Victorian Readers and their Library Records Today

K.E. Attar

Published in: (ed.), *Reading and the Victorians*, ed. Matthew Bradley and Juliet John (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 99-110.

The early twenty-first century has already seen growing interest in recording the use of books in the context of library catalogues, perhaps reaching its apogee in the *Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century Now in the Bodleian Library*:

The presence of manuscript notes has always been recorded and their frequency has been indicated (copious, frequent, a few, occasional), and it has been noted if annotations occur only in certain sections of a book. Where possible, the type of annotation has been indicated (for example, underlining in black ink in the text, extracting key words, 'nota' marks, providing summaries of short passages, extracting keywords [*sic*], structuring the text, providing glosses, commenting on the text, providing corrections to the text). A date, however approximate, is given where possible, as also is the geographical origin of the hand of the notes.[1]

Printed catalogues of fifteenth-century books, or incunabula (of which such eminent Victorians as Thomas Grenville (1755-1846) and Bertram, fourth Earl of Ashburnham (1797-1878) assembled impressive collections),[2] admittedly are not indicative of standard library catalogues. Not only have incunabula traditionally been accorded detail of description denied to later books, but printed catalogues are discrete entities which create their own rules and, therefore, follow scholarly trends more easily than standard library on-line public access catalogues (OPACs), which follow international rules established only after years of consultation. However, they are valuable examples of academic projects instigated by libraries; of the merging of scholarly and professional interest. What potential exists for recording reading in general library catalogues, intended primarily to index author, title and subject matter and identify editions to point users to more recent (including nineteenth-century) publications, and how is it exploited? The books are present in profusion: numerous collections now in academic libraries stem from Victorian readers and collectors.[3] This article looks at three Victorian readers, their reading habits and the method of recording their reading in electronic catalogues.

The three readers have all left their mark at Senate House Library, University of London (formerly the University of London Library). The collections of two of them, the mathematician and mathematical historian Augustus De Morgan (1806-1871) and the Greek historian and Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, George Grote (1794-1871), formed the foundation collections of the University of London Library in 1871.[4] Lord Overstone purchased and donated the first; Grote bequeathed the second. De Morgan and Grote were very differently circumstanced. Whereas De Morgan was a Cambridge man, Grote was denied a University education by his father and compelled at the age of fifteen to join the family's banking business. De Morgan, as a professor of mathematics at University College London and the father of seven children, died with an estate of under £7,000 and

spent within limited means, so much so that when in 1840 he spent twenty pounds and eleven shillings at the auction of mathematical books from the library of John Orchard Halliwell, he recorded the expense on his copy of the sale catalogue as 'a warning to book-buyers';[5] his wife wrote that, owing to lack of funds, 'he was soon obliged to deny himself the luxury of buying, except the chance treasures which fell in his way at bookstalls'.[6] Grote, who was childless, was from his father's death in 1830 a wealthy man,[7] whose estate at the time of his death was under £120,000, and on 12 April 1851 his spouse recorded in her diary: 'George has bought books of Alex. Durlacher to the amount of 131*l*'.[8] While De Morgan collected books pertaining to the history of mathematics and, in addition to assimilating their content, was interested in and noted for his knowledge of their physical features,[9] Grote acquired rather than collecting, and his wife wrote that 'his taste for bibliographical *curiosities* is not so lively as that of some other scholars'.[10] Yet both men read widely and voraciously, were famed for their erudition, took pleasure in their collections of books, left records of at least some of their reading, and died the owners of notable libraries.[11]

The third, and most famous, reader is Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881). He is represented in this essay by annotations on a single book, Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *Aurora Leigh* (1857), which belonged to his niece, Mary Aitken, at the time, and which entered Senate House Library as part of the library of first and fine editions of English literature given to the University of London by the EMI magnate Sir Louis Sterling (1879-1958) in 1956.[12] The book contains fifty-nine pencilled annotations throughout, and is outstanding for being annotated by an identified individual who was not the owner.

