Aug. 21, my time had come at last. […] I sat by the phone from morning to night, a list of my published books to hand, but the call never came. There was to be no room for me in Le Jardin au Bout du Monde. The sapients who preside over the Commission de Toponymie, its primary job to rechristian [sic] Quebec places besmirched by Anglophone names, had found me wanting. […] Diminished as I am in this province I am still proud to call home, I will try to be objective. […] I also think our esteemed culture minister, Louise Beaudoin, and the literary critics in place at the Commission de Toponymie, are to be commended for finding 101 post-World War II literary immortals in la belle province. If it was a difficult chore, it was certainly well done, and has surprised us with an unsuspected cornucopia.

Many in Québec’s anglophone community shared Richler’s bemused frustration. Nevertheless, the community did not pursue its objections to *The Garden at the End of the World*, and initial indignation quickly subsided. As the *Boston Globe* suggested, “Québec’s English-speaking minority, mainly in and around Montreal, is too busy
fighting on other fronts – such as the move by the government to restrict use of English in hospitals – to get overly upset at the literary slight.”

As Monmonier suggests, however, Indigenous communities were more than just “annoyed” by The Garden at the End of the World. Unlike Richler’s affected disgrace, Cree leaders expressed genuine outrage and accused the Toponymy Commission of audaciously renaming landforms that already had names such as Rabbit Mountain, Fish Mountain, Beaver Mountain, and Our Grandfather Mountain. Charles Bobbish, chief of the Cree Nation of Chisasibi, explained, “They didn’t ask us. They unilaterally decided. The Cree people were hurt when they put in the [hydroelectric] projects. I don’t think they should hurt them more by renaming the islands.” Alan Penn, an advisor to the Grand Council of Crees, agreed: “They should know better. These are very large areas. People have place-names all over the place.”

The Grand Council’s director, Bill Namagoose, elaborated:

We have our people buried under the reservoir. Naming these islands is the same as naming tombstones after people. It’s totally inappropriate. This is a political move, an attempt to occupy our territory and rename it, rather than adopt local names. When you fight over territory or sovereignty, one of the important things is to have title to the names.

Toponymy is a geographic bibliography – a short reference that keys the trained reader to a much more complex narrative about a people’s history, spirituality, or humour. By disregarding existing place names, the Toponymy Commission brushed aside traditions that root the Cree Nation to the Caniapiscau region. In celebrating Québec literary nationalism, the Toponymy Commission attempted to erase cartographically Cree heritage and undermine Cree sovereignty.

Inuit leaders expressed similar outrage. Zebedee Nungak, former president of the Makivik Corporation, branded The Garden at the End of the World a “naming assault.” In a letter to Toronto’s Financial Post, Nungak wrote,

The recent efforts to artificially manufacture French history where there is none is not the only experience we have had with the zeal of authorities to re-arrange the face of place names. […] The northern two-thirds of the land mass of Quebec as seen on the map today is ancient, millennial, aboriginal homeland of the Cree and Inuit people. We possess a relationship to it that predates the arbitrary acts and
colonial strokes of pen that have carved up land into political units with absolutely no consideration for those who lived, struggled, survived, and died on these lands and seas.\textsuperscript{16}

At first glance, one might mistake Nungak’s letter for something written by folklorist Richard M. Dorson. His accusation that Québec authorities had manufactured French history where none existed before sounds like Dorson’s argument Paul Bunyan had been manufactured by lumber companies and commercializing publicists.\textsuperscript{17} Yet, Nungak’s indignation is not a matter of scholarly debate but of the active and tangible intrusion against Indigenous peoples by settler-imposed cartographic practices.

The Toponymy Commission attempted to defuse Indigenous criticism. In an op-ed printed in \textit{The Gazette}, president Nicole René urged Cree and Inuit leaders to realize that with regard to aboriginal toponymy, the Commission de Toponymie itself, with the announcement of the James Bay hydro-electric development projects of the 1970s, began compiling systematic inventories of place names in collaboration with local authorities. This program has led to the granting of legal status and the publication on maps of thousands of aboriginal toponyms. Far from posing a threat, this operation effectively raised the total number of official aboriginal toponyms from 1,560 in 1969 to nearly 12,000.\textsuperscript{18}

Rather than focus on 101 remote, insignificant locations, René suggested, Indigenous leaders should acknowledge the Commission’s good, self-directed, and self-satisfied work. Conveniently, René did not mention that the systematic collection of James Bay toponyms in the 1970s had focused on coastal regions and not the inland communities actually affected by the creation of the Caniapiscau Reservoir.\textsuperscript{19} Christian Bonnelly, one of the Toponymy Commission’s geographers, told \textit{The Gazette}, “We were convinced that [the islands] didn’t have names. If the Crees have some names in their inventories, the commission will consider the file in light of this new information. It could lead to certain changes. We could replace some of the names. It’s not a closed file. If we can officialize the Cree names, we will do so.”\textsuperscript{20} At the same time he pled an innocent mistake, Bonnelly admitted that the Toponymy Commission had not consulted Cree communities about \textit{The Garden at the End of the World} and that the official inventory of Indigenous place names had not been updated for twenty years.
Especially between Indigenous nations and settler groups, the politics of place names reflect larger issues of appropriation and control. According to Monmonier, “Labeling privileges are most powerful when a map maker replaces toponyms of the vanquished with those of the victor.” The Toponymy Commission did just that, and René’s and Bonnelly’s remarks certainly betray the victor’s privileged position. Even if Cree place names exist, their legitimacy in contemporary Québec comes from the authority of the Toponymy Commission – not accepted practice among Crees. Indeed, as René put it, the Toponymy Commission had “raised” the number of toponyms. She frames the Commission as the cultivator of Indigenous place names; the implication is that Cree and Inuit communities in the James Bay region are toponymic beneficiaries and not originators. Indigenous sovereignty and naming practices have little bearing on official Québec maps, even for parts of the province that are overwhelmingly populated by Cree and Inuit communities. Rather, place names are “compiled,” “considered,” and “officialized” in ways that conform to and reinforce settler-imposed cartographic standards.

René and Bonnelly attempted to placate Cree and Inuit concerns; others simply derided them. Marc Richard, who headed the committee that originally compiled the new names, shrugged off criticism: “They’re not names that are offensive. There are no warriors. They enrich pieces of land that now have no names.” Canadian Geographic writer Bill Casselman indignantly suggested, “[It] might be time for aboriginal peoples to understand they now share Canada with peoples other than themselves. Canada is NOT theirs to the exclusion of all other humans. As our land is shared, so we ought to share the names we give it.” John Geiger, a columnist for the Edmonton Journal, reiterated Casselman’s views:

If you accept the premise that only aboriginal names can be affixed to places in northern Quebec because it is “traditional territory,” then the same rules should apply everywhere else in northern Canada. [...] Like it or not, the Cree (or is it Inuit?) territory in question is still within the province of Quebec, and that province’s Commission de Toponymie still has jurisdiction.

Like most observers, Geiger did not actually acknowledge the specific concerns Cree and Inuit leaders had raised. Rather than discuss the particulars of the Caniapiscau
Reservoir – where burial sites had been renamed without consultation – Geiger attempted to render Indigenous opposition absurd by generalizing the situation. In a country where all lands were once “traditional territory” (note his patronizing use of quotation marks), where does one draw the line? By framing the debate in national terms, Casselman, Geiger, and others pandered to the overwhelming majority of Canadians who will never visit northern Canada. If the Toponymy Commission concedes, they implicitly ask, what’s to keep Inuit and First Nations radicals from challenging all Canadian place names? What’s to keep these out-of-touch Indians from changing the name of your street? Your hometown? Casselman and Geiger might just as well have added that The Garden at the End of the World actually honours Indigenous presence. After all, isn’t Cree author Bernard Assiniwi among those Québécois literary giants now immortalized with new islands?

Actually, the existence of Assiniwi’s island, La Lune-Oû-Il-Gèle, is shot through with ambiguity. Ostensibly, it honours Assiniwi’s career as a writer and curator of the Canadian Museum of Civilization; specifically, it recognizes his novel La Saga des Béothuks, which won the 1996 Prix France-Québec Jean-Hamelin. But the island is not a simple recognition of literary merit. For one thing, Assiniwi was familiar to the literary map’s creators; in fact, he was one of the members of the Québec Toponymy Commission who approved The Garden at the End of the World. At a more complex level, La Lune-Oû-Il-Gèle – whether a genuine honour, tokenism, or critical nepotism – does not undo the project’s silencing of Indigenous voices from the Caniapiscau region itself. Assiniwi’s island amounts to an allotment on a map imposed by literary conquerors.

