

## Some Aspects of the Older Printed Collections of The British Library: A Review Essay

B. J. McMULLIN

Giles Mandelbrote and Barry Taylor, eds, *Libraries within the Library: The Origins of the British Library's Printed Collections*. London: British Library, 2009. xii + 448 pp. ISBN: 978 0 7123 5035 8. £45.00.

Judged by its title, *Libraries within the Library* promises rather more than in the event it provides; at the same time, however, it provides considerably more. It is *not* a systematic account of the named collections/libraries within the Library<sup>1</sup> or of the major benefactors, in the way that Esdaile's history was.<sup>2</sup> What it is is a series of articles in one way or another related to the printed books collections, primarily to various of the component named collections and their previous owners. It is partial, in the sense that, for example, Major Edwards gets only a passing mention and Henry Huth and T. J. Wise none at all. Welcome summary articles are included on benefactors of the stature of Cracherode<sup>3</sup> and Grenville,<sup>4</sup> but equally welcome are those devoted to less-well-known figures whose books are to be found within the Library, such as those of Sir William Musgrave<sup>5</sup> and Sergei Aleksandrovich Sobolevskii,<sup>6</sup> both model introductions to these comparatively lesser, though estimable, lights. Nor is the volume a competitor to P. R. Harris's monumental history of the Library,<sup>7</sup> an indispensable detailed reference work, being a chronological account, based on the Library's own records, not just of the collections but also of the buildings, staff, finances, catalogues and a good deal more of less obvious, though still possible, interest to the student of the Library. *Libraries within the Library* does, though, complement an earlier collection, edited by Harris,<sup>8</sup> which deals mainly with the organization of the collections—for example, the cataloguing and classification processes, the acquisition policies, and the maintenance of the General Catalogue of Printed Books.

<sup>1</sup> I use "Library" to refer to the British Museum, the British Museum Library (the appropriate title up to 1973), and the British Library (the current title).

<sup>2</sup> Arundell Esdaile, *The British Museum Library: A Short History and Survey* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1946); Part II comprises "The Collections and their Catalogues."

<sup>3</sup> Paul Quarrie, "Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode," 187–201.

<sup>4</sup> Barry Taylor, "Thomas Grenville (1755–1846) and his Books," 321–40.

<sup>5</sup> C. J. Wright, "Sir William Musgrave (1735–1800) and the British Museum Library," 202–21.

<sup>6</sup> Chris Thomas, "The Collection of Sergei Aleksandrovich Sobolevskii (1803–1870)," 353–62.

<sup>7</sup> P. R. Harris, *A History of the British Museum Library 1753–1973* (London: British Library, 1998).

<sup>8</sup> P. R. Harris ed., *The Library of the British Museum: Retrospective Essays on the Department of Printed Books* (London: British Library, 1991).

The present volume is arranged in four sections: “The Foundation Collections,” “The Early Decades,” “The King’s Library,” and “Later Collections of Printed Books within the British Museum Library,” along with two “Appendices.” It gets off to a surprising start—surprising because the first article is an account of a single volume actually not in the Library’s collection, Petrus de Crescentiis, *Ruralia commoda* (Speyer: Peter Drach, c.1490/95);<sup>9</sup> it was once owned by Henry VIII, came to the Library as part of the Old Royal Library foundation collection, was disposed of by the Museum in 1788<sup>10</sup> as a duplicate, and is now in the Royal Library at Windsor. This article shares a characteristic with some of other articles in the volume: a tendency to over-elaboration (to the extent of irrelevance) and a weighting of the text with lengthy lists of book titles; here the background overwhelms the exposition. Indeed, the first four chapters (all “pre-Sloane”) have at times a tenuous connection with the Library: for example—significant though in itself the list may be—it hardly seems justified to devote twenty-four pages to listing the printed books owned (demonstrably or only probably) by the Cotton family and now located, where identified as Cottonian, in a variety of libraries.<sup>11</sup> And similarly with the twenty-six pages later appended to Sir Hans Sloane’s purchases at the sale of Robert Hooke’s library.<sup>12</sup>

There is plenty to admire in the articles devoted to individuals and their libraries, but I found the most appealing articles those devoted not to a specific named collection but to more general aspects of the Library and the management of its collections, in particular to the sales of duplicates,<sup>13</sup> to the use of invoices in provenance research,<sup>14</sup> and to the various means of identifying the source of volumes acquired before 1837.<sup>15</sup>

Birrell’s discussion will shock those innocents who may be under the misapprehension that once a book has entered the Library it cannot, or will not, be alienated.<sup>16</sup> The unpleasant truth for modern scholars wishing to compare copies from within the one edition of a volume printed in the hand-press period

<sup>9</sup> James P. Carley, “Henry VIII’s Library and the British Museum Duplicate Sales: A Newly Discovered De-accession,” 11–23.

