

CASQ

Culture Alcohol & Society Quarterly
Newsletter of Kirk/CAAS Collections at Brown

Vol. IV no. 5 October/November/December 2009

This nineteenth (or is it twenty-first) new issue of the CA&SQ (since its revival in October 2004) is Volume IV, no. 5. The Editor apologizes again for an even more than usually excessively over-late appearance, besides being unsure of his numbering. We begin with “News and Notes,” with “News” on recent and forthcoming work relevant to this newsletter’s mandate, including a report on the publication of the printer’s copy of the 1939 First Edition of *Alcoholics Anonymous* (“the Big Book”) – *The Book That Started It All* (September 2010) from Hazelden – and two brief historical “Notes” on A.A., specifically one on a matter of identification and one on studying early women in A.A. After these “News and Notes” is printed the first part of the editor’s preliminary version of a paper on the founders and incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore (1840-1841), the opening part of a paper on John Zug, and – for comment and discussion – material from the editor’s 2009 AHA/ADHS very preliminary paper presented as “Prolegomena to Studies of Writers, Alcohol, Taverns, Plays and Stories.” This is followed, as no. 27 in our “Washingtonian Notes and Queries,” by further material on 1841 Incorporator John Adler. Next issue (IV, 6) is scheduled to see more early *Grapevine* material (following up on CASQ 4,4), new *olla podrida*, more WN&Q, and, as usual, contributions on current work at Brown, plans for future work, and results of past work, from the collections and by those on the KirkWorks listserv. All receiving CASQ are invited (indeed pleaded with) to contribute notes, queries, studies, data on work in progress, or requests for data – Jared Lobdell, *December 31, 2009* (rev. *January 2011*)

News and Notes pp. 2-4

News: *The Book That Started It All* p. 2

Note: Who Poured Whiskey into Milk? p. 3

Note: Studying Early Women in AA or Women in Early AA pp. 3-4

The Founders and Incorporators of the WTSB: Part I pp. 4-11

Introductory Pages on John Zug and His ‘Little Book’ pp. 11-15

Editor’s AHA/ADHS Paper 2009: Part I pp. 15-21

Washingtonian N & Q: John Adler (of Tuolomne) pp. 21-22

News: *The Book That Started It All*

The full title-page title is *The Book That Started It All: The Original Working Manuscript of Alcoholics Anonymous* (Hazelden 2010). It is, in fact, a “coffee-table” reproduction (photographic copy in color) of the printer’s copy of the original [1939] “Big Book” of Alcoholics Anonymous, with the final manuscript insertions (some in red, most apparently in ordinary pencil) made on a copy of the mimeographed (“multilith”) preliminary text – available from various sources, including (I believe) AA’s General Service Office. The photographic copy (which is very good) is prefaced by two essays and followed by three appendices.

The first essay, “Historical Context and Suggested Framework for Reading the Working Manuscript” (pp. 1-9) is written by the author of the third appendix, “The Publication of *Alcoholics Anonymous: A Short History*” (pp. 219-233), and while I think I recognize the author, he will remain anonymous here as in the publication itself. The second opening essay is “The Big Book Revealed” (pp. 11-17); the first appendix is “Notes on the Manuscript: Thematic Listing of Edits with Annotations” (pp. 191-203) and the second appendix reprints “How the Book *Alcoholics Anonymous* Came About: Bill W.’s Speech at the Texas State AA Convention, June 12, 1954” (pp. 205-218). The printer’s copy was given by Bill W.’s widow Lois to Barry L., who died in 1985, when it passed into the hands of his heirs. It was sold at Sotheby’s in 2004 for \$1.56 million to a California man, who sold it at auction (again at Sotheby’s) in 2007 for \$850,000 (with commission \$992,000) to its present owner, who arranged its publication by Hazelden.

Most of the manuscript changes are believed to be in the hand of Hank P., some are in the hand of Bill W., and some are not identified as of the time of publication. One complicating factor in identifying the hand by which the changes were made is that Hank P.’s hand is not unlike that of his wife or of her sister Ginny M, the owner and annotator of the first copy sold, or of their sister Dorothy S, wife of Clarence S. Dorothy S was one of those who took the printer’s copy to the printer.

For what it’s worth, the first copy sold is now in the GSO Archives in New York, annotated, as noted, by Ginny M., with signatures of many of the 1939 members (though it is not certain of the signatures in the first copy sold were all made by those whose names were signed – the handwriting of Marty M and her brother-in-law Grenny C, for example, are suspiciously similar. Non-members (Ginny was not a member at the time) did make at least copy-editing changes in the text (Kathleen R, wife of member Bill R, was one of the typists who prepared the multilith copy). It does not greatly matter, of course, whether Hank P.’s changes were in his hand or his wife’s – they were almost certainly his changes.

Some of the pages are extensively rewritten (particularly in Chapter Six, “Into Action”). The manuscript changes cast new light particularly on the “religion/spirituality” question, and even more on the recasting – and especially the attempted recasting – of the Twelve Steps (see pp. 4-5). But as the author of the first essay points out (p. 4), “if experts can someday identify all the writers of the different handwriting that entered these suggestions, we will gain even further insights into the creative process that resulted in the final text of the Big Book’s first edition.”

Happy hunting!

Note: Who Poured Whiskey Into Milk?

Continuing research on early members by Jack B. and others has led to further discussion, summarized here, on a question that may seem minor and tangential – except that it may help to identify one of the AAs Bill refers to under a pseudonym in the “Big Book” and therefore shed additional light on Bill’s story-telling and editing techniques. (Where we can check Bill’s version with the author’s own version, as with Fitz M’s conversion or Jimmy B’s experience in the hotel room, it sometimes seems that Bill may be using the experiences of others as surrogates for his own experience – as with his uncle’s spiritual experience on Mt. Aeolus – or is it using his own in telling theirs?) In any case, here’s a summary of the research on the question of identifying “a friend we shall call Jim” in pages 35-37 of the Big Book (in Chapter 3 “More About Alcoholism”) with Ralph F, whose story “Another Prodigal Story” appeared in the first edition of the Big Book.

The only link between those two figures seems to be that in “Another Prodigal Story” the protagonist drinks an ice cream soda AFTER drinking heavily simply in order to cover up the smell of the booze on his breath, while Jim in “More About Alcoholism” thinks that if he mixes whiskey in milk, he can drink that mixture without getting drunk – not the same thing at all. Chapter 3 “More About Alcoholism” says that Jim had “inherited a lucrative automobile agency,” lost it through his drinking, but then got sober for a while, and “began to work as a salesman for the business he had lost through drinking” (Big Book p. 35). “Another Prodigal Story” says nothing about the author ever owning an automobile agency, losing it, having to go back to work there as a salesman, getting sober in AA, or having a slip and being committed back to the asylum once again. How, one historian has asked, could this be the same person?

This presumed mis-identification has led to questions whether Ralph F (identified by Ginny M) is really the author of “Another Prodigal Story,” rather than Roland Arthur (Bob) F (which seems more likely) and whether perhaps automobile salesman Harlan S, in the early lists of Ohio members, is the “Jim” in question. It has even led to a question whether the salesman and the agency were involved in automobile sales (would a salesman drive to a bar to sell autos?), or possibly automobile tire sales – which makes more sense and would give us Sterling P, of Akron and of Ridgewood NJ, who drove to Akron with Bill, whose father owned either an agency affiliated with one of the Akron tire companies or a smaller company taken over by them – and very little of whose story is known.

Just another step in looking at Bill’s creative techniques, do you think?

Note: Studying Early Women in AA or Women in Early AA

The question, who was the first woman to get sober in AA, recently the subject of considerable inquiry among historians of AA, has led to increased recognition that not much has been put together on Jane S (1894-1974 – who was sober in Cleveland for a year coming to Akron meetings, but who never came to meetings of something called AA), or Florence D R (1894-1943 – of New York, who went to DC around 1940 and died there, and the D is whose initials tied her to another FDR, a not really very close cousin). We have, of course, much more on Marty M and even on Ethel M, sober from 1941 till her death in 1958 (I believe) still sober, on Sylvia K (probably the first woman to get and stay permanently sober in AA), and on later comers like Felicia M (sober 1944 to her death in 1999) or Esther

E (sober 1942 to her death in 1960). But the women in early AA included Ginny M (who much later decided she was an alcoholic), Dorothy S., their sister married to Hank P, and of course Lois and Anne, the wives of Bill and Dr. Bob, and Henrietta Seiberling, who was neither an alcoholic nor an “Al-Anon.” In the next CASQ (Vol IV no. 6) we will be looking at new findings both on early women members and women at early AA meetings.

