

August 23, 1956

Dear Sherman:

You have correctly passed the ball back to John Donaldson. After all I guess it is squarely my decision.

I am now pretty well convinced that the manuscript needs some rather extensive cutting, especially the part preceding the trial. The trial is much longer than the preceding two parts combined, but it seems to run along better, is clearly tenser and more dramatic reading, in fact is the heart and guts and culmination of the narrative. On the other hand, as the title implies (ANATOMY OF A MURDER), it was not my purpose merely to write about what I hope is an entertaining and exciting trial, but, among a number of other things, to demonstrate that in a big criminal case what goes before the trial is sometimes equally exciting and important and, if the pretrial work is well done, that the actual trial itself is frequently something of an anti-climax. To my knowledge this is a job of writing that has never been done by anyone who knows whereof he speaks. I am amenable to reasonable cutting, as I have said, but I do not want either to abandon or hamstring my basic narrative plan to please bored and witless readers. I want instead for once to dredge down and tell about a murder case from A to Z.

I find myself torn between loyalty to you and my desire to possibly place my book with one of the country's oldest and best publishers. Loyalty wins out, sir, and I dump my ton of manuscript unceremoniously on your lap. If you see no merit in it, that's that; if you do we will take it from there.

All the best.

Sincerely,

P. S. Whatever you decide, Sherman, I wonder if you would please correct the worst bloopers as you go along, putting an X, say, in the left margin so I'll know the corrections are yours. Dutton readers caught quite a few in the first two parts they read.

Jno.

Mr. F. Sherman Baker, Editor  
St. Martins Press, Inc.  
103 Park Avenue  
New York 17, New York

ST MARTIN'S PRESS Incorporated

103 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Telephone: MUrray Hill 6-8820

CABLE ADDRESS: SAINTMART

September 17th, 1956

Notes on --

ANATOMY OF A MURDER

to: John Voelker  
From: F. Sherman Baker

- Page - 2 "To get herself laid" ? ?  
3 Gretchen's timing had been poor, whether in or out of bed. ? ?  
6 "On a jock strap." No.  
10 "Fired out on his can." ? ?  
11 This is a weak ending. Tighten Chapter II a little.  
14 "He was a whiz." Old slang.  
19 "You can't giss this man." ? ?  
21 Tighten this page.  
40 Cut in half.  
46 "I've got to go to the can" and following. ? ?  
48 There are not, I believe, four Spillanes if my memory serves me, only three.  
How should I know, I have only read one.  
And what's this bugout?  
56 Too many violets. Tiresome.  
66 "Raw rhubarb," etc. ? ?  
57 "Sweet violets". Out.  
65 Too much talk about the can.  
74 "A mutual lay." ? ?  
"Even lying with his dame." Necessary? ?  
77 "Sweet violets." Out.

[Sept. 17, 1956]

-2-

Sept. 17, 1956

Notes on---

ANATOMY OF A MURDER

to: John Voelker  
From: F. Sherman Baker

- Page 90     What lake? First mention; better drop this tag end of a line and bring in the lake later -- or before.  
          "No, I answered carefully," How about "Said with deliberate emphasis." ?
- 91        "Legs and titties." Unnecessary, out.  
          "Perish the notion." Out.
- 92        Cut some, tighten.
- 94        "A booming tocsin that the bell of freedom still rings." No, too florid.
- 96        Self-pity. Cut.
- 97        "Pause that depresses." Out.
- 98        "Gretchen." Identify her as "my ex-wife, Gretchen."  
          Leave something to the reader's imagination.

Note that you have an awful lot of "I answered," "I said."-- There is a need for characteristic action in many of these phrases. Your novel frequently reads like a play. I don't want you to go into high flown prose, but we need physical action-- characteristic of the speaker to tie all this dialogue into a visual picture.

September 20, 1956

Dear Sherman:

Your letter gives me a tremendous lift. Yes, the script is too long and must be hacked away at, particularly the pre-trial portion. Almost all of your points have validity. Some I knew about all along but was powerless to change. As a writer you will know what I mean, the strange trance-like uncritical inertia while writing. *that grips me*

I am presently thinking of opening the book with the retainer, "All jails stink, etc," sketching in the background as I go along. That alone will cut many pages. My wife Grace insists that I get Polly properly married off, too, or there might be a real divorce among the Voelkers. Aren't women strange?

