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Like our first co-edited book, *Translated Poe*, this book began with a series of conversations and then came to fruition through the magic of electronic communication and a number of personal meetings between the editors and contributors at various conference venues around the globe. In 2016, we were discussing the possibility of a project on the relationship, or lack thereof, between the fields of American studies and translation studies when Margarida and Alexandra Urakova had a long conversation about Poe, anthologies, and nineteenth-century gift books that made us ask questions about Poe and the anthologizing apparatus—questions that Margarida had already started to ponder in her work on anthologies in Portugal and that synergized with work that Emron had been doing on Poe’s reception and presence in Argentina and Spanish America in general. So, we put our other project on the back burner and began to invite scholars to write on specific topics under the larger umbrella of Poe anthologies, collections, editions, and translations.

Most of our communication with our contributors has taken place via email, but we have also been fortunate enough to meet at least once in person with almost all of our contributors through the organization of conference panels on Poe and anthologies. We have met in smaller groups at the 2017 American Literature Association’s Annual Conference in Boston; the 2018 Conference of the International Association of Inter-American Studies in Coimbra; the 2018 International Poe & Hawthorne Conference in Kyoto;
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Edgar Allan Poe wields more influence in the spheres of literature and popular culture on a world scale than any other U.S. author. This influence, however, does not rely on the quality of Poe’s texts alone nor on the compellingly tragic nature of his biography; his reputation and his ubiquitous presence owe much of their longevity to the ways Poe has been interpreted and portrayed by his advocates—other writers, translators, literary critics, literary historians, illustrators, filmmakers, musicians—and packaged by various “professional mediators” (Price 10) in the literary field, especially editors and anthologizers. As our study demonstrates, the division between Poe’s advocates and the “professional mediators” who organize his work for consumption by the reading public can be very porous, as many of Poe’s most adamant proponents—Charles Baudelaire and Julio Cortázar, for example—also anthologized, edited, and/or translated his works. Anthologizing Poe: Editions, Translations, and (Trans)National Canons focuses on the works produced by Poe’s anthologizers and editors, both the famous and the lesser-known, whose labor can take place behind the scenes and, as Leah Price points out, often appear in the “scholarly footnotes” or margins of academic discourse rather than in the “critical text” even though editions and anthologies help to “shape a larger generic system” (10). According to translation studies scholar André Lefevere, anthologizers, just like “translators, critics, and historians . . . are image makers, exerting the power of subversion under the guise of objectivity” (6–7). Poe’s editors and anthologizers wield real power,
and over the last 170 years, they have crafted and framed the various Poes we recognize, revere, cherish, and critique today.

Unlike Poe—whose works have led to countless adaptations and refractions and to a proliferation of scholarly books and articles—anthologies and the concepts of anthologizing, organizing, collecting, and/or editing an author’s work receive relatively little coverage in the literary market or in the scholarly tradition. In the introduction to his 2004 edited volume, On Anthologies: Politics and Pedagogy, Jeffrey R. Di Leo notes that “while anthologies are a pervasive and dominant part of academic culture, they have not yet been given sustained analysis by cultural theorists” (6). Most serious treatments of anthologies have appeared in the twenty-first century, and anything approaching what we can now call the field of anthology studies has only emerged over these past two decades, even though the concept of the anthology takes us all the way back to ancient Greece.

It is our aim to contribute to the growing critical conversation around anthologies and other editorial practices of textual organization, and our book builds upon the works of Barbara Mujica, Paul Lauter, and Joseph Csicsila (who examine how anthologies are used for teaching literature); Leah Price, René Audet, Kasia Boddy, Anne Ferry, and Neil Fraistat (who analyze how collections and selections shape the development of the novel, the short story, and poetry as genres); Patricia Anne Odber de Baubeta, Joe Lockard and Jillian Sandell, and Alan Golding (who historicize the roles of anthologies and editorial practices in particular literary traditions); and Teresa Seruya, Lieven D’hulst, Alexandra Assis Rosa, and Maria Lin Moniz (who have put together a volume of essays that explores the interplay between translated and native literary production and how translation functions in anthologies and collections of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries).