What distinguishes Victorian readers from earlier and later ones is that the books they read bridged a technological gap. In 1800, every aspect of book production was carried out by hand, resulting in the potential for a considerable amount of variation between copies of an edition, and also in scholarly interest in the book as an artefact. By 1850, book production had been entirely mechanised.[13] Victorian readers did not demarcate. Old books were readily available, on market stalls in streets as well as via second-hand dealers and auctions, and our 'antiquarian' was the Victorians' 'second-hand'.[14] Samples from the 1876 printed catalogue of the University of London reveal approximately 50% of De Morgan's books and 80% of Grote's as dating from the nineteenth century.[15] De Morgan annotated his books uniformly, writing notes on the title page or tipping them on to flyleaves, regardless of whether they were printed in the fifteenth century, the nineteenth, or anywhere inbetween; the only distinction that he makes is that the occasional annotations in the body of the text are normally in nineteenth-century works.[16] There is no indication that Grote, reading exclusively for content, regarded his books of whatever vintage as anything other than a working library. Carlyle, to judge from the manuscript markings and annotations made on his books about Oliver Cromwell and Frederick the Great printed from the seventeenth century onwards and bequeathed to Harvard University, did not distinguish between the age of books by his treatment of them either.[17]

Modern librarians, by contrast, demarcate sharply between books of the hand-press and those of the machine-press period, although the precise cut-off point (normally 1800, 1830 or 1850) varies between libraries. On the basis that in the machine-press period all copies of an edition left the publisher's house identically to each other, and on the assumption that machine-press books contain less artefactual interest, cataloguing rules for them are

simpler. That annotations on modern books might be of scholarly value did not enter the rule-makers' consciousness. Thus there is one brief rule (1.7B20) in the 1998 revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, the main set of rules in the English-speaking world for describing modern books, entitled 'Copy being described, library's holdings, and restrictions on use' and beginning: 'Give important descriptive details of the particular copy being described'; the example, 'Ms. notes by author on endpapers', implies that only authorial markings are of value.[18]

Rules for describing early printed books – relevant for a considerable amount of Victorian reading - are more generous. The English Short-Title Catalogue (ESTC), a union catalogue covering books published either in English-speaking countries or in the English language to 1800, includes searchable copy-specific details. [19] A long and comprehensive list of examples, available on the internet, promotes uniformity of terms when inputting, which facilitates success when searching.[20] Examples of provenance include the Victorian collectors William Henry Miller (1789-1848), Sir Robert Leicester Harmsworth (1870-1937) and Henry (1815-1878) or Alfred Henry (1850-1910) Huth. Suggested examples of non-negative physical characteristics are 'MS. notes', 'Bibliographical MS. notes', 'Copious MS. notes' (for notes occupying a space equal to at least 10% of the book), 'Interleaved', and -- implying that a book has not been read -- 'Unopened and uncut'. The disadvantage is that absence of a note on ESTC suggesting reading by no means rules out evidence of reading. Owing to lack of space on the mainframe, detailed copy-specific information was originally discouraged; as late as 2005, ESTC instructions to cataloguers about to report material to ESTC were to report only famous names, and to ignore anything outside the text block – so that marginal annotations would be recorded, but an index jotted on an endpaper would not be. Moreover, some ESTC entries are carry-overs from the recording of a library holding in STC or Wing, the main printed bibliographies of books printed in the English language or in English-speaking countries to 1700,[21] where evidence of reading was not a concern. Libraries themselves are selective in how much copy-specific information they choose to take time to submit to ESTC.

In 1988, the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association produced the indexing tool *Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing*. Its terms pertain not only to ownership, but also to evidence of reading: for example, 'annotations', 'fists', 'genealogical notes', 'insertions', 'marginalia', 'markings' and 'underscoring'.[22] Terms are refined by date and place, for example:

Inscriptions (Provenance) -- England -- London -- 19th century.