After a month of controversy, the front page of The Gazette pronounced, “Quebec Admits Mistake.” Seemingly, the Toponymy Commission had backtracked on The Garden at the End of the World and had abandoned the province’s larger-than-life literary map. A decade later, Monmonier observed, “As far as I can tell, the commission quietly dropped the proposal, thereby sidestepping an equally embarrassing revelation that many of the celebratory ‘islands’ were part of a giant mudflat, exposed annually when Hydro-Québec discharges much of the impounded water through its turbines.”26 So short-lived
and insignificant was the fiasco, it does not even merit a footnote in Alan Rayburn’s expanded and revised Naming Canada: Stories about Canadian Place Names (2001). Even Anishinaabeg activist Winona LaDuke, who has written about the impact of the Caniapiscau Reservoir on Cree communities, has not mentioned The Garden at the End of the World in her discussions of settler maps and the diminishment of Native land title.27

And yet, if one visits the Québec Toponymy Commission’s online inventory of place names today, one finds that La Fleur de Lyse, Le Nid du Silence, La Lune-Où-Il-Gèle, and 98 other fictional locales remain the province’s official designations for 101 islands in the Caniapiscau Reservoir. Regarding the origins of these 101 place names, the Commission’s website currently explains,

The Toponymy Commission, the agency responsible for managing place names in Québec, wanted to highlight the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Charter of the French language (1977–1997). To mark the occasion, 101 islands in the Caniapiscau Reservoir were named after titles or passages from Québec’s French post-war literature.28

Fourteen years after Bonnelly suggested that the Commission would attempt to “officialize the Cree Names,” the provincial inventory of toponyms does not cross-reference Cree or Inuit designations for any of the 101 islands, nor does it acknowledge the controversy that surrounded the project’s announcement in 1997.

To be sure, The Garden at the End of the World emerged from a series of complex sovereignty debates over land, language, and political power. Multiple groups claim sovereignty over northern Québec, including the Government of Canada, the Bloc Québécois, and Cree and Inuit communities. That the Caniapiscau Reservoir is part of the province’s larger James Bay hydroelectric infrastructure, which generates nearly half of Hydro-Québec’s power, makes the situation even more fraught.29 Yet, the most enthusiastic English-language observers did not dwell on the sovereignty debates. Indeed, they were taken with the uniqueness of the Toponymy Commission’s naming project and not its implications for Québec separatism.
Like those literary journalists who celebrated Wilstach’s *Bookman* designs at the turn of the twentieth century, commentators at century’s end applauded *The Garden at the End of the World* as an innovative and unobjectionable way to transform previously deserted spaces into productive ones. Shortly after the Toponymy Commission rechristened the islands in a dramatic expression of literary nationalism – what amounts to an act of literary conquest – the *Ottawa Citizen* reported, “101 Quebec authors will be granted immortality: they will get deserted islands in northern Quebec named after their works.”

The Caniapiscau Reservoir represented “a bounty of virgin territory” and “a golden opportunity to pay homage to Quebec’s literary figures.” With this “new landscape,” an ostensibly unnamed place, the Toponymy Commission could avoid the “kind of controversy that arose when Montreal city council renamed Dorchester Blvd. after the late premier Rene Levesque.”

In *Canadian Geographic*, Casselman celebrated *The Garden at the End of the World* as a “revolutionary gesture” and the “most imaginative act of place-naming in Canadian history.” The Toponymy Commission had transformed a “vast sheet of water covering more than 4,000 kilometers [into] a ‘geographic poem,’ where each island in this newborn archipelago would bear a resonant name drawn from the title of a story, a poem, or a book by Quebec authors important now and since the postwar period.”

A reader of the map could now follow an original poem by beginning in the reservoir’s southeast section and making her way clockwise: “La Fleur de Lyse / L’Herbe Rebelle / […] / La Banquise-Qui-Chante / Le Paradis Perdu.” For Casselman, settler imagination (innovative geographic verse of 101 lines) was more compelling and important than cultural respect or toponymic specificity (blank sheet of paper).

Phrases such as “bounty of virgin territory” and “new landscape” recall Harry Thurston Peck’s use of “fresh fields and pastures new” when he described the “unclaimed” spaces on Wilstach’s *A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States*. Casselman’s use of “revolutionary” suggests pioneering originality, but it also recalls the martial overtones of Wilstach’s literary invasion maps. Even the commonplace “golden opportunity” and the fixed number of islands evoke the finite nature of controllable literary resources – one of the genre’s most enduring conceits. The value of these limited resources is underscored by the simultaneous extraction of energy from Native lands. Like other literary maps, *The Garden at the End of the World* is built upon a conceptual framework of blank, unclaimed
spaces. This fallacious framework whitewashes settler violence (physical, cultural, and otherwise) and neglects existing Indigenous traditions. While the project demonstrates a more dramatic marriage of cartography and literary nationalism than a typical pictorial map, it puts into relief the appropriative implications of all literary mapping. Moreover, the quiet continuation of *The Garden at the End of the World* today demonstrates that, once they appear on the map, literary claims have the pernicious tendency to stick.

It is worth pausing again on Marc Richard’s suggestion that the 101 authors who had secured literary claims on Indigenous lands are not “warriors.” This reactionary response to Indigenous anger belies the basic formula of literary mapping: claiming, invasion, and conquest. Symbolically, the writers identified by Richard’s committee were dispatched as literary soldiers to Québec’s northern front. Indeed, when it comes to literary frontiers, whether in late nineteenth-century America or late twentieth-century Québec, the distinctions between writers and conquerors quickly disintegrate. Ultimately, *The Garden at the End of the World* demonstrates the need to un-settle the unsettling claims of literary mapping.

Figuratively, the process of un-settling the literary map has already begun with works that challenge us to rethink “what constitutes literary efforts.” Following the publication of Acoma Pueblo poet Simon Ortiz’s foundational essay “Towards a National Indian Literature: Cultural Authenticity in Nationalism” in 1981, and especially since the mid-1990s, Indigenous literary nationalists and their allies have redefined Native literatures as “the total written output of a people,” “anything [written or spoken] with the intention of meaningful endurance,” and “literature of, from, by Native Americans, and not about them – or, worse yet, set among them.” Based on such definitions, scholars have increasingly valued and contributed to a “Native literary criticism, written by Native authors.” Osage scholar Robert Warrior, for example, has produced studies of twentieth-century Indian activism and intellectual histories of Vine Deloria, Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux) and John Joseph Mathews (Osage); Jace Weaver (Cherokee) has examined a range of Native literatures written since 1768; and Womack has encouraged Native
scholars to recover and study the literary traditions that are specific to their own tribal communities. Tribally specific criticism is seen in the work of Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) and Lisa Brooks (Abenaki), for example, who have recontextualized writers and literary traditions of the U.S. Southeast, Northeast, and Oklahoma. Native Studies allies such as J. Edward Chamberlin, Philip H. Round, and Matt Cohen have written complementary studies that reinforce expanded definitions of literature and further recover a variety of textual histories from throughout Indian Country. While literary nationalists and their allies vary in their geographic, historical, and linguistic approaches – and at times define Native identity, kinship, and culture differently – they recognize that Indigenous literary criticism goes hand-in-hand with Indigenous sovereignty.

By prioritizing Indigenous voices and textual practices, literary nationalists have begun to un-settle the metaphoric literary map within the academy; at the same time they have expanded the academy to include elders, traditional storytellers, artisans, and others who may not hold formal degrees or university positions. In doing so, they have challenged dominant critical practices and cultural assumptions that, to paraphrase White Earth Ojibwe historian Jean O’Brien, have worked to define Indians out of existence. Whether in the form of “definitional extermination,” “legislative genocide,” “documentary genocide,” or actual genocide, military actions, legislative policies, and, indeed, critical pronouncements have justified settler expansion for centuries by “making [Native] property available for others to take.” Recent scholarship confronts the legacy of these justifications, and, in the spirit of Indigenous literary nationalism, a process of literary un-mapping is another critical move to make.

Printed literary maps, or those built on artificial reservoirs, may not be as obviously or immediately violent as cavalry charges, Gatling guns, forced relocations, and legislative detribalizations, but cartographic genocide is complicit with such violence. In schools, libraries, popular magazines, and increasingly online, literary maps have been and are still part of what Womack calls the “historical silencing of Indian viewpoints.” The use of Native iconography on many designs shows that “America loves Indian culture.” The dearth of Native writers actually on literary maps, however, affirms that “America is much less enthusiastic about Indian land title.” If Indigenous criticism “roots literature
in land and culture,” then Indigenous critics cannot discount the subtle but consequential effect of discursive literary mapping in U.S. and North American print culture. Literary maps evoke interest and contemplation as few other critical documents can. Unlike written criticism, literary maps can establish for larger audiences in much less time a colloquial connection between literature and geographic space. With deceptive authority, the genre has consistently linked North American geography to settler literary culture – a process Chad Allen refers to as “grafting.” Within popular print culture, literary maps graft onto the landscape what Weaver describes as “a formal, if not actual, indigeneity” that erroneously allows settler groups to “trace their national literature uninterrupted back to an autochthonous past.”

