

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 429

CS 209 215

AUTHOR Laurence, Dan H.
TITLE A Portrait of the Author as a Bibliography. The Center for the Book Viewpoint Series No. 9.
INSTITUTION Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8444-0426-8
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 21p.; Lecture presented at the Library of Congress (Washington, DC, November 3, 1982).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bibliographies; *Books; Information Dissemination; *Literary History; Literature Appreciation; Publications
IDENTIFIERS *Book Collecting

ABSTRACT

A lecture given at the Library of Congress by the literary and dramatic advisor to the estate of Bernard Shaw and author of a two-volume bibliography of Shaw is presented in this pamphlet. The lecture discusses kinds of author bibliographies, the demands of early book collectors, first edition mania, the Soho bibliographies, R.L. Purdy's bibliography of Thomas Hardy, the Bernard Shaw bibliography, and other contemporary bibliographies--such as Warren Roberts's bibliography of D. H. Lawrence, Alan Denson's bibliography of George Russell, and the James Joyce bibliography by John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon. The lecture examines characteristics common to the work of modern bibliographers and their most significant contributions as well as qualities of the new breed of book collectors. (EL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED260429

A Portrait of the Author as a Bibliography

Dan H. Laurence

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan H. Laurence

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

DS 209 215

*The Center for the Book
Viewpoint Series
No. 9*

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Laurence, Dan H.

A portrait of the author as a bibliography.

(The Center for the Book viewpoint series; no. 9)

*Originally presented as an Engelhard Lecture on the
Book, at the Library of Congress, Nov. 3, 1982.*

Includes bibliographical references.

Supt. of Docs. no.: LC 1.1212: P83

- 1. Bibliography—Addresses, essays, lectures.*
 - 2. Book collecting—Addresses, essays, lectures.*
- I. Title. II. Series.*

Z1005.L33 1983 010'.9'24 [B] 83-600082

ISBN 0-8444-0426-8

The text of this book is printed on permanent, durable paper.

Copyright © 1983 by Dan H. Laurence.

PREFACE

☞ The Center for the Book in the Library of Congress is pleased to publish "A Portrait of the Author as a Bibliography," a lecture by Dan H. Laurence, Literary and Dramatic Advisor to the Estate of Bernard Shaw. Mr. Laurence, whose two-volume bibliography of Shaw was published this year by Oxford University Press, is one of the leading bibliographers of our time. He presented this paper, an Engelhard Lecture on the Book, at the Library of Congress on November 3, 1982. A cogent, personal account of the contribution that bibliography makes to scholarship, it amply fulfills the purpose of the lecture series: to stimulate public interest in books and the printed word.

The Engelhard Lectures on the Book were established at the Library of Congress by Mrs. Charles W. Engelhard in memory of her husband, who died in 1971. Previous Engelhard lecturers have been Nicolas Barker, Philip Hofer, Elizabeth Eisenstein, Edwin Wolf 2nd, Ian Willison, and Robert Darnton.

Proposed by Librarian of Congress Daniel J. Boorstin and established by Act of Congress in 1977, the Center for the Book exists to keep the book flourishing by stimulating interest in books, reading, and the printed word. The center works closely with organizations outside the Library of Congress to remind the public of the advantages of books, to promote reading, and to stimulate the study of books. It pursues these goals primarily by bringing together members of the book, educational, and business communities for

symposia and projects. It also sponsors lectures, visiting scholars, exhibits, publications, and events that enhance the role of the book in our society. The center's major interests include the educational and cultural role of the book, both nationally and internationally, reading promotion, the history of books, and the future of the book and the printed word. The center's programs also address authorship and writing, the printing, publishing, and preservation of books, the use of books and printed materials, and literacy.

The Center for the Book's activities are supported by tax-deductible gifts from individuals and organizations. This publication would not be possible without such support from Mrs. Charles W. Engelhard, to whom we are grateful.

