CHAPTER IV

THE BOSTON ATHENAEUM: 1881-1893

While the first half of Cutter's term at the Athenaeum had been an almost total personal and professional triumph, the second half had conflicting themes. On the one hand there was a continuation for at least a portion of this period of those objectives and measures that had highlighted his success. On the other hand his administrative measures came into conflict with the Athenaeum's leadership and led to his decision to leave the institution in 1893.

Continued Progress

The most immediate effect of the Howes legacy was the completion of the printed catalog ahead of its plodding schedule. The Library Committee argued that increased funding would allow the catalog to be completed in two and a half years instead of the projected five and would be less expensive given a steady inflation in costs. The trustees authorized the increased expenditures including the addition of extra members to the work force and the allowance that Cutter would do a portion of the work at home. They also approved the Library Committee's appointment of Francis Parkman and Howard Stockton of the committee to oversee the expenditure of the extra funds. The result was to print
twice as much per year of the catalog as had been done in the previous eight years (that is, between fifty and sixty quarto sheets per year for 1880 and 1881) and to finish all work on the catalog by January 1882.¹

The largest expansion of the Athenaeum's program during the 1880's was in building the collection. The Howes legacy made possible the purchase of more current literature. It also enabled the library to begin filling gaps in the collection as recommended by Cutter in his 1879 annual report. The total number of books rose from 121,136 volumes at the end of 1880 to 177,228 volumes at the end of 1892, an increase of more than 56,000 volumes. The average number of volumes per year (4,674) does not give a true picture of the acquisition pattern. The years of heaviest purchases were from 1882 to the end of 1887 when nearly 6,000 volumes a year were added. For 1881 and from 1888 to 1892 the average was held to the more normal 3,382 volumes a year. By the end of 1881 it was noted by the Library Committee that an unusually high number of new volumes was being bought and during 1882 the total volumes added for the year reached 6,400.²

The Library Committee was strongly committed to expanding the collections. In January 1881, after the catalog had been cared for and the delivery room relocated, the

¹Records of the Trustees, February 16, 1880, December 20, 1880, and December 19, 1881.

²Statistics are taken from the annual reports of the Library Committee.
trustees authorized increased expenditures for acquisitions.\(^1\) In using the increased funds, the Committee gave Cutter unusual freedom. He was authorized to negotiate with both foreign and domestic booksellers to supply current literature regularly, even weekly. In March 1882 the Library Committee authorized him to buy New England town histories without restriction, "using the word in a very broad sense."\(^2\) One month later the directive on town histories was extended to cover American history generally. At the end of the year the Committee reported that though a considerable number of the books added in that area were of little literary value, their addition to the collection filled in gaps and consequently provided the Athenaeum with a valuable basic reference collection. In January 1884 the Committee reported that for 1883 over one thousand volumes had been added in history alone, especially in Americana, noting that such purchases were not in the rare books category.\(^3\)

Literature was also collected. Almost all worthwhile English language fiction was purchased and a special effort was made to purchase fiction in other languages, 

---


\(^2\) Records of the Library Committee, March 21, 1882. See also the entry for January 3, 1882, for Cutter's arrangements with Clarke, the bookseller.

\(^3\) Records of the Library Committee, April 4, 1882; Annual Reports of the Library Committee, February 13, 1882 and February 11, 1884.
notably French and German. Saintsbury's *History of French Literature* was used as a guide and everything listed in it was sought out. Recognizing that not all literature was of the best taste, the Committee made some restrictions, especially in the French language materials. For other materials Cutter was authorized to sell or exchange books that he would consider "unworthy to put into our Library."¹ In January 1884 Cutter was authorized to buy all editions of New England authors such as Bryant, Emerson, Holmes, Longfellow, and others, in an effort to have complete collections of their works. By 1907 these volumes had become of such importance to merit them being considered a special collection.²

Books were not the only type of material vigorously pursued. Newspapers were also included in the expansion. Working on a solid base built by previous librarians, by 1886 the Library Committee reported that only the Library of Congress had a better or more complete collection.³ The Fine Arts Committee also pursued a vigorous program of purchases, although funded separately and not connected directly to the Howes funds. Following their earlier decision to collect

¹ Records of the Library Committee, November 22, 1886. For general directives on literature, see Annual Report of the Library Committee, February 12, 1883 and February 11, 1884.


³ Annual Report of the Library Committee, February 8, 1886. Cf. also the one of February 11, 1884.
photographs of famous paintings, the collection was expanded to include photographs of all kinds of works of art. Ordering mainly through the Adolph Braun company in Europe, they purchased between 1885 and 1889 alone over 3,800 separate photographs costing more than $7,600. More often than not, the sets of views were ordered as the collections of particular famous European galleries. In addition the Fine Arts Committee made a special effort to collect extensively works on art and on art teaching. In all of the purchasing Cutter was involved in carrying out the negotiations.  

The unusual freedom given Cutter to purchase at book auctions expedited the acquisition of books. During the earlier period the Library Committee had gradually allowed the librarian to buy at his own discretion. With the general book selection directives given in history and literature, he was allowed almost complete freedom. Often directed to buy at his own discretion, beginning in September 1882 he was given the authorization to buy at several sales without limit. In fact, the notes in the Library Committee minutes in this period are in some places occupied with nothing but this sort of authorization and suggest that the need to make individual authorizations had become a pro forma matter. In

1See the Annual Reports of the Fine Arts Committee for the years mentioned. See also Records of the Fine Arts Committee and various items of correspondence between Cutter and the Adolph Braun Company for the same period, BA.

