FOUR FACES OF BIBLIOGRAPHY

My somewhat cinema-marquee title, "Four Faces of Bibliography," came to me with some vague idea of the four points of the compass, but then the notion of the Greek masks worn according to the type of drama and the persona of the characters began to seem pertinent. I leave it an open question which is the tragic or the comic mask of bibliography, the tragical-historical, or the tragical-comical-historical-pastoral; whether it is bibliography indivisible, or bibliography unlimited, how far the law of writ runs and how far liberty.

I gather that this colloquium may become an historical event, a seminal attempt to systematize the field of Canadian bibliography. I hope so. I hope that with the exercise of that noted Canadian rigour and thoroughness you can furnish an example to other regions, not least that area that lies on your southern borders. But systematizing implies that one knows where one is going, and why — that the principles are fixed and accepted, and that it is only the implementation of these principles that needs setting in order and a logical extension. In certain areas of bibliography I am not certain that, in fact, the principles are understood or accepted. There may be some excuse, then, for an attempt on my part to bring the four masks on the stage, with some few comments and illustrations that will touch on their nature and distinctive expressions.

I conceive of bibliography as separable into four major fields: enumerative, descriptive, analytical, and textual. Each field can be ploughed separately. A scholar can spend his whole life within one boundary. That is a virtue, but it is also a virtue that each field is not separated from the other by stone walls. We must not forget that Robert Frost was ironic when he made use of the old saw that good walls make good neighbours. Each of these four areas of bibliography is, in fact, interdependent, and each merges — sometimes almost imperceptibly — into the other. A scholar, then, may concentrate, but he should always be conscious of his place in the whole spectrum and aware that he holds hands with his neighbours to the right and to the left. I will not say that the order I have stated for these divisions — enumerative, descriptive, analytical, and textual — is necessarily an ascending one in any aristocratic sense. I do not propose to make value judgments that could scarcely be defended. I do remark that there is something of a pyramidal effect, however. I am minded of the medieval belief in the ascending order of all created things in the world, each rising category containing within itself all the elements of those below as well as the new element that it contributed. Objects like stones had substance; vegetation had substance and growth; animals had substance, growth, and sense; man had substance, growth, sense, and soul.

This expanding comprehensiveness is also true for bibliography. The base of the pyramid is surely enumerative bibliography, the systematic collection and preliminary identification of specimens of the printed and written word. The more detailed and accurate identification and investigation of such materials as seem worth the effort occupies descriptive bibliography. Analytical bibliography

faces two ways. Accurate and meaningful description cannot be written unless the books have first been subjected to analytical examination, at least in their externals. To that extent, one cannot be a good descriptive bibliographer without first having had some training as an analyst. On the other hand, the application of analytical bibliography to textual problems differs in proposed results from the aims of description, even though eventually many of the analytical findings about text prove to be of service to description. Textual bibliography may not be, like mathematics, the queen of the sciences but it cannot be practised until the ground has been cleared by enumeration, clarified and ordered by description, investigated by analysis. There may also be a rising scale of difficulty in these areas: at least — whether because of popular requirements or of natural selection — there are more enumerative bibliographers than descriptive, and more analytical than textual. I should, of course, mention a fifth area although I am not prepared to discuss it. This is historical bibliography, the study of the history of the implements of printing like type, presses, paper, inks; or of the records of printing like the accounts kept by the seventeenth-century Cambridge University Press, the eighteenth-century publisher Strahan, or the nineteenth-century Ticknor and Fields. The products of this research may sometimes have the most intimate application to any of the four methods I have cited. And, of course, we must not neglect that subdivision of the historical that might be called aesthetic bibliography, the history of type and book design as an art.

It is not my purpose to give a text-book analysis of the four or five divisions in which I am most interested. I am aware that I am preaching to the converted, to an audience that is more knowledgeable than I am in certain of these tools of the trade and thus in its understanding of the disciplines. Instead, within my categories I propose to touch briefly on certain special problems in the nineteenth century that come crowding to my mind from personal experience. They are problems because they are sometimes overlooked or undervalued and hence have received insufficient attention. They are also problems that I hope will have a special pertinence to any systematic proposals that may arise in the future from this colloquium.