John Y. Cole
Executive Director
The Center for the Book

A PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR
AS A BIBLIOGRAPHY

 Dan H. Laurence

 This lecture begins with a confession. For more than thirty years I have been an author-bibliographer and, if you were to ask why, for the life of me I couldn't give you an answer. There are, God knows, few tangible rewards for the bibliographer. My just-completed bibliography of Bernard Shaw, which Oxford will publish in two volumes in the Soho Bibliographies series in the spring of 1983, has monopolized much of my working time for the past twenty-seven years. The result will be an edition of one thousand copies, from the eventual sale of which I shall receive a modest royalty, less the cost of the inevitable author's revisions in the galieys and page proofs, netting me perhaps 5 percent of what I have over the years invested out of pocket. I shall garner no more than half a dozen reviews, in specialist journals, about a year to eighteen months after publication, which hopefully will contain only a modicum of carping. And that will be about the extent of the public recognition of my labors. For bibliographers there are no Oscars or Emmys, no Pulitzers or Nobels, no National Medal for Literature. Admittedly, Leon Edel, my collaborator in a Henry James bibliography, was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters, but to accomplish this feat he had to dash off a five-volume biography of James on the side. For the rest of us, no ribbons or boutonnières. Nobody ever promised us an invitation to the Rose Garden.

Despite this, author-bibliographies continue to be created and published, and the quality of some of the recent

ones has never been equaled. Bibliographic scholarship, apparently, provides a challenge that, needing no dangling carrot to set it in motion, appeals simultaneously to the intellect and to the imagination. It seems to satisfy that innate element we call curiosity; to provide the excitement of the quest and the tantalizing stimulus of mystery. The bibliographer becomes an amalgam of supersleuth, prestidigitator, and soothsayer. In his subject area he reigns supreme. To his colleagues he is the Eliotic or the Hardy-esque or the Shavian equivalent of the oracle of Delphi.

It wasn't always thus, however. Author-bibliography as we know it today is almost entirely a postwar phenomenon, inspired and influenced in large measure by the emergence of Rupert Hart-Davis's *Soho Bibliographies* in the early 1950s, commencing with Allan Wade's admirable bibliography of W. B. Yeats.

There have, of course, been author-bibliographies of one sort or another for centuries. As early as 1698, ten years after John Bunyan's death, the printer Charles Doe appended to an edition of Bunyan's *The Heavenly Footman* "A Catalogue of all Mr. Bunyan's Books." In the early nineteenth century, author-bibliographies and catalogs included the *Shakspeariana* of John Wilson (1827), the Defoe of Walter Wilson (1830), the Voltaire of J. M. Querard (1842), the Goethe of E. J. Saupe (1866). Author-bibliographies, however, have traditionally come into existence principally to serve the needs of specialist collectors. The sparsity until almost the end of the nineteenth century of bibliographies that recorded the work of single authors would, accordingly, evidence that the gentlemen of taste and discrimination who expended their elegant leisure in amassing great collections of rare books and manuscripts were less parochial in their collecting instincts than were their descendants. These collectors were attracted aesthetically to delicately tooled leather bindings, to specimens of fine printing from historically significant presses, to artistically illuminated manuscripts, to calligraphy, to engraved illustrations, and to those editions of celebrated authors that

were believed to be the best edited, not merely the earliest published. They were universal in their tastes, these collector gents, spanning the centuries, bestriding geographical boundaries, mastering classical and modern languages.

Near the end of the nineteenth century collecting spread—or, perhaps, it being an age of evolutionary theory, one should say collecting descended—to the middle class, many of these being parvenus and dilettantes who joined literary societies to take tea with Mr. Browning and to absorb instant culture. As few of the new collectors could compete with the giants who had preceded them (this being a case, paradoxically, of homo sapiens giving way to the ape), they were encouraged to specialize in literary moderns, the example having been set for them by a young, aggressive, social-climbing, and extraordinarily acquisitive office clerk named Thomas J. Wise. Commencing with a monumental Ruskin bibliography in 1893 (in collaboration with James P. Smart) and going on to Browning, Swinburne, Tennyson, Coleridge, Wordsworth, the Brontës *en bloc*, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Conrad, Keats, and Byron, Wise established himself as the unrivaled bibliographic authority of his day, each new publication adding luster to his image as a nonpareil among collectors.

What wasn't recognized until John Carter and Graham Pollard in 1934 published their damning *Enquiry into the Nature of Some Nineteenth Century Pamphlets* was that this enigmatic figure was one of the great literary forgers of all time, surreptitiously manufacturing and insinuating into the rare-book market a series of pamphlets that, by their dating, purported to be earlier editions than the hitherto earliest known printings of the same works. As a secret bookseller, who was to leave an estate valued at nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, including his immeasurably valuable Ashley Library collection of books and manuscripts, the wise hawk was better able to mulct the ingenuous wrens among collectors by using his bibliographies as self-serving vehicles for gaining legitimacy for the forgeries, the reputation of which, as an obituarist in the *Times* recognized

after Wise's death in 1937, had depended almost entirely on Wise's own "elaborate descriptions, histories, or discoveries of them,"¹ all bogus.