The thesaurus is generally accepted in theory as a cataloguing tool in the United Kingdom, although its application is limited, perhaps because keyword searching dispenses with the need for such indexing.[23] The indexing of names of people connected with specific copies of books is more common, appending to the name a word or phrase which indicates the person's connection to the book, most commonly 'former owner', 'inscriber', 'annotator' (used if the annotator is not the former owner) and 'associated name' (for an ambiguous or undefined relationship to the book).[24]

In Britain in 1997 the Rare Books Group of the Library Association produced the booklet *Guidelines for the Cataloguing of Rare Books*, updated in 1999 and 2007, to meet a

need in the library world for guidance when recording copy-specific features of books.[25] Its instructions pertain primarily to provenance and binding; while the examples of provenance pertain exclusively to evidence of ownership, its definition at C.2 is: 'Provenance is concerned with the individuals or institutions who may have owned *or handled* a book up to and including the present time' (my italics). Increasing awareness of the value of provenance information is most apparent in the main set of rare book cataloguing rules. *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books* (DCRB; 1991) stated (rule 7C18): 'Make notes on any special features or imperfections of the copy being described when they are considered important. [...] Features that may be brought out here include [...] provenance (persons, institutions, bookplates)'.[26] The equivalent paragraph in the 2007 revision of this code, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* (DCRM(B)), expands 'provenance (persons, institutions, bookplates)' to: 'provenance evidence (such as bookplates, stamps, autographs, and manuscript annotations), the names of persons or institutions associated with specific copies' (rule 7B19.1.3), then cites a paragraph from the *Guidelines for the Cataloguing of Rare Books*.[27] Especially significant for the recording of Victorian reading is that whereas DCRB was intended to be applied to antiquarian material, DCRM(B) acknowledges circumstances for which it will be relevant for machine-press books.

By far the most frequent way in which owners of all periods have marked their books is to write, or otherwise affix, their name in them, and this, with perhaps the addition of a date, place or price, is often the only marking in a book.[28] Named owners are more tangible than anonymous figures who wrote in books, besides which appreciation of association copies dates back further than a general interest in the history of reading by ordinary people and categories of people rather than merely by individuals recorded in biographical dictionaries or recognised by the creators of sale or library catalogues as eminent.[29] Thus all the rules and guidelines clearly privilege the long respected and concrete interest in ownership over the new discipline of the evidence of reading. This is understandable. When owners are known to be avid readers, a mere note of ownership may lead a researcher to other sources: for example, from Augustus De Morgan to his published writings; from George Grote to his diaries, notebooks, and correspondence, scattered throughout various institutions and abounding with references to his reading.

The inevitable limitation of a library catalogue for an historian of reading is that the purpose of a general library catalogue is to describe that library's books as seen. Consultation of works beyond the book being catalogued is prompted by that physical book (for example, to learn a date of publication absent from the imprint, note bibliographical references, or to establish further information about a former owner who has left some trace on a book). Exceptionally a cataloguer may examine extraneous sources, such as old library accessions registers to establish the acquisition date, source and price of incunabula. Even this is a consultation of a known source expected to yield results about a specific copy of a book. The catalogue is thus diametrically opposed to a database such as the Reading Experience Database, of which the purpose is to record reading and which begins with the readers, taking information from a variety of written sources outside books, and for which the particular edition of a book often is neither identified nor important.[30] An example of this difference of approach comes from one of George Grote's books, concerning which Grote wrote to G. C. Lewis on 30 September 1852:

He [Guillemot, a Paris bookseller] procured for me one work of the Abbé St. Pierre, in two volumes, small octavo, entitled 'Annales Politiques'; which I will send you on the first opportunity. I have read it myself, with great interest and instruction. It contains a sort of annalistic review of each separate year of the Abbé's life – 1658 to 1730; and exhibits a degree of knowledge, beneficient views, and power of original thought, which impress me with a very high esteem for the author – whom I before knew only by name.[31]

This record has an evident place in a database of reading. But as the book itself betrays no signs of reading, and as Grote's comment does not reflect on the physical volume (and could theoretically pertain to a copy other than that in the library), it does not belong in the catalogue record.

