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The idea for this forum on the future(s) of teaching analytical bibliography came out of an animated discussion Bryan Coleborne and I had after the second day of proceedings of the 1994 annual conference of the Society at the University of Melbourne, walking down Swanston Street, dodging cars at intersections. Our steps finally took us into the satisfying confines of a licensed establishment in Little Collins Street, and then of course agreement about all manner of things went on at a terrific rate. But before we got to that generous, glowing state of mind, we had talked about our teaching. We became aware that we were facing allied problems. Both of us could see, if not too clearly, ways in which the terminology of bibliography, and the discipline of thinking in the bibliographical way, could benefit not just our professional work as scholarly editors, but also our students’ study of literature and, in Bryan’s case, of other cultural forms.

Both of us, I recall, expressed our keen irritation at the way in which cultural and literary studies have been saturated by explanations that locate works of literature and film within the ambit of socially circulating discourses. While this is a powerful method of explanation, it dismisses questions of authorship and intention as old hat; it offers little help in dealing with the ways in which physical production and distribution of books mediate the reading experience for the reader; and it ignores the (consequent) questions of textual transmission and of the versional nature of literary and other cultural forms of communication. We suspected that the cause of this striking intellectual lacuna lies in the common conception of the bibliographic pursuit as dry-as-dust and unfashionable, and in the allied fear of many literary and cultural critics of having to do some hard empirical work rather than elegant or densely theoretical essay-writing. If our admixture of disgruntlement and enthusiasm was ever to harden into an idea, then we should get some
discussion going on how other other people went about teaching their bibliography courses. Thus was the idea for a panel discussion born.

The occasion elicited a variety of viewpoints, and a good discussion ensued. The papers have since been prepared for publication but retain some of the informality of their original presentation at the Society's 1995 conference at Monash University.

In their papers, both Brian McMullin and Chris Tiffin in their different ways tilt at forces which have been unsettling the consensus on which the bibliographical pursuit was built. For McMullin, 'the book as object' remains 'the basis for all bibliographical studies' - despite the literary and cultural theorising of the last thirty years. For Tiffin, the now-widespread conception that the book will soon become a dinosaur in an electronic age needs to be faced down. Without bibliographical knowledge one the grand narratives of Western culture - the history of the book - cannot be intelligently understood.

That leaves the practical question of how to engage students of today (whom McMullin observes seem to need to be 'seduced' into the subject rather than 'recruited') with 'a body of information and rigorous forensic knowledge'. Tiffin has some very useful things to say on that score, and my paper offers some others.

Bryan Coleborne raises another order of question, about the best point within the curriculum to begin teaching bibliography. My paper was written on the understanding that such courses would not be able to commence till the Fourth (Honours) Year, at least in Departments of English such as I teach in. However the resistance one sometimes encounters at that level to the subject may have its origins in the fact that students have had little or no prior experience of it. Bryan Coleborne's bold proposal about structural change in the undergraduate BA might well be the answer - or at least one answer. I hope that other contributions to this discussion will be forthcoming both at the Society's annual conferences and in these pages.
TEACHING BIBLIOGRAPHY AT ADFA: AN APOLOGIA

PAUL EGGERT

In March 1932 Sir Walter Greg delivered a presidential address to the Bibliographical Society. Greg was in his 57th year and was in a position to reflect on the changes in literary study which he, McKerrow and others had been introducing, in particular the application of bibliographic method to the solution of literary-historical and text-critical problems that had otherwise been only the subject of speculation. In the course of his address, printed the same year in *The Library as Bibliography – An Apologia*, he called for more use of bibliographic technique by literary scholars and even envisaged the creation of 'a faculty of textual criticism, of what might be called bibliographical critics, whose business it would be not to produce critical editions themselves, but to investigate the facts of textual transmission, and prepare the material which the literary editor would be bound to use, and give a verdict which he would be bound to accept' (p. 260).

Greg was to be proved right, at least in part: bibliographic method became the mainstay of the editing of literary works in the English-speaking countries in a way it never did in France. I'm not aware of any such faculty or department such as Greg envisaged being created in Britain or Australia, but, as English Departments developed in the following decades, the twin thrusts of I.A. Richards' practical criticism, strengthened by the moral earnestness of F.R. Leavis and his school, developed on the one hand, countered by the literary historical and bibliographic on the other. Both were a reaction to the literary diletantism that had characterised the study of English literature in the early decades of the century. I might recall two pertinent facts here: the celebrated run-in between Fred Bateson and F.R. Leavis in the pages of *Scrutiny* and *Essays in Criticism* in the early 1950s as they argued the toss on the relevance of historical facts to the appreciation and understanding of works of literature.1 That there could be an argument on such a question might be surprising at first, but one has only to reflect on the rise of the New Criticism in the United States in the 1940s, on Wimsatt's seeing the literary work as a self-sufficient 'verbal icon', and on the related title of Cleanth Brooks' famous work of criticism, *The Well-Wrought Urn* of 1947. Historical and authorial contexts were dispensable.