From the emphasis on Wise's "rare firsts," which found their way into the hands and onto the library shelves of avid, wealthy collectors on both sides of the Atlantic, came the unfortunate rise in interest in the amassing of "first editions," culminating in what John Carter called "the chronological obsession."² As the new century progressed, there emerged an unending stream of booksellers' guides for collectors: Gilbert Fabes's *Modern First Editions: Points and Values* (3 vols., 1929-32); Percy Muir's *Points 1874-1930* (1931) and its sequel *Points: Second Series* (1934); Andrew Block's *The Book Collector's Vade Mecum* (1932)—all designed to identify the peculiarities of printing or binding, commonly known as "points," by which a "genuine" first might be recognized, and to estimate the market value of the desirable "issue" (for then, as now, books and manuscripts were gobbled up as investments).

One required to know, for instance, that he would be the possessor of a first issue of the first edition of Galsworthy's *The Island Pharisees* (published under the pseudonym of John Sinjohn) only if the list at the front of the book, of other novels published by Heinemann, identified the author of *Uriah the Hittite* as Wolf Wyllarde, an error that was corrected in the second issue, on a tipped-in cancel leaf, to Dolf Wyllarde. Or that one must warily approach Butler's *The Way of All Flesh* to be certain it was the genuine article in bright red cloth, and not sheets of the same first impression removed from a damaged or worn binding and cased for improvement in a "faked-up" first binding, identifiable by its maroon cloth.

It was a consciousness of this (to him) imbecilic state of affairs that gave Bernard Shaw the inspiration to inscribe on the half-title of a scarce copy of his first published play, *Widowers' Houses* (1893), intended for a charity auction, a statement that, though the volume had, as he recalled, been issued originally in "a green colored cloth case of the shade

called citrine," here was a copy bound in blue cloth. "I never saw or heard of any blue copies," said Shaw. "Consequently, though I am actually writing these words in a blue copy I deny its existence."³

When a collector-bibliographer, Iolo Williams, author of *The Elements of Book Collecting* (1927), challenged a conventional definition, by the bookseller Percy Muir, of a first edition as the first appearance of a work separately, in its own covers, given to the public (that is, formally published), and questioned the value of collecting "first editions" in this restricted sense, without regard for the textual history of the books collected, Muir recoiled with horror. Such an argument, he exploded, "attempts to identify two different things and seems to show a certain confusion of thought. It entails, for instance, the admission that any edition of a book which contains any considerable textual revision by the author is equally as important as the first edition. There is a sense in which this is true, but it seems clear that the first-edition collector is working from an angle which differs fundamentally from that expressed by such a point of view."⁴

Whichever angle the first-edition collector was working from, he was being singularly myopic. In collecting Shaw first editions exclusively, for example, he deprived himself of the enjoyment of reading, in the "second edition" of Shaw's novel *An Unsocial Socialist*, the taunting letter from its protagonist Sidney Trefusis to the author; the alternative prologue to *Cæsar and Cleopatra*; the polemical preface to the Home Rule edition of *John Bull's Other Island*; the added chapter in *The Perfect Wagnerite* and its significant preface to the first German edition; the commentary on Ibsen's four important last plays in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*; and the chapters on Fascism and Sovietism in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*. Moreover, the poor benighted soul would, alas, never know that Eliza Doolittle was going to marry Freddy.

This ignorance was, of course, the crux of the criticism. Williams, said Muir scoffingly, was attempting (perish the

thought!) to "construct a bibliographical Utopia in which textual scholarship and first-hand collecting go hand in hand."⁵ Worse, Williams had the effrontery to insist that the first edition of a book is the first printed text, "irrespective of when it was actually given to the public."⁶

Again to cite Carter, "*When is a first edition not a first edition?* is a favourite debating exercise among bibliographers and advanced collectors."⁷ And when one considers such categories in bibliography as part-issues, trial-issues, copyright editions, private printings, reviewers' advance copies, piracies, foreign translations (Shaw, it might be noted, encouraged publication of his plays in translation two and three years prior to first book publication in English), one realizes how complicated the question is. Shaw's succinct advice, in any event, was *not* to collect first editions, but to destroy them—"to suppress their blunders."⁸ They were, he insisted, invariably the worst.⁹

