



“. . . [a compilation], being the result of the judgment of one man, cannot be expected to satisfy the judgment of every other man; but [this] Compiler has always worked on this principle: to insert not only those references which he himself considered to be of consequence, but also to insert those which he thought it possible for anyone else to consider of consequence.”

— John Faulkner Potts

*Swedenborg Concordance*

(The Swedenborg Society, London, 1888), Volume 1, p. ix

**A** CANON affords that which is essential guidance, counsel, or support; one definitive or recognized for its authority. It's a shame that ecclesiastical communities have so elevated the word “canon” that it's really difficult now to appreciate its variant meanings. In this personal excursion in time and places I promote canon's other-worldly connotations, even if they are pedestrian compared to canons of scripture and clerics.

THE GRAND CANON contains things that a particular user can view as consequential for, or of interest to, work at hand. Within the framework of the subject-specific parts of this bibliography there are occasional items cited that *are* canonical, in that they are recognized contributions to historiographical thought or scientific impact, or are respected for their cultural or spiritual human guidance. THE GRAND CANON is a canon by its exhaustive inclusiveness; for the geographical region that it embraces there is nothing comparable. Reflecting upon the quotation above, I have no particular point of view to advance, beyond that it is paramountly important for one to be *apprised* of available resources. It is not beneficial for I to selectively withhold some items from those who, unbeknownst to me, *could* make use of them. (As a declaration of potential conflict of interest, Rev. John Faulkner Potts was the father-in-law of one of my great-uncles.)

One may wonder where all this comes from. As long as people are born, there is the answer! We each of us is an individual. We have ideas and perspectives; we have livelihoods and avocations. We learn, we adapt, we communicate, and every one of us will have something to say about it; something different in view, in thought, and in offering, whether as the result of employment or educational pursuit, or as a matter of personal reflection and commentary. The succession continues, generation after generation. THE GRAND CANON testifies to this; it assembles in one place as much as could be found (so far) on the subjects it embraces, even though it is limited to one geographical area. These things were created by thousands of people.

If one waits for a bibliography containing only “essential” items to be offered, one awaits a selective bibliography, which will have been the product of someone else’s biased evaluation of essentiality among the chosen items. A few such products exist for the regions studied here, but they are outdated now, having been published in the last century. Assuredly, in the meantime many essential works have been produced. However, selective bibliographies do not anticipate many users’ specialized interests and needs, so the user remains oblivious to many things that may be of interest. It is the purpose of THE GRAND CANON to find as much as possible, not to dismiss subjectively inconsequential things. I object to treating as “superfluous” the hundreds, if not thousands, of less “essential” items recorded among these citations; not everyone can agree on the distinction between essentiality or superfluousness. If the resulting comprehensiveness of this bibliography repels some users by the sheer number of things captured, then I have to assume those users do await a product that is customized to their particular needs. But must the user have to rely on a selection that is not their own? If instead a user carves a customized, selective bibliography from *this* one, needs will be met by THE GRAND CANON’s exhaustive coverage. I recognize that such work takes time. So has this one.

This is really “A Bibliography of the Lower Colorado River Region”. It embraces everything of the river country between the Utah–Arizona boundary and the sea; the Grand Canyon is a part of it. But if I had titled it as a Lower Colorado River bibliography, it would not have much attraction on a shelf, or in writers’ citations—witness Richard Yates and Mary Marshall’s *The Lower Colorado River: A Bibliography* (Arizona Western College Press, 1974), comprehensively useful, yet geographically less attractive. But *The Grand Canyon* is known around the world, a profoundly effective inspiration. People write profusely about their travels to see it; some create their impressions in works of art, visually, musically, and in performances of bodies in motion. They present it in works of fact and fiction. They visit from the six principally inhabited continents. Why, they even produce these things if they have *not* been to the

canyon! Moreover, people have named or compared hundreds of other places to it, around the world and on other bodies in space; and they have used the canyon as a unit of measure and as a universally recognizable concept in crafting analogies and metaphors. Few places in the world have a comparably strong and insistent hold on the human imagination and infatuation. So this has to stand out as “A Worldwide Bibliography of the Grand Canyon and the Lower Colorado River Regions in the United States and Mexico”, because after all, *The Grand Canyon* catches the user’s attention!

Users who are interested *only* in the Grand Canyon will be frustrated by the inclusion of thousands of items that are about the lower Colorado River region downstream from the canyon, the Salton Sea and Imperial and Mexicali Valleys, and the upper Gulf of California. On the other hand, those who are focused on the Colorado River delta region may be delighted to discover this bibliography, but they are bound to be disappointed by the inclusion of thousands of items about the Grand Canyon and its environs. I admit that even though these areas are historically, culturally, geologically, and geographically entwined, all users of the bibliography are not expected to be so engaged. It is the rare bibliography that is so concise that it will satisfy all of its users. This one, though, is a *historical* bibliography because it will provide information to a great *variety* of users (see the bibliography’s [separate table of contents](#)). It strives to be the record of (wishfully) every publication that is about or includes notice of all or parts of this geographical region and the array of human activities there. Those among the “disappointed” of the topical users can ignore the parts that do not relate to their interests. But for those interested in it all, here it all is.

Beyond the bibliography-proper, essays accompanying THE GRAND CANON present information about conventional bibliographies and their good uses even in today’s world of digital resources, in addition to documenting how of this one was conceived and how it evolved. And so by this, I think all bibliographies should be read. They are useful tools, as expected; good for look-ups and for gathering statistics; and they are historical storehouses of resources that follow the evolution and progress of the subjects they embrace. Every person who is new to the things about, and to studies of, the Grand Canyon–Lower Colorado River country would do well to start to peruse the bibliography as an introduction to the *kinds* of things that are already available, and to take into consideration the notes and comments that appear with many citations. Of course this means “reading”—not the jump-in and -out activity of look-ups, but reading for comprehension.

*But really, **to read?*** Read on!

A BIBLIOGRAPHY IS AN ADVENTURE. It consolidates works that relate to a single subject or purpose. It shouldn't be likened to the mixed-purpose list that appears at the end of many publications—unfortunately also called a bibliography—that really is a list of references consulted by the author; some of them may have no direct bearing on the theme of the author's publication.