My experiences in editing two nineteenth-century American authors — Hawthorne and Stephen Crane, with an excursion or two into Walt Whitman — have shown me the particular weakness that exists in the simple collection level of enumerative bibliography. I fancy that the problem arises because few attempts have been made towards organizing the efforts of individual scholars. In Evans and in Blanck we have comprehensive listing of books, in Blanck with detailed descriptions. But I am concerned with the much more difficult problems of periodical publication. Scholars are likely to tackle the collection of serialized publication on an author-by-author basis. This strikes me as a wasteful and inefficient method. The same newspapers and magazines that are searched to find the periodical appearances of Stephen Crane's stories and journalism must be gone over by another scholar concerned with W.D. Howells, say, or Edgar Saltus. This is a sad duplication of effort. Moreover, in my experience it is done very badly on an author basis because most scholars do not have the facilities or

the financial support (which is the same thing) to be sufficiently comprehensive. As a result, enumerative lists of periodical publications of individual authors are seldom if ever complete. Indeed, few efforts have been made toward completeness except, say, to secure an example of one periodical appearance, at least, for every serialized or syndicated work. This last is usually thought to be sufficient to provide scholars with the necessary text, but I assure you it is not. Historically, it distorts the picture of the popularity of particular works, of the audience that they received. In the Williams and Starrett *Bibliography of Stephen Crane*, which by conventional standards is an admirable compilation, ordinarily only one newspaper publication is listed. This selectiveness has obscured some vital historical information. The reader would never know from the listing that only the *Nebraska State Journal* seems to have printed on May 22, 1895, the first of Crane's Mexican fables, "The Voice of the Mountain." At least forty-one other newspapers my assistants have searched never ran this or its successors. On the other hand, an impressionistic sketch of his daily-life observations in Mexico, syndicated only three days earlier, was run by at least nine newspapers of the forty-two examined, although the bibliography lists only a single appearance also. One sketch of New York Bowery life entitled "In the Tenderloin," on November 1, 1896, was confined to the *New York Journal*. One month later a similar sketch, "In Minetta Lane," appeared in the *New York Herald* and in six other newspapers throughout the country. These variations are important critically for his American audience's knowledge of what Crane wrote besides *The Red Badge of Courage*; and they are also important as standards of taste — why did one newspaper accept a particular Mexican sketch and reject another? They are biographically important as they reveal his associations with different syndicates, not always mentioned in the newspapers listed in Williams and Starrett. It is not at all unusual to find the clue to whether an article was a McClure or a Bacherler syndication in only one newspaper out of eight or ten, and often in quite obscure journals.

For textual critics, any enumerative bibliography that does not list all known appearances in multiple form is misleading and dangerous. Editors of Crane's journalism have not had the private resources nor the curiosity to pursue printings other than the single newspaper listed by Williams and Starrett. But when with resources supplied by the federal government and the curiosity of a textual bibliographer I was able to have forty-two newspapers searched, the results were usually of the highest importance. It frequently turned out that the New York newspaper text listed in the standard bibliography was either incomplete or else was the most corrupt of all the versions. In the Spanish-American war dispatches my assistants recovered several thousand words of Crane's writing, previously unknown, scattered through his recorded reports but cut in the New York newspaper though printed in full in Chicago, or Kansas City, or San Francisco, or Omaha. In various war dispatches but also in some of his city-life sketches, the *New York Sun* customarily rewrote his articles; yet these sophisticated texts have been accepted as Crane's true text because editors did not bother to search out other newspaper printings when the information was not available in the standard bibliography. To get down to the ultimate