The second fact I would cite comes from the list of critical editions by Australians and New Zealanders which Kym McCauley and I compiled to act as the basis of an article in the *Bulletin.*2 The number is in fact quite

---


2. Eggen and McCauley, 'Critical and Scholarly Editing in Australia and New Zealand in the Last Twenty-Five Years: An Essay on the Nomenclature of Editions, and a Representative
substantial. It is partly explained by the number of antipodeans going to
Britain to study for a higher degree and finding themselves as a matter of
course, at least at Oxford or Cambridge, being set to work on a critical edition.
This was necessarily slow and difficult work and lacked the glamour of the
prevailing literary-critical debates. Perhaps that helps account for the fading
away of courses devoted to bibliography and scholarly methods during the
1970s and after. When I got into Fourth Year of my BA at Sydney University
in 1973 I learnt, to my then-relief I have to admit, that the bibliography course
had only been recently abandoned. When I went to Melbourne to do an MA,
S.L. Goldberg was in charge, and such matters were not even talked about.
When I got to the University of Kent at Canterbury in 1976, I was told that its
bibliography course, taught I presume by Peter Stone, had just been wound
up.

Since that period, English Departments have changed radically. My
argument is going to be that, just as Greg was reacting to the institutional
imperatives of his day, so must we to the different ones of today. What can’t
be ignored in the English Departments of today are the successive waves of
literary theory that have swept over the study of canonical literature
questioning the factuality of fact, the historicity of history, and liberal-
humanist assumptions about the importance of the individual as an initiating
centre of value, including the individual author’s right to be taken as the source
of authority for a text or a point of reference for interpretation. Instead the
emphasis has gone on socially circulating discourses into which the meanings
of texts can be said to be dispersed; that is now their primary source of
interest. Given that assumption, it makes little difference whether one sets
one’s students to read Jackie Collins or George Orwell. The advent of cultural
studies, which the ever-chameleon Departments of English are avidly
absorbing, is a related phenomenon.

The (unholy) trinity of race, gender and class is now said to locate us in our
speaking and reading ‘positions’, refracting, pre-packaging, what we say and
what we know, indeed who we are. This new, relativising scepticism, with its
carefully tended self-consciousness about the power or privilege inhering in
our own positions, readily puts the skids under assumptions about positive
knowledge with its implicit claim to universal truth. The basis of the earlier
agreements are, with comparative ease, redefined as gendered or eurocentric or
white. The politics of knowledge – of how we legitimate it – has been pushed
centre-stage. In a spirit sometimes of new age revivalism, theory is rehearsed
and anxieties confessed, preferably in public.

If I parody here, it is only slightly, and because it gives me a wicked kind of
joy. But what is equally true is that I am not parodying only what others have
done. I have – we have – all been affected by the relativisms of feminism,
multiculturalism, Mabo and postcolonialism. Our thinking has changed to
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lesser or greater degrees because of them. We have been enabled to see things and understand things in ways we never would have been able to do before. Knowing where you are in this way and what intellectual forces have been moulding your students is the starting point for me when I consider my teaching of a bibliography course which I first put together in 1986 and have adapted every year since.

It follows from the intellectual scenario I have described that I don't believe teaching bibliography is only a matter of passing on a body of knowledge, difficult though that is. It is partly that. But, for me, it is more important to get students thinking bibliographically, asking questions that challenge the prevailing intellectual highgrounds. That is why I make sure they get some printer's ink on their hands and some archival dust up their noses. I want them to know the ways in which a sheet can be folded, and the forms in which a novel could be sold in the nineteenth century, so that when they turn to think about textuality in my course or in others they cannot fail to bear in mind the material objects which serve as the carriers of texts, and the questions which they implicitly beg. If a work was reissued in a new form or new edition I want my students to be able to ask themselves what effects the new issue may have had on its audiences, or what opportunities for revision the new edition afforded. I want them to ask the whodunnit questions: who wrote these words? who made these changes? for what reasons? when exactly? In other words I want them to be able to reinsert notions of individual responsibility and historical context back into their literary-critical and -theoretical thinking. I want to interest them in questions that have to some extent fallen through the postmodern sieve and, as a result, out of sight.

That's how I see the course ten years after having set it up, but when I began I only dimly forewore this rationale. I had begun to get interested in editorial theory in 1985 largely through being irritated with the approach I was being invited to take to an edition of The Boy in the Bush which I had begun a few years before, and the happy coincidences of a visit to the Department that year by Peter Shillingsburg and the planning then taking place for the Colonial Texts Series. Not having had one jot of training in analytical or any other form of bibliography I had nevertheless, as a budding editor, started to realise the need for it. So, inheriting the bibliography course from the Hardy scholar, John Laird, who was then retiring, and given carte blanche to do with it as I thought fit, what I did was what everyone in the situation does: try to keep one step ahead of the students, concentrate on the things I did know about, and rope in other people to teach in areas in which I did not. So Leonie Rutherford took a class on descriptive bibliography for a couple of years, and lecturers at the Canberra School of Art took the two-day printing workshop which has been an annual feature of the course ever since.

The course is one session in length and is given at the Fourth Year/ MA (Pass) level. Students are obliged to participate in the printing workshop which is worth ten percent of the marks. It comes in the fourth week of the course after an introductory week in which forms of literary scholarship and
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bibliographical sources are discussed, recently via chapter 1 of David Greetham's *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*.3 I have in the past provided students with a tailor-made annotated listing of sources relating to Australian literary subject matter. On other occasions I have taken the students up to the Library for a session on databases. I have my doubts about how much goes in during sessions of this kind, and suspect the students feel as if they are being bombarded with useless information. As I don’t think I teach this kind of class well, I have minimised its role in the course, making it perhaps less useful as a service course but giving me other opportunities with the time thus freed up.

