THE ANATOMY OF BIBLIOGRAPHY

Somewhere in his *Essays in Musical Analysis*, Donald Francis Tovey speaks of the ancient sculptor Torso and the author Palimpsestos. Here is a work by their modern successor: a brief survey of the worlds of bibliography, meant to be provocative rather than definitive, and perhaps damned to remaining unfinished because its author has been enamored more by the provocative than by the definitive.

It is still a work in progress. The structure is largely what I want. There are still too many typos, however; bad and incomplete sentences, infelicities, sloppy reasonings, and arguments that need to be better shaped. “Under Construction” signs are still posted throughout. If this book is ever to be published, a thorough editorial vetting will also be needed. Much is yet to be done, and I am in my mid/late 80s, working alone and too close to what I have written. There are still many writings I need to come to grips with and more are turning up all the time, and it is hard for me to get to U. of I. library for to use the printed sources. (Online access is easy, but many sources are not yet online, where they are hard to navigate strategically, let alone serendipitously, and hard to size up in their totalities.) The topic is limitlessness when it is defined as broadly as it deserves to be defined, and this has kept me stimulated. I that hope readers of this preliminary version may be stimulated too.

This text is available in part on http://people.lis.illinois.edu/~donkay/, my library-school website. Its computer files, however, are meant to be read on paper, where ideas can hold still and be compared. The layout is designed to be printed out with pages front-to-back, as a kind of camera copy, with this page as a half-title. I hope to be able to continue to revise the text, so the dates of revision, in the header of each page, may be important. / dwk
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Sources

BIBLIOGRAPHY lives in citations. A book about bibliography needs to abound in them. To bibliographers, citations are the dogs who take their masters for their morning walks. Readers rely on them. I hope the hundreds of citations in this book may be seen here not as random displays of authorial erudition, but rather as guidance in probing the literature, exploring the topic, and questioning my arguments. Appropriate to a book on bibliography, the citations need to appear in the immediacy of the page of text, as footnotes or in source notes, and not as endnotes. If I have omitted important titles, recent ones most likely, it could be either because I am not yet aware of them or because I do not know what to make of them. Nor (pace Bayard below) can I claim to have read all of what I have cited, or agree with all of their opinions. Some will argue that I have misread what I have cited. My choices are also sad personal testimony. Lacking are writings that I once knew but forgot about, whether many years ago or an hour ago. My selection, like my arguments, begs to be revised and re-revised by those who know the specialties of bibliography better than I do.

Citation Style. The citations are designed not from a cataloguing code or style manual, but as if they were being delivered orally. Brief but distinctive particulars have been more important than consistency of form. I have preferred personal names, for instance, to corporate entries, which tend to be cumbersome, often unclear, and changeable, often pretentious too. Imprint dates are of first editions and major revisions. Cities are named only when the publisher’s name is uncommon. Few publishers before ca. 1900 are cited: the endorsement of the ir good names is rarely understood and appreciated today.

For online sources, I have not cited URLs. They are soporific to read and easy to garble (they are meant to be read by machines, not people). They also change: URLs became common only slightly over a decade ago, and by the time readers see this book, the formulations, perhaps even the concept, may again have changed. (The recent term “link-rot” identifies the problem, although this term may now be rotting away all by itself.) Online searching, however, is now wonderfully easy, and should be even easier as search engines improve. I have tried to fit in words that may be useful in online searches or will carry some special import to those who know the literature.

Below are the most important or frequently cited titles that I have used most often or pervasively. These works are often cited in the short forms at the right:


CERL (Consortium of European Research Libraries) website, online, with links to online databases at CERL Resources, those on bibliographical data in particular.

Umberto Eco, *The Infinity of Lists*. (Rizzoli, 2009). Tr. by Alastair McEwen of *Vertigine della Lista* (Bompiani, 2009), and based on a Louvre exhibition.

Jeremy Norman, Entries of bibliographical interest in *BookHistory.net, HistoryofScience.com,* and *HistoryofInformation.com*


RBMS (Rare Books and Manuscripts Section, ALA), Bibliographic Standards Committee. *Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger*, online.