From Wilstach’s *A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States* to Québec’s *The Garden at the End of the World*, the genre has classified North America as a cultural wilderness originally devoid of books – the type of classification that has legitimized “colonial adventures in the settlement of aboriginal territory.” The ongoing production and circulation of these documents, which take for granted the availability of free land and the mythic process of westward expansion, continue to justify settler encroachment and continue to undermine Indigenous title. Vizenor’s inclusion on Minnesota Writers or Assiniwi’s island in the Caniapiscau Reservoir does not fundamentally alter the genre’s conceptual framework. Instead, such recognitions amount to tokenistic allotments; far from benign honours, these tokens further normalize settler hegemony.

What, then, might an un-settling of the discursive and figurative literary map look like? First, scholars who support Indigenous nationhood and sovereignty must recognize literary maps as serious critical documents and not dismissible ephemeral ornaments of a bygone era. By acknowledging the ways the genre has linked, and continues to link, North American literature to a mythology of frontier settlement, scholars can begin to demystify the landscape these documents depict. While national literary map production slowed after 1960, local literary maps remained an important part of U.S. print culture. Today, literary maps hang in bookstores, libraries, schools, and universities. In addition to a number of ongoing literary map projects sponsored by newspapers and educational groups, extant twentieth-century designs are experiencing reinvigorated circulations as
cartography enthusiasts and bloggers of all stripes digitize and post literary maps online. A process of un-mapping actively complicates the continued display and circulation of literary maps in English departments, in library reading rooms, and on the Internet. Because these documents offer clues to the development of canon, U.S. literary nationalism, and the teaching of literature throughout the twentieth century, they should not be rounded up and destroyed. But we should ask ourselves what their continued display entails, instills, and engenders. The most powerful aspect of literary un-mapping, however, would be the recognition of a fifth subgenre: the Indigenous literary map. This new category privileges Indigenous configurations of space, instead of the now familiar projections and assumptions of discursive literary mapping.

Over the past century, scholars have reassessed the accuracy and sophistication of Indigenous mapping technologies that existed throughout North and South America prior to European exploration, conquest, and settlement. Previously, Indigenous maps were largely dismissed for their “primitive” crudeness. In an often cited essay originally published in 1911, for example, the Russian geographer B.F. Adler credited “good eyesight and a highly developed gift among primitive peoples of finding their bearings” for maps that were “simple” and “truest of the region best known to the map-maker.” A generation later, Leo Bagrow, the cartographic historian and founder of Imago Mundi, argued that “primitive savages” knew “nothing of abstract maps, conventional generalization, or data of a general kind.” Supposedly primitive peoples lacked “an aptitude for drawing” and their attempts at mapping were more or less “like a child’s.”

More recently, cartographic historians, curators, literary critics, and other scholars have observed the speed with which Aztec maps were reproduced for Spanish explorers who valued the firsthand and accurate knowledge of pre-conquest Mexico. Others have discussed ways English and French explorers and trappers in the Great Lakes and Hudson Bay watersheds relied on Indigenous maps recorded on paper, birchbark, and a variety of other material surfaces. Louis DeVorsey and Paula Gunn Allen (Laguna Pueblo-Sioux) have demonstrated the many similarities between European and Indigenous worldviews, as well as mapping practices in the early sixteenth century. Gordon Brotherston has suggested that the incorporation of Indigenous cartographic knowledge on European
maps may have contributed, in part, to the invention of the post-Renaissance grid map.\textsuperscript{53} As Brotherston and Mark Warhus have both observed, today’s scholars are not always able to recognize extant Indigenous maps because of the numerous and not always obvious material forms they take; it is likely that countless maps have been misidentified in the past and are incorrectly catalogued in museums and library collections.\textsuperscript{54} Our inability to identify, locate, or interpret Indigenous maps does not, however, negate their validity, accuracy, and sophistication. For thousands of years, Indigenous peoples have recorded geographic knowledge that is undeniably “deep and detailed” using petroglyphs, manuscripts, scrolls, winter counts, pen and paper, and the printing press.\textsuperscript{55} Further appreciation and recovery of Indigenous mapping practices, then, offers alternatives to settler-imposed cartography for future literary map productions.

Over the past few decades, an increasing number of Indigenous communities throughout North and South America have used extant maps that predate European invasion, and contemporary maps based on Indigenous worldviews, to assert sovereignty and to resist further encroachment.\textsuperscript{56} Literary maps based on Indigenous worldviews can likewise challenge writerly invaders and conquerors. In many respects, this is what Lisa Brooks has recently offered in \textit{The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast}. Brooks shows what is critically possible when figurative un-mapping of literary studies goes hand-in-hand with maps that privilege Indigenous conceptions of geography and space. In her attempts to recover and prioritize Native voices, Brooks re-examines the complex cultural, geographic, and economic relationships between Algonquian and Iroquoian writers and European colonizers of New England. Like other Indigenous literary nationalists, Brooks rejects the premise that writing technologies somehow corrupted Native cultures by collapsing commonly held distinctions between books, maps, pictographs, wampum, and other non-book texts. Using the Abenaki root word \textit{awigha-} as an example, she demonstrates the interdependence of oral, written, and cartographic traditions. The root word “denotes ‘to draw,’ ‘to write,’ ‘to map.’ The word \textit{awikhigan}, which originally described birchbark messages, maps, and scrolls, came to encompass books and letters. […] For Abenakis, as well as for Mayans, Mixtecs, and Ojibwes, writing and drawing are both forms of image making, and they are not always easily read.”\textsuperscript{57} Brooks at once blurs the lines between material texts and establishes her
monograph as a textual map of the Northeast. She invites her readers to use The Common Pot like any other awikhiganak – as an “adaptive tool” and a “map that guides communal activity in a changing landscape.”

Brooks shows that for Abenakis and many other Indigenous communities “the map and the book are the same thing.” An ability to negotiate and engage the “intertwining of writing and the oral tradition,” as well as the cartographic, empowers Native Studies scholars and their allies to shift geographic and intellectual perspectives away from imposed frameworks. To this end, Brooks asks a series of provocative questions:

What happens to our view of American history when Native narratives are not just included but privileged? What happens to our conception of literature when we momentarily set aside the literary frameworks of Europe and consider what constitutes Native American writing? What happens when we put Native space at the center of America rather than merely striving for inclusion of minority viewpoints or viewing Native Americans as part of or on the periphery of America? What does the historical landscape look like when viewed through the networks of waterways and kinship in the northeast, with Europe and its colonies on the periphery? What happens when the texts of Anglo-American history and literature are participants in Native space rather than the center of the story? What kind of map emerges?

Intellectually, what emerges is a critical landscape that is un-mapped, where unsettling claims about North American literature are un-settled. The Common Pot is the kind of map that is possible; it is both a critical monograph, a personal narrative, and a literary map made up of words. However powerful that combination is, Brooks also recognizes the usefulness of printed maps that partially conform to popular expectations.

Brooks complements her awikhigan – her book, her map, her message – with maps that visually guide readers through the recovery of Native space. Yet, the printed maps she includes continue to challenge expectations by rejecting settler-imposed cartographic grammars. Gone are compass roses, scales, modern geopolitical boundaries, and most European toponyms. Brooks’s maps depict places we think we know, but they prove powerfully disorienting. Through that spatial and critical disorientation, Brooks dares us to question our geographical and intellectual bearings. By emphasizing rivers, Indigenous place names, and trade networks, for example, she destabilizes the authority of settler geography. Brooks recovers Indigenous space by first un-mapping it.
The relationship between literary maps and Indigenous literatures is especially fraught because the genre is inextricably tied to the rhetoric of settlement, appropriation, and conquest. More than anything, a process of literary un-mapping recognizes the pervasive power of such ties. It does not deny the critical, emotional, and stylistic relationship between literature and place, nor does it mean we must abandon those works that have appeared on North American literary maps over the past century. Most importantly, the need to un-settle the literary map does not mean that Indigenous sovereignty and cartography are antithetical. Rather, because the relationship between literature and place is so significant and because Indigenous sovereignty and cartography are anything but antithetical, the framework on which literary maps are currently built must go.

Breaking the dam on this settler framework allows us to see the Caniapiscau Reservoir not as a “geographic poem” written by toponymic poets or as the birthplace of Paul Bunyan, but as the land where Cree and Inuit peoples lived and died in the past – where they live and die today. Abandoning this settler framework prompts the popular imagination to evacuate ascribed meanings of literary worth in North America and to appreciate Lakota, Acoma-Pueblo, Cherokee, and other Indigenous storytellers who craft literature and criticism today – and who have crafted literary criticism for centuries. Critically voiding the claims of this settler framework allows us to recognize pre-existing claims and pre-existing literatures that have been mapped differently. Like Lisa Brooks and other Indigenous literary nationalists, Ojibwe writer Louise Erdrich encourages us to do just that.