Donna-Maida is your deathless slave for your kind words. I deliberately under-described her to permit reader's choice, but will see.

I already have plans to increase reader tension and fear over the outcome. One way is to improve Dancer's argument, for which I have a good angle. Another is to possibly inject a surprise last-minute jail inmate witness against the Lieutenant. Something to the effect that the Lieutenant had bragged to him he'd fooled his lawyer and psychiatrist and now bets he'll fool the bumpkin jury.

You ship it back and I'll go to work. But I fear you won't find it done upon your return. First, I'm in a four-alarm rape case; second, Donna wants time off; and, third, it's too big a job anyway. But I'll hack away. In the meantime many thanks for all your labors and your fine letter. I guess I'll have to break the news to Alex Williams of Little, Brown, promising him next crack after you.

Please, Sherman, fetch me back Marilyn from the coast.

All the best,

P.S. Congratulations on the splendid Bonar Law review in the Times. I see Simon & Schuster has a turkey called "The Prosecutor."

Jno.

Mr. F. Sherman Baker, Editor  
St. Martins Press, Inc.  
103 Park Avenue  
New York 17, New York

\$ 3.98

October 18, 1956

Dear Sherman:

I return the ANATOMY manuscript which I now hope is sufficiently revised so that you can determine whether there is an acceptable book. I am returning the entire original script, including the portions that have now been physically removed, so that you can not only readily observe the extent of these deletions but also determine precisely what has been altered or cut or added. Most of the cuts occur, of course, in the script that you will be reading.

At this time I have confined most of my cutting to the pre-trial portion of the script, although I have cut the trial as well, including the cutting of Paul's jury argument by about one-third. I have done this deliberately because I feel that the problem of cutting in the pre-trial section was more peculiarly legal than literary or editorial in its nature. This is not to say that the trial section cannot profitably be further cut (the Judge's jury charge, for example) or that I am unwilling to do so; it is merely that I would much prefer to have your expert and detailed editorial counsel and guidance before undertaking any further cutting of that important section.

In this cutting I have not paid too much attention to small things (including strengthening Paul's weak kidneys) feeling that these things can be taken care of later and at more leisure. I have been concerned here almost exclusively with the brutal problem of possibly hacking down this book to a printable size.

Many of my bridges and necessary inserts of new material have been typed on different paper so that they will be readily apparent to you. Where this has not been feasible or where the new typing includes both old and new material, I have tried to so indicate.

To get down to cases you will observe that I have cut out the entire old and long five-chapter opening first section, formerly called "Before the Fact" and telescoped it into a single background chapter, now called Chapter 2. I have tried to do this by what I hope is an acceptable flashback technique. And throughout the script I have also ruthlessly telescoped or entirely cut out my long legal discussions with Parnell and the trip to Thunder Bay and Paul's various huddles with the Manions.

In the trial section you will observe that I have followed two of your earlier suggestions which struck me as being very good ones: I have tried to sharply increase the tension and doubt over the trial's outcome (see new Chapter 25 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and I have also injected what I hope is some plausible but not

excessively glutinous love interest between Mary Pilant and Paul Biegler. These things have been accomplished, I feel, without too great additions, and those additions have of course been many times more than offset by my massive butchery elsewhere.

This, then, is not submitted or intended in any sense as a final revision beyond which I will not budge. It is more of a broad trial run. You know well from the past that I am always open to further suggestion on these things. I simply did not wish to further butcher the trial, which is after all the heart and guts of the book, without the benefit of further counsel from you, if you choose to take the book. And I do hope that you and Ian can wade through this horrible-looking hodge-podge without too great pain.

All the best,

John D. Voelker

P. S. I send this by registered mail as it is now my only completely revised copy and so that I will know it arrived. For obvious reasons please do not acknowledge by postcard, as was done the first time.

Jno.