However, certain types of scholarship are still lacking in the critical dialogue around anthologies and anthological practices. For example, in-depth studies about (or essay collections with diverse perspectives on) the effects and affects of anthologizing and editing as projects of public literacy for a given writer—whether extending the possibilities of interpreting him or her, or cutting up the slices into which the writer is to be consumed—are still missing. The field has yet to produce many book-length projects that bring anthology studies and single-author studies into the same sphere. Anthologizing Poe follows this research combination by examining how anthologizers and editors package, repackage, and ultimately create one particularly influential and extremely popular American writer—Poe.

In the field of anthology studies, the actual definition of “anthology” can be more slippery than one would hope. In Anthologies, Di Leo claims that
“the basic notion of an anthology as a collection of writings remains the same. Today an anthology is a collection of connected or interrelated writings that center around a topic. Organizing topics may include themes, disciplines, persona, and historical periods” (3). But he also avers, “In the classroom the term anthology tends to be conflated with collection, as well as reader, casebook, and even textbook” (4). In Translation in Anthologies and Collections, Teresa Seruya and her colleagues point out the circularity in many definitions of the terms anthology and collection:

The terms anthology and collection are used interchangeably and tautologically in several definitions (“an anthology is a collection...” and “a collection is an anthology”), and they are also used to refer to a single volume or to a series of volumes including mainly literary texts, but also music pieces, films or works of art, in general. (3)

We agree with Seruya and her co-editors’ belief in the utility of a “prototypical definition of the conceptual core of anthology and neighbouring notions (such as collection, or album) as an ‘anthological class,’ a dynamic generic construct” (3).

Inspired by the hermeneutic approaches to anthologies, we seek to expand the spectrum of the concept in order to broadly gauge the editorial devices that direct how texts are to be interpreted within larger assemblages, contributing at the same time to situate an author within an artistic community and in the imagination of his or her readers. Accordingly, the different authors in our book analyze various Poe editions (from multivolume attempts at complete works to single-volume “portable” editions); shorter Poe collections (which can also be termed single-author anthologies); genre anthologies (in terms of form—e.g., poetry or short fiction—and in terms of content—e.g., horror/gothic tales, detective stories, science fiction); large multi-author anthologies used in college classrooms (such as the Norton or the Heath); nineteenth-century gift books; illustrated Poe editions; and translated editions, collections, and anthologies from various literary traditions. In short, our study explores how the anthologizing process—choosing which authors and texts to include and exclude; ordering those authors and texts; deciding how to frame the chosen pieces with introductions, epilogues, and other front matter and back matter; determining the scholarly/editorial apparatus that should accompany the primary texts (e.g., footnotes, endnotes, headnotes, a glossary); selecting or commissioning illustrations; and many other decisions—shapes the various images and reputations of Poe that we read for work, read for pleasure, and/or teach to our students.
Anthologizing Poe follows its own anthological design, planned as an edited collection in four sections, each one representing different facets and assumptions of the anthologizing model. The first section covers early prototypes of anthologies and editions that circulated during Poe’s life, including projects for which Poe himself served as the editor and/or anthologist. The second section traces Poe’s anthological fate in the Anglophone transatlantic axis (the United Kingdom and the United States). This section examines the best-known editions of Poe in English, and in the case of U.S. literary history, it also places a special focus on the anthology as textbook in the university classroom. The third section explores the significance of programmatic, genre, and theme anthologies that give us Poe the poet, the horror writer, the father of the detective story, and the precursor to modern science fiction. The fourth and final section analyzes translated literary anthologies and editions, contextualizing them in the target regional or national traditions as well as from an interdisciplinary angle that includes the visual arts, while assessing their impact across borders and the interplay between literary promoters over time and areas of influence.

Exclusion, Inclusion, Recuperation, and Relation

Anthologies, in their various types, are both objects of inclusion and exclusion and objects of recuperation and relation. They help to contextualize the industry and history of literature and to deepen our understanding of geopolitics. They reflect shifting literary tastes, while also performing cultural work that projects traits and trends. As Helga Essman and Armin Paul Frank have pointed out, anthologies can be likened to museums in their preservation function. However, unlike the museum, their lack of notoriety thus far in the scholarly field relegates them to a site of resistance and potential subversion, that of a “shadow culture.” Moreover, the cognitive operations involved in gathering texts are, on the one hand, discriminatory and contrastive and, on the other, interconnecting and intertextual, enhancing the experience of reading.

