

REVIEWS

Mark R. Godburn, *Nineteenth-Century Dust-Jackets* (Pinner, Middlesex: Private Libraries Association; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2016). 215 pp. ISBN 978 0 900002 88 5 (Private Libraries Association); 978 1 58456 347 1 (Oak Knoll Press). £50.

Reviewed by Patrick Spedding

G. Thomas Tanselle's *Book-Jackets: Their History, Forms, and Use* (2011), is described by one Amazon reviewer as "An Invaluable Reference for Bibliophiles," but Mark R. Godburn's *Nineteenth-Century Dust-Jackets* seems to have the better claim to the attention of bibliophiles. Almost every element in the production of Godburn's book is beautiful: the cloth binding, rich paper stock, the elegant typesetting, wide margins and numerous colour images are all designed to appeal to the bibliophile in ways that Tanselle's *Book-Jackets* is not. Notwithstanding the unappealing dust-jacket on *Nineteenth-Century Dust-Jackets*—ironically, the only unappealing element of the book—Godburn's account of the history, forms and use of his subject also appears better designed to appeal to bibliophiles than Tanselle's. Godburn is a collector/dealer, whose passion for his subject, a specialist area of collecting, has led him to make a useful contribution to book history. Unlike Tanselle, he is not an academic and, though he has produced a book of some use to scholars, it appears that he has approached his subject with bibliophiles and book-collectors in mind, rather than scholars or scholar-collectors. Of course, *both* Tanselle's *Book-Jackets*, the product of over forty years of research, and Godburn's *Nineteenth-Century Dust-Jackets*, the product of two decades of collecting and seven years of enquiry (13), are valuable works of reference. And, together, they represent a significant expansion of our knowledge about the early history of the dust-jacket; as such, they will be used by bibliophiles and book-historians alike.

Godburn's book is divided into seven chapters and includes two appendices. The first three chapters cover the origins of publishers' jackets, sealed wrappings and early flap-style jackets; the following three chapters cover the development of the modern dust-jacket in the mid- to late Victorian period, with a section on the many jacketed books in the John Murray archive, and a chapter devoted to Lewis Carroll's use of dust jackets. A final chapter, "End of an era," sketches out developments in the first decade of the twentieth century. The appendices list jacketed books that survive in the John Murray archive (163–76) and jacketed books from before 1871 (177–80). Two hundred of the 216 jacketed books in the Murray archive are from the 1880s and 1890s, so the appendices are somewhat complementary. There are 110 illustrations; many of these are full-page, and all of them are sharply focussed, well illuminated and in impeccably balanced colour. As a result, the reader has no difficulty identifying the grain-patterns on cloth

bindings (such as those on 58, ill. 28) or reading the fine-print advertising on the jackets (148, illustrations 97 and 98).

Godburn's historical account is almost always clear and sensible, explaining the likely origins and functions of the early paper coverings, and the topics discussed are well organised. There were only a few times I was confused by an explanation, felt there was an obvious opportunity not taken for the discussion of a related topic, or the subject was misplaced. An example of the first is the explanation (49) for the difference between "three-flap style" and "single-flap" jackets, which requires an illustration or a diagram. Strictly speaking these jackets ought to be called six- and two-flap jackets, since this is the total number of flaps on the jackets concerned. The key to these otherwise-cryptic terms being the fact that single- and triple-flap refers to the number of flaps for each of the two boards on a hard-cover book. As an example of the second type—missed opportunities—Godburn skims over the subject of trade-bindings, and the development of almanac slipcases (17–18), raising and dismissing both with sweeping statements covering the periods from the Middle Ages (slip-cases) or the mid-seventeenth century (trade bindings) to the Romantic period. Since Godburn's focus on the subject is so fleeting, he cannot be said to have entirely ignored recent work on the subject of trade bindings, such as Stuart Bennett's *Trade Bookbinding in the British Isles, 1660–1800* (2004), but there is certainly more material to be explored in relation to the development of the jacket. Developments in the mid- to late eighteenth century, which are relevant to the appearance of the earliest jackets, might include: printed wrappers (intended to be discarded) on periodicals and works sold in parts; printed stiffened wrappers (intended to be retained) on children's books; and printed paper titles and labels (intended to be retained) on works published in boards; and the trade sale of matching-patterned leather slipcases in the mid- to late eighteenth century. These topics are given little or no attention. Finally, an example of a misplaced topic is the multiple discussions of books issued as box-sets (63–66, 93–95 and 132–36), which may have benefited from a separate and more complete treatment.

