

James Madison Carpenter: the Cataloguing of a Folklore Collection

Eddie Cass

Originally, I had known *of* James Madison Carpenter through my work on folk drama but it was not until I read Hamish Henderson's *Alias MacAlias* that the man himself began to have an appeal for me. It was in this collection of essays that Henderson reprinted his paper on John Strachan first published in *Tocher* in 1981. Strachan recalls his first meeting with Carpenter.

Well, this Dr Carpenter came to my house one night, late, about twelve o'clock, an' I knew, whenever I went to the door, that he was somebody! So he introduced himself an' said he was Dr Carpenter from the Harvard College in America.¹

Now, imagine knocking on somebody's door at midnight to introduce yourself. That is style. I rather took to Carpenter. It was not, however, until I was invited to join the team which Julia Bishop was trying to set up to work on a catalogue of the Carpenter Collection that I really got to know more about the individual. What I did get to know convinced me that Carpenter was indeed a fascinating man and his collection a hugely important resource of folk material – and English and Scottish material in the main. In this paper, I want to set out some details of Carpenter and his work; to discuss the collection and to explain the work we are doing in conjunction with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress.

James Madison Carpenter was born in Booneville, Mississippi in 1888. His initial schooling was in Booneville and in Hainesville, Louisiana. Sometime around 1910/11, Carpenter enrolled at 'Old Miss', the University of Mississippi and graduated with a BA in 1913, obtaining an MA the following year. In his interview with Alan Jabbour in 1972, Carpenter skates over the years 1914-16 but it seems that at some time he was ordained as the Reverend James Carpenter and spent at least part of that period as pastor at the Central Church in Columbus, Mississippi. In 1916, Carpenter started a PhD in philosophy at Harvard but, fortunately for us, these studies were interrupted by the First World War. Carpenter failed his army medical as a result of an early accident – he had been kicked in the head by a horse and was told that the sound of gunfire would injure his brain. So, he spent the war in various teaching posts in Louisiana and Alabama. He resumed his studies, however, in 1920 when he enrolled on a PhD course in English at Harvard under the early English literature scholar, George Lyman Kittredge. This was the beginning of the phase in Carpenter's life which is of most interest to us.

Prior to his enrolling at Harvard, there is no evidence that Carpenter had any interest in folk song but he seems to have been influenced by Kittredge's work on Francis James Child and his thesis was on sea songs and shanties. Carpenter admitted to Alan Jabbour that he found the work at Harvard more than a little arduous but he seems to have

shown an aptitude for fieldwork which he first carried out in Massachusetts and in the romantically named ‘Sailor’s Snug Harbor’, a home for retired seamen in New York. Following on from this work, Carpenter was awarded a scholarship to collect sea shanties in England during 1928. During this first visit to Britain, Carpenter travelled widely, collecting in London, Bristol, Cardiff, Swansea, Barry Dock, Glasgow, Greenock as well as Belfast, Dublin and County Wicklow.

Carpenter was always prepared to acknowledge his debt to Kittredge and told Alan Jabbour that ‘Professor Kittredge was my mentor, I was collecting ... under his inspiration, and enthusiasm ...’² Carpenter’s first trip lasted four months rather than the three months originally planned. After Carpenter’s return to Harvard, he completed his work on his thesis, ‘Forecastle Songs and Chanties’ and was awarded his doctorate in 1929.

Carpenter’s success as a collector appears to have impressed Kittredge who put his protégé forward for a Sheldon Fellowship in 1929 to enable him to resume his collecting in Britain. The preparations for this major collecting trip cast a fascinating gloss on the contrast between the work of the study-bound scholar and the fieldworker. Carpenter appears to have had a free hand in what he collected on this second visit but before setting off, he asked his mentor how he should set about his task.

When I left home, I asked Professor Kittredge – I knew he knew the ballads and so on – and I said, ‘Now whom should I approach? He said, ‘Well, I guess you ought to approach the parson and the dominie and the squire, the three top men ...’ So, I undertook [and at this point in the tape, Carpenter laughs] I undertook to get ballads from the dominie and the parson and the squire, and I found they didn’t know a thing in the world about ballads.

At this time, Carpenter’s life skills also left a little to be desired for arriving in England in the autumn of 1929, he bought a little Austin open topped tourer and set off to go north intending to sleep in the car but he found the combination of the weather and the car not quite what he had expected.