The process of anthologizing requires serious decision-making about whom or what to include and exclude, and the anthologist or editor inevitably excludes much more than she includes because, as Paul Lauter notes via another effective anthology-as-museum metaphor, “one runs out of room: books fall apart, the binding will not hold, the limits are upon us.” This ontology of exclusion exerts real power; it creates literary canons, and it affects or even controls whom and what are available to read. Karen Kilcup writes, “Composing an anthology creates a miniature canon, no matter how
resistant the editor is to the vexed notions of goodness and importance. . . . By definition, what's in is important and good, and what's omitted is at least potentially questionable" (113). Price goes as far as to argue that “[a]nthologies are more than a referendum. They determine not simply who gets published or what gets read, but who reads, and how” (3; emphasis added).

Anthologizers, then, not only leave out writers, but they also inherently leave out or change certain readers when they exclude particular writers, pieces, or genres. This exclusion is inherent to every anthology regardless of the particular politics or agendas of any given anthologist.

In contrast to this ontology of exclusion, anthologies also function as significant sites of inclusion and recuperation. Multi-author anthologies often serve to rescue certain authors from oblivion, as well as to imprint a different trend, mode, or (sub)genre in the literary field. The same is true for “selected works” that recuperate previously ignored pieces; even the literary find of recondite or buried material is often the justification for a new series of edited works, reassessing an author’s stance in terms of literary innovation. An anthology's or an edition's most radical potential rests in the possibilities it allows for providing different coverage from the anthologies or editions that preceded it. Including previously ignored or forgotten writers in a new anthology or choosing different texts to represent an author in a new edition have the potential to create new canons in specialized fields; to alter how, when, and/or if a particular author is studied at all; and to change the canon—the limited number of texts by a limited number of writers that professors and professionals in the fields of literary and cultural studies deem a well-read or well-trained individual should know.

In Poe's case, at least from the twentieth century onward, these potentialities revolve more around the type of Poe that an anthologizer or editor hopes to emphasize rather than on his complete exclusion from or inclusion in the canon. However, decisions to include what have become viewed as Poe’s “minor” or “atypical” texts (his comic or satiric pieces, for example) do have canonical consequences in Poe studies, in how Poe is read or taken seriously (or not) in the academy, and in how Poe is understood by the reading public and media consumers at large (most often as a writer of horror and/or detective stories). Indeed, we could argue that the seriousness with which Poe’s mediators—from Rufus W. Griswold to Charles Baudelaire, and from Thomas O. Mabbott to Jorge Luis Borges—have treated Poe’s “darker” or “heavier” texts (whether that treatment demonstrates itself in the commentary surrounding these works and/or via the exclusion of works that do not match these texts in tone or content) clearly demonstrates the anthology’s power to shape an author’s reputation. Across almost every tradition that
Anthologizing Poe covers, the simultaneous inclusion and/or praise for Poe’s dark works and exclusion and/or belittling of his lighter corpus has remained intact for 170 years. In short, anthologies, editions, or collections that emphasize what we might call the “other” Poe still have a canon to challenge and a long-running tradition (both academic and popular) to confront when making a case for Poe’s lesser-known works.

Apart from the space that anthologies allow for recovery or recuperation, anthologies—for better and for worse—also recontextualize, creating new relations between the materials included. The inevitable blending of textual and editorial procedures that occurs whenever texts are put together (and more blatantly when the responsibility falls on an agent other than the author) challenges, as T. S. Eliot once feared, an idea of “significant unity” of the writer’s work (4). However, this mixture can and should be studied for the richness of its “contexture,” a felicitous term coined by Fraistat for “a larger whole fabricated from integral parts” (4). There are cases in which the very integrity of the parts is challenged, particularly in textbook anthologies that use excerpts. One extreme example exists in the popular French pocket readers, analyzed in this collection’s chapter 13, “Startling Restitutions, Significant Partialities,” which announced the author par lui même (by himself), while in fact presenting an intricate narrative that was culled by someone else from excerpts of that author’s work and a mix of critical and historical documents. The interweaving of text and paratext in editions under a particular light—an author, a theme, a period, a trend—is one of the elements that concur with the dichotomy between integration and disunity in what we broadly call an anthology.