refinement, let me add that we discovered not only in New York but also in Philadelphia and no doubt in other cities that the text of a Crane war dispatch might vary according to whether it was printed in the city or in the out-of-town edition. This is a possibility not envisaged in any enumerative bibliography I happen to have seen, but it exists as an ever-present danger. Four or five hundred words of his most famous Spanish-American war dispatch on the taking of San Juan Hill have never been reprinted in edited texts because they were present in the city edition but cut in the out-of-town edition of the *New York Journal* that is most commonly on file, especially at the Library of Congress. In fact it takes some doing to locate a file of the *New York Journal's* city edition in 1898. For some obscure reason, the Minnesota Historical Society seems to have the best. Even more disturbing, we found that in Crane's most famous Graeco-Turkish war dispatch, the battle of Velesino, the text was rewritten in two completely different versions, one for the city and the other for the out-of-town *Journal* edition. The relationship of both of these to Crane's actual cable, as it could be reconstructed in part from other appearances of the same story in still somewhat different versions in Chicago, Philadelphia, Kansas City, and Omaha, was of singular importance to the editing of an authoritative text. Newspaper syndicated texts can vary considerably between New York and other cities, and not just in simple cuts. The *Journal* received Crane's Graeco-Turkish war cables and many of his Spanish-American war dispatches and would ordinarily put these on the wire to subscribing newspapers in earlier stages of editing the typescript than that represented by its own final published version. Thus to recover the pure Crane text with the least amount of *Journal* rewriting, the *Chicago Tribune* was usually more authoritative than the originator, the *New York Journal*.

These are enumerative problems that might never have been uncovered had it not been for the requirements of textual bibliography. They serve to highlight the need for comprehensive newspaper enumeration of literary works. This must be a co-operative enterprise, government or foundation funded, and destined for preservation in a computer bank. And it must be started soon, newspaper by newspaper, year by year, through the whole nineteenth century before these newspapers crumble to dust. The files are becoming mutilated by time and by use, there are not many files extant, and these are often of mixed or unidentified editions. Canadian literary study will be the poorer if your newspapers are not systematically searched and indexed for poems, essays, articles, stories, and reviews about and by Canadian authors. Time is running out, I warn you. These newspapers are disintegrating and they have immensely valuable material locked up in them, unknown and untouched.

Is there a comprehensive index of material in Canadian magazines in the nineteenth century? If so, you are more fortunate than we in the United States, who have nothing of the sort. One New York magazine called *Truth* in the late nineteenth century that printed several Crane stories as well as work by other important authors exists to my knowledge in only one major file, that at the University of Idaho, and even it is incomplete. Nor is it available on microfilm. We had to send in a camera crew from Minneapolis to have films made of the years when Crane was writing for the magazine so that we could check the

accuracy of the Williams and Starrett listings.

There is another aspect of this textual need for comprehensive listings in enumerative bibliographies. When an author's works are syndicated, the syndicate has them put into type and proofs are pulled from this typesetting and dispatched to member newspapers for publication on a fixed date. Each newspaper sets up its own type using the common proof as copy. As a result, any individual newspaper text is one stage removed from the proof, which in turn is one stage removed from the manuscript. No single newspaper text can be trusted to be authoritative, therefore. From a composite collation of as many texts as possible an editor can attempt to weed out errors and ultimately to recover from the various imperfect documents the purer readings of the lost common proof. His edited text, thus, will usually differ from that in any individual newspaper, for all compositors will depart from their copy in various respects. But an editor cannot recover his author's text from these multiple witnesses if the enumerative bibliographer has not told him where to go to secure the raw material for his analysis.