The Founders and Incorporators of the WTSB: Part I (Originally prepared as “William K Mitchell and the First Year of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore 1840-1841”

In this paper, we are looking at the Washington Temperance Society (of Baltimore), the shooting star of nineteenth-century Temperance and putative forerunner of Alcoholics Anonymous as a Baltimore institution, founded by Baltimoreans, and successful so long as it was a Baltimore institution. The classic modern account of the founding of this Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore (Milton A. Maxwell, “The Washingtonian Movement” in the 1950 *Quarterly Journal of Alcohol Studies*, pp. 410-452) begins with the following words. “One Thursday evening, April 2, 1840, six friends were drinking, as they were wont to do almost every evening, in Chase’s Tavern, on Liberty Street, in Baltimore. They were William K. Mitchell, a tailor; John F. Hoss, a carpenter; David Anderson and George Steers, both blacksmiths; James McCurley, a coach maker; and Archibald Campbell, a silversmith. Their conversation turned to the temperance lecture which was to be given that evening by a visiting lecturer, the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith. In a spirit of fun it was proposed that some of them go to hear the lecture and report back. Four of them went and, after their return, all discussed the lecture.... ‘I’ll tell you what, boys,’ says Steers, ‘Let’s form a society and make Bill Mitchell president.’... The idea seemed to take wonderfully; and the more they laughed and talked it over, the more they were pleased with it. We note that the account emphasizes the local – one might say, the Baltimore – aspect of the founding of the Washingtonians.

On Sunday, April 5th (Professor Maxwell continues), while the six were strolling and drinking, the suggestion crystallized into a decision to quit drinking and to organize a total abstinence society. It was agreed that Mitchell should be the president; Campbell the vice-president; Hoss, the secretary; McCurley, the treasurer; and Steers and Anderson, the standing committee. The membership fee was to be twenty-five cents; the monthly dues, 12½ cents. The proposal that they name the society in honour of Thomas Jefferson was finally rejected and it was decided that the president and the secretary, since they were to be the committee to draft the constitution, should also decide upon the name. It was agreed that each man should bring a man to the next meeting. And it was left to the president to compose the pledge which they would all sign the next day. The pledge was formulated by Mitchell as follows: ‘We whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society for our mutual benefit, and to guard against a pernicious practice which is injurious to our health, standing, and families, do pledge ourselves as gentlemen that we will not drink any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider.

The name, ‘Washington Temperance Society,’ was selected in honor of George Washington. Two new members were brought to the second meeting. Strangely enough, they continued to meet for a number of weeks at their accustomed place in Chase’s Tavern. When the tavern owner’s wife objected to the increasing loss of their best customers, Mitchell’s wife suggested that they meet in their home. This they did until the group grew too large, whereupon they moved to a carpenter’s shop on Little Sharp Street. Eventually, they rented a hall of their

own. As they grew in membership they faced the problem of making their weekly meetings interesting. President Mitchell made the suggestion that each member relate his own experience. He started off with his story of fifteen years of excessive drinking, adding his reactions to his newly gained freedom. Others followed suit. This procedure proved to be so interesting and effective that it became a permanent feature of their programs. Interest and membership mounted. In November the society resolved to try a public meeting in which Mitchell and others would tell their personal experiences. The first such meeting, held on November 19, 1840, in the Masonic Hall on St. Paul Street, was a decided success. Not only did it bring in additional members but it also called the movement to the interested attention of the people of Baltimore. It was decided to repeat these public meetings about once a month in addition to the regular weekly meetings of the society.

In a book widely-known but not perhaps so widely-studied among historians of alcoholism and temperance, John Zug (1818-1843), a young Pennsylvanian temperance reformer and schoolmaster but lately resident in Baltimore, provided the basic account of *The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore* (1842), on which Milton Maxwell's account of the founding is largely based. The Rev. Mr. Zug goes on to assure his readers that he is giving them "no fancy sketch. The circumstances have often been stated by the founders of the society, just as we have detailed them." A constitution for the society was agreed upon; and "as the movement was a great and important one, a great name was proposed to be affixed as the title of the society. It was adopted. And this was the foundation of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore... From the character of the deed itself, and the extraordinary results, which have proceeded and are yet proceeding from it, justice requires that the names of the founders of this association should be recorded, that they may be handed down in all the future annals of the Temperance cause. William K. Mitchell, John F. Hoss, David Anderson, George Stears, Archibald Campbell and James McCurley were the 'original six,' who founded the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore.... They determined that the regular meetings of the society should be meetings for the detail of personal experience, not for debates, lectures and speeches. Even on matters of necessary business, as few remarks as possible only would be tolerated. Thus all temperance addresses were to be in the form of the individual experience of the several members. In six months after its formation, the society numbered eighty or ninety, many of whom were reformed drunkards.

No man could attend their meetings, Zug reports, "without seeing that there was a spirit among them which would not die – a principle which would diffuse itself abroad in the community, and pour the richest blessings on the heads of many a family in Baltimore – and even spread to the farthest borders of the land. As yet, however, their meetings were held in their own private hall, which they had rented for the purpose. The citizens did not generally know of the movement; and such as did, hardly had confidence in the permanency of the reformations. But in November, 1840, their first public meeting was held in the Masonic Hall, which was crowded on the occasion. As this was their first public effort however, and as the object was rather intended to be an introduction to the public, very little *experience* was given. In addition to these remarks made by gentlemen invited to address the meeting, the President simply stated the principles of the society, that they might be understood by the community.

"Not long after this another public meeting was called in one of the churches of the city, on which occasion several of the members of the society publicly told their tale of woe and warning, counsel and advice, and with thrilling effect. Numbers were induced to sign the pledge; many of them victims of intemperance. And in the bosom of the society they found a home, and

friends to counsel and defend them. Frequent public experience meetings now followed, and were continued week after week during the entire winter. Public attention was now fully arrested. The meetings, though held in the largest churches of the city, were crowded to excess. Every family that had a poor miserable inebriate connected with it, hailed with joy and hope the influence which this society was exerting in reforming the intemperate, and used every exertion to induce such persons to attend the meetings of the Washington Society, and sign the pledge.

“In the progress of time, the news from Baltimore had gone abroad. The friends of Temperance in other sections of the country, by means of the *Maryland Temperance Herald*, the city papers generally, and private and published letters, had heard of our extraordinary operations, and were looking with hope to the spread of that flame, which had been first kindled among us. By several letters written to individuals in New York, which were published in the daily, as well as Temperance press of that city; and subsequently by the statements made at a public meeting there by a citizen of Baltimore, the New York Temperance Society was led to write to the Washington Society for a delegation of her reformed men, who might go on to that city, and by relating their experience, give a new impulse to the cause, and awaken a fresh interest among them; and especially that they might reach those, who hitherto had been almost beyond their influence – the drunkards. Accordingly in March, 1841, a delegation, consisting of Messrs. Hawkins, Casey, Pollard, Shaw, and subsequently President Mitchell himself, went to New York, and the abundant and glorious success with which they met, is a matter of public history. Thousands flocked to the meetings held on the occasion in the largest churches in the city. In the space of several weeks, hundreds of the most debased and unfortunate drunkards were reformed, and an impulse given to the cause there, which has not died or diminished; nor is it likely to do so soon. There the second Washington Temperance Society was formed on the model of the first; and under the presidency of Captain Wisdom and his zealous compeers, they have reaped the same glorious harvest, which we were reaping before them. The recent splendid Temperance Procession in New York has shown the country that the cause is still onward there as elsewhere.

“April 5th, 1841, the anniversary of the formation of the original Washington Society, was celebrated in Baltimore by a grand Procession. This Procession was admitted by all to have been one of the most splendid affairs ever witnessed in Baltimore. It was estimated that at least six or eight thousand persons were in the ranks. The Procession moved through the principal streets of the city, with bands of music, and numerous magnificent banners, and countless badges - with at least fifty mounted marshals, besides hundreds of marshals on foot, with their various insignia. One of the 'original six,' Captain *John F. Hoss*, was the Chief Marshal of the day. President *William K. Mitchell* and the remaining four, in company with distinguished strangers, and the orator and chaplains of the day, rode in open barouches drawn each by four grey horses. It was a proud and happy day to many a heart, and many a family; and will be remembered by the citizens of Baltimore, as one of the greatest days ever celebrated in this city. This celebration and procession, as well as the unexampled success of our delegates in New York, produced a deep impression on the public mind of the country. It was evident that a moral revolution was beginning to work, and all eyes were now directed to the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, as the centre of all its operations. Missionaries were now applied for from almost every quarter of the land, and the Missionary operations of the society began to be developed on a large scale. Messrs. Hawkins and Wright in New England, and the Eastern and Middle States generally - Pollard and Wright in New York – Vickers in the valley of the Ohio – Carey, Stansbury, Morrison, Mules and Michael in various parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland – Carey

in North and South Carolina – Michael in Virginia, with numerous others.... By their influence tens of thousands, yea, we may say hundreds of thousands, have been induced to sign the pledge - many of them the most unhappy inebriates.