The framing and order within an anthology—especially when, as previously suggested, its editor’s aims differ from the author’s—put forth a genealogy of reading along a new interpretative context. Anne Ferry, studying the forces that submit the individual poem to different readings when grouped in an anthology, stresses that “[t]he anthologist as author of the book supplants the author of the poem, in choosing how it should be presented, with interpretative consequences that . . . can give a different direction to the experience of reading a poem than if it were read elsewhere” (2). We suggest that Ferry’s argument applies to other short texts—tales, sketches, and essays—that are published alongside various other pieces (whether in the groupings made by the author in an original collection or by the anthologist in a later publication). In Poe’s case, nearly all of his works go through this type of contextual shift because he only published one novel and one lengthy prose poem during his lifetime. Our contemporary reading experience of Poe, unless we are hunting down first editions or reading them online, is always
affected by the surrounding texts (whether in Poe editions or in anthologies that place him alongside other authors) in a way outside of or foreign to what Poe could have planned, and Anthologizing Poe seeks both to map and to analyze these differences.

Perceiving and receiving this type of combined literary object entails three operations described in the title of a study by René Audet—“To Relate, to Read, to Separate.” Audet sees these cognitive processes as increasingly intertwined in postmodern and contemporary times, revealing the ascendency of “a poetics of diffraction,” with portions that are either aggregated by more or less loose common elements, or orchestrated as layers favoring “representational complexity” (44). Although Audet’s piece envisages “the [story] collection,” applicable to volumes organized by the author of the assembled texts, or at least under his or her supervision or blessing, the narrative of (dis)aggregation that he enunciates seems portable to our book’s broader scope of text types—anthologies, collections, editions—that take texts from their original homes and place them in new contexts.

The anthology compensates for the disunity it causes when pulling texts from their original contexts by offering a greater picture of the collective—a picture that favors distinctive American resonances since it propitiates the metaphor of “quilting” pieces together, particularly in the case of the short-story anthology, as compellingly argued by Kasia Boddy (147). In her “Variety in Unity, Unity in Variety: The Liminal Space of the American Short-Story Anthology,” Boddy claims for anthologies of multiple authors, much as Rólf Lundén or J. Gerald Kennedy have done for the short story cycle, an expression of the composite communities and the confederate organization of the United States. Boddy also highlights a unique characteristic of anthologies in the strictest sense, which is the paratextual framing we have already foregrounded—things like section titles, introductions, and headnotes—for which she borrows from Gérard Genette the term “thresholds of interpretation” (148). This is likely a prominent feature in the institutionalizing role performed by anthologies, including the making of the literary canon and the production of national and regional traditions.

The quilt that is the U.S. literary canon certainly contains both stitches and blocks from Poe’s literary fabric, and we would argue that significant patterns in this patchwork come from Poe’s cloth; but, how do these pieces change when viewed alongside the surrounding pieces? We could ask the same question of how Poe’s texts change in the smaller quilts that are each anthology or edition in which his works appear. How does the reading of a Poe text differ when that text is bookended by the works of other writers (Hawthorne and Phoebe Cary in the current Heath, John Greenleaf
Whittier and Abraham Lincoln in the current Norton, or the lighthearted poems or stories of long-forgotten authors in the early 1840s releases of *The Gift*), and how much of that difference depends on the specific writer him- or herself or on the particular work selected to represent that writer? What happens when Poe’s poems are kept apart from his fiction (as in all of his own book-length publications) versus when they reside in the same volume (in, for example, Penguin’s *The Portable Edgar Allan Poe*)? How do we see individual Poe works differently when they are placed with, or even cast as foundational to, specific genres? These questions matter, especially when reading an author who carefully crafted a unity of effect—in his second review of Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *Twice-Told Tales* and in “The Philosophy of Composition”—that demonstrates fastidious concern with word, sentence, and textual organization and that favors mathematical calculation and order over inspiration or communion with the muse. In short, *Anthologizing Poe* examines how the shifts in effect, due to the changes of the textual surroundings in various forms of the anthology, influence Poe’s individual works and his varying reputations.

