The Inconvenient Legacy

Randy Silverman, Preservation Librarian, University of Utah Marriott Library

Introduction

The role of research libraries is to preserve the long-term memory of humankind. Straddling competing interests, they strive to provide unimpeded access to scholarly books while maintaining those same volumes in perpetuity. In practice, these "bastions of knowledge" lean toward pragmatic maintenance solutions when dealing with the vast majority of their collections, loaning books to users in patterns antithetical to archive or museum practice. While providing a huge service, this compromise often disregards the significance of the physical material culture held by these cultural storehouses, with their own policies governing general collection repair naively shortchanging future scholars.

The premise that circulating books are by definition well suited to be returned through book drops, for example, muddies the distinction between research and public library collections. Research libraries generally buy only one copy of a given work and that single book is usually retained for as long as it serves the institution's mission; in reality, most books are never weeded. While some volumes are purchased in multiple copies and others may be withdrawn in time, the depth of the cumulative holdings – which

frequently represents one of the most valuable asset owned by a state government – sets research libraries apart as institutions capable of supporting original scholarship because of their comprehensiveness.

Protections afforded by exhibition cases or prohibitions on handling do not provide viable solutions for approximately three-quarters of the research library's collection that is stored in the open stacks. Even fragile books need to be in functional condition, lacking the safeguards imposed by special collections for the most rare, valuable, or historically significant volumes. But does the bulk of the institution's cumulative property lack artistic, historical, or cultural import? And as the collection ages like maturing wine how does its value shift? Astute special collections librarians comb the stacks to identify books whose market value has increased , a simple indicator of growing significance or commercial demand, but monetary value is unequivocally tied to condition. Books that have been grossly mishandled or inappropriately repaired are the kinds of disappointments that accompany many of these searches. Fortunately, gems survive.

Nineteenth and twentieth century publishers' cloth bindings scattered throughout a research library's circulating collection represent treasures of this type . These fragile

UU IR Author Manuscript

objects are important artistic works integrally linked to the book they were designed to protect and significant as evidence of publishing's evolving history. Unfortunately, their preservation is often arbitrary. Over the past century, sanctioned library repair and rebinding practices have destroyed the covers and sewing structures of at least half of these scarce bookbindings and the butchery is unabated.

Research potential for books retaining their original publishers' binding has gained recognition during the past two decades because these three-dimensional works provide evidence of 200 years of book history including technological advances brought on by the industrial revolution, the development of commercial art, and women's changing roles in the work place. Laudable examples were designed by noteworthy painters, architects, typographers, and some of the first female graphic artists. Yet future scholarly use of these increasingly rarified resources will be thwarted if research libraries do not actively reverse the trend.

Throwing Out the Baby with the Bath Water

Collecting and preserving material needed for scholarly research is a universally acknowledged responsibility of research libraries that evolves as research foci shift. Editing a scholarly edition of Herman Melville today, for example, requires access to the

UU IR Author Manuscript

unpublished manuscripts as well every edition of his published works. Comparing subtle changes occurring between different editions can lead to an understanding of the author's role in shaping a text's evolution and how this has possibly been adulterated by other editors over time. Further, the quality of the materials used in the book's production reveal clues about the publishers' intended market with different editions and the way the book was originally received by contemporary readers. Pirated editions, often lacking a publication date, can be attributed to a specific decade by clues gleaning from the binding's physical cloth, stamping media, and graphic design elements. Rather than being redundant, retaining numerous copies and editions in original condition, both locally and in numerous libraries throughout the country, provides access to three dimensional information essential for scholarly comparison.[1]

Since the early 1980s the study of material culture has blossomed as a methodology for exploring the previously undocumented evolution of specific technologies or little known histories of minorities, working women, or the anonymous masses who left few if any written records upon which to base critical research. Some of these types of scholarship lend themselves to using physical evidence and research libraries, as the only storehouses of both material and textual literary information, must recognize their role in preserving their three-dimensional holdings accordingly. This concept has been recognized over

UU IR Author Manuscript

time by library organizations such as the Commission on Preservation and Access and the Council on Library and Information Resources and scholarly groups such as the Modern Language Association.[2]