If, on the other hand, a book shows evidence of reading, that is, ideally, recorded. Thus numerous books in Senate House Library have a provenance note in the catalogue recording the presence of notes (dated where possible) and other evidence of reading, such as:

ULL copy is from the library of Augustus De Morgan, with his note pasted on front flyleaf, 22 Sept. 1853;

ULL copy at [DeM] L^{o} (B.P.22) is from the library of Augustus De Morgan, with his list of contents pasted in at front of vol., 8 Oct. 1851, and his light pencilled marginal markings;

ULL copy is from the library of Augustus De Morgan, with his inscription and note on t.p.: "received from Author. June 20, 1857", and with his light underlinings in red ink;

ULL copy is from the library of George Grote, with his pencilled jottings (partial index) on final page and his pencilled marginal markings.[32]

Annotations need not indicate reading – some of De Morgan's notes concern rarity or the source of acquisition, or relate anecdotes about the author – but the historian of reading at least has a guide. The Senate House Library catalogue has an advanced keyword search option which allows searching by note fields, so that users can search for books by combining terms like 'De Morgan' or 'George Grote' and 'note*' (truncated to cover 'note' and 'notes') or 'annotat*' (truncated to cover 'annotated' and 'annotations'), further limitable by date of publication or subject.

Turning to Carlyle, Carlyle pencilled comments and markings in fifty-nine places on his niece's copy of the first edition of *Aurora Leigh*. Five remarks come at the end of books, serving as general commentary: 'How much better had all this been if written straight forward in clear prose utterance' (p. 41; Book 1); 'fine spun, very – cobweb?' (p. 88; Book 2); 'Watery but pretty: 'A high child"!' (p. 133; Book 3); 'Teapot running furiously clear now' (p. 321; Book 7); and, at the conclusion of the entire poem: 'A very beautiful tempest in a teapot. What a gift of utterance this high child has, - and how very weak and child-like all it has to say. 12 jany, 1857' (p. 403). Others relate to single words or phrases under- or

overlined in the text, such as 'Fr^{h} *yard*' beside 'A metre' (overlined, p. 238; Book 6). Most of Carlyle's other comments accompany marginal markings pertaining to between three and eight lines. They range from clear approval of certain sentiments, such as a tick beside the line 'For darning stockings past their natural age' (p. 126; Book 3) and the exclamations 'Oh, yes' (p. 26; Book 1) and 'devilish fine!' (p. 85; Book 2) to patronising approval ('Goodish', p. 15; Book 1) to terse ejaculations and to snide comments on the plot: 'Twaddle?' (p. 14; Book 1), 'so?' (p. 22; Book 1) 'If!' (p. 116; Book 3), 'que faire/ que dire' (p. 254; Book 6), 'Ach!' (p. 289; Book 7), 'que ne veux-tu?' (p. 344; Book 8), 'du Himmel!' (p. 392; Book 9), 'whew-w-w!' (p. 339; Book 8), and, a little longer, 'What a tissue of crotchets!' (p. 286; Book 7), 'A very natural letter this – many such come by the Twopenny' (p. 375; Book 9), 'To Bedlam with him!' (p. 375; Book 9), 'The facts? Come to the facts!' (p. 257; Book 6), 'Getting rather vapid?' (p. 312; Book 7), 'How extremely probable the story is getting' (p. 170; Book 4), 'Yes, if it *must'* (p. 193; Book 5) and, beside the lines 'We had a strange and melancholy walk: The night came drizzling downward in dark rain' (p. 149; Book 4): 'why not call a cab?'[33]