The greatest strength of Godburn's book is the scores of early wrappers he enumerates, describes and provides images of, and the many primary sources he quotes at length. It is not clear what the total number of wrappers encompassed by his study might be, but 63 books with dust-jackets published before 1871 are listed in an appendix (177–80), of which 36 are marked as having also been listed by Tanselle. Of the 27 not listed by Tanselle, only 11 are examples of British and American practice—the focus of Tanselle's study—so Godburn's list represents an increase of more than 23% for the period during which the modern dust-jacket developed in Britain and North America. Unfortunately, the list stops at 1870; though Godburn's book extends to 1910, items in the list are not numbered, and no locations are provided (a subject I discuss below), limiting the usefulness of

the list either as an indicator of the scope of Godburn's study or as a guide to the primary material upon which it is based. Godburn has uncovered important primary sources for his study, many of which are extensively referenced. He frequently provides long—and useful—quotations from contemporary sources, both in-text and in footnotes, concerning such subjects as slip-covers (141) or the Louis de Meuleneere collection (201, n. 36). Godburn has also made extensive use of the John Murray archive (as noted), and the Carrol–Macmillan correspondence for his account of the jackets used on Carrol's books.

The most obvious weakness of Godburn's book—from the perspective of any reader wanting to learn more about any of the many fascinating examples he gives—is the lack of locations for the vast majority of the jacketed books he describes. More often than not, a book will be mentioned, the notable features of the wrapper will be described, and if there is a footnote at all, it will lead the curious reader only to the title and imprint details of the book. As is the case with his appendix of "Jackets to 1870," no information is provided about where the (often) lone copy of the book which retains its jacket is located: whether it is in Godburn's own collection, or that of another private collector; whether it is held in any public or private institution; whether it is a book Godburn or someone else has seen exhibited for sale; or whether there is any documentary evidence for the information he provides. The following examples are typical, and could easily be multiplied: when discussing manufactured jackets (23), Godburn instances surviving examples on a set of *The History of Scotland* (1762)—the footnote (186, n. 18) provides author, title and imprint information for the book, but not a location, nor does it direct the reader to a photograph of the books concerned, which appears on page 21 (ill. 4). The caption to this illustration, however, acknowledges Princeton University Library as the supplier of the image, so it seems likely that this is where the set resides. On the same page, Godburn states that "several examples ... survive" of "manufactured jackets with the rules of the library printed directly on them" (23) but gives no examples and there is no footnote to this statement. Shortly afterwards (25), Godburn mentions two sets of sheets that survive in contemporary loose wrappers. In one instance, the unbound sheets are wrapped in a folio-sized bifolium, in the other, in a scrap of hemp. In the first instance, the location for the set is provided (186, n. 23), in the second, no location is offered (186, n. 22). Because of the lack of locations, there is no way to learn anything more about most of the books Godburn describes. As a result, his book is a dead end. His study almost certainly cannot be replicated, and the evidence he gathered scrutinised by others; scholars, collectors, hobbyists and enthusiasts alike can only quote what Godburn himself has said about each of these items and trust that nothing has been missed, misinterpreted or inadvertently misrepresented by him.

Godburn also makes several claims and generalisations, many of which are undoubtedly accurate, without offering any relevant information that might support those generalisations. So, for example, he quotes a claim made by Robin de Beaumont which is not footnoted (32). It is possible that the statement appears in an article listed in the Periodicals section of the bibliography—but there is no reference to that article in Godburn’s text or in the surrounding footnotes, and it is likely that many readers would miss this reference anyway. The Periodicals section of the bibliography (182–85) has been arranged in such a way as to thwart the curiosity of the reader: entries contain author, title, periodical and date—as usual, but *unusually*, lack any page range—and they are arranged chronologically, by *periodical*. Having no clue to when or where de Beaumont’s statement was recorded, the determined reader must scan the entire bibliography in the hope [1] that de Beaumont is named as the author, or in the title, of an article, and in the hope of [2] locating said article in Godburn’s “Select” bibliography. Elsewhere, Godburn states that “less than one percent” of books issued with jackets have survived (13) and refers to the single jacketed survivor from an edition of 1250 copies as demonstrating a “better [rate of survival] than for most nineteenth-century books” (78). If Godburn has any information relevant to the survival rate for book jackets, beyond that scattered throughout his text, he does not supply it, nor does he summarise the relevant information at any point in the text. In another place, he warns that “most” transparent wrappers found on nineteenth-century French books “were added later by French antiquarian book dealers” (56) and that “many” such books are “covered by transparent jackets that were often added later” (143)—a claim he attributes to the “Parisian book scout Martin Stone” (191, n. 10 and 201, n. 36), who died in 2016. It is unclear what proof Stone might have had for this claim, but no evidence is provided to the reader.