In her 1988 novel Tracks, Erdrich explores the consequences of imposed cartography for Indigenous peoples. Set on a fictional reservation in allotment-era North Dakota, Tracks tells the story of two Chippewa families – one who embraces settler maps and one who opposes them. Early in the novel, the protagonist Fleur Pillager twice drowns in the reservation’s large lake. As a young girl, her limp body is pulled from the “cold and glassy waters of Matchimanito” by two men in a rowboat. One of the men wanders off and disappears; the other, Jean Hat, “[gets] himself run over by his own surveyor’s
When Fleur is fifteen, she drowns a second time. George Many Women finds her body on the shore; as he approaches, she hisses, “You take my place.” Spooked by Fleur’s ominous words, Many Woman stops “[leaving] his house and would [no longer] be forced to go near water or guide the mappers back into the bush.” He later drowns in his own bathtub. Years go by. When Fleur learns that an act of betrayal will result in the loss of her allotment, she again enters the waters of Matchimanito. Her husband, Eli Kapshaw, pulls her back to shore. As he does, Fleur curses Eli’s brother, the one who betrayed her: “Nector will take my place.”

Those who know Fleur whisper about her hexing abilities and her tendency to not stay dead. The community attributes her supernatural qualities to the unnatural rapport she shares with the monstrous manidog, or water man, that resides in Matchimanito. Reservation gossips speculate that the men who rescue Fleur die because of an undoubtedly illicit, though not fully understood, relationship:

Men stayed clear of Fleur Pillager after the second drowning. Even though she was good-looking, nobody dared to court her because it was clear that Misshepeshu, that water man, the monster, wanted her for himself. He’s a devil, that one, love hungry with desire and maddened for the touch of young girls, the strong and daring especially, the ones like Fleur.

Community members speculate that, among other things, Misshepeshu is the father of Fleur’s daughter, Lulu. In discussing Fleur and the water man’s relationship, critics have entertained the possibility as well. Victoria Brehm, for example, has called the relationship “Erdrich’s statement that American Indian culture will survive and thrive – despite capitalism, Christianity, and the U.S. government – because the persistence of mythology is an indication of long-term cultural stability.” Erdrich’s depiction of Misshepeshu as a “spirit helper” is a contemporary adaptation of the Ojibwe manidog’s “traditional role as a game boss.” Annette Van Dyke, on the other hand, has considered the “transformational power illustrated in [Fleur’s] animal characteristics which she takes on from her spirit guardian, Misshepeshu.”

Compared to the origins of Misshepeshu in traditional Ojibwe oral and textual culture, and the symbolic nature of the water man himself, critics have not spent as much time exploring the consequences of Fleur and Misshepeshu’s relationship for Jean Hat and
George Many Women – admittedly two minor characters who die in the novel’s first few pages. Their deaths merit further consideration, however. Peter G. Breidler and Gay Barton, for example, observe that Misshepeshu “[waits] in hiding for the trespassing government surveyors.”71 But it is not only the water man who waits; in fact, it is a shared antagonism toward settler-imposed cartography that most powerfully links Misshepeshu and Fleur. More than any other human character in the novel, Fleur holds “contempt” for allotment maps and “for those who [draw them].”72 She recognizes the imposed cartographic practices as tools of cultural erasure. Contrary to many readings, I would argue, Fleur does not merely curse those who save her; indeed, she curses her brother-in-law, Nector, when it is her husband, Eli, who pulls her from the water the third time. What most unites those she curses, then, is their connection to imposed conceptions of space – the pernicious threat that Fleur and Misshepeshu both challenge.

This is not to say that Fleur resists all mapping or to say that maps themselves are not Indigenous technologies; rather, Fleur challenges those mapping practices that ride roughshod over Ojibwe geographic concepts. Throughout Tracks, Erdrich highlights the incongruity of traditional Ojibwe spatial representations with the imposed cartographic vocabulary of allotment maps and logging surveys. After explaining that the “earth is limitless” in the novel’s opening paragraphs, for example, the bawdy trickster narrator, Nanapush, is forced to acknowledge the realities of an increasing confined world.73 Bolstered by allotment-era policies, the Turcot Lumber Company threatens to “sweep the marks of our boundaries off the map like a pattern of straws” as white surveyors “draw lines across the land with their strings and yellow flags.”74 Nanapush often mentions the “tracks” that have recently scarred the reservation. Not only does the title word refer to the wagon ruts that testify to the weight of extracted timber; it also suggests the cartographic grid used to measure, divide, and break-up the tribal land base. Even when Pauline Puyat, the increasingly unstable Christian zealot and Fleur’s antagonist, experiences a vision of the long road that is Ojibwe heaven, she returns to a world with “no fences, no poles, no lines, no tracks” – no imposed markers that ensure the “land will be sold and divided.”75
In their unconventional and misunderstood relationship, Fleur and Misshepeshu resist the new survey grid and those individuals who seek to establish it. Together, they confront the invading lines; they challenge, and at times kill, those who survey and map the reservation. Jean Hat, for example, is a surveyor before succumbing to Fleur’s curse; George Many Women once guided the Turcot Lumber Company’s mapmakers across the reservation. At the end of the novel, Fleur curses Nector, who she perceives as culturally deviant – showing an unhealthy interest in settler cartography from an early age. When Nector, as a small boy, “[wants] to know how land [is] parcelled out, what sorts of fees [are] required,” he essentially asks questions about U.S. government surveys and allotment maps. Nanapush tells the reader, “We were often worried on this front and Nector took the worry inside himself, more, in fact, than I understood at the time.” Nanapush playfully teases Nector about his interest in maps, saying, “You’re not even supposed to think of girls yet […] let alone an allotment.” But Nector portentously sights along the blade of his knife, and he coldly responds, “I’m just about a grown man.”

Though brief, this exchange between Nanapush and Nector highlights the novel’s central concern about exploitative cartographic practices and ideologically determined maps. Nanapush links surveying, mapping, and allotment with sexual maturity and, as such, a loss of innocence. His aside – “more than I understood at the time” – foreshadows Nector’s eventual betrayal. It is Nector’s savvy appreciation – “the worry inside himself” – of government surveys that enables and, likely, motivates his betrayal of Nanapush and Fleur. Just as she does with Jean Hat and George Many Women, Fleur recognizes that Nector is implicated in settler mapping, and control, of Indigenous space. So she curses him and his lumberjack cronies.

Fifteen years after the publication of Tracks, Erdrich returned to issues of mapping in her non-fiction travel journal Books and Islands in Ojibwe Country (2003). There she poses the question that serves as this chapter’s lead epigraph: “Would it be better to confront an ill-motivated intruder who was well read, or one indifferent to literature?” Erdrich might also have asked, “Would it be better to confront an ill-motivated intruder who was well read, or one indifferent to our literature?” The reframed question reminds us to approach literary maps with a necessarily skeptical eye. Literary maps are not harmless,
easily dismissed relics of twentieth-century print culture. Rather, they are weapons in the arsenal of well-read (or, depending on how you look at it, not so well-read) conquerors and settlers who are indifferent to a place’s Indigenous literary traditions.

In *Books and Islands*, Erdrich recounts her journey from her Minneapolis bookstore to the Boundary Waters on the U.S.-Canadian border. For Erdrich, the Boundary Waters are a depository of Ojibwe texts that she can read and study:

> The Ojibwe had been using the word *mazinibaganjigan* for years to describe dental pictographs made on birchbark, perhaps the first books made in North America. Yes, I figure books have been written around here ever since someone had the idea of biting or even writing on birchbark with a sharpened stick. Books are nothing all that new. People have probably been writing books in North America since at least 2000 B.C. Or painting islands. You could think of the lakes as libraries. […] And in truth, since the writing or drawings that those ancient people left still makes sense to people living in Lake of the Woods today, one must conclude that they weren’t ancestors of the modern Ojibwe. They were and are the modern Ojibwe.  

Like Womack, Brooks, and other Native Studies scholars, Erdrich challenges prevailing assumptions about literature—the type of assumptions given cartographic expression on discursive literary maps. Doing so, she asserts that the Ojibwe Nation has always been a nation of the book. Whether in the form of rock paintings or codices, material texts and literatures of all sorts have been composed, circulated, and consumed since the beginning: “Ojibwe people were great writers from way back and synthesized the oral and written traditions.” Even an oral performance is linked to textual culture; before sharing a story, a teller must preface that story’s history in a way “that is as complicated as the Modern Language Association guidelines to form in footnotes.” Whether oral or written, literary traditions among the Ojibwe Nation, like other Indigenous nations, predate European invasion.

The painted rocks that Erdrich visits in the Boundary Waters are not unlike the Cree and Inuit texts that have been drowned and renamed in the Caniapiscau Reservoir. Water management, provincial politics, and popular misconceptions all pose threats:

> When the pictures were painted, the lake was a full nine feet lower, and as it is nearly four feet higher this year than usual, some paintings of course are submerged. The water level is a political as well as natural process—it is in most
large lakes now. From the beginning, that the [Ontario] provincial government allowed the lake levels to rise infuriated the Anishinaabeg, as the water ruined thousands of acres of wild rice beds. As it is, I mentally add about one story of rock to the painting, which at present lies only a few feet out of the water.”