What do we know about the six founders? Because of John Zug's youthfulness, the tone of *The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore* is youthful and the unexamined implication is that the founders were youthful. But this is not in fact the case. We begin with President William K. Mitchell, and specifically with a description of President Mitchell in action at an experience meeting. The following passages are from Timothy Shay Arthur's *Six Nights with the Washingtonians*, originally published in separate parts in the *Baltimore Merchant* in 1840, then as separates in *Baltimore* in 1842, collected in two volumes bound together as *Temperance Tales, or, Six Nights with the Washingtonians* (Philadelphia: Leary & Getz, 1848). Specifically they are from "The Experience Meeting" (pp. 45-90 in the 1848 edition). They are printed here because they refer by name to the President of the Washingtonians, Mr. Mitchell, and allowing for possible reporter's license, they may be taken to give something of a genuine portrait of William K. Mitchell, in action. Timothy Shay Arthur (1809-1885) was born in Orange County, New York, moved to Baltimore as early as 1831 (when he married Eliza O'Brian there), and was remarried there (to Eliza Alden) in 1837. He is best known as the author of *Ten Nights in a Bar-Room* and of the song "Please, Father, Dear Father, Come Home."

"A few weeks after my first visit to the Washingtonians, I again attended one of their meetings (p. 45).... After the preliminaries of the meeting were over, the President announced that an hour or so would be spent in the recital of their experiences by such members of the society as felt inclined to speak (p. 49)....

"'Mr. President,' said a short, stout man, with a good-humored countenance, and a florid complexion, rising as the last speaker took his seat, 'I have been a tavern-keeper.' At this announcement there was a movement through the whole room, and an expression of increased interest. 'Yes, Mr. President,' he went on – 'I have been a tavern-keeper, and many a glass have I sold to you, and to the secretary there, and to dozens that I see here,' – (glancing around upon the company.) 'That's a fact,' broke in the President – 'many a gin-toddy and brandy-punch have I taken at your bar. But times are changed now, and we have begun to carry the war right into the enemy's camp. And our war has not been altogether unsuccessful, for we have taken prisoner one of the rum-sellers' bravest generals! But go on friend W—— ! Let us have your experience...(pp. 72-73)

"The time had gone on until nearly ten o'clock, and, as the last speaker took his seat, Mr. Mitchell, the President, rose, and in a brief, but pertinent address, invited and urged those who had not yet done so, to come forward and sign the pledge. The Secretary was then directed to read the pledge, which was done. After this followed a scene hard to be described. 'Come along,' cried the President, as the Secretary resumed his seat. 'Who will sign first to-night? Ah! there he comes! The very man for whom I have been waiting these two months. That's right, friend L—— . I thought we should get hold of the same end of the rope again. Many a drinking frolic, and fishing frolic have we been on, together! And now we strike hands again;' grasping the hand of the individual he was addressing, who had, by this time, reached the secretary's table – 'and shoulder to shoulder, hand to hand, and heart to heart, we will wage together, a war of extermination against old KING ALCOHOL and all his emissaries!.. [The man signs the pledge.] ...

"'You never did a better deed than that in your life, friend L——!' the President said in a lively, exulting tone, as the man rose from the secretary's table. 'And now who will come

next?'.... (pp. 85-86)...'Ten names already!' the President now cried out, loud and cheerfully, 'and the table crowded. Come along! We have room for hundreds and thousands; we'll stay here all night if you'll keep coming' ... 'Sixty names!' said the President, as the space in front of the secretary's table became once more vacant. 'We must have more than that number to-night. Yes, come along my friend,' he continued, his voice changing to one of encouragement and sympathy as he looked steadily towards the door. 'Come along, my friend, and we will do thee good!' ... 'Do go, John!' I could now hear the woman urging, 'Do go! And we shall be so happy!'

"'Yes, John, come along!' the President said, taking up the earnest persuasion of his wife – 'and we shall all be so happy! Come along, my good man!' (p. 87)...[He signs the pledge] ... 'Come along, we are waiting,' again urged the President. 'Don't put it off a single day. Come along, and make your wives happy, as John did just now. None of you like to see their faces clouded, and yet how can sunshine rest there while you are neglecting and abusing them? Come along! Why eighty signed at the last meeting, and here we have only sixty-two. We surely haven't got all the drunkards yet! O no! I see three or four down there that ought to sign. So come along my boys! If you want excitement, come and get a little of this teetotal excitement. It makes one feel a thousand times better than rum-excitement, and produces no after consequences but good ones. Ah! there comes another! – and another! and another! That's the way. One helps another. You don't know how much good you may do by coming forward. You influence one, and he another, and they others, until from the impulse given by a single individual, hundreds are brought in. There were only six at first, and now we have hundreds upon hundreds. Suppose those six had held back, where would we all have been? Come along then, and do your duty to yourselves and society.' (p. 88) ...[Ten more come forward.]

"'Any more?' the President asked. 'Yes, one more at least,' said a man near the door, rising to his feet. 'You've just got my last customer, and now you might as well have me. I've sold liquor for fifteen years. But you temperance folks have broken me up. And now I am forced to try some better and honester means of getting a living.' And so saying, he walked resolutely up to the table and signed the pledge. 'And now, friend P—,' the President said to him, 'what are you going to do with the liquid fire you have on hand?' 'What am I going to do with it?' in a tone of surprise. 'Yes, what are you going to do with it?' 'As to that,' the man replied, 'I never gave the subject a thought.' 'You won't sell it, I hope.' 'And why not?' 'Sell poison?' 'What shall I do? Give it away?' 'O no, that would be as bad.' 'Well, sir, what would you do, if you were in my place?' 'Why, I would throw every drop of it in the gutter. It will hurt no one there. You needn't be afraid of the hogs getting drunk, for a hog won't touch it.' 'My liquors cost a good deal.' 'No doubt of it. How much do you think?' 'Two hundred dollars, I should suppose.' 'No more?' 'I think not.'

"'There must be some mistake in your calculations,' the President said: 'you have forgotten the sighs and tears of abused and neglected wives and children. The money that bought your liquor cost all these and more.' The man paused a moment, and then said, emphatically: 'I'll do it! I've made enough men drunk in my time!' And thus saying, he turned away and mingled with the crowd. The books were then closed, seventy-five having signed the pledge that night. A few remarks were added by the President, and then the meeting broke up, and I returned home."

Another view of William K. Mitchell is found in Charles Jewett, M.D., *A Forty Years Fight with the Drink Demon, or a History of the Temperance Reform As I Have Seen It* (New York: National Temperance Society and Publishing House, 1872, pp. 136-137): "Mitchell, one of the original five [sic!], and the leading spirit of the group, held that, as Washingtonians, they

should have nothing to say against the [liquor] traffic or the men engaged in it.... He would even admit men to membership in his societies who were engaged in the traffic, and in my hearing he admitted that he had paid for liquor, at the bar, for others to drink after he [himself] had signed the pledge. He would not drink liquors, but if others chose to, that was their business.... Our business was, so he argued, to get everyone to sign the pledge of abstinence, and then, of course, grog shops would have no customers.... Among the other false notions advocated by Mitchell was that religious exercises of every kind were out of place in temperance meetings, including prayer. This notion was, however [Jewett says] so preposterous that but few of his followers accepted it, and it was pretty soon abandoned.”

What else do we know about William K. Mitchell? William Mitchell, William K. Mitchell, or Wm Mitchell is listed as a tailor (and then merchant tailor) in the various Baltimore city directories in the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s. In the 1850 Census of Baltimore he appears (296b 12) as William K. Mitchell, aged 49, born Maryland. He would therefore have been 39 at the founding of the Washingtonians. However, in the obituary in the *Sun* February 15, 1875, though the apparent year of birth (1801) is the same, we have his birthplace as Accomac County, Virginia – “Wm. K. Mitchell, formerly a resident of Baltimore, d. last evening, at Oxford, Baltimore County, in [his] 74th year. Born in Accomac County, Virginia, he was a merchant tailor and did business at Baltimore Street and McClellan’s Alley; Member of City Council in 1867; one of the founders of the Washington Temperance Society, which was organized 5th April 1840. [He is] survived by a daughter, the wife of Mr. Ezekiel Scarborough, of this city.”

