

It is, however, an enumerative bibliography with minimal descriptions mainly based on secondary sources. It covers only the first fifty years of the Declaration, not long enough to account for the surge of patriotic publications in the nineteenth century.<sup>17</sup>

If it had gone on for ten more years it would have brought Allen and Sneff up to the Bridgham miniature. But even then a brief listing of this kind would not show the facsimile's relevance to their concerns or its relationship to the other Boston editions. Worthy in other ways, an enumerative bibliography is not intended to answer questions about form and content. It does not describe physical objects with the details that might disclose the influence of one artifact on another, the information that might reveal resemblances in production methods, textual elements, and stylistic motifs. To make their claims for the Sussex Declaration, Allen and Sneff looked hard for this kind of information but only looked in one place and did not consider the commercial context. The manuscript they found deserves bibliographical scrutiny, but if I am correct about its sources, it has nothing to do with James Wilson and the Constitution. Rather, it should be dated at least fifty years later, when someone copied Bridgham's engraving in an attempt to emulate the engrossed Declaration. If not an entirely successful effort, it is an interesting byproduct of the trade in patriotic prints and a good example of a text entangled in transcriptions large and small.

17. Many of the catalogue entries are derived from Stephen M. Matyas, Jr.'s *Declaration of Independence: A Checklist of Books, Pamphlets, and Periodicals Printing the U.S. Declaration of Independence, 1776–1825* (2009). The Matyas checklist has transcriptions of titles, collation statements, contents notes, and locations of copies examined but does not include prints and broadsides. A pdf version can be downloaded at <http://usdeclarationofindependence.com> (accessed 20 March 2023).