2Records of the Library Committee, September 19, October 3, and November 21, 1882.
March 1883 the minutes stated, "The librarian was authorized to make purchases at several auctions, and his course in sending bids on a catalogue received too late to be submitted to the committee at the last meeting was approved of, and the same action authorized in similar cases."1

Occasionally, of course, he went to the auctions themselves. With regard to the sizable Murphy sale of Americana at Leavitts on March 3, 1884, Cutter wrote to Melvil Dewey, then in New York City,

I shall be in N Y Monday morning, and will see you at the library [i.e., Columbia University]. The sale is afternoon and evg. so that I shall have mornings to talk A.L.A. catalog, if (as is possible) you have any words at command and (this is more doubtful), any time. If you buy at the Murphy sale let me take your bids. 2

Upon apparently receiving Dewey's invitation to stay with him, Cutter wrote again,

On reflection I think I'll go to my usual gite, the Ewing House, I believe. It is so near the auction room, it will be some advantage as the sessions will last till 10. I should not like to keep you up waiting for me. Otherwise I would accept your kind invitation.3

---

1Records of the Library Committee, March 6, 1883.

2Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, February 27, 1884, CUL, M. Dewey Papers. The 434 page catalog of 3,227 lots of the Henry Cruse Murphy library is listed in McKay, American Book Auction Catalogues, p. 177. The Athenæum's Library Committee authorized $2,000 to be spent at the discretion of Charles Deane and Francis Parkman, but apparently it was Cutter who went to the sale. Cf. [Murphy Book Sale], Nation, XXXVIII (January 31, 1884), 99-100, for a survey of the sale catalog. The article was most likely written by Cutter.

In addition to the extensive purchasing at auctions, Cutter also continued his heavy exchange program, especially with the American Antiquarian Society. The Library Committee's approval was manifest. In their 1884 annual report they noted that the exchange of duplicates was being "vigorously pushed." With the great increase in acquisitions the Library Committee was inundated with work. In order to pursue their usual procedure of approval of purchases they resorted to having Cutter read to them at the next regular meeting the lists of books he had bought during the interim.  

In other areas of the library's administration, Cutter kept equally busy. He saw to it that the regular processing of books was cared for. After being cataloged and classified, new books were put in a special non-circulating display section in the delivery room for a week. Next they were stamped with circulation periods individually determined and put in the new book section for six months. Only afterwards were they sent to the regular shelves. The catalog cards were printed on the Athenaeum's own press and were filed daily. One copy was set aside for the List of Additions which was published every third week. For the list Cutter used one assistant for its general oversight and another to index it. The index to the list came out annually in the last yearly number. It is probable that he

himself did the major part of selecting or at least of approving the annotations. In addition to the above procedures, the Athenaeum carried on a special program of reserving and notifying patrons of new books purchased. Whether or not, however, the book delivery service was continued is not known. No specific mention is made of it beyond the notice of its inception in 1879.

The multiple copies of current periodicals were put in temporary coverings and were circulated on three-day loans, one at a time. Fines constituted somewhat of a problem. Because so many members sent for the books they wanted from the List of Additions and did not come into the library themselves, fines were accumulated. Once a year they were assessed with the threat that library privileges would be suspended if they were not paid. The same threat was imposed upon those who did not pay their annual subscription fee promptly. Rare books and specially illustrated books were kept in a special room and were to be used only in the library. Like newspapers they were used under the surveillance of a library attendant, probably one of the few cases of superintendence. A map collection was organized. The maps were placed in portfolios and arranged geographically.


according to the geographical list of the regular library shelf classification. Each map was given a classification number, a place number, a "Cutter" number, a date, and sometimes an author designation. A special card index was also developed for the photographs, engravings, and other non-print materials.¹

Pamphlets also received special treatment. When Cutter came to the Athenæum he inherited a large collection of pamphlets bound by size. For instance, quarto sized pamphlets were kept in series "A", volumes 1, 2, 3, etc., octavos in series "B" and so on. Because they did not fit into the regular classification they were kept in a special location and access to them was gained only in the catalog and, before Cutter included them in the printed catalog, only by author and title. By the end of 1875 the bound pamphlets alone amounted to 34,320 individual items within the bound series. But bound pamphlets were the small part of the pamphlet collection. At the same time it was estimated that the library contained 50,000 others that were unbound, and each year more were added. From 1876 to the end of 1880 the annual reports of the Library Committee

¹ C. A. Cutter, "How we Keep Unbound Maps... Boston Athenæum," LJ, XVI (March, 1891), 72. The index was kept in six catalog drawers and by 1889 included references to between five and ten thousand separate items. See C. A. Cutter in A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, XIII (September/October, 1888), 313-14; R. R. Bowker, "Report on Index to Portraits, etc.," LJ, XIV (May/June, 1889), 175.
indicate that 5,955 pamphlets were added apart from duplicates. From 1881 to 1892 the total number of pamphlets added was 18,662.¹

As early as 1876 in his first paper before the American Library Association, Cutter described the collecting of pamphlets as involving both a problem of bulk and a problem of preservation.² Pamphlets were often a part of the historically significant materials that libraries should collect. Reflecting the sentiments of John Langdon Sibley, Cutter concluded that they could not be neglected because the librarian was a collector of the literature of a people, and pamphlets, among other things, would be most certainly needed for research. But, they included much of an ephemeral nature; they were difficult to store—they would not stand up by themselves, open pamphlet boxes collected dust, and closed boxes took a lot of time to work with—and no one really had the time to catalog them anyway. Yet, the libraries of the nation could not rightly neglect them. His solution for the overall problem of their enormous number was for all libraries to collect them systematically dividing the labor. The rules for collecting would be,

Like to like: local pamphlets to local libraries, professional or scientific pamphlets to special libraries, miscellaneous and all sorts of pamphlets to the larger libraries.³

¹Annual Report of the Library Committee, January 10, 1876; A.I.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, 1 (October, 1876), 103.
³Ibid., p. 53.
And for the whole problem of an increasing explosion of print,

I would therefore have our library system composed, *first*, of a collection of books in every town, small perhaps, but exceedingly active in circulation because chosen for that express end . . . , and *secondly*, of libraries in our cities or at colleges, well endowed, capable of doing all that the others can do in a greater degree, and serving as safe depositories where the entire literature of this generation can be carried on to the next.¹