The vast number of author-bibliographies that surfaced in the 1920s and early 1930s served little more purpose than to feed the "first edition" fire. These, like Wise's earlier productions, were also self-serving, being compiled mostly by book dealers, though also by specialist collectors or by Grub Street hacks on commission. Most often the volumes were repositories of semidigested information, questionable assumptions, and hasty conclusions. Research was scant, many bibliographers not looking any further than the British Museum catalog or their own bookshelves; and they drew freely upon secondary references with no effort at corroboration. A consequence is that gross factual errors and "ghost" editions have been perpetuated from contemporary gleaners like Jacob Schwartz, whose *1100 Obscure Points* (1931) ran to four impressions, but whose usefulness becomes suspect with the discovery of a prefatory reference to SHELLEY'S *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, right down to the newly revised edition of the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. A Shavian illustration of this perdurability of inaccurate information is the phantom 1907 American first edition of Shaw's *Passion, Poison, and*

Petrifaction, called for erroneously by B. D. Cutler and Villa Styles in their *Modern British Authors: Their First Editions* (1930), and still called for in the 1982 fourth edition of Van Allen Bradley's *Book Collector's Handbook of Values*, where on the supposed examination of auction records and dealers' catalogs it is given an "up-to-date" evaluation of \$150.

Percy Muir, surveying the author-bibliographers of his generation, from Geoffrey Wells, whose Shaw (1925, enlarged 1928) Muir evaluated as "a very unsatisfactory and fragmentary work,"¹⁰ to the bibliographers of such imperishable and eminently collectible writers as Eden Phillpotts, Austin Dobson, Maurice Hewlett, James Branch Cabell, and William McFee, was moved to mourn "the low level of accuracy and scrupulousness observed by some bibliographers of modern authors."¹¹ And it is reasonable to accept this criticism as objectively reliable, for, whatever faults he may have had, Muir was a man of integrity and remarkable candor, as evidenced in his mea culpa: "I take this opportunity of solemnly warning the possessors of those bibliographies of mine that every one of them, with the possible exception of that on Ronald Firbank, is exceedingly unreliable."¹²

And so the chase went on, with misguided collectors galloping apace after their baying pointers, as they hunted for broken type, transposed lines, dropped letters, misprints, placement of advertisements, and dates of inserted advertising catalogs, in an effort to distinguish between a first state, a first issue, a copyright issue, or a proof copy; and solemnly debated whether the first issue of Kipling's *Just So Stories* or Bennett's *The Old Wives' Tale* was isolable by the tendency of the paint on the spine to flake off, or whether the flaking occurred from defective blocking on the binding of the second issue. They sought pristine copies, with uncut pages (it never having occurred to them that books were meant to be read), and they stored them on their library shelves in expensive levant-leather, gilt-lettered cases. But then the walls of their Jericho came tumbling down. After 1929 the Brobdingnagian auction prices shrank

to Lilliputian dimensions. The days of the ascendancy of the point-oriented collector were no more.

There were other things to think about than collecting during the next decade or so, but when, at last, the winter of war was past, and the rain of bombs over and gone, lo! the voice of the scholar was heard in the land. In 1951 Rupert Hart-Davis launched the Soho Bibliographies, under the general editorship of a peerless quartet of bibliographical scholars: John Carter, John Hayward, William A. Jackson, and A. N. L. Munby, promising to present "all the relevant information with the strictest possible regard for accuracy and consistency of description."¹³ Most important, the Soho planners recognized the need for the bibliographies to serve as essential tools, not only for librarians, collectors, and booksellers, but also for literary students and researchers with interests in textual scholarship, biography, or publishing history and practice as a social or economic phenomenon. And their contributing author-bibliographers saw to it that the promise was fulfilled.