**Anthologizing Poe**

We have divided *Anthologizing Poe* into four sections based on Poe’s differing relationships with anthologies and editions in both time and space. Our first section contains three chapters that reveal how Poe himself attempted to anthologize his works and/or his literary relationships. In the leadoff chapter, Jana Argersinger sees Poe’s whimsical fashion of selecting and framing his peers (in “The Literati of New York City” and “The Living Writers of America”) as “an attempt to establish the authorial self at the center of an anthological web of people and texts that stays unsteady— . . . because it is roiling with affective crossfire” (28), while in the second chapter, Harry Lee Poe argues that Poe conceived his works in an anthological way following a system of scansion similar to what he advocates in “The Rationale of Verse.” In the third chapter, Alexandra Urakova examines a book format cherished by both publishers and consumers during Poe’s life—the gift book—to shed light on how particular factors such as “dress (the cover, binding, title) and society (the company of its poems, stories, and plates)” (64) influence Poe’s story “Eleonora” in *The Gift* of 1842.

This first section emphasizes how the work of anthologies puts subjectivities and affinities into play, with combinatory strategies that favor exchange of feelings and stir audiences toward particular moods. The practice of assembling texts and/or literary relationships becomes, in this light, an agency
of the “cultural politics of emotion”—to use the words of Sara Ahmed’s impacting title, which has boosted the recent equation of rhetoric, performance, and affect theory.10 Poe was concerned about the company he kept, both in the literal and literary senses, and these initial chapters demonstrate a marked effort on his part to control how his works and his person were seen and interpreted both on an individual level and among groups of peers.

The second section of our volume addresses the creation of a Poe canon through the work of his major editors from the 1850s through the present (in both the United States and the United Kingdom) and Poe’s ever-present but shifting place in the canon of American literature. Poe is a particularly fitting subject for this section’s focus on both editions and anthologies for several reasons examined by the authors of these five chapters, not the least of which is Poe’s purported request that Rufus W. Griswold, a rival editor and a pioneer of national poetry anthologies in the United States, serve as his literary executor. The double facet of Poe’s editor/collector and critic/anthologizer of American literature was followed by other important literary figures, such as Edmund Clarence Stedman and Floyd Stovall in the United States and Jorge Luis Borges in Argentina, which helps us make the case for “anthologizing” in a broad sense that comprises not only compilations of multiple authors, but also “single author collections” (Mujica 210) and even complete editions. How the latter were constituted in the formative years of Poe scholarship is addressed by Jeffrey Savoie’s meticulous account of the preparation of notable early editions by Griswold, J. H. Ingram, E. C. Stedman and G. E. Woodberry, and J. A. Harrison. The twentieth century, according to Travis Montgomery’s chapter, favors more specialized endeavors, as well as attention to more private documents and supplementary sources—Killis Campbell and Floyd Stovall for the poetry, John Ward Ostrom for the correspondence, Thomas Ollive Mabbott for variants of poems and tales, Burton R. Pollin for the longer narratives—along with the popular consecration of the Library of America, divided by G. R. Thompson and Patrick F. Quinn.

Poe’s reputation in the United States also fluctuated according to international praise in languages other than English (which we will return to in section four) and the different estimations of various members of the literati in the United Kingdom, who also went to great lengths to establish Poe’s body of work and construct his multifaceted image in anthologies and collections. Starting in 1874–1875 with John H. Ingram’s attempt to rescue Poe’s status from what he deemed to be the editorial bias of Griswold, Bonnie McMullen takes us through collected and selected Poe editions in the United Kingdom, considering also the impact of anthologies in the poetics shared by communities of affinities until the Second World War. In the subsequent chapter,
J. Gerald Kennedy provides a valuable insider’s look into one of Penguin’s most circulated formats of representative dissemination of a particular author, the “portable.” Kennedy offers a remarkable “think aloud” rationale for his mapping of Poe, very much aware that “[e]very single-author anthology produces a certain version of the writer by selection and exclusion, based on available texts, calculations of essential material, and copyright constraints” (135).

Our book moves from single-author to multi-author anthologies, and its second section ends with the most influential type, encompassing literary entertainment, information, and education: the “textbook anthology.” Referencing Joseph Csicsila’s previous work in survey anthologies of American literature, Scott Peeples corroborates the impression that Poe’s fiction in the later part of the twentieth century became more valued than his poetry, but he also demonstrates a remarkable consistency between the choices over the last ninety years, indicating an overlap between the academic and the popular Poe.