The strengths of this book are likely to appeal to every reader—the extensive use of primary materials, the clear account of the subject, the attractiveness of the book itself—while the weaknesses are likely to trouble only the specialist. Notwithstanding these weaknesses, however, both the bibliophile and the specialist will likely benefit from Godburn’s book.

Lucien Reynhout and Benjamin Victor, *Librorum Studiosus: Miscellanea Palaeographica et Codicologica Alberto Derolez Dicata. Bibliologia* 46 (2018). 394 pp. ISBN 978 2 503 57572 8. €80.

Reviewed by Rodney Thomson

Festschriften generally fall into one of three categories: one type is organized by a particular subject or field in which the honorand has made his/her mark; another consists of offerings of the honorand’s pupils and friends, without a

subject-theme; the third is made up of the published articles of the honorand. The first and third are probably more useful to readers who are interested in the subject area; the second is more of a personal offering. In the case of Albert Derolez, whose active publishing began in 1958 and continues to the present day, in five languages and across a multitude of topics in the realm of codicology, only a *Festschrift* of the second type was possible. The result is a collection of thirteen contributions by fourteen of Derolez's friends and former students, in three languages (but predominantly English), from nine nations. In addition, there is an essay on Derolez's scholarly career—disappointingly impersonal for such a genial honorand, but this is compensated for by the expressions of personal friendship in many of the contributions. And there is a valuable bibliography of his writings (occupying no fewer than thirty-nine pages: 15–53!).

The subject-matter of the contributions, arranged in alphabetical order of their authors' names, is amazingly diverse. Ranging in time from the ninth well into the sixteenth century, in space across Europe from Paris (Donatella Nebbiai, "Les livres et les relations d'un théologien italien en France: Adinolfo d'Anagni (m. en 1290)") to Seitz (modern Žiče in Slovenia; Nataša Golob, "The Size of the Book Collection in the Žiče Charterhouse in the Late Fifteenth Century: The Evidence of Paolo Santonino"), to Mistra in Greece (the late Peter Gumbert, "Manuscript Editions: Manuel Tzycandyles, Scribe, and John Cantacuzene, Author"), and in subject from palaeography in its narrowest sense of the study of script (Jan Klein, "The Gothic (Manu)script: The How and Why," Bernard Victor, "The Dutifully Incompetent Autographs of Daniel de Blochem, Canon of Saint Paul in Liège" and Stefano Zamponi, "Struttura, esecuzione, stile: Ripensando il protocollo Mallon"), to broader topics of codicology (the reconstruction of early European libraries, book history, the working methods of scribes). And even then, there is diversity in the languages in the books studied: Greek in Peter Gumbert's essay, and Dutch in James Marrow's (especially 261–66) as well as Latin. Such diversity presents a challenge to the reviewer. The contributions are in alphabetical order of their authors' names, and therefore it is a most happy coincidence that, literally and metaphorically, the central one, also the longest and illustrated by 26 of the book's 32 colour plates, is James Marrow's "The Wilmerding Book of Hours: A Reconstructed Manuscript Illuminated by the Masters of the Feathery Clouds (Meesters van de Vederwolken)," 199–275. How sad it is that this great book has since 2016 been in a European private collection that is not identified! Marrow has obviously made his study and description of the book as detailed as possible, not only to commemorate fifty years of friendship with Derolez, but because it cannot be known when it will again be available for further work.

What can be said of such an array of contributions, other than that they exemplify the broad interests of the honorand? Beside the magisterial study of the Wilmerding Hours, I can only select some examples to illustrate the surprises

that await their reader. Who would have thought that the charterhouse of Seitz/Žiče could have had a library of some 2,000 manuscripts and incunables by the late fifteenth century, when it replaced the Grande Chartreuse as the seat of the General Chapter of its Order? While the Rouses' "Bridging the Gutenberg Gap: The Parisian Booktrade Shifting from Manuscript to Print" further demonstrates a recent direction in research: the porosity of the boundary between manuscript and printed book, as exemplified in the careers of a number of families of Parisian bookmen (illuminators, parchmenters, binders and booksellers) who continued to flourish and ply their trade between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries. Lucien Reynhout, "La bibliothèque de saints-Pierre-et-Exupère de Gembloux dans le Registrum de Rouge-Cloître," adds another to the many studies based on extracts from the famous union catalogue made 1532–1540 at the Augustinian priory of Rouge-Cloître/Rooklooster, near Brussels. His edition of its sections on the manuscripts from the great library of Gembloux illustrates what a good edition of the latter should look like—when some scholar or scholars finally have the courage and dedication to produce it!