Rare Book School (Univ. of Virginia). Advanced Reading Lists, online.
January 25, 2016


Georg Schneider, *Handbuch der Bibliographie* (Hiersemann, 1923 and later eds.), in two parts: a “Theoretisch-Geschichtlicher Teil” (pp. 3–199 in the 1923 ed.), an extended essay on bibliographical lists, and a “Verzeichnender Teil,” a guide to reference bibliographies. Most later eds. consist of the second part only. The first part was tr. by Ralph Robert Shaw as *Theory and History of Bibliography* (Columbia Univ. Pr., 1934.) See pp. 000. The German text of the first part, reissued as an *Einführung* (1936), was reconceived by Friedrich Nestler (Bibliographisches Institut, 1977; Hiersemann, 1999; further revised and updated: 7th ed., 2005).


——. *Essays in Bibliographical History*. (Bib. Soc. of the Univ. of Virginia, 2015). Reprints of articles, mostly from *SB*, including “Bibliographical History as a Field of Study” (1988).

——. *A Bibliographer’s Creed*. (100th Winship Lecture; Houghton Lib., 2014).

——. *Introduction to Bibliography*. Seminar syllabus (19th rev.

Were I to expand the present book, I would start by annotating the entries in this list and in the Essays above, supplemented by writings in other languages. This syllabus is complemented by an *Introduction to Scholarly Editing*.


2000), and in general the many historical writings of Anthony Grafton. The IFLA Book History Online: International Bibliography of the History of the Printed Book and Libraries (online) has also provided useful leads, as of course have many classics of analytic and descriptive bibliography discussed below (i.e., McKerrow, Bowers, Gaskell, Carter them).

Jorge Luis Borges’s “The Library of Babel”: what can one say about it? Other than that I have quoted the translations both by James E. Irby in Labyrinths (New Directions, 1962, pp. 51–59), and Anthony Kerrigan in Ficciones (Grove Press, 1963, pp. 79–88).

Source notes (marked with ✺) have been used for many general topics to recognize (a) landmark writings; (b) major bibliographies; (c) peripheral writings that have helped define my perspectives; and (d) selected earlier works, now superseded but important as part of the historia litteraria of the topic. (In the vast secondary literature, these are clearly personal selections.) These and the other works cited are accessible through the Name Index at the end of the book.

**Abbreviations**

### Journals

- *BkCol* The Book Collector (London, 1952–)
- *JLH* Journal of Library History (later Libraries & Culture, etc.) (Austin, &c., 1966–)
- *Lib Qty* Library Quarterly (Chicago, 1931–)
- *PBSA* Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America (New York, &c., 1907–)
- *SB* Studies in Bibliography (Charlottesville, 1948–)

### In citations

The most important terms and their derivatives, covered under one abbreviation:

- bibl. = bibliography, and derivatives
- lib. = library, and derivatives
- pr. = press
- ed. = edition, or edited by
- tr. = translation of, or translated by
- p. = page
- vol. = volume
- pseud. = pseudonym
- univ. = university

Organizations and Institutions:

- AAS = American Antiquarian Society
- ALA = American Library Association
- APHA = American Printing History Association
- Bib Soc = The Bibliographical Society (London)
- BSA = Bibliographical Society of America
- IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations
- GSLIS = Graduate School of Lib. and Information Science, Univ. of Illinois
- LA = Library Association (London)
- PHS = Printing History Society (London)
- SHARP = Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing
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Boccaccio’s Angel

FOREWORD

The frontispiece of this book depicts an angel at work in the Barnabite library of St. Eloi in Paris around the year 1700. The angels’ scribal work is an act of faith: some day readers will notice, be stimulated, and be thankful. For now, however, the duty is to cite God’s evidence, convincing and dubious, for readers credulous and questioning, scrupulous and casual.