In the second week come the first two class papers. Such papers are worth twenty percent of the marks for the course. The papers are on topics I have nominated which I want the course to cover. I provide a lengthy, annotated bibliography of relevant recent books and articles, a list to which I have been steadily adding over the years. The first two papers have been on Ada Cambridge’s *A Woman’s Friendship*. One student is set to read the novel from hard copy or microfilm of the Age; another reads the critical edition. I am replacing it in 1996 with the latest Colonial Texts Series edition, Catherine Martin’s *The Silent Sea* (1892), edited by Rosemary Foxton, which was also serialised in Australian newspapers.4 Unlike the Cambridge novel it was not lost and rediscovered, merely neglected; but its publishing history is nonetheless intriguing given that Martin was having to provide copy to three different publishers: the Observer and its Saturday edition, *Evening Standard*, in Adelaide, the *Age* in Melbourne and Bendley in London. She did so, differently. This class raises a raft of book-history and editorial questions with which the course later goes on to deal via class papers which review existing critical editions or works on the history of the book, or deal with authorship, copyright and forgery. The electronic book has also been the subject of one paper, and the bibliographic questions raised by the recording of oral cultures, and the clash of oral against literate cultures, are a regular feature via Don McKenzie’s monograph, *Oral Culture, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand: The Treaty of Waitangi*.5

Having set the intellectual parameters of the course in the second week, the third week is devoted to an introduction to physical bibliography based, this year, on chapter 3 from Greetham and an ancient 16mm film which I borrow from the National Library, *The Story of Printing*. This is followed the week after by the printing workshop. The production is different every year. In 1995 the students had to find a revealing or funny ‘par’ in the *Bulletin* about life in the city or life in the bush from the 1880s or 1890s, set their par in type and correct it after galleys were pulled, collectively come up with a title for the collection, and assist the lecturer with the final printing and folding. This involves the students in two full days whereas in other weeks the classes are

two-hour seminars. No-one becomes expert in what they are learning, and in fact I don't try to teach them descriptive bibliography at all any more. But they all do enough to realise that books and texts (their favourite term) are not at all the same thing. And they know where to go to find out more.

The fifth week is devoted to an introduction to the theory of critical editing in the Greg-Bowers final-intentions school. Until last year when I decided simply to use Greetham's summary (pp. 283-335), I had had the relevant articles xeroxed. Although I know there is disagreement about the accuracy of earlier chapters in Greetham, I find this part is really quite helpful and accessible. A class paper or two follows the next week, reviewing an edition prepared according to the traditional principles. Usually at this point, confusions emerge about the meanings of 'edition', 'impression', 'issue' and 'state'. They can be dealt with quite nicely because the clarification by now has some point.

Recent editorial theory occupies the next week, followed again by a review of an edition, usually Hans Walter Gabler's edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Questions arise about what are the competing sources of textual authority that would be suitable for basing critical editions on, whether authorship has a continuing role as an organising device, concepts of textual product vs textual process, the inevitably mediating role of the editor, and how we shall determine the boundaries of a literary work if it consists of many versions and is read by several audiences. The rest of the session is taken up with papers on the topics I have already mentioned. They usually have a way of returning to the same kinds of problems but from different directions.

What I have not mentioned is that, occupying the students' minds in all of this, is the major assignment which they set themselves in the first couple of weeks and have to hand in by the end of the session. It is intended to give point to a course which, to literature students, is replete with subject matter totally unlike what they are used to studying. I have found, in the past, resistance from Fourth Year students whose minds are on their theses, particularly if the course is scheduled for the second half of the year; but the MA students in the same class are usually far more open. That is how I hit on the idea of introducing the major assignment in the first class. They finish that first class by a visit to Special Collections in the ADFA Library. In the course of follow-up visits they, with the expert help of the curator, each work their way through parts of one or more collections aiming to find a poem or story existing in several versions which would be suitable either for a critical edition or for an interpretative essay based on textual criticism.

At first I was strict about the need for them to prepare an edition, until I realised that what I was really trying to teach was how to ask bibliographical questions, how to figure out the textual sequence of a series of manuscript
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versions of a poem, how to think about the transition into printed forms, how to deal critically with the textual fluidities that many literary works exhibit before publication. So, if the student indeed wants to do an edition I require more emphasis to be put on the headnote which precedes it and which defends the editing approach which is being adopted. If the assignment is interpretative, then there is more emphasis on the description of the various documents and the establishment of the textual sequence.

The topics the students come up with for their major assignments continually surprise me. In 1995 one student worked on the circumstances of the editing, publication and the reception of The Anzac Book which C.E.W. Bean edited in 1915, initially for distribution amongst the troops at Gallipoli. This student used the archive at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra which has the pieces written by the soldiers which Bean rejected. In 1994 a student worked on the fairly recent Australian adaptation of the American revival of the 1960s tribal rock-musical, Hair. The heavily annotated director's script is in the ADFA collection; it is a cut-and-paste and partial rewriting of the American version for which a licensing fee had been paid. The major question here, once the textual sequence had been mapped, was how and for what reasons the various changes for an Australian audience were made. To what extent in popular entertainment is the audience the de facto 'author' or authority? Another student faced a similar question when trying to explain the differences in the play scripts of Alma de Groen's feminist play, Vocations, for its performance in Melbourne and then Brisbane in 1982 and 1983. The argument was that the two directors' understanding of the climate of likely acceptance for de Groen's ideas had changed sufficiently between the two productions to allow the play to be tougher in Brisbane than it had been in Melbourne.

