

class it as a rare, learned, and literary word. It is odd that this abstruse and rare word should have been used when the simple *amica* would have done equally well. But on reflection it will be remembered that literary pretension and lack of scholarship are often concomitant.

At Ep. VI.30 a note by Hand C makes a pertinent cross-reference to an epigram of Ausonius (Ep. XVI). This, as far as I know, has been made by no commentator on the epigrams from antiquity to the present day.

The picture then is clear. Hand C was weak both in Greek and Latin. He copies out notes put together by some scholarly person who took the commentary of Calderini as his guide but added, subtracted, and altered. The annotations in the incunabula have thus no interest for the scholar—but this fact could not be assumed and had to be determined by investigation. If in the course of this the annotations have served to illustrate a method and a technique then they have perhaps served some useful purpose.

A. J. Dunston.

Some Reflections on the Future of Bibliographical Research and Teaching in Australia and New Zealand

The following pages reproduce in substance a brief talk given from the chair at the beginning of the Society's first annual general meeting in August 1970. They are printed here at the meeting's direction. Some excisions and amendments have been made, but there has been no attempt to dress-up an occasional address as a scholarly paper. The author's situation explains an unavoidable concentration on problems of library and university organization in Australia.

Something less than three months ago an imprudent journalist wrote in a review published by *The Australian*:

We are lucky in being one of the few countries in which almost all our history has been recorded, or is still available to the enthusiastic seeker from oral sources.

Anyone who has attempted to study the operations of nineteenth-century Australian publishers or booksellers will recognize the absurdity of this statement. Readers of Mr John Holroyd's monograph on the Melbourne George Robertson, our most substantial nineteenth-century publisher and bookseller, will remember and regret that Robertson's private and business records were not available, having apparently been destroyed. Indeed some of the most interesting documents examined by Mr Holroyd were drawn from the Bentley Papers in the University of Illinois Library to illuminate a facet of that mysterious subject, the circulation of American pirated editions in colonial Australia and New Zealand. How intractable yet fascinating the topic is has been shown by Mr Simon Nowell-Smith's recent *International Copyright Law and the Publisher in the Reign of Queen Victoria*. It can hardly be hoped that the resources of distant but enlightened foreign libraries will help us out of other difficulties; for example, the meagreness of available accounts of Gordon & Gotch or the virtual disappearance of the archives of E. W. Cole of Book Arcade fame. Sadly, too, I must report that a promising line of enquiry ended recently and abruptly when I discovered that the major book auctioneers of nineteenth-century Melbourne no longer possess their accumulation of records. The business archivists of the University of Melbourne and elsewhere have come too late for us. Even worse perhaps, in one public repository, which had better be nameless, I discovered that the documents ceded by a long-established newspaper had been carefully culled to remove amongst other things the vouchers that, where they survive, as, for example, for the early-eighteenth-century Cambridge University Press, are a marvellous and necessary antidote to "printers of the mind." In short, we are extraordinarily underprivileged in Australia, far worse off than the historians and bibliographers investigating the book-trade of eighteenth- or even seventeenth-century France with all the aids provided by an inquisitive and meticulous bureaucracy, not least the now available compulsorily-preserved notarial archives.

It is not so long since I published some suggestions for exploring Australian book-trade history, so I shall not proceed to enumerate all that has to be done to study printing, publishing, bookselling, binding, papermaking, and typefounding in our two countries. It is enough to say that these tasks are ones our Society will have to take seriously, and this means that we shall have to foster greater awareness of the value of the records whose loss I have been lamenting. In an era of co-operative research it is desirable to envisage a blueprint for the preservation of relevant materials and for their systematic investigation. A bibliography of work already done, however fragmentary and provisional, and an inventory of archival sources are first necessities. It may be pretentious for our infant Society to think of setting-up working parties in Australia and New Zealand to pursue these enquiries, but I believe the enterprise is so urgently required that we should forget any misgivings on this score. It is an initiative we owe to historical scholarship.

Australia and New Zealand are not, of course, our only preoccupations. The listing of English and European manuscripts and early printed books in our libraries is proceeding at a commendable pace. In the field of an eighteenth-century English STC the efforts of our colleague Professor W. J. Cameron amongst others have given us some sort of lead, as will be seen when the proposals recently expounded here by Professor G. E. Bentley, Jr., come to be discussed. No doubt relative poverty is partly responsible for this anxious scrutiny of our possessions, but I should like to hope that the Society will give its blessing and support to efforts that are ultimately of more than local relevance.

It is less obvious, less well known, that some of our members are making significant contributions to the analytical study of the English and European book-world. Or, rather, less well known outside our own circle, since the work of Professor McKenzie and Mr Maslen hardly needs any commendation to bibliographers. There are welcome signs, too, that Australians are helping in the sometimes formidable job of presenting the "bibliographical way" to literary historians concerned with French and other European literatures. It is one of our more important responsibilities to foster these trends, to make sure that we do not ignore the mainstream of bibliographical scholarship. In this connection I am particularly happy that this Conference includes a paper on an aspect of textual criticism in the strict sense. Bibliographers are sometimes accused of applying their skills to routines of description and enumeration, with the implication that our profession is a particularly dreary form of mindlessness. It is good to remind our detractors that methods are constantly receiving critical examination in our discipline, and indeed that, if one surveys the development of bibliography since 1940, one sees both readiness to accept cross-fertilization from other fields like economic history and effective calling into question of the theories and practices of earlier generations. In this essential quest we must continue to share.