Society trusts museums to collect and permanently protect significant artwork and historical objects: the paintings of John Sloan and Dante Gabriel Rossetti; the ceramics and embroidery of Walter Crane; the furniture and textiles of William Morris; the drawings of Aubrey Beardsley; the posters of Will H. Bradley and Blanche McManus; and outside the museum walls, the architecture of Augustus Welby Pugin, Bertram Goodhue, and Stanford White. That these same notable individuals also designed publishers' bookbindings is a fact seldom recognized by museums collecting their other media or the research libraries holding their books. Precariously, most of these nineteenth and early twentieth century bookbindings are not yet considered rare and reside in the open stacks. Undervalued and unappreciated as significant cultural property, those that still survive are at risk of being destroyed by the library's prevailing rebinding and repair policies (paradoxically, its "preservation program").

Preserving the artist's intent is a broadly held tenet of professional museum conservation because modifications or alterations to a work of art can forever obscure its meaning.

UU IR Author Manuscript

Within research libraries, however, the idea of preserving the original intent of the author, publisher, designer, or manufacture typically prevails only if the book becomes classified as "rare." The broadest representation of Victorian bookmaking remain in the path of current rebinding practices that can "clear-cut" a collection within a generation or two. While libraries are not museums[3] – and this paper advocates continued public access to historic collections to keep patrons in touch with reality as opposed to virtual reality – no other type of collecting institution can take responsibility for protecting the cultural treasure trove represented by original publishers' bindings.

Repair policies in both the United States and Europe habitually disregard the potential scarcity and aesthetic or research value of the bookbindings housed in general collection.[4] Records in shared bibliographic databases do not describe the physical condition of "non-rare" books, thus the uniqueness of a binding cannot be determined before rebinding occurs. Most research library collections contain material that could easily be used to illustrate art historical surveys of Impressionism, Art Nouveau, or Art Deco, but the significance of the work runs far deeper. The oeuvre of master engravers and typographers such as Frederic W. Goudy, and books designed by their own author such as artists John Leighton, Christopher Dresser, and James McNeill Whistler,[5] are often rebound with little concern for the essential connection between the cover and the text.

UU IR Author Manuscript

Were a museum to discard a picture frame designed by Rossetti or Whistler for one of their own paintings, the loss would be deemed irresponsible and brutish by the art world at large and the museum's judgement justifiably questioned; in libraries the loss of a binding designed by one of these same people occurs unceremoniously as matter of course.

The Survey

Recognizing that no online record exists to define whether books in circulating collections retain their original bindings, Liz Call, a library school student I advised in 1996, conducted a survey to determine the loss rate of a representative hundred-year-old publishers' cloth binding. *A Singular Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1896) was designed by Sarah Wyman Whitman, the first professional woman bookbinding designer and an important, although as yet largely unsung, figure in the women's movement in American.[6] This particular binding is unsigned but typical of the work Whitman produced during her reign as principal bookbinding designer at Houghton Mifflin from 1880 until her death in 1904. Of the 45 copies of *A Singular Life* identified in OCLC (Online Computer Library Center, the largest United States bibliographic database) and ordered through interlibrary loan for hands-on examination, only 49% retained their original Whitman binding. Today, ten years after Call's survey, it is conjectured the loss

UU IR Author Manuscript

rate has continued to decline.

Through serendipity, the survey revealed that *A Singular Life* had originally been produced in at least three colors of bookcloth – green, blue, and grey – each with a different grain pattern. The prevalence of color variants in Victorian editions in is not yet well understood and can never be documented without data drawn from numerous original bindings representing different publishers, time periods, and geographic locations. Unfortunately, the evidence needed to conduct such a study may already be lost. More critically, the lack of appreciation for original publishers' bindings in circulating collections generally has a long lineage in library culture.

Book Repair, A Nonissue

Book repair has traditionally been a subject of little interest within librarianship and the training of new aspirants has historically been inadequate and occasionally inappropriate. E. W. Browning (second director of the Library Binding Institute) observed that book conservation theory was almost completely lacking in library school curricula in the United States in 1950.[7] According to Pelham Barr (creator and first director of the Library Binding Institute), this irresponsible attitude toward collection care often left crucial decision making in the hands of an "inexperienced assistant, whose only training"

UU IR Author Manuscript

was learned on the job, and where both the "good or bad methods employed by [their] predecessor" were readily absorbed.[8] As such, determinations about which books to retain in their original bookbindings and which to rebind were randomly made and had nothing to do with meeting future researchers' needs. The pragmatic necessity of balancing a predetermined budget overshadowed the entire question.