The book is splendidly produced, to the best standards of the *Bibliologia* series: the plates, whether black and white or colour, are clear, legible and of a good size. Many readers will take pleasure from the first colour plate, a portrait of Derolez with his favourite book, the Ghent autograph of the *Liber Floridus* of Lambert of St. Omer, taken from a Belgian series entitled "Proud 2b 80."

John A. Fish, *An Analysis of the 1969 Kroepelien Catalogue*. Uppsala: Dahlia Books, 2017. (*Banksia*, 10). 50 pp. ISSN 1101-234X. ISBN 978 91 984356 2 7. SEK 250.

Reviewed by Wallace Kirsop

In his preface John A. Fish states that he "had hoped to have [his] essay published in *Script & Print*," but that his contribution was declined, essentially because of its length. He records, nonetheless, his gratitude for "constructive suggestions and encouraging remarks" (5). Since frank admissions are the order of the day, the present reviewer should note that Rolf DuRietz generously gave the then President of the Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand a copy of *Bibliotheca Polynesiana: A Catalogue of Some of the Books in the Polynesiana Collection Formed by the Late Bjarne Kroepelien and Now in the Oslo University Library* (Oslo, Norway: Privately published by the heirs of Bjarne Kroepelien, 1969). Some time later an offprint of the review by André Jammes in the *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* (volume 26, 1970, 169–71) came to hand. Both items were subsequently listed in Wallace Kirsop and Joan Lindblad Kirsop, "Bibliography in and about Australia, New Zealand and the South Pacific: A First Check List for the years 1969 to 1972" (*BSANZ Bulletin* 5, November 1972 [issued in early 1974], 101,

nos. 90 & 90B). There was no attempt, however, to engage with the substance of the arguments put forward from various quarters.

Is it appropriate to return to matters raised half a century ago? A reading of John A. Fish justifies an affirmative answer to that question. Apart from the fact that catalogues and bibliographies are best judged after years of assiduous use—and this is not meant to be a lame excuse for dilatoriness—the problems discussed by DuRietz in his own long “Introduction” (XIX–XLVII) and now by Fish have lost none of their centrality in bibliographical studies, particularly in relation to this region.

Fish’s account of DuRietz’s book and of his position is strongly appreciative, but it is by no means uncritical. The introduction (6) lists DuRietz’s innovations in “Pacific bibliographical studies” and the salient features of his catalogue. In “Background” (7–8) we are informed about Kroepelien and his collection as well as about the author’s massive contributions to bibliography over more than six decades, in English and in his native Swedish. In the section entitled “Explanation of the Catalogue” (8–17) Fish sets out in detail DuRietz’s approach to bibliography and what distinguishes the Kroepelien catalogue from other works in the Pacific field. The aim was to go beyond mere bibliophily and long routine descriptions in order to present analyses focused on the ideal copy of the work listed. The vehicle for this was a carefully designed pagination statement backed up, where necessary, by explanatory notes. Although the spirit and the letter of Greg and Bowers were everywhere present, DuRietz made only occasional use of the signature collational formula. Cancels and blank leaves were scrupulously noted, as was the fact that works were printed on laid paper. Bindings were generally ignored. Indeed, DuRietz had a particular dislike for rebinding and restoration that hampered bibliographical analysis. “Assessment of the Catalogue” (17–23) covers Fish’s generally positive view of DuRietz’s achievement, but it also draws attention to faults, especially the organisation of the complex introduction and the relative neglect of original bindings and wrappers. “Response to the Catalogue” (23–38) deals seriatim with the original reviews of the catalogue, in particular those of André Jammes and Peter Gathercole (*The Library*, 5th series, 26 (1971): 77–78), with references in the bibliographical literature, especially the remarks of G. Thomas Tanselle (“Descriptive Bibliography and Library Cataloguing,” *Studies in Bibliography*, 30 (1977): 1–56) and with citations of DuRietz’s work in booksellers’ and auction catalogues since 1969. Some failures to profit from the Kroepelien catalogue, notably in the Ferguson *Addenda* volume of 1986, are also mentioned. Fish discusses what adoption of DuRietz’s analytical perspective and techniques could have meant for collectors and the Pacific bibliographical world, but he concludes that the impact of something requiring serious training has been small. Yet as concerns German and Scandinavian Australiana there have been perceptible benefits. Overcoming general ignorance of and reticence about

bibliographical analysis is an ongoing problem. In his “Conclusion and Recommendation,” Fish asserts his belief in the quality of the Kroepelien catalogue and in DuRietz’s success in achieving the aims he set for the work. However, he concedes that the Pacific collecting and bibliographical community has not been converted to DuRietz’s way of thinking. Despite this he insists that proper attention to physical bibliography is the only way forward.