The third section of Anthologizing Poe analyzes Poe’s presence in (and, sometimes, his founding influence on) various types of genre anthologies. Stephen Rachman focuses on Poe’s works that have been included or referenced in publications that endorsed a nascent “scientific” approach to storywriting in the late nineteenth century, and particularly the dissemination of speculative and science fiction in the twentieth century, very much connected with the “hothouse culture” of pulps in the United States (173). Rachman also enunciates the “anthology-function” that mostly informs the rationale of our entire third section: to “represent crucial generic elements or innovations” (167). John Gruesser’s chapter demonstrates how Poe’s consensual status as the father of detective fiction, in its modern guise, is likewise greatly indebted to the critics and editors who have ranked him as such in anthologies and collections. Gruesser argues that the eventual “recognition of Poe as a major writer with a profound and sustained influence abroad and at home coincided with and contributed to the coalescing of detection into a discrete literary genre” (194). This particular genre is also significant in our book’s fourth section because Poe’s detective tales have formed a sturdy foundation upon which his global reputation has been built since Charles Baudelaire’s French translations of Poe in the 1850s.

Michelle Hansen’s chapter continues our third section by offering an original interpretation of Poe’s reputation as a “horror” author through her analysis of a significant multimedia lens: the thirteen audiobooks that constitute Doug Bradley’s Spinechillers audio anthology. Produced between 2010 and 2016, this collection is emblematic of the audiobook revolution, and Hansen’s interpretive work proves that the anthological force in literature
is likewise capable of revolutionizing itself by adopting new formats and an inter-semiotic approach to literary dissemination. The fact that these horror audiobooks pervasively showcased not only Poe’s tales but his poems demonstrates that “genre,” conceived as a literary mode (science fiction, satire, horror, the fantastic), crisscrosses the traditional literary genres, basically defined in terms of shape and utterance (lyric, drama, narrative). However, the evaluation of Poe’s poetry, which has been much disputed and negotiated transnationally, deserves and receives an exclusive chapter in our volume. Philip Phillips considers how multi-author anthologies have appraised Poe in “the canonical pantheon of American poetry” (233), revealing “not only the changing literary tastes of different generations of editors and readers, but also the ways in which the inclusion or exclusion of his poetry affected his status as a poet” (222).

With the fourth section of Anthologizing Poe, we turn outward to translated literary anthologies and editions and to the contextualization of their significance in negotiating national and universal claims of literary merit and cultural attribution/appropriation. Translators and anthologizers share much in common—they both make decisions about which authors deserve further representation; they include certain materials and exclude others; they offer philological criticism; and they make connections between writers, between literary movements, between literary traditions (both national and regional), and between individual texts. As we have already cited in our opening paragraphs, both anthologizers and translators “are image makers” (Lefevere 7).

Many translators simultaneously play the double role of anthologizing/editing and translating, and one particular translator-anthologizer of Poe looms large in Poe’s global reputation and in this fourth section. Charles Baudelaire, arguably still Poe’s most influential collector-critic and translator, can also be pointed to as one who recognized, at a very early date, Poe’s penchant for the ratiocinative and the fantastic. This estimation not only affected Poe’s French reception, but it also influenced how Poe was seen in several other national and regional literary traditions, including the Spanish and Argentine traditions covered in the fourth section of our volume.

Margarida Vale de Gato opens this last section with a chapter that not only analyzes how Baudelaire inaugurated a model of restoring the “real” Poe, seen from the point of view of a learned and distanced congenial mind, but also explores how the American author was parcelled in different “selves” according to different anthology formats in the French literary field. These range from multi-author volumes dedicated to the “fantastic” to single-author poetry selections and the aforementioned pocket editions that blend criticism and supporting extracts of works and documents as well as
illustrations. In a chapter that converses both with Vale de Gato’s piece and with McMullen’s entry in our second section, Christopher Rollason offers further analysis on what he calls the “quality popular” editions (277) of Poe in the United Kingdom during the twentieth century, comparing them with their French counterparts. This juxtaposition sheds light upon the anthological practices of two major publishers that have shaped the European market of literature, Penguin and Gallimard.

