



Printed Books, 1640-1800

D. G. NEILL

IT IS HEARTENING to reflect that some, at least, of those who work in libraries and are principally concerned with printed books regard themselves as something more than custodians. As wise parents bring love and an effort to understand its individuality to their duty of training a child, so some librarians seek to establish a like relationship with their charges, based on knowledge and affection. What Wordsworth wrote of the poet may be adapted to books, for

. . . you must love [them], ere to you
[They] will seem worthy of your love.¹

Nowhere is it more possible for the librarian to be both custodian and pioneer, to combine a double duty of preservation and exploration, than in the period 1640-1800, and if the individual accepts his responsibility he will see the necessity for possessing himself of the techniques of bibliography, and having once accomplished that considerable task, for trying to follow the current bibliographical articles and books which are concerned with his particular interest. It is the aim of this article to describe some of the work done and being done, and to indicate some of the important bibliographical desiderata for this period.

The student of bibliography, whatever period he may wish, or happen later, to study, will almost certainly begin his course with R. B. McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography*, a rewriting and considerable enlargement of some "Notes on Bibliographical Evidence. . ." which were first published in the twelfth volume of the *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*. This was pioneering work, and the *Introduction* has justly been described as a classic. In November 1933, Sir W. W. Greg delivered his profoundly important paper on "A Formulary of Collation."² Greg had thought more deeply and to

Mr. Neill is at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, England.

better effect about what a formula could and should achieve than anyone else, and his paper was not only important in itself but immensely fruitful in its consequences. Fredson Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description*,³ is dedicated to Greg, and in his Foreword he writes: "I have been the more emboldened to pursue, with certain modifications and extensions, the formulary of collation advocated by Dr. W. W. Greg, not only because I have been convinced of its logic but also because my experience has shown that it works more efficiently than any other." *Principles* is not an easy book, but it is of the first importance to anyone who wishes to understand the aims of, and perhaps later to attempt, bibliographical description. What Bowers's principles mean in practice can be seen in *George Sandys: A Bibliographical Catalogue of Printed Editions in England to 1700*,⁴ in which he collaborated with R. B. Davis. This *Catalogue* sets such a high standard of description and so well shows how necessary it is to examine as many copies as possible of each work described, that the dangers inherent in lesser standards is immediately apparent. In his article in the present number of *Library Trends*, Bowers lays stress on the fact that identification is not the sole end of descriptive bibliography, but it is nevertheless certain that an author bibliography which, by its paucity of detail, makes it impossible to distinguish between editions, or to identify an imperfect copy, fails at the lowest level.⁵ A bad bibliography, like a bad biography, is worse than no book at all; a good subject has been ruined to very little effect, and a publisher will naturally be reluctant to undertake the great expense of a properly organized bibliography within a short period of time.

This point will bear some laboring, for the users of bibliographies can and must make it clear that only the best is good enough for their purposes, and librarians have a special responsibility and opportunity in this matter both as users and producers. The claim that bibliography should be reserved for the dilettanti, for the amateurs, that the professionals are somehow spoiling an agreeable pastime is understandable, but it is a plea offered to the heart and not to the head, a plea that the bad coin should drive out the good, and it cannot be accepted.

A desire for high standards in descriptive bibliographies need not prevent one from justly estimating the value of enumerative bibliographies to which equally high, though different, standards are to be applied. The British Museum's special catalog of Early English books, published in 1884 in three volumes, ended at 1640 in order to avoid the mass of Civil War material, and was followed in this by the

Printed Books, 1640-1800

Bibliographical Society's *Short Title Catalogue* in 1926 and one must therefore recognize the extraordinary fortitude and determination shown by D. G. Wing of Yale University Library in undertaking the enormous task of compiling a *Short Title Catalogue* of books printed in the British Isles, and printed in English abroad, for the period 1641-1700 which was published in three volumes at New York between 1945 and 1951. The production and some of the final checking was affected by the war, and it is remarkable that the task was ever finished. It would be unwise, however, to underestimate its defects, as Wing was inclined to do in his article "Interim Report on the Second 'S.T.C.'" in *The Times Literary Supplement*.⁶ Anyone who uses Wing constantly, and regularly benefits from its merits, soon becomes aware of the large number of titles missing, which is greater than Wing allows. A friend of this writer, for instance, has already found a sufficient number of Catholic books to encourage him in his hope of eventually publishing a list of one hundred of them not listed in Wing.