The oldest of the six founders was Captain John F. Hoss, born either in 1792 or 1794; the youngest seems to have been James McCurley, born in 1807, though David Anderson, like James McCurley, was born in 1807. Archibald Campbell was apparently born in 1796, George Stears (or Steers) in 1798. Mitchell, as we noted, was born in 1801. We begin our brief look at the other five founders with Captain Hoss.

Captain John F. Hoss was a well-known Baltimorean, a veteran of the War of 1812, born in 1792 (or possibly 1794), and in 1842 Alderman of the 4th Ward. He may have been living in 1870, when his War of 1812 Pension was commuted to a single lump-sum payment, though his last Census appearance seems to have been in the 1850 Census. We have not yet discovered any copy of his obituary. In fact, the absence of an obituary in the Maryland Historical Society files for Hoss, a former alderman and veteran of the War of 1812, is odd, and we are checking to see if it was misfiled. He is apparently still living in 1871 (according to the City Directory for that year), which would tie in with the 1870 pension commutation. Hoss’s wife’s obituary in 1858 indicates he was living in Baltimore at that time.

The next oldest was the silversmith, Archibald Campbell. Archibald Campbell, silver plater, is listed in Matchett’s 1829 *Directory* and up through Ward’s 1856-1857 *Directory*, eventually in the 1855-57 period as silver plater and saddlery dealer. Archibald Campbell. Here is the obituary in the *Sun*, Monday, June 15, 1863 – “Mr. Archibald Campbell, an old citizen of Baltimore, died in his residence on S. Paca St., on Saturday [June 13 1863] at the age of 67 years. Mr. Campbell was for a long series of years engaged in the silver-plating business in this city, and was of a social and genial temperament. He was one of the six who founded the old Washington Temperance Society. He leaves a widow and family of grown children, several of whom are now in Richmond.”

Next in order of age of the original six, and the least remembered, is George Steers or Stears. There is a record of the marriage of George Steers to Mary Lee in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore on 25 October 1841. This is presumably our George Steers and

the George Steers listed as a wheelwright in the 1842 Directory. There is a brief obituary of George Steers in the *Sun* October 11, 1842 – “On the 9th inst., Mr. George Steers, aged 44 years, one of the founders of the Washington Temperance Society.” In the 1850 Census Mary Stears, 43, is living with her children, David Lee 19, carpenter, three other Lee children (ages 17, 15, 13), and George Stears, 8. In Zanesville, Ohio, in the 1860 Census, we find David Lee, RR master, 29, his wife Jane 24, children Wilbur, David, and George (1), and George Stears 17, apprentice carpenter with wages. A son, George Steers, Jr., was therefore born in 1843 and in 1860 was living with the Lee family (his half-siblings) in Zanesville, Ohio. He may have fought with an Indiana regiment in the Civil War. In some Temperance literature from the later 1840s, George Steers is replaced as a founder by the professional Temperance advocate John Hawkins.

The two youngest of the original six were David Anderson and James McCurley. The David Anderson, blacksmith and farrier in the Baltimore City Directories from the 1830s to the 1850s, may be the David Anderson, aged 62, in the 1870 Census, 13th Ward. He appears in the 1840 Census, but the Census of 1850 and 1860 are more useful here. In 1850 the household contains David, Jane, children James 13, Eliza 11, Catherine 10, Margaret 9, George 7, one servant Ann Dibbs (b. Ireland), 60, and four apprentice or journeyman blacksmiths (Frank Henry, William Broderick, both born in Ireland, John Brand 18. Charles Hyatt 22, born in Maryland). In 1860 the household contains David, 57, Jane 50, James 24, Elizabeth 22, Kate 20 (milliner), Margaret 19 (dressmaker), George 17 (apprentice wagon maker). In 1870 David, Jane, Lizzie, and Kate are living at home. The obituary for David Anderson is in the *Sun* Thursday, August 7, 1873 – “Mr. David Anderson, the well-known blacksmith, died very suddenly yesterday morning, a few minutes before nine o’clock, at his residence, No. 166 West Saratoga Street, of heart disease. He had, shortly before seven o’clock, proceeded to his shop on German St., near Paca, and after opening it, felt unwell and returned home. In a few minutes after reaching the house he expired. It was not deemed necessary to hold an inquest. Deceased was one of the best-known horse-shoers in the city.”

There is a James McCurley coachmaker listed in Baltimore city directories from 1833 through 1857, but no James McCurley at all in the city in the 1850 Census except one aged two years. However, there was in 1850 a James McCurley who is almost certainly our man. He was indeed a coachmaker, born 1807, resident in Baltimore Ward 13, with his wife (Elizabeth Wallace Graham McCurley, born 1811/1812, died according to the IGI, in 1866), five children (the eldest being Felix, born 1834), and with them was living his mother Mary (b. 1776). In 1860 there was a James McCurley, coachmaker, with whom was living son Felix, 26, a sailor, son Isaac, 22, a coachmaker, sons William (19), James (12), and daughter Sarah (14). In 1870 there is a James McCurley aged 64, presumably the one listed in 1850 (as James McCurley) as born 1807. In 1880 James McCurley, retired coachmaker, 73, is living in the 19th Ward in Baltimore. His father is listed as having been born in PA and was almost certainly the Felix McCurley (1779-1845) born in York PA. His mother was therefore Mary Pierpoint. James McCurley’s son Felix McCurley, by the way, was an Acting Lieutenant USN in 1865, retired as Commander, and became prominent in the Sons of 1812 (a Vice President) and Sons of the American Revolution (through his mother’s grandfather John Graham). He died in 1896. (He is to be distinguished from his first cousin Felix McCurley 1833-1911, son of another son of Felix McCurley 1779-1845.) James McCurley was 33 when the Washington Temperance Society was formed.

Here is the obituary of James McCurley in the *Sun* Wednesday, March 9, 1881 – “Mr. James McCurley, aged 73 years, an old and respected citizens, died yesterday at his residence, No. 133 Franklin Street. Mr. McCurley was at one time in the carriage business at No. 21 N.

Liberty St., but had been a retired merchant for several years past. He was one of the incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society which was founded April 5, 1840, and was the oldest organization of the kind in this state. The other incorporators were Messrs John F. Hoss, George Stears, Wm. K. Mitchell, David Anderson, and Archibald Campbell. A book giving the history of the Society was written and dedicated to the founders. On October 16, 1879, Mr. McCurley became blind. [He] leaves three children, namely James McCurley of James, attorney-at-law, Mrs. Col. Seth G. Reed, and Lt. Commander McCurley of the U. S. Navy.” There is an overlooked clue to the membership in the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore in January 1841. Here from the *Archives of Maryland*, Volume 592, *Session Laws 1840*, pp. 22-23, is Chapter 26, An Act to Incorporate the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore (Passed January 29, 1841), Section 1. “Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, That William K. Mitchell, John P. Hoss, Archibald Campbell, David Martin, David Anderson, Daniel A. Piper, James McCurley, Robert Neilson, John Werdebaugh, John Adler, George Stears, Elijah Stansbury, Thomas L. Murphy, John Wright, Francis Gallagher and others, who now are, or may hereafter become members of said society, and their successors, are hereby declared to be one community and body corporate, by the name, style, and title, of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, and by that name they shall be and are hereby made able and capable in law to have, receive and retain to them and their successors, property, real and personal; also devises or bequests of any person or persons, bodies corporate or politic, capable of making the same; and the same to dispose of or transfer at their pleasure, in such manner as they may think proper; provided always, that the said corporation shall not at any time hold or possess property, real, personal or mixed, exceeding in value the sum of one thousand dollars, other than that which may be invested in a hall to be erected for the purposes of the society.”

The original six members of the Washingtonians were thus William K. Mitchell, John F. Hoss, Archibald Campbell, David Anderson, James McCurley, and George Stears, (sometimes Stears). What is interesting about the list in the Act is that it includes these six, along with nine others, these being David Martin, Daniel A. Piper, Robert Neilson, John Werdebaugh, John Adler, Elijah Stansbury, Thomas L. Murphy, John Wright, and Francis Gallagher. We know the original six were drinkers with a drinking problem (on their own showing). At least four of them (the ones in whose obituaries the Washington Temperance Society appears) may be presumed to have overcome their drinking problem. We have no idea who among the other nine incorporators were drinkers or former drinkers, though there are some small clues.