"This bibliography," wrote Edel and Laurence in the preface to their Henry James bibliography in 1957, "tells the story of what happened to the writings of Henry James after they left his busy work-table to be set up in type and published in magazine and book."¹⁴ In this, we not only were living up to the expectations of the Soho series but were following in the footsteps of the one memorable author-bibliographer of the earlier era, that annunciatory angel Michael Sadleir, whose *Trollope* (1928) is, in its examination of an author's descent into the marketplace, one of the finest exemplars of modern bibliography. Although Sadleir to some extent adhered to the conventions of bibliography of his generation by his concern for questions of comparative rarity and value, and by his provision of detailed lists of first-edition misprints, he made giant bibliographical strides in his concern for conditions of publication, including a firsthand history of "a long and typical series of author-publisher contracts"; for serial issues and subsequent editions; and for the illustrations in *Trollope's*

works by such popular nineteenth-century artists as Hablot K. Browne (known as "Phiz") and J. E. Millais. As a consequence his bibliography became, in his own words, "a commentary on the book and publishing crafts of mid-Victorian England."¹⁵ And even his examination of "Rarity and Value" took on new dimension as Sadleir philosophically examined what he termed "the puzzle of comparative scarcities" and attempted "to establish certain general causes, which have in the past governed the survival chances of otherwise analogous books, which may in the future govern those of the new books of to-day."¹⁶

Though the Soho formula soon came to dominate the bibliographical field, it must not be supposed that all the quality bibliographies of the day were published under its sponsorship. One that wasn't was R. L. Purdy's *Thomas Hardy: A Bibliographical Study* (1954), a landmark work that grows ever more estimable with the passage of time. When he commenced his study, as he related in his introduction, Purdy thought of it in conventional terms and along familiar lines. By the time he completed it, however, it had taken an un contemplated tack. "I have given," he noted, "a full and detailed description of the first edition of every one of Hardy's books and I have recorded the original appearance in print of everything that he wrote, so far as I have been able to discover it. But I have also located and described manuscripts where they survive, I have collected what can be known about composition and publication, and I have traced the development of texts through subsequent editions . . . drawing freely on unpublished papers and private sources." His book, Purdy concluded, "has become, one might almost say, a biography of Hardy in bibliographical form. No form, certainly, can better reveal 'His whole sincere symmetric history.'"¹⁷

Thus, in Purdy's Hardy, as in Sadleir's Trollope and in the Soho bibliographies, the conventional limits of bibliography had been dramatically extended. The bibliographer, unpredictably, had assumed the mantle of the biographer, resulting in the creation of what I have teasingly chosen to

call "a portrait of the author as a bibliography." Where in earlier years the bibliographer, when he did any research at all, concentrated solely on examination of printers' day-books, publishers' ledgers, or copyright records, he now draws extensively upon unpublished correspondence, manuscript writings, diaries, journals, working notebooks, contracts, and even on book inscriptions. In the forthcoming Shaw bibliography I have fleshed out the portrait of Shaw by resort to all of these sources. Moreover, I have incorporated information obtained by that means which Henry James characterized as "the visitable past": interviews with contemporaries who survived Shaw, including his three principal secretaries, his financial adviser, his solicitors, his copyright attorney, Fabian colleagues, the official shorthand recorder of his London lectures, his German, French, and Swedish translators, his American theater producers, performers of his plays, several of his newspaper interviewers, his housekeeper, and his chauffeur.

As a consequence of these extended researches the Shaw bibliography will shed significant new or added light in many areas: on Fabian Society activities and controversies and on Shaw's multiplicity of committee involvements; on his unsuccessful political campaign in 1904 for election to the London City Council; on his method for dealing with play-text rough proofs for use by his translators and for actors' rehearsal copies; on his efforts to aid British authorities in Irish military recruiting and in counteracting German propaganda among the Moors in North Africa during the First World War, and, at the start of the Second World War, on the introduction of his war remarks into the *Congressional Record* as read from the floor of the U.S. Senate; on the extent of his silent collaborations with, or editing of the work of, T. E. Lawrence, Frank Harris, the Antarctic explorer Apsley Cherry-Garrard, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and most of his biographers, notably Archibald Henderson and Hesketh Pearson; on problems of the Society of Authors as it sought with Shaw's assistance to effect a workable treaty between dramatic authors and

theatrical managers; on Shaw's battles with publishing pirates; on the unauthorized use, without his knowledge, of his 1899 essay condemning flagellation in the British navy, as preface to a French contemporary pornographic work, *Records of Personal Chastisement* (of which, I am proud to say, I possess the only known surviving copy); and on his recourse to stereotyped-message postcards for dealing with impossibly burdensome quantities of correspondence, including more than three dozen basic texts (every one of which is reproduced in full), which communicated to correspondents Shaw's opinions on vegetarianism, alphabet reform, and capital punishment, or advised them "Please do not ask Mr. Bernard Shaw for money. He has not enough to help the large number of his readers who are in urgent need of it. He can write for you: he cannot finance you."¹⁸