Thomas Carlyle's intellectual eminence is such that any notes he made on books are likely to contribute to intellectual history. His notes on *Aurora Leigh* have an added interest. Carlyle, while friendly with Robert Browning, was known to have entertained a lower opinion of his wife and her poetry, which he regarded as flat, sentimental and conventional.[34] His dislike of *Aurora Leigh* is well recorded: the sculptor Thomas Woolner reported him as speaking 'with profound contempt of Ruskin because the little Art Deity called "Aurora Leigh" the finest poem by far of the present age and gave him a copy to read',[35] and Kaplan wrote that Carlyle was unable to disguise from the Brownings 'his contempt for Elizabeth's stupidity on such issues' (i.e. Italian nationalism and liberal aspirations).[36] Carlyle's comments on the text of *Aurora Leigh* are the primary source evidence. They are significant for their contribution to our knowledge of the relationship between Carlyle and the Brownings, especially Elizabeth Barrett Browning. They are valuable in indicating a reader's response to a work of fiction, allowing us to compare how Carlyle approached it as opposed to fact. The annotations reveal a similar terseness in reacting to anything he saw as bad: his summary of Karl von Schmettau's *Lebensgeschichte des Grafen von Schmettau* (Berlin, 1806) was: 'Not good for much', while that on Eléazar de Mauvillon's *The Life of Frederick-William I, Late King of Prussia,* translated by William Phelips (London, 1750) was: 'Not ill translated; the Book itself being of little merit,'[37] and comments on his copy of John Stuart Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* include: 'O Himmel!' and: 'Yes, yes. But oh, get on to something more substantial!'[38] The contextualisation depersonalises Carlyle's asperity. Any response to fiction in this way gains significance for the fact that annotations on fiction are much rarer than annotations on theological or polemical works. Annotations on *Aurora Leigh* are particularly interesting as additional evidence of contemporary reaction to a poem which received a mixed critical reception.[39]

Library recording of the annotations is, however, minimal. The printed catalogue of the Sterling Library states:

Copy lent by his niece Mary Aitken to Thomas Carlyle, and extensively annotated in pencil by him. The final comment, on p. 403, is dated '12 jan^{y} 1857', and the original front end-paper is inscribed: 'To be *returned* (by and by), not being properly mine. T.C. (3 Feb^{y}).[40]

Provenance and annotations are not indexed. The catalogue card for the item deviates from the card catalogue's usual practice of silence concerning annotations to record: 'With autograph notes in pencil by Thomas Carlyle. S.L.C., I,84' ('I,84' being the book's reference number in the printed catalogue).[41] The library did not maintain a provenance or an adversaria index, and the book is not indexed under Carlyle. The provenance note in the computer catalogue entry, generated in 2004, reads: 'ULL copy is from the library of Sir Louis Sterling. Previously owned by Thomas Carlyle's niece Mary Aitken, and lent by her to Thomas Carlyle; contains his pencilled annotations, the final one dated: 12 jan.y, 1857'. Mary Aitken Carlyle and Sir Louis Sterling are indexed as former owners; Thomas Carlyle is indexed as an annotator.

Could and should this information be more detailed? Practically, the likelihood of more detail about Carlyle's annotations is slight. Although the days of trying to compress information into a three by five-inch catalogue card or on to a small slip in a guard book are gone, visually it remains convenient for catalogue records not to extend beyond a single screen. And whereas a database of reading has as its *raison d'être* scholarly interest in reading, catalogue users have diverse needs. They may be interested in former ownership and in signs of reading. They may equally possibly be interested in the binding, printer or publisher, paper, layout, illustrations, or advertisements. Or they may merely want to read the text. The cataloguer, who may be working to stringent targets and who will almost certainly have multiple demands on his or her time, lacks time to cover all eventualities in detail. A long copy-specific note can, moreover, overwhelm a catalogue record. But even if time and space permitted, it would be difficult to record reading more meaningfully in a catalogue record. To record the numbers of pages which Carlyle has marked means nothing unless the user has the correct edition before him. One might overcome this by comparing the first edition, in which the lines are not numbered, against a more recent one with line numbers and adding those; even then, the reader needs a text of the poem before him. Otherwise all passages marked or annotated would need to be cited – an exercise which, for Carlyle's copy of Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, occupies thirty-eight A4 pages, double-spaced.[42] A more satisfying alternative would be to link the record to digital images of the relevant pages; to provide a hybrid of a description with full text. This is what full-text databases with a detailed front-page description already do, and may be the way forward: not overwhelming the description with detail, but showing the evidence of reading more accurately than a paraphrase can do. *Guidelines for the Cataloguing of Rare Books* includes the provision: 'Where notes are too extensive to be included as part of a catalogue record or where images are available, references could be made to other files, manual or electronic' (C.2.6).