Somewhat similarly, when an author's work is printed in two or more magazines the texts may perhaps not derive one from another but instead may radiate independently from a common typescript and its carbons. In such cases no one magazine text has superior technical authority to any other, and an editor must undertake to recover the lost typescript text from the evidence of the two or more magazines. This is a technique of editing that is almost invariably ignored, but it is an important one, and its advanced methods of editorial analysis are completely dependent upon adequate enumerative information about magazine text sources. Even derivation of one magazine text from another may have evidence of editorial significance. For instance, the English editorial changes from Crane's manuscript of "The Scotch Express" as distinct from his own typescript alterations may be discovered from the fact that the American *McClure's Magazine* text was set from an early proof of the English *Cassell's Magazine* before these unauthoritative changes were made. Correspondingly, the book edition of Crane's *Great Battles of the World* was set from the uncorrected proofs of *Lippincott's* magazine texts, and thus offer here and there the opportunity to recover what Crane actually wrote instead of what the magazine editor thought he should have written.

Just so, even when the transmission of a series of texts within journals is not in question, the relation of any periodical to book publication is usually significant. Again, editors have overlooked the value of what they have regarded as comparatively ephemeral and preliminary publication, and they have tended to regard the book as the only authority. This textual blindness has created a situation in which practically every nineteenth-century English and American novelist who was serialized needs to have his works re-edited. It also means that libraries and private collectors cannot put too much emphasis upon the accumulation not just of first editions but of the more difficult to come by magazine and newspaper versions of an author's text, and that bibliographers must give these texts their fullest attention. Indeed, whenever there is international publication textual problems of particular significance are likely to

arise. Kathleen Tillotson found a stretch of the most authoritative text of *Oliver Twist* in an obscure Philadelphia edition. Unknown to his American publishers, James Gould Cozzens was in the habit of revising the proofs of his English editions so that in many respects they offer a more authoritative text than the original American publications, which have still not been revised.

I have taken a disproportionate amount of time on this problem of indexing newspaper and magazine publication for material of literary and historical interest because I take it to be the most pressing and certainly one of the most fruitful tasks for an enumerative bibliographer of the nineteenth century. It goes without saying, however, that every prominent nineteenth-century Canadian author deserves a full-dress descriptive bibliography. The records of this detailed form serve as a particular stimulus to book-collecting and thus to the dissemination of fresh information, until finally what one hopes will be a definitive study for historical, biographical, critical, and textual purposes can be built up. And it is not to be overlooked by librarians that book-collectors are prone eventually to generous impulses.

The general formula for the presentation of material in full-fledged descriptive bibliographies is by this time tolerably well established. But it should not be allowed to harden into dogma. David Foxon has queried the usefulness and certainly the practicability of detailed description for vast eighteenth-century compilations. Something of the same sort of problem may well face nineteenth-century Canadian bibliography. In some respects the questions of practicability do indeed begin to enter as one goes down the pecking order of authors and arrives at relatively minor figures unless, as I urge, bibliographies are as much a part of publishing history as they are the technical biography of a man's literary efforts. Yet I must emphasize that we cannot rest on our oars in nineteenth-century descriptive bibliography. As the hand-press gives way to power, as printing from type-metal is modified by the use of stereotype plates, and as in the latter years the linotype machine produces its peculiar revolution, it might superficially seem that the need for comparison of multiple copies would diminish because the kinds of variants that delight the bibliographer of the seventeenth century are rare indeed if not non-existent under the changed conditions of the nineteenth. Yet nothing could be farther from the truth. Complexity is still present, though in a different form. If it is unlikely that the presses will be stopped to insert authorial or shop press-corrections as in Elizabethan days, it is not unlikely that changes in stereotype plates will be made within a series of well-concealed small printings, sometimes of no more than two to three hundred copies. The most scrupulous attention needs to be given to minor binding variants in the cloth, stamping, and endpapers as a clue to possible printings, even though often these variants represent only different bindings-up of identical sheets. Yet they may start one off on the search for other evidence that will prove rewarding. One must pay attention to the weight and quality of the paper, to variant gathering not always in agreement with the signatures, and even to the wear of the plates and the evidence of progressive batter, the purpose being to distinguish and if possible to order concealed printings that are so very characteristic of the nineteenth century, printings that

may need textual examination for variation that might or might not be authorial. Even if the textual examination is negative, the number of different printings is a matter of importance for the full record of an author's publishing history. In some respects, then, the evidence for variation that in the Elizabethan age knocks at one's consciousness for recognition, conceals itself very quietly in the nineteenth century. If anything, the standards required of the investigative stage of nineteenth-century descriptive bibliography are more rigorous and scrupulous than those for earlier periods.