Questions of collaborative authorship arise more frequently in these topics than I had anticipated. A few years ago another student worked on the textual development of Mary Gilmore's poem on the fall of Singapore ('Singapore', 1942). One of her notebooks is in the ADFA Library, as are William Wilde's papers - he wrote the biography of Gilmore, Courage a Grace (1988), and co-edited the Letters of Mary Gilmore (1980) with Tom Inglis Moore - but the student became so enthusiastic as he uncovered the censoring of the poem's successive early versions that he made a trip to the Mitchell Library in Sydney to complete the story. His assignment has been passed on to Jennifer Strauss to help with her editing of Gilmore's complete poems in the Academy Editions of Australian Literature series.

Probably because the students are mainly working on recent Australian literary material it has made sense to de-emphasise the traditional elements of analytical bibliography courses which usually tend to concentrate on sixteenth- to eighteenth-century book production. The course could be accused, as a result, of falling between two stools. But I think what I have done, although I am never satisfied with it, at least recognises where the students are coming from and what materials we have at hand for them to work on independently.
Usually each student is the first person ever to have worked on the materials he or she chooses.

Whatever its faults, my bibliography course is at least in tune with recent developments in editorial and bibliographic theory which see works as continuous from the point of their creation, physical production and revision to their reading by successive audiences. Discussing the border at which 'bibliography and textual criticism on the one hand' is separate from 'literary criticism and literary history on the other', Don McKenzie commented in his Panizzi lectures of 1985:

My own view is that no such border exists. In the pursuit of historical meanings, we move from the most minute feature of the material form of the book to questions of authorial, literary and social context. These all bear in turn on the ways in which texts are then re-read, re-edited, re-designed, re-printed, and re-published. If a history of readings is made possible only by a comparative history of books, it is equally true that a history of books will have no point if it fails to account for the meanings they later come to make.8

Greg, in his 'Apologia', had defined bibliography differently, and McKenzie was taking him to account in his lectures. For Greg, 'what the bibliographer is concerned with is pieces of paper or parchment covered with certain written or printed signs. With these signs he is concerned merely as arbitrary marks; their meaning is no business of his.'9

For my money, McKenzie is right when he replies:

Greg's definition of what bibliography is would have it entirely hermetic. By admitting history we make it secular. The two positions are not entirely opposed, for books themselves are the middle ground. It is one bibliographers have long since explored, mapped, and tilted. Their methods far surpass semiotics as a science of signs. In the ubiquity and variety of its evidence, bibliography as a sociology of texts has an unrivalled power to resurrect authors in their own time, and their readers at any time. (p.19)

There's something of a call to arms in that declaration of faith. If the dominant pedagogy which I described at the start of this paper is to be counter-balanced by a habit of thinking in the bibliographical way, then more needs to be done. Surely we have an opportunity in this country now that we are gathering momentum: the Australian Book Heritage Resources Project, the Academy

Editions of Australian Literature Project, the History of the Book in Australia project having been generously funded, and the existence of two centres devoted to bibliography and editing. Yes.
I come to this panel on the future of teaching analytical bibliography from a position which, I imagine, is quite different to those of my colleagues here today. When I took over as the third Director of the Centre for Bibliographical and Textual Studies in the Faculty of Arts at Monash at the end of 1993, after the work of the foundation Director, Wallace Kirsop and his successor, Ross Harvey, I began to consider the role that the Centre might have in a radically altered university environment, not only at Monash but also throughout the whole country, with its so-called Unified National System, in which universities assumed a new, minimum size and, as I am sure I am not the first to say, in which mottoes were replaced with slogans.

In our initial contact on what this panel might consider, Paul Eggert raised a number of questions: how have we taught bibliography, and how might our aims and methods be reviewed in the light of the students we are now teaching? What new approaches might be worth exploring? Would bibliographical awareness assist the teaching of literature or film, or any cultural form with versions? Does the growing interest of historians in the history of the book offer an opportunity for widening the relevance of the teaching of bibliography?

These and other questions had been growing in my own mind since 1993, particularly as I faced the task of re-structuring the MA in Bibliographical and Textual Studies which the Centre had offered since the early 1980s. The Centre had functioned primarily as a research centre, its outstanding success being the research monies which it had been awarded for the Early Imprints Project, subsequently the Australia's Book Heritage Resources Project, or ABHR, and it faced an exciting future in research through its involvement in the History of the Book in Australia Project, or HOBA, which has now been awarded an ARC grant of $204,000 for the next three years. In late 1993 and early 1994, however, HOBA was in an earlier stage of development and the MA had to be changed to bring it into line with DEET's regulations for the structure of research degrees at the master's level. How might it be restructured, from a mixture of coursework and thesis which functioned at the level of Part II, that is, at that of a fifth year, and how might that restructuring consider what students would bring to it from an undergraduate level on the one hand, and what connexions might be established with the new research activities of the Centre on the other? Given the growth of HOBA, not only in its initial pursuit of funds, but also into the early years of the next century, what connexions might be made between possible directions in teaching and seemingly assured developments in research? In short, would it be feasible to develop an undergraduate teaching programme co-ordinated by the Centre, since it has no teaching staff allocated to it, a
programme which would feed students into the new MA and enable them to be involved, in varying ways, with the new developments in research? Finally, a question prompted by the responses of some prospective overseas students who have been surfing the Internet in search of graduate study in bibliographical and textual studies, and whose inquiries remind me that it is an uncommon degree: how might the distinctiveness of the MA be retained and even developed?

