

tive purpose, both looping down to fill hollow portions of the border. The state groupings would have had no meaning in this graphic concept and would have prevented the artist from placing the signatures in an even array, although vestiges can be detected in sequences of Maryland, North Carolina, and New Jersey delegates. Symmetry was the top priority of the artist. By a simple computation, he found a way to accommodate the fifty-six signatures in a graphic construct composed of six columns and nine rows with the exception of the first and last columns, which have ten signatures instead of nine.

Allen and Sneff argue against the priority of the Bridgham print on the grounds that the Sussex copyist could not have replicated its sequence of signatures. They believe that he would have had to backtrack between columns if he started the transcription process by reading across the rows. Diagrams in the *PBSA* article (pp. 401 and 402) intimate that he would have been confused by the extra names in the first and last columns and could not have dealt with them to arrive at the sequence in the Sussex Declaration. The transcription process does not seem all that difficult to me. The copyist proceeded through the six rows of names, one name after another left to right, allowing the first and last columns to be slightly staggered. He then inserted the two extra names, Roger Sherman and Elbridge Gerry, to restore the alignment between the inner and outer columns. Then he resumed the regular progression from left to right in the last three lines.

Turning that argument around, I question why Bridgham's artist would have replicated the sequence in the Sussex Declaration. Why would he use it as a starting point and then go off and consult some other source to turn those round hand names into facsimile signatures? In the manuscript, the names occupy six rows and then spill over to a seventh row containing a name and a half. What value would he have seen in that haphazard arrangement? He would have been much more interested in creating his own sequence to make a block of signatures in pleasing proportions. Let's say he knew about the hidden ordering principle and wished to preserve it. But why would he be privy to the secret rather than anyone else in the Declaration business? There are too many loose ends and coincidences in this scenario. It is much more likely that he began with the Boston Bewick letterpress broadside, an easily adaptable model for the layout and decoration. He then reconceived it as an engraved miniature and decided on a symmetrical composition in accordance with the aesthetic of that genre. To achieve the "neatness" highly prized in that period, he changed the order of the signatures to fit them in a rectangular block, nine rows deep, six columns across. Neatness, uniformity and symmetry were his goals and the real reasons for rearranging the signatures.

Misspelled signatures. Allen and Sneff note that the copyist misspelled some of the signatures. They cite eight problematic names, three of which might be excused as alternatives: Pinn for Penn, Rutlidge for Rutledge, Hayward for Heyward. A ninth could be added to their list, a garbled superscript in the signature of Samuel Huntington: Sam^u. for Sam^{el}. More egregious errors occur in four names: Floys for Floyd, Harnson for Harrison, Witherspoare for Witherspoon, and M. Keap for M: Kean. The *PBSA* article includes a series of thumbnail illustrations juxtaposing the Sussex Declaration versions with the signatures in the Stone facsimile, the best record of the originals in the engrossed Declaration. It is true that some of the originals are barely legible and that ignorant