By launching our own publications or by remaining active contributors to overseas journals? No doubt both are possible and desirable. But whatever publishing programme we embark upon, we should be prepared to set theoretical discussion alongside the necessary enumerative or descriptive material resulting from our researches. We face a problem of financial support; we have to justify the intellectual respectability of our science to governmental agencies and perhaps to universities. Our own conviction has to be patiently argued, demonstrated. For our own good we cannot shirk this chore of removing strange misapprehensions among some of our masters. Here, as in all our research activities, co-operation, dialogue, discussion are unavoidable. But it is for these very reasons that we are a Society and not a group of scattered individuals.

If our common interest in research, in publication, and in their enlightened support is clear enough, what about teaching? It seems to me that our responsibilities are no less evident in this sphere. Yet one hesitates to suggest that we should become a teaching body, a poor relation perhaps of the universities and of the colleges of advanced education whose courses for librarians include matter that is our concern. Before dismissing the notion out of hand, let us look for a moment at the way higher education is being dispensed to the Australian public. I dare not speak of New Zealand, where bibliography seems in any case to be more solidly implanted in the universities, although I suspect some of my points may be applicable.

The last decade and a half in Australia have brought unprecedented growth in almost all universities and a much-needed strengthening of the colleges of advanced education. University libraries have become in the various States better endowed than the State libraries that often outclassed them in the past. The National Library of Australia has begun to assume the stature of a great library with ambitious collecting policies. For the believer in progress through sheer growth there seems to be much to commend: wider educational opportunities for young people, bigger and better-equipped libraries. And yet there are reasons for hesitation, for doubt. Has this spectacular progress brought the quality of scholarly opportunity one would like to expect?

I am delighted by the treasures that have come to the National Library, and I should not want for one moment to see undone anything that has been done in Canberra. However, Canberra is not Paris or London—the analogy with the British Museum or the Bibliothèque Nationale breaks down as soon as one considers the community served. Canberra is not even Melbourne or Sydney, where scholarly needs of the general public go unsatisfied. But what of the universities? How much are they doing for those that are not callow youths fresh from school or scarcely-less-callow candidates for postgraduate degrees? Idle questions? Not, I submit, in a Society such as ours.

Australian universities have been restricted, for various perfectly valid reasons, to a certain maximum or optimum size, with the result that the larger cities have had a proliferation not only of campuses but also of institutions. Leaving aside some of the difficulties of library provision, there is one consequence worth noting, especially in a system whose accounting in terms of "effective full-time students" and "equivalent academic staff" has become extraordinarily rigid. Small and unpopular subjects are not offered, cannot be offered, not because they are intrinsically unimportant, not because there is no demand at all for them, but because there is no mass demand in the limited community of post-adolescents that is each separate university. If these subjects are taught at all, it is by subterfuge or as adjuncts by persons whose nominal duties are at best vaguely related. Unusual languages,

palaeography, and bibliography, these are some of the victims, waiting perhaps for the clarity of a mediaevally-inclined history department or of an unsectarian school of English. In any case the makeshift benefits only the regularly enrolled undergraduate, usually one reading for Honours. Nowhere is it possible—outside vocationally-oriented schools of librarianship—to appoint lecturers in palaeography or bibliography or book-trade history. Yet we have only to consider the diversity of our own backgrounds to recognize that a serious interest in these subjects can be professed by persons who are neither undergraduates nor PhD candidates nor aspiring librarians. In short there is a demand, limited in extent no doubt, but nonetheless quite respectable, that will have to be satisfied in new ways.

These new ways involve a rethinking of the universities' role in adult education or in continuing education. Low-level or medium-level courses in general culture, refresher courses for engineers and managers, these seem to be the ambitions at present formulated for university extension work. I believe universities must go further, must institutionalize what some groups and societies parallel to our own have attempted to do by *ad hoc* courses or summer-schools in subjects like Mediaeval Latin, Old Provençal, and the auxiliary sciences of mediaeval history. French models, especially since May 1968, might appear singularly unpromising for the educational reformer. Yet it is a century-old French institution, the *École pratique des hautes études*, that suggests a way out of the *impasse*, towards making scholarly training and enquiry available to all those interested whatever their previous attainments or their present occupation. If in the rather rigid educational hierarchy of France, where degrees and diplomas have long been regarded with excessive veneration, not least for admission to the Bibliothèque Nationale, it is possible for persons of little or no formal academic training to enrol, gratis and with no formality beyond signing a register, in advanced seminars in bibliography and book-trade history or to take courses in palaeography, it is surely possible in our so-called egalitarian countries to guarantee similar access to scholarship and to the scholarly community to all those with sufficient curiosity and stamina to join groups where no intellectual concessions whatsoever need be made. This is not the place to set out a detailed scheme, but I am convinced that such courses and seminars can be grafted with relatively little expense on to existing arrangements for university extension activities. State libraries, which must be recognized by the Commonwealth Government as part of our scholarly arsenal *with appropriate financial support*, could well serve such a scheme, especially if the individual universities of the larger cities decided to pool their resources to bring it about.

All this may sound utopian. We can after all get on as before, pursuing our separate researches and seeking the occasional fellowship of our colleagues whenever we are especially dispirited. But I suggest that, if our existence as a Society is to have any meaning, we must look and plead for opportunities to teach our subject adequately, to infect new generations with our own enthusiasms. Our several fields are too important to be sacrificed to a system the Government finds convenient for the disbursement of funds to higher education. We are, I venture to think, determined to survive as a Society and to ensure the survival of our discipline, which is in any case flourishing in other parts of the world. We know that we are not pleading for an ossified tradition but for a living science. This thought alone should encourage us to work—individually, or collectively—for educational institutions that guarantee our two countries' right to share in the scholarly pursuits that might be considered a legitimate form of leisure activity even by those that deny the sort of vocation some of us may still feel.

Wallace Kirsop

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)