The MA has now been re-formatted, for the time being, into a programme of study at Part I and Part II levels. Students enrol in four subjects in Part I, which contains a core of three subjects with the choice of a fourth. The three core subjects are Analytical and descriptivbe bibliography, Historical bibliography, and Textual studies (the term used in the Centre for Aims and methods of scholarly research, which has now been renamed The life of the text: genesis, production, reception), and the fourth may be chosen from Australian booktrade history, or from English or a related discipline (for example, Professing literature is available from English; Professing bibliography, then, could be considered as a matching subject to be developed). It is also possible for a student to complete a research project as an alternative to the last two possibilities. Part II comprises a research thesis of 40,000 to 60,000 words. It would be possible for a suitably qualified student to proceed direct to Part II.

In time, as resources permit, new subjects could be added to either Part. I have already indicated my own interest in meetings at Clayton in complementing the emphasis on transmission which marks The life of the text and which I will introduce shortly as a key component in a sequence of undergraduate subjects. The area which interests me at this level arises from the distinction between the circumstances and nature of those texts which, say, are widely published in their own day, come to be widely translated and do not go out of print, and those of texts which would be appropriate for case studies of the different kinds of disruption to transmission. Some texts, which have been affected by conflict between their producers and the forces of authority, whatever the nature of those forces, direct attention to the study of the realities of their political context. Others, which prompt case-studies of a range of problems or issues in the history of culture, suggest an examination of matters which are apparently more diffuse, although political factors may still be involved. These may include the recovery of texts from the ancient and modern worlds (e.g., Menander, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Thomas Traherne, Jonathan Swift's correspondence, Matthew Flinders' journal); the transmission of corrupt texts, such as Pericles; the transmission of multiple texts, such as Dr Faustus or King Lear, which exist in recent scholarly editions whose study might lead to the concept of hypertext; the transmission of originally incomplete printed texts, such as Gulliver's Travels, to which six paragraphs were restored after almost two hundred years; the phenomenon of re-established or reconstituted texts, such as those of the Cambridge edition of D.H. Lawrence; the status of the translated text, which may lead to issues of appropriation and the complexities of translation theory, and so on.
This panel provides another opportunity to discuss what an undergraduate sequence of subjects might comprise in the environment of the questions that have been raised. The number of established and emerging courses in librarianship, English, cultural studies, media studies, communication studies and so on may suggest that no new pathways to a graduate degree in bibliographical and textual studies exist, but I challenge that notion with the proposal that a sequence of subjects in oral, print and electronic media awaits development. Such a sequence would place emphasis on the transmission of texts, under the general themes of their emergence, production, distribution, survival and reception. It would begin to explore the territory which was viewed by Robert Darnton in his seminal essay, 'What Is the History of Books' (1982) and D.F. McKenzie in the Panizzi Lectures of 1985, Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts (1986). It would direct attention to areas of controversy in contemporary bibliographical and textual studies. It would be alive to the conjunction of disciplines which has led, say, to the publication of The Epic of Gilgamesh, and it would continue to work, as recent scholarship has demonstrated, towards the synthesis of ideas and approaches which arises from contemporary notions of the nature of texts and the appropriateness of the inclusion of textual forms which have been hitherto neglected or scantily considered. It would draw on disciplines ranging from archaeology to those forming around the phenomenon of the electronic text. It would be open to the various gatherings of research and the commissioning of further work that are occurring now in the various national projects on the history of the book and print culture. It would take up the challenge of addressing areas which bibliographical study appears to have neglected, or has made minimal headway with, such as the development of a theory of annotation, and it would recognize the importance of engaging, as other areas have, such as librarianship, archives and records, the issues which arise from the cluster of questions surrounding the perishable or manipulatable text.

I envisage six subjects in the framework in which I am working, although more could easily be added, with refinement of the concept I am proposing. These six, which could be taken over three years, would study orality, writing, the author, reading, publishing in Australia, and the electronic book, in that sequence, if they were to stand alone, or in some variant, if they were to be offered within a cognate department such as English, where they might begin in the second semester of the first year.

What I offer now are some suggestions as to how this proposal might be constituted. I do not mean these remarks to be taken as exhaustive or definitive, and if it comes to working through them with a view to their implementation, I envisage planning in subject groups.

First, a subject in orality, ranging from the emergence of oral texts in indigenous cultures to the new orality of post-industrial culture, such as Ted Hughes creates in the demotic voice of Crow, whose eponymous protagonist survives destruction in a cartoon-like world of continuous possibility, or Italo Calvino creates in Marcovaldo, whose characters attempt to recreate the lost primal or oral world. There are numerous possibilities here, which could engage
the study of balladry and the work of Milman Parry and his followers on the creation of epic literature. The insights of Walter J. Ong in Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word (1982, 1989) would inform the subject and be tested within it.

Second, a subject in writing, emphasizing the emergence of writing and systems of alphabets and scripts, the development of writing as an institution and the social position of the scribe, the work of decipherment, the nature of documents, the overlapping of scribal culture with print culture, contemporary notions of non-manuscript writing, and the image of writing and the writer in texts. Illustrations could be drawn from numerous cultures, and students would be expected to be familiar with recent work such as Albertine Gaur's A History of Writing (1984, 1992), Georges Jean's Writing: The Story of Alphabets and Scripts (1987, trans. 1992), and Henri-Jean Martin's The History and Power of Writing (1988, trans. 1994).

Third, a subject in the history and theory of authorship, covering the different conceptions and theories of the author and ranging over the different conditions of authorship in diverse cultures, from anonymity, for whatever reason, to multiple authorship, the author in exile, the author in hiding, and the pseudonymous, hoax or bogus author, and so on. I do not intend these suggestions, of course, to be exhaustive. Dugald Williamson's Authorship and Criticism (1989) could be adopted as an initial text, with more detailed exploration continuing with the work of Sean Burke in The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida (1992, 1993) and Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader (1995).