Introductory Pages on John Zug and His ‘Little Book’

There are times when biography – individual or collective – can be used to provide detail to round out what we know to be true, and times when it can be used to dispute what we have thought we knew to be true. And then there are the times when we discover, in the biography of a peripheral – or thought to be peripheral – figure, a new explanation of something on which there has previously been no fully accepted explanation. This paper deals with one of those new explanations.

Modern interest in the Washingtonians – the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore, established in April 1840 – has come largely through Alcoholics Anonymous (A.A.). A.A.’s original interest seems to have come largely through a piece contributed to the *A.A.*

Grapevine by one Clifford K., a newspaperman and A.A. member in Lansing MI, back in 1945, and A.A.'s continuing interest from the fact that Bill W. used the failure of the Washingtonians (as he considered) as a text for warning what A.A. shouldn't do, in his *Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions* (1953).

Clifford K., whose special expertise was (Michigan) conservation and natural resources, not temperance history, took his cue from John Allen Krout's *The Origins of Prohibition* (New York: Knopf 1925). Here are the final paragraphs of his *Grapevine* piece: "Washingtonians were not atheists; it just hadn't occurred to them that God as we understand Him could help them to stay sober. In fact, some of them believed that if they invited God into their councils, sectarianism also would push its way in, and their movement would be taken over by one or another of the churches. The society wasn't on God's side and, consequently, it disintegrated....

"An editor of that day [the Rev. John Marsh (1788-1868), the longtime editor of the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, the Washingtonian's older (though not much older) rival, scarcely an unbiased source] wrote: "That the exclusion of all religious forms and the entire abstraction of religion from temperance, was necessary for the reclamation of the drunkard, we have never believed... The drunkard may have felt hostile to religion while in the bar-room and amid the fumes of liquor, and he may feel so after he has reformed and taught to believe that he is better than a Christian, but never did a poor drunkard go up in sincerity to sign the pledge, without feeling himself a prodigal, commencing a return to his Heavenly Father, and needing that Father's help, and who would not have gratefully knelt and listened to a prayer for that help on his new endeavors. And we believe that if the hundreds of thousands of signatures in our country had been accompanied with prayer and some religious enforcement, their power and efficiency would have been incomparably stronger.

"Is it necessarily true that there's 'nothing new under the sun,' or that 'history repeats itself'? A.A. IS new, a new partnership with God in a useful endeavor. History NEED NOT repeat, in the case of A.A., the sorry story of the Washingtonians' rise and fall. There are, however, lessons to be learned from history."

Before this point, he had already observed that the "press of the day gave the society uncounted columns of publicity. The society's unusual methods were NEWS! And then – in less than ten years – the society petered out. The "why" contains a lesson – and a moral – for A.A. There was no ONE reason, of course. A reason was that the older temperance organizations hired some of the society's better speakers. That reason couldn't have wrecked the society if it had had its feet solidly on the ground. Another reason was that politicians looked hungrily at its swelling membership. Some of them climbed aboard the wagon (there is inference that in those times, at least, some politicians could qualify for membership) and they helped to wreck local groups through their efforts to line up votes. The Abolition movement was gaining strength and there was division within groups as men took their stand on the issue of slavery."

Of course Bill W. did not pick up on this "religious" explanation of the Washingtonians' fall (just as well, given the strong place of religious belief among the founders and leading speakers). What he did pick up on were the subordinate explanations Clifford K. provides – insertion of politics (to be sure, Abraham Lincoln – for example – gave a speech in support of the Washingtonians in 1842, but that scarcely killed the Washingtonians), the stress of the Abolitionist controversy (but several of the six founders in Baltimore, and particularly John F. Hoss, were strongly in the Abolitionist camp), the hiring away of Washingtonian speakers (which didn't really happen – such speakers as John H. W. Hawkins and John Gough simply

emphasized temperance generally rather than Washingtonian temperance). But I suspect Bill W. picked on that statement to provide a warning for A.A. not to split over the race question.

In another paper [above] it has been pointed out that the principal guide to the founding and first year (actually a little more than a year) of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore is *The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore* (1842), registered by John Zug, who was in fact the author. Does this little book provide an inside view of the foundation of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore? Despite the fact that John Zug was neither a member, nor present at the foundation, it was designed to do just that, and while it is not so much an inside story as A.A.'s big book, this Washingtonian little book could have been, I think, much more than it was, had John Zug lived longer – though, as I say, Zug was neither a founder nor a Baltimorean.

Zug and his wife (and widow) Margaret Hood spent most of their lives in southern Pennsylvania. His family lived in Carlisle in Cumberland County, while Margaret Hood evidently lived in several southern Pennsylvania towns, including Newville, Springfield, and Stoughstown in Cumberland County and York in York County. John Zug, was, in fact, an agent of the Colonization Society, an active speaker for the temperance movement, and an advocate of the Methodist Church, before entering Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to study law. He graduated from Dickinson in 1840. Later that year he relocated to Baltimore, where he helped establish a private school and served as instructor. Margaret Hood remained in southern Pennsylvania until July 1841, when she married John Zug and joined him in Baltimore.

Life in Baltimore was not easy for the newly married couple. In August 1842, as Margaret recovered from the birth of their son Edgar, John departed for several months of travel to Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. He attempted to sell copies of *The Foundation, Progress and Principles of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore*. The couple's correspondence from this period indicates that they sold some of their furniture and personal belongings in an effort to reduce their debt. The Zugs moved back to southern Pennsylvania by September 1842, probably owing to their deepening financial problems. John returned to his family's farm to assist his father and practice law. Margaret and Edgar moved to Newville, where they probably stayed with her family. In early 1843, the couple still lived apart, although John planned to move his family into a new home in Carlisle in April. John Zug's health was a perennial concern for his family and friends. Immediately before his wedding in July 1841, he suffered a ruptured blood vessel in his lung. He believed that his illness was due to "frequent exposure in public speaking [for the temperance movement], particularly in the open air," and he curtailed his excessive schedule of public addresses thereafter. In March 1843, Zug wrote to John Hoss that he had been ill since Christmas and that a recent convalescent trip to the country was unsuccessful. (The letter, with significant information on the Washingtonians, is printed below.) Zug's efforts to move his family and to begin practicing law compromised his recuperation. Despite the assistance and care of family and friends, John Zug died during the latter half of 1843, Margaret remaining in Carlisle with her young son after her husband's death. She remarried in 1847.

While several of the six founders (and of the nine additional January 1841 incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore) are of individual biographical interest – including William K. Mitchell (1801-1875), President of the Society, with his controversial insistence that he was concerned with drunks, not with other drinkers – it is with this almost-unknown John Zug that I am concerned here. His letter to John Hoss (March 2 1843) is printed here, as a lead-in to further consideration (by courtesy of the University of Maryland Collections, from the Zug Papers at the University of Maryland):.

Carlisle PA March 2nd 1843

Captain John Hoss

Dear Sir:

My absence from home for two weeks past is my apology for not having answered your very kind letter earlier. Upon my return today, I find it here waiting for me. And I assure you I cannot sufficiently thank you for the distinguished honor you offer me, in assigning me so high a post in your expected Jubilee Procession. This is but another of the many tokens I have received assuring me that though absent I have not been forgotten in Baltimore.

But I may as well not keep you any longer in suspense; and at once inform you that though my heart longs and pants to go and be with you on the 5th of April, it will be utterly out of my power to do so, so that I must decline all the honors offered me, and deny myself all the pleasures I had promised myself on that occasion.

My reasons for not being able to be with you are simply these: In the first place my health has failed me again since Christmas, and I have been confined to the house for many weeks – As soon as I was able to be out, I went to a friend's in the country, to try a change of circumstances, diet, &c. – I have just now returned, and am not much better. In fact, I am very feeble, and am sure that I could hardly endure the fatigue of a procession by next 5th, even on horseback. The nature of my disease is such that I have to be very careful. Even if my health improves in a month, as I suppose it will, my friends would not allow me to venture myself in this matter – so much for being your Aide. Still, I would like to be present on the occasion, if it were only as a spectator, but there are other difficulties in the way. On the first week in April I have to move with my little family, and commence housekeeping in a new house. It must be done at that time, and I must be there to superintend.