I bought a big, heavy leather coat with the fleece on the inside, and as I went north, it got colder and colder, and ... at first I had my ... shorts, underwear that I was used to wearing; [but then] I first got a lightweight wool, very lightweight, and then as I drove farther north, I got the heavier and heavier suits, and finally when I got to Aberdeen I said “Give me the thickest, warmest woollen suit of underwear you have.” And it was like a coat, but I wore it ...

But Carpenter did, apparently live in his car, open top though it was. According to Hamish Henderson, John Strachan recalled that Carpenter:

was “an independent cratur” who seemed to be sleeping and even eating in his car. However ... he caught a chill, and John insisted on bringing him into the farmhouse and putting him to bed. In a few days, Mary, John’s wife, had nursed him back to health.³

Like most good fieldworkers, Carpenter took to the people he was working among. “The hospitality of the Scottish people is unbelievable. [He said] They’ll do anything for you when they like you.” Among the things which impressed him was their capacity for drinking tea. “Well, one thing, this woman came in one day and said “Well, I’ve had

my 17th cup of tea today.” “17 cups in one day” was all he could say, still apparently astounded forty years later.

Despite his inauspicious introduction to the vagaries of the British winter and his seeming wonderment at some aspects of the behaviour of the Scots, Carpenter was a most impressive fieldworker. He covered a considerable part of lowland Scotland, later moving down to Devon and Cornwall then the Cotswolds and the south midlands, back up to Scotland through Yorkshire and the counties east of the Pennines. Carpenter, himself, claimed that he had travelled ‘Forty thousand miles through Britain.’ It is my great regret that he never appeared to collect in Lancashire although he has one or two items from contributors who lived there. Carpenter seems to have had an innate ability to get on with people and to encourage them to talk to him and to collaborate in his collecting work. In the seven years he spent here after completing his PhD, Carpenter assembled most of the material which now takes up 14, 500 pages of notes; 560 photographic images; 220 disks and 179 Dictaphone cylinders. He undertook further fieldwork in America and many of the wax cylinders are from this time, the disks being, in the main, working copies of the cylinders

He did not just collect but sometimes used the major libraries near to his collecting centres to help contextualise the material he was collecting. As he, himself explained, his theories about the material he was working on developed through an understanding of the link between what he collected and the material in the libraries he used. In addition to cities such as Aberdeen and Edinburgh, Carpenter is known to have spent time in London, Cambridge and Oxford. One thing which does seem odd is that in all of this research work and collecting, there is no mention of him meeting up with people from the English folk world. He tells of seeing Chambers at work in the Bodleian Library after he had started collecting his plays but made no apparent attempt to discuss their mutual work.

After his return to America, Carpenter did comparatively little with his hard won material. He did give some lectures based on the collection and he transcribed some of the ballad tunes that he had collected but little else. A number of reasons have been put forward to explain Carpenter’s failure to publish his work; his lack of success in finding a suitable post in the university world – his longest salaried position after his return was as head of English at Greensboro Woman’s College, a Methodist college in North Carolina. A second suggestion is that whilst he was an excellent fieldworker, he was temperamentally unsuited to the disciplined library work necessary to prepare the collection for publication. Despite his ambitions to work on the material, it was largely untouched until it was sold to the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress in 1972 for some \$7, 000; a not insignificant sum at that time. After his retirement from teaching in 1954, Carpenter stayed in Greensboro for ten years, moving back home to Mississippi in 1964. In these last years of his life, he spent much of his time composing tunes on an electric guitar and writing his own songs on slips of papers which he carefully folded rather like spills and filed away. He was clearly proud of these songs and hoped that he might break into the profitable country music market. He was so proud of these songs that on occasions, Alan Jabbour, in his interview, has to be circumspect in bringing Carpenter back to what we consider his main work. There is some uncertainty about the time of Carpenter’s death. His family are sure that ‘Uncle Madison’ died in 1983 at the age of 95 and that is what his gravestone records. There is, however, a note in the Library of Congress dated 1984 which states that Marjorie Waters, Carpenter’s niece, rung to let them know that her uncle had died. Marjorie recalls making the call and thinks that this was in the year of his death. The uncertainty

remains. Carpenter was, apparently, bright to the end although he suffered badly from diabetes in the last few years of his life.

But what did Carpenter collect and just how important is that collection? Most aspects of British performance tradition are represented including Morris tunes, English country dances, Christmas carols for example but the strength of Carpenters work lies, in the main, in the field of folk songs and Child ballads, sea shanties and folk plays.