<sup>10</sup> The item itself is stamped “British Museum Sale Duplicate 1787.”

<sup>11</sup> Colin G. C. Tite, “The Printed Books of the Cotton Family and their Dispersal,” 43–75; there are 191 items all told, including 83 that “must have been owned by the Cotton family but whose titles and/or locations have yet to be identified.”

<sup>12</sup> Giles Mandelbrote, “Sloane’s Purchases at the Sale of Robert Hooke’s Library,” 98–145.

<sup>13</sup> T. A. Birrell, “The BM Duplicate Sales 1769–1832 and their Significance for the Early Collections,” 244–57.

<sup>14</sup> Arnold Hunt, “Libraries in the Archives: Researching Provenance in the British Library Invoices,” 363–84.

<sup>15</sup> P. R. Harris, Appendix I, “Identification of Printed Books Acquired by the British Museum, 1753–1836,” 387–423.

<sup>16</sup> The legislation governing alienation is discussed by Esdaile, 332–36, Appendix 4, “Alienation, Lending and Removal.”

(and even beyond) is that, in the eighty years from the foundation of the Library in 1753, large numbers of volumes were identified as duplicates and therefore sent off to be auctioned. It was inevitable that with the acquisition of several huge general collections containing large numbers of relatively common titles there would be duplicates galore. Of the foundation collections, the bequest of Arthur Edwards<sup>17</sup> contained approximately 4000 volumes, the Old Royal Library (presented by George II) some 9000, and the library of Sir Hans Sloane (purchased from his trustees) a further 47,000. These collections fed the earliest sales, but with the arrival of the King's Library in 1823, containing 65,000 volumes (plus 20,000 pamphlets), a further 12,000 duplicates were identified. However, since the King's Library, as well as the Banks (received in 1827, containing 8000 books plus 6000 pamphlets), the Cracherode (received in 1799), and, later, the Grenville (received in 1847) were all donations or bequests volumes from them were considered inalienable, and so duplicates for the later sales were taken predominantly from the foundation collections, thus diminishing them further.

The incentive to dispose of duplicates was both spatial and financial: the Museum could use the money generated by the eight auction sales, which took place in 1769, 1788, 1805, 1818, 1819, 1831, and 1832 (two), to make room for the developing collection, for maintenance of the fabric of Montagu House (the Library's initial home), and for further purchases. As an indication of the returns to be had from selling off duplicates, the 1769 sale, comprising 1663 lots, fetched £682 12s. 3d. at a time when the government's biennial grant was £2000, to be shared with Antiquities and Natural History. The 1788 sale, which Birrell describes as "the largest and most disastrous," comprised 4813 lots and fetched a disappointing £554 17s. 9d., but subsequent sales were more productive: 1805 (855 lots), £952 10s. 6d.; 1818 (2713 lots), £1358 10s.; 1819 (2271 lots), £2703 8s. The decision to forgo further sales was, it seems, prompted by the relative failure of the three 1831–32 sales, which in total raised only £2044, though at the same time there may well have been an increasing awareness of the potential variability of apparent duplicates. Certainly, ahead of the 1832 sales, Panizzi, newly appointed as an extra assistant librarian, insisted that twenty-six duplicates be withdrawn, to be used for reference in the reading room. And, as he told the royal commissioners enquiring in 1847–49 into the constitution and government of the British Museum:

There are so many things to be done before the book is sold, that it is a loss to the house to sell it at all [...] there is the obloquy which has been attached to this house for selling their duplicates; and that for books that did not fetch their expenses of sale.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Major Edwards died in 1743, but his bequest was subject to a life interest and was not received until 1769.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted in George M. Kahrl, in collaboration with Dorothy Anderson, *The Garrick Collection of Old English Plays: A Catalogue with an Historical Introduction* (London: British Library, 1982), 53.