In this connection I urge a continuing dialogue on the usefulness of the different items conventional in descriptions. Is there more virtue in a small line cut of a title page than in a quasi-facsimile transcript? Are detailed lists of contents necessary? Is the signature collational formula still meaningful or is the pagination formula sufficient? In the pagination is it of any real use to list every unnumbered page whenever the omission of the page numbering is conventional, as on section titles and their blank versos or on pages that begin chapters? Is it worthwhile to transcribe all headings in quasi-facsimile? I must say some years ago I was horrified to see a bibliography of a nineteenth-century poet that down to the last reprint faithfully transcribed every heading, yards and yards of them. What about the value of the description and measurement of type? Is it necessary to have a gadget that will measure the thickness of a leaf of paper to within a thousandth of a millimetre? The list of queries is a long one that should be re-examined not merely on an opinionated basis but after experience and from an informed point of view of their practical value. My own experience is that the discussants of this problem are sometimes confused because they have not come to a broad enough conclusion about the purposes of bibliographical description. It is quite true that identification is important. That when a collector or a librarian holds a copy of a book in his hand and compares it with a bibliographical description he is concerned to be given enough detail to enable him to decide whether the book he holds is physically identical with the copy the bibliographer held when he described it, or that it differs in certain specific ways according to the bibliographer's record of variance, or even that his copy differs in ways unknown to the bibliographer who wrote the description. It is legitimate to ask, in this connection, what are the differences normally to be expected between copies of nineteenth-century books and then to enquire whether the details of the description are actually suited to identify them or whether modification or substitution of other details would be more useful than the standard set. After all, what *are* the major problems of identification in the nineteenth century? Are they likely to be previously unknown editions, close reprints, piracies, press-variant imprints, reprinted gatherings, cancelled leaves with substitution, and so on, as in the days of hand printing, or are they more likely to be concealed impressions or printings than unknown editions, modified plates, remainder issues, and so on? According to the problems, what can be done to adjust the details of the description in the direction of greater usefulness for the detection of variation? Can they be better adapted, or are the problems of a nature not susceptible of detection by any terms of bibliographical description unless the bibliographer has himself recognized and noted them?

Unquestionably, a more subtle and often more searching examination is needed by a bibliographer of nineteenth-century books if we are to require of him the record of replated pages than if we do not. To give one practical example that I shall illustrate in a moment, should we begin in this century to add as a standard item the gutter-measurements of books — that is, the distance between the two type-pages in an opening? This is a measurement which does not necessarily differ when plates are put back on the press for a new printing, but it may. Many new questions, and possibly new techniques to solve them, arise in the nineteenth century.

However, the confusion I spoke of comes, I believe, when the sole criterion applied to the value of any item in a description is its usefulness in identifying different copies of a book. I take it that a descriptive bibliography has other purposes in addition to the simple one of identification as a guide to collection, and that certain of its items record facts that are of historical importance primarily. This importance may be of two kinds. It may concern chiefly the publishing history of the author who is the subject, and it may record facts and details that bear on this matter without regard for their value as an identifying factor in the detection of variation. But there is a larger publishing history to which each individual descriptive bibliography contributes. This concerns the details of printing and publication as they change from year to year. What about the rise and fall of the popularity of certain typefaces? Of recent years we have seen a tendency in book designers to give us longer and narrower pages (a design that personally I detest). When did this start — how common is it — is it confined only to certain categories of books and not to others? Do certain printing-houses or publishers favour it and others not? As a matter of curiosity, I should myself like to know more about the selection of paper that was customary in the house of Appleton in the 1890s. Is it significant when they use laid paper for one author and wove for another? Is it significant if one printing of the same author is on laid and another on wove? I have seen various nineteenth-century books where the signing bore no relation to the actual imposition. How customary was this anomaly? One could make up quite a long list of items which might be of comparatively little practical value in some cases for identification but which, when accumulated in the records of descriptive bibliographies, are illuminating for the history of printing and book-production. I grant that the process of accumulation of these details so that they can be used by scholars is a lengthy one if we must rely exclusively on author bibliographies, and I urge your attention to the rewards of descriptive bibliographies of individual Canadian publishers. By the way, what efforts are being made to see that these publishers' records are preserved? In sum, any new formulation of standards of bibliographical description should not be undertaken on a narrow front even when specifically directed toward the special problems of the nineteenth century. The needs of the collector or accumulator, important as these are, must not be allowed to overshadow larger purposes of history to which descriptive bibliography contributes.