My basic premise is that a bibliography can be *reading material*. It can be read for its historical perspective, to gain a broad awareness of what has been done, and the contexts of when, where, and by whom those productions have been created, and the sorts of things they are. If a bibliography also contains additional notes or commentary—separately or appended to individual citations—all the better. And indeed, how *does* one “read” a bibliography? Not so much as one would read a story, following the thoughts of paragraph after paragraph. Instead, it is read as paragraphs (citations) by themselves, each to be dismissed or acknowledged as useful or interesting, yet as with conventional reading with some anticipation for what may come. All the while, one does begin to grasp the idea that there is a lot of information that is beyond the simple list of authors, dates, and publishers.

As generally expected, a bibliography is consulted to find specific things. Publications can be discovered, too; things that may never have been found except by reading a bibliography. These discoveries can offer unexpected perspectives of, and contribute new information for, one's work; and further, other things might lead to new ideas for different work. My perspective on this may seem to be pedestrian, yet I have been offered these very opportunities in my own work over decades as a professional in museum collections, libraries, and archives. I have also witnessed the same avenues of discovery while working side by side with researchers, especially younger ones who are embarking on careers; and I have learned from their discoveries as well.

As a matter of necessity, THE GRAND CANON is a set of hybrid publications, three volumes in searchable PDF. Even the form of this Preamble anticipates the two kinds of readers this series will reach: those who are more comfortable with books (thus this is the “Preamble”) and those who are most familiar now with digital files (thus this is a “Read Me” file). And to all, “read me” is also an appeal.

Effectively, THE GRAND CANON is now far too large to economically produce in a hardcopy format, at least without sacrificing some digitally embedded features that have been inserted to make it more easily used. Still, it is designed to appear more or less like a conventional book, for the very reason that it is meant to be read in this format. In this way it exposes all of its contiguous information in a familiar layout, not

distracted by frames or sidetracked by other devices through which many strictly digital productions are engaged. This is presented in a way that, in some places, it is best viewed as odd- and even-numbered pages, side-by-side like a conventional book. Yet, I concede that many digital users will only view a page at a time, whether by choice or a technological limitation, so some pages display “continued” notes or specific language that refers to a previous or following page. And numerous hyperlinks redirect the reader to other parts of the volume and to external sources. Of course, these directional devices would not necessarily appear in a “real” book (except that, in much older books, it once was customary to include a catchword as a prompt at the bottom of the page being read, which presented the first word or syllable of the following page).

Were this an inkprint product, its some 13,700 pages—plus another 1,200 in Volume 2, the *Cartobibliography*—would have to be spread across multiple volumes, which might seem to be a terrible waste of paper and materials. These are moot points in the digital environment. So THE GRAND CANON employs a font size and various typographical elements that are meant to allow easier reading and browsing. It is designed to be more relaxing than the tedious, often myopic formats of most bibliographies that seem to warn that they are not to be “read”, just used for brief amounts of time. And, not being a huge inkprint product allows it to be distributed without cost. Even though a few people might even be willing to pay for a comfortable, shelf-resident, encyclopedic offering (I admit, I would like to have a copy, too), the cost of such a thing might require a Grand Canyon-deep wallet.

While even a multivolume bibliography might be welcomed by users who are more comfortable with hardcopy, THE GRAND CANON is more exceptionally useful as a single document, book-like in appearance, that encourages the use of its digital enhancements. Users have the ability to search within it, and the many embedded hyperlinks enable precise, instantaneous migration to different places within the document and to external sources. This would not be possible in an inkprint product. However, I do recognize that it is a step backward from being an online queryable database (a medium, though, which disadvantageously does not allow users to appreciate the whole). Regardless, the book medium still commands in this era of digital awareness and resources; and to top it off, bibliographies are viable and valuable even amidst the electronic clamor around us—see herein my essay, [“A necessary nuisance”—The Traditional Bibliography in the Digital Age](#).

The entire Grand Canyon–Lower Colorado River bibliography project has been conducted for nearly a half century, on the cusp of analog and digital ways of doing



bibliographical research. During this time the digital world inexorably closed in on me. I transitioned from index cards and typescripts to productions that were made as so-called “camera-ready copy” (for offset printing), and then to wholly digital products. I learned software of all sorts—much of which became obsolete in short order—and with them I first crafted publications that went away to be born in paper format. In due course, publications were produced, from concept to release, entirely in digital formats. “Born digital” documents became a normal thing, though not so normal that they dis- or re-placed the world of print, as their loudest adherents promised would happen. Many publications are concurrently available in hardcopy and in digital format (often PDF, such as this one, from which, pointedly, print copies can be produced). True, the means by which publications are produced and disseminated has changed—epicly—over the centuries, particularly in the past few decades; and they will change more in coming decades and centuries. Still, they all have to be *read*.

BUT DIGITAL IS TENUOUS. Whereas the world of ink survives from centuries past, the uncertainty of continued access to digital products centuries hence is unknowable. Today’s web-based resources could comprise a digital Alexandria, a shuddering prospect. So *THE GRAND CANON*, because of its sheer size that demands a digital presence, has a shaky foothold on longevity. I hope that it can eventually survive somewhere, if not in print then in a medium for permanent legacies not now imagined, some insurance against a digital shipwreck. Is it “worthy” enough for that? It’s not great literature, nor is it a significant work of historiography. But it *is* a consolidated, historical record of all works—as many as which could be found—for a pretty remarkable and celebrated part of the world. I am struck by the persistence of writers and artists who use the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River as mighty examples of inspiration even when they do not write about the places themselves, or for that matter even if they have never been there themselves. I think this broadly happens more often for the Grand Canyon than for other inspirational or wondrous places; the Himalayas or the South Pole for example. And that most of this bibliography logs inkprint resources, spanning nearly five centuries, which all are accessible somewhere, is testimony enough that ink commands even in the digital world.

Ink is history, an undercurrent of the human experience. In America, it ranges from the silver inkwell in the Signers’ room of America’s “Independence Hall” (in colonial times known as the Pennsylvania State House) to the modern megaprinter of Washington, the Government Printing Office. Our legacy is ink. The cornerstones of this nation are colonial and antebellum newspapers that incongruously advertised,

side by side, choice imported goods, taverns, and enslaved humans, and reported the latest news (as up to date as the speeds of wagons and ships allowed). There were alongside them courageous printers who squeezed off pamphlets of political or social agitation and abolition. Yet this is but one nation.

