

**Robert A. Fenn\***

## **Kann man "texttreu" sein, wenn der Text nicht treu ist?**

### **Reflections on the Editing of Marx's Articles in the *New-York Tribune***

A close reading of Marx's "Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera—Strikes—Sailors' Movement"<sup>1</sup> raises some questions about the rules regarding the editing of the articles that appeared in English language newspapers.<sup>2</sup> What I wish to propose is a more forthright use of the tools of editorial modernization in order to achieve a greater *clarification* of the text. As the article in question was grossly mishandled by the editors in New York,<sup>3</sup> its editing raises some questions in an unusually severe form. It should be noted that there is an old legal maxim "Hard cases make bad law."<sup>4</sup> One must beware of making a procrustean bed for editors out of rules derived from one difficult article. I shall, however, make an extreme case for modernization of the article (and hence others in the *New-York Tribune* series) for the purpose of discussion.

There are a variety of problems in this piece as it appears in the MEGA<sup>2</sup> edition. And there are other, different problems with the version that appears in the *MECW*.<sup>5</sup> In MEGA<sup>2</sup> the following types of errors seem to be present: (1) Errors in the reading of the original; (2) Errors made by Marx; (3) Errors made by Marx or the printers in New York; (4) Errors of setting, and, (5) Missing notes in both the Korrekturenverzeichnis (KV) and the Erläuterungen (ERL).

There is no KV for this article. I believe that, for a variety of reasons, there ought to be one,

\* Die Herausgeber der *Beiträge* teilen hierdurch mit, daß der Autor im April 1993 infolge einer schweren Krankheit verstorben ist. Der kanadische Wirtschaftshistoriker, der über viele Jahre Dogmengeschichte der politischen Ökonomie an der Universität Toronto lehrte, hat sich vor allem um die Herausgabe der Werke von James Mill bemüht (*James Mill's Articles in the Encyclopædia Britannica, 1816-1823*, ed. by Robert A. Fenn, University of Toronto, Toronto 1991). Zuletzt beschäftigte er sich mit der Edition von *James Mill's Common Place Books*. Fenn verfolgte aufmerksam die Arbeit an der Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe (siehe Bemerkungen von Prof. Robert A. Fenn (Toronto, Kanada) zum Band III/4.1. In: Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch 13, Berlin 1991, S. 345/346). Als die MEGA<sup>2</sup> 1991 den Kampf um ihre Fortsetzung führte, gehörte er zu denjenigen, die sich nachdrücklich für ihren Erhalt und einen kritischen editorischen Neuanfang einsetzten. Ausdruck dafür ist auch der vorliegende Artikel. Intensiver Meinungs- und Austausch entwickelte sich ebenso über die Möglichkeiten der computergestützten MEGA<sup>2</sup>-Edition. Wir erinnern uns gern an seinen Besuch in Berlin im Juni 1992 und die mit ihm geführten Diskussionen über editorische Probleme der Mill-Ausgabe und der MEGA<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> MEGA<sup>2</sup>, Berlin 1984, I/12, S. 312-314. See also the same text in the *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Moscow 1979, XII 287-9 (hereafter *MECW*). The text of MEGA<sup>2</sup> was checked against the original publication in the *New-York Daily Tribune* from a microfilm made by the Bell & Howell Micro Photo Department (Recordak Microfilm), Cleveland, Ohio. Unfortunately the provenance of the copy used is not given. I did not have access to the versions in the *Semi-Weekly* or *Weekly Tribune*.

<sup>2</sup> This note has its origin in my attempt to work out a hypothetical set of guidelines for computerizing the remaining volumes of MEGA<sup>2</sup> so that they may be published by means of "desktop" publishing. Hence the choice of a short (2 pages) article in English with a relatively short commentary in the notes (2 pages).

<sup>3</sup> See the "Entstehung und Überlieferung" for this article, I/12, S. 851-852. As these notes indicate at the very least some fifteen lines were probably used elsewhere by the editors. The opening three paragraphs seem very disjointed, for example, to this reader.