Mr. F. Sherman Baker, Editor  
St. Martins Press, Inc.  
103 Park Avenue  
New York 17, New York

90: A change is required here by the "leaky" deletion on Galley 82. Suggest last two paragraphs be changed as follows:

"Oh, fine thank you. I appreciate getting them and will look forward to reading them." Just then the Judge's phone rang and he clamped one big hand over the cradle and grinned sheepishly up at me, blushing like a boy. "Excuse me, Mr. Biegler," he said. "Today's our wedding anniversary--and I think that's Edith now returning my call."

"Congratulations," I murmured, softly closing the big door behind me, wondering that if it was true that every Jack must have his Jill-- where and when would I ever find mine?

(NOTE: This change possibly serves two purposes: it not only bridges the "leaky" business--which here was clearly a device to abruptly end a scene-- but also presages the romance between Polly and Mary Pilant.)

131: Another change required by "leaky" deletion on Galley 82. Suggest last paragraph be changed to read as follows:

The Judge looked out at the clock and batted his sandy forelock out of his eye. "I think we'll take ten minutes before examining the next witness," he said. "All right, Mr. Sheriff."

(NOTE: Thank goodness judges don't have to explain their intermissions!)

141: Suggest deletion of lines 20 and 21 from the bottom to accord with the logic of the earlier "semen-tic" deletion on Galley 14. Possibly the passage was overlooked by the BOMC readers, but actually it constitutes the most pointed non-medical reference to this touchy subject outside of offending Galley 14. In any case I think the book club people should be notified. I therefore suggest the deletion of the following two sentences (lines 20 and 21, as noted above):

"What evidence?" I pressed.

Again the words were spat: "Seminal fluid," he said.

(NOTE: In passing I observe that in the galley page the question mark is omitted from Polly's first question following the suggested deleted material: "What did you do?")

147: I believe this may still stand, despite the previous "leaky" deletions, as a mere nervous and understandable gesture of relief.

166: I see no obscurity here and suggest that it stand unless a hassle develops. Two things had to happen in connection with the smears: (1) They had to be taken right; (2) they had to be tested right. Failure in either department would produce a negative report for sperm, even had it been present. The test here was not made for the presence of semen (merely a natural culture or host for the storage and transmission of spermatozoa) but for the life-creating sperm which might or might not have been present therein. No question is raised that Barney Quill might have been impotent, that is, either physically or psychologically incapable of performing the sexual act.... But I must hurry to surgery. Class dismissed.

John Voelker  
(Robert Traver)  
July 29, 1957

COMMENTS BY AUTHOR TO PAGE PROOFS OF "ANATOMY"

---

PAGE

- 135 Note new change by author, who will gladly pay and pay.... Are my printer directions O.K.?
- 137 Note small printing dilemma here. Have I resolved it O.K.?
- 170 Note printer's error here. Are my directions O.K.?
- 183 Note restored passage of necessary dialogue which the printer erroneously omitted from the galleys and again here, and the absence of which all of us overlooked when correcting the galleys. (See typescript page 235 at check mark.)
- 197 Note my attempted patch job here. Maybe you can patch it better.
- 216 Note tweedledee, etc., crisis here. Are my directions clear?
- 232 I don't understand that proof reader bracket sign at the top line and want to make sure that nobody adds any brackets. Please check and advise.
- 243 Shouldn't it really be "veritable Mr. Demos himself" rather than "Mr. Demos itself"?
- 272 Shouldn't it be "Abie's Irish Rose" with a capital R. (The play was not about a rose, but about an Irish girl called Rose.)
- 279 Note added sentence erroneously deleted by one of us from page 352 of the typescript. I'd like it put back as it not only adds power and emotion to the passage but makes sense instead of nonsense out of Mary Filant passing Polly a drink in the very next paragraph. Please check to see that my printer's directions are O.K.
- 427 Note new poetic phrase of mine added to the "tension" passage here, and please check clarity of my directions to the printer. I'll gladly pay, damn it.

GENERAL COMMENT: This is a terrificly able job of printing and proofreading. Please bestow the Medal of St. Biegler on those responsible. My other corrections (all in red) are routine and scarcely require special comment.