For the problem of their actual preservation in any one library, Cutter also had definite ideas. In the discussion occasioned by his above-quoted paper, William F. Poole described the practice of binding by size done by him at the Athenaeum during earlier years. Cutter, already having declined to describe the practice, spoke up in disagreement. Too many subjects were included in any one volume and, because the pamphlets were not in an ordered subject sequence, they had to be kept in a section by themselves. It seems obvious that Cutter was troubled not so much by grouping the pamphlets by size, but rather by the lack of subject access, taking into account what indexing had been available. He had consequently begun a new series "E", classed by subjects and inserted in the regular sequence of books. He would collect pamphlets at various locations in boxes until enough accumulated for classification and binding.²

By the mid-1880's the swollen number of pamphlets caused him to seek a compromise plan. He already had the

¹*ibid.*, p. 54.

bound series. He also kept up with the practice of collecting pamphlets in various locations in the regular classification, binding them together when enough accumulated. But he limited such collecting and binding to "newer" pamphlets. For other unbound but older pamphlets he instituted a third series. These he arranged by subject in a mini-classification that paralleled the regular classification. In addition, for those pamphlets that he kept in holders in the regular stacks, he reported that he was devising a new kind of pamphlet box that would operate like a cabinet. His compromise for the third series seemed justifiable to him inasmuch as the mini-classification was based on the 'scientific' classification that he had so recently introduced into the library.¹

In countless other areas Cutter tried new technical approaches to the problems of a large and rapidly growing library. He experimented with such things as book supports, color-coded book cards and helpful techniques for the card catalog, the latter including varnishing the metal card dividers for their preservation.² He expedited the binding


needs of the library by renting a room in the building to
a commercial binder. It was an advantage to the binder
because the rent was cheap, the insurance rate low, and he
had at least one sizable account for regular work. It was
an advantage to the Athenaeum because by agreement its own
binding needs came first, regular books on a one month
schedule and special rushes to be treated in three days.¹

Cutter also championed and won his case for the in-
troduction of the electric light into the building. As
early as the original meeting of the American Library
Association in 1876 he brought up in discussion the problem
of disintegrating bindings due to "hot, impure air collecting
in the upper part of an ill-ventilated room."² He surmised
that if gas lighting contributed to the problem, perhaps
electric lighting would lessen it. As a source for his
comment he referred to a recent issue of the Scientific
American that described the invention.

American librarians were apparently slow to accept
the challenge. An article in the April 1879 Library Journal
reported that the British Museum had recently introduced
electric lighting in their reading room and was now staying
open at night. It was not until 1882, however, that even
Cutter began to pursue the idea in earnest. He editorialized
on the subject in the Library Journal. Reporting on

¹A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, XVI (Conference
No., 1891), C83-84.

²A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, I (October,
1876), 124.
improvements in the device since it was first spoken of "at our convention in Philadelphia," and also on the promises of Edison and the panic of the gas companies, he compared electric lights with gas lights and found the electric lights far superior. He went on to advise, "It behooves library committees to be on the lookout and to prepare themselves to make their choice before long."¹

At the same time he was not silent before his own library committee. In his annual report for 1881 delivered in February 1882 he reported at length:

The electrical light is rapidly attaining such excellence that we may bear it in mind as a possible substitute for our dim, flickering, heating, and expensive gas. A light which requires no appreciable quantity of oxygen and does not raise the temperature of a reading room, which therefore does not boil the brains and starve the lungs of those who use it;--such a light librarians and those who frequent evening reading-rooms have always wished for and now see some prospect of obtaining. It is true there are some drawbacks. The arc lights are still unsteady, but the flickering has been wonderfully reduced by late improvements, till it is less than that of gas. The incandescent lights are neither flickering nor dazzling. There is also the danger of fire and the danger of death. But both of these can be entirely prevented by proper precautions and by care. One would think from the tone in which these perils are sometimes urged that there had never been any gas explosions.²

In a summary of his Athenaeum annual report in the Library Journal in April 1882, Cutter simply condensed his essay into one concise sentence: "The librarian recommends the use of incandescent electric lights in the reading-room."³

¹Editorial, LJ, VII (March, 1882), 43. It was Cutter, of course, who had brought the subject up in 1876.
²Cutter, "Annual Report of the Librarian [for 1881]."
³[Summary of "Annual Report of the Librarian (of the Boston Athenaeum) for 1881"], LJ, VII (April, 1882), 64.
The trustees did not immediately take his overtures on the subject to heart. It was not until November 1885 that the need for additional lighting was mentioned. But in 1886 after considerable discussion the lights were ordered along with a "Johnson heat regulator." Cutter reported the success of the venture the following year and unapologetically noted the thirty-two per cent increase in the total gas and lighting bill. It was allowable inasmuch as the lighting was much better, more area was lit up, and the building's inconsistent heating was at last under control.  

In another area Cutter also continued the pattern of his success from the previous period. He continued and even expanded his program of interlibrary cooperation. At the beginning of the period such cooperation took the form of a continuation of the support of indexing arrangements. When the Library Committee voted to support the cooperative work on Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, they put the administration of the special funds in Cutter's hands. He used at least part of the money to hire "Mrs. Dui" (that is, Annie Godfrey Dewey) to index thirty-three volumes of the Monthly Review for the cooperative work. He also used some of his own staff for the effort which amounted to a total of 166 volumes in five periodicals. After the Index was finally completed in December 1881, the Library Committee noted in a satisfied way that the Athenaeum had cooperated

---

1 Records of the Trustees, November 16, 1885 and March 15, 1886; C. A. Cutter, "Practical Notes," LJ, XII (May, 1887), 206.
with fifty other libraries in the project and that it would become more useful than any other item in the library except its own catalog.\textsuperscript{1} It was an ongoing project, however, and the Library Committee approved of Cutter's continued participation, although with no further special appropriations.\textsuperscript{2}

Cutter also cooperated in a project sponsored by the English Index Society. In 1880 that society had proposed a universal index and Cutter promised to help with it. The following February Cutter reported at the Washington, D. C. American Library Association conference for the Cooperation Committee that plans for a union list of obituaries were formulated and Cutter himself would be responsible for indexing the Proceedings of the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia, the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, and "odds and ends."\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{2}Records of the Library Committee, January 9, 1883; Poole, \textit{Index to Periodical Literature}, The First Supplement from Jan. 1, 1882 to Jan. 1, 1887, pp. vi-ix, and The Second Supplement from Jan. 1, 1887 to Jan. 1, 1892, pp. vi-ix, where Cutter is listed as having been responsible for 33 and 46 volumes, respectively. See also C. A. Cutter, Editorial, \textit{LJ}, VIII (March/April, 1883), 47, where Cutter is listed as one of seventeen indexers for the first supplement.