Then again, I am hardly able to go: my purse is too short. Ever since I left Baltimore, I have not earned one cent, but have been living at home, with my father, doing what my health would allow, helping him to farm. For two months past I have not done a thing. At our April Court I am going to offer my services to practice law. – So that I have all these things to do the first and second weeks in April, which added to bad health and a worse pocket, I think you will allow are sufficient reasons for my declining to come. I have given you these reasons at length so that you might be satisfied no slight difficulties would keep me away on the 5th of April. As it is, it is impossible for me to think of going, though I cannot tell you half the regret I bear at being compelled to banish the matter from my mind.

I again thank you for the honor intended for me, and also for your kind offer to obtain me a horse for the day. Be pleased to bestow these favors on some other worthy fellow, who shall share honors with our old friend, A. B. Wolf, Esqr. One thing I can assure you; if I can't be with you in person on the 5th I shall be with you in spirit. I shall be thinking of you all the day. Let me simply add, your friends, the Thomsons, are in their usual health and circumstances, excepting the old gentleman, who is now beginning to decline rapidly. Remember me kindly to Mitchell, McCurley, Anderson, Campbell [these four, with Hoss, were the surviving founders], Wolf, Uncle Billy and the whole host of the good old Washingtonians. God bless you all. I shall never forget you.

Believe me.

Yours sincerely,

John Zug

This is the only letter I have found from or to one of the Six Founders, though I am seeking access to McCurley family correspondence believed to be in private hands.

[to be continued]

AHA/ADHS Paper 2009: Part I

“Reflections on the Globe, the Mermaid, and Shakespeare on his Birthday: Prolegomena to Studies of Writers, Taverns, Plays and Stories”

I. WHAT THIS PAPER TRIES TO DO

This paper is designed – possibly over-ambitiously – to look at the connections between and among writing and performing, alcohol and alcoholism, taverns, stages, and publication (the last three primarily through the lens provided by the development of markets), beginning in the later Middle Ages and coming up through Shakespeare’s great change in the portrayal of the alcoholic (inwardly rather than outwardly – a step toward individualization, matching a kind of “individualization” when market replaces hierarchy), to set up a framework for a continued study of writers, taverns, and stories – and, not incidentally, alcoholism and drunkenness – and to begin that study. Though I hope it had some relevance to the more specific (and more modern) studies by the other members of the panel at which it was given, it is designed to be relevant, indeed as an introduction, to studies of taverns and theatres, drinking and drama (and songs), in Stuart and Early Hanoverian England and in the Alcoholic Colonies and Republics (or States), to the tavern scene specifically in Baltimore around 1840 (ranging from Poe and Tim Arthur to the Washingtonians – to be called “Baltimore Taverns to Ten Nights in a Barroom”), and personal narratization connected with Jerry McAuley, Samuel Hadley, Jack London’s *White Logic*, and *Alcoholics Anonymous*

The principal model we make use of here is provided by Jean-Christophe Agnew, in his *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theatre in Anglo-American Thought 1550-1750* (Cambridge 1986). Agnew has suggested that the progress (or at least process) from specific spatially and temporally bounded markets, one to a place and time, toward the idea of “markets” (or “transactions”) and then the idea of “the market,” is analogous (if no more) to the progress (or process) from specific spatially and temporally bounded theatres (or performances of plays, as with the “Miracle” or “Morality” plays, even if annually performed), to the idea of “theatres” (or “Morality plays” as a group) to the idea of the theatre – though this final stage includes also the further generalization of publication in print. We have here entered into this analogy an additional and possibly complicating factor, the Tavern, which is sometimes and in some senses both market and theatre, and in any case a meeting-point of the two.

In addition, we introduce (as Agnew introduces) the matter of carnival (essentially in the Bakhtinian sense), because it is relevant (as we will see) particularly to our over-all concern with drinking and drunkenness. We will also be looking at any possible fundamental relationship (though this will only be suggested) between drinking and creativity. The model for this was first presented in Chapters 3 and 9 of my 2004 study, *This Strange Illness: Alcoholism and Bill W* (Berlin and Hawthorne NY: Aldine De Gruyter 2004). But let us look first at carnival. Here

is what Professor Agnew, building on Bakhtin, has to say on the subject of mediaeval carnival (pp. 32-36):

“Carnival would have offered little more than empty ritual had it not retained the possibility that one – indeed many more than one – could be carried away by it. For that reason, the ultimate function of these rituals of misrule, whether as calls to arms, safety valves, or sounding boards of social antagonism, was a thing known only and quite literally *post festum*. Carnival’s violent anti-structural side lay enfolded within the outer envelope of communal celebration. Carnival effectively projected another reality sitting astride the workaday world of the Middle Ages and, on appointed occasions, turning it upside down and inside out....Feasting, masking, burlesque, and the symbolic inversion of social roles distinguished the Shrove Tuesday, Hocktide, and Midsummer’s Eve celebrations.... Men dressed as women, and servants as masters; a subdeacon was elected the Abbot of Unreason, and a choirboy became the Boy Bishop.... Because the human body was periodically subject to the unpleasant regimen of famine and feast, it was engorged with food and distended with drink during carnival. Because the body was also idealized as the symbolic membrane of personal honor, it was deliberately defiled and shamed by means of kettling, ducking, and other rough, symbolic play... In each of these instances celebrants acted out the Protean possibilities of carnival in a manner that might forestall or rectify the countless natural and social affronts that flesh and spirit were heir to.... Whether it was the flamboyant misrepresentation of self in burlesque, the mock coinage passed from hand to hand during the rituals of misrule, or the reckless invective hurled at all available targets, the medieval carnival declared itself a creature of the marketplace. That connection is as visible in the lively sixteenth-century panoramas of Pieter Bruegel as in the cautionary tableaux of William Hogarth some two centuries later. And it is the connection drawn by Mikhail Bakhtin in his now classic study of Rabelais’s world. In that analysis, Bakhtin puts Rabelais’s scholastic and ecclesiastical background to the side and singles out a “second,” unofficial folk culture as the immediate inspiration for *Pantagrue* (1533) and *Gargantua* (1534). Both works, he argues, staked out the countercultural terrain of the carnivalesque, where street theater mixed freely and easily with the theater of the streets.

“Carnival and the ritual drama with which it was associated shared the ‘freedom, frankness, and familiarity’ of the marketplace; if anything, they amplified the peculiar inflections of irony and self-mockery already audible in the cries of hucksters and chapmen. The spirit of the Trickster infused the marketplace festival of the Middle Ages in much the same way as it had entered into the Roman Kalends or Saturnalia, as a satirical reminder of the seasonal, regional, social, and personal differences brought together, if not reconciled, at the threshold of exchange.”

II. MERMAID AND GLOBE: DRINKING AND CREATIVITY THEN AND ALWAYS

The Mermaid Tavern, on Cheapside in London in Shakespeare’s time, east of St. Paul’s Cathedral on the corner of Friday Street and Bread Street, was the site of the so-called Friday Street Club (the Tavern’s entrance being on Friday Street). The Club, meeting monthly, was allegedly founded by Sir Walter Raleigh in 1603, and included Ben Jonson, John Donne, John Fletcher and Francis Beaumont, Thomas Coryat, John Selden, Robert Bruce Cotton, Richard Carew, and, probably, William Shakespeare. According to legend, Shakespeare and Jonson had witty debates in which they discussed politics, religion, and literature, but how much of this is true is an open question. There is an extended reference to the Tavern and its alleged witty

conversation in *Master Francis Beaumont's Letter to Ben Jonson*. Coryat's letters also refer to the Tavern, and mention Jonson, Donne, Cotton, Inigo Jones, and Hugh Holland—though Coryat was intimate with this group apparently only from 1611 on. Shakespeare did have some connection with the tavern, through its landlord, William Johnson, and when Shakespeare bought the Blackfriars gatehouse on March 10, 1613, Johnson was listed as a trustee for the mortgage. Hugh Holland, mentioned in Coryat's letters, composed one for the commendatory poems prefacing the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays (1623).

The Globe Theatre, on the other hand, was built in 1599 by Shakespeare's playing company, the Lord Chamberlain's Men, and was destroyed by fire on 29 June 1613. A theatrical cannon, set off during a performance of *Henry VIII*, misfired, igniting the wooden beams and thatching. According to one of the few surviving documents of the event, no one was hurt except a man whose burning breeches were put out with a bottle of ale. A second Globe Theatre was rebuilt on the same site by June 1614 and closed in 1642. The original Globe was owned by actors who were also shareholders in the Lord Chamberlain's Men. Two of the six Globe shareholders, Richard Burbage and his brother Cuthbert Burbage, owned double shares of the whole, or 25 percent each; the other four men, Shakespeare, John Heminges, Augustine Phillips, and Thomas Pope, owned a single share, or 12.5 percent. (Originally William Kempe was intended to be the seventh partner, but he sold out his share to the four minority sharers, leaving them with more than the originally planned 10 percent).