Again, the constant user realizes how very poor the editing is in places; analytical entries relating to parts of books have been taken from old-fashioned catalogs and treated without due editorial suspicion or examination, as though they were complete units in themselves. The entries under Xenophon, for example, need to be considerably reduced in number for this reason. A difficulty in using Wing, though far from always being a defect in the arrangement, is that many of the principal libraries do not catalog anonymous books under the first word of the title (disregarding "A" and "The"), as Wing does, and this means that books appear to be rarer than they are.⁷ This by itself may cause no great inconvenience, but the price asked by a bookseller when he has one of these books often brings sharply home to the would-be buyer how seriously the number of copies recorded is taken by the trade, despite Wing's warning in the preface that "This is not a census of copies."⁸ The difference in the headings used for anonymous pieces by Wing and by the Bodleian Library, for example, means, to take only those for which less than five copies are recorded in England, that the latter often has, and has had since the date of their publication (sometimes an important point), a considerable number of books, pamphlets, and broadsides with which it is not credited.

Supplements to Wing have been compiled by J. E. Tucker (translations from the French);⁹ John Alden (Irish books);¹⁰ and by Mary I. Fry and Godfrey Davies;¹¹ and W. G. Hiscock's two lists record the presence in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford, of works (a) of

which fewer than five copies are recorded by Wing in Great Britain,¹² and (b) of press variant imprints, issues, editions, and works which are not in Wing.¹³

A check list of Scottish printing up to 1700 had already been compiled by H. G. Aldis in 1904, and one of Irish printing 1641-1700, by E. R. M. Dix in 1898.

Oxford books have been treated in greater detail by that indefatigable scholar the late Falconer Madan, in his three volumes of *Oxford Books* "1468" to 1680, and then in 1954 *A Chronological List of Oxford Books 1681-1713*, a "transcript from his notebooks," was published in a duplicated edition of twelve copies, four of which were sent to the Bodleian. Though printed in too small an edition for libraries to hope to possess it, this list is invaluable for those who can consult it in person or by letter. Anyone who has read the story of the inception of Wing's *Short Title Catalogue* will recall Madan's close connection with it.

For Cambridge books there is Robert Bowes's *Catalogue of Cambridge Books*, and *A List of Books Printed at the University Press, 1521-1800*,¹⁴ though it is no very difficult matter to find books not recorded in these two lists.

The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, together with its *Supplement*,¹⁵ is constantly of service, though it inevitably falls short of the claim in the blurb that "The four volumes of this Bibliography contain particulars of every writer and every book worthy of inclusion in a record of English Literature . . . to the beginning of this century." A great quantity of bibliographical information is to be found in the early sections of Volume 2, though these tend to be neglected while the entires under individual authors are more fully used and appreciated.

It would be possible at this point to fill several pages with lists—and useful lists—of subject and author bibliographies, but these can be found by an intelligent use of reference books and of the catalog of one's library. Here only one work will be singled out, the late Sir W. W. Greg's monumental *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 1939-1957*, of which three volumes were published before the author's death in March, the last volume being expected later this year.

It is more important to direct attention to some of the newly developed techniques, and to some of the ancillary lines of bibliographical investigation, which have come into being or into effective use since

Printed Books, 1640-1800

the war. The most important postwar investigation so far as the period 1640-1800 is concerned is W. B. Todd's work on press-figures. These are the symbols which are found at the foot of some of the pages in certain books and pamphlets published between the late seventeenth century¹⁶ and the beginning of the nineteenth century.¹⁷ In the beginning obelisks and daggers were used but gradually arabic numerals took their place. Press-figures generally occur on pages which are unsigned and, at the most, one expects to find only two figures to a sheet, one to each form, though very occasionally there are three. This is an absurdity and it is quite likely that not all copies would have the redundant third figure. There has been much discussion as to whether the figure relates to the press or to the press-men; since in some books the figure is as high as twenty-six and no printer in the eighteenth century, however successful, could have had as many presses as that, opinion tends towards the second explanation. But their significance is not easily grasped in books where there are not regularly two figures to a sheet, nor, indeed, even one to a sheet. Sometimes one finds figures right at the beginning and then not again until the end of the book. The problems of interpretation are not fully solved. Press-figures, however, provide one with a further aid to deciding whether two books are copies or not, though unless one has them both in front of one it will not always be possible to say with certainty whether they are different impressions or different editions. A further complication arises from the fact that it is not unknown for a (piratical) reprint, making fidelity its aim, to reproduce even the press-figures.¹⁸ Problems such as these require for their solution the use of the Hinman collating machine, which D. F. Foxon describes and discusses in his article in this issue.