Much evidence of Victorian reading in books now in institutional libraries will have been suppressed, the books having been catalogued at a time when annotations were not considered worthy of mention. Yet the position in the early twenty-first century is reasonably positive for historians of reading. Books printed during the Victorian era are gaining a higher bibliographical status with increasing age, and as part of a trend which saw the scholarly

spotlight begin with incunabula and move forward century by century. As the supply of handpress books decreases, gifts to libraries are more likely to be of modern material, and modern collections are regarded as special: an indication of this trend is that in 2005 the Rare Books Group of the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals renamed itself the Rare Books and Special Collections Group, acknowledging an existing state of affairs that most special collections departments house machine-press books. Following scholarly trends, new cataloguing codes are paying more attention to copy-specific matters. Even Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), the base code, which starts from a technological rather than a bibliographical standpoint, has four levels of object to be taken into consideration, including the item – i.e. the specific copy within an edition.[43] Technology is on the side of the reading historian, with web catalogues enabling integrated resources (description and image). Also important in a digital era in which texts no longer necessarily rely on the printed page for transmission is appreciation that the book as an object and copy-specific features are important.[44] The standard library catalogue is unlikely ever to be a final reference point for recording reading: for pragmatic reasons, because it is not its purpose, and because the evidence of reading often is not in books. It can, however, be a worthy starting point, as librarian and scholar work fruitfully together.

---

[1] Alan Coates et al., *Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century Now in the Bodleian Library*, 6 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. lxxxv. See also *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century Now in the British Library. Pt. XI: England* ('t Goy-Houten: HES & De Graaf, 2007), which includes as a standard part of its entries 'notes of ownership and other traces of use in each copy', 'fully presented in the copy notes' (p. 4), and indexes 'Features as noted in the description of copies', divided into 'Manuscript additions' (8A), 'Manuscript text added on blank pages' (8B), and 'Insertions' (11), subdivided into 'Letter', 'Notes, inserted and on fly-leaves' and 'Inserted drawings, engravings, etc.'

[2] Other examples of Victorian collectors of incunabula among other books and manuscripts include Benjamin Heywood Bright (1788-1843) and John Bellingham Inglis (1780-1870) from the beginning of the Victorian era, the Rev. Thomas Corser (1793-1876) , David Laing (1793-1878) and Sir Thomas Phillips (1792-1872) of the middle part, and George Dunn (1865-1912), Lord Amherst of Hackney (1835-1908) and Charles William Dyson Perrins (1864-1958) at the end of the age. For an overview of some salient collectors, including those given in this list, see Seymour de Ricci, *English Collectors of Books & Manuscripts (1530-1930) and their Marks of Ownership* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930; repr. New York: Burt Franklin, 1969), pp. 105-83.

[3] See, for example, A.N.L. Munby, *Cambridge College Libraries: Aids for Research Students*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Heffer, 1962). For wider examples, see David Pearson, 'Private Libraries and the Collecting Instinct', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, vol. 3: *1850-2000*, ed. by Alistair Black and Peter Hoare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 180-202.

[4] For introductory biographical information about the two men, see Joseph Hamburger, 'Grote, George (1794-1871)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn, May 2008 (http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11677); Leslie Stephen, 'Morgan, Augustus De (1806-1871)', rev. I . Grattan-Guinness, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn, May 2006 (http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7470).

[5] *Catalogue of a Selected Portion of the Scientific, Historical and Miscellaneous Library of James Orchard Halliwell* ... ([London: Sotheby], 1840); De Morgan wrote prices besides the lots he bought and the sum in shillings of lots bought on each page at the bottom of that page. See Senate House Library, [DeM] Z (B.P. 354). The prices fetched in this sale were in fact phenomenally low, especially for early English books (see A.N.L. Munby, *The History and Bibliography of Science in England: The First Phase, 1833-1845* (Berkeley: School of Librarianship, University of California, 1968), p. 18.

[6] Sophia Elizabeth De Morgan, *Memoir of Augustus De Morgan* (London: Longmans, Green, 1882), p. 58.

[7] Grote's inheritance included capital in the family banking house, Lincolnshire estates and some £40,000 of personal property; see M.L. Clarke, *George Grote: A Biography* (London: Athlone Press, 1962), pp. 35-6.