There are three appendices. Appendix A: “The Cancel in Bligh’s *Narrative*” (39–40) reports Fish’s own happy discovery of a cancellandum posited by DuRietz. Appendix B: “Remarks about DuRietz in the first Davidson catalogue” (41–45) takes Australian Book Auctions’ cataloguer to task for comments about—and misunderstandings of—DuRietz in the first catalogue of the Rodney Davidson dispersal sale in 2005. Appendix C: “The Oslo University Library Kroepelien Catalogue” (46–50) provides severe criticism of the summary catalogue of the whole collection by Svein A. H. Engelstad in 2008.

I believe that Fish is right in underlining the importance of DuRietz’s achievement. The Kroepelien catalogue is not only rich in references and information; it is also a substantial step towards offering bibliographical analysis of the many books that recorded the great Pacific adventure of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Nonetheless, fifty years after this milestone some points need to be made.

As physical bibliography has evolved to take account of the interests of book historians and not just textual editors, we are unavoidably more attentive to original bindings as well as to the features that are recorded in copy-specific cataloguing. To this extent some of the comments made by André Jammes and Peter Gathercole, and more gently supported by Fish himself, are justified. A full study of the official report by Rossel of the D’Entrecasteaux expedition—as opposed to the Labillardière titles held by Kroepelien—will reveal the potential significance of the surviving bindings.

In 2018 it is possible to observe that more work has been done on some of the items listed by DuRietz. We know, for example, that no. 1330 (*Voyage de Robertson aux Terres australes*, 1767) is widely held in the two issues (1766 and 1767) of the original edition, but much scarcer in the 1767 reprint and the 1768 German translation (see Wallace Kirsop, “Gabriel de Foigny et sa « Terre australe connue » (Genève, 1676),” *Cinq siècles d’imprimerie genevoise. Actes du Colloque international sur l’histoire de l’imprimerie et du livre à Genève 27–30 avril 1978*, publiés par Jean-Daniel Candaux & Bernard Lescaze (Geneva: Société d’histoire et archéologie, 1980) I, 341–65, esp. 359). The Foigny case is a reminder that much more has been done on some of the imaginary voyages to the South Land and that Australians, blessed with exceptional holdings of these books, can and must use them to pursue bibliographical analyses. From a Canadian base the late Aubrey Rosenberg explored the Tyssot de Patot, *Voyages et aventures de Jaques Massé* of “1710,” first in an article in the *Australian Journal of French Studies* in

1970 and then in his monograph *Tyssot de Patot and His Work (1655–1738)* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972).

DuRietz's no. 132: Charles de Brosses, *Histoire des navigations aux Terres australes*, 2 volumes (Paris: Durand, 1756) is closely observed, but certain aspects of the analysis need to be revised. It is, in fact, a prominent example of the use of paper-quality marks, as one can discover in Wallace Kirsop, "Paper-Quality Marks in Eighteenth-Century France" (*An Index of Civilisation: Studies of Printing and Publishing History in Honour of Keith Maslen*, edited by R. Harvey, W. Kirsop and B. J. McMullin (Clayton: Centre for Bibliographical and Textual Studies, Monash University, 1993), 55–66, esp. 60, 62). In this instance, as in others, one can ask whether a Greg–Bowers collational formula, admittedly a very complicated one, would not be the best way of recording the essential part of the analysis.

The pagination formula in the Kroepelien catalogue has been very carefully devised, but it must be read and interpreted attentively. To that extent it is problematic. Since collectors and historians need to be educated (of that there is no doubt whatsoever), should one not instruct them in the Greg–Bowers way? In all cases the formula must be complemented with notes of varying length and complexity. There is an effort involved in learning the standard formula, but once it is familiar it is a quite powerful tool for understanding.

There can be no quarrel with the requirement that Pacific bibliography learn the analytical techniques of physical bibliography. Fish's appeal is a timely one. The Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand could do worse than putting its collective mind to the task of educating present and future generations. Fish and DuRietz deserve commendation for calling us to that path.²¹