It was built in 1599 using timber from an earlier theatre, The Theatre, which had been built by Richard Burbage's father, James Burbage, in Shoreditch in 1576. On 28 December 1598, The Theatre was dismantled beam by beam and transported it to a waterfront warehouse near Bridewell – then with the onset of more favorable weather in the following spring, the material was ferried over the Thames to reconstruct it as The Globe on some marshy gardens to the south of Maiden Lane, Southwark. Examination of old property records has identified the plot of land as extending from the west side of modern-day Southwark Bridge Road eastwards as far as Porter Street and from Park Street southwards as far as the back of Gatehouse Square. Its exact location remained unknown until remnants of its foundations were discovered in 1989 beneath the car park of Anchor Terrace on Park Street (the shape of the foundations being replicated in the surface of the car park).

The Globe was thus not near to nor connected with the Mermaid, and the foundation of the Friday Group (which is what gave the Mermaid its later fame) came after the building of the Globe. The Mermaid, though playwrights were involved, was not a child of the London stage, though it was in London while, in fact, the Globe was not, being rather in that same Southwark where Chaucer's pilgrims met at the Tabard. In fact, it is worth quoting Agnew on Southwark (p. 55): "It had been to London's suburban liberty of Southwark, for example, that Wat Tyler had brought his rebels in 1381 [and did Long Will Langland ever come there?], Geoffrey Chaucer his pilgrims in 1387, Jack Cade his insurgents in 1450, Edward Alleyn his players in 1588, and Cuthbert Burbage the timbers for his Globe Theatre in 1599. And it was to Southwark that wayfaring preachers came to lecture the thousands of Protestant refugees who eked out a living (and an occasional prison sentence) cheek by jowl with Bankside prostitutes and cutpurses from the Clink. 'London,' Nashe lamented, 'what are thy Suburbes but licensed Stewes?' (Nashe, *Christ's Teares*," 148) Yet it was just this hothouse atmosphere of art, piety, criminality, and entrepreneurialism that moved some of England's most articulate, imaginative, and inspired citizens to find forms and figures adequate to the new and vexing 'economy' that had brought them so indiscriminately together."

What is particularly important in looking at the Globe and the Mermaid is that the Friday Group at the Mermaid represents, so far as we know, the first use of a commercial property as a meeting place for literary creation (even the “tavern” where Marlowe was killed in 1593 seems to have been a private house). Where Agnew observes (p. 54) that “separated, like the market, from its original ritual and hierarchical aegis, the Elizabethan and Jacobean theater furnished a laboratory of representational possibilities for a society perplexed by the cultural consequences of its own liquidity,” we can here supply the converse: separated, like the theatre, from its original ritual and hierarchical aegis, the Elizabethan and Jacobean market inn furnished a laboratory of representational possibilities for a society perplexed by the cultural consequences of its own free-flowing ideas.

Here we come to our speculation (it may alas! be no more) on the connection between drinking and creativity, in general. We know, from Stanley Kauffman and the Santa Fe Institute, that autonomous agents will evolve such that causally local communities are on a generalized “subcritical-supercritical boundary” exhibiting a generalized self-organized critical average for the sustained expansion of the “adjacent possible” of the effective phase-space of the community, which gives us the outlines of a model of biospheric construction where the rapidity of change will depend (perhaps critically) on the “edge-of-chaos” location of the local biosphere, and thus to the ease of gating into the adjacent possible, where there will be a kind of quantum leap in the diversity and complexity of the biosphere as chaotic ordering “heats up” and entry into the adjacent possible speeds up, and we have the “emergence of novel functionalities in evolution” (Kauffman, *Investigations*, New York 2000, p. 5) such as language (Kauffman’s fourth example, after hearing, sight, and flight, and thus his first specifically human example). Two points to note here: First, this development is co-created. Second, at the point where language comes in, it is possible for the agent to become conscious of agency: the adjacent possible here is the realm in which mind exists along with brain, and where co-creation can be conscious or, perhaps, in some sense, willed. This brings us back to the question of language.

It is an old saying that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny – that is, the natural history of the individual recapitulates the natural history of the race or type. It was in a conversation with the philosopher Owen Barfield (1898-1997) that I first heard the punning statement that ontology (the study of being) recapitulates philology (the historical study of language), in other words that what we are (and what we think, and what we think we are) is all determined by our language. In fact, it may be argued (was to be argued, I think, by C. S. Lewis and Ronald Tolkien in their *Language and Human Nature*) that language ability (particularly language invention) is precisely what distinguishes human nature from the nature of other animals.

I am myself convinced that, with a community of agents on the edge of chaos or the subcritical-supercritical edge, if the development of language does not occur, there will be an avalanche of local extinction, and the community will cease to be. The research program suggested in *This Strange Illness* was based on the separated development of languages at relatively recent times (say the Later Wisconsin Ice Age, possibly as a critical event), with the development beginning with interjections and winding up with the first development of proper nouns (names) perhaps 10,000 to 20,000 years ago – and we should note that the capacity or predisposition for language is proposed (hypothesized) as a genetic mutation, meaning that it should obey the laws we have already discussed. And it should in principle be possible to construct biogenetic connections between “speech genes” and the genes for predisposition to alcoholism – though, given our present almost-naked nescience on the subject, and given the

doubtless polygenic nature (probably multiple natures) of both speech capacity and alcoholic predisposition, we are a long way from knowing how to test for the connection.

A few fragments of our knowledge may, however, be shored up here: (1) the speech areas of the brain are affected by ingestion of alcohol, and (2) there is some possible evidence of differential effect in alcoholics and non-alcoholics. Also (3), as Kay Redfield Jamison has shown, there are unquestionable connections between artistic creativity and manic-depressive psychosis (to which Jellinek type- γ alcoholism is connected). What I am suggesting here, making use of Dr. Siegel's *Intoxication: Life in Pursuit of Artificial Paradise*, is that in proto-human communities on the supercritical-subcritical edge, the realization of the goals of the "Fourth Drive" was in some way connected with the creation of language for that *koinosphere*. This linking of intoxication and the creation of language is scarcely a new point: as Dr. Siegel notes (p. 214), "William James believed that the intoxication revealed the uniqueness of our species to contemplate the hidden meaning behind language and thought" – and it is only a step from contemplating the hidden meaning behind language to being part of the creation of that meaning.

Here we may note the suggestions of Julian Jaynes, in *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Princeton 1982), that consciousness (in the sense we ordinarily use the word) is a new thing, coming into the world perhaps 3000 years ago, so that (*inter alia*) before this time there was – there *could be* – no philosophy. In one sense, of course, this is scarcely a new proposition: it is found implicit in Henri Frankfort (1897-1954) and others in the first half of the Twentieth Century, and indeed in Goethe (1748-1832), in Rudolf Steiner (1861-1925), and in Owen Barfield (1898-1997). Frankfort's conclusions are particularly worth noting (in *Before Philosophy: The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, Chicago 1946, Pelican Books 1949, pp. 17, 29): "Even early man, entangled in the immediacy of his perceptions, recognized the existence of certain problems which transcend the phenomena.... Natural phenomena, whether or not they were personified and became gods [this is not perhaps the best way to put this], confronted ancient man with a living presence, a significant 'Thou,' which, again, exceeded the scope of conceptual definition." Yes, we do suggest, in effect, that the ontogeny of individual drinking recapitulates the phylogeny of drinking generally in the human race – and even perhaps that ontology recapitulates philology (or the other way 'round).

It has been suggested that in language development "calls, modifiers, and commands" came before nouns, and that names – "proper nouns" – were the last stage, coinciding with the ceremonial burial of the dead (after all, what *is* it that would be buried ceremonially if *it* didn't have a name?), about 10,000 years ago. (Myself, I think this may be too recent a date, by some few thousand years. I find the apparent personalizations implicit – and possibly announced – in the art at Lascaux suggestive here.) In any case, it is very likely that we would find alcoholic beverages (or possibly other mind-altering substances) involved in this development of language – one of the things, perhaps, "that the first poets knew, all air and fire."