Robert Traver  
(John D. Voelker)  
August 15, 1957



H. in  
3 final

COMMENTS BY AUTHOR TO PAGE  
PROOFS OF "ANATOMY"

---

Page 135 Note new change by author, who will gladly  
pay and pay.... Are my printer directions O.K.?  
(An old dog with a new bone)

137 Note small <sup>printing</sup> dilemma here. Have I resolved  
it O.K.? (tethered cuspidors)

170 Note printer's error here. Are my directions  
O.K.? (~~tethered~~)

183. Note ~~for~~ restored passage of <sup>necessary</sup> dialogue which the printer erroneously omitted from the galleys and again here, and <sup>the absence of</sup> which all of us <sup>overlooked when</sup> ~~missed~~ <sup>correcting</sup> the galleys.  
(See typescript page 235 at check marks.)

Judge "And are you fully aware that you may be punished for your crime?"

197 Note my attempted patch job here. Maybe you can patch it better. (Where Judge breaks in on Mitch's "Lots' to do --")

216 Note twaddledoo, etc, crisis here. Are my directions clear?

232. I don't understand that proof reader <sup>bracket</sup> sign at the top line and want to make sure that nobody adds any brackets. Please check and advise.

243 - Shouldn't it be "really veritable Mr. Demos himself" rather than "Mr. Demos itself"?

272 - Shouldn't it be "Abie's Irish Rose" with a capital R. (The play ~~was~~ <sup>about</sup> was not about a rose, but an Irish girl called Rose)

279 Note added sentence erroneously ~~omitted~~ <sup>deleted by us</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>one of</sup> from ~~the~~ page 352 of the typescript. I'd like it <sup>put</sup> back as it <sup>not only</sup> adds <sup>and</sup> <sup>clarification</sup> ~~power~~ <sup>but</sup> to the passage ~~and~~ <sup>instead of nonsense</sup> makes sense out of <sup>the next</sup> Mary Pilant passing Polly a ~~drink~~ <sup>the next</sup> drink in ~~a~~ <sup>the next</sup> ~~successive~~ paragraph. Please check to see that my printer's directions are O.K. (I selected ~~hand~~ <sup>held out</sup> ~~her~~ <sup>her</sup> ~~my~~ <sup>her</sup> ~~glasses~~ <sup>glasses</sup> and

she took it and went away

427

Note <sup>poetic</sup> <sup>new phrase</sup> ~~sentences~~ of mine added to the "tension"  
passage here, and please check clarity of my  
directions to the printers. I'll gladly pay, damn it.

GENERAL COMMENT: This is a terrible <sup>job</sup> <sup>by</sup> <sup>able</sup>  
of printing and proofreading. Please bestow the  
Medal of St. Biegler on those responsible. My  
other corrections <sup>(all in red)</sup> are routine and scarcely require  
special comment.

Robert Traver  
(John D. Volker)  
August 16, 1957.

(COPY OF A LETTER FROM MR. FADIMAN TO MR. IAN MACKENZIE)

9/22/57

Dear Mr. MacKenzie:

At the moment I'm engaged in re-reading ANATOMY, preparatory to writing the long piece about it for the Club NEWS. (I'll also do a short notice for HOLIDAY, copy of which I will send you, when completed).

I was told that the new galleys I am reading have been revised so that the seminal passages (sounds highly physiological, doesn't it?) are omitted.

This does not seem to be the case. I have encountered a key passage on page 31 (Chapter 4) which will surely cause offense. Cannot these "marks" be dropped out entirely - particularly as the conclusion drawn by Biegler ("conclusive evidence that the man had had sexual intercourse") seems to me unjustified - unless sexual intercourse and coitus interruptus (or premature ejaculation) are identical in law, which I do not take to be the case. It would seem to one whose expertise in this matter derives only from personal experience, that the "marks" on the thighs might indicate that Quill had not effected forcible entrance, but had emptied his vesicles before penetration; and might, in that case, have been unable to make further progress.

Whatever the law says, the whole discussion of the "evidence" on this page is not particularly attractive, and would certainly revolt many lady readers, and some males, too.