Fernando González-Moreno and Margarita Rigal-Aragón’s chapter is unique in our volume, in two senses. First, they offer an “interpretative tool of narration” of the images that have accompanied Spanish Poe anthologies since 1887, “demonstrat[ing] how Spanish artists render their visual understanding of Poe’s works” (293), and thus offering a complementary account of how anthologies work with the languages of different media. Second, in a national literary tradition whose long-term embrace of Poe has been heavily determined by the work of Baudelaire, González-Moreno and Rigal-Aragón’s chapter explores a lineage of image-making in Spain that might be regarded as straying autonomously from the French reception. Emron Esplin’s chapter also examines a Spanish-speaking literary tradition in which Poe’s reputation has been mediated through Baudelaire. Esplin shows how both lesser-known (Carlos Olivera and Armando Bazán) and internationally renowned (Jorge Luis Borges and Julio Cortázar) anthologizers, editors, and translators of Poe’s fiction in Argentina have demonstrated a century-long proclivity for Poe’s tales of terror, ratiocination, and the supernatural. Finally, our volume concludes with a non-Western exploration of the anthologizing process as the prominent Japanese Poe scholar, Takayuki Tatsumi, examines various Poe editions and anthologies in twentieth- and twenty-first-century Japan. Tatsumi, himself a Poe translator and a Poe anthologizer, frames his narrative autobiographically and takes his reader on a dual journey—the journey of Poe’s literature in Japan and the journey of a Poe anthologizer from his childhood readings of Poe, to his graduate studies about Poe, and to his eventual participation in both the academic and publishing industries as a curator or creator of Poe for a Japanese reading audience.

Edited volumes, just like the broader umbrella of anthologies under which they rest, can never be all-encompassing, even of their specific subject matter. The editors—as anthologizers themselves—include and exclude material, invite some scholars and not others, have their invitations both accepted and rejected, and help their participants hone their topics and their coverage. In short, an edited volume is also a mini-canon for its subject, and it inherently limits the very conversations it hopes to nurture. This bind can
be particularly problematic in a study on anthologies. In the introduction to *Translation in Anthologies and Collections*, Seruya and her colleagues suggest that a “study of anthologies is strongly advised—if it is not the best possible means—to understand the interplay between the dynamics and relationality principles as they meet in given corpora” (12).

Recognizing our own limits, we would have preferred to cover many more traditions than circumstances have allowed, to offer an even broader picture of the “transnational” perspective offered in our title. We also wish that we could have forayed into other avenues of research in anthologies. For instance, we originally hoped to examine how Poe shifts and changes in crossover literature—especially juvenile adaptations—a feature addressed only in Takayuki Tatsumi’s contribution; we had also planned to include a study of celebration anthologies or collections of homage, especially those where a host of invited writers is called to reimagine the predecessor’s work. It was our aim with *Anthologizing Poe*, after having co-edited *Translated Poe*, to both broaden the research in matters of perception and reception related to Poe and to continue to work in liminal spaces where single-author studies can fertilize interdisciplinary research. We are aware, and gladly so, that much terrain remains left to mine, and we hope that other scholars will carry this work to adjacent grounds.

Like any other anthology, ours, despite its structure, invites any and all disaggregated readings, as well as the combination and circulation of topics and subtopics between individual chapters. For instance, there are editors—such as Griswold, Stedman, and Baudelaire—who appear at length in more than one chapter, and the advances of Poe in science fiction and in the detective genre emerge in contributions outside of the two chapters especially devoted to these subjects. The chapters on audiobooks and illustrations create a space in which to debate the reach of anthologies beyond written language, and the juxtaposition of chapters focusing on American and British traditions with the non-Anglophone chapters leaves room for conversations about the similar or disparate structuring or grouping of Poe’s works in these traditions. We invite our readers to leaf through the volume and build their own narrative of reading, to create their own anthology from ours. We hope that this book will trigger discussions on the concept of the anthology (single-author edition or collection, miscellany, multi-author anthology, genre collection, translated edition, or translated anthology), including further suggestions on how to integrate its study within other fields of research. Whether focusing on an author or a group of texts, the crossroads of investigation in anthology studies are multiple: the canon, genre theory, transnationalism, reception and translation studies, affect theory, or other
combinations of literary and cultural studies. We also hope, in the end, to inspire further study of Poe’s texts and their contexts—the ways he has been packaged, framed, constructed, and conveyed in both literary and academic markets across the world.