[8] Harriet Grote, *The Personal Life of George Grote*, 2nd edn (London: Murray, 1873), p. 200.

[9] See especially [Obituary of Augustus De Morgan], *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 32 (1872), 112-18 (p. 117).
[10] Grote, p. 200.
[11] These are listed in: *Catalogue of the Library of the University of London, Including the Libraries of George Grote and Augustus De Morgan* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1876), with an indication of the source of each book.
[12] Collection described by Julia Walworth, 'Sir Louis Sterling and his Library', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 40 (2005), 159-175; Walworth notes this particular book on p. 170.
[13] The standard textbook, covering book production in both periods, is Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972; repr. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1995).
[14] For the second-hand market, see David McKitterick, 'Second-Hand and Old Books', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. VI, 1830-1914*, ed. by David McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 635-73. For examples of low prices of incunabula, the earliest printed books, see Kristian Jensen, *Revolution and the Antiquarian Book: Reshaping the Past, 1780-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 185-7.
History of the Book in Britain, vol. VI, 1830-1914, ed. by David McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 635-73. For an idea of low prices of incunabula, see Kristian Jensen, *Revolution and the Antiquarian Book: Reshaping the Past, 1780-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 185-7. For examples of low prices fetched by incunabula, the very oldest printed books, see Kristian Jensen, *Revolution and the Antiquarian Book: Reshaping the Past, 1780-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 185-7.
[15] The proportion for De Morgan rises to 61% on the basis of a computer search: a method inapplicable for the books of George Grote, most of which have not yet been catalogued online. Offprints and sale catalogues, omitted from the printed catalogue explain the De Morgan discrepancy.
[16] For notes in De Morgan's incunabula, see K.E. Attar, 'Incunabula at Senate House Library: Growth of a Collection', *Library & Information History*, 25 (2009), p. 99.
[17] See William Coolidge Lane, *The Carlyle Collection: A Catalogue of Books on Oliver Cromwell and Frederick the Great Bequeathed by Thomas Carlyle to Harvard College Library*, Library of Harvard University: Bibliographical Contributions, 26 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Library, 1888). Several entries record the presence of manuscript notes by Carlyle, sometimes qualified by an indication of quantity (e.g. 'a few', 'frequent').
[18] Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR, *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd edn, 1998 revision (Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Library Association Publishing, 1998). Rule 2.7B20 refers back to this rule and supplies a similar example: 'Library's copy signed and with marginalia by the author'.
[19] English Short-Title Catalogue, http://estc.bl.uk. Rule 1.7B20 expands slightly upon the American Library Association et. al., *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd edn, ed. by Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler (London: Library Association, 1978), its immediate predecessor, which gives the same example but without any preceding general instruction. *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, due to replace AACR2 in the second decade of the twenty-first century, provides an additional relevant example, 'Marginalia by Robert Graves', but assumes that the information is of interest only for early printed books: 'For early printed resources, in addition to imperfections, etc. (see rule 3.21.1.3), record special features of the item in hand. These include […] manuscript additions […]' (rule 3.21.2.3).
[20] Star Guide Part III: Copy Specific Notes, available at: http://estc.ucr.edu/starhelp/starguid3.html .
[21] A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd edn, begun by W.A. Jackson and F.S. Ferguson, completed by Katharine F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1986-91); Donald Wing,, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*, 3 vols (New York: Index Society, 1945-1951) and 2nd edn (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1982-98).
[22] Standards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (ACRL/ALA), *Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1988). Available electronically at: RBMS Controlled Vocabularies: Provenance Terms, http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/controlled_vocabularies/provenance/alphabetical_list.htm.
[23] Chetham's Library in Manchester is a salient example of a British library which uses the thesaurus; however, it does so only for books printed before 1801. See Chetham's Library, http://www.chethams.org.uk/catalogue.html.
[24] MARC Code List: Relator Codes – Term Sequence, http://www.loc.gov.marc/relators/relaterm.html .