Before the war, R. B. McKerrow, R. W. Chapman, and others had commented on these press-figures, and important conclusions were drawn from them in F. B. Kaye's 1924 edition of *The Fable of the Bees*, and in W. E. Knott's study of John Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*.¹⁹ Todd's thesis, *The Identity and Order of Certain XVIII Century Editions*, made widely available in 1949 as no. 433 in the University of Chicago Microfilm Editions, was based on a close study of a large number of works containing press-figures. He has published extracts from it in a number of different journals, generally taking one or more works and revealing the presence of unsuspected editions or impressions, and sometimes showing that so-called editions are really nothing more than impressions. Todd has considered their general significance

in "Observations on the Incidence and Interpretation of Press Figures."²⁰ He has directed attention to, and suggested how to use, largely neglected evidence, and it is to be hoped that before long the printing of the press-figure pattern, and, if possible, an explanation of its significance, will become a standard part of the bibliographical description of a press-figured book. His article on "Recurrent Printing" shows that the very success of this technique in exposing not strictly accurate claims of new "editions" made by the publisher, leads to problems of terminology, and Todd there suggests some new terms to fit the awkward facts.

Press-figures occur so little outside this period that a knowledge of how to interpret them, though useful for the early nineteenth-century bibliographer, is irrelevant to the specialist in the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and early Caroline periods, which hitherto have, by and large, provided the problems which led to the introduction of new bibliographical techniques.

The concentrated work on the *S.T.C.* period has encouraged such developments as the using of the evidence afforded by the patterns in running titles, and the measuring horizontally of the lines of type on different pages in a book to see if the same measure was used throughout. By means of the first, one can with luck,—that is, with enough patience and a fair supply of distinctive (sometimes bent or broken) letters or round brackets—determine how many skeletons were used, and discover whether the running titles were moved regularly from one position in one form to the same position in the next but one form, or not. This will show whether the printer was keeping pace with the compositors or not, and should in addition reveal the presence of cancel sheets and leaves, or of sheets inserted from another edition. The running-titles confirm, for example, the existence of two 1693 editions of John Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, and an examination of the pattern of their movements has revealed that in Locke's own copy of the first edition, now at the Bodleian Library, sheet K is from the later setting.²¹ A consideration of the evidence to be deduced from the second technique is included in Bowers's "Bibliographical Evidence from the Printer's Measure."²²

All these techniques depend upon a careful examination and measurement of the type. Commonplaceness and poverty of design is noticeable in many fonts of the period, and this makes it difficult, without very intensive study, to identify the printer from the type used. It is only later on in the eighteenth century that English typog-

Printed Books, 1640-1800

raphy changes from being a disgrace to the country to being a credit and an influence abroad. Caslon and Baskerville, who "reformed the English printing of their day," Bulmer and Bensley, and, in Scotland, the Wilson Foundry have had and are having a due measure of scholarly attention paid to them; their books are being listed, sometimes with bibliographical details, as for example in Philip Gaskell's *Baskerville* and his articles on the Foulis Press and the Wilson Foundry,²³ and their types described.²⁴ But the most hopeful means of identifying the printer of a book when the type is not particularly distinguished, is by the ornaments, initials, and factota.²⁵ This form of scrutiny is well-established for the *S.T.C.* period, but is in its infancy so far as the eighteenth-century period is concerned. In 1952, K. I. D. Maslen, a New Zealander, submitted a B. Litt. thesis at Oxford University on *Works from the Bowyer Press (1713-65): a Supplement to John Nichols* which included a small album of contact prints of ornaments etc., each of which was numbered, and reference was made, in the chronological list, to those used in the books, or part of books,²⁶ produced. With a similar aim Foxon, who is engaged in compiling a check list of English poetical pieces 1701-1750, is amassing a collection of prints of ornaments which will in all probability enable him to identify, for the first time, the printers of some of the important poems in this period.

A knowledge of the practices of the printer is sometime essential for the solution of a bibliographical problem. Since printing has always been a conservative trade, and the practices remained essentially the same for three hundred years or more, the more important English manuals for printers draw considerably on their predecessors. The first, and, in some ways, the most important, of them was Joseph Moxon's *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing, 1683-84*,²⁷ which was republished in 1958, edited by Harry Carter and Herbert Davis, at the very heavy price of £5.5.0.

Maslen's thesis was made possible by the presence in the Bodleian Library of William Bowyer's Paper Ledger which gives the debit and credit account of books in which he was concerned in terms of paper received from and copies delivered to the Stationer.²⁸ A still more important and far larger collection is William Strahan's ledgers most of which are now in the British Museum. Four were sold at auction recently and went to America, though microfilms are available at the British Museum.²⁹ These ledgers had previously been quoted from by R. A. Austen-Leigh in the second edition of *The Story of a*

*Printing House Being a Short Account of the Strahans and Spottiswoodes.*³⁰

The postwar technical advances in bibliography have been informed by a readiness to exploit the evidence of material used in the manufacture of a book. Overlooked or misinterpreted evidence has been re-examined, and discoveries, which were published some time since but were never appreciated and used as they deserved, have had to be made again.