Fourth, a subject in reading, which would cast its net over the history, experience and theory of reading, together with some emphasis on its image in texts from literary and visual culture. Chew Chiat Naun's recent essay in the BSANZ Bulletin last year, 'The History of Reading in Australia', reminds us of the ground to be covered between the Annales school of history and the work of Martyn Lyons and Lucy Taksa in Australian Readers Remember (1992), which might be followed as an example of recent Australian research into the experience of reading. Some more explicit attention should also be placed on reader-response criticism.

Fifth, a subject in publishing in Australia, which is already taught at Monash by Wallace Kirsop in the English Department. This subject makes a critical and historical examination of publishing in Australia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It examines how a publisher works, including the various stages of production, through the study of case histories, and it places the local trade in the context of the British and American industries. One of its key texts is the pioneering study, The Book in Australia: Essays towards a Cultural and Social History (1988), edited by D.H. Borchardt and W. Kirsop.

Sixth, a subject in the electronic book, which ranges from the emergence of electronic publishing to a consideration of its techniques and the issues it raises, such as the impact on the law of copyright and the nature of conventional publishing, with one response already appearing to be a renewed emphasis on
book arts. Some attention would be paid to case studies of contemporary practice and to exercises in the production of electronic material, in the form of a CD-ROM. A substantial bibliography has begun to appear.

The emphasis in these subjects on emergence, production, distribution, survival and reception should create a framework broad enough to introduce students to various aspects of bibliography, especially the analytical and the historical. It should also underpin the more advanced levels of the broader field, in the way that the subject in writing, say, should underpin an advanced level subject in palaeography. It should be possible to draw upon the interests and expertise of staff in a variety of cognate disciplines, and it should enable the study of some themes and subjects which are not emphasized in part or as a whole in the current structures. Where, for example, is Pericles taught in the present system? And, to revert to my suggestion for a subject at fourth- or fifth-year level dealing with the conflict between the producers of texts and authority, where is the history of the Stage Licensing Act taught in the present pattern? In conjunction with cognate subjects, it should allow sufficient study of literary texts to support a fourth year and graduate study in the more specialized areas of bibliographical and textual scholarship. It should provide linkages between the teaching and research interests of the Centre, and it should be attractive to students enrolled in other degrees, such as those in communication studies, who may take a sequence from elsewhere.

In opening my mail at the Centre I began to notice the variations on 'Bibliographical and 'Textual Studies', from 'textural' to numerous versions of 'bibliographical'. (I delight in the mechanical compulsion of the computer, or perhaps I should say its yoked companion the printer, one of which decides when it has had enough in producing a line in an address with total disregard for morphology.) The clear winner has long been 'Biblical and 'Textile', but if we begin with orality, when the Word was, after all, in the Beginning, and move on to some forms of textile-based media, then perhaps the term is not so far off the mark! It was not long before a correspondent, whose powers of literacy I leave to your imagination, drew my attention to the fact that by dropping the 'c' from 'Faculty' you could create the 'Faulty of Arts'. I would like to think that in a big Faulty of Arts it would be possible to mount a sequence of subjects in oral, print and electronic media as a means of underpinning the more advanced levels of bibliographical study that are involved at fourth- and fifth-year levels. If it is not, then perhaps a consortium of those who are interested in the proposal could investigate what could be done through some other means such as Open Learning.
BIBLIOGRAPHY IN THE LIBRARY SCHOOL AT MONASH

B.J. McMULLIN
Monash University, Clayton

It is probably appropriate that I be the first speaker on this occasion, since my attitudes and practices are likely to be seen as somewhat reactionary when set alongside those of my fellows. No doubt the attitudes derive in part from an unimaginative cast of mind, from a suspicion of that which cannot be supported by empirical evidence. 'Empiricism', I note in passing, has in some quarters become a term of denigration; I simply reaffirm here my attachment to the book as object, which I regard as the basis for all bibliographical studies. I might also venture the view here that some of the pursuits which pass for bibliography today (perhaps under the general rubric of 'history of the book') are only tangentially bibliographical - like readership, for example, which I would prefer to classify as a species of sociology, or perhaps of cultural studies. Though not personally uninterested in matters textual, I inhabit a territory somewhat different from that of the other three speakers: it may be that, working within a department of librarianship, archives and records, my day-to-day concerns are more utilitarian - perhaps more circumscribed - than if I were working, like the others, within a department of literary studies and therefore subject to competing theories, which to an outsider appear to have little connexion with the object of study. Like theory, however, utility can be a fickle master: in the past two decades or so Australian library schools have - with, I think, the sole exception of Monash - abandoned historical studies of any kind in pursuit of the more obviously utilitarian in the guise of 'information technology'. I accept that newcomers to the profession must be able to operate in an 'automated' environment, but I remain convinced that historical studies are a useful component in professional education - how else can one understand the phenomenon of the brittle book, for example, unless with a knowledge of bookmaking? how confidently catalogue an item without a knowledge of the physical relationships of its components? how properly maintain a collection without some awareness of the status of various editions? These are matters obviously vital to people working with older printed materials, but my view is that they are of at least some concern to all librarians, whose particular expertise used to be books, and whose particular expertise may once again become books as more of the populace become held in thrall by the computer.