Lacking Barr's insight into responsible collection custody, library administrators during the 1940s and 1950s frequently situated their institution's in-house bindery "in the basement or one of the not-so-respectable corners of the building."[9] This out of sight, out of mind legacy still exists in some libraries and corresponds with a prevailing predisposition to ignore the repair program.

Surprisingly, a more progressive discourse on preserving the collection's physical integrity was actually in play 100 years ago. In 1903, for example, librarian Walter Powell (of Birmingham, England) advised:

> Before sending an old work to be rebound, it should be carefully considered whether it actually needs rebinding. Even if the side is off and the back is loose, is it beyond repair? . . . is there sufficient character in the old binding to make it desirable to preserve it? . . . In such cases the old binding can be "restored" by

with the strength, or almost the strength of a new one.[10]

In fact, the professional library literature a century ago was rife with debate about whether to repair books in-house or send them out for commercial library binding with a byproduct of that decision whether to retain of lose the book's original binding.[11]

Published lists of tools and machinery needed to establish an in-house bindery were common and occasionally included whimsical admonitions such as: "Often a little attention given to a book when it first shows signs of wear will postpone [by] many months the evil day when it must be withdrawn to go to the binders."[12] The design value of original publishers' bindings was also commonly mentioned in late-nineteenth century book reviews, a fact noted by Brander Matthews in his 1895 classic, *Bookbindings old and new*.[13] Yet, seldom was the sagacity of Walter Powell's admonition to preserve original publishers' bindings for their own sake debated. The fate of this material was often only a matter of happenstance or the kindhearted attention of an anonymous library mender.

Instead, most early twentieth century preservation deliberation focused on the economics of durability rather than collection historicity. In 1910, for example, librarian George Stephen (St. Pancras, England) called attention to the "steadily deteriorating . . . quality" of raw materials and workmanship incorporated into publishers' bindings, and urged

UU IR Author Manuscript

book manufacturers to reform this irresponsible trend he felt would otherwise absorb "a book did require repair, Arthur Bailey (Wilmington Institute Free Library, Delaware), believed "resewing and recasing" (that is, saving the original binding) constituted "a mistaken policy" because he feared a "recased book [would] not wear as long as it should." Librarians of his generation recognized, however, that attracting readers was the overarching goal and that decorative publishers' bindings did just that. Bailey held out that:

> since recasing often preserves an attractive cover, the possibility should always be considered when such books come up for binding. Furthermore recasing may be done by girls in the library at a very small expense.[15]

The advantage of paying low wages to female employees in the early twentieth century predictably affecting the economic decision to repair in-house or send books out for commercial rebinding. Cyril Davenport (Superintendent of Bookbinding, British Museum), could not have been more forthright in his assessment of the benefits realized by employing one "binder" – inevitably male – "provided the workman is paid the full union wage,"[16] to train and oversee a group of semi-skilled workers who could mend paper or resew books, tasks traditionally entrusted to women in binderies. He explicitly stated that these techniques were "expensive to send out and cheap to do on the premises,"[17] noting as well that a supervisor's technical instruction was "difficult to obtain," especially for women, because "the Technical Education Board of the London

[illegible] admit amateurs."[18] Use of this staffing strategy was rare but [illegible] t and for retaining 67% of the original bindings repaired that year.[19]

Assuming most libraries were not going to employ a professional binder, the American Library Association published its first book repair guide in 1910, aimed at "librarians who are entirely inexperienced in the work of mending and repair."[20] Authored by Margaret Wright Brown (Iowa Library Commission), this tiny but influential manual (republished four times by 1921) described, among other approaches, recasing as an the option. Unfortunately, the instructions for executing this technique for retaining original bindings were so poorly described they offered little help to the unskilled practitioner. Other important bookbinding manuals – the most famous being Douglas Cockerell's *Bookbinding and the care of books* (first published in 1901 and still in print today)[21] – provided elegantly clear direction for seasoned tradesmen working in well-equipped binderies, but the craft is best learned experientially and so the technique of recasing remained obscure to the average librarian.