<sup>4</sup> Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes (1841-1935), in 1904.

<sup>5</sup> As these are not at issue here I would merely note that their added punctuation is almost invariably incorrect (the points in the title of the article for example), and that they do not know how to handle set down paragraphs of quotation.

that the notes need to be enlarged, and that the setting of the article needs to be reconsidered. All these conclusions have implications for the other articles written by Marx and Engels for English language papers, and, in particular, as I will show later, for those published in the *New-York Tribune*.

#### § I. ERRORS OF READING

##### 312.9 MEGA<sup>2</sup> Königsberg) J<sup>1</sup> Konigsburg

This correction ought to be in the KV. If this correction is made should not “Dantzig” be corrected to “Danzig”? There were three possible English transliterations of “Danzig” in use in the 19<sup>th</sup> century: “Dantzig, Dantzick, and Dantzig.” The one used by the *Tribune* was the one recommended by Noah Webster’s *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, revised ed., New York 1851 (a reprint of the 1847 ed.). But the spelling of “Königsberg” as “Konigsburg” is not to be found there, instead “Königsberg or Koenigsberg” is recommended.

##### 312.11 MEGA<sup>2</sup> 6s.) J<sup>1</sup> 6s.

J<sup>1</sup> is correct—*s.* = *solidus/solidi* not shilling[s]. Modern usage (since the 1970s) has gradually shifted to the non-italicised form, but academic printing would still use *s.*

##### 313.4 MEGA<sup>2</sup> knowledge week) J<sup>1</sup> knowledge, week

It is fairly clear on the microfilm that there is a broken (half-formed) comma here. It is also required by the structure of the previous phrase “enumerating, letter after letter,”.

##### 313.24 MEGA<sup>2</sup> Seamen’s bill) J<sup>1</sup> Seamens bill

This tacit correction ought to be in the KV, on which more below in § III.

##### 313.32 MEGA<sup>2</sup> has) J<sup>1</sup> had

Correct in the *MECW*. J<sup>1</sup> is correct grammatically.

#### § II. ERRORS MADE BY MARX

##### 312.18 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “decided Asiatic cholera”

Should read “diagnosed Asiatic cholera”. Here we have a not entirely rare example of Marx’s writing in English but thinking in German. It is fairly clear that he is thinking of the verb “bestimmen”, and that he has translated it with its primary meaning of “decided” rather than its secondary one of “to diagnose [an illness]”. The English makes little sense without this change. Possibly a note is needed here in both the KV and in the ERL.

##### 313.32 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “Navigation law”

“Navigation Act” would be better—see 313.20. As I indicate below in § V, “Acts” might even be better. Put in KV.

#### § III. ERRORS OF MARX OR THE PRINTERS

##### 312.8 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “viz.”

Incorrect, “viz.…” Point after abbreviation required. Put in KV.

##### 312.15 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “potatoe”

Surely by this time this spelling was incorrect? “potato” should be used? Put in KV. In *Webster’s Dictionary* “potato” is the spelling used.

##### 312.25 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “bricklayers,”

There seems to be a word missing here. Suggest correction of “bricklayers’ [unions]”. Put in KV.

- 313.19 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “Sailor’s”  
 “Sailors” might be a better reading, but this change is optional. It depends on how one reads the sense of this sentence. Put in KV?
- 313.24 J<sup>1</sup> “Seamens”  
 “Seamen’s” would be the correct possessive. Put in KV.
- 313.24 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “Owners”  
 If the correction “Seamen’s” is made then “Owners” should read “Owners”. Put in KV.
- 314.4-5 MEGA<sup>2</sup> & J<sup>1</sup> “the seamen will”  
 Here the version in the *MECW* provides a correction: “[...] the seamen [...] will”. See also § V *re* missing notes below.