What is to modern eyes the most disturbing aspect of the sales is that, according to Birrell, the policy seems to have been to dispose of better copies rather than poorer. As the sales were designed to raise as much money as possible, little consideration was apparently therefore given to provenance or annotations. Thus of the two copies of Bathsua Reginald, *Musa Virginea Graeco-Latino-Gallica* (London: J. Hodgets for E. Griffin, 1616), one with no association, the other with the signature of Charles, Prince of Wales, it was the latter that was sold off. And of two copies of Francisco Hernandez, *Nova Plantarum, Animalium et Mineralium Mexicanorum Historia* (Rome: sumptibus B. Deversini & Z. Masotti, typis V. Mascardi, 1651), one in a plain binding, the other “in a magnificent Charles II ‘Mearne’ binding, and originally part of the library of John Morris” (244), it was the latter that was sold off; when it re-appeared at auction in 1987 it went to a dealer for £14,850. Not surprisingly, the Library made an effort to buy back some of the items inadvisably disposed of; perhaps the most celebrated example is Domenico Nani Mirabelli, *Polyanthea cum Additionibus* (Savona, 1514), containing annotations by Henry VIII, which fetched 1s. 9d. at the 1788 sale and was bought back in 1865 for 65 guineas (£68 5s.).

Certain of the consequences of custodial attitudes towards the collections, especially in the first century but by no means restricted to that period—and hence the difficulties that may be encountered by modern scholars faced with (or unaware of) the lack of integrity within the collections resulting from the sale of duplicates, as well as from other management decisions—may be illustrated by reference to the treatment of seventeenth-century plays.

David Garrick bequeathed to the Library his collection of about 1300 English plays, bound in 242 volumes, which arrived in 1780. The first stage of depredation was the removal of duplicates for inclusion in the 1788 sale—Dorothy Anderson judges that forty-two titles in that sale can be identified as Garrick copies.<sup>19</sup> But, as she goes on to note, “It is unfortunate also that the Keepers appear to have accepted duplicate titles as their guide and made no examination of the actual copies, some of which were not true duplicates” (3). However, unlike the practice described by Birrell, where the better copies were sold, it appears that inferior or defective copies of plays were chosen for the 1788 sale. The volumes thus broken were rebound, only for some of them to be disbound again in 1805–6 in order to insert twenty copies from the Thomason collection as replacements for the copies sold; and plays from elsewhere in the Library, including three recognisably from the Sloane collection, were added to the Garrick in order to bring together books of a similar kind. Next, at Panizzi’s insistence, the volumes were broken

<sup>19</sup> Dorothy Anderson, “Reflections on Librarianship: Observations Arising from Examination of the Garrick Collection of Old Plays in the British Library,” *The British Library Journal*, 6 (1980), 1–6. There is also a history of the Garrick Collection following its arrival in the Library in Kahrl, *The Garrick Collection*, 47–80.

up in the 1840s and the individual plays bound separately—this as a means of lessening the wear and tear on the collected volumes. Regardless of the origin of a particular copy it received the Garrick arms on the front cover, so that a Thomason play may today be in a Garrick binding, though it will probably be recognisable from the manuscript date on the title page in Thomason's hand. In the process individual plays that were in some way defective were also made good in pen-and-ink facsimile, by inserting leaves from more seriously defective copies bought especially for the purpose, or by exchanging leaves between Garrick copies. And then leaves from Garrick copies were used to make good copies in the King's Library and leaves from unidentified sources inserted in Garrick copies.

The final (?) depredations were at the hands of T. J. Wise, who stole leaves from Garrick (and other) plays for insertion in defective copies, either (a) for incorporation into copies in his own Ashley Library, bought by the Library after his death in 1937, or (b), in the period 1901–7, for the perfecting of copies to be sold to other collectors, notably the American John Henry Wrenn, whose books are now in the library of the University of Texas.<sup>20</sup> D. F. Foxon was able to document at least some of Wise's depredations in an astute application of some fundamental observations deriving from a knowledge of the physical attributes of hand-printed books. He confined his study to pre-1661 publications on the grounds that, in the entries in his bibliography of pre-Restoration drama, W. W. Greg had already identified Library copies that were defective,<sup>21</sup> but there is no necessary reason to believe that Wise confined his nefarious activities to that period. Foxon established that 206 leaves had been stolen from Library copies of plays published before the Restoration, with eighty-nine now found in Ashley copies (where they have been allowed to remain) and at least sixty in Wrenn copies; of the forty-one copies reported on by Foxon, thirty-four were Garrick, one of which has lost as many as seventeen leaves, another fourteen. Wise has truly muddied the bibliographical waters of the English drama, with the unwitting assistance of Rivière, the binder, who skilfully homogenised the made-up volumes. Foxon's objective in reporting his findings bears noting here:

But above all I hope that it may encourage bibliographers to cast a critical eye on the copies from which they are working so that they may not be led into error or waste of time by past sophistication. Books are often made up with the best of intentions; but unless the bibliographer is aware of this or has the skill to find it out, he may stray far from the path. (1–2)

<sup>20</sup> D. F. Foxon, *Thomas J. Wise and the Pre-Restoration Drama: A Study in Theft and Sophistication* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1959). References to Foxon are included in the entries in Kahr, *Garrick Collection*.

<sup>21</sup> W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1939–70).

Sophistication and alienation took other forms, too. For example, Harris reports in his *History* (153, 277) that in 1841 some leaves from an Aesop in the King's Library were exchanged (with a cash consideration) for larger ones from the bookseller Pickering and that in 1844, on the Library's purchase of a binder's volume containing Caxton's Aesop and *Reynard the Fox*, the latter (a duplicate) was sold to Pickering. Similarly, in 1857 the Library exchanged with the bookseller Boone damaged leaves from its Sarum Missal of 1554 for superior leaves. In addition outright exchanges took place: Harris (405) reports that in 1910, "because funds were lacking, two duplicate incunables were exchanged with Boerner of Leipzig for a *Novum B.M.V. Psalterium*" of 1495 and that in 1913 thirty-five duplicate incunables were exchanged for thirty-one from the Bodleian Library. Duplicates were also exchanged with individuals, by which means the Library acquired from the Reverend G. E. Mackie the first edition of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* (1642) in exchange for a duplicate Jenson Latin bible of 1479. And just before the outbreak of World War One 6000 duplicates, presumably of no great value, were offered to other libraries, among them the Guildhall Library, the Royal College of Music, the Fitzwilliam Museum, Trinity College Dublin, the Royal Botanic Libraries, and "the principal free public libraries."

Volumes disposed of by the Library may have found a home in publicly-accessible collections around the world, and so—to the extent that their provenance as Library duplicates has been recorded—they will remain available for consultation. But in one area the disposal of duplicates (or any other item deemed in some way inappropriate for retention) may have involved—and may still involve—actual destruction, *viz.*: books considered obscene and therefore for much of the Library's history excluded from the public catalogue and made available, on special application, only to readers who had divined their presence in the Private Case.<sup>22</sup> When H. S. Ashbee died in 1900 his collection of over 15,000 volumes passed to the Library; among them were, as Keeper of Printed Books G. K. Fortescue reported, "1,000 books in 1,600 volumes of an erotic or obscene character," and, of these, the duplicates (number unspecified) were put into six boxes and then, with the blessing of the Trustees, destroyed. A further 267 Ashbee duplicates were passed on to the Bodleian Library in 1914, but, as Cross supposes, "Many of the less-literary items amongst his erotic books and all the erotic sale catalogues were not retained and were probably destroyed in 1900, not for being duplicates but because they were considered to be of no value" (209). This pattern continued: in 1920 fifty-three books were destroyed as "worthless,"

<sup>22</sup> Paul James Cross, "The Private Case: A History," in Harris, *Retrospective Essays*, 201–40. This article is a measured account of the "P.C.," countering the sensationalist speculation about the contents of the Private Case and criticism of the Library authorities for their long-standing reluctance to publicly acknowledge its existence.

twenty-four of them duplicates, the others “mostly bad reprints of works of a very offensive character [of which] few have any literary or bibliographical value.”<sup>23</sup> (Books subject to legal restrictions are kept in the “S.S.” [Suppressed Safe] collection, not entered in the catalogue, and not made available to readers under any circumstances.) Destruction apparently continues, though now confined, F. J. Hill<sup>24</sup> reports, to unwanted duplicates: “It has been the rule that duplicates received by copyright deposit and not required for use in the Library shall be destroyed: those acquired by other means, however, can be discarded, and are sometimes given away or used for exchange” (38).