Additionally, from the late 1920s through the early 1990s, any serious book repair training that might have included the means to preserve original bindings was almost nonexistent in the United States. Librarians interested in learning basic book repair techniques gained their meager one-on-one experience primarily from traveling bookbinder/salesmen employed by one of the large library vendors. This instruction

UU IR Author Manuscript

products sold by the respective suppliers and classes were

ıited tools, materials, and guidebook. Gaylord's *Bookcraft: On book repairing for schools and libraries*, published in 1928, depicted its title page the United States divided north-to-south from North Dakota to Texas, illustrating the eastern and western territories covered by their two itinerant binder/salesmen.[22] Similarly, Joe Holler, retired regional manager for Demco, is remembered today as having "personally conducted book repair workshops for more than 20 years," from the late-1960s through the early-1990s, although the territory covered by Demco, but the company's involvement in book repair instruction before that time is now forgotten.[23]

***

During the 50-plus years library venders employed this marketing strategy to promote their own products, their book repair techniques emphasized strength and durability without concern for the solution's appropriateness for permanent retention material. While reasonable for heavily circulated public library books, repair decisions for research library collections were inevitably entrusted to "inexperienced assistants" with abysmal consequences, as noted by Pelham Barr above. Lacking alternative sources of instruction or supplies, menders in U.S. research libraries indiscriminately applied these crude approaches to historic bookbindings with pressure sensitive tape residue proving disfiguring over time. Yet, despite shortcomings, these rudimentary efforts often managed to retain the books' original boards and spine, leaving modern conservators with at least something to salvage. The same cannot be said for those books routed to the

Library Binding

In the first years of the twentieth century, England's Royal Society of Arts established a blue-ribbon Committee on Leather for Bookbinding to identify the cause of leather deterioration (termed "red rot") in libraries. Included among the luminaries comprising this 20-member committee were Douglas Cockerell, T. J. Cobden-Sanderson, Cyril Davenport, Sarah T. Prideaux, and Joseph Zaehnsdorf.[24] Among its published findings, the Committee issued a "Suggested Recommendation for Ordinary Library Binding," a specification so exacting it came to clearly demarcate the English definition of library binding from the far more damaging approach adopted in the United States.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, rebinding – which included the replacement of a book's original cover and the repair or replacement of its original sewing – was widely seen by libraries as the optimal answer to reinforcing weak publishers' bindings when the materials broke down. The rapid development of free libraries during this period opened the door to specialization within commercial bookbinderies willing to provide a cost effective rebinding that emphasized durability. A range of innovative technical solutions arose to service this new "library binding" market, but the few individuals who truly understood the craft recognized that some of these were shortcuts that, while profitable to the binder, would ultimately have deleterious effects on the books.

UU IR Author Manuscript

consumer, the aforementioned Committee on Leather for

cks of

damaged sections with thin paper ("guarding") before resewing them through-the-fold. Although labor intensive, guarding preserves the text's ability to open completely to the spine fold of each section during use, thus retaining the book's normal functionality after rebinding. Conversely, the Committee prohibited the use of overcasting,[25] a laborsaving trick advocated by Cedric Chivers in his patented (1885) "Duro-Flexile" binding style. Overcasting eliminates the need for guarding by simply ignoring spine fold damage and sewing straight through the side of small groups of sections rather than through each section's fold. These small groups of stab-sewn sections were then additionally sewn to tapes or cords to form a text block with gaps inevitably occurring between the sections. Like tiny mousetraps attached to the spine, overcasting prevented the text from opening flat.

Chivers streamlines this approach in 1904 by patenting hand oversewing, a modification that would come to define American library binding for most of the twentieth century.[26] In its original design, hand oversewing required that each section be opened to its center and pierced with a series of holes running parallel to the spine fold. The sections were then closed and stab sewn obliquely through the pre-drilled holes and into the gutter margin of the two sections immediately below, adding additional sections until the entire text block was similarly stitched.[27] It soon became clear, however, that the work could be expedited by simply cutting off the spine fold of each section as a first step, turning every

book into a generic block of pages readied for uniform oversewing.