§ IV. CHANGES OF SETTING BETWEEN J<sup>1</sup> AND MEGA<sup>2</sup>

NOTE: ALL OF THESE ARE MINOR—BUT THEY RAISE THE QUESTION OF THE PROBLEMS  
 INHERENT IN MODERNIZING THE TEXT

- 312.3 The heading “Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune” is centred in MEGA<sup>2</sup>. In J<sup>1</sup> it is flush to the left margin. Centring it detracts from the main heading for the article. In J<sup>1</sup> the setting is “N. Y. Tribune”, in the MEGA<sup>2</sup> “N.Y.Tribune” (no space between “Y.” and “Tribune” is definitely wrong). The modern setting would be “N.Y. Tribune”.
- 312.4 J<sup>1</sup> London) MEGA<sup>2</sup> London  
 Use small caps. This emphasis was undoubtedly used by the paper to highlight the fact that they had foreign correspondents—it should be retained.
- 312.6 First paragraph is indented in J<sup>1</sup>, but flush to the margin in MEGA<sup>2</sup>. Your style is correct—but such changes raise the question of the aesthetic appearance of the work, including that of using indented, smaller type paragraphs for extended quotations.
- 314.6 J<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx (no point)) MEGA<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx.  
 use small caps. For both aesthetic and emphasis reasons the small caps should be retained, and no point should be added.

§ V. MISSING NOTES (ERLÄUTERUNGEN)

- 312.14. Was there a “conclusive” crop report, presumably governmental, in the next few weeks? The use of the word “conclusive” is a bit odd; “final” would be a better term if Marx meant the last governmental report of the year (which surely would not have been published so soon in the year?). If he meant that a report would soon *prove* his description then “conclusive” should stand. I have checked the index to *The Times*, and nothing shows up their to the end of 1853 (which is not to say that an item may not exist; this index is more than a bit fallible).
- 313.19 “An Act to Amend Various Laws Relating to Merchant Shipping,” 20 August 1853, 16 & 17 Vict., c. 131.
- 313.20 The cross reference in the notes to the description of the “Navigation Act” of 1651 needs a bit of rethinking. In reality, there is not *one* Navigation Act, as the reference to 302.12 implies, but rather a *series* of Acts (1650, 1651, 1660, 1663 and 1696) which were finally abolished as a whole in 1849. See the note “Navigation Acts” in D.M. Walker, *The Oxford Companion to Law*, Oxford 1980, p. 872. The Act of 1651 was the one most concerned with the *manning* of ships in the *foreign* but not the *coastal* trade.

314.4-5 There is no note to this extended quotation. The *MECW*, XII 669, note 233 (reference to p. 289), suggests that this passage was possibly quoted from a leaflet that was published in its totality several months later in the *People's Paper*, no. 80, 12 November 1853. Hence the added ellipses in the text of 314.4. If the edition has reasons for rejecting the editing of *MECW* XII, which appeared four years earlier than the volume in the *MEGA*<sup>2</sup>, possibly they should have been stated. If it does not then the omitted material should be included in this note.