Humankind's intellectual and historical inheritance, through books and records from even long before the time of the American nation, is also in ink and paint, as is the inheritance of most every nation except the most ancient. This was made most immediately possible by Johannes Gutenberg's introduction to Europe of movable type in the 1450s, which reliably assured *multiple, easily produced, identical copies* of text. (Unknown to Europe, earthenware movable type had already been used in China in the 11th century, and metal and wooden movable types in Korea and China, respectively, in the 13th century.) And by the middle of the 19th century, truly prodigious numbers of identical texts were made possible by the massive steam presses that began to roll out miles of newsprint and sheets of book pages.

Before Gutenberg and his 15th century adherents in Europe, things were written and copied by hand (though in limited instances some were laboriously carved in wood blocks, then printed in limited numbers with ink). The reliability of exact copies sometimes faltered, as scribes fatigued or unadvisedly practiced editing. Still, for centuries it has been the flow of ink that has best preserved the records and ideas of individuals and states alike. Only today's world of the web and digital resources has freed us from the monopoly of ink—though we do, at will, summon these documents from their electric sarcophagi with ink and paper. Still, everything is tenuous. Paper and ink burn; their products can be destroyed in numerous other ways. Digital products succumb to the vanishing of the hardware and software with which they were used. Online presences can perish at the press of a button or rendered invisible by the absence of electricity. All of the above can vanish by the malign intents of individuals, too, whether by fiat or criminality. And, even just a few decades now into the digital era we rarely consider what likely has *already* been lost from its midst. Frighteningly, we have not yet experienced in the digital world the kinds of onslaughts such as those in history that have destroyed entire libraries; one can only imagine the calamity that can arise.

A bibliography is predominantly a record *of* ink. In this one, THE GRAND CANON, only about 1.7 percent of the citations list products that are not in ink—films, audio materials, or selected items that are digitally available on disk. Even so, many of those products came in containers printed with ink. Looking back over the centuries of citations recorded here accentuates the fact that, despite the marvelous ways by

which we interact with digital productions today (even digital representatives of inkprint originals) our experiences are *still* effectively shaped by ink. It is ink's legacy that pours into a bibliography. Therein is recorded things that are available, for better or worse, in multiple, identical copies. Precise and complete citations, better with informative notations, offer up the information that makes it possible to find these items. Poignantly, THE GRAND CANON, for economic reasons, is produced digitally because of its tremendous size; and further, it can be digitally searched and copied. It is nevertheless meant to serve like a book—and, so designed, we may be heartened that digital searching within it is very conveniently un-booklike. It is also for browsing and reading, really, as you will see. It can be quickly printed from, too, preserving the same appearance with uniquely citeable (and relocatable) pages.

THE GRAND CANON DOCUMENTS the world's heritage as enfolded in the Grand Canyon and along the Colorado River, as conveyed through publication. It verifies, as should any bibliography, the works of others and communicates enough information about those works so that they can be obtained or informatively cited. While this work is bound by physical geography, these bounds contain a very special historical record of human activities and behaviors; Indigenous, colonial, immigrational, and transient alike. THE GRAND CANON will attract two principal groups of users: *a*) professionals, administrative persons, and individuals who gather information from this work as a part of their studies or professional activities; and *b*) browsers, who by entrance at any point of this work may be enticed to wander farther, both herein and into wide-ranging sources that offer more uses. They will have many possible objectives in their searches; for example: 1) the need to find specific bibliographical citations; 2) to obtain details about specific items (if any are provided), such as variants, editions, or particular content notes; 3) information about author- or publisher-specific items; 4) to discern trends from chronological perspectives; 5) to identify items potentially pertinent to a project or program of study; 6) to list accounts of resource use within a particular region or political entity; 7) to sort out descriptions of items written in various languages.

One may argue that the bulk of the publications cited herein are unread, of very limited usefulness or attention even in their immediate lifetimes. True; but one has only to walk through the aisles of a large library to raise the same argument.<sup>1</sup> Yet, all

---

<sup>1</sup> I must take note of a telling example. Some thirty years ago, as an editor I prepared for publication another author's translation of several works by the brilliant (some say incorrigible) early 19th-century naturalist Constantine Samuel Rafinesque, whose body of taxonomic work laid ground for problems throughout the 19th and 20th centuries in the scientific naming of living organisms and



these things exist. I will not be the one, at least here in THE GRAND CANON, who establishes that “this” item is potentially more useful than “that” item; re-read the quotation at the head of this Preamble. Per chance in 2122 there will be a young scholar working on a thesis, studying “brief”, “casual”, or “restricted” references to prominent geographical locales, as an exploration of “marginal awarenesses” in geography, as perceived by individuals and as it transitioned over the centuries; or similarly, an exploration of writers’ reliance upon superficial references in order to pad out work that is implied to be very involved. Who am I to say that one or another, or many, of the citations herein will not be of interest in such pursuits? And yet, this is just one of myriad possible examples.

Now, my inclusion in this bibliography of items in 113 languages other than English may be bewildering; 9.0 percent of the citations are not in English. One might say, “Few can read Georgian. Why bother to cite so few items in a vast bibliography?”; or on the other hand, “Surely there are more!” One may consider works in *any* language that is incomprehensible to an individual are not practically useful. Yet, these works exist; someone produced them, so here they must be documented. The citations are useful *even if* one cannot read the items. With the increasing availability of automated translation services, which admittedly are not perfect, at minimum the gist of things can be obtained. Many of the translations are nonetheless very good; and it stands to reason that the automated services will improve with time. The plethora of “foreign”-language citations *can* serve users who do not need to read them; for example, for the gathering of statistics about what has been published, where, when, and by whom. Further, to omit a citation because it may be “unreadable” does not serve those users who *can* read those languages—and there *are* many. In the end, all of these citations offer up an idea of the great breadth of attention paid to the Colorado

---

fossils alike. (Among other peculiarities, Rafinesque believed his taxonomic names would, rightfully and logically to him, have priority over those already published. He also peculiarly expounded on a wide variety of natural phenomena.) Prof. A. J. Cain, during one of mostly annual visits from England to Philadelphia’s Academy of Natural Sciences, where I worked, translated into English for the first time several of Rafinesque’s works on biological classification (Cain, “Constantine Samuel Rafinesque Schmaltz on Classification: A Translation of Early Works by Rafinesque with Introduction and Notes”, *Tryonia*, no. 20, 1990). When we went to the Academy’s library to retrieve one book, we discovered that it displayed the personal ownership stamp of one of the paramount naturalists of the early 19th century, Georges Cuvier. Rafinesque generally resorted to self-publication, and he duly sent out copies of his books to recipients he believed would welcome—and embrace—them; this volume included. We discovered that the book, though it had been in Cuvier’s library in France, still had its folded signatures of pages uncut—for the better part of two centuries the book had never been opened for study! And yet, it was there, in another library, waiting to be used. Cuvier may not have been interested, but Cain was.