Paper in certain circumstances has most important evidence to give, and A. H. Stevenson's articles, "New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence" and "Watermarks are Twins"³¹ have given instances of their value. In "Watermarks are Twins," Stevenson shows that the differences in the watermarks in a book are quite often to be explained as the result of the papers having come partly from one and partly from the other of the pair of molds with which the vatman and his coucher worked: one dipping, while the other released and stacked the newly-made sheets. He shows, too, that "The basic equation is: two watermarks similar but not identical equal one paper," and goes on to this conclusion: "Forty years ago Falconer Madan uttered his belief and warning: 'There is no such thing as as duplicate'." (Librarians have scarcely heeded him.) There is new truth in his words. In terms of mixed watermarks, twin watermarks, press variants, cancels, and the gathering of sheets, every copy of every book (above the rank of mere pamphlet) may be expected to differ from all others. Even a thin play-quarto "with one watermark throughout" yields startling arithmetical combinations: The bibliographer does well to remember that an irregularity in the occurrence or position of the watermark may reveal or confirm the presence of a cancel, or of leaves inserted from another copy.³²

The chances of finding the particular watermark in the book one is examining in any of the albums of examples are not very high but C. M. Briquet, W. A. Churchill, Edward Heawood and the others often provide something to which reference by comparison can be made. Interest in the history of paper and paper-making has grown greatly and all the publications of The Paper Publications Society merit attention, though even with the subscription method their prices are far above the means of most individuals. It is a tremendous advance that, with the publication of A. H. Shorter's *Paper Mills and Paper Makers in England*, a dictionary of mills, makers, and their marks is now available. One hopes that eventually from it will follow more

Printed Books, 1640-1800

histories of the individual firms and of the families which ran and run them, on the lines of Thomas Balston's two excellent volumes, *William Balston, Paper Maker, 1758-1849*, (1955) and *James Whatman, Father and Son*, (1957).

Harry Carter's *Wolvercote Mill: A Study in Paper-Making at Oxford*, (1957), tells the story of an individual mill which has had a very strong connection with, and is now owned by, the University Press at Oxford.

By the terms of 34 George III (1794)c.20 "An Act for repealing the duties on paper . . .," a drawback (a refund of part of the duty paid) was allowed on those quantities which were exported unused or in books, provided that the paper bore the date of manufacture. The Act remained in force until 1811, but watermarked dates continued until well on into the nineteenth century, and, since paper was generally used within a year or two, frequently are helpful in dating undated books.³³

A considerable number of books, pamphlets, and in particular, single sheets were published without a date, and the practice of the older library catalogs was to abandon the problem of dating them without the pretense of a struggle and to print the accurate but unhelpful initials "n.d." (no date), and often, when there was no place of publication, though quite frequently the names of one or more stationers was given, to add to this the equally dispiriting "n.p." (no place). It is as much the duty of the cataloger to deal with this sort of problem as to try to discover the name of the author of an anonymous work, and the Christian or other names represented by his initials. Help in dating can naturally be got from any relevant date within the book, from advertisements of other books at the end, and from the stationer's name and place of business, if it is given. P. G. Morrison has continued the essential work he did for S.T.C. by producing an *Index of Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short-title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700* in 1955. This period is also covered by the three volumes of *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers . . . 1641-1775*, compiled by H. R. Plomer and others and published in 1907, 1922, and 1932 respectively. These *Dictionaries* are very far from perfect and they leave a large gap at the end of the century. This is only partly filled by John Pendred's *The London and Country Printers, Booksellers and Stationers Vade Mecum*, 1785, edited in 1955 as *The Earliest Directory of the Book Trade* by H. G. Pollard who added an introduction and a number of valuable ap-

pendixes on, among other things, printers, booksellers, paper-mills, and directories.

Not many publishing firms have a history going back into the eighteenth century and such works as C. J. Longman's *The House of Longmans 1724-1800: A Bibliographical History*,³⁴ and Austen-Leigh's *Story of a Printing House*, which has been mentioned earlier, are particularly welcome. The results of more restricted inquiries have been made available by I. G. Philip in his essay, *William Blackstone and the Reform of the Oxford University Press in the Eighteenth Century*³⁵ and by Cyprian Blagden and Norma Hodgson's edition of *The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements*,³⁶ which has important information on congers and their place in the London book trade. Blagden is at present engaged in writing the history of the Stationers' Company and has published a number of articles on subjects arising from, and connected with, that work.