No longer did the individual characteristics of the text or its construction affect the repair approach employed, and every damaged book – regardless of size, sewing structure, or paper condition – could be treated identically by technicians instead of trained binders. Most attractively, the approach was inexpensive because it converted bookbinding into production line work. Oversewing's tendency to inhibit the text from opening fully in use was seen as a minor inconvenience because the technique was strong; exchange of the original publishers' binding for a characterless buckram case, simply the cost of doing business.

The low profit margin inherent in library binding required an enormous flow of material to generate substantive profits. Being tremendously ambitious, Chivers, in addition to his shop in Bath (England),[28] opened an American branch in New York City in 1905 which he relocated to Brooklyn the following year to accommodate ongoing expansion.[29] By 1908, his American operation employed 80 people and serviced approximately 500 libraries from coast to coast.[30] To manage operations on both continents Chivers sailed between England and the United States at least 120 times during the 18 years he operated his American plant.[31] Libraries in the United States were far less concerned with traditional bookbinding methods than they were with price and business boomed. Always suave and charismatic, Chivers is reputed to have set foot inside more public libraries in the United States than any American then living;[32] his noncompliance with the

Chivers marketed his services directly to his customers by actively exhibiting and presenting papers at regional and national library conferences in both the United States and England. His two principal publications are self-published, professional talks.[33] His 1909 book entitled, *Paper of lending library books,* bears scrutiny. This work essentially undermines the belief in traditional rebinding methods by contending that oversewing is stronger than traditional, through-the-fold sewing and therefore more appropriate for repairing contemporary (1890-1910), poor-quality, wood pulp book papers. Chivers' position is diametrically opposed to the conclusion reached four years earlier by the blue-ribbon Committee on Leather for Bookbinding and is eminently self serving. While this argument helped Chivers build his clientele and would ultimately make him a wealthy man, it also provided the intellectual underpinning for oversewing becoming broadly accepted as an essential component of library binding in the United States.

In 1920, Los Angeles library binder W. Elmo Reavis invented the oversewing machine,[34] effectively mechanizing Chivers' hand oversewing process and further converting library binding into mass produced, assembly line work. Three years later, in 1923, the American Library Association's Committee on Book Binding, in conjunction with the Library Group of the Employing Book Binders of America (of which Reavis was a member), established the first standard for library binding in the United States, explicitly

UU IR Author Manuscript

incorporating Reavis' invention into the guidelines by stating:

all library

> binding, including books and periodicals, estimated by various binders at eighty to ninety per cent of the entire output."[35]

Once adopted, oversewing remained the national standard for 63 years (until 1986) regularly promulgated in the industry's professional publications. For example, the 1981 edition of the Library Binding Institute's *Standard for library binding* clearly specified, "Oversewing shall be used on all volumes with suitable paper provided that the sewing does not infringe on the print,"[36] stubbornly failing to acknowledge the technique's by then well identified shortcomings.

European research libraries seem to have avoided the pitfalls of mass oversewing, largely because commercial hand binderies in England and on the Continent continued to observe the specifications for library binding defined by Douglas Cockerell and the Committee on Leather for Bookbinding in 1905. One possible explanation for America's love affair with mechanized library binding, a phenomenon that affected numerous fields during the twentieth century, was proffered by the architect and United States émigré Walter Gropius in 1960, who contended:

> Increasingly, patterns of taste dictated by purely commercial considerations win acceptance, and the natural feeling for quality and appropriateness is dissipated in the giddy tumble from novelty to novelty.[37]

rary perspective, it is now abundantly clear that American

nes fragile over time, oversewing causes text leaves to fracture approximately 3/8 inches from the thread due to the stress of opening acutely against the sewing's fixity. Books afflicted with this "guttersnap" are usually impossible to repair, having little or no remaining margin. First documented as a severe problem by Matt Roberts (Chief, Circulation Department, Washington University) in 1967,[38] challenges to oversewing's market dominance proved futile during the following two decades. Even the "brittle book crisis" of the 1980s glossed over oversewing's contribution to the problem in its myopic rush toward microfilm replication. However, it cannot be denied that library binding can absolutely destroy book papers grown fragile with age. This point is clearly driven home when two copies of the same title remain shelved together, the pages of the oversewn volume cracking in the gutter while the paper in the original publishers' binding remains in serviceable condition.