One reader would be Giovanni Boccaccio, scholar, teller of delightful tales, and advisor to the powerful, who often found himself with time to do what he loved to do: discover libraries. His student Benvenuto of Imola tells of his master’s visit to Monte Cassino around the year 1350:

Being eager to see the library, . . . he sought out one of the monks to do him the favor of opening it. Pointing to a lofty staircase, the monk answered stiffly, “Go up, it is already open.” He stepped up the staircase with delight, only to find the treasure house of learning destitute of door of any kind of fastening, while the grass was growing on the windowsills and the dust reposing on the books and bookshelves. Turning over the manuscripts, he found many rare and ancient works with whole sheets torn out, or with the margins ruthlessly clipped. As he left the room, he burst into tears, and, on asking a monk . . . to explain the neglect, was told that some of the inmates of the monastery . . . had torn out whole handsfull of pages and made them into psalters, which they sold to the boys, and had cut off strips of parchment which they turned into amulets to sell to women.

Out of such romantic legends emerge the agenda of bibliography. Are we really looking at an angel (where are the wings?), or a muse, or an angel with wings hidden so as to look like a muse, or perhaps only a scribe? And what is he or she doing: copying a text, citing it, annotating it? I must leave it to the angels to explain how Boccaccio may have seen this engraving (if he indeed did see it) several
centuries before it was created, and in a different library. (Angels do things like this.) Did Boccaccio ever make this particular trip to Monte Cassino? How did he learn about the library: what “bibliographical sources” told him that he might find the trip worthwhile? Did he, living during the birth of the Renaissance, that day uncover several books of Tacitus that had been lost for centuries? How did my sources, Longfellow and Sandys, learn about Benvenuto? What is my best source on Benvenuto? Can I trust him, or Boccaccio, or Longfellow, or Sandys? Answers to such questions begin in bibliographical records – statements that index the written contract that, as Edmund Burke proposed, ties together those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are yet to be born. The metaphors of the angel of St. Eloi – the prototypical bibliographer – and Boccaccio – the prototypical reader – watch over this book.


See further Jackson *Anatomy*, pp. 418-19. The account was largely forgotten over the centuries, and is rarely cited today. Did these events ever happen? Luigi Tosti, in his *Storia della Badia di Monte-Cassino* (1853; vol. 3, pp. 97–99), has his doubts. But does his love for his monastery undermine his credibility? Benvenuto was a devoted student of Boccaccio, and Boccaccio himself is not known to have either confirmed or denied the legend.

The original Latin text, from a commentary on book 22 of Dante’s *Paradiso*, may be seen in the Barbéra edition of Benvenuto’s *Comentum super dantis Aldigherij Comœdium*, vol. 5 (1887), pp. 301-02; also in Edward Edwards’ *Memoirs of Libraries* (1859), vol. 1, pp.–72, and Paget Toynbee’s *Dante Studies and Researches* (Methuen, 1902), pp. 233–34. For more on Benvenuto, see William Warren Vernon’s several studies from around 1900, also recent scholarship by Paolo Pasquino.

Browsing turned up this story: many years ago, I stumbled onto Sandys, who led to Longfellow, with no clues that I would ever wish to remember and cite ig. Boccaccio’s role in preserving Tacitus is well known, although it is today generally agreed: he did not that day filch what may be the greatest of all Tacitus manuscripts and take it to Florence, where it is now Medicea-Laurenziana 68.2.

This Barnabite congregation was of the order of St. Eloi (patron saint of goldsmiths, and thus perhaps engravers and punch cutters as well), founded in Milan in 1629. The Paris congregation was suppressed during the Revolution, but reconstituted in 1865. One can imagine this library serving as the working collection for Jean-Pierre Nicéron, a noted Barnabite and author of one of the bibliographical landmarks of the Enlightenment, the Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres, avec un catalogue raisonné de leurs ouvrages (1727–45).

But is the library not in fact merely an allegory of the world of knowledge: did the library in St. Eloi actually look like this, with these classical titles on the shelves? Angels, like God, move in mysterious ways. My case for an angel copying a citation must rest on two arguments: (1) the scene appears in the catalogue of a notable religious library, and (2) catalogues are the work of angels who do what is pleasing in the sight of God. Not a strong case at all, except to those with a strong faith in the angels of bibliography.