River and its Grand Canyon, whether in depth or simply as a parenthetical remark pertinent in one context or another.

The very purpose of THE GRAND CANON is to provide as completely as possible an accounting of publications that were offered to readers or viewers. I ignore “demand” in favor of “offering”. Demand for a publication, a measure of popularity or perceived usefulness by the inquiring (and acquiring) public, has no role here; but that a publication was offered or distributed in the first place is the act that requires it to be listed in this bibliography. And scarcity is a moot point. Once a publication is made available, it is up to users to determine whether it has any value toward work at hand, and how it can be found if a copy is needed. THE GRAND CANON does not document a history of the creation or production of these publications, but of their origins and the channels of delivery to audiences.

Some bibliographies serve relatively brief useful lives—even this one. Despite the Grand Canyon–Lower Colorado River bibliography project being cumulative, its earlier incarnations were left behind as the project’s context and methodologies expanded and matured by leaps and bounds. (See the [Appendix to Part 1](#) of the bibliography herein; and see the example of [“Citation style and improvement of citation content in this bibliography from 1981 to 2021”](#) in the “Coverage and Format” section of the Introduction herein.) Starting with the very conventional, printed list of 1981 (that had been transcribed from handwritten index cards), the bibliography was reformatted in 1990 both conceptually and physically. It then included introductory essays to numerous newly arranged subject areas; it was produced concurrently in loose-leaf inkprint, on microfiche, and on digital disk (ASCII-formatted, or “text only”). A large “Supplement” followed in 1993, which managed to fill the loose-leaf binder far sooner than either the publisher or I thought it would. In 2000, a web-based database was inaugurated by the Grand Canyon Association, which I frequently updated into 2015, when technological issues in the customized software finally overwhelmed the process; it was taken offline in 2021. By then, THE GRAND CANON had been born, in 2012. I wish I could claim prescience of the effective end of the online database, but I originally meant for THE GRAND CANON to restore the bibliography as a monograph, where the whole bibliography could be seen again, one rather more useful as a searchable PDF than plain inkprint despite being less powerful than a database. There should be more to it, and there may yet be, but ideally it awaits new essays to introduce its various thematic parts and to place them in historiographical context. Still, this revised work also includes things that were not possible to include in the online database; perhaps the most startling is the typographical use of 31 non-Roman

orthographies. And with THE GRAND CANON the whole has returned, where with the database it was not possible to see or browse the whole.

This bibliography project, now in its fifth decade, is a more permanent—historical—record. It grew and moved forward as its editions were produced; it left nothing behind, except some errors. Looking to the future, when the editions cease, that permanent chronicle will be frozen within its bounding years of record, still useful for that timeframe. As I have noted in the front matter to previous editions of THE GRAND CANON, this bibliography’s meager beginning was a compilation of publications on Grand Canyon geology, soon hugely expanded to include other subject areas. From its inception in 1974, the object of this ever-expanding worldwide bibliography has been to record it all. I thought it could be done. In 2021, I’m still trying to do it.

THE GRAND CANON can be rough or cumbersome to some users *because* of its overarching usefulness: there is so much in it that is beyond their interests. Yet, all of these things exist thanks to all the people who created them. Even those items that were produced by and credited to organizations and government agencies were created by people. What may be disinteresting to one person can be useful to another. The bibliography’s principal duty is to record, and to serve the person who finds information in it. Others will see the entirety as useful because of the statistical record it embodies, or for the historical assessments that can be crafted with it.

Then there is the matter of concentration. The core elements of this bibliography are the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River. One will see, however, that many citations include mention of these areas only in small measure, as compared to the full publication. Does that make this bibliography too far-reaching? Should I have excluded a book or a magazine article on the national parks because it includes far more than the Grand Canyon? Of course not. Then I must as well take note of a book or article whose author briefly takes note of a visit to the canyon. (I omit spurious things that mention a stop at the canyon without further remark; for example, a simple statement that “we went to see the Grand Canyon”, and nothing else, does not warrant inclusion herein.) But even a brief note, or the inclusion of a photograph, reveals the author’s perception of the canyon in comparison with other places about which are written; that the writer effused even briefly, or brushed past the canyon quickly, tells us something. Then, there are the items that are published far afield from the canyon and its river. Does a note in a Hungarian book or a South African magazine carry less weight because there are so many more American perspectives?

Or do those same notes take on greater significance because of the attraction the canyon has had even far from America?

In terms of temporal distribution, things that are (relatively) very old inspire fascination, for many reasons, whereas very recent things may be seen with reduced interest. Why does older material hold innately greater interest? Consider the points of the following thought exercise:

- Looking from 2021, which might hold the greater fascination—a publication from 2017 or from 1849?

Probably the 172-year-old item from 1849. “Old” things pique interest.

- Zoom ahead in your mind to a user in 2300 and look at the same two items. Which might be more fascinating, 1849 or 2017?

Probably both of them, because they will then be proportionately and particularly old—451 and 283 years, respectively. Yet for our user in 2300, something from 2293 would be “just” a routine seven years old. On the other hand, an item 172 years old to our user will likely be fascinating, too, as it had been published in 2128—a date that is still seven years in *our* future (of 2021).

- Were you startled when asked to imagine a user in 2300, or to picture yourself reading a publication from 2293?