In his later years, even Cedric Chivers came to publically concede oversewing's trap. In 1925, three and a half years before his death, the then-Mayor of Bath was invited to address the Royal Society of Arts (whose Committee on Leather for Bookbinding had rebuffed him 20 years earlier). During his lecture on oversewing he confided his change of heart:

> These methods were the best which at that time could be contrived, but presently complaints began to be made as to the durability of some of my bindings. Pages

sewing . . . Indeed I [now] frequently lose contracts for

pecification

which under other conditions I personally drew up.[39]

While a touching confession, Chivers' acknowledgment of the damage caused by the unbridled use of oversewing did not go far enough. A far more serious consequence to America's indiscriminate reliance on library binding throughout the 20th century is that by systematically jettisoning publishers' bindings, research libraries helped drive to extinction the single type of cultural patrimony they were responsible for preserving.

Preserving General Collections

If a percentage of the historical bindings remaining in research libraries are to be preserved, these institutions will need to consider the long-term benefits achieved by implementing a competent, fully integrated approach to book repair. As has always been the case, some repairs are simply more cost effective to carry out in-house than to send out commercially.

Approximately 15% of the total number of books from the circulating collection passing through a research library's book repair department have historic bindings requiring rebacking or some comparable form of hinge repair to retain the original cover. Preserving these bindings, however, is impossible without providing sufficiently trained staff access to appropriate materials, tools and equipment. Outsourcing to private conservators is typically too expensive to be practical for circulating collections. Bottom

to act in their own best interest to maintain their older book

all-too-

common, one-size-fits-all alternatives will continue blindly stripping the historic and artistic primary source material from the general collections.

Shades of the Things to Come

A study of the Library of Congress' (LC) collections conducted in 1997 revealed a startling fact. In a random sample of 294 books published between 1830 and 1914 by six prominent American publishers, only 105 (36%) retrieved from LC's general collection retained their original publishers' bindings. Nearly twice that number – 180 (61%) – had already lost that covers to library rebinding.[41] While retention of publishers' cloth bindings from the general collection is clearly not a priority for LC, this prestigious institution is as close to a national library as exists in the United States, and research libraries often have a tendency to follow its lead. It is time to acknowledge that there is no library of last resort and that as a result of previous well-intended acts of preservation, fragments of America's cumulative cultural heritage are already lost.

Most publishers' bindings are unlikely to be reclassified as rare books in the foreseeable future and so ongoing rebinding and repair practices will continue nibbling away at their diminishing numbers. Be assured, the day-to-day practices destroying these holdings are not motivated by callousness but are typically caused br a lack of practical alternatives. In permanent retention collections, "collection development" does not generally include a

review process to ensure each individual book receives an appropriate level of care *in*

archers.

This idea was suggested by the Modern Language Association in their 1994 "Statement on the Significance of Original Materials," to safeguard otherwise vulnerable material but research libraries have chosen to discount this direct appeal from one of their numerous scholarly constituent groups who rely on material culture for their research.[42]

In conclusion, the motivations for preserving original publishers' bookbindings and other forms of historic material (such as dust jackets) are simple: 1) this materials already belongs to the library; 2) ongoing maintenance demands little more than a level of stewardship appropriate to preserving research collections; and, 3) future academic research will require the use of these physical resources. Research libraries are experienced at protecting primary source material – it is now time to fine tune the definition of what is significant and what is at risk for the 21st century.

Endnotes

1. Tanselle, G. Thomas, *Textual criticism and scholarly editing* (Charlottesville : Published for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia by the University Press of Virginia, 1990).

2. See for example: Barclay W. Ogden, *On the preservation of books and documents in original form* (Washington, D.C. : Commission on Preservation and Access, 1989); Stephen G. Nichols, and Abbey Smith, *The evidence in hand: report of the Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections* (Washington, D.C. : Council on Library and Information Resources, 2001); and, Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of the Print Record, "Statement on the Significance of Original Materials" 14 October 1994, recovered from the World Wide Web 23 October 2006: http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byorg/mla/mlaprimd.html.

museums, and reading: the 6th Sol. M. Malkin lecture in bibliography, (New York: Columbia University School of Library Service, 1991).