Bibliography is the attempt to make sense of the fertile chaos of the written record of civilization. Its goal is, through citations and perspectives, to match that record with the readers who stand to benefit from knowing about it. The citations identify books, defined either narrowly – after the 1450s, printed objects in folded gatherings – or broadly – anything to be read. This book is an extended essay on the different forms of bibliography. Per its subtitle, it is an anthology of perspectives on the practices (a fertile chaos in their own right) of listing, examining, cataloguing, citing, and tracing the story of books.¹ It is a Global Positioning System of sorts, proceeding from the Table of Contents above, to the main text and to the writings it cites, as on to others written and yet unwritten.

My basic arguments are based in the premises discussed in Chapter I: the terms and purposes of bibliography and its five “attributes”: medium (oral, written, electronic), authority (the compilers who do and the organizations that support bibliographical work), readers, textures, and structures. The most important domains of bibliography are summarized in the next five chapters. Chapter II surveys the events before Gutenberg, too easily passed off as “pre-history.” Chapter III is on enumerative bibliography (lists), Chapter IV on analytical,

¹In “Science and Bibliography,” SB, 27 (1974), 87, G. Thomas Tanselle proposes that “Bibliography is not a ‘subject’ but a related group of subjects that happen to be commonly referred to by the same term.”
descriptive, and textual bibliography (the study of physical evidence), Chapter V on library cataloguing, Chapter VI on miscellaneous bibliographical references. A brief entr'acte after Chapter III digresses to play with disingenuous bibliography; a long field trip after Chapter IV introduces genres other than printed books that now ask for bibliographical listing and study. Tutorials after Chapter VI cover compiling, searching, and verification. The last three chapters look at political settings. Chapter VII, on the dialectics of lists, is followed by a brief case study on the bibliography of printing. Chapter VIII introduces the culture of historical bibliography in the form of a survey-census of the world of written books, while Chapter IX looks at some of the ways in which the different forms of bibliography have been and can fit together to make for something of an anatomical whole.¹

Each of the bibliographical domains — enumerative, analytical, descriptive, textual bibliography, library cataloguing, references — serves readers in different ways. Each has developed its own practices, and each enjoys its special autonomy and credibility. Each is continually redefining itself through its expanding scholarship. Each has its circle of leaders and practitioners, its formal organizations and publications, its informal canons of practices and protocols, its nuances of

¹This anatomy in this book is thus quite unlike that of Holbrook Jackson’s Anatomy of Bibliomania (1930). Jackson’s title, of course, pays tribute to Robert Burton’s The Anatomy of Melancholy (1621 – a work which, incidentally, Jackson edited for Everyman’s Library in 1932). Jackson, however, like Burton, deals with the body’s “humours,” I rather with the limbs, organs, and circulatory system. (Nor did Burton in his day have footnotes to call on; nor would Jackson have wanted to use them.) My title came into focus some years ago, when Terry Belanger, on reading a draft of early passages, and with his legendary candor, described its meanderings as “Shandean.” My prose may be less noble than Sterne’s, or Burton’s, or Jackson’s, but I hope it may be given credit for being no less exuberant.

My greater debt in choosing my title, however, is to Dan Traister, for telling me that I was writing the kind of book that Philip Stevick had in mind in his “Novel and Anatomy: Notes Toward an Amplification of Frye,” Criticism, 10 (1968) 153–65. In his Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton Univ. Pr., 1977), Northrop Frye proposes that anatomy could be seen as a literary genre. Stevick expands on Frye by suggesting that the genre is distinctively encyclopedic in impulse; willfully perverse; “a minority genre . . . carried out on the fringes of its culture.” Of the infinite number of anatomies of bibliography, mine is written for readers with enough attitude to enjoy strange things like this.

Stevick also speaks of the genre as being distinctly musical. I have drawn many examples from my work as a music bibliographer, although my broad conception of bibliography has, too often and too clearly, made it hard for me to keep my tunes in the right key.