In addition to rising water levels, vandalism has also marred many of the rock paintings that Erdrich visits. In describing a horned man in Lake of the Woods, who appears with a cross in his left hand, Erdrich anticipates a likely Christian reading of the image. The figure “is not a devil, and he isn’t throwing away a Christian cross – the local white Christian interpretation of the painting, which has led to its close call at defacement.” Rather, the horned man represents “intellectual and spiritual activity,” and the cross “probably signifies the degree that the painter had reached in the hierarchy of knowledge that composes the formal structure of the Ojibwe religion, the Midewiwin.” The horned man is misinterpreted – a text that is not judged by Ojibwe standards or even recognized as a text. Somebody, perhaps a drunken teenager, once tagged the horned man in white spray paint. Erdrich observes, “I can still make out Jesus Christ in fairly neat lettering.” Then, with a modestly triumphant tone, she adds, “But the thirty-year-old graffiti has nearly flaked off, while the original painted figures still blaze true.”

Despite environmental and cultural threats, Erdrich is quick to point out that the long-term survival of textual traditions is not really in danger. Rather, what is threatened is twenty-first century access to textual sites. Aerosol spray paint may temporarily deface the horned man, but the modern paint lacks the longevity of traditional formulas. Similarly, the rising waters may complicate one’s ability to visit and read the islands, but the stories themselves will not simply disappear. Like the traditions that are drowned in the Caniapiscau Reservoir, the book islands and their paintings will continue to testify to Indigenous legacies and futures. They will be visible again when the waters someday recede.

In describing a different island in the Boundary Waters, Erdrich calls attention to the imposition of place-names by those who do not recognize Indigenous toponymy:

The name on the map is actually Devil’s Bay, so tiresome and so insulting. Squaw Rock. Devil’s This and Devil’s That. Indian or Tomahawk Anything. There’s no
use railing. You know it as well as I do. Some day, when there is nothing more important to do, the Anishinaabeg will demand that all the names be changed. Erdrich does not mourn the destruction of Ojibwe books or the long-term effects of toponymic and critical misinterpretation. Even though settlers have been incapable or unwilling to recognize the textual history of the Ojibwe nation, Erdrich refutes the idea that North America was ever a textual blank. Maps – allotment maps, survey charts, and even literary maps – have imposed limits and bounds on Indigenous space. But, Erdrich remains optimistic. Someday, such claims will be un-mapped.

Notes

1 Hopkins, introduction to Language of the Land, 16 (see introduction, n. 6). Some national maps did appear after 1960, including Literary America: Visual-History Wall Map, which the Civic Education Service published in 1966, and American Literature, which the Perfection Forum Company of Logan, Iowa, published in 1967. A number of other national designs emphasized genre fiction, specific literary movements, or minority writers. For example, the District of Columbia Council of Teachers of English published Black Writers for Young Americans in 1976; the Aaron Blake Company of Los Angeles published The Beat Generation Map of America in 1987; and Sisters in Crime of Raleigh, North Carolina, published Sisters in Crime: Solving Mysteries Coast-to-Coast in 1991.


3 Zitkala-Ša, or Gertrude Simmons Bonnin, spent thirteen years living and writing in Utah. In contrast to Utah’s map, which makes no reference to Native authors, Literary Map of Nevada does include Paiute author Sarah Winnemucca, the first American Indian woman to copyright a book in English. The Nevada map was published in 1993 by the Nevada State Library and Nevada State Council of Teachers of English.

4 Originally, the Dawes Severalty Act stated, “[The] provisions of this act shall not extend to the territory occupied by the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, and Osage, Miamies and Peorias, and Sacs and Foxes, in the Indian Territory, nor to any of the reservations of the Seneca Nation of New York Indians in the State of New York, nor to that strip of territory in the State of Nebraska adjoining the Sioux Nation on the south added by executive order.” The passage of the Curtis Act in 1898,
however, changed the legislation and allowed President Grover Cleveland to initiate allotment among the Five Tribes of Oklahoma.

5 Porter, “What We Know That We Don’t Know,” 468 (see introduction, n. 36).

6 “I say that tribal literatures are not some branch waiting to be grafted onto the main trunk. Tribal literatures are the tree, the oldest literatures in the Americas, the most American of American literature. We are the canon” [emphasis original]. Craig S. Womack, Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 6–7.

7 “D’autre part, afin que le poème géographique puisse être aisément perçu sur une carte, médium pour lequel il a été conçu avant tout, il importait que les 101 lieux en question soient regroupés. […] Innommées et regroupées, sises sur des terres publiques, dans un paysage remodelé en profondeur par l’action humaine, [les îles] constituaient un théâtre idéal pour une opération de dénomination d’envergure: c’est Le Jardin au Bout du Monde. […] La Commission a voulu que la commémoration toponymique de la loi qui touche au plus près l’identité collective québécoise s’appuie sur la manifestation la plus prestigieuse de sa langue, soit sa littérature.” Commission de toponymie du Québec, Toponymix: Note Toponymique 17 (Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, August 1997), n.p. (All French to English translations courtesy of Catherine Schwartz, Centre for Comparative Literature, University of Toronto.)


9 Members of the naming committee included Benoît Boisvert, François Cardinal, Murielle Daigle, Jacques Fortin, Marcel Fourcaudot, Yolande Morency, Jacques Toussaint, Denis Tremblay, and project manager Marc Richard. Commission de toponymie du Québec, Toponymix, n.p.

10 The Toponymy Commission board included president Nicole René, a former Bloc Québécois candidate and head of the Office québécois de la langue française; director general and secretary Alain Vallières; Anne MacLaren, an anglophone representative; Cree writer Bernard Assiniwi; Montagnais chief Georges Bacon; historian Jacques Lacoursière; scientist Jean-René Côté; and geographers Jules Dufour and Cécyle Trépanier. Commission de toponymie du Québec, Rapport Annuel 1997–1998 (Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 1998), n.p; and Irwin Block, “Names Decided by Board of 7,” The Gazette [Montreal], February 20, 1998.

12 Mordecai Richler, “Cherished Dream Shatters on 101 Islands,” *The Gazette*, September 7, 1997. Richler’s op-ed was reprinted in the *Calgary Herald* and *Edmonton Journal* (September 7); *Windsor Star* and *Toronto Star* (September 8); and the *Vancouver Sun* (September 11).


17 See chapter 3.


19 Monmonier, *From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow*, 89; and Roslin and Webb, “Iles 101: Quebec Admits Mistake.” Roslin and Webb’s article quotes Marguerite MacKenzie, who compiled Cree place names for the Toponymy Commissions before the construction of James Bay hydroelectric projects. Regarding her own work, MacKenzie said, “There is no way that was an exhaustive study. There was never any idea that the list of names I did was exhaustive. It’s silly what they’re doing. I think it is an incredible insult to the Crees, a bold-faced insult. I’m amazed they’re still doing that in this day and age. This seems to be an about-face, a return to an earlier colonial situation. They’re trying to create instant history.”

20 Christian Bonnelly, quoted in Roslin and Webb, “Iles 101.”

21 Monmonier, *From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow*, 148.


25 Linda Goyette, a columnist for the Edmonton Journal, was one of the few English-language commentators to acknowledge the legitimacy of Indigenous concerns: “I’d say the Inuit have a fair grievance. The Quebec government is ignoring its own rules, and Canadian rules, to impose a nationalist imprint on northern territory. In the war of the maps, Quebec is treating the Inuit in the same shabby way that English Canada once treated Quebec.” See Linda Goyette, “Nationalism Behind Island Baptisms: Inuit Ignored as Islands Named for Quebec Writers,” Edmonton Journal, August 27, 1997.

26 Monmonier, From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow, 89.


29 In 1997, Grand Council director Namagoose argued that Hydro-Québec’s presence in the James Bay region, along with proposals to settle nearly 2,000 non-Indigenous workers in the heart of Cree territory, represents “ethnic occupation”: “Quebec sovereignty is the motive behind this plan. It is part of an attempt to declare the north as part of the future modern independent state of Quebec. They want to drown out the Cree vote in any future referendum.” Namagoose, quoted in Jack Aubry, “Cree Claim Hydro-Quebec Plan Is ‘Ethnic Occupation,’” Calgary Herald, September 9, 1997.


32 By translating the names into English, the poem reads, “The Flower of Lyse / The Rebel Grass / […] / The Glacier-That-Sings / The Lost Paradise.”

33 See chapter 1.

34 The selection of 101 islands symbolizes the Charter of the French Language’s popular designation as Bill 101. In a more pernicious way, however, the fixed number artificially inflates the perceived worth of literary real estate. While the Toponymy Commission named 101 islands, hundreds of other islands in the Caniapiscau Reservoir lack “officialized” names. The naming project could have honoured hundreds of additional writers; the immortalization of a limited number of writers brings to mind the perceived self-reliance of literary claimants at the turn of the twentieth century.