Decisions to destroy unique items were variously motivated but clearly in the main reflected contemporary moral attitudes or even the distaste of a particular keeper. Moral attitudes have obviously changed, but unknown and unknowable items have, it can safely be assumed, been permanently lost.

As Arnold Hunt observes, “In recent years there has been a steady growth of interest in book ownership and reception history.” Consequently users are “more likely to ask copy-specific questions about the history of the books they hold in their hands. When did the Library acquire it? Where was it before? When was it bound? Whose signature is that on the title page—and is it in the same hand as those marginal notes in the text?” (363) Some of the problems associated with the determination of provenance are illustrated by Alison Walker,<sup>25</sup> who asks “Why is it difficult today to identify Sloane’s printed books?” (89) Again the answer is related to management decisions made during the early years. The importance of the Sloane collection is that “it was one of the largest scientific study collections of its time, and evidence of the content of such a collection is a significant resource for the study of the history of science and medicine. [...] and artefactual examination of the books and their previous ownerships provides evidence of other scientific collections and for the transmission of knowledge” (97). Though a manuscript catalogue came with the collection, today it is not always possible to equate a catalogue entry with a specific copy in the Library. First, Mandelbrote<sup>26</sup> assumes that some of Sloane’s ephemera—known now only from an entry in the manuscript catalogue—were lost before the collection even reached the Library, that others were deliberately weeded on receipt, and that “Many of Sloane’s broadsides and pamphlets printed in the 1640s and 1650s appear to have been

<sup>23</sup> A. W. Pollard, Keeper of Printed Books, quoted in Cross, “The Private Case,” 211.

<sup>24</sup> F. J. Hill, “The Shelving and Classification of Printed Books,” in Harris, *Retrospective Essays*, 1–74. I note that Hill includes neither “P.C.” nor “S.S.” in his list of “Special Pressmarks” (pp. 64–66).

<sup>25</sup> Alison Walker, “Sir Hans Sloane’s Printed Books in the British Library: Their Identification and Associations,” 89–97. Walker is Lead Researcher for the project designed to reconstitute, as far as is possible, Sloane’s library, the Sloane Printed Books Catalogue (SPBC), accessible via the British Library website. As at July 2009 SPBC contained over 19,000 entries from the estimated 30,000 still in the Library.

<sup>26</sup> Giles Mandelbrote, “Sloane and the Preservation of Printed Ephemera,” 146–68.

discarded or sold as duplicates following the arrival in the British Museum of the Thomason tracts in 1762” (147). Once in the Library, Sloane’s books were not kept together but interfiled with books from the Old Royal Library and from other sources, and, as already noted, when duplicates were found it was the Sloane copy (because it had been purchased) that was likely to be sold. Finally, in an unknown number of volumes, the practice of rebinding in Museum style undoubtedly led to the destruction of evidence of a Sloane association by the discarding of original binder’s leaves.

My purpose in dwelling on the Garrick and Sloane collections has not been to castigate posthumously the librarians who made decisions that their modern-day successors—and modern-day users—would find reprehensible but to disabuse would-be users of any assumptions that they may have about the status of the Library’s older collections.

One aspect of the Library’s collections that modern-day users have come to rely on, in such endeavours as the reconstruction of the publishing history of a particular work or edition, is the dating of acquisitions, either as proof of the date of publication—especially since the more rigid enforcement of the legal deposit regulations in the middle of the nineteenth century—or of the date of receipt of volumes that have been bought. Cross, for example, uses date stamps to indicate when Dr. Eric John Dingwall presented various erotic works to the Library. Caution, however, is required in interpreting the evidence of date stamps: the date may indicate no more than the day on which the stamp itself was applied. Hunt reports that in the mid-nineteenth century “There was generally a backlog of auction purchases which was left to accumulate for a few months, then cleared off all at once—which can present problems for provenance researchers, as it means that the purchases from several different sales will all bear the same date-stamp. Sometimes books simply got mislaid or forgotten” (370). He cites the example of books bought at sales in May and July 1867 which were “put aside” by Thomas Watts, Keeper of Printed Books, who died in September 1869; they apparently escaped further notice until June 1871, when they were duly accessioned—i.e. four years after the sales.