Just based on the dates alone, such remoteness ahead in time can be disengaging. While “1742” (279 years ago) is comfortably imaginable, “2293” (279 years in the future) glares, more difficult to comprehend. What about imagining ahead seven years from the present (2021) to 2028? It is not only comprehensible, but imminent. When you look *back* 279 years, any item from that year is interestingly “old”, but not unfathomly so. It is comprehensible because we have a sense of history. After all, in America at least, 1742 is “only” in Colonial times, about which many people are somewhat familiar.

- Why, then, should a look ahead 279 years to 2300 be disregarded as a stretch of the imagination, “too far into the future” to be of *practical* consideration to us now?

Looking back is a perspective more easily grasped because we are comfortable with concepts of the past (regardless of how we regard its lessons). Looking ahead is full of uncertainty and, if the time is long enough, it is something in which we cannot directly participate; perhaps we cannot even imagine it. It is a time of the “future generations”, or as yet unborn “children’s children” about whom are so casually spoken, though we have not a clue who they are or how

they will engage amongst themselves and with the planet—or how they will see us.<sup>2</sup>

The object of this thought exercise is to point out that *THE GRAND CANON* holds many citations from centuries past, all of which will be points of fascination to a user, to wonder just what is of interest in the region covered herein, from so long ago. We can grasp the idea of how much time those centuries represent, and how they present themselves as historical resources. So this is also a bank, from which users over the next five centuries and more can withdraw not only for *our* five-century look back from 2021, but for what to us are simply contemporary things, too. Those very same contemporary items will be to the future users as old as are centuries-old citations are to us. That is why any bibliography is important—it is for use in its day, *and* for documentation long past its own date.

To look again at the idea that *THE GRAND CANON* can be rough or cumbersome to use, consider that just the idea of bibliographies regrettably presents to many people an image of tediously bland recitations of authors and titles, often displayed in uncomfortably small print, their use being an exercise of low inertia, to be done with as quickly as possible. They are, after all, just lists, hardly fireside reading except by the more peculiar of people (like bibliographers). That is the sort of bibliography I had been introduced to in the sixth grade (1963) by my elementary school librarian, Mrs. H—. It’s a wonder that I ever returned. But a decade later I discovered the *annotated* bibliography, a *super*-bibliographical sort of thing that delivered information, sometimes with critical commentary, that was useful beyond the who did what, when; plus, some bibliographies even lay between the basic and critical forms. So here we are, six decades along from Mrs. H.’s wearied, Southern-accented reminders to a room full of perplexed kids to “get your bibl’ography”. It was at about that very time, too, that Marshall McLuhan famously proclaimed, “the medium is the message”, that it is the medium through which a message is communicated, not the message itself, that should be the subject of attention. So it is with bibliographies, a medium that should be met eagerly.

“Bibliography” is, honestly, an awful word. If one is directed to a bibliography but is not otherwise an enthusiast of, or at least appreciates, them, a common

---

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps this is a contributory reason for our present (2021) impetuous reactions to the real impacts of climate change and the artificially political concerns of Colorado River water supply and apportionment, which are not even in our *immediate future*, but *here and now*. See [Part 12/Section 1](#) of this bibliography. In spite of hope, it is not possible to honor fixed rights and appease resolute legalities if the natural resources of a living planet are simply not there. Those who craft practical solutions will be mighty people.



response is impatience, if not evasion. Even the suffix “-ography” is a turn-off to some people. If only there were another term, one less dull, one that promises interesting engagement. Some bibliographies are minor contrivances; others are monumentally important within their scope. Some are spectacularly unimaginative presentations that promise tedium or quick disinterest; others are beauties of layout, typography and binding that lure in their users. Yet they all use the same term. If one bibliography were to stand out for its purposes, if it promises to be tremendously comprehensive, it might as well be called a canon. Thus, the name for *THE GRAND CANON* follows on this theme—and it plays on the mostly nineteenth century, Spanish-influenced typography that spelled the world’s Grand Canyon as “Grand Canon”. (In non-Spanish language publications, it appeared widely with or without the *n*’s tilde, virtually never with the *o*’s accute accent.) Despite some earlier attempts to avoid it, I concede to having to use the word “bibliography”, at least in the subtitle, so that users and librarians will recognize it as such; and hopefully they will see the canon in it. *THE GRAND CANON*, with its dreaded “B” word, may as well aspire to some whimsy.

I recall my first visit, in the early 1980s, with Grand Canyon National Park’s librarian, Louise Hinchliffe (1922–2016). I was barely, if not yet, 30 years of age. We had known each other only through (typewritten) correspondence—she was irreproachable in that respect, always responding promptly, often with more information than I had asked for—the perfect public servant-librarian. When we met, she was rather taken aback, having assumed that I was an “older man”, perhaps “retired” with time on my hands and indulging myself in Grand Canyon–Colorado River bibliography. Now that I *am* older, and in fact retired, I look back on five decades of indulgence with astonishment. Louise, who had been with the park a long time, had had in hand a few substantially out-of-date, selective, mimeographed bibliographies—and my then-recently published, bare-boned bibliography containing fewer than 4,000 simple citations, still in the sad, economical, myopically “familiar” appearance of many bibliographies. Now, what has become *THE GRAND CANON* is not only hugely expanded in the number of citations, but its format and overall presentation is something that neither Louise nor I could have imagined—something more engaging, perhaps alive—something more *readable*.

The 1981 edition first had been spun through a typewriter, on paper. I corrected galley proofs from the publisher (again, on paper). Personal computers were just on the horizon, word processing was not in the home, and the modern form of the web was still years away. Over the decades, my professional experience in typesetting and page composition (one of my several concomitant careers) has benefitted this latest product (though I admit limitations). Along the way, the 1990 second edition of the bibliography

graduated to loose-leaf and microfiche (I provided the already laid out, camera-ready pages used for offset printing), and digital diskettes in ASCII format (“text only”, as better understood today). We were on a bandwagon, but it had a short trip

Enter: the online database in 2000. Leading up to it, the Grand Canyon Association and I (mostly I) envisioned a next edition produced statically, on CD-ROM. GCA conceived the interactive database. Its content was shopped out to a digital-products firm that constructed interactive pages for the use of the public, and provided a layer of password-protected pages with which I was able to frequently update and edit the bibliography using tools fashioned by programmers. It was a slow process, yet it was a success; but, as I noted already, that new bandwagon in turn inexorably rusted to a halt by 2015, limited by advances in technology with which it could not keep pace.