Other projects were also approved by the Athenaeum's officers. In December 1882 the Library Committee appropriated up to fifteen dollars for a new edition of the union list of periodicals first issued in 1878. They also voted to subscribe to the American Library Association's Publishing Section in 1887. And the library carried on an active interlibrary loan program that at one point had books out to forty-one different libraries, the furthest being in Poughkeepsie.\(^1\)

Two other projects were perhaps even more significant. The List of Additions had begun in 1878 and in 1879 the Worcester Public Library had joined the Athenaeum in a joint operation. In 1880 the Buffalo Young Men's Association reported that it too had joined.

By a co-operative arrangement between the Athenaeum, the public library of Worcester, Mass., and ourselves, these lists have, since that time, been made up in common by the three libraries, so far as practicable, using the same notes and the same type, to the extent that the purchases coincide. The lists are printed at the Athenaeum, which employs its own compositors, and something is saved by the co-operation in money as well as in labor. The notes are generally selected from the best reviews, and they certainly lend important aid to readers in their selection of books.\(^2\)

By 1883 the List had become a syndicate including the above libraries, the Milwaukee Public Library and others.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Records of the Library Committee, December 5, 1882 and January 17, 1887; [Editorial notes], LJ, XII (April, 1887), 171, and XIII (January, 1888), 5. In the latter, Cutter claimed, "In twenty years no book has been lost."

\(^2\) Buffalo Young Men's Association, "Report," LJ, V (March, 1880), 86.

Cutter apparently promoted the cause vigorously by sending samples of the List to librarians that wrote to him. For example, when F. J. Soldan of the Peoria, Illinois, Public Library wrote in 1889 concerning how to make such a list and for recommendations of examples to follow, Cutter listed several other contemporary lists and then added,

Probably you could make a saving by joining our bulletin-syndicate, tho that may depend on the price of printing at Peoria. I find that the average cost of 11 lists (4 pp. each) to Worcester P. L. was $12.78 a list. But you are so far off that there would be some delay in the issue. We print a list for Worcester as soon as material enough is accumulated to fill four pages. But after it is all printed it would be two or three days getting to you by express and there would be the same delay from sending the copy to us. However I should like to have you join us.\(^1\)

The other significant cooperative venture involved the ordering of foreign books. During the 1883 Buffalo conference of the American Library Association, F. J. Soldan suggested a plan for forming a cooperative book-purchasing union. The idea itself was not new for the Cooperation Committee had had it under consideration. But nothing came as a result.\(^2\) During the 1888 conference held in the Catskills, Josephus Larned of the Buffalo Public Library brought the matter up again and asked President Cutter to provide information on the subject, especially with regard to purchasing

\(^{1}\)Letter, Cutter to F. J. Soldan, October 17, 1889, CUL, M. Dewey Papers. The reason for the letter having been sent on to Dewey is not clear.

\(^{2}\)A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, VIII (September/October, 1883), 296; American Library Association, Cooperation Committee, [Report], LJ, VIII (September/October, 1883), 263-64.
foreign books. Cutter declined, claiming that he was too busy.1 Within a year, however, he must have pursued the matter further, for not only did the trustees newly authorize him to accept shipments at the Boston Custom House, but Samuel S. Green of the Worcester Public Library reported in the Library Journal that in buying foreign books he had joined several other libraries and the Athenaeum in a book-purchasing union. The orders were collected by Cutter who compiled them and ordered them directly with the advantages of quantity discounts and lower freight charges. They were able to deal for English, French, German, and Swedish books. Once a month the books would come in and were "despatched by express to the Libraries to which they belong, under the supervision of Mr. C. A. Cutter, . . . Mr. Cutter keeps an account of money paid out for freight, and notifies the different libraries, from time to time, of the amount owed by them as determined by the proportion of the money value of their purchases."2

1 A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, XIII (September/October, 1888), 313.
2 Samuel S. Green, "How We Choose and Buy New Books," LJ, XIV (August, 1889), 336-37. An authorization for Cutter to receive goods for the Athenaeum at the Custom House is recorded in the Records of the Trustees, November 21, 1887, but a revised authorization is recorded on May 27, 1889. The latter also included the secretary and the treasurer of the trustees. The date when Cutter began the practice is uncertain. But his editorial in the same issue that held the proceedings of the 1888 conference suggests that perhaps he was already doing it informally at that time. See C. A. Cutter, Editorial, LJ, XIII (September/October), 275.
Cutter was doubtless a very busy librarian with these various tasks. But the activity that perhaps gave him the most satisfaction was the completion of his classification for the Athenaeum's collections. It formed the basis for his systematizing of the library's internal processes. He did not complete it all at once however. His staff spent at least twelve years of steady effort to convert to the new system. He began the use of the new system in 1879 by applying the classification to recently acquired books. By 1881 when he began the systematic reclassification of older books he had already placed over 12,500 volumes in the new plan. By the end of 1883 that total, including both old and new books, amounted to 41,073 volumes. At that point when asked by the trustees to give an accounting as to how much longer it would take, he gave two estimates. At 15,000 volumes a year, 5,000 of which would be new books, the total job would take an additional ten years. But discounting the immediate conversion of newspapers, periodicals, and public documents which together totaled 30,000 volumes, he suggested that it would take not quite seven years. The number of new books purchased by the Athenaeum for the succeeding four years averaged about 6,000 a year rather than 5,000, but despite the increased acquisitions he was able to keep his schedule. The reclassification seems to have been for the most part completed by late 1890.¹