Up to October 1850 arrivals were entered in an accession register, but from that date—in response to Panizzi’s argument that it was “of no use on earth”—the register was abandoned in favour of an enhancing of the existing parallel record, the file of invoices. Thereafter all purchases were date-stamped in red and the same date stamped on the invoices, which were bound in chronological order. Hence it is now possible to work from the date stamped in a volume in hand back to the related invoice, thus establishing at least its immediate source. As a tool of provenance and bibliographical research the invoices, housed in the Library’s Corporate Archive, have been little used, because little known; they are, as Hunt admits, “one of the best-kept secrets of the Library’s

collections” (364). How indispensable the invoices are he demonstrates by “drawing attention to the ‘hidden’ collections, or fragments of collections, that have remained largely unnoticed until now” (372). The outcome of the first of his two brief case studies is to add to the known items in the published account of the library of Frances Wolfreton.<sup>27</sup> The outcome of the second is not only to identify a large number of volumes from William Beckford’s library but also to increase significantly the number of his annotated volumes from the mere two listed in the General Catalogue (and therefore in Robin Alston’s catalogue).<sup>28</sup> Hunt concludes that “This is only a small sample of the research projects that could be done using the invoice volumes to reconstruct the provenance of books in the Library’s collections” (377), a suggestion for future research that is a minor theme running through *Libraries within the Library*.

Alongside dates stamped in Library volumes are its ownership stamps, which, lacking any other evidence and if properly understood, may allow the provenance of individual volumes to be established. In Appendix I Harris provides a provisional but wide-ranging guide to identifying the source of volumes acquired by the Library from its foundation to 1836, after which date acquisition records of one kind or another are more abundant. Thus—in addition to such things as library pressmarks, bookplates, price codes and so on—it may be possible to identify volumes from the Sloane, Edwards and Old Royal collections, which at the foundation were inter-filed, on the basis of the form and colour of the ownership stamps. In the *History* Harris quotes from a note in the scrapbook compiled by Sir Henry Ellis, to the effect that “The square black mark [actually octagonal, reading “MVSEVM | BRITAN | NICVM”] denotes Sir Hans Sloane’s books only. The books purchased have an oval mark in red. The books presented have a square mark in yellow. The blue square mark denotes the [Old] Royal collection [...]” (25). Unfortunately, as Appendix I here notes, these distinctions are not watertight: the Sloane mark, for example, appears in other acquisitions up to 1780, purchases 1791–98 and 1804–13 and for Cracherode and Musgrave.<sup>29</sup>

I conclude with the opening words of Harris’s “Introduction” to his *History*:

Some institutions inspire respect and affection on the part of those connected with them—this applies to certain schools, universities, regiments and other organizations—and it certainly applied to the British Museum Library which I

<sup>27</sup> Paul Morgan, “Frances Wolfreton and ‘Hor Bouks’: A Seventeenth-Century Woman Book-Collector,” *The Library*, 6th ser., 11 (1989), 197–219. Hunt adds 27 items to Morgan’s 106.

<sup>28</sup> R. C. Alston, *Books with Manuscript: A Short Title Catalogue of Books with Manuscript Notes in the British Library* (London: British Library, 1994); this catalogue is derived from the computerized General Catalogue. Hunt identifies 25 items in the Library annotated by Beckford.

<sup>29</sup> Thus Plate VI (opposite p. 261) provides examples in colour of the most common early stamps; but p. 423 records Edwards in red, p. 396 in black; and Cracherode has its own stamp, in black, incorporating the initials “CMC.”

joined in 1947. Whatever its faults, and of course it had faults, it had many virtues, and people were proud to work for it. (xiii)

*Libraries within the Library* evidences a continued pride on the part of the Library's current officers—with a little bit of help from their friends. The twenty-two hands represented here have produced an impressive collection of essays that will be an enduring source of both information and pleasure to those interested in the history both of the national institution which is the Library and of the profession of librarianship. Need I add that the volume is a steal at what these days is a decidedly modest charge.

*Melbourne*

Copyright of Script & Print is the property of Bibliographical Society of Australia & New Zealand and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.