35 Womack, Red on Red, 1.


37 Womack, Red on Red, 11.

38 See, for example, Robert Warrior, Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Weaver, That the People Might Live; and Womack, Red on Red.

39 See, for example, J. Edward Chamberlin, If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories? (see chap. 1, n. 79); Philip H. Round, Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663–1880 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); and Matt Cohen, The Networked Wilderness: Communicating in Early New England (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

40 Linguistically, for example, David Treuer (Ojibwe) has argued that Indigenous literatures are limited to those works written in traditional languages. Simon Ortiz, on the other hand, argues that Natives peoples have used the “newer languages” of English,
French, and Spanish “on their own terms” for centuries. These languages have been actively Indigenized by generations of Native writers, leaders, thinkers, and storytellers. See David Treuer, *Native American Fiction: A User’s Manual* (St. Paul, MN: Grey Wolf Press, 2006); and Ortiz, “Towards a National Indian Literature,” 10.


46 Chamberlin, *If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories?*, 29.

47 In commenting on the “Dakota Representation in History and Literature” panel at the 2010 Western History Association Annual Conference, historian Susan Miller rightly observed, “Indian tokenism is a tactic of colonial hegemony!”

48 Within the past several years, dozens of local and national newspapers have sponsored online literary map projects, including the New York Times, *Lincoln Journal Star* [Nebraska], and Harvard University’s Crimson. Through its “Guide to 21st Century Literary Maps,” the National Council of Teachers of English encourages state literary map projects, as has the Center for the Book at the Library of Congress. Anecdotally, for the past two years, my Google Alert for “literary map” has alerted me to new projects, postings, and discussions on almost a daily basis.


Brotherston, Book of the Fourth World, 82; and Mark Warhus, Another America, 9.

Brotherston, Another America, 2.

Brotherston, Book of the Fourth World, 83.


Brooks, The Common Pot, xxxv [emphasis in original].

Maps appear throughout The Common Pot, including fifteen full-page examples that form part of the book’s front matter. Other examples of contemporary Indigenous mapping are reproduced and described in Warhus, Another America, 208–229.


Erdrich, Tracks, 10.

Erdrich, Tracks, 11.
64 Erdrich, Tracks, 11.

65 Erdrich, Tracks, 213.

66 Erdrich, Tracks, 11.

67 See, for example, John Purdy, “Against All Odds: Games of Chance in the Novels of Louise Erdrich,” in The Chippewa Landscape of Louise Erdrich, ed. Allan Chavkin (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), 21.


69 Brehm, “Metamorphoses,” 693.


72 Erdrich, Tracks, 174.

73 Erdrich, Tracks, 1.

74 Erdrich, Tracks, 8–9 [emphasis added].

75 Erdrich, Tracks, 159, 204.

76 Erdrich, Tracks, 121.


78 Erdrich, Books and Islands, 5–6.

79 Erdrich, Books and Islands, 11.

80 Erdrich, Books and Islands, 39.

81 Erdrich, Books and Islands, 52.

82 Erdrich, Books and Islands, 53–54.
Conclusion

Thus graced by its absence, the unknown world
Floats beyond the reach of being named,
and the cannibals there
don’t have to find out yet they’re cannibals:
they can just think they’re having lunch.

–Lucia Perillo, “The Oldest Map with the Name America”

In 1878, the American textbook company A.S. Barnes published Philological and Historical Chart (fig. 26). The New York Times said of the large map, “[It] cannot fail to be of great service in schools and families, and gives the private student at a glance, with its locality indicated, the leading facts about the languages and history of mankind.”

Crowded with information, the map was compiled by A.E.D. de Rupert, a Parisian vicomte who had fled the French Commune in 1871. Despite his nobility, de Rupert was of modest means when he arrived in the United States. Before eventually finding work as a newspaperman in Philadelphia in the 1880s, he taught high school French, history, and natural philosophy in Erie, Pennsylvania. A self-described Bohemian with a love of language, de Rupert “most respectfully dedicated” his map to “all educational institutions and to the general reading public” of his adopted country.

Vicomte de Rupert, who would later return to Paris with his moneyed 52-year-old bride from St. Louis, Missouri, believed, “It is through the languages that we learn the histories of nations and the migrations of races.”

To help illustrate the philological origins and relative progress of each nation and race, de Rupert compiled lists of literature that exemplified the world’s languages – what he considered the “standard authors and their best works.” The usual suspects appear on Philological and Historical Chart. Hebrew writers include Moses, David, and Solomon; Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristotle exemplify Greek literature; Plautus, Julius Caesar, and Virgil represent Latin; Arabic texts include the Koran and the Arabian Nights; and the Vedas represents the best of Sanskrit. The modern languages of French, German, and English boast writers such as Rabelais, Montaigne, Descartes, Dumas, Luther, Kant, Goethe, Chaucer, Spenser,
Shakespeare, and so forth. American literature, which de Rupert would later describe as “full of wit and repartee,” had begun with the Puritan ministers Thomas Hooker and John Cotton. By the late 1870s, it also included the novels of James Fenimore Cooper and Harriet Beecher Stowe, the non-fiction writings of Noah Webster and Ralph Waldo Emerson, and the local colour of Bret Harte and Joaquin Miller. In fact, every country and every language group that de Rupert identified on Philological and Historical Chart is shown to possess a literary tradition of note. Every language group, that is, except those of Indigenous peoples.

Designed by a spirited French nobleman and published by a leading American textbook company, Philological and Historical Chart is one of the earliest literary maps printed in the United States. It is also an ambitious example of the scholarly subgenre that preceded the more discursive designs examined in the previous chapters. Despite its comprehensively scientific posturing, what Martha Hopkins describes as a “Victorian love of classification,” the map betrays some significant lacunae. In addition to lists of “standard authors” that blanket the world’s oceans, Philological and Historical Chart assesses each country’s literary progress on a scale of four values: “No literature,” “Literary culture,” “Advanced literature,” and “Most advanced literature” (fig. 27).

According to the map, those who speak the majority of languages in Europe and the Middle East have inherited the world’s “most advanced” literatures. Citizens of the United States, China, and Japan have inherited “advanced” ones. Many European colonies (and former colonies) enjoy a developing “literary culture.” For instance, Mexico, Australia, Brazil, and Cape Colony, Africa, do not yet possess the quality or quantity of “standard authors” that Europe and the United States do, but they are nonetheless in the process of developing respected traditions of their own.

De Rupert reserves the label “No literature,” indicated by a blank rectangle, for the Indigenous languages of North and South America, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Identified as “British America,” for example, the western half of modern Canada is populated “mostly by natives: Esquimaux, etc.” and has “No literature,” nor does Alaska, Somauli, Guinea, or Malaysia. Places such as New Zealand and the Hawai’ian Islands do not even appear on the map. Thus, Philological and Historical Chart renders huge swaths of the
world textually and literarily barren. Not only do the blank rectangles indicate an absence of Indigenous culture, the design itself leaves little room for Indigenous literatures to even develop. Visually, there is no space left on the map.

A.S. Barnes published de Rupert’s scholarly map twenty years before Paul Wilstach introduced a highly discursive subgenre of literary mapping in the pages of the New York Bookman. In many ways, Philological and Historical Chart and A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States could not be more different. At 125 x 85 cm, the former is an unusually large literary map, and it suggests the vicomte faced an embarras de richesses of philological, historical, and literary data. In sharp contrast, the latter is merely 21 x 13 cm and conveys what appears to be a deficiency of information available to a minor playwright. Despite their differences, the vicomte’s and the playwright’s respective maps treat Indigenous literary traditions in the same way; they similarly render Native lands blank and free for the taking. Indeed, de Rupert’s Philological and Historical Chart anticipates the more explicitly discursive tropes of “unclaimed” regions and literary frontiers that Wilstach and Harry Thurston Peck would explicate in 1898 and subsequent literary mapmakers would replicate through the present day.

Peck’s Bookman published A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States at a time when average Americans were abandoning what Susan Schulten has described as their former geographical “parochialism.” Schulten characterizes late-nineteenth-century U.S. cartography as “a reactive medium” that responded to the moods and ambitions of the nation. As yellow journalists whipped up war fever and anti-Spanish sentiment following the sinking of the Maine in Havana Harbour, Americans grew increasingly curious about the world beyond the nation’s borders. With recently developed wax engraving methods and newly affordable printing technologies, publishers such as Rand McNally and Crams reacted to this newfound geographic curiosity with mass-produced atlases that brought the world and its riches into countless American homes for the first time. So drastic was the change, the maps and atlases that flooded the market during the Spanish-American War can give the impression that the U.S. popular imagination did not “discover” the world until 1898.
As mass-market cartography awakened Americans to the world’s mineral resources and foreign commercial markets, and as affordable maps fuelled the nation’s expansionist desires, Wilstach and Peck directed the attention of “ambitious writers” back to the United States. In the context of 1898 current events, Wilstach’s A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States might appear terribly behind the times. Its simplistic design and lack of data come across as technologically and intellectually outmoded, and its isolationist lack of cartographic referents to the rest of the world is more than a little passé. But the map’s simplicity is deceptive. With a design that newspapers could easily reproduce, Wilstach and Peck reminded Americans that resource exploitation and frontier adventure were alive and well at home. “Unclaimed” lands were still free for the taking.