THE QUESTION OF THE MODERNIZATION OF THE TEXT

What I am suggesting in some of these remarks and queries is that once one modernizes the text slightly with regard to its physical and aesthetic appearance (first paragraph being set flush to the margin, removal of the small caps for “London” and “Karl Marx”, etc.), then does not one have the responsibility for correcting a great many other problems that arise from the fact that you are basically printing in *academic article form*, a text that was originally *set in a newspaper*. The two formats are different and impose their own imperatives. The problems that are caused by the original format are obvious. (1) Newspapers are set at a great rate of speed—hence the possibilities of misreading and printer’s errors are greatly augmented (this article was received only the day previously, and had to be used with a great amount of other material).<sup>6</sup> (2) The author had no chance of reviewing how his work was set (let alone the mangling and misappropriation the *Tribune* editors sometimes imposed upon his articles—the one I choose for use is an excellent example of this). One must also note a problem with the fact that Marx undoubtedly learned English English, not American English (a difference delightfully highlighted by the French habit of noting that a novel has been “Traduit de l’américain” or “Traduit de l’anglais”—American English is a language separated by a very large ocean, a great deal of time, and, as well, a vast, foreign, non-English speaking immigration). Horace Greeley or his editor Charles Dana may not have been as eccentric in this regard as the late Col. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune* (who tried to print his papers in a form of phonetic English), but they clearly had some ideas about the nature of American English which were not orthodox (New York, for example, is not hyphenated in any other newspaper of the period so far as I know). Further, American English usage was greatly affected by the triumph of Noah Webster’s splendid dictionary (1828ff.), which tried to render consistent what was not in the English they had inherited. Much of the standardization of the American usage of the English language flows from this source. Hence Marx’s articles suffered at times from editorial mangling—as this one undoubtedly did—and, depending on your point of view, *all* suffered from, or were improved by, editorial or printer transliteration.<sup>7</sup> It would not be the worst of ideas to check the odder spellings or geographic place names against Noah Webster’s *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, in the revised edition of 1851. This printing, based on an 1847 one made after Webster’s death in 1843, removed some of the eccentricities of the original 1806 Hartford edition of the *Compendious Dictionary of the English Language*. Just as one uses the *Oxford Dictionary* as a standard

<sup>6</sup> See the “Entstehung und Überlieferung” for this article, S. 852.

<sup>7</sup> Printers, more than editors, were often the determiners of *how* a work was set with regard to punctuation in this period. Some quite noticeable changes occurred, for example, in James Mill’s punctuation in 1805 when the printers of the *Literary Journal* went on strike and his articles were set by scab labour for over a month.

reference for the correct spelling and use of English, so Webster ought to be used as a benchmark for American usage (not that it ought *always* to be accepted).

I do not mean, for example, to suggest that we restore "labour" for "labor" in Marx's *Tribune* articles, but one needs to be aware of the following potential errors: (1) Misreadings; (2) Missed words; (3) Missed lines (a very common misreading when a text is set quickly); (4) Mistranscriptions caused by the conversion of Marx's English into American usage; and, (5) Misunderstandings of what Marx was actually saying. But these remarks are merely cautionary and the problems are well known to the editors of MEGA<sup>2</sup> given the difficulties inherent in editing many of Marx's German language texts.

The much more important point to emphasize is that Marx's texts in English, and particularly those in the *New-York Tribune*, need greater editorial reworking if they are to express what he intended them to express. Marx's English was pithy, pointed, vigorous, and vivid. But it is also fairly clear that he *worked his way into the language* in terms of both fluency and accuracy. This is scarcely surprising, but it needs to be emphasized that he made mistakes which ought to be corrected, or, at the very least noted, as well as minor slips in the mode of expression which may or may not need correcting given their context. For example, in Marx's first article written in English, "Capital Punishment—Mr. Cobden's Pamphlet—Regulations of the Bank of England," there is a minor slip of expression that ought to have been caught by the editors in New York, but was not: "who also hung himself."<sup>8</sup> This should have read "who also hanged himself." This is a common mistake in English, but a mistake nonetheless. It is surely the duty of a scholarly edition to *correct* but also to *note* these corrections. It is very striking that the KV for this article<sup>9</sup> only contains corrections from the sources Marx used, but only one of any other matter (and there are other mistakes in this article which were probably generated in New York).

Further, virtually no one today would reprint articles containing extended quotations in a scholarly edition without setting them in the modern style; the text should be separated from the main paragraph by a line, or slightly less, of space, and set at a smaller size. This setting might also require some slight alteration of the punctuation, or shift of where the quotation begins. Thus the last quotation in the article should be separately treated. The previous three, 313.14-16, 313.28-30 and 313.34-36, are too short to be thus treated. Since you have in your edition already removed the old-fashioned use of "beside each line of the quotations, you have already tacitly introduced the beginnings of this form of modernization.