III. EXCHANGE AND DRAMA – AND A SIDE NOTE ON TOBACCO

As the market replaces hierarchy, as exchange and drama move forward together, we find the poets meeting in the market inn, whether the Mermaid or some other, replacing the bards who drank the mead or beer of CuChulainn or Niall of the Nine Hostages, the ancient connection of alcohol (or perhaps something else in the taverns) and insight remaining true. The documents collected for an exhibition at the New York Public Library a few years back (under the title "Dry

Drunk” and dealing with drinking tobacco) give us some insight into this tavern scene in the years not long after, besides suggesting that it was in the market nexus that creativity blossomed, while in the countryside, well, “sweet lovers love the spring,” and old couples would reach the seventeenth-century equivalent of being “stoned” on tobacco and alcohol – and nothing much would come of it except (maybe) children – which is a kind of creativity, but not the kind we were speaking of.

Particularly we might look at the culture of tobacco as a type of drinking in British “High Life” (remembering that nicotine is at least as addictive as alcohol, and for many addictive where alcohol is not). Sir Walter Raleigh (he of the Mermaid) is credited with championing the habit of tobacco smoking at the Elizabethan court. While it was far from being a respectable practice throughout the general population, by all accounts the extravagantly dandified beau monde of the late 16th and early 17th centuries immersed itself deeply in the novelty of tobacco at a time when it was still a fresh and new, albeit alien and savage, *drink* (for that is what it was considered). Dutch, French, and English images and reports make it clear that the greatest propensity to smoke in the early decades was on the part of those most eager to be at the height of fashion. But also, as the catalogue of the *Dry Drunk* exhibition points out, among the early smokers were mercenary soldiers. “With money to burn and a precarious, nomadic existence, they easily fit the rugged, manly, and dandyish stereotypes associated with tobacco.”

In the next century in England, the gentleman's club was the locus par excellence for manly conversation and relaxation, aided by consumption of a good glass of beer or punch and a fine, long, slow-burning pipeful of tobacco. Indeed, in the 18th-century smoking club (replacing the 17th-century smoking shop), tobacco's narcotic effects are plainly, blatantly sought and achieved. But of course, particularly in the Netherlands, there was another side to the culture of smoking, and the peasant is by far the single class of character most commonly represented smoking – in such genre artists as Adriaen van Ostade, Cornelis Dusart, and David Teniers. The genre's long-lived and widespread popularity is evident in innumerable copies and adaptations, including the likes of Madame Pelletier's engraving after van Ostade's old smoker and Gainsborough's Gipsies. Tobacco, with its mind-dulling narcotic capacities, was ideally suited to such representations of the peasant, in which the peasant's character ranges from naive, earthy simpleton to diligent worker to aggressive brute. Not unlike the breakfast beer soup that predated coffee as a morning drink, tobacco was, in a sense, a way of keeping the lower classes in their place – a class in a perpetual state of drunkenness poses little threat. Along the same lines, the peasant represented a means to criticize tobacco use as a dirty and unsophisticated custom, but at the same time to justify further commerce in tobacco and its related products.

IV. ALCOHOL AND ALCOHOLISM

We know what alcohol is, and we have a number of definitions of alcoholism of various types. These are dealt with at some length in my study *This Strange Illness: Alcoholism and Bill W.* (Aldine 2004). Let me here summarize a major point from my ninth chapter in that book (pp. 349-352). We are constructed so that we relish natural highs, but what exactly are we relishing? The Fourth Drive (going back to Siegel, p. 217) “is not just motivating people to feel good or bad – it is [also] a desire to feel different, to achieve a rapid change in one's state” – which, of course, suggests being *consciously* on the subcritical/supercritical edge. The direction of the change, whether up or down, good or bad, Dr. Siegel argues, is of secondary importance only. Of course, this is not original with him. Consider the lead provided by William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, where he suggests that alcoholic experience opens the mystic doors of

perception. Here he is, on the question of the "value" of alcohol and more specifically of intoxication by alcohol (p. 304):

"The sway of alcohol over mankind is unquestionably due to its power to stimulate the mystical faculties of human nature, usually crushed to earth by the cold facts and dry criticisms of the sober hour. Sobriety diminishes, discriminates, and says no; drunkenness expands, unites, and says yes. It is in fact the great exciter of the *Yes* function in man. It brings its votary from the chill periphery of things to the radiant core. It makes him for the moment one with truth." Only, I suggest, not all men (or women) – only those who have the gift of alcoholism. And James goes on to say this. "To the poor and unlettered [drunkenness] stands in the place of symphony concerts and of literature; and it is part of the deeper mystery and tragedy of life that whiffs and gleams of something that we immediately recognize as excellent should be vouchsafed to so many of us only in the fleeting earlier phases of what in its totality is so degrading a poisoning" (p. 305). But the earlier whiffs and gleams are recited and thus engraved in communal memory, which is one reason adolescents drink to get drunk in self-reinforcing groups.

James remarks that he is convinced that "our normal waking consciousness ... is but one special type of consciousness, whilst all about it, parted from it by the flimsiest of screens, there lie potential forms of consciousness entirely different ... apply the requisite stimulus, and at a touch they are there in all their completeness, definite types of mentality *which probably somewhere have their field of application and adaptation*" (p. 305, emphasis mine). I would myself go further than *probably* – like Darwin, I would say this type of mentality would not have evolved if it were not valuable. Our understanding of natural selection strongly suggests that this alcoholism (the predisposition to drink alcoholically) must either have had a survival value for those with this genetic inheritance, or that it accompanies and accompanied other genetic characteristics with such a survival value. Or, rather, different types of this alcoholism would be attached to different genetic characteristics with such a survival value. This is an area where future research (and putting together results of research already carried out) would be useful.

For the moment, let us suggest that in Celtic peoples, the "priestly" or "prophetic" orders of druids and bards might well have involved altered consciousness from intoxication. Also, in Germanic peoples or Nordic (to the extent they are differentiated from the Celtic) a relative ease in attaining the *berserkr* rage of battle might have been related to alcoholic intoxication (perhaps with a premium on a periodic pattern). In both these cases, the premium would be on the differential effect of alcohol on those with the relevant differential characteristics. Of course, those times are long gone: what was valuable for CuChulainn or Harald Baresark is not valued by today's society. But writer's creativity is, and the number of alcoholic writers in English, beginning with Shakespeare, cannot be accidental. Perhaps we might look here at a connection noted in another context.

Washington Notes & Queries no. 27

John Adler (of Tuolumne)

This note finally covers the career of John Adler, one of the fifteen Incorporators of the Washington Temperance Society of Baltimore in 1841. With thanks to Karen Davis, Gordon Norris, and Harold Wesley, all of Tuolumne County CA.

In the International Order of Odd Fellows records, meeting minutes, etc., for Yosemite Lodge #97 in Big Oak Flat (Tuolumne County CA) there is a notebook that appears to be perhaps from the 1920s, hand-written in pencil, about ten pages long, apparently a brief history of the lodge and some of its earliest members. John Adler is mentioned twice.

First mention, page 1:

"John Adler joined Franklin No. 2 Baltimore Maryland in the year of 1822, the second Lodge instituted in the U.S. He passed away April 6th 1878, 56 years a member"

Then about halfway through the book he's mentioned again:

"April 6th, 1878 Brother John Adler passed away. Brother Adler at the time of his death he was one very few remaining, who were contemporary with Thomas Wildey the Father of the order in America. Brother Adler was made a member of the second Lodge instituted, Franklin No 2 Baltimore Maryland in the year 1822. He joined Yosemite Lodge as an Ancient Oddfellow in September 1860."

That's exactly how it appears in the booklet, missing words, punctuation and all. Also, on ancestry.com John Adler is on the 1870 non-population census (agriculture). It shows he had 100 acres of land, an orchard and he produces wine. The land may be closer to Chinese Camp (down the hill from Big Oak Flat). It also looks as though he paid someone \$20 per year to "work" the farm.

He is found on the 1870 Census of , Tuolumne Co., CA / Series: M593 Roll: 93 Page: 399 Line 23/ P.O. Big Oak Flat / as ATTER/ADLER JOHN 70 M W b. MD. His parents appear to have been foreign born

John Adler appears in the "The Great Register of Voters" from 1866 to 1896:

ID	ARCHIVE	ID	ARCHIVE	RECORD	PRIMARY	S	NAME	PRIMARY	G	NAME	SECONDARY	S	NAME	SECONDARY	C
1398	0354	Atler	John	N/A	N/A	7/13/1866	1866	Mining Superintendent	Big Oak Flat	MD					
1398	0354	Atler	John	N/A	N/A	7/13/1866	1866	Mining Superintendent	Big Oak Flat	MD					

Note: The fact that a significant number of the 1841 Incorporators were members of various lodges (Masons, IOOF, et al.) may help explain what Jerome Murray called the disappearance of the Washingtonians behind the doors of fraternal societies such as the International Order of Good Templars.