By 2010 I had been looking for a way to revive the monographic presentation of the online nebula of citations, in tandem with the database. The 2012 reappearance of the booklike monograph, in the form of *THE GRAND CANON*, ushered in new ways in which much more information was conveyed than could be done online. One can only guess what might be done decades from now with the information delivered *here*, applied to more greatly improved resources (digital or post-digital). The content is here; it is only a matter of personal and technological wherewithal and recrafting that can offer it up in unimagined ways without losing the direct and contextual information conveyed by the structure and content of these thousands of citations.

*THE GRAND CANON LOOKS AT* just one geographical area: on a map it is the Γ-shaped landscape that encompasses the greater Grand Canyon region and the lower Colorado River country between the canyon and the northernmost waters of the Gulf of California, its boundaries inflating here and there to envelope a historically if not physically connected locale like the Salton Sea and the Imperial–Mexicali Valley of California and Baja California. The histories from this geographical andiron are intertwined; the activities of its peoples are over millenia incredibly varied. Moreover, the coincidence is not lost on me, that in July 1776 the Pennsylvania State House, mentioned earlier, served as a stage for throwing off bonds of colonialism, while during the same time, in Nuevo México, padre Francisco Tomás Garcés had just been the first European to contact in their homeland the Havasupai, traditional inhabitants of the Grand Canyon, forecasting a colonialist storm that would put limits on their world as it already had in the worlds of their neighbors.

This is a five-century treasury of what writers of every bent, artists of all kinds, and other crowds and individuals have found of value or necessity enough to

publicize: personal experiences, inspirations, reports on work that was done, or presentations of perspectives of the human and natural histories and conditions of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River country. Yet I dare not claim that the bibliographical study of this place prior to the present project was in a deplorable state; only that it had been superficial—at its most original, a judicious *selection*. Such selected compilations have their very good uses when seen as choosings of “valuable” or “pertinent” works. But frankly, valuable and pertinent to whom? Such lists are usually biased in favor of *recognized* works, familiar ones that show up again and again in these lists. Sometimes the lists tease with ancillary materials, such as those that are picked from serials rather than individually shelvable books. Instead, [THE GRAND CANON](#) has attempted to snare as much as possible—period. There are, though, many more items as yet undiscovered. We are too distantly separated in time and geography to be able to find *everything* that has been produced. So many items have been found serendipitously that the gigantic number of things that must still be recovered is tantalizing.

My intention has never been to assemble an encyclopedic bibliography—because encyclopedias abridge—but to create as closely as possible one that is exhaustive, knowing fully as well that the goal is elusive. It is, though, comprehensive; it accounts for every *kind* of production in every *subject* that I could think of. This compilation adds as much information as possible, too, to assist users in determining whether one or another item may be pertinent to their needs or interest. In other places, for the benefit of librarians and collectors (and other bibliographers), I have added points that distinguish between printings, states, or editions, and other peculiarities of interest to such specialists.

Moreso than a compilation of “publications”, [THE GRAND CANON](#) represents a gathering of attention. It consolidates a worldwide, five century awareness of the Grand Canyon–Lower Colorado River region: how it has been seen, used, and reimagined, and how humans have explored, worked, and lived there—and most tellingly, how, where, and when those messages were delivered to audiences small or large, locally, nationally, or globally. The Grand Canyon has unfailing worldwide attention,<sup>3</sup> at least since it was visibly brought to our awareness in the 19th century, and particularly since it was enthusiastically dropped into the churns of tourism and publishing.

---

<sup>3</sup> In comparison, the Grand Canyon has likewise been incredibly widely used by those who name other places after it, and who contrive analogies and metaphors embracing the idea of the canyon. See what now is Volume 3 of [THE GRAND CANON](#), *Grand Canyon, Colossal Mirror*.

Seeing the vastness of this work after nearly five decades, it is difficult to avoid the idea that I may be accused of showmanship, an observation that comes to mind simply as a consequence of this having been such a long-lived, continuous, and voluminous project. But this is a work that simply shows to present users—and those of the future long after me—the tremendous number of publications, in numbers, scope and content, that can be applied to work at hand. One item may be useful for its information or perspective; sets of items may be useful as contributions to a historical review or a statistical survey of publications. And so on.

Were I to know of more publications, they would be listed here. (Of course!) After all, over the decades I have not just reported the new works that came along, but have continually unearthed older publications that probably should have been found on earlier rounds. And the process of editing and embellishing citations from earlier editions continues unabated. In the end, though, omissions are due to my oversight and ignorance—if something is not known to me, I want to know about it. And errors are, well, never on purpose. We all are human.

I KEEP REFERRING to “publications”, but just what are these? One might suppose, correctly, that the term refers to books, magazines, and so forth, though more broadly they include non-paper media like film-based materials, audio recordings, and digital disks. Publications are (we hope) available somewhere. But more precisely, publications are the very ways by which thoughts, ideas, and findings are not only broadcast but are sent to the future. Whereas manuscript materials, such as correspondence and unpublished journals, properly are the gold standard of historians’ resources, they are effectively unknown to those to whom *publications* are directed. It is the *published* things that reach the general public and administrators and managers of every sort (and historians, of course). Publications are the medium of the public’s memory. In multiple, identical copies they continually reach the masses, immediately and usually forever. They can embrace everything from orations and institutionally produced tomes to the simplest statements of observation and the thinnest of pamphlets or brochures.

I also refer to “researchers” and “users”. Although I imply that researchers are more studious than general users, the two really tightly intertwine, and I make no real distinction between the two other than that general users may have more casual or personal objectives than researchers who may be working with an academic or administrative perspective. All users may have to sift through a staggering amount of available resources in order to locate that which is deemed useful. In the case of this

bibliography, those resources are citations that identify published materials. A bibliography can only go so far to identify pertinent material for research. Naturally, they provide individual citations to users who look for specific items. Beyond that, a bibliography can somewhat help by presenting its citations organized by categories. Then it is up to the user to *read* it. If reading is not desired, a user wants a “selective” bibliography or a database, and the user will have to be satisfied with the biases introduced by the creators of those resources.