I have already raised the question of the nature of punctuation regarding the possessive case (seamen's, not seamens, etc.). Parenthetical words and phrases also need to be marked off by commas,<sup>10</sup> hence; "and, of course," at 312.10 rather than "and of course". This omission may have been caused by the printers rather than by Marx (they clearly did not know, for example, that "viz." requires a point at 312.8).

#### THE VISUAL APPEARANCE OF THE TEXT

Once one discusses the computerization of the text this element of the whole is largely in your hands. May I suggest that the obligation to be "textreue" does not obligate you to obey

<sup>8</sup> MEGA<sup>2</sup>, I/12, S. 24.14-15. The "Entstehung und Überlieferung," S. 733-734, provide the evidence for this article being the first one written by Marx in English.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, S. 734.

<sup>10</sup> See *The Oxford Dictionary for Writers and Editors*, Oxford 1984, p. 329 under the entry "punctuation."

every squiggle and nuance in the original setting? For example, the exact punctuation of the heading of the article is already indicated in your own editorial title, running title, as well as in your notes to the article. Would it not look visually better if the em dash was removed from the end of the first line? Thus:

### Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera Strikes—Sailors' Movement

You may note that I also split the title earlier for a better visual balance. No information is lost this way, and the aesthetic dimension of the opening is, I believe, enhanced. My reason for setting the subheading "Correspondence of the N.Y. Tribune" back to its original place (flush left) arises not from a respect for the original setting, but rather from a desire not to draw the eye away from the main heading. There is also an aesthetic consideration, as well as one of emphasis, in using small caps for "London" and "Karl Marx". This should not be ignored.

I have in this note argued, quite deliberately, the maximal case for editorial modernization. I would not go as far as I suggest myself—but greater intervention is needed to correct the errors of Marx's English, and the vagaries of setting of the New York printers.

I append to this article a copy of the article as it would look with all the changes suggested, and, as well, the notes with the added changes in the KV and the ERL.

**Autor:** Professor Robert R. Renn, Dept. of Political Science, University of Toronto.

## Anhang

---

Karl Marx  
Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera—Strikes—  
Sailors' Movement

---

New-York Daily Tribune.  
Nr. 3873, 15. September 1853

### Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera Strikes—Sailors' Movement

Correspondence of the N.Y. Tribune

LONDON, Tuesday, Aug. 30, 1853.

The Breslaw *Gazette* states that the exportation of corn from Wallachia is definitively prohibited. 5

There is at this moment a somewhat greater question at issue than the Eastern one, viz.: the question of subsistence. Prices of corn have risen at Königsberg, Stettin, Danzig, Rostock, Cologne, Hamburg, Rotterdam, and Antwerp, and, of course, at all importing markets. At the principal provincial markets in England wheat has advanced from 4 to 6s. per qr. The constantly increasing prices of wheat and rye in Belgium and France, and the consequent dearness of bread, create much anxiety. The French Government is buying up grain in England, at Odessa, and in the Baltic. The conclusive report of the crops in England will not be out before next week. The potato disease is more general here than in Ireland. The export of grain has been prohibited by all Italian Governments, including that of Lombardy. 10 15

Some cases of diagnosed Asiatic cholera occurred in London during the last week. We also hear that the cholera has now reached Berlin.

The battle between labor and capital, between wages and profits, continues. There have been new strikes in London on the part of the coal-heavers, of the barbers, of the tailors, ladies' boot and shoe makers, umbrella and parasol coverers, shirtmakers and makers of underclothing generally, and of other working people employed by slopsellers and wholesale export-houses. Yesterday, a strike was announced from several bricklayers' [unions], and from the Thames lightermen, employed in the transit of goods between the wharfs and ships in the river. The strikes of the colliers and iron-workers in 20 25

---

 Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera—Strikes—Sailor's Movement
 

---

South Wales continues, and a new strike of colliers in Resolven has to be added to the list, etc., etc.