David Atkinson has argued for the importance of Carpenter's English Child Ballads, most of which were collected in the south midlands and Cornwall with some from his shanty singers especially those from Wales. As Atkinson points out

‘Carpenter was arguably the first to bring the academic legacy of Child directly to bear upon folksong collecting in England and, even though the majority of his ballads are from Scotland, his attention to Child ballads from England and Wales distinguishes his work from that of his English predecessors, and even to a degree from that of Child himself.’⁴

Carpenter was far from modest in his own claims about the value of his collection. In the prospectus for his proposed publication ‘British and American Traditional Ballads with Tunes’, it ‘would prove’, he said, ‘the most valuable ever in scope, in range, in fullness, in fidelity of recording techniques, in quality, in scholarly value and in the demonstration of ‘the greatest ballad singer of all time.’ He was referring here to Bell Duncan who was his most prolific contributors of ballads and a woman unknown to other collectors. Ian Olson was happy to endorse Carpenter's view of the strength of his collection.

Having sampled the James Madison Carpenter Collection, I have little doubt that these claims will be fully vindicated, and not only with regard to his ballad findings. ... material so far examined suggests that his findings will be of the greatest importance as far as Scottish songs and informants are concerned.⁵

Bob Walser, the shanty expert is, however, somewhat more circumspect. Whilst being prepared to argue that ‘In the dying days of commercial sail James Madison Carpenter gathered one of the largest collections of shanties and sailor's songs ever made’,⁶ he considers that the shape of the collection and its current inaccessibility makes a full evaluation of this material difficult.

In my own field of folk drama I would argue that not only was the Carpenter Collection important at the time of the original fieldwork but it remains important today and I want to argue this case using the play material as an exemplar in view of the fact that this is the part of the collection I know and understand best. Then I want to conclude by explaining what it is that we are actually doing with Carpenter's *magnum opus*.

For Carpenter, size mattered. It was a slogan coined for him long before present day marketing executives began to take it up. Carpenter often refers to the number of plays he had collected and is manifestly proud that his collection was larger than anyone else's. And that is true, as Roud and Smith point out. His collection was unrivalled until the work of the post war generation of play scholars from the 1950s. What is perhaps even more important, although there *are* some examples copied from printed versions, the play material was largely collected in the field. The only other collection of any importance which existed prior to Carpenter's work is the Ordish Collection and that has many faults; Ordish did no fieldwork and his accumulation of texts for his proposed

book was far from systematic. Moreover, the collection became to be considered by The Folklore Society as something of a 'filing cabinet' for anything of a play nature and the integrity of the collection was compromised. The other, but much later collection, that of Alex Helm is much better and its structure far more considered. But Helm was no fieldworker either and relied on the work of others such as his colleagues Christopher Cawte and Norman Peacock in addition to a network of supporters such as the late Stuart Laurence who collected plays from the Furness area of Lancashire. As Christopher Cawte put it succinctly to me recently 'Alex was a great collector of collectors.' The standard of Carpenter's fieldwork methods, on the other hand, was in advance of its time, as Roud and Smith point out:

Not only did he routinely use a Dictaphone and a camera, which greatly increased his ability to record accurate information, but he was also concerned with details beyond the bare text, such as the words and tunes of accompanying songs. He almost always recorded the names of his informants, asked questions about where and when they learned or first performed the play, and often noted other details such as costume and the names of other performers. The one significant, and most irritating, omission is the almost complete absence of dates in his papers.⁷

There are other omissions. It is not easy, for example, to work out how long the custom had been known or whether the plays were still being performed in Carpenter's time. Whilst these are now seen as reprehensible shortcomings in today's academic environment, for Carpenters time what we have from him is much more than we might have expected. I suppose that we ought to be grateful for the fact that Carpenter was trained in America.