4. *A ienza in Nord America e confrontoo con l'approccio europeo*, or *Book repair as an integrated discipline: Analysis of the experience in North America and comparison with the European approach*, Masters thesis, Università "Ca' Foscari" di Venezia, 2005.

5. Randy Silverman and Maria Grandinette, "Connoisseurship of nineteenth and early twentieth century publishers' bookbindings," in Carlo Federici, et. al., (eds.), *International conference on conservation and restoration of archive and library materials, Erice, 22-29 April 1996* (Rome: Istituto centrale per la patologia del libro, 2000): 287-317.

6. Charles Gullans, "The New Generation: Sarah Whitman and Frank Hazen," in, Sue Allen & Charles Gullans, *Decorated Cloth in America, Publishers' Bindings 1840-1910* (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for 17th- and 18th-Century Studies, 1994).

7. E. W. Browning, "More training needed in bookbinding and book conservation," *Library Journal* 75 (1 February 1950): 190-91; quoted in Edward Connery Lantham, "Some personnel considerations for binding and conservation services," in John P. Baker and Margerigte C. Soroka (eds.), *Library conservation: preservation in perspective* (Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, Inc., 1978): 161. An exception to this norm was the Teachers College of Columbia University which taught binding and repair early in the twentieth century, and published, Sarah J. Freeman, A syllabus of a course on elementary bookmaking and bookbinding (New York: Teachers College of Columbia University, 1910).

8. Pelham Barr, "Book conservation and university library administration," *College and research libraries* 7 (July 1946): 214-219; quoted in Edward Connery Lantham, "Some personnel considerations for binding and conservation services," in John P. Baker and Margerigte C. Soroka (eds.), *Library conservation: preservation in perspective* (Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, Inc., 1978): 150.

9. Pelham Barr, *op. sit.*

10. Walter Powell, "Library bookbinding," *Library world* 5 (1 January 1903): 173.

11. See, for example: Harriet Price Sawyer, *How to care for books in a library* (Madison, WI: Democrat Printing Co.: 1912); and, E. R. Norris Mathews, "Library binderies," *Library Association record* (15 March, 1906): 73-78.

12. Lovina Knowlton (Indianapolis, Indiana), "Library mending kit," *Library occurrent* 10 (December 1907): 5; see also, F. J. Williamson (, "Specification for the fittings of a small bindery," in E. Wyndham Hulme, et. al., *Leather for libraries* (London: Library Supply Co., 1905): 51-54.

...ngs old and new (New York: Macmillan company, 1895).

14. C...): 10.

15. Arthur L. Bailey, *Bookbinding* (Chicago: American Library Association Publishing Board, 1911): 14.

16. Cyril Davenport, "The repairing and binding of books for public libraries," in, E. Wyndham Hulme, et. al., *Leather for libraries* (London: Library Supply Co., 1905): 44.

17. Davenport, *ibid*: 42.

18. Davenport, *ibid*: 43.

19. Davenport, *ibid*: 46. In 1903, Hull (UK) Public Library recased 633 volumes, repaired and glued up 1,697 volumes, and rebound 3,465 volumes.

20. Margaret Wright Brown, *Mending and repair of books,* library handbooks no. 6 (Chicago: American Library Association Publishing Board, 1910): 3-4.

21. Douglas Cockerell, *Bookbinding and the care of books* (London: ???,1901).

22. Donald M. Kidd, *Bookcraft, an industrial art subject: on book repairing for schools and libraries* (n.p., Gaylord Brothers, Inc, 1928).

23. Letter to the author dated 1 December 1998 from June Paynter, Manager, Bids and Specification, Demco Inc., 4810 Forest Run Road, Madison, WI 53707-7488.

24. Cobham and Wood (eds.), *Committee on Leather for Bookbinding*, (London: Royal Society of Arts, 1905). Douglas Cockerell had an enormous influence on the Committee, as his own library binding specification, published in 1901, looks nearly identical. See, Douglas Cockerell, *Bookbinding and the Care of Books*, 2nd ed., (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912):173-177, 308-311.