It would be tedious to go on enumerating, letter after letter, the different strikes which come to my knowledge, week after week. I shall therefore merely dwell occasionally on such as offer peculiar features of interest, among which, though not exactly a strike, the pending conflict between the police-constables and their chief, Sir Richard Mayne, deserves to be mentioned. Sir Richard Mayne, in his circular addressed to the several divisions of the metropolitan police force, has prohibited policemen from holding meetings, or combining, while he professed himself willing to attend to individual complaints. The policemen responded to him that they consider the right of meeting to be inalienable from Englishmen. He reminds them that their scale of wages was struck at a time when provisions were much dearer than they are at present. The men reply that "their claim is not grounded on the price of provisions only, but that it rests on the assurance that flesh and blood are not so cheap as they have been."

The most important incident in this history of strikes is the declaration of the "Seaman's United Friendly Association," calling itself the Anglo-Saxon Sailors' Bill of Rights. This declaration refers to the Merchant Shipping Bill, which repeals the clause of the Navigation Act, rendering it imperative on British owners to carry at least three-fourths of British subjects on board their ships; which bill now throws open the coasting trade to foreign seamen even where foreign ships are excluded. The men declare this bill to be, not a Seamen's bill but an Owners' bill. Nobody had been consulted but the ship-owner. The manning clause had acted as a check on the conduct of masters in the treatment and retention of crews. The new law would place seamen completely in the power of any bad officer. The new law proceeded upon the principle "that the 17,000 masters were all men of kind disposition, overflowing with generosity, benevolence and amiability; and that all seamen were untractable, unreasonable and naturally bad." They declare that while the owner may take his ships wherever he pleases, their labor is restricted to their own country, as the Government had repealed the Navigation Act without first procuring reciprocal employment for them in the ships of other nations. "Parliament having offered up the seamen as a holocaust to the owners, we as a class are constrained to combine and take measures for our own protection." These measures consist chiefly in the intention of the seamen to uphold on their part the *manning clause*, it being declared at the same time that

the seamen of the United States of America be considered as British; that an appeal be made to them for aiding their union; and that, as there would be no advantage to sail as an Englishman after the first of October, when the above law will be passed; as



---

Karl Marx

---

on the contrary freedom from impressment or service in Her Majesty's Navy during war might be secured by serving as foreigners in British ships during peace, and as there would be more protection during peace by possessing the freedom of America, [...] the seamen [...] will procure certificates of the United States citizenship, on arrival at any port of that Republic.

5

KARL MARX

---

Karl Marx  
 Rise in the Price of Corn—  
 Cholera—Strikes—Sailors' Movement  
 30. August 1853  
 (S. 312-314)

---

ENTSTEHUNG UND ÜBERLIEFERUNG

Die kurze Korrespondenz ist im wesentlichen der Entwicklung der Streikbewegung in Großbritannien gewidmet. Das letzte Mal hatte Marx etwa einem Monat zuvor, am 29. Juli, darüber berichtet (S. 254-262).