Even with a bibliography that desires to be comprehensive, there are biases. Except when a user is looking for a specific publication, citations arranged by category really just display a *probability* of whether the content of a cited item is pertinent to a task at hand. That probability depends upon whether or not the item’s author conveyed suitably useful information in a title to reasonably indicate the overall content of that publication; but we know they are not always successful. Then there is the bibliographer’s decision as to whether or not it is necessary to add a useful comment that conveys some meaningful analysis of what that publication actually contains, which means of course that the bibliographer must at least browse through the publication to ascertain its pertinence to the bibliography. Such added comments are most useful when just a smidgen of an item is pertinent to the subject of the bibliography, as compared to the whole of that item, saving the user from having to hunt down the complete item unless there is some particular reason to do so.

All this said, I will be the first one to admit that this bibliography can fail those who expect a quick look-up. Some authors cited herein are represented in several different parts—for the simple reason that they wrote about different subjects—so they (and even I, as one of those authors) are not represented in a single list in THE GRAND CANON. Then, because this is an alphabetically arranged series of citations, based on a first author’s name when multiple authors are credited, one will not easily find an author in citations where the author is not the first of two or more in a by-line. What the user needs is a database. One did exist for this bibliography, but at the expense of less precise data and its inability to allow the user to see the whole bibliography at once. Regarding this work’s shortcomings, read on.

Each part of THE GRAND CANON is a separate subject or genre, yet once into it there are no assists to find the topically more specific citations. For example, Part 19 (Biology and Ecology of the Grand Canyon Region) does not separate botany from zoology. Surely, specialist users like mycologists (who study fungi) and malacologists (mollusks) would appreciate even more direct access to the specific items in their fields. Nonetheless, with this bibliography in hand, they can if necessary create their



own specialized bibliographies. In the haste of a short human life, the paramount task for *this* bibliographer has been to round up as many items as possible, to funnel them into broad categories, where, the legwork done, they might await the re-creation of a database, since the technology that served the old database (that was kept current 2000–2015) failed to ensure a longer lifetime. However, the database must not deconstruct the citations but preserve the detailed elements that precisely convey information within each citation. Subtraction would defeat the very objective of the *canon* in THE GRAND CANON.

AS AN ASIDE, I am astonished to have felt the need to add a Catalogers Note—unheard of, I think—to the publisher’s (or copyright) page of this Fourth Edition ([see it here](#)) and the two complementary volumes of THE GRAND CANON. It points out that the word “canon”, which is conveniently the same in both English and Spanish, can mean a standard, or authoritative, list. The word is neither “cañón” nor “canyon”.<sup>4</sup> Already in the short life of THE GRAND CANON the series title has been made into *The Grand Canyon* in several libraries’ catalogs; I do not know whether by inattention, unfamiliarity with the word by individual catalogers, or by procedurally romanizing a “foreign” word (which it is not, nor is it pronounced like “canyon”). The bibliography has also been cited by authors who have introduced “Canyon” for Canon. Among librarians and researchers, at least, this should not happen. I hope it is not an expression of careless or oblivious neoacademics. Perhaps now literarily defiant, I stand by this precise title, one purposely whimsical (it plays on the principally 19th-century spelling of Grand Canyon as “Grand Canon” that appeared in non-Spanish publications, a form that transmuted the Spanish *cañón* but pronounced it the same way). THE GRAND CANON, then, as a CANON, influentially serves as a guide to almost anything that has been published on its subject; and thus, it might serve as a foundation for new products that can be based on it (those who are interested, see the [Fair Use](#) statement on p. III of this volume).

---

<sup>4</sup> In older Spanish, “canon” had been spelled “cánon”, though the diacritical mark has fallen into disuse. See, for example, in Thomas (Tomas) Connelly (compiler), *A New Dictionary of the Spanish and English Languages, Part the First, Volume I / Diccionario Nuevo de las Dos Lenguas Española é Inglesa, Parte Primera, Tomo I* (Madrid: Pedro Julian Pereyra / Madrid en la Imprenta Real, Pedro Julian Pereyra, 1798), p. 399, one of several definitions: “cánon. Catálogo ó lista. *A catalogue, list, or roll.*” (Bilingual title, publisher’s information, and definition, thus.)

TO PAUSE ON the idea of “research”: I write a part of this Preamble during a most unusual time in the world, when the pandemic not so catchingly named COVID-19 sweeps around us (the name stands for COrona VIRus Disease, also designated “2019 novel coronavirus”). This thing will, hopefully, even without the promise of vaccines (as yet not forthcoming at the time that I write this particular paragraph), pass away as much as did the plagues of past centuries for which effective remedies were unknown. [As I re-edit this paragraph late in 2021, even with vaccines Covid is still, insidiously, with us, due to new variants naturally, but also because of those who are vaccine-hesitant (which is not novel to today’s population) and partisan politics that is shameful in the realm of public health. Incidentally, THE GRAND CANON does cite items concerning “plague”; and now, necessarily, “COVID-19”.]

During 2020 [and 2021], with many of the world’s places of human congregation shuttered (libraries among them), I have even more industriously devoted my time to travel—via the web! Among my recent electronic sojourns outside the United States, I have gone most frequently to France, Spain, and Japan, though I have touched down in less likely places, too, like New Zealand and Russia (the latter revealing a scarce 19th century atlas, in Russian, that was an important contribution to the *Cartobibliography* that is now Volume 2 of THE GRAND CANON).

In fact, my virtual travels have gone on for years, in search of resources for this bibliography. Peculiar spots unexpectedly provide information. For example, who knew that across eastern Europe and in Germany are individuals and clubs who are infatuated by cacti, who home in on, and even travel to, places like the Grand Canyon region’s more out-of-the-way House Rock Valley? Most enjoyably for me during the nervous time of covidity were long forays deep into the Library of Congress and various universities and colleges worldwide, on the hunt for maps. Even some auction houses are providential sources of high-resolution images that can be inspected in detail. At my leisure, in retirement and by the euphemistic “social distancing” required by the pandemic, I have been able to track down hundreds of citations that I had thought I would never get to—and discovered many more—all because these institutions and firms had had the wherewithal to create high-quality digital images of these maps in the first place, post them to their websites, *then* to have kept their websites up and running during crises of public shutdown. (Thank you, everyone!) I have been fortunate to have seen many of the actual maps I cite—though hardly not as many one might expect or that I would wish to see in person—but the web resources were undeniably

invaluable. In fact, as much as I hate to say so, many times there is no need to be present in a library now, in order to obtain answers to some questions.