In our post-graduate diploma (a first-professional award) we therefore continue to include a compulsory component of historical studies, though with changing personnel that commitment is not necessarily permanent. In addition to a course on the history of libraries we have a first-semester course entitled 'History of the Book' (which is also offered in a modified form to higher-degree students as 'Historical Bibliography'), with the emergence of 'History of the
Book’ as an umbrella discipline perhaps the title is misleading for some potential recruits – in an era when departments are adopting flamboyant titles for their offerings maybe students need to be seduced rather than recruited. The ‘History of the Book’ course ranges from the mid-fifteenth century to the present, emphasising changes in materials and technology and thus providing the background for an understanding of current practices and concerns (such as preservation), it includes a visit to the department’s Ancora Press, involving a small amount of setting and printing by hand.

The ‘real’ bibliography is offered at fifth-year level, in ‘Bibliography and Textual Scholarship’, familiarly known as BATS, which is offered as an elective to M.A. and M.Lib. candidates from within the department, to candidates in the inter-departmental M.A. in bibliographical and textual studies (in a modified form as ‘Analytical and Descriptive Bibliography’) and to candidates for other degrees whose regulations allow it, and on a non-credit basis to librarians and other interested people. That recital is not to suggest that we are dealing with large numbers: 10 is, I believe, the largest group ever assembled. The course would, I imagine, be regarded as a particularly traditional one, and for that I need make no excuse. We concentrate on eighteenth-century books for a variety of reasons, one of which is my belief that – as perhaps with literary studies too – from the books of that period one can master the basics before moving backward or forward in time. We deal in succession with quasi-facsimile transcription, format, collation and so on, building up to the point where students can construct exhaustive descriptions of complex books and critically judge published descriptions. I might add that ‘traditional’ is not synonymous with ‘unchanging’: the objects of our study constantly change and emphases may vary. Nonetheless, we remain firmly rooted in a tradition which regards books themselves as the objects of our study.

Descriptive bibliography is simply the lingua franca of communicating the results of analysis; as with grammar, I maintain that the conventions of bibliographical description must be mastered before undertaking bibliographical research or devising one’s own system. Underlying descriptive bibliography is analytical bibliography, which I accept in the usual sense of ‘the study of the printed book (however defined) to determine the processes by which it was produced, often as a prelude to description, textual study or editing’; analytical bibliography is the fundamental concern of bibliography, descriptive bibliography being no more than the conventions of communicating the results of that analysis. But before analysis can be undertaken it is vital to have a grounding in historical bibliography. For example, if concerned with the hand-press period one would need to know something about the mechanics of composition in order to comprehend the phenomenon of setting by forms in the First Folio of Shakespeare; if with the nineteenth century the technology of stereotyping in order to understand the use of duplicate plates in frequently-reprinted works. Similarly one needs to understand the norms of various technologies and periods (yes, I accept the lessons of ‘Printers of the Mind’; and I expect students to read it) – that in the hand-press period the unit of proofing
was the forme, that in the twentieth century Monotype spools may be used to
generate impressions typographically different one from another, and so on.
Students must be familiar with Gaskell's New Introduction, just as they must be
prepared to take a deep breath and plunge into Bowers's Principles of
Bibliographical Description when necessary.

I think that it is important to dispel the notion that analytical bibliography is
an arcane specialisation. I like to view it as a species of forensic science,
'bibliographical' in that it deals with books. Like any other reputable discipline
it must observe the logical relationships of the phenomena under consideration
and treat the evidence with respect. Of students I expect these attitudes, along
with the ability to communicate their findings.

As far as the future of teaching analytical bibliography at Monash is
concerned I envisage no change beyond the incorporation of new kinds of
evidence of more than limited application whenever I become aware of them and
the materials are at hand to pursue them. And at this point I should stress that
an approach which depends so heavily on physical objects is in turn dependent
on the support of library staff; at Monash I have always had unqualified support,
including freedom to use the entire resources of the Rare Book Collection in the
teaching process.

In talking about BATS I should not ignore the 'Textual Scholarship' of the
title. I acknowledge that of course not all textual problems are soluble by
reference to bibliographical analysis. Nonetheless, I continue to introduce
students to aspects of textual bibliography, such as compositorial analysis, the
printer's measure, variant forms, standing type and so on in order to
demonstrate a utility for analytical bibliography other than in matters
taxonomic. We then look at approaches to editing and examine a number of
particular cases, and finally each student talks to the group about the textual state
of a work of their choice (not always literary) and discusses the practices of
modern editors of it (the texts have ranged from the late-sixteenth century to the
mid-twentieth).

One semester of weekly three-hour sessions (with the best part of two days a
week working on exercises) is limiting, not so much in length as in compression.
Nevertheless, I am invariably impressed by the capacity of students, within those
twelve or thirteen weeks, to develop a laudable sophistication in analytical,
descriptive and textual bibliography. Some significant work - both formally
published and in theses - has come out of what they have done, among it the
work on tranche files by Annemie Gilbert and Sylvia Ransom (BSANZ Bulletin
no.17 (November 1980), 269-75), the results of which now provide a technique
for the determination of format. (In not citing other student work I do not
intend to deprecate it.) Likewise I would like to think that one's own research is
contributing to the students' experience and perhaps too that in encouraging
close observation and a thinking and questioning attitude one is inculcating
attitudes which are of general application.
PHYSICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

CHRIS TIFFIN
University of Queensland

We live, in other words, in the twilight of the Age of the Printed Book. It is at least arguable that many of today’s children, and most if not all of their children, will come to think of the printed book as a quaint device from another era – useful in many ways, to be sure, and no doubt never to disappear; but fixed, linear, noninteractive, and most restrictive of all, essentially confined to a single medium. Indeed, many of those aspects of the printed book, responsible for its hegemony over the last several centuries are precisely those that are now seen as crucial short-comings. . . . There are certain aspects of the printed book that digital technology will doubtless never fully replicate or replace . . . but there is no use in denying the future.1

In the face of such dismissals of the dinosaurs, it is a real issue whether we should still be teaching physical bibliography at all. In an age when the computer has displaced the composing stick, the screen has displaced the page, and the free play of readerly desire within the semiotic web has displaced the futile hunt for the Ideal Text which might imperfectly embody the Author’s Final Intention, it can seem strangely anachronistic and pedantic to be worrying about imposing conventions for duodecimos in the late seventeenth century.