Die von dem sonst Üblichen abweichende Kürze dieser Korrespondenz macht es wahrscheinlich, daß die Redaktion entweder etwas fortließ, oder im redaktionellen Teil verarbeitet. Darauf deutet auch Marx' Bemerkung in der folgenden Korrespondenz (S. 317.3-4) hin. Sie zeigt auch, welchen Inhalt der fehlende Teil hatte. Ein redaktioneller Artikel in der gleichen „Tribune“-Nummer, in der die vorliegende Korrespondenz abgedruckt wurde, enthält ein Resümee der Nachrichten aus Europa, in das höchstwahrscheinlich die sich auf diese Thematik beziehenden Ausführungen von Marx eingearbeitet wurden. Dieser Teil des Artikels lautet: „The news from Europe would seem to leave the Eastern question as far from actual settlement as ever. The Czar had accepted the Vienna propositions on the express condition that the Sultan should make no modification in them, and without any stipulation as to the withdrawal of his troops from the Turkish dominions. The Porte has however, made some modifications in these proposals, and one or two of them are sufficiently shrewd and important, as our readers may see by reference to another column. Now it remains to be seen whether the Czar will allow these changes, or will go to war, To us it is by no means certain that he will not, after sufficient time for consideration, and after the season for naval operations has fully passed, reply that he cannot submit to such indignities, and that he will now proceed to take further guarantees by annexing as much of Turkey as he may judge proper. We are no believers in a long maintenance of peace, and shall admit there has been a settlement of the Turkish question only when the papers have been signed on both sides, and the Russian army marched back to its own side of the Pruth.“ (S. 4, Sp. 2) Diese Ausführungen sind umso bemerkenswerter, als der andere Londoner Korrespondent, Ferenc Pulszky, in bezug auf die türkische Antwort nur von „some slight modifications“ schrieb (S. 5, Sp. 6). Einige Punkte der von der Türkei vorgeschlagenen Veränderungen druckte das „Journal des Débats“ bereits am 29. August ab (Journal des Débats. Paris. 29. August 1853. S. 1, Sp. 1). Wenn auch die französische Zeitung selbst die Veränderungen als unbedeutend einschätzte, kam Marx offensichtlich auf Grund ihres Inhalts zu einer anderen Einschätzung, die in seiner Korrespondenz zum Ausdruck brachte.

Nach der Marxschen Korrespondenz druckte die „Tribune“ außerdem die gesamte Note der vier Mächte (Großbritannien, Frankreich, Österreich, Preußen) an die Türkei und Rußland ab, einschließlich der von der türkischen Regierung

Karl Marx - Rise in the Price of Corn - Cholera - Strikes - Sailor's Movement

geforderten Veränderungen (siehe Erl. 317.14-16). Möglicherweise war auch das ein Bestandteil der ursprünglichen Marx'schen Korrespondenz. In welchem Maße die Redaktion den Text von Marx kürzte oder veränderte, läßt sich nicht sagen. Wahrscheinlich waren die Modifikationen doch stärker, weil sonst in derartigen Fällen die Redaktion einen gesonderten Leitartikel mit Überschrift brachte, während sie hier einen Teil der Korrespondenz in ihre eigene Übersicht einbaute. Bemerkenswert ist auch, das sie zwar in der nächsten Korrespondenz Marx' Hinweis auf seine Einschätzung der Wiener Note stehen ließ, aber gegen ihre sonstige Gewohnheit keine Unterschrift brachte (S. 325).

Eine gekürzte Übersetzung des vorliegenden Artikels brachte die „Reform“ (Die Kriegsfrage wird von einer ... in: Die Reform. New York. Nr. 49, 17 September 1853. S. 2, Sp. 2). Der Name des Verfassers wurde in einer redaktionellen Vorbemerkung genannt.

Die Korrespondenz ist ohne Titel unter dem 30. August im Notizbuch eingetragen. Sie ging mit dem Postschiff „Franklin“ am 31. August aus Southampton ab und erreichte New York am 14. September.

Zeugenbeschreibung

- J<sup>1</sup> Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera—Strikes—Sailors' Movement. [Unterzeichnet:] Karl Marx. In: New-York Daily Tribune. Nr. 3873, 15. September 1853. S. 6, Sp. 1. Rubrik: Great Britain.—Erstdruck.
- J<sup>2</sup> Unveränderter Nachdruck in: New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune. Nr. 867, 16. September 1853. S. 1, Sp. 4-5.
- J<sup>3</sup> Unveränderter Nachdruck in: New-York Weekly Tribune. Nr. 627, 17. September 1853. S. 8, Sp. 1-2.

Der Edierte Text folgt J<sup>1</sup>.