It is true that absolute accuracy in bibliographical description is dependent upon the knowledge of analytical bibliography, that art or science of deter-

mining from the physical evidence of a book how it was printed and then the application of this knowledge on the one hand to the details of bibliographical description and on the other to the editing of texts. It goes without saying that a descriptive bibliographer who does not have an adequate knowledge of how a book is printed can scarcely write an accurate description when the facts are not truly revealed by the appearance that meets the eye. Description is not simply a mechanical process of recording certain external data: it has its roots in analysis because the external data may be false, as when the signatures do not in fact correspond to the gathering. Hence the greater the analytical knowledge of the printing process, the better the bibliographer will be able not only to recognize irregularities that lie under surface appearances but also to explain them, put them in their proper sequence, and evaluate their importance for collection and for textual scholarship, and sometimes for printing history. In this process the Hinman Collator, or one of the several substitutes now coming on the market, has proved itself to be an important contributor to knowledge. Without its use, for example, Professor Brucoli could very likely not have distinguished fully and ordered the different early printings in the United States of Hawthorne's *Marble Faun* and thus determined not only their relative importance to the collector but also to the textual critic. It is textually significant that the third prepublication printing suddenly changes certain of the plates in order to incorporate variants that seem to have come to the attention of the publisher from the belated arrival of a set of revised English proofs. It is more interesting that the important question of the variant text of Hawthorne's added Postscript, or Conclusion, and the priority of his writing of the English or the United States version, in part may rest on the identification and dating of the exact Boston printing in which it made its first appearance.

The Collator was designed to detect press-variants in the Shakespeare First Folio; but it has come to be the chief analytical and textual tool of the bibliographer of nineteenth and of twentieth-century books because of its ability rapidly to detect plate changes and sometimes to isolate separate printings not only on this evidence but also on that of progressive plate deterioration. The descriptive bibliographer of Hawthorne, for instance, could not write a definitive account of *The House of the Seven Gables* without the evidence furnished by the Hinman Collator. Ordinary methods of examination short of complete textual collation by hand would not reveal that a textual variant occurs in half-sheet 22, depending upon the presence or absence of a comma after the word 'solitude'. Yet even if he saw it, if the describer were not an analytical bibliographer he could readily misinterpret this evidence in a manner that would affect his description. This is an excellent example, although of a tiny point, to illustrate the principle that recording without interpretation simply is not enough. Was the comma removed from the plate or added? If the bibliographer were working only with two copies that showed the variant he might be puzzled if his knowledge of printing did not come to his aid to whisper in his ear that in the typesetting a place must be left for the comma, so that it is unlikely a comma could be added without something of a squeeze, not present in that line. Was the comma removed, then, leaving a blank space? That could be the natural

inference and it might satisfy an unwary or an inexperienced investigator. A difficulty arises in that the comma is more desirable than not. Moreover, in this case if the bibliographer thought to check a photograph of the manuscript he would see that the comma was written there and hence ought to have been set. Why should a useful and certainly inoffensive comma be removed? If the book had been printed from type-metal the answer would be easy: it was loose and fell out during the course of printing, the way a useful exclamation point fell out during the first printing of *The Scarlet Letter*, leaving a blank space that was filled by an unauthoritative comma in the second edition and in all editions thereafter. But *The House of the Seven Gables* was printed from plates, and to remove the comma someone would need to have cut a hole in that plate and solder in a space instead. No other changes were made in the line, the page, the form.