A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States was a cartographic celebration of U.S. literary nationalism at a time of fervent patriotism and a renewed sense of unity following the Civil War and Reconstruction. Unlike de Rupert’s Philological and Historical Chart, Wilstach’s design did not seek to advance scholarly knowledge. Unlike a map of Utopia, it did not attempt to make imaginative spaces intelligible for readers. Instead, it was fundamentally a patriotic expression that recast American authors as frontier heroes, conquerors, and the vanguard of literary progress. Love of country has inspired discursive literary map production ever since. Whether it was Paul Mayo Paine designing maps that expressed U.S. literary nationalism and a profound commitment to civic responsibility or William Gropper celebrating the “common man” with a map of American folklore, such maps have been and remain grounded in local, regional, and national pride.

Nominally, A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States depicted participants of the local colour movement. For Wilstach, “local colour” was a loosely applied term and more of a critical catch-all for what he formulated as a finite, controllable, and extractable resource. Claimants of this resource were overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon American men, many of whom actually preceded the local colour movement. Over the past century, discursive mapmakers have distanced the genre from local colour and have expanded the field of claimants to include women and other once-marginalized groups. Paine, for example, filled his maps with novels, songs, poems, plays, and non-fiction adventures,
and widely circulated maps of American folklore combined tall tales, historic figures, and fictional characters in an increasingly pluralistic literary landscape. Reflecting significant immigration, the Great Migration, and the rise of American Studies, Paine and other mapmakers began to recognize naturalized Americans and writers of color. State and local maps produced in the second half of the twentieth century, in particular, have presented diverse topographies of literary styles and authorship.

Americans were first introduced to discursive literary maps in popular print culture. Literary journalists celebrated Wilstach’s *A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States*, as well as the designs it inspired, and the nation’s newspapers and magazines reprinted them often. Paine’s maps were similarly circulated and discussed, and they appeared in some unlikely places – movie theatres, streetcars, storefronts, and, of course, the public library. Authors who appeared on these maps responded favourably to their recognition as claimants on America’s literary frontier, and some actively participated in staking of those claims. After World War II, a number of high-profile maps that mirrored the vogue of American folklore appeared in popular magazines and on gas station countertops. Other maps, such as the controversial *William Gropper’s America: Its Folklore*, were sold as affordable works of art to the emerging middlebrow consumer who wanted to display his or her literary nationalism at home.

Literary maps enjoyed a widespread circulation in popular print culture; simultaneously, they served a variety of purposes in schools and universities. On classroom walls and textbook endpapers, discursive literary maps helped students with waning geographic vocabularies locate where novels and adventure narratives took place, both in the U.S. and around the world. Teachers perceived the genre as an effective stimulus that encouraged student reading and comprehension. Literary maps in the classroom became necessary “equipment,” or what the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) marketed as a helpful “crutch” for undergraduates. Literary maps were also used as efficient and afforded alternatives to adult education programs such as John Erskine’s *Great Books*. Paine’s designs, in particular, offered self-directed courses of study that affirmed the value of popular taste and the edifying potential of “good reading.” And
librarians throughout the United States used discursive literary maps to bring patrons into the library and closer to books.

Whether Wilstach’s *A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States* or the Québec Toponymy Commission’s *The Garden at the End of the World*, literary maps have marginalized writers and groups of writers who do not conform to the mapmaker’s standards or are not recognized by the mapmaker’s critical worldview. Maps have silenced and ignored many authors because of their gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious or political affiliation, and literary style. The choice to display a literary map – or the choice of which map to display – can raise important questions about how a nation, a state, or a city perceives itself.

Consider, for example, three literary maps from my home state that were published between 1967 and 1998. The oldest, *Nebraska Centennial Literary Map and Guide to Nebraska Authors*, identifies fifty-two writers, including novelist Bess Streeter Aldrich, poet Weldon Kees, scientist George W. Beadle, and Benjamin A. Botkin’s doctoral supervisor Louise Pound. Though almost fifty years old, this map still hangs in many of the state’s elementary schools, high schools, libraries, and university English Departments. It also hangs in the governor’s mansion across the street from the state capitol. Between undergraduate English classes at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, I often looked at this colourful map, displayed in Andrews Hall. There is also *Literary Map of Nebraska*, which the Nebraska Council of Teachers of English published in 1996. Several years ago, I bought a copy of this map while visiting Willa Cather’s house in Red Cloud. This monochromatic map depicts just twenty-three authors, including the education reformer Dorothy Canfield Fisher and the philosopher Hartley Burr Alexander. Finally, Carol MacDaniels co-designed *Nebraska Literary Map with Wild Flowers* in 1998 for the Department of Economic Development’s Division of Travel and Tourism and the Nebraska English Language Arts Council. MacDaniels, incidentally, taught at Unadilla’s public elementary school when I attended the third and fourth grades there. Her design identifies sixty-eight authors connected to the state; my copy of the map, which I picked up at the tourism board’s booth at the Nebraska State Fair, has a number of pushpin holes from when I put it on my dorm room bulletin board in college.
Schools, libraries, tourist destinations, and newspapers continue to display and circulate Nebraska’s various literary maps. The choice of which map to display, distribute, or teach can raise or obscure important questions about the state’s relationship to its authors, its minority communities, and its Native peoples. The most widely circulated maps, Nebraska Centennial Literary Map and Literary Map of Nebraska, make use of Native iconography, but neither references important authors and storytellers such as Susan La Flesche (Omaha), Susette La Flesche (Omaha), Francis La Flesche (Omaha), and Black Elk (Oglala Lakota). Moreover, neither map acknowledges Nebraska-born Malcolm X; the explanatory note to Nebraska Centennial Literary Map explains that the design recognizes “any writer born in Nebraska (including those who have left the state, even in childhood.” In contrast, the less circulated Nebraska Literary Map with Wild Flowers does include these and other writers, and their importance to the state’s cultural heritage is detailed in the map’s accompanying Guide to Nebraska Authors. Nebraska’s literary landscape dramatically shifts according to the map one sees and the map one values. The same is true for other states and their maps, as well as national maps.

As the eventual inclusion of The Autobiography of Malcolm X on Nebraska’s 1998 literary map suggests, the field of recognized literary claimants has expanded since 1898. Many authors who were formerly excluded have been placed on state, city, and national literary maps that have been published in the second half of the twentieth century and the early decades of the twenty-first. What remains the same is the rhetoric of literary settlement on Indigenous lands. However troubling and critically, culturally, and politically consequential, discursive literary mapping does not destroy Indigenous literatures so much as obfuscate them within the popular imagination. Yet, as The Garden at the End of the World demonstrates, the act of mapping over Native traditions has tangible consequences for Indigenous nationhood, cultural sovereignty, and land title. A new category of Indigenous literary mapping can help un-settle the unsettling claims the discursive category has repeatedly reinforced within the collective consciousness.
Perhaps more than ever, it is critically important to work toward a process of un-mapping that challenges the claims A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States, Nebraska Centennial Literary Map, and other discursive designs have made and continue to make. The circulation and production of national, state, and city literary maps have increased recently as a result of renewed interest and New Media technologies that make amateur and pictorial cartography easier than ever. The NCTE and its state affiliates, as well as the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress and its local affiliates, have encouraged students, educators, librarians, and community groups throughout the United States to compile, revise, and share literary map designs.13 Newspapers from coast to coast have also shown revived interest in the genre. These recent projects vary in style and scope. For example, the Harvard Crimson and the San Francisco Chronicle have recently published in print and online literary maps of Cambridge and San Francisco, respectively. The Chronicle’s map, The Literary City, has since been reproduced on numerous blogs and cartography websites.14 These two maps maintain the pictorial and animated qualities previously seen in James Lewicki’s Storyteller’s Map of American Myths and John Dukes McKee’s American Folklore & Legends. A number of interactive maps, such as the NCTE’s U.S. Literary Map Project and A Literary Map of Manhattan, which is maintained by the New York Times, have taken advantage of Google Maps and similar technologies.15 The stories these online projects tell are especially important to interpret and un-settle because their use of satellite imagery and Rand McNally-style cartography, as opposed to more animated pictorial methods, enhances further their authority in the minds of many. Like maps in general, literary maps are in many ways more accessible than ever before; their ready availability and technological sophistication normalizes the settler politics at play in discursive literary mapping.