Along the same line, I don't particularly care for "horseshit" on page 42 - not that it is offensive to me, but because this book - to put it plainly - is essentially a high-grade crime story, and not a work of art - it can't bear the weight, so to speak, of obscenity.

If the relevant material on page 31 is omitted, the "panties" reference on pages 91-92 should probably also go.

See also the interview with the doctor on pages 98-99.

The whole "spermatogenesis" argument reoccurs on pages 225-226-227. I'm damned if I can see how this is relevant to determining guilt or innocence. Reoccurs on 231-232. Sperm reoccurs pages 290, 298, 299, 300, 317, 318. Don't know how much of this must be retained - but it's rather a bore. "Evidence on her legs" - page 344 - ditto page 361.

Clifton Fadiman

September 27, 1957

Mr. Clifton Fadiman  
Old Stamford Road  
New Canaan, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Fadiman:

I should like to thank you for your letter of 22nd September and for the carbon of the Holiday notice which you sent to Sherman.

We both want to thank you most sincerely for the time and thought you have given to ANATOMY, and for giving such a good send-off to this book.

We have, you know, made all the changes and omissions which were confidentially handed to the publisher, as an informal note, by a friend and associate of yours. Of course, I do feel that if you still consider certain passages to be offensive to the wide generality of readers, earnest consideration, with the author's agreement, should be given to further amendment.

It seems to me that your remarks, in your recent letter, raise two principal points: First, the necessity for all the forensic medical passages, and secondly, the taste or attractiveness of these passages.

I am greatly concerned that the question of taste should still be raised at this point, but I cannot personally make up my mind just yet about the relevance of this question to ANATOMY OF A MURDER as a book and to its potential readership.

On the forensic medical aspect, I do not believe, after mature consideration, that anything further can be cut, and I say this before consulting Justice Voelker, who is quite certain to take the position that if rape offstage becomes the point on which the trial turns, then the legal consideration in and out of court that may prove or disprove rape becomes vital to the plot.

On the principle that the McNaghten Rules are used both in Michigan State and in Scotland, I have turned for clarification of the problem to Sidney Smith, FORENSIC MEDICINE, 8th edition, 1945 (Edinburgh). I shall quote or paraphrase from this book.

Page 295: "Neither complete introduction of the penis, rupture of the hymen, nor emission of semen are necessary to constitute...; penetration, however slight, within the vulva being all that is required."

The keys to the constitution of rape, apart from penetration however slight, are: "by force and against her will." Consent induced by fraud, fear or force is not free consent. In Scotland, even slight weakness of mind reduces the

degree of resistance necessary before the charge of rape will lie in the courts. Consent is obviously no plea for the defense whatsoever if the victim is under sixteen.

Page 299: 1) There may be no physical evidence of the fact of assault whatsoever, since the slightest penetration, with or without emission, constitutes rape. 2) In general, evidence is obtained from signs of physical violence on the body and the limbs, local signs of violence to the private parts and the presence of spermatazoa.

The extent of physical violence must vary with the victim, according to age and a great variety of factors which need not be detailed here.

Page 300: No time should be lost in securing medical evidence. The emotional state, the walk, complaints of pain in the relevant parts on walking, in micturation, in defecation, must all be checked by the physician or surgeon consulted. The clothing must be examined for tears, loss of buttons, marks of mud and grass on the back and buttocks, stains of blood or semen. The identity of blood groups should be established as soon as possible and wherever practical. No false modesty should be permitted to interfere with speedy and complete examination. Seminal matters may be found about the pubic hairs, and if the hairs are stuck together, a portion must be cut off and kept for examination. As spermatazoa may persist in the vagina for a variable period after emission (a matter of hours possibly, but in the whole tract up to two or three days) some mucus should be taken from as far up the vagina as possible by means of a glass rod or spatula and examined immediately for living sperms. Some of the smears should be preserved on a glass slide, over which another glass slide should be inverted to maintain moisture as long as possible. Bloodstains about the legs or the vagina should be noted and analyzed. Bruising lacerations or swelling of the vulva or evidence of tenderness on touching should be recorded.