Nevertheless, if the investigator had some notion of the printing process — that is if he were an analytical bibliographer — he would accumulate more copies, and he would find that eventually by the use of the Collator he could distinguish four different printings of this first edition, partly from plate repair in other places and partly from type batter. He would then discover that in each of these four printings some copies would have the comma and some not. Any hypothesis for plate-revision is therefore shown to be impossible, and only one answer results: half-sheet 22 was machined for economy and speed with two identical forms made up of duplicate plates, as one might well have anticipated anyway if one were an analyst. Still, what about that comma? Priority of printing cannot account for it, because the plates were bolted on the press side by side and hence printed the same sheet of paper at the same time. Priority of manufacture of the plate seems to be the only answer; and from that hypothesis it is only a step to an explanation that the typesetting with the comma was the authoritative original, but when the first flong for plate-making was removed from the type-page it carried with it the loose comma so that the second flong from which the duplicate plate was manufactured did not have it. Hence the description of this book can record, accurately, that half-sheet 22 was printed from duplicate plates, and it can identify them and assign the order of their manufacture, of some interest to the collector and to the editor.

Yet this particular little piece of analytical bibliography produced a second dividend. Each of the four concealed printings in 1851 can be identified for a collector by precise details of plate repair or of type batter. By this means a collector who understandably wants a copy of the first printing of the first edition can recognize it and buy it, instead — in his ignorance — of paying the price of a so-called 'first edition' for a superficially identical copy of the second, third, or fourth printings in 1851. However, over and above this desirable identification and ordering so that collectors and libraries may know what they have got, the bibliographer can accurately describe still one more feature. The Ticknor, Fields *Cost Books* list these four printings in 1851, and a fifth printing in 1852. What was this like? But correspond as widely as he can, the bibliographer will not turn up a copy of *The House of the Seven Gables* dated 1852. The Collator will not help here, because its evidence reveals only four

printings. But an alert analytical bibliographer looking for special evidence appropriate for nineteenth-century books will find that the presumed fourth printing that can be identified by three reset lines on page 57 varies within itself in the gutter measurements between pages. This difference cannot be produced by alterations within the manufacture of each gathering of the same printing, but it can be produced in a different printing when the pressman arranges the plates on the press with somewhat different standard spacing between them. Now the description can be completed. The 1851 date on the plate of the title page was never altered for the 1852 printing, but the gutter measurements identify it. The publishing history is now finished and the description is accurate.

As for the application of analytical bibliography to text, on the one hand analytical investigation applied to the recovery of the printing process and its interpretation as concerns textual problems is still alive and kicking in the nineteenth century if one adjusts one's techniques to the different sorts of problems. I am told that some scholars have taken too seriously as discrediting the whole methodology the strictures on some claims of analytical bibliography so persuasively argued by D.F. McKenzie in his well-known article "Printers of the Mind." For myself, I am unpersuaded and although I acknowledge the usefulness of this article in warning us to beware of extending hypotheses too thinly without supporting evidence of some kind (not necessarily publishers' records), in my opinion the basic soundness of analytical bibliography as a method remains untouched by Professor McKenzie's attacks. That the interpretation of its evidence by a few scholars has not been impeccable is of no more consequence than the occasional misinterpretation of the evidence of Strahan's ledgers in the eighteenth century has been for the soundness of the methods used in Professor McKenzie's own field of publishing history. However, the questions raised by McKenzie have pertinence only for the earlier period and so far as I can see should not trouble the analytical bibliographers of the nineteenth century. I will not pretend that the results in the nineteenth century are as rich as they are in Elizabethan printing, but analysis cannot be ignored. The anomalies in the text of Stephen Crane's short story "A Little Pilgrim" can be resolved only by a curious analytical explanation for simultaneous setting of the story in both the magazine and book versions, one half of each typesetting being made from the uncorrected proof of the other and the opposite half of each from the typescript. The identification of certain peculiarities of a Heinemann printer's compositor named in the manuscript of "Five White Mice" can be applied to textual problems in the book version of the story "Death and the Child," set in part, one may conjecture on the evidence, by this same compositor. The variable punctuation system in "The Clan of No-Name" in the collection *Wounds in the Rain* can be related to the printing shop and not to the copy or the author by the identification of three different compositors who were concerned with the typesetting. And instead of following this anomalous and unauthoritative printed copy an editor has some foundation for principles of emendation that restore a close approximation of what the lost typescript that was the printer's copy must have contained in these respects. In another story a