1
terminology and its values. Each sees itself as the central focus of all bibliography: the others are ancillary. Each has its special place in the communities of ideas, its philosophies and policies, its controversies and orthodoxies, its dealings with its neighbors, friendly, hostile, or indifferent. Each is supported by a rich literature (which is accessible, of course, bibliographically). Countless scholars have devoted their lifetimes to these specialties. My summary of the totality of bibliography and its main parts, I hope, may be seen as a survey more than a heresy.

This “anthology of perspectives” assumes that blood is coursing through the bibliographical anatomy, many of them in the form of discursive footnotes. The anthology is also meant to work also like the repertory of anecdotes a lecturer uses in answering questions from the class and in hopes of stimulating more questions. Out of the practices of bibliography the politics of bibliography emerges, in all its digressive abundance. The profusion of citations, I hope, may serve to suggest the rich literature of bibliography. (Like its citations, bibliography is easy to ignore, except when it is discovered.) As they look for adjectives to describe the book, I hope that readers may see it as lambent rather than superficial.

The chronology of bibliography, even when it is datable, is still porous. Citations began in antiquity as oral references. Later they were written but based on oral practices, at first recorded one copy at a time, later printed and published so that their titles might be more widely known. In recent years electronic forms have been developed based on written practices. As a grand narrative, this sequence is obvious and simplistic. There are also many other important considerations, some

---

1 Neil Harris comments thus: “most extant definitions of bibliography have been produced by the simple device of having bibliographers sit in front of a mirror” and describe themselves. (See the 2004 syllabus for his course, “Introduction à la bibliographie matérielle,” on the website of the Institut d’histoire du livre in Lyons.) Harris further quotes A.E. Housman: “everybody has his favourite study, and he is therefore disposed to lay down, as the aim of learning in general, the aim which his favourite study seems specially fitted to achieve, and the recognition of which as the aim of learning in general would increase the popularity of that study and the importance of those who profess it.”

Hazard Adams’ “Third Principle of Faculty-Administration Polity” (The Academic Tribes, New York: Liveright, 1976; p. 8) expresses the point in a different setting: “the fundamental allegiance . . . [is] to the smallest unit to which [an academic] belongs.”
interrelated, some not. Many threads dangle for centuries before reappearing in much different forms. Some events and trends call for chapters, others for a single sentence. Might this book then better have been conceived as hypertext? The interplay of the premises would have been hard to bring out: their music may seem aleatoric, but its counterpoint works best when it is organized symphonically. The subject index may help. The perspectives and arguments are for readers to explore as they redefine the practices and participate in the politics of bibliography.

Will bibliography in the future involve printed books at all? The internet is widely used today for citing texts, presenting and printing them as well. Our world has been both oral and written for several thousand years now, however, and the prospect of dispensing with printed and oral forms seems as undesirable as it is unlikely. We may be on the cusp of a biblioapocalyptic age – all ages are apocalyptic – and bibliography addresses the future. Its objectives are anything but atavistic, since it benefits from being expressed in many forms.

The future of books – printed editions as well as manifestations of the concepts that make up the collective world of bibliography – involves both ideas, which grow out of reading, with its ideal on paper, and citations, the consulting of which is easier in an ever-changing electronic world. Those who predict the disappearance of paper can still benefit from historical perspectives, but those who predict a coexistence face the even greater challenge of working to see that each of the media are used to its best advantage. Fredson Bowers’s adage, “bibliographies are meant to be both read and consulted,” pervades the book. All reading is consulting, and consulting is most effectively guided by reading, and listening.

For those who never read, bibliography is dull; for those who read, it is essential. It guides our reading and, as it leads us to more places to look, it often helps us figure out what we needed in the first place. When all sources fail us, we often blame not our bibliographies but ourselves: our faith in the written word extends to the sources that lead us to the written word. Bibliography enjoys a credibility that makes us patient with its systems. Its arcane erudition often even bullies us. Some bibliographers may be left in tears, not always rightly. Others learn not to care, not always rightly. Their works often become known by their names, and their worlds come to life as readers discover what those they cite have written. This book celebrates the richness of these worlds.