In the case of a woman previously accustomed to intercourse, despite resistance, evidence of direct damage to or pain in the private parts may be slight. In such a case, the court will be concerned primarily with signs of violence in other parts of the body and the presence of sperm in the vagina or on the clothes for the chief evidence of the crime.

Page 308: In examining the accused male, great attention must be paid to bloodstains. The group should be ascertained and a microscopic examination should be conducted for vaginal epithelium and bacterial flora. Pressure should be applied along the urethra and a liquid sample secured at once in a wet state to see if there are any living spermatazoa present. Other samples must be kept for staining.

After having said all this, may I reply to your points on the necessity for certain passages, avoiding for the moment your question of taste.

Page 31, ANATOMY OF A MURDER: - "his marks on thighs." This phrase was left in since it was not specifically objected to and two other lines: "Oh, you mean semen..." were omitted. Rightly or wrongly, I believe that sexual intercourse is never defined in law - rape is. Biegler was not going to use the word rape. That use of rape would have implied a prejudgment of the issue

at that stage, even on the part of the attorney who contemplated taking the defense. Sexual intercourse seems wide and elastic enough as a phrase to me to cover marks of sexual commerce or congress on the person of a woman. Most foolish was the burning of cloth or of clothing containing these stains in the light of the previous references from Sidney Smith. Your other point in this context depends on rape being constituted by the slightest penetration of the vulva, even with subsequent emission outside it. I think one could argue, even with initial deep penetration, for such external evidence in a case of forcible coitus. The victim would neither be passive nor receptive.

Page 42, ANATOMY OF A MURDER, the excretal point. "Malarkey" or some such word could be substituted in that line. The next paragraph would then require some changes, if we can get the author to do it. We are most grateful for your appreciation of ANATOMY and we need your approbation and your ~~right~~ <sup>PIPE</sup> judgment as a critic. I'm not convinced, however, that ANATOMY is simply a high-grade crime story in which words that may be construed as obscene are out of place. My own feeling is that it is, if you like, an amateur's book - in the original and the best sense. It is about evidence and courts and ultimate social authority. It seems to me to be without genre and to be a Midwest contemporary manifestation of the sort of experience and interest that produced JONATHAN WILD THE GREAT. For me, it also has the directness of response and natural, even if diffuse expression, that went underground somewhere after Tobias Smollett.

Page 91, ANATOMY OF A MURDER: "Panties." We are back to a clothing question seen from my position and that of a judge. Cf. Sidney Smith. I am personally most reluctant to distort the lawyer's vision as here expressed. I have doubts also that the Judge, having been presented with a confidential list of suggestions for palliation and having freely complied with them after consideration, will now start to alter again. Secondly, as the publisher, I have made the informally agreed changes once.

Pages 98 & 99, ANATOMY OF A MURDER. If Justice Voelker is to follow through with the evidence for rape as constituting a cause for diminished responsibility on the part of Lieutenant Manion, I think he still needs these pages, because it is in them that he gets the whole discussion of proof of rape before the jury (presence of spermatazoa and possible blood group identification in the vagina or on the victim's clothing. In the case of the dead man, who is, one might say, now being indirectly tried for rape, a liquid sample of seminal fluid to see if there were any living spermatazoa. ~~absence~~ <sup>absence</sup> *would be an* indication of recent ejaculation.).

Page 224, ANATOMY OF A MURDER: "Spermatogenesis in both testes." This was from the Crown's, I beg its pardon, the People's suppressed report on the death of Quill. A pretty damning line for the defense to get into evidence. The sovereign people were apparently originally contemplating the evidence for rape.

Page 225, ANATOMY OF A MURDER. The same comment applies. Furthermore, if the defense is diminished responsibility (however it is that Michigan gets tied up in the McNaghten Rules issuing from the trial of a delusional madman



4.

who shot Sir Robert Peel's Private Secretary), the state of the deadman's seminal vesicles and Laura Manion's recorded bruises apply so long as the defense can get them into court.

Page 315, ANATOMY OF A MURDER. We come back to Sidney Smith and bruises.