I have ranged over the earth in search of material for THE GRAND CANON. Does it matter that I did not visit libraries and bookstores of other lands myself? I surely have missed out on opportunities for discovery. On the other hand, I would have been limited by these places' acquisitions programs, restricted to their academic needs, budgets, and (in the case of bookstores) sales potential. So instead, during the more recent years of the five decades I have been working on this project, I have relied on the remarkable resources of the web for many citations. I am never ceased to be amazed, not that so much material is available online (though, admittedly, it is a small fraction of all that must have been produced), but that people have made the effort to put it all there in the first place! And in some cases, discoveries made online, which I may never have known about, have led me to acquire items for my own library, which someday may be someone else's asset.

Bear all this in mind when using this bibliography. Within THE GRAND CANON's geographical limits there are many works that will be seen as essential. A huge number of less essential works appear, too. There must be a lot more, of every kind of worth, not yet accounted for. And this bibliography can be reworked and built upon; no part of it is an end point.

#### WHAT THEN IS the use of THE GRAND CANON?

Throughout the front matter of this volume, I elaborate on many of THE GRAND CANON's uses. Speaking in generalities here, I instead defy a user to identify its actual *unusefulness* as a complete body of work. Elsewhere, I do address those who might condemn it because it contains "too much" (that is, too much that is not of interest to them, or that might be perceived as too cluttered for "serious" use). Yet the point is, every cited item exists. Every citation documents as much as possible that which might signal some usefulness to a particular user. One can always ignore that which is deemed of no interest, but the greatest disservice is to have not been informed in the first place.

THE GRAND CANON is a time capsule. Here is a lot of stuff that people have produced about the Grand Canyon, the Colorado River, and the lands 'round about. *Use* this bibliography. Take the time. *Read it*, even. One might scoff that one may as well read a dictionary. Bear with me. By looking through these pages, even if not on a hunt for anything specific, what catches your eye? It is predicatable that users, to

answer the question, will jump to the names of the nobles of Grand Canyon and Colorado River history—but one knows them and knows what will be found. Then again, maybe there will be a few newish details to go along with those works; or, more telling, a citation *nearby* may trigger attention. Go and see.

After one's appetite for the expected is satisfied, look about for strangers; there are ever so many. What, too, of the souls who didn't sign their work? "Anonymous" they all are; a thousand or more of them are preserved in time herein. Or turn to years—or subjects—you have not explored before. Leave your comfort zone. See what people thought worthwhile to spend a few minutes, or years, to tell us what they saw, thought, felt, or imagined. Mostly with words they bring it to us, in prose and verse alike; others greet us through art, sound, and moving pictures, by lecturing or entertaining audiences in plays, or by resculpturing continents and countries on maps.

Several sections of Volume 1 offer up publications and products that are of use to people who are not often separately recognized by compilers of a broad-based bibliography: those who have physical impairments or emotional needs. The citations in those parts may also be useful to those who work with and help these people. The authors and other creators of publications that are cited in other parts herein are adults, of course, yet a few are youngsters who caught the attention of their elders—a couple were precocious enough even to have produced and marketed their work on their own.

I encourage the *reading* of bibliographies, or at least browsing through them, when beginning to work on a project or at any time when there is an opportunity to step back from that work, just to see "what might be there" in walks through time. I have seen researchers, even those accomplished in their fields, working with books and manuscripts unexpectedly discover something that interests them from among *adjacent* items in front of them—if not for the project at hand, then for another one, even possibly starting a new one. It's not a novel observation, but the principle applies to bibliographical citations, too. Such guidance cannot happen with a single return, or a discrete set of returns, from a digital query. For the gathering of ideas, and for pointers as well as answers, bibliographies are treasure houses; they *can* be gone into and read. Humans gave their all to make the things that show up in bibliographies; and bibliographies are for human uses. I also encourage users—especially those who are new to THE GRAND CANON and expect to return to it—to read the Introduction in its whole. It provides the history of this work, it describes all of its content and its purposes and intents, and it offers ways in which it can be of continued, greater use.

If a user tends to see parts of this bibliography as swarming or congested, it is because it is not a refinement of theater or literature; it is a precise record, one not amenable to reduction. It is here for users, to be used; to be read, even. It offers bibliographical facts, historical perspectives, and data for statistics. Were one to declare a majority of citations as informational shipwrecks, practically unuseful if not outright rubbish, it would hide these very wrecks from the users who want to examine them. Here is everything. Use the citations or pass over them, but they at least are brought to your attention.

THE GRAND CANON is a tour guide. It tells of things: people, places, sounds, sights, smells, tastes, narratives, chronicles, memoirs, findings, reports, anecdotes, fibs, tales, statements, lessons, discoveries, debunkings, summaries, sermons, legends, poems, opinions, laws, rumors, announcements, pronouncements, speculations, assertions, dogmas, suggestions, novelties, resolutions, decrees, repetitions, petitions, pleas, beliefs and aliefs, truths and falsities (depending upon the writer or the reader); all presented in books, booklets, serials, pamphlets, maps, musical scores, transparencies (which, do not forget, include movies of the celluloid type), records (the paper kind, the kind for phonographs, and the kind that are photographs), and bytes (invisible, but they generate things that we humans can engage)—numerous and varied products from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe, on and on. They speak to us on these pages in the babble of 114 languages. Experiencing and sharing these citations (and then their thousands—millions—of points condensed in them) is the reward of *reading* a bibliography. And if you do embark on a reading, the citations will with time very likely wonderously change when they are re-read as we, too, age.

Read a citation, and you will grasp an idea. Obtain the item, and you will find what it can tell you. Read (or view or listen to) the item through, and what it does not tell you will lead you onward. And you will find that the trails and tales never come to an end.

Read! Explore! Often! because the ink never dries.

EARLE E. SPAMER

---