Books both newly published and reprinted were advertised in *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1708* which Edward Arber reprinted together with a *Number for Easter Term, 1711*, in three volumes, 1903-1906. Wing gives the *Term Catalogue* reference where relevant, and it is clear that, if a large number of books were not advertised there, there are on the other hand quite a number advertised of which copies have not yet been located. These catalogs can be to some extent supplemented, and additional information found, by searching the advertisement columns of newspapers. Unless one has access to a longish and complete run of any newspaper it is unwise to rely on an isolated advertisement announcing that "This Day is Published" such and such a book, for the advertisements were sometimes kept in for a matter of weeks and standing type was used in one issue after another.³⁷

Blagden has traced "The Genesis of the Term Catalogues" and has compiled a suggested list of the contents of "The Missing Term Catalogue" for Michaelmas Term, 1695. He has also published a valuable set of "Notes on the Ballad Market in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century," with a table by which one can date "rather more closely the (almost always) undated ballads printed for the members" of a group of booksellers operating between 1655-1692.³⁸

G. E. Briscoe Eyre edited *A Transcript of the Register of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640-1708*,³⁹ and a privately printed index for the period, 1710-1773 was published in 1910,⁴⁰ though the latter is not a well-arranged book. The Stationers' Registers have now all been filmed by University Microfilms and can therefore

Printed Books, 1640-1800

be much more widely consulted than before. The names of the book-sellers concerned in entering a book sometimes differ from those in the imprint, and the Registers should therefore never be forgotten, though one must expect to find that many a book was not entered at Stationers' Hall "as the Act directs."

In a full-scale descriptive author-bibliography the list of copies seen of each book should pay attention to their binding and to their provenance, subjects which are sometimes closely linked. It is always interesting, and is sometimes vitally important, to know who were the former owners of books; if, for example, the sale catalog shows that Richard Heber had a copy of a certain book and none of those so far seen is his, then the probability is that at least one copy—and in all likelihood a good, if not fine, copy—remains to be found. The provenance of books is being more and more studied and this interest in part stems from Seymour de Ricci's Sandars lectures of 1929-30.⁴¹ De Ricci had an enormous collection of sale catalogs which helped him to trace the history of a book or manuscript from one collection to another. He appreciated to the full the value of these catalogs, and it would be better were his enthusiasm shared by more librarians.

The binding is one of the unique facts about a book; if it is in a dated binding by a well-known binder, perhaps with a famous owner's instructions tipped-in, the evidence is full and clear. The binding, however, may be the work of an obscure London or provincial binder who has escaped the searches of Ellic Howe⁴² and the late C. F. I. Ramsden,⁴³ and its first interest is as evidence of the unknown workman's existence. In an undated binding the endpapers may bear a watermark date or have an inscription of ownership which will suggest a date.⁴⁴

The identification of binders by their tools requires a keen memory for detail, a wide acquaintance with examples of their work and a plentiful file of rubbings to supplement the illustrations available in catalogs. H. M. Nixon regularly contributes an article on "English Bookbinding" with a plate to *The Book Collector*, and is the author, for example, of the superbly produced *Styles and Designs of Bookbindings from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century*,⁴⁵ based on A. Ehrman's rich collection known as the Broxbourne Library.

The numerous techniques being devised by bibliographers, principally to subject the quarto and the folio texts of Shakespeare's plays to the closest possible scrutiny, all have as their purpose and discovery of the nature, and then the recovery of the readings, of the copy

text behind the printed words, and in some cases this text was a manuscript. Only a handful of manuscripts has survived from the early period which were certainly used as printer's copy, and there are not many for the later period. The manuscript of Pope's "Essay on Criticism" (1721), for instance is on display in the New Bodleian Library, showing the marks of casting-off, and his "Windsor Forest" (1712), now at Washington University, has been reprinted in a facsimile edited by R. M. Schmitz in St. Louis (1952). The survivors, particularly valuable if the printer can be identified, enable the bibliographer to follow the history of the book from manuscript to print, to estimate the degree of compositorial interference, and perhaps to identify the further thoughts of the author when he saw his work in proof.

The lines of investigation, and the list of books and articles relating to them, are obviously and necessarily incomplete, since it is here intended only to draw attention to some of the most prominent and valuable, while recognizing that others exist which in particular cases may prove to be more valuable.⁴⁶ Much that has not been referred to is to be found by using G. W. Cole's *Index to Bibliographical Papers Published by the Bibliographical Society and the Library Association, London, 1877-1932*.⁴⁷ The publications, be they proceedings, transactions, or monographs of the bibliographical societies of such universities and cities as Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow (newly revived), London, Oxford, Virginia, and the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* are rich in easily-overlooked works, articles, and notes of importance. The "Selective Check List of Bibliographical Scholarship" published annually in *Studies in Bibliography* began in Volume 3 with the year 1949, and is a god-send. The Check List for 1955, omitted from Volume 9, was printed first in Volume 10, which principally consisted of a reprint of the indexes for the years 1949-1954, with a cumulative index for the seven years. This volume is the nearest thing in print to the urgently needed successor to Cole.