series of puzzling little omissions of words and phrases here and there that might have been authorial pruning are revealed to have had a mechanical and unauthoritative origin when a textual critic notices that they all occur in the final line of a paragraph that was a short line, and thus represent a subtle means of shortening the story by small alterations. These save enough lines and sacrifice relatively few words so that the end of the story can coincide with the foot of the page, plus an illustration, without reducing the size of the illustration — already manufactured — or running the story a half dozen or more lines over on the succeeding page.

In other cases textual bibliography diverges in the nineteenth century from traditional techniques of analytical bibliography, especially when a critic undertakes to trace and to evaluate the authority of the transmission of a text through a number of different versions. By applying logical principles of textual bibliography the complicated and apparently random verbal differences in four different authorities for "Death and the Child" can be reduced to two lines of the text, each stemming from two different typescripts, with their respective carbons, made at different times from the original manuscript. With this information the editor can reduce the scores of variant readings to a dozen that diverge according to the two main textual traditions and he can then deal with this dozen as best he may instead of with fifty or sixty. Textual bibliography testing the evidence can decide in the case of Crane's short story "A Self Made Man" that the later book collection *Last Words* was not set up from a clipping of the earlier magazine appearance but instead from a carbon of the typescript from which the magazine text derives. Hence the book text is of equal authority with the magazine. In addition, a typescript that has been preserved can be shown not to be related either to the magazine or book but instead to be a document made up at another time from the manuscript to serve as printer's copy for an abortive American edition of *Last Words*. The editor has three equal authorities to deal with, not two, although arranged in two different independent derivations from the same manuscript. If he does not know what to do with the verbal variants under this situation, he had better turn in his union card.

It took the Universities of Oxbridge a long time to recognize that the study of literature later than the Anglo-Saxon was really a substantial discipline and not something that a gentleman picked up in his own library. Somewhat the same attitude has until recently set off the nineteenth century as so familiar and recent that it could scarcely contain problems worthy of intensive scholarship. All that is changed in the universities now, of course. But the position of nineteenth-century bibliographical studies has not perhaps kept up with the advances of other forms of scholarship in the period. You are to be congratulated on this colloquium and on the results that may reasonably be anticipated. May I offer two brief suggestions, in conclusion. First, do everything in your power to encourage all forms of bibliography as reputable and indeed necessary parts of post-graduate liberal arts training. Do not make the mistake of unconsciously trying to confine bibliography to the libraries, simply because it is always welcome there, and appreciated. And recognize that the most valuable

kind of bibliography for the training of academic scholars is textual. Second, do not tacitly confine the study of bibliography in its different forms only to those who have begun to be sympathetic to its promise, the students of literature. The most bibliographically benighted scholars in the universities these days are the historians, who will not even encourage the training of archivists as a legitimate subject for the doctorate. A real effort must be made to show these scholars not just the advantages of enumerative bibliography, with which they are acquainted, but instead the necessity of descriptive and particularly of textual, the importance of pure texts, and the fatal innocence that accepts the authority of the details of any document without having traced its textual transmission and the effect of this process on its words. Send missionaries to the heathen. Convert the historians!

FREDSON BOWERS