¹Information on the progress of the reclassification is taken from [Account of Books Transferred from Fixed Location to Cutter System, 1881-1890], MS, BA, and from Letter,
Reclassifying the collection under his new system engendered related problems. By himself Cutter was not able to elaborate the subdivisions in all parts of the system. Accordingly he was aided by specialists who advised him in various subject areas, the most active being Richard Bliss, a former assistant of Louis Agassiz at Harvard. Bliss wrote the schedules for the natural sciences and at least in the beginning was given a stipend for his efforts by the Library Committee.¹ Cutter also found it necessary to set up very explicit procedures for his staff to follow in the work. To that end he arranged for a corps of two classifiers, two assistants, two markers and two letterers.²

Another problem involved the proprietors' acceptance of the new system. Like the charging system, it represented

¹Records of the Library Committee, July 21, 1879. The stipend was $50. Bliss served as an assistant in Harvard's Museum of Comparative Zoology from 1871 to 1873, and again during 1876-77 when he was in charge of the Ichthyology Department. See Harvard University, Historical Register of Harvard University, 1636-1936, p. 126.

²Letter, Cutter to Howard Stockton, February 14, 1884, in Records of the Trustees, February 18, 1884.
a change from old established patterns. A later reminiscence of the Athenaeum stated,

The old arrangement of the library pleased me better than the new. An alcove with its own windows and table and light with books grouped by subject seemed a cozy little place, with a bit of privacy.\(^1\)

In his annual report for 1881 Cutter outlined what he thought might help. First he thought it best to have a large visual guide to the classification posted at various places in the building. Since the classification was still in progress, however, he posted an in-progress list of the classes and their locations above the card catalog. More important, he saw the need to have some sort of guides in the individual alcoves that would inform the user how the classification proceeded at that point. He explained,

During the last two years I have devised half a dozen unsatisfactory contrivances to meet this want, but only lately have hit upon something which promises to be effectual. It takes little room, each "guide" being merely a strip of pastebord inserted between the books; it is easily read at a distance, and yet it is not glaringly conspicuous. It marks unmistakably where each class or subclass begins and ends; and, in the large divisions in which there are many books arranged alphabetically, it shows similarly where each letter of the alphabet begins and ends. When these guides are provided for every sub-class, when at the entrance of each alcove a large card shows what class is there, and when in some uniform part of the alcove there may be found a list of the whole arrangement of the library, showing in what part of the building each class is, and also an index of subjects showing in what class any particular topic is, the library will be easier to consult than any which I have ever seen.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Mrs. James F. Thomas, "Reminiscences of the Boston Athenaeum," November, 1928, MS, BA.

\(^2\)Cutter, "Annual Report of the Librarian [for 1881]."
Considering that such obvious needs (to us, at least) were in that day as yet unthought of, the simplicity of the plan found a ready audience especially in the library profession. Cutter wrote up his various experiments for a wider hearing.¹

A final way that he made the new system more acceptable to the proprietors came by writing an explanatory booklet. He entitled it, *Boston Athenaeum: How to Get Books, with an Explanation of the New Way of Marking Books*. The Library Committee authorized its printing in May 1882 and directed that a copy be sent to each proprietor and be given to other users of the library.² In the booklet Cutter began by giving a short justification for the change to the new system. First he demonstrated the need for a system that gave a relative location for a book rather than affixing a number that indicated only the physical location of the alcove and shelf. Given the need to shift books and therefore to constantly change the location numbers in the catalogs, he stated,

> It is therefore plainly expedient to abandon the antiquated system which makes this decennial change of shelf marks necessary, and to adopt a method which will allow the books to be moved hereafter, when necessary without any change of the marks on the catalogues. This can be effected by making the book-numbers indicate not

---


a given alcove and shelf, but a given class and subclass; so that a book-number once correctly assigned will remain unchanged forever, although the place of the book be changed a hundred times; and, consequently, the cost and loss of time and liability to mistakes inherent in the other plan, will be done away with at once.

The old method may be compared to the line in the directory which states that a man lives at 129 Grace Street; the method proposed may be compared to the army register, which says that he is captain of Company C, 5th Regiment, M.V.M. Let the regiment be marched all over the country, yet the soldier is easily found by his position in it. If the citizen moves to a new street, a new directory is needed, but the army register does not have to be altered whenever the regiment is quartered in a different town. Similarly, books may be found by their position in a certain class, though the class itself be transferred from one alcove to another, or from one building to another.1

Second, having demonstrated the need for relative location, Cutter argued for the usefulness of a specific author number.

In the old system books are marked merely to alcove and shelf, an insufficient practice, to be found in hardly any other library of importance in the country. When one had reached the right shelf, one was far from having found one's book. It was still necessary to hunt it up, by its title, among the often badly lettered volumes, on the often ill-lighted shelf. In the new system, every book has a definite place in its section, and the mark which determines that place is legibly stamped on the back.2

A contemporary newspaper account described the changes by using the above military analogy and then continued,

So the books in Captain Cutter's regiments have got to move down the road of time in solid phalanx, the only changes permitted in the interior organization being the admission of new members. But does your book regiment permit this? Yes, it is elastic in structure. Captain Cutter has hit upon the idea of using a table of decimal fractions in his marking, so as to admit of intercalculations ad infinitum. How these modern librarians are

1 How to Get Books, pp. 6-7. 2 Ibid., p. 7.
systematizing things! If past ages produced great literatures, this age can say that it has rendered them known and made them accessible to the most indolent and simple minds.1

Having justified the principle of the new notation, Cutter next proceeded to outline the thirty-five class symbols and what subjects they represented. He demonstrated the use of the geographical tables, the special symbols to denote sizes of books, how the author numbers and work letters functioned, and the special symbols for special collections. He elaborated several different classes as examples. He also cautioned the patron about the limitations of any shelf system. Books with multiple subjects could only be put in one location. Therefore, one would need to use the catalog and to be aware of special collections. The notation was new and complicated but by using it, one would begin to learn the arrangement of various classes. In conclusion Cutter gave due credit to several persons responsible for various of the principles of the notation, notably, Melvil Dewey, Jacob Schwartz, and John Edmands.