Carpenter's own view of the collecting methods of his distinguished English predecessors is clearly set out in a letter he wrote to Kittredge in November 1933 not long after he had first discovered mumming plays but by which time he had collected 'sixty-five [plays] covering fifty-two different versions' – that size thing again. Carpenter was aware that *The English Folk Play* by E.K.Chambers was due to appear before the end of the year. An event to which Carpenter looked forward with some anticipation, he had asked Blackwell's to let him have a copy as soon as it was available. This was the first book on the folk play to have been published since the posthumous publication of R.J.E.Tiddy's book *The Mummers' Play* in 1923. Carpenter's sense of anticipation, however, did not stop him writing of Tiddy and Chambers in a somewhat disparaging manner and stressing his own successes. 'In short, my collection, if completed, will remain as an outstanding authority on the Mummers Play. Instead of a mere two-score of versions, [Tiddy's tally] often stupidly collected I shall have two or three hundred plays.'⁸ And in an undated lecture text, Carpenter adds:

In 1903 Sir Edmund Chambers, in *The Medieval Stage*, gives an account of the Mummers' Play, basing his conclusions on twenty-nine examples. In 1933, in his book *The English Folk-Play*, he states, "I can now draw upon well over one hundred more or less complete folk-plays." While he was writing those lines, I was collecting in his home town of Eynsham two traditional plays of which he never knew. In the two years following I collected, from all parts of England three hundred traditional folk-plays – twice the number to which he had access after thirty years of research. [Carpenter's emphasis]⁹

I must add that, whilst we cannot avoid noticing the apparent self-aggrandisement again, we do have to note that in some of his correspondence, Carpenter was seeking funding to enable him to continue his research in Britain, or, later, to provide him with the wherewithal to write up his work. I am sure that those of us having to deal with present day applications for funding may have some sympathy with the hyperbole!!

So much for overall numbers, but what about the geographical distribution of Carpenter's collecting. That is most definitely skewed. The most readily accessible figures are those given in Christopher Cawte's *A Guide to English Ritual Drama in the Carpenter Collection* which is in essence a guide to the microfilm of the drama portions of the collection. Paul Smith said of this guide in 1984 'Chris Cawte has done a great job of indexing this play material just about every which-way round that you could think of so that it is a very good inroad into what is on the microfilm at the moment.'¹⁰ Cawte states that Carpenter collected plays from the following counties:

England

Oxfordshire	30	Gloucestershire	27
Lincolnshire	20	Yorkshire, N. Riding	14
Berkshire	11	Warwickshire	6
Northamptonshire	5	Worcestershire	5
Cornwall	4	Yorkshire, W. Riding	4
Durham	3	Yorkshire, E. Riding	3
Buckinghamshire	2	Northumberland	2
Nottinghamshire	1	Somerset	1
Staffordshire	1	Wiltshire	1

Scotland

Roxburghshire	7	Berwickshire	4
Selkirkshire	2	Fife	1

Carpenter does not give any explanation for the choice of the areas in which he collected plays. It might have been a reflection of the bias which existed in the play material which had been published in the decade before Carpenter started his work. Tiddy's book which I have already mentioned has a bias towards plays of the south midlands and in 1924, *Modern Philology* published Charles Read Baskervill's paper 'Mummers Wooing Plays in England' which may have led him to Lincolnshire and the east midlands. Whilst we cannot be sure, we have to remember that Carpenter never had a systematic plan on what he would collect and where – except for sea shanties which he realised he was likely to get at seaports. Carpenter came across plays by accident during the period he was in Oxford from 1932 to 1933. He heard that a member of a Womens' Society in Oxford had collected a mumming play from a local village – and Carpenter was hooked. Presumably, however, did not know how to set about the work of collecting further examples in a systematic manner and started in the Oxford area moving from one lead to another just as he did with his ballad collecting. Such a process would introduce an inevitable bias into the collection as mummers would be unlikely to know others of their ilk outside their own immediate area.

But to move on from the size and the scope of the collection – does it remain of value to scholars today? I would want to argue strongly that it does and in presenting my arguments I shall rely again on the play collection – my colleagues working on other areas of the collection have their own arguments.

It is true that as far as the geographical distribution of the folk play, we know a lot of what there is to be known. It would be nice to know without doubt why the play is not known in East Anglia or whether or not the pace-egg play was a custom in the large farming areas of central Lancashire but Carpenter will not provide answers to those questions. But there are questions that Carpenter could help us to answer. We can confidently say that there are certain accepted groupings of plays, souling plays, pace-egg plays, wooing plays are examples which readily spring to mind. But there may be others. Peter Millington, for example is currently arguing for a sub-set of plays to be called 'Father Christmas and the Turkish Knight'. In order to demonstrate that there is a discrete set of similar texts with these two characters as distinguishing features, it is essential to have available for analysis as many texts as possible. Millington has written a computer program which allows him to compare a series of texts looking for affinities. He used this program to great effect in a paper published in *Folklore* in 1996; a paper which proved that the West Indies mummies play was derived, in the main, from the Peace Egg Play written by Juliana Ewing. This program is ideal for trying to prove that this 'new' sub-set is, indeed, a valid set. The program can also be used to examine in detail texts used within a particular county or region. If we are ever going to have a full history of the mumming play in Britain from the eighteenth century, such studies are essential as providing the building bricks for that study, the primary research on which the larger synthesis would be based. Here it will often be necessary to compare the collection assemble by Carpenter with those assembled by other collectors. A comparison of the Carpenter collection of plough plays with the somewhat later one of Ethel Rudkin is one which immediately springs to mind.