KORREKTURENVERZEICHNIS

- |        |   |
|--------|---|
| 312.8  | viz.:] J <sup>1</sup> viz:  |
| 312.9  | Königsberg] J <sup>1</sup> Konigsburg   |
| 312.9  | Danzig] J <sup>1</sup> Dantzie  |
| 312.10 | and, of course,] J <sup>1</sup> and of course   |
| 312.15 | potato] J <sup>1</sup> potatoe  |
| 312.18 | diagnosed] J <sup>1</sup> decided<br>Should read "diagnosed Asiatic cholera". Here we have a not entirely rare example of Marx writing in English but thinking in German. It is fairly clear that he is thinking of the verb "bestimmen", and that he has translated it with its primary meaning of "decided" rather than its secondary one of "to diagnose [an illness]". The English makes little sense without this change. Possibly a note needed here in both the KV and in the ERL. |

## Erläuterungen

312.25	bricklayers [unions].] J <sup>1</sup> bricklayers, There seems to be a word missing here. Suggest correction of "bricklayers' [unions]".
313.19	Sailors'] J <sup>1</sup> Sailor's
313.24	Seamen's] J <sup>1</sup> Seamens
313.24	Owners'] J <sup>1</sup> Owners
313.33	Act] J <sup>1</sup> law

## ERLÄUTERUNGEN

312.5-6	Marx bringt die Meldung aus der „Breslauer Zeitung“ nach: Belgium and Germany. In: The Morning Advertiser. London. Nr. 19 403, 30. August 1853. S. 5, Sp. 3.
312.14.	Was there a "conclusive" crop report, presumably governmental, in the next few weeks? The use of the word "conclusive" is a bit odd; "final" would be a better term if Marx meant the last governmental report of the year (which surely would not have been published so soon in the year?). If he meant that a report would soon <i>prove</i> his description then "conclusive" should stand.
312.8-17	Vermutlich benutzt: The British Corn Trade. In: The Morning Advertiser. London. Nr. 19 403, 30. August 1853. S. 7, Sp. 3. The Foreign Corn Trade. In: The Morning Advertiser. London. Nr. 19 403, 30. August 1853. S. 7, Sp. 4.
312.18-19	Death from Asiatic Cholera. In: The People's Paper. London. Nr. 69, 27. August 1853. S. 5, Sp. 6.
312.21-25	Meeting of the Trades of Manchester in Support of the Dyers on Strike. In: The People's Paper. London. Nr. 69, 27. August 1853, S. 2, Sp. 3-4.
312.25-313.2	The Bricklayers's Strike. In: The Morning Advertiser. London. Nr. 19 403, 30. August 1853. S. 6, Sp. 4.
313.4-16	The Police Movement. In: The Morning Advertiser. London. Nr. 19 399, 25. August 1853. S. 3, Sp. 1-2.
313.19	"An Act to Amend Various Laws Relating to Merchant Shipping," 20 August 1853, 16 & 17 Vict., c. 131. This act was further amended in 1854.
313.20	The cross reference in the notes to the description of the "Navigation Act" of 1651 needs a bit of rethinking. In reality, there is not <i>one</i> Navigation Act, as the reference to 302.12 implies, but rather a <i>series</i> of Acts (1650, 1651, 1660, 1663 and 1696) which were

---

Karl Marx - Rise in the Price of Corn - Cholera - Strikes - Sailor's Movement

---

- finally abolished as a whole in 1849. See the note "Navigation Acts" in D.M. Walker, *The Oxford Companion to Law*, Oxford 1980, p. 872. The Act of 1651 was the one most concerned with the *manning* of ships in *foreign* but not *coastal* trade.
- 313.17-314.5 Vermutlich benutzt: The Merchant Shipping Bill. In: The Morning Herald. London. Nr. 22 250, 30. August 1853. S. 3, Sp. 2.
- 313.20 Siehe Erl. 302.12.
- 314.4-5 There is no note to this extended quotation. The *MECW*, XII 669, note 233 (reference to p. 289), suggests that this passage was possibly quoted from a leaflet that was published in its totality several months later in the *People's Paper*, no. 80, 12 November 1853. Hence the added ellipses in the text of 314.4. If the edition has reasons for rejecting the editing of *MECW* XII at this point, possibly it should have been stated. If it does not then the omitted material should be included in this note.