[25] Library Association Rare Books Group, *Guidelines for the Cataloguing of Rare Books* (London: Library Association Rare Books Group, 1997; repr. 1999); 2007 update available at: http://www.cilip.org.uk/specialinterestgroups/bysubject/rarebooks/bibliographic/index. The *Guidelines* are an outcome of: Ann Lennon and David Pearson, *Rare Book Cataloguing in the British Isles: Results of a Survey Carried out on Behalf of the Rare Books Group of the Library Association*, British Library Research Paper 94 (London: British Library Research and Development Department, 1991).
[26] *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books*, 2nd edn (Washington: Library of Congress, 1991).
[27] Association of College and Research Libraries, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* (Washington: Library of Congress, 2007).
[28] See, for example, H. J. Jackson, *Marginalia: Readings Writing in Books* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 19.
[29] T.H. Howard-Hill lists 663 items published between 1724 and 1889 pertaining to some aspect of book collecting or to private libraries in T.H. Howard-Hill, *The British Book Trade 1475-1890: A Bibliography*, 2 vols. (London: British Library and New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2009), items 16987-17177 and 17371-17842. By contrast, Jonathan Rose, *The intellectual life of the British working classes* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001) is a seminal work on the reading of ordinary people.
[30] See The Reading Experience Database, 1450-1945 (RED), http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/RED. The database is introduced and discussed in: Mary Hammond, 'The Reading Experience Database 1450-1945', in: *Owners, Annotators and the Signs of Reading*, ed. by Robin Myers, Michael Harris and Giles Mandelbrote (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll and London: British Library, 2005), pp. 175-87.
[31] Grote, p. 213.
[32] Notes on De Morgan's copies of John Wells, *The Compleat Art of Dyalling* (London: N. Fussell, 1637); W. Whewell, 'Mathematical Exposition of Some Doctrines of Political Economy: Second Memoir [offprint from the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. 9] ([Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850]), and on William Spalding, *Introduction to Logical Science* (Edinburgh: Black, 1857) respectively (the last records another example of De Morgan's use of the book with the note: 'ULL copy has part of printed assessment of Sir William Hamilton's work on logic and notice of William Spalding's death, 16 Nov. 1859, tipped in'); Grote's copy of Pierre Barbay, *Commentarius in Aristotelis Moralem* (Paris: G. And L. Josse, 1690)).
[33] As further examples of the context of Carlyle's comments, 'Goodish' appears beside the lines: 'I learnt my complement of classic French / (Kept pure of Balzac and neologism) / And German also'; 'Twaddle?' besides: 'Alas, a mother never is afraid / of speaking angerly to any child, / Since love, she knows, is justified of love'.
[34] Fred Kaplan, *Thomas Carlyle: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 257, 380.
[35] Cited in David Alec Wilson, *Carlyle to Threescore-and-Ten* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1929), p. 297.
[36] Kaplan, p. 426.
[37] Lane, p. 19; p. 16.
[38] *Carlyle: Books & Margins, Being a Catalogue of the Carlyle Holdings in the Norman and Charlotte Strouse Carlyle Collection and the University Library, with a Transcription of Carlyle's Marginalia in John Stuart Mill's* Principles of Political Economy *and an Interpretative Essay Thereon*, UCSC Bibliographical Series, 3 (Santa Cruz: University Library, University of California, 1980), pp. 89 and 91.
[39] See Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, ed. by Margaret Reynolds (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1992), p. 95. Reynolds, despite having examined the Senate House Library copy, does not mention Carlyle's response to the poem. A brief overview of criticism in a more popular edition appears in Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh and Other Poems*, ed. by Cora Kaplan (London: Women's Press, 1978), pp. 12-13.
[40] *The Sterling Library: A Catalogue of the Printed Books and Literary Manuscripts Collected by Sir Louis Sterling and presented by him to the University of London* (privately printed, 1954), p. 29.
[41] Senate House Library card catalogue, http://cards.ull.ac.uk.
[42] *Carlyle: Books & Margins*, pp. 68-106.
[43] IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Report* (Munich: Saur, 1998), section 3.2.4. (p. 23), available at http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/sc.htm.
[44] See especially David Pearson, *Books as History* (London: British Library, 2008).