In the printing of the booklet one other aspect of Cutter's work at the Athenaeum is revealed. That is, he used the Athenaeum's printing equipment to produce a wide variety of pamphlets and other materials for the library profession. In the absence of any consistently successful Association effort at printing, before the re-establishment

---

of the Library Bureau, such materials were often hard to obtain. As early as 1880 Melvil Dewey had mentioned in the Library Journal that there was not enough use by smaller libraries of the printed materials that only the larger libraries could afford to produce. He mentioned as examples, the Boston Public Library's handbook for readers, and Cutter's List of Additions.

I believe there is not one of those named that would not feel gratified rather than annoyed, at the largest possible use of their material. Today it is only possible to reprint, or get a few extra copies, except with Mr. Cutter's bulletin.¹

Cutter felt strongly about the lack of materials and sought to provide as much as he could from his own facilities at the Athenaeum. In response to a proposal from Dewey about taking a different library position, he wrote in 1892,

The publication part especially draws me. I have become a little "Publication Section," all alone by myself . . . , and as editor of the Library Journal I have known of many bibliographical works that were crying out for publication or would be undertaken if there was any chance of issue, but that perished for want of a publisher.²

Most of his publishing was understandably of his own writings. He advertised their availability and he often gave them away. A typical note in the Library Journal reads,

¹M. Dewey, in "Notes and Queries," LJ, V (March, 1880), 89.
Mr. C. A. Cutter's "Author-notation for Greek and Latin Writers," his "Arrangement of the States of the United States in a Classed Catalog," and the "Condensed Rules for Cataloging," will be forwarded by him to any person asking for them and sending the postage (one cent each).  

He also distributed his pamphlet on the Athenaeum's classification widely. His most ambitious personal project was the printing of his Expansive Classification. Between the years 1891 and 1893 he was able to get through the press the first six expansions. Not all of his work was his own, however. Besides the above mentioned 1883 A.L.A. Condensed Rules for Cataloging, he was able to produce Klas Linderfelt's Eclectic Rules, a book of 104 pages that in effect compared all of the major cataloging codes of the day, although it was mainly based on Carl Dzitzko's then recently published German code. 

In most of his publishing one curious characteristic stands out. Cutter believed that the widest possible use should be made of different type sizes and styles. He insisted upon it in his printing of the Boston Athenaeum's catalog and he noted in his reviews when other catalog makers failed to use the resource. He also used it in his printing of cataloging codes and in his classification. It became, however, a cause of grief for both himself and others because of the need to be very careful in typesetting and proofreading, and consequently because it slowed significantly

1_LJ, XI (December, 1886), 494.
2_Klas A. Linderfelt, Eclectic Card Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries (Boston: Charles A. Cutter, 1890).
the printing process. For example, typesetting began on Linderfelt's *Rules* in mid-1889, but the finished product did not appear until almost a year later. When the notice of the publication appeared in the *Publisher's Weekly* prematurely in July 1890, Linderfelt apologized for the mistake to his friends and, although Cutter was publishing the volume at his own risk, could only ruefully complain that the printing had been "unpardonably slow." The same problems afterward plagued the completion of the seventh expansion of Cutter's *Expansive Classification*.

In other areas of his professional and private life Cutter experienced both joy and sorrow. He continued his active involvement in the American Library Association serving as its president for the years 1887 to 1889. He attended all of the annual meetings of the Association and took special pleasure in the post-conference excursions that were held after many of them. A typical occasion was the excursion to the Saguenay River in Quebec after the 1887 Thousand Islands meeting at which he was elected president. On this particular trip he took his son Roland with him. It was

---

1 Letter, K. Linderfelt to W. F. Poole, July 30, 1890, Newberry Library, Poole Papers; letter, K. Linderfelt to G. W. Cole, July 31, 1890, American Antiquarian Society, Cole Papers; Linderfelt, *Eclectic Card Catalog Rules*, p. vi; C. A. Cutter, *A.I.A. Conference Discussion*, *LJ*, XV (Conference No., 1890), C101. After relating how he tried to get a sponsor for Linderfelt's work, Cutter went on to say at the 1890 conference, "Being unwilling that so much good work should be lost, I am printing it myself. I am sure that it is not the foolish affection of a foster-father that makes me believe the book to be of the very highest importance to all catalogers."
during such trips that he became even more a devotee of the pleasures of the outdoors. In 1888 he joined the Appalachian Mountain Club and found a favorite summer retreat in the White Mountains of New Hampshire.¹

Cutter received a steady stream of visitors, both American and foreign, at the Athenaeum, who were interested in his work there. When Dewey began the School of Library Economy at Columbia University in 1887, Cutter was one of the first special lecturers to be invited, a task that he continued until his death even though the school moved to Albany in 1889. His earlier lectures were more or less uniform, beginning with his own reminiscences of his life in librarianship, and covering, of course, cataloging and classification.² In April 1890 a group of fifteen students and members of the School staff traveled to Boston. They visited with the Library Bureau staff, spent time at both the Harvard College Library and the Athenaeum, and after a social time at Justin Winsor's home on Friday afternoon, April 18th, some of the visitors went to Winchester for the

¹ "Attendance Register," LJ, XII (September/October, 1887), 461. The trip is described by G. B. Keen on p. 460. Cutter's membership in the Appalachian Mountain Club is noted in W. P. Cutter, Charles Ammi Cutter, p. 53, in a chapter that describes Cutter's love of the outdoors.

² Notices of Cutter's lectures are found yearly in the Library Journal, often with a note on the content. Short-hand notes on his first lectures given in February 1888 are available by M. Dewey in the Dewey Papers, CUL, and by George W. Cole in the Cole Papers at the American Antiquarian Society.
evening to see a couple of plays in which Cutter participated. Mary S. Cutler's comment on Cutter's avocation was a warm, "He was charming." ¹

In between the various occasions of personal satisfaction and joy there were other instances of pain and loss. On April 28, 1883, Cutter's second son, Philip Champney, died. His aunt, Charlotte, who with her sister Cordelia and the Bradbury's continued to live with the Cutters, died three years later. ² And Charles Cutter himself experienced a growing difficulty with his vision. While it is not certain what the specific ailment was, it is known that from an early age Cutter experienced severe nearsightedness. He was also known for a certain amount of absentmindedness, and in 1889 at the approach of his second annual meeting as president of the American Library Association, he answered Dewey's reaffirmation of attendance in the following words:

Moreover, I rely on you to assist with your good eyes and unfailing memory a purblind and forgetful president who will have difficulty in "recognizing" the speakers. The thought that you might have failed to come freezes my blood. ³

¹ Letter, Mary S. Cutler to M. Dewey, April 20, 1890, CUL, M. Dewey Papers; Mary S. Cutler, "Library School Visit to Boston," LJ, XV (June, 1890), 176-78.

