a lost descendant when writing out his "emphatical words," a 65% correlation, how are we to explain the 90% correlation in the Bridgham print? Bridgham's artist would have had to be even more dependent on the Sussex Declaration, which would have somehow re-emerged in Boston eighteen years after coming into the hands of Tyler. Here again we should seek an easier explanation: the Bridgham print is the source of the Sussex Declaration. The copyist acknowledged its rhetorical effects by writing out in a larger script almost every one of its distinctive words.

Textual variants. Allen and Sneff relegate to a footnote a discussion of textual variants that appear only in the Bridgham print and the Sussex Declaration (*PBSA,* p. 398). In fact, the same readings also occur in the Franklin Print Company facsimile, the last in the succession of Boston editions. They are all ordinary errors although the spelling "paralelled" in the phrase "scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages" might be justified by precedents in that period. Binns and Tyler adopt a primarily British usage in the spelling "connexion," which they employ in the phrases "interrupt our connections" and "all political connection." This variant, not mentioned by Allen and Sneff, occurs in all of the Boston editions but not in the Sussex Declaration. That could be an argument in favor of a direct relationship with the engrossed Declaration, although one could just as easily surmise that the copyist opted for the "connection" spelling, which was also prevalent in England in the 1830s. Perhaps more to the point, the variant spelling "paralelled" in the Sussex Declaration becomes significant because it did not originate in the Tyler facsimile but in the Bridgham facsimile. Bridgham's artist had to cope with the spelling "parallelled" in the Boston Bewick edition, an obvious mistake, but guessed wrong when he tried to fix it. The Sussex copyist did not have any better ideas.

The sequence of signatures. For Allen and Sneff, the signatures are the most important part of the Sussex Declaration. They perceive a pattern in the signatures, a "hidden ordering principle" devised by the copyist in accordance with James Wilson's aspirations for a strong federal government (*PBSA,* p. 386). That pattern breaks a precedent they detect in other government documents and other Declarations, beginning with the engrossed parchment. There the signatures are grouped by states (excepting that of Matthew Thornton, who signed it at a later date when there was no more room to put it in the proper place). The state groupings are even more explicit in the "authenticated Copy" printed by order of Congress in 1777 and some of the letterpress broadsides issued in the era of Binns and Tyler. By changing the order of the signatures, they say, the Sussex Declaration downgrades the prominence of the states and asserts the supreme power of the central government prescribed by the Constitution. Wilson's role in framing the Constitution provides additional evidence for dating the manuscript. If that date is valid, and if Wilson was involved, the Sussex Declaration would be a bridge between the two great founding documents of the United States and a means of explicating the political precepts behind them.

The "hidden ordering principle" is based on a cipher system used in encrypted correspondence during the Revolutionary War. Allen and Sneff consulted with a codebreaking expert who confirmed that a system can be discerned in the sequence of signatures. I will not try to describe it in detail except to say