I think there is a sufficient response to this charge in the unrivalled impact that printing has had on the spread of information and ideas over five centuries. While reading is a complex skill normally requiring years to acquire, most Western countries have instutionalised the general dissemination of this skill for almost a century, and before that it was widely dispersed among the ruling elites. What the skill is applied to – the book – is a fairly durable, portable item which requires no further technology to use it. Thus it continues to have advantages over other media such as television which may require far fewer interpretive skills.

Moreover, the book is a comparatively diffused rather than a centralised technology. Even today, the continued impact of print is often underrated because other communicative media are newer and more directly impactful. But it is precisely because television requires immediate impact that it sacrifices the extensive, the reiterative, and many forms of the subtle. A television programme

which does not create its impact instantaneously is dead; the book can afford to wait for a second or third reading of an elaborate argument.

The impact of any communicative medium is inseparable from its technology, so to understand how the book or the newspaper works on an audience, what it means, what it might have been intended to mean and how that meaning might have transmuted through the material processes of production, one must understand the history of the technology which brought the physical object into existence. Moreover, one must be able to read the physical object — not just the language system which constitutes the narrowly-conceived "text", but the arrangement of paper, ink, white space, and binding which constitutes the material object. It is for these reasons that physical bibliography stands in a different relationship to modern knowledge than does Ptolemaic astronomy or phlogistin chemistry.

The fact is, however, that to today's twenty-year old who is offered on the one hand courses on analysing TV soap operas and on the other courses on South American magic realist fiction, physical bibliography does not seem either relevant or interesting. Postmodernity's tendency to solipsism, and its distrust of canonicity has depreciated much of the pleasure of inquiry into the past, and engendered a certain impatience with detail which makes the painstaking meticulousness of physical bibliography a pointless drudgery rather than an intellectual challenge. The problem for the teacher of physical bibliography is to find ways of reinserting that challenge into the pedagogical equation.

As an undergraduate I took a half-year course in seventeenth-century printing technology including setting a page on a hand press. Such courses were a required orientation in scholarly method; the only aspect of scholarly method which was ever explicitly taught. By the time I came to teach in this area myself, the physical bibliography component had shrunk to a couple lectures on printing history in a subject that dealt also with planning a thesis, evaluating scholarly editions, using information sources, and documenting research according to the conventions of a style sheet. Clearly in that range of material there was little scope to go into the subtleties of the folding for a duodecimo. We did, however, take a stanley knife to a book to see how it was made (rather an unsubtle method of inquiry, I fear) and each student printed off a certificate of completion for themselves which they were given at the end of the semester.

This seems to me now an especially unintelligent way to convey even a minimal awareness of the book as object. I now come at the problem in quite a different fashion. Teaching is largely a matter of harnessing and redirecting egos, so to engage students with physical bibliography one must find ways to involve their sense of selfhood. The best way of doing this, I believe, is to present bibliographical problems which create a need both for a body of information and a rigorous forensic logic.
Let us imagine a course on the history of handpress printing. Probably the traditional way of dealing with this is by a series of lectures describing a print shop and the different processes that went on there. If there is a hand press available, students can be shown and can be involved in setting type and imprinting. Otherwise slides of the press and its component parts can be shown including copious reproductions of quaint woodcuts.

While the explication might be very lucid, it may not be effective at involving the students. Probably more successful is the presentation of enigmatic phenomena which require explanation and which progressively call forth different types of information as reasons for the enigma are explored. For example, a book might be displayed which has blank pages at 50, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 62 and 63, and the question might be posed how this has come about. Students soon come to realise that to understand the cause of the blank pages they need to know certain information about how printing was effected. This can be channelled to embrace general practices of imposition, folding, gathering, formats and so forth.

Again it is possible to lecture on spelling practices in early eighteenth-century composing in a coherent and lucid way, but lucidity alone will not necessarily engage the student. Alternatively, students can be asked to inspect some pages of such material and asked to deduce the spelling practices which differ from modern ones. Elements like the long "s", capitalization of nouns, and variable spelling to support justification should all be deducible in this essentially problem-solving way.

This basic method is adaptable for many pedagogical situations since all it involves is a change in the starting point and in the relationship between instructor and student. It replaces a model of assuming that a need for the information will be felt by the student with one which first seeks to initiate or arouse that need. Since the student is foregrounded in the pedagogical exchange through being confronted with his or her lack of information or knowledge there is less chance of the information being simply filtered out as irrelevant.

If we believe that the history of the printed book is one of the great narratives of world culture, we will also feel that it is worth communicating in as rich detail as time constraints allow. But we must realise that the current climate is not particularly propitious, and that we will be successful only if we can develop adequate strategies of engagement. My suggestion for this is a bibliographical version of a detective novel where a phenomenon is presented which clearly requires explanation and where, in solving the problem, students are led to identify the gaps in their knowledge and are motivated to fill them.