The richly informative biographical materials interwoven in modern bibliographies defy categorization. Warren Roberts's bibliography of D. H. Lawrence (1963) becomes an annotated travelogue of the writer's peregrinations in Europe and America, with especial enlightenment on his activities and associations in Taos, New Mexico. Ronald Ayling and Michael J. Durkan, in their Sean O'Casey bibliography (1978), chronicle his involvement in the Irish civil war and place his early political ballads in historical context. Matthew Bruccoli's *F. Scott Fitzgerald* (1972) supplies a list of the author's Hollywood film-writing assignments, with dates, and for good measure gives us a ten-page record of the complete publications of Fitzgerald's wife Zelda. John R. Payne's *Hudson* (1977) provides a history of the work of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and of W. H. Hudson's pamphleteering and fundraising for the institution.

Alan Denson, in his *George Russell* bibliography (1961), prefaces the work with seventeen pages of detailed chronology of Æ's life and associations, and rounds it out with a section on Russell's "Oral Evidence to Parliamentary Committees" and a census of public exhibitions of his paintings. Brownlee Kirkpatrick's *Edmund Blunden* (1979)

offers a glimpse into the poet's multifarious educational and publishing activities in Japan and Hong Kong. Purdy reveals Hardy's theatrical proclivities in a history of the Hardy Players, from its inception in 1908 as the Dorchester Debating and Dramatic Society, with a complete list of productions; gives an annotated calendar of Hardy's correspondence with his first publisher, Tinsley Brothers, from 1869 to 1875; sketches the fascinating development of Hardy's poetic epic-drama *The Dynasts* from initial conception in 1875 to publication in 1904; and traces the bowdlerization of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*.

John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon, in their James Joyce bibliography (1953), examine the censorship problems that confronted the expatriate Irishman in his twice-suppressed *Dubliners* and in the subsequent confiscation of copies of *Ulysses* by the United States postal officials and customs authorities. Slocum and Cahoon are, like Roberts in his Lawrence and like B. C. Bloomfield and Edward Mendelson in their W. H. Auden bibliography (2d edition, 1972), further confronted with the need to come to grips with the manifold forgeries and piracies of the works of the author. Other bibliographers grapple with questionable attributions of anonymous or pseudonymous writings, with William B. Todd, in his Burke (1964), painstakingly singling out some thirty or more false attributions of authorship.

Unlike the bibliographers of the twenties and thirties, who concentrated on first editions almost to the exclusion of serial contributions, the modern bibliographers record serial publication in meticulous detail, indicating volume, page, and column numbers (indispensable for scholars when requesting microfilm or photocopies from inaccessible, understaffed newspaper libraries); isolating the specific editions of newspapers in which contributions appear and the changes of caption or position between one edition and another; recording verbatim reports of lectures and identifying written interviews (Shaw, it might be noted, provided an incalculably huge number of responses to

questionnaire interviews, sometimes composing the questions as well as the responses); and calling attention to variations of text between English, American, and even foreign serial appearance.

Additionally, usually in appendices, they incorporate indexes of first lines of poetry; catalog the musical settings of poems, the liner notes written for phonograph-record sleeves, "copy" for commercial advertisements, and blurbs for the author's own works and for the publications of his colleagues; enumerate radio talks, film and television appearances. And, in an age of expanding media, appearances—vocal or visual—on cassettes and video cartridges.

Their most significant contribution, however, has been one that biographers and autobiographers have seldom been capable of accomplishing, in those instances when they have made the attempt: the graphic recreation of the subjects' lives in the context of their professional 'business involvement and experience; of their struggles and frustrations and yearnings reflected through commercial intercourse, as when Hardy, after optimistically anteing up £75 toward the cost of production of his first novel *Desperate Remedies* (1871), discovers from the final royalty accounting that he has recovered only £59.12.7 of it;¹⁹ when Shaw, disgusted with his American publisher for altering the size of the page and tampering with the margins of a book, informs T. E. Lawrence, "No gentleman would be seen reading their edition";²⁰ or when Henry James, preparing an inexpensive twelve-volume collective edition of his fiction, pleads with his publisher, "Can you make them really pretty for 18-pence a volume? I should like them to be *charming*"²¹