So much for the past and the present, but what of the future? The postwar revolution in bibliographical methods has confirmed the view, if one may adapt Chesterton's words, that "Bibliography has not been tried and found wanting; it has been tried and found difficult." Much of the dissatisfaction, even disgust, which some librarians and literary critics feel for bibliography arises from this fact; they are not prepared to undertake the hard work necessary to master the theories and techniques. Extravagant claims for bibliography have further

Printed Books, 1640-1800

excited feelings of hostility in those already little disposed to favor it. With the final words of his last Sanders' lecture Bowers summarized the limits of the part it can play when he said that "Bibliography is a good servant but a bad master."⁴⁸ What can the "good servant" do for the eighteenth century? It has already made most prewar bibliographical analyses obsolete and dangerous, and it must now set about constructive work. Earlier it was implied that there are scarcely any reliable author bibliographers for this period, and Todd's bibliography of Burke, to be published in the Soho Series, is therefore awaited with great interest. Important in its own right, it will, one feels sure, set standards for the future. Then, in the field of subject bibliographies, there is Bowers's own bibliography of the Restoration drama, to which he has referred in his article in this issue; the publication of this great work will, among other things, demonstrate that the detailed examination of many copies of a work against a control copy is the only rational way of getting books to reveal the secrets of their printing and publication. Such an examination will reveal facts which collateral evidence may confirm, but cannot establish.

Detailed studies of printers, their type and their ornaments are wanted; much more work should be done on booksellers—the revision of H. R. Plomer and his collaborators' heroic work is recognized as essential, but it has not yet been begun. Dare one hope that the Bibliographical Society will commission an editor or editors to gather material for new editions? The technique of compositor determination clearly has something to offer bibliographers working on the eighteenth century and Arthur Friedman has apparently done some work on Goldsmith along those lines. Instead of using spelling tests it will be necessary for the bibliographer to examine the capitalization, italicization, and punctuation—on which Swift and Pope, for example, seem to have held decided views. The almost total lack of variant spellings is counter-balanced by the greater quantity of surviving manuscript material which can be used as a control in any investigation of compositorial tendencies.

All these will help the bibliographer in his essential, if inevitably unsuccessful, struggle for completeness and accuracy. Now that printing costs, especially for bibliographies, have become so great, economy must insure, as good sense has always indicated, that preliminary check lists, perhaps only photocopied from typewriting, should be circulated to important libraries and to well-known collectors before any full author bibliography begins to reach the stage of printing. The greater

circulation of more material in a tentative form cheaply reproduced, cannot but benefit the author and the users of works of bibliographical scholarship. Librarians must play their part in this, both by being able to understand, use, and appreciate—if necessary, to criticize—the new techniques, and by doing all they can to answer bibliographical inquiries and to institute them where necessary, and, if possible, to dovetail into this the work which they have on hand in their private capacities. If the librarian rejects bibliography his professional ability can only suffer; he will buy the important editions only by accident, he will quote from the best text only by accident. He will indeed be a blind guide, at one with the literary critic who “has investigated the past ownership and mechanical condition of his second-hand automobile, or the pedigree and training of his dog, more thoroughly than he has looked into the qualifications of text on which his critical theories rest.”⁴⁹

Bibliographical Notes

1. Wordsworth, W.: A Poet's Epitaph. In: *Poetical Works*. Edited by Ernest de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire. vol. 4. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1947, p. 67.

2. Greg, W. W.: A Formulary of Collation. *The Library*, 4th series, 14:365-382, Mar. 1934.

3. Bowers, F. T.: *Principles of Bibliographical Description*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1949.

4. Bowers, F. T., and Davis, R. B.: George Sandys: A Bibliographical Catalogue of Printed Editions in England to 1700. *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 54:159-181, April 1950; 54:223-244, May 1950; 54:280-286, June 1950. (Also separately printed.)

5. It is imperative that, even if much the same wording is used on the title page of successive editions, these constant words should be printed each time, and, as this writer sees it, there are two reasons for this: (a) It is hard enough for the bibliographer to insure accuracy in his description when faithfully reproducing every word of the original, without giving himself the additional burden of insuring that the line-endings and omitted words are the same, say, in the tenth as in the sixth edition. If he makes a mistake the normal becomes a variant and his work has been in vain.

(b) The second reason is practical. If one is comparing a book with the pseudo-facsimile transcription in a bibliography it is often difficult to keep both books open and in use, and to have, in addition, to refer several pages back in the bibliography to the full transcription adds a complication which leads at best to annoyance, and at worst to inaccuracy.

6. Wing, D. G.: Interim Report on the Second “S.T.C.” *The Times Literary Supplement*, 57:648, Nov. 7, 1958.

7. Some booksellers feel that a book not in Wing should never be listed at less than £5 however obscure the author or unreadable the book.