25. Cobham and Wood (eds.), *Committee on Leather for Bookbinding*: 34

26. *Abridgments to Specifications, Class 16, Books*, 1901-04 (1906), no. 10,439. The method is illustrated in Cedric Chivers, *The Paper of Lending Library Books with Some Remarks on their Bindings, Illustrated by Diagrams and Photomicrograms* (Portway, Bath: Cedric Chivers Ltd, [c. 1909]), p. 22; see also, W. Elmo Reavis, "Book sewing distinguished from book stitchery, part III," *Pacific Bindery Talk* 10, no. 5 (January 1938): 74-77.

27. Cedric Chivers, "Bookbinding,"*Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* (6 November 1925): 1082.

UU IR Author Manuscript

28. Cornelia Marvin, "Notes for librarians," *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* 1 (May 1905): 42, gives the address as, 542 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

29. alifornia Libraries 2 (1907): 105, places the new bindery at 1242 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, New York. An ad on the inside cover of Chivers self-published pamphlet, *The Relative Value of Leather and Other Binding Materials, Illustrated by Diagrams and Photomicrograms* (n.p., n.d., [c. 1911]), places the bindery at 911-913 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., indicating a third move.

30. Barbara Buckner Higginbotham, "Cedric Chivers: portrait of a turn-of-the-century binder and entrepreneur," *Technicalities* 15, no 12 (December 1995), 10-11. Chivers is discussed in glowing terms by numerous American librarians in the literature, including: Cornelia Marvin, "Rebinding made unnecessary, *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* 1 (May 1905), 42; Clara Field, "Book repairing," *News Notes of California Libraries* 2 (July 1907): 105; Kirke H. Field, "Binding and other workroom problems," *News Notes of California Libraries* 5 (July 1910): 372.

31. Chivers sold the Brooklyn bindery in 1923 to Karl Schaefer and Frank Barnard, themselves owners of well-established binderies. See Michael Dewe, "Cedric Chivers and library binding," *Library World* 72, no 844 (October 1970), 125.

32. Dewe, "Cedric Chivers and library binding," 1970, 123-127; Harris, 1978, p. 5.

33. Cedric Chivers, *The Paper of Lending Library Books with Some Remarks on their Bindings, Illustrated by Diagrams and Photomicrograms* (Portway, Bath: Cedric Chivers Ltd, [c. 1909]); and Cedric Chivers, *The Relative Value of Leather and Other Binding Materials, Illustrated by Diagrams and Photomicrograms* (n.p., n.d., [c. 1911]).

34. W. Elmo Reavis, "The stream of bookbinding, a historical sketch, Part III," *Pacific bindery talk* 10, no. 9(May, 1938): 180-82.

35. The A.L.A. Committee on Book Binding, and the Library Group of the Employing Book Binders of America, "General Specifications for Library and School Book Binding," reprinted from the *Library Journal* (September 1, 1923): 4.

36. Library Binding Institute, *Standard for library binding*, 7th ed. (Boston: The Institute, 1981): 3.

37. Walter Gropius, "The curse of conformity," in Richard T Thruelsen and John Kobler (eds.), *Adventures of the Mind from the Saturday Evening Post* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960): 263-274 (quote is from 264).

38. Matt Roberts, "Oversewing and the problem of book preservation in the research library," *College and research libraries* 28(January 1967): 17-24.

39. Cedric Chivers, "Bookbinding," *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* (6 November 1925): 1077.

approach to conservation," in, *La conservation: Une science en evolution, bilans et perspectives, acte* *on pour la Recl* d Maria Grandinette, (eds.), *The changing role of book repair in research libraries*, SPEC Kit 190, (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, 1993).

41. Linda J. White, *Packaging the American word: a survey of nineteenth and early twentieth century American publishers' bindings in the general collections of the Library of Congress*, masters thesis, Catholic University of America in conjunction with the Library of Congress Preservation Directorate, 1997. Besides original publishers' cloth binding or commercial library bindings, other possibilities included: 2 leather bindings (0.00068%); 6 paperbacks (0.02%); and 1 unbound (0.0034%).

42. Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of the Print Record, "Statement on the Significance of Original Materials" 14 October 1994, recovered from the World Wide Web 23 October 2006: http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byorg/mla/mlaprimd.html