In any consideration of the latter-day bibliographer it must not be overlooked that there has been comparable metamorphosis in the collector with whom he is allied. Where hitherto a credulous collector relied on an unflinching bibliographer for what too often proved to be dubious advice and questionable information, today the bibliog-

rapher as frequently relies for assistance on an astute, knowledgeable collector. The new breed of collectors builds for the benefit of scholarship, exercising sound individual judgment while working in tandem with bibliographers, textual scholars, and enlightened booksellers and librarians, not infrequently becoming, as witness John J. Slocum and Adrian H. Goldstone, bibliographic collaborators. These collectors, assuming an editorial function, seek out and often themselves study *all* the texts, from manuscript to serial to book proof to first book publication to final revised text. Moreover, they amass correspondence and accumulate diaries, working notebooks, account books, contracts, royalty statements, presentation copies of books, and a trove of ephemera as working tools for the grateful bibliographer.

The immense range of invaluable scholarly gifts made by these collectors to institutional libraries—C. Waller Barrett's to Virginia, Robert H. Taylor's to Princeton, Bernard F. Burgunder's to Cornell, and, greatest of all, the late Lessing J. Rosenwald's to the Library of Congress—serves as mute testimony of extraordinary generosity, aesthetic sensibility, and large erudition as well, for before these collectors donate their treasures they read them.

☞ I don't know how meaningful any of the foregoing has been to you; but as I completed this text, I realized that unconsciously I had supplied the answers to the hypothetical question that initiated it. The reward of an author-bibliographer is his stimulating relationship with bibliographic colleagues, with librarians, and especially with collectors. The reward is the opportunity to handle the fascinating source materials that hold him in thrall and that he eventually will weave into a unique tapestry: into a biobibliographic portrait of an author in the workshop, the printshop, the bookshop. The reward, finally, is that of the only sort of immortality a bibliographer really cares for—his

work accepted and honored as authority by fellow scholars in his field, and cited by booksellers and auctioneers in their catalogs, if only in the three challenging words that will set him scurrying to work on a second edition: "Not in Laurence."

NOTES

1. Summation of statements by the obituarist of the *Times* (14 May 1937), in Wilfred Partington, *Thomas J. Wise in the Original Cloth* (London, 1946), 299.
2. John Carter, *A B C for Book-Collectors* (London, 1952), 51.
3. Flyleaf inscription to E. V. Lucas, 14 June 1929, quoted in auction catalog of Parke-Bernet, Inc., New York (Frank J. Hogan Library, Part II, Sale No. 665), 24–25 April 1945, lot 625.
4. Percy Muir, *Points: Second Series* (London, 1934), 4.
5. Muir, 4.
6. Muir, 5.
7. Carter, 84.
8. Letter to R. J. Hayes, 6 December 1945, in Alf Mac Lochlainn, "Shaw's Mice," *New Edinburgh Review* (March 1975), 10.
9. Hesketh Pearson, *Bernard Shaw: His Life and Personality* (London, 1942), 357.
10. Muir, 55.
11. Muir, 39.
12. Percy Muir, *Points: 1874–1930* (London, 1931), xiv.
13. Brochure for Soho Bibliographies, issued by Rupert Hart-Davis, Ltd., 1951, and in subsequent years.
14. Leon Edel and Dan H. Laurence, *A Bibliography of Henry James* (London, 1957), 12.
15. Michael Sadleir, *Trollope: A Bibliography* (London, 1928), ix.
16. Sadleir, xi.
17. Richard Little Purdy, *Thomas Hardy: A Bibliographical Study* (Oxford, 1954), vii–viii.
18. Reproduced in Bernard Falk, *He Laughed in Fleet Street* (London, 1933), 137.
19. Purdy, 4–5 (with inserted plate reproducing, in facsimile, Tinsley Brothers final account, submitted on 22 February 1872).
20. Letter to T. E. Lawrence, 23 June 1928, quoted in Dan H. Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* (Oxford, 1983), 173.
21. Letter to Frederick Macmillan, 19 April 1883, quoted in Edel and Laurence, 59.



☞ *A Portrait of the Author as a Bibliography was set in ITC New Baskerville on the Mergenthaler CRTronic digital typesetting system by Duke & Company, Typographers, St. Davids, Pennsylvania. The ornaments are from a border design used in a Rupert Hart-Davis brochure advertising the Soho Bibliographies in the 1950s. The text paper is Mohawk Superfine, natural white, and the cover Strathmore Americana Prairie Gold. Printing was done by Printing, Inc., Cheverly, Maryland.*

☞ *This booklet was designed by Adrienne Onderdonk Dudden.*