Printed Books, 1640-1800

8. Though a book is recorded only at two or three libraries, there may be at one or more of them two, three, four, five or more copies. Few libraries will be able to exceed W. G. Hiscock's discovery that the library of Christ Church, Oxford, has eighteen copies of Wing S4592 (British Museum copy only in Wing), and thirty-three copies of H3698 (two in the United Kingdom, four in America). *The Times Literary Supplement*, 55:544, Sept. 14, 1956. Both of these are as nothing in comparison with S.T.C. 8953: one copy is recorded at the Record Office in London, but there are 163 unrecorded copies at Cambridge (teste J. C. T. Oates).

9. Tucker, J. E.: Wing's Short-Title Catalogue and Translations from the French, 1641-1700. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 49:37-67, First Quarter, 1955.

10. Alden, John: *Bibliographica Hibernica: Additions and Corrections to Wing*. Charlottesville, Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1955.

11. Fry, Mary I., and Davies, Godfrey: Supplements to the Short-Title Catalogue, 1641-1700. *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 16:393-436, Aug. 1953.

12. Hiscock, W. G.: *The Christ Church Holdings in Wing's Short-Title Catalogue 1641-1700 of Books of which less than five copies are recorded in the United Kingdom*. [Oxford?] 1956. Duplicated.

13. Hiscock, W. G.: *The Christ Church Supplement to Wing's Short-Title Catalogue, 1641-1700*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1956.

14. Bowes, Robert: *Catalogue of Books Printed at or Relating to the University, Town, and County of Cambridge*. Cambridge, Macmillan and Bowes, 1894. *A List of Books Printed in Cambridge at the University Press, 1521-1800*. Cambridge, University Press, 1935.

15. Bateson, F. W., ed.: *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. 4 vols. Cambridge, University Press, 1940. *Supplement*, 1957. The *Supplement* has been the subject of some searching reviews, for example: Hanson, L. W.: *The Library*, 5th series, 13:208-210, Sept. 1958; Kolb, G. J.: *Modern Philology*, 56:197-203, Feb. 1959.

16. Madan noticed them in the Oxford Bible in English of 1679, (Madan 3243) but misunderstood their purpose; there four symbols are used: round brackets, asterisk, dagger, and double dagger. The earliest use of Arabic numerals known to the writer is in the *Book of Common Prayer*, Oxford, 1685. It is unfortunate that it is undated, but since King James II and Queen Mary are prayed for—and the leaves on which the prayers are printed are not cancels—it cannot be earlier than 1685 or later than June 1688, when the Prince of Wales was born.

17. The practice seems to have been completely abandoned by about 1830.

18. Giles E. Dawson has proved that this was the case with the later surreptitious reprint, one of the two editions of *Othello* dated 1724. See: Dawson, G. E.: Three Shakespeare Piracies in the Eighteenth Century. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*. vol. 1. Charlottesville, The Society, 1948-49, pp. 49-58.

19. Knotts, W. E.: Press Numbers as a Bibliographical Tool. A Study of Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*. *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 3:198-212, Spring 1949.

20. Todd, W. B.: Observations on the Incidence and Interpretation of Press Figures. *Studies in Bibliography*, 3:171-205, 1950-51; Recurrent Printing. *Studies in Bibliography*, 12:189-198, 1959.

D. G. NEILL

21. The late Sir Frederic Kenyon wrote to *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1933 (32:276, April 20, 1933) asking where the second edition was to be found. Dudley Massey in a letter published in the same paper (36:156, Feb. 27, 1937) distinguished between the two editions, but, though in his own words, "they differed throughout," he concluded that they were "two variant states." They are quite clearly editions. It is a good illustration of the extraordinary and irrational attraction that the word "issue" has for booksellers and others that even today, the first edition of *Some Thoughts* is offered for sale as "the first issue of the first edition," though it is known that it comes from a different setting of type.

22. Bowers, F. T.: Bibliographical Evidence from the Printer's Measure. *Studies in Bibliography*, 2:153-167, 1949-50.

23. Gaskell, Philip: The Early Work of the Foulis Press and the Wilson Foundry. *The Library*, 5th series, 7:77-110, June 1952.

24. See also the relevant sections in, Reed, T. B.: *A History of the Old English Letter Foundries*. New ed., rev. and enl. by A. F. Johnson. London, Faber and Faber, 1952; and Updike, D. B.: *Printing Types*. . . Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1951.

25. W. M. Sale, Jr., illustrates Richardson's ornaments and distinguishes them from similar ornaments used by other printers in: *Samuel Richardson, Master Printer*. (Cornell Studies in English vol. 37) Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1950.

26. Bowyer, for instance, printed sheets T-Y of the second edition of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). See: Maslen, K. I. D.: The Printers of Robinson Crusoe. *The Library*, 5th series, 7:124-131, June 1952.