² Winchester, Massachusetts, Reports of the Town Officers [for 1883] (Boston: Press of Stanley and Usher, 1884), p. 84. The cause of death for Philip Cutter was listed as "peritonitis." For Charlotte's death, see Probate Records, County of Middlesex, Massachusetts, Case 21063, 1886.

³ Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, May 4, 1889. In an undated letter also to Dewey, Cutter wrote, "Your letter came too late: I have had my eye taken out and cleaned, to speak popularly, and have to depend on others eyes and
Administrative Conflict

Despite the continuation of those themes of success that had highlighted his earlier period at the Athenaeum, Cutter encountered during the last half of his stay a concurrent and growing opposition to his administration. The causes that led him to resign his post in 1893 were not, however, an open conflict over any particular administrative action. Rather they arose as a result of an accumulation of various actions by the trustees that limited Cutter's administrative freedom and that brought into question the priorities of his administrative philosophy. To the trustees, Cutter simply did too much that was unsettling. A comment by C. K. Bolton some years after Cutter had left his position is enlightening. In reviewing the history of the institution and in attempting to characterize its strong points, he wrote, "Its policy has been progressive, but, as far as possible, without the spirit of unrest which sometimes characterizes the introduction of new library methods."¹

He went on to point out the importance of the institution's tradition:

¹ Bolton, "The First One Hundred Years," p. 56.

and pens . . . " In this case the letter was dictated to Anna G. Soule of the Athenaeum staff, which would place it before 1892, the year she left. Both letters are in CUL, M. Dewey Papers. In an earlier letter to Charles Alexander Nelson, May 13, 1886, Cutter wrote disparagingly, "Dr. Homes [of the New York State Library] was here today. He's 25 years older than 1 and he's just beginning to have trouble with his eyes. I don't expect to have any eyes at all when I have added 50 per cent to my life." NYPL, C. A. Nelson Papers. Cf. also, W. P. Cutter, Charles Ammi Cutter, p. 5.
Through all its various changes, the Athenaeum has represented what was best in Boston. The "golden age" of New England literature grew with it and even within its walls. Its traditions are a part of its life, and are passed on from father to son. Because its ideals have been high the Athenaeum has appealed to men who lead as well as to those who follow. And with their continued support success in the future seems assured.  

Cutter ran into difficulty precisely at this point. It would seem that in his enthusiastic professional attitude and his willingness to submit the Athenaeum to all that was best and advanced in the emerging library field, he failed to fully take into account the Athenaeum's traditions and the perception held by the proprietors of their own institution.

Basic to an understanding of the events of this period is a knowledge of the changes that occurred in the two official bodies that had most to do with the operation of the library. The Trustee Board was composed of four officers and fifteen other members. The presidents during Cutter's years were John Amory Lowell (1860-76), Charles Francis Adams (1877-79), and Samuel Eliot (1880-98). The vice-presidents were Andrew T. Hall (1866-75), Charles Francis Adams (1876), Charles Deane (1877-84), Robert W. Hooper (1885), and James Elliot Cabot (1886-98). The treasurers were Henry Bromfield Rogers (1869-76) and Charles Pickering Bowditch (1877-98). And the secretaries were Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (1868-72), his brother, Brooks (1873-79), Charles H. Williams (1880-87), and William R. Richards (1888-94).

1Ibid.
After the stormy years of the early 1850's when the trustees had had an almost complete turnover in membership, the constancy of the membership was regained. In fact some of the members elected in the mid-1850's served very lengthy terms well past 1880. Among those were Robert W. Hooper (1855-85), Edward N. Perkins (1856-98), James Elliot Cabot (1857-98), and Francis Parkman (1858-93). From 1869 through 1876 the fifteen member board remained essentially unchanged. And its members represented views of longstanding tenure. Beginning in 1877, however, a slow turnover of the membership began that accelerated during the 1880's. It began with the election of Ephraim W. Gurney and John Chipman Gray and included the election of Henry Cabot Lodge in 1879. In 1880 two more of the older trustees were replaced, one of the new members being Howard Stockton. In the next two years three more trustees were elected, representing in six years a turnover of seven of the fifteen members. From 1883 to 1887 four more new members were elected, among whom were John T. Morse, Jr., Stanton Blake, Edward J. Lowell, and George B. Shattuck, bringing the total change to eleven of fifteen of the pre-1877 membership. The four new members elected between 1888 and 1892 did not change that makeup, but they included among their numbers, Barrett Wendell and Thomas Minns.¹

¹The changes that took place in the membership of the Trustee Board are taken from "Officers," in The Athenaeum Centenary, pp. 115-122.
The Library Committee of the Trustees also remained constant in membership during the earlier period. From 1868 through 1876 its membership did not change at all except through the attrition of one member. In 1876 the members were James E. Cabot, Charles Deane, Charles E. Ware, Robert W. Hooper, Christopher T. Thayer, Francis Parkman, and Samuel Eliot, all long-standing trustees. Beginning in 1877, however, new members of the Trustees were appointed regularly to the Library Committee and it too underwent a change in composition. The committee was also increased from its undermanned number of seven to a total of nine. By 1881 only four of the pre-1877 members belonged to it. By 1885 this number had shrunk to three and by the next year to two, namely, Cabot and Parkman. Of those new members added, the most active seem to have been Lodge, Stockton, Edward J. Lowell, and later, Barrett Wendell and Thomas Minns.¹

It cannot be demonstrated that specific changes in the makeup of the leadership of the Athenaeum were directly responsible for a growing dissatisfaction with Cutter's administration, although the newer trustees seem to have been conspicuously involved in those actions that represented a gradual tightening of the trustees' control over Cutter's work. During this period there was, however, a pervasive movement toward defensiveness by many within the more elite

¹The appointment of the Library Committee is recorded each year in the Records of the Trustees.
Boston intellectual circles. To the extent that that movement was in fact reflected in the newer leadership, it lends support to the idea that a basic shift in the spirit of the institution itself was an underlying, although probably unconscious, cause of the conflict.