Another area of play research which I think needs opening up is that of the mumming teams which arose from the post Second World War revival. I don't think that the distinction between these teams and those which performed before the war is as intellectually sustainable as do some of my colleagues. Somebody has to be doing the fieldwork to record these teams and to compare their texts with those which went before. To do that clearly means that these older texts need to be available. Hence the importance of Carpenter and the work we are doing to catalogue the collection. Of course, there are large collections of texts in Ordish and in Helm but neither of these collections is readily accessible to any but the most determined researcher. They are certainly not on-line as the Carpenter collection will be, nor are there any signs of that happening.

So what is being done to make Carpenter so accessible? Whilst working on her PhD at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, Julia Bishop of the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield, was 'mulling over' possible post-doctoral projects. It was Ian Russell who suggested that she could work on James Madison Carpenter and the first outcome of that work was the special issue of *Folk Music Journal* which appeared in 1998. Some two years ago now, Julia applied to the Arts and Humanities Research Board for a grant to produce an on-line version of the Carpenter Collection. In addition a hard-copy critical edition of his work was proposed. This application was declined but, nothing deterred, Julia decided to break the project up into two or more sections and applied for funding for the first section which was to be the on-line catalogue with a view to re-applying for funding for the other work later.

This time the application was successful. Julia already had her team of researchers: Bob Walser of Minneapolis was to work on the sea shanties which had been Carpenter's original reason for coming to Britain; Elaine Bratke would deal with tunes and dances; I would catalogue the plays; Julia herself, as well as leading the team, would be responsible for songs along with Tom McKean of the Elphinstone Institute and David Atkinson. I should add that Ian Russell of the Elphinstone Institute had long been a supporter of the project and the Institute has been a partner with NATCECT from the outset.

The timing of the proposed project has been superb. Originally it was planned that we would work from photocopies of Carpenter's original pages, however, the Library of Congress decided that they would digitise the whole of the collection and make it available on the web. By this time, Jennifer Cutting had raised some funding to re-master all of Carpenter's cylinders under the American Folklife Center's Save Our Sounds scheme. In addition, those disks which represented unique copies of his recordings were also to be re-mastered. Some of the disks are only copies of the cylinders. The catalogue of the text parts of the collection is being compiled from the digitized images.

In the formative stages of the project, a decision had to be made as to whether or not a data base, Access or something similar could be used. An IT specialist from Sheffield University's Humanities Research Institute, suggested, however, that we would be much better served if we used EAD, encoded archival description. A decision to use EAD was set out in the project document submitted to the AHRB. It was a decision with which Mike Heaney, a consultant to the project following the departure of Julia's Sheffield based IT expert, later concurred, based on his experience at both the Bodleian Library and the British Library. EAD is a document type definition (DTD) - a standard for encoding archival finding aids - which uses mark up languages to encode data. EAD can use SGML, standard general mark-up language, but there is now a later generation, XML - extensible mark-up language. This is what we are using. We use the tags to signal (to another person's computer, as it were) what certain pieces of information within a document are - a personal name, a geographical name, a date, and so on. This information is called metadata - data about data. In other words, the XML tags define or explain what the data is. This allows us to create a structured document in which rules not only for describing the layout of the document, but also the types of data it contains, are embedded. There are 'Agreed Rules' which define the tags and the way in which they should be used. These are defined by the Society of American Archivists and are available on the Library of Congress EAD web site. Unfortunately, these rules are effectively unenforceable and hence, the use of EAD varies somewhat from one institution to another.