27. Moxon, Joseph: *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing, 1683-84*. Edited by Harry Carter and Herbert Davis. London, Oxford University Press, 1958.

28. See Herbert Davis's lecture: Bowyer's Paper Stock Ledger. *The Library*, 5th series, 6:73-87, Sept. 1951.

29. William Strahan. Autograph Manuscript Account Books and Journals. *Sotheby's Catalogue*, lot 616, Dec. 9-11, 1957.

30. Austen-Leigh, R. A.: William Strahan and His Ledgers. *The Library*, 4th series, 3:261-287, Mar. 1923.

31. Stevenson, A. H.: New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence. *Studies in Bibliography*, 1:149-182, 1948-49. Watermarks are Twins, *Studies in Bibliography*, 4:57-91, 1951-52.

32. The deplorable habit of silently making-up copies by the insertion of leaves, or of altering their original state by moving advertisements or manuscript material from one copy to another should not require any condemnation; yet librarians as well as booksellers are at times guilty of it. The imperfection caused in certain plays at the British Museum (some of them once David Garrick's copies) by the stealing of leaves from them was the starting point of Foxon's inquiry, which led to the publication of his excellent monograph, *Thomas J. Wise and the Pre-Restoration Drama*. Some of the plays fall in the S.T.C. periods, but Foxon's skill in devising techniques—for example, the measurement of the distance between the stab holes, and the argument from the impression which a creased leaf makes in the following leaf—deserves the warmest praise and serves as an example for investigators in any period.

Printed Books, 1640-1800

33. C. B. Oldman drew attention to this Act in his note: Watermark Dates in English Paper. *The Library*, 4th series, 25:70-71, June-Sept. 1944-45.
34. Longman, C. J.: *The House of Longmans 1724-1800: A Bibliographical History*. Edited by J. E. Chandler. London, New York, Longmans, 1936.
35. Philip, I. G. *William Blackstone and the Reform of the Oxford University Press in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford, Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, 1957.
36. Blagden, Cyprian, and Hodgson, Norma: *The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements*. Oxford, Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, 1956.
37. Other uses and dangers are discussed by W. B. Todd in: On the Use of Advertisements in Bibliographical Studies. *The Library*, 5th series, 8:174-187, Sept. 1953.
38. Blagden, Cyprian: The Genesis of the Term Catalogues. *The Library*, 5th series, 8:30-35, Mar. 1953; The Missing Term Catalogue. *Studies in Bibliography*, 7:185-190, 1955; Notes on the Ballad Market in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century. *Studies in Bibliography*, 6:161-180, 1954.
39. Eyre, G. E. B.: *A Transcript of the Register of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, from 1640-1708*. 3 vols. London, Privately Printed, 1913-14.
40. *Index of Titles and Proprietors of Books Entered in the Book of Registry of the Stationers' Company*. . . . [1910].
41. De Ricci, Seymour: *English Collectors of Books and Manuscripts (1530-1930) and Their Marks of Ownership*. Cambridge, University Press, 1930.
42. Howe, Ellic: *A List of London Bookbinders, 1648-1815*. London, Bibliographical Society, 1950; Howe, Ellic: *The London Bookbinders, Masters and Men, 1780-1806*. London, Dropmore Press, 1950; Howe, Ellic, and Child, John: *The Society of London Bookbinders, 1780-1951*. London, Sylvan Press, 1952.
43. Ramsden, C. F. I.: *Bookbinders of the United Kingdom (Outside London) 1780-1840*. London, Privately Printed, 1954; *London Bookbinders 1780-1840*. London, Batsford, 1956.
44. Manuscript notes should always be carefully studied; this will hardly be questioned by anyone who knows the story of the discovery that the Chatsworth copy of Walter Hylton's *Scala Perfectionis* had been inscribed and presented by Lady Margaret Beaufort and Elizabeth of York—a discovery made after the sale. Dated notes of ownership are particularly useful, if used with discretion, when trying to date an undated book.
45. Nixon, H. M.: *Broxbourne Library. Styles and Designs of Bookbindings from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century*. London, Published for the Broxbourne Library by Maggs Bros., 1956.
46. Edmund Burke's correspondence, of which a large amount has been preserved, has, for example, a number of letters referring to cancels in his work. In 1952, Myers and Company (Booksellers) Ltd. of New Bond Street, offered for sale a letter of his about leaves which must be cancelled in the second of the *Two Letters* on a Regicide Peace, (1796). (Myers 371/62).
47. Cole, G. W.: *Index to Bibliographical Papers*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press for the Bibliographical Society of America, 1933.
48. Bowers, F. T.: *Textual and Literary Criticism*. Cambridge, 1959, p. 116.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 5.