Notes

1. J. Gerald Kennedy and Scott Peeples open their introduction to The Oxford Handbook of Edgar Allan Poe with a similar claim about Poe’s visibility, although they limit their scope of comparison to Poe’s nineteenth-century peers (1). For us, this judgment about the depth and breadth of Poe’s global impact is less an argument and more a fact; we make a similar statement in our introduction to Translated Poe (xi), and Emron Esplin substantiates the claim in the opening paragraphs of “Poe and His Global Advocates” (597–98) in Kennedy and Peeple’s aforementioned handbook. Poe’s influence on specific literary traditions (for example, the French or the Spanish traditions) has been examined seriously for several decades, but one of the first books to show Poe as a truly global author was Lois Davis Vines’s 1999 edited volume, Poe Abroad: Influence, Reputation, Affinities. That collection has been a key text for us while working on both Translated Poe and Anthologizing Poe, and it has inspired scores of other scholars to write on Poe’s connections with various writers and traditions across the globe.

2. Di Leo’s 2004 edited volume, and the 2000 double issue of symplokē out of which the edited volume emerged, serve as early foundational texts in the field of anthology studies.

3. With the exceptions of Fraistat and Golding, each of these scholar’s works on anthologies and/or editions has been published from 2000 onward.

4. It was the turn of attention to the fluctuations of Poe’s ranking and appearance in early American poetry anthologies as studied in Golding’s 1984 article, “A History of American Poetry Anthologies,” that lingered in Margarida Vale de Gato’s mind when she decided to contribute to the series The Anthology in Portugal. Her preliminary study on Poe’s editorial designs (and desires), followed by the examination of the successive arrangements in Portuguese anthologies over a century, led to the unveiling of the agendas and positions in the literary market of important mediators such as the Portuguese poets Fernando Pessoa and Jorge de Sena. This article also helped to shape, for our editorial team, the idea of where to go next with the study of Poe and the concept of the anthology.

5. The question of number is often blurred when discussing a “collection” across linguistic boundaries. In English, the term usually refers to a single volume while in the romance languages a colección (Spanish), coleção (Portuguese), collezione (Italian), colectie (Romanian), or collection (French) most often designates an editorial line or series.
6. The interpretative framework, critical viewpoint, and agendas of anthologies can be motivated by various causes and purposes, basically enumerated by Patricia Odber de Baubeta in the multivolume project, *The Anthology in Portugal*: “[A]n anthology’s selection could be made for any number of reasons: in order to convey a particular message (moral, religious, sentimental, ideological), to illustrate a theme (see, for example, all the Christmas anthologies that have been published in Portugal over the years), or to exemplify a particular mode of expression, a literary school or artistic trend, to allow the anthologist to share his or her favourite poems or stories with the reading public, to present readers with what are purportedly the best or most beautiful lyrics, the most moving or even the most terrifying short stories, or allow a publishing house to foreground its authors” (34; emphasis added).

7. By the same token, Theo Hermans uses the phrase “prejudice of perception” to refer to the translator’s interference with the original, and it could likewise be said of editors that they “construct or produce their originals,” and sometimes even “invent” them (95).

8. In the entry devoted to “Anthologies of Translation” in the first edition of *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Armin Paul Frank makes a similar point: “The arrangement, the configuration, creates a meaning and value greater than the sum of meanings and values of the individual items taken in isolation, and translation anthologies are important manifestations of this phenomenon” (13).

9. In this respect, also, anthologies arguably hold a more central place in the United States than in any other culture. Since the early nineteenth century, their double function of “historicizing” and inspiring (Golding, *From Outlaw to Classic* 6) a characteristically American repository has singularly placed them as a sort of frontier or crossroads, embodying representativeness and mobility, individual ingenuity, and democratic inclusion (Lockard and Sandell 229).

10. We are indebted to Aleix Tura Vecino, who has shared with us his insights and bibliography from his PhD research on the short-story anthology, and whose paper—“Affect and the Women-Only Short Story Anthology,” presented in Lisbon at the 2018 Conference of the Society for the Short Story in English—inspired us to further explore the link between the anthology and affect theory.
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