The advantages of EAD over a proprietorial database are basically twofold. First, this kind of metadata, based on SGML/XML tags, is seen as a route to a common language allowing people to share information whatever operating system and data types they have (for example, one of our colleagues uses an Apple Mac whilst the rest of us use PCs but we can all read the same data). Moreover, this way of encoding data does not rely on one having a particular make of database, or a particular operating system, it is a portable language which is not susceptible to the changes which might affect proprietorial data bases and which should ensure the longevity of the catalogue we produce. Secondly, in an archival collection, it is often the case that we want to make fairly discursive entries to describe the material. This is not readily possible in a database in which the length of the fields is 'set'. DTD allows us to include or exclude

various tags so that we enter only the data which pertains to a given record, organised, through nesting, in a comprehensible way – a way which seeks to reflect the physical or intellectual organisation of the original materials. Our work is, therefore, at the cutting edge of cataloguing mixed media collections. Whilst there are sites on the web which use this language, our work on the Carpenter collection represents the first time that it has been used to catalogue such a large folklore collection. The work is so much at this cutting edge that Sheffield University is having to look at the facilities on its server as they are not presently able to handle our needs.

In practice, the team is currently working its way through the ‘first pass’ at the material. Here, it is intended only that what is on Carpenter’s page should be catalogued. Later there will be a ‘second pass’ where we will add external information relevant to the entry; Child, Roud or AT numbers, grid references and so on. At this stage links will be established so that a searcher looking at an entry will eventually be able to move from the initial entry to other related entries; from a typed text of a song to a cylinder on which the original recording was made; from a mummers play text to other versions of the same play or to a photograph of the mummers. By the time we have finished, anybody looking for material really will be able to search the collection ‘just about every which-way round that you could think of.’

This archaeological recovery phase of our work will be completed by the end of October of this year when we expect to launch our catalogue on to the net. Later and as part of the next phase of our work, we will be seeking permission from the descendants of Carpenter’s informants to publish the material in the Library of Congress on the web, then the complete digitised collection will become available for the benefit of a research public interested in working on any aspect of the collection. This next phase of our work remains a little way off at the moment but if all works out as we hope, and Julia is as successful with her third application to the Arts and Humanities Research Board as she was with her second, we shall start work on the critical edition of Carpenter’s material in November.

When I was asked to join the Carpenter team, I don’t think that I thought that we would be giving to the folk world the significant resource that we will. I merely thought that yes, I would like to work on this collection because I wanted to work on Carpenter’s drama material as an extension of the work I had already done. I saw myself as a play scholar. Now, I see the situation somewhat differently. I am conscious of the value implicit in the Carpenter Collection as a whole and I want to help to make sure that scholars, whatever their principal area of research, but as part of the folk world as a whole, will be able to access the archive. As Alan Jabbour said in his introduction to the special issue of *Folk Music Journal* which Julia Bishop edited.

For others, field collecting may have served as a means to other accomplishments, such as publication and academic advancement. For James Madison Carpenter, the Collection itself was his accomplishment, and our thoughtful exploration of the Collection and its cultural significance will provide the belated testimony his work deserves.¹¹

Jabbour was writing of that issue of the journal. I believe, however, that that is precisely how the Carpenter team see their work.

Notes

¹ Hamish Henderson, *Alias MacAlias. Writing on Songs, Folk and Literature*. Edinburgh, Polygon, 1992. p.200

² J.M. Carpenter interview with Alan Jabbour, Booneville, Mississippi, 27 May 1972. Unless otherwise stated, Carpenter quotations are from this interview.

³ Hamish Henderson, *op cit*

⁴ David Atkinson, 'The Child Ballads from England and Wales in the James Madison Carpenter Collection', *Folk Music Journal*, 7:4, 1998 p. 435

⁵ Ian A. Olson, 'Scottish Song in the James Madison Carpenter Collection', *Folk Music Journal*, 7:4, 1998 p. 421

⁶ Robert Young Walser, 'Here we Come In a Leaky Ship!': The Shanty Collection of James Madison Carpenter', *Folk Music Journal*, 7:4, 1998 p. 471

⁷ Steve Roud and Paul Smith, 'James Madison Carpenter and the Mummers' Play', *Folk Music Journal*, 7:4, 1998 p. 496

⁸ Draft letter from Carpenter to Professor [G. L.] Kittredge, dated 3 December 1933. AFC 1972/001, Folder 66 (Box 2, Packet 9B); on Microfilm Reel 5.

⁹ Lecture text – typescript. AFC 1972/001, Folder 157 (Box 7 Packet 2A) on Microfilm 9.

¹⁰ Paul Smith, James Madison Carpenter: Rewriting History. Unpublished paper given at the Traditional Drama Conference, Sheffield, 1984

¹¹ Alan Jabbour, 'Introduction', *Folk Music Journal*, 7:4, 1998 p. 400