It has already been mentioned that what has been called an intellectual community of patrician bearings grew out of conservative and Federalist wealth in combination with an advancing Unitarian moral philosophy. In its earliest form the patrician bearing of the community rested primarily in its self-image as an intellectual and cultural resource for the re-ordering of the nation. As the century progressed, however, kinship ties grew stronger and the social relationships became even more determinative, giving rise to the social register and to the popular conception of the "Proper Bostonian," an opinion of the elite that was not always complimentary.¹

¹The phrase is taken from Cleveland Amory, The Proper Bostonians, although similar overtones can be seen in Henry James' Bostonians published in 1886. On p. 35 Amory records the jingle,

And this is good old Boston,
The home of the bean and the cod,
Where the Lowells talk to the Cabots,
And the Cabots talk only to God.

Originally proposed after the turn of the twentieth century as a toast, the rhyme should be taken in the hyperbolic sense in which it was given. It does point out, however, at least a sense of a trend that was taking place. In a similar vein, Walter Muir Whitehill has noted a highly colored, but, in his eyes instructive, caricature of the leadership of the Museum of Fine Arts—and perhaps incidently of the Athenaeum—from the same time as the above rhyme, in Museum of Fine Arts, pp. 212-13. Regardless of any social exclusiveness that may have arisen, it is important to note that this is cited only to highlight the more general shift in spirit that for the
The former leaders passed their mantle to a younger generation. The younger leaders not only faced currents of social unrest and change that seemed far more complex and unmanageable than those of ante-bellum years; they also bore the legacy of frustration among many of that intellectual community to directly effect their own idealistic goal of enlightened democracy. It was indeed for many of that bearing an 'Indian Summer'. By the end of the century, varying conceptions of America's national destiny led to the contradictory extremes of national imperialism and immigration restriction. The effect upon the patrician intellectual community was to provoke a defensiveness that reinforced a renewed racial nativism. John Higham has written an account of the crisis of the nineties that is instructive not only in general outlines, but also by reason of the individuals within the New England community that he has noted.

On the whole, the Anglo-Saxon tradition in its new nativistic form still found its support within the patrician circles where it had persisted throughout the age of confidence. Now, as then, the race-thinkers were men who rejoiced in their colonial ancestry, who looked to England for standards of deportment and taste, who held the great academic posts or belonged to the best clubs or adorned the higher Protestant clergy. Some . . . were active reformers, especially in the municipal field. But, in general, racial nativists worshipped tradition in a deeply conservative spirit, and in the tumult of the nineties it seemed to them that everything fixed and sacred was threatened with dissolution. . . .

A substantial number of these patrician nativists belonged to the cultivated intelligentsia of New England, the region where the Anglo-Saxon idea was most firmly entrenched. There the proportion of foreign-born in the total population was rising more sharply than in any present purposes had to do with intellectual concerns.
other part of the country. There too the declining vitality of the native culture contributed to a defensive attitude. Brahmin intellectuals such as Lodge, Henry Adams, and Barrett Wendell, knew that the historic culture of New England had entered its "Indian Summer," and the knowledge gave them added cause to see their race and region beleaguered by the alien. . . . At Harvard, Barrett Wendell, whose English accent matched his Anglophile interpretation of American literature, was settling into the conviction that his own kind had had its day, that other races had wrenched the country from its grasp for once and all.¹

It seems likely that the general growth of pessimism and of a defensive posture among patrician intellectuals was generally related to the emergence of a limited self-image in such institutions as the Athenaeum. In former days the community's ethic placed a high value on the personal, if not a bit sentimental, obligation that wealth and culture gave one towards society as a whole. Accordingly, the Athenaeum was seen as a public institution even if the "public" served was somewhat restricted. The goal of proprietors and librarians alike was to make of the library the best possible service available to that public. In that way, patrician philanthropy could affect the growth of the national character and identity.

Charles Cutter, who had come to the institution in an earlier day, had been schooled in the older tradition and had accepted many of its goals as his own. He himself felt the strong pull of tradition and culture. James Lyman

Whitney, an assistant librarian at the Boston Public Library, quoted Cutter as having said on the subject of training library assistants, "The older I grow the more I believe in cultivated assistance and the Brahmin blood."¹ He was well aware of the special nature of the Athenaeum and of its special clientele, quite a different class than those who frequented a regular public library. He could point to that clientele as the chief reason that the Athenaeum could afford the luxury of free access to the stacks, a freedom that he, along with many others in the profession, doubted would work in a public institution.² The same clientele also made it possible to perfect and use in it a classification that was minutely subdivided, for "Libraries used by the learned can profitably be much more subdivided than those used by the ignorant, who would not understand even the names of the divisions."³ Above all the Athenaeum represented the best in cultured and intelligent users.

¹C. A. Cutter, quoted in James L. Whitney, "Selecting and Training Library Assistants," LJ, VII (July/August, 1882), 138. Whitney quoted Cutter as agreeing with his contention that prospective assistants not only be examined, but that the examination delve into their background. "I have said that this examination must be a thorough one, and it may well go back of the candidate himself to his ancestors, to see what of intellectual as well as physical quality he has inherited from them."


But regardless of the different class of users that the Athenaeum represented, its mission could still be spelled out in terms of its service. In commenting on the publication of the first two volumes of the *Index Catalogue* of the U. S. Surgeon-General's Office, he reported in the *Nation* that a French scholar had supposed the rationale for such an expensive catalog to be "because Americans of the Brahmin or reading caste" enjoyed