Page 317, ANATOMY OF A MURDER. The seminal vesicles again. The ~~accused~~ dead man, as Sidney Smith would say, was examined for living spermatazoa present, and the mature woman for bruises on the knee and in the pelvic area as well as vaginal pain and disorders.

Page 344, ANATOMY OF A MURDER. Back to torn clothing and to Sidney Smith. Again, on this page we have killed two lines which we were not asked to remove but which repeated "You mean, semen..."

I am personally against long letters. In this case, I feel obliged to write one and I very much hope that you will see my point and the Justice's on the importance of this medical evidence. If rape is to be an element of the plot at all, I am sure he must pass through all these steps.

I still have not decided on the question of taste, but I think what I have said tends to render that question irrelevant in the passages concerned with medical evidence. The business of the colloquial and emphatic expression: "Horseshit," is different. You may well be right in suggesting that this word should go.

Justice Voekker is going to be in town from about 19th October for about a week. I understand that you cannot, because of other engagements, make lunch on 23rd October, but I do hope to be able to arrange for you to meet the Justice at some time convenient to yourself during the course of that week.

Sincerely yours,

Ian MacKenzie  
Managing Director

IM/bb

# PURCHASE ORDER

ST MARTIN'S PRESS Incorporated  
103 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

ORDER NO. 3154 amend. 12

TO:

DATE December 2, 1957

H. Wolff Book Mfg. Co.  
508 West 26th Street  
New York, N.Y.

Purchase Order Number must appear on all invoices and packages

## ANATOMY OF A MURDER

Please incorporate the following changes in the next reprint:

*SB query*  
Page 17, 10th line from bottom of page, in the following sentence please add an "a" and change "groceries" to "grocery": "the kind that workmen buy at corner grocery stores, " change to "the kind that workmen buy at a corner grocery"  
*groceries*

*no. 10*  
Page 31, 11th line from bottom of page, put semi-colon instead of comma after "over" so that the passage reads: "His dark eyes seemed to wall up and cloud over; he sipped his small moustache, etc."  
*from the bottom*

*OK* Page 269 lines 7&8 the word "before" is separated but the hyphen has been omitted.

*OK* Page 407, 4th line from bottom of page, insert "he" so that the sentence reads: "Whatever happens here he has brought lasting infamy and, etc."  
*change "degradation" to "infamy"*

*you you you.*  
Page 435, *3rd line from the top* add a dash and another "you" right after the first "you" in that sentence so that the line reads: "his freedom and you—you got whatever it is you've got."

ST MARTIN'S PRESS Incorporated

By \_\_\_\_\_

Comments on Suggested Corrections John Voelker Wanted Made

- P. 97 (new)--15th line from top--It should be "fishing trip" not "fishing tip" (Sp.)
- P. 97 (new)--12th line from top--Raise question on spelling of "macaberly." Should it properly be "macabrely"?
- P. 269 --(Sherman Baker has OK'd correction in his letter of 12/3/57)
- P. 279 --(not new but not mentioned by you)--9th line from top--the word "he" should clearly be "she" so that it reads: "...that finally only she seemed, etc."
- P. 401 --(not new but recent and not mentioned by you)--4th line from top--since this is a list I think there should clearly be a comma after plump,
- P. 401 --(not new but recent and not mentioned by you)--12th line from top--think there should be a semi-colon instead of a comma after Barney to conform the punctuation there to that of the rest of the passage.
- P. 407 --4th line from bottom--I must respectfully record my disagreement that a comma should follow "here" if "he" is replaced. I would like the "he" added without a comma, as it always was in the original.
- P. 435 --8th line from top--I have noted your comments but I still request that the change be made for the reasons I explained at some length when I sent this new correction in, namely, that there be a dash put in after the first you, to be followed by a second you. (It is one of those many unarguable and undemonstrable propositions in writing, but this is a high and significant point, <sup>that</sup> moved and fumbling Parnell is grappling with--and I want to impress that on the reader even at the risk of admitted repetition.)
- P. 17--corner groceries--You are right. I waive this suggested correction.

J. D. Voelker

12/5/57