Extant twentieth-century literary maps are also experiencing renewed circulations and popular interest. Previously, cartophiles and niche collectors relied primarily on dealer catalogues, map fairs, and auctions to acquire and discuss antique maps. Today, however, they can buy and sell maps of all sorts, including twentieth-century pictorial maps, online. Consequently, digitized copies of numerous U.S. literary maps are being reproduced and re-circulated on map dealer websites, eBay, Craigslist, and blogs of all stripes. In addition, following its 1994 “Language of the Land” traveling exhibition, the
Library of Congress maintains high resolution images of dozens of literary maps on its website.\textsuperscript{16} Other institutions, including Libraries and Archives Canada and the Illinois State Library, also maintain digital collections of literary maps.\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, the Internet has aided my own research, and continued digital circulation will likely prompt me to rethink the survival rates of extant literary maps that I discuss in chapters 2 and 3.

The largely unacknowledged relationship between discursive literary maps and the spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences ought to encourage further study of the genre. As the geographers Neil Smith and Cindi Katz observed in 1993, figurative maps are a common part of our spatialized grammar.\textsuperscript{18} Unlike much of this grammar, the figurative literary map is not the result of the spatial turn, though the spatial turn has given it renewed currency. Rather, the literary map, as a conceptual space where distinguished authors and works are placed for veneration, emerged in the early twentieth century as journalists and book reviewers linked critical success to Paul Wilstach’s \textit{A Map Which Is a Literary Map of the United States}. Today, the expression has a hackneyed quality to it, but it remains a frequently used part of our spatialized grammar and critical vocabulary.

The story behind discursive U.S. literary maps, particularly their relationship to Indigenous peoples and other marginalized groups, complicates our continued use of the phrase. To assess an author or an author’s work as worthy of the proverbial literary map is to invoke the imagery of violation, claiming, settlement, and improvement of once blank spaces. That should give us pause.

With the obvious exception of \textit{The Garden at the End of the World}, the literary maps discussed in the preceding chapters are materially similar. While they differ in size, colour, and style, most are printed documents that have circulated as wall maps, as posters, and in periodicals. Scholarly, imaginative, and discursive literary maps alike have also circulated in a variety of other material forms. There is the postcard, the coffee mug, the barbecue apron, the wall clock, the diner placemat, the tote bag, and, my favourite, the jigsaw puzzle literary map.\textsuperscript{19} Far from undermining the seriousness of the genre, however, these numerous material forms reinforce the appealing and almost ubiquitous nature of such maps, which people do contemplate in some unexpected places.
Library gift shops, author homes and tourist sites, bookstores, and, of course, schools and universities continue to make use of literary maps today.

The varied materiality of literary maps – and their pervasiveness in print and digital cultures – highlights the diverse and often subtle circulations of these documents. Ask someone what a literary map is, and he will likely give the perplexed response: “What’s a literary map?” Show someone a literary map, and she will likely respond, “Oh, I’ve seen maps like that before.” Literary maps have stories and agendas. So, too, do those who make them, those who use them, those who appear on them, and, especially, those who do not. Literary maps are not simply maps of literature. They are not simply depictions of “space in literature” or “literature in space.”\(^{20}\) Indeed, literary maps are literature. In whatever material or digital form they take, literary maps tell us stories about who we are, who we have been, and who we imagine ourselves to be. It is worth our time to listen.
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Fig. 7. Paul Wilstach, A Map Showing the Invasion of North America by Foreign Authors, from Bookman 35, no. 1 (May 1912): 5. Reproduced from an original in the collections of the Victoria University Library, Toronto.
Fig. 8. Paul Mayo Paine, Map of Good Stories (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Public Library, 1924). Reproduced from an original in the collections of the Geography & Map Division, Library of Congress (G3701.E65 1924 .M3).
Fig. 9. Paul Mayo Paine, Map of Good Stories, 2nd ed. (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Public Library, 1925). Reproduced from an original in the collections of the Geography & Map Division, Library of Congress (Fair 295’58 C).
Fig. 12. Paul Mayo Paine, *The Northward Map of Truthful Tales* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Public Library, 1926). Reproduced from an original in the collection of Kyle Carsten Wyatt.
Books on the Making of the West

THE CHATTANOOGA (TENN.) PUBLIC LIBRARY’S DISPLAY OF BOOKS ON THE MAKING OF THE WESTERN STATES HAS BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS. THE BOOKS ARE “TIED” TO THE WESTERN HALF OF PAUL PAINE’S MAP OF AMERICA’S MAKING

Fig. 15. “Books on the Making of the West,” from Library Journal 51 (December 15, 1926): 1114. © The Library Journal. Reproduced in accordance with Fair Use provisions and consultation of The YGS Group.
Fig. 16. Robert L. Ramsay, A Map of the Principal Local Color Regions of the United States, from Short Stories of America, ed. Robert L. Ramsay (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1921). Reproduced from an original in the collections of the Don L. Love Memorial Library, University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
Fig. 17. [William Purviance Fenn], Literary Frontiers and Local-Color Regions, from American Poetry and Prose, ed. Norman Foerster (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1934). © Estate of William Purviance Fenn. Used with the permission of Sara Fenn Luth and Mary Fenn Hazeltine.
Fig. 19. John Dukes McKee, American Folklore & Legends, from Living in Our America: History for the Upper Grades (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1951). © Pearson Education, Inc. Used with permission.
Fig. 20. James Lewicki, A Map of Full of Myths, from Life, August 31, 1959. © Estate of James Lewicki. Used with the permission.
Fig. 22. Detail, Storyteller’s Map of American Myths.
Fig. 23. Frank Soltesz, Folklore and Legends of Our Country (Covent Station, NJ: General Drafting Company, 1960). [Classroom variant]. © Estate of Frank Soltesz. Used with the permission.
Fig. 24. Verso detail, Folklore and Legends of Our Country. (Covent Station, NJ: General Drafting Company, 1960). [Commercial variant]. © Estate of Frank Soltesz. Used with the permission.
Fig. 25. Le Jardin au Bout du Monde (The Garden at the End of the World), from Toponymix: Note Toponymique 17, August 1997. © Commission de toponymie du Québec. Used with permission.
Fig. 27. Details, Philological and Historical Chart.
Fig. 28. Bernice Kauffman and Jack Brodie, *Nebraska Centennial Literary Map and Guide to Nebraska Authors* (Lincoln: Nebraska Centennial Commission, 1967). © Nebraska Arts Council. Used with permission.
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Appendices
## Appendix 1. Working List of Literary Maps Designed by Paul Mayo Paine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PUBLISHER</th>
<th>PAMPHLET</th>
<th>WALL MAP</th>
<th>PULL-DOWN</th>
<th>B &amp; W</th>
<th>COLOUR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS (cm)</th>
<th>PRICE (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>[Public Library Map]</td>
<td>[SPL?]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>[Library Map]</td>
<td>[SPL?]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Map of Good Stories</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 x 13</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls; Stories, Trails, Voyages, Discoveries, Explorations &amp; Pieces to Read About</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 x 71</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Map of Good Stories</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 x 13</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>A World of Good Stories [ghost edition?]</td>
<td>[SPL?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Backlowers Map of America: A Chart of Certain Landmarks of Geography</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 x 77</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>The Map of America’s Making</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 x 80</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>The Northward Map of Truthful Tales</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 x 13</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>The Country Library Comes Home to the People</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61 x 51</td>
<td>$9.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Backlowery’s Map of the British Isles (-index)</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 x 49</td>
<td>$0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Twenty-Two Good Stories of 1926</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 x 11</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Map of the History of New York [with Alexander C. Flick]</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 x 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Map of the History &amp; Romance of Wyoming [index] [with Grace Raymond Hebard]</td>
<td>dl.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 x 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Map of Great Adventures</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 x 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Map of America’s Making</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 x 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Map of the History &amp; Romance of Onondaga County</td>
<td>dl.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61 x 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Map of Good Stories</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 x 11</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>A Map of the History of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>dl.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44 x 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>[George Washington Bicentennial Expedition Map]</td>
<td>dl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61 x 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>The Backlowers Map of America Showing Certain Landmarks of Literature Geography</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 x 77</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>A World of Good Stories</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 x 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Backlowers’ Map of the British Isles</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 x 71</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The Backlowers Map of America [with F. Hause]</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 x 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPL = Syracuse Public Library | Bowker = R.R. Bowker Company | ALA = American Library Association

*Price per unit based on minimum 25 unit order | **Price per unit based on minimum 100 unit order
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATOR OR ARTIST</th>
<th>PAINE’S ORIGINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>The Booklovers Map of the British Isles</td>
<td>Dolly Tingle</td>
<td>The Booklovers/ Map of the British Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Map of Great Adventures</td>
<td>F. Haane</td>
<td>Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls: Stories, Trails, Voyages, Discoveries, Explorations &amp; Places to Read About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>The World of Storybooks</td>
<td>Mary Gould Davis (compiler), Amy Jones (illustrator)</td>
<td>Map of Adventures for Boys and Girls: Stories, Trails, Voyages, Discoveries, Explorations &amp; Places to Read About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>The Booklovers’ Map of the United States</td>
<td>F. Haane</td>
<td>Booklovers Map of America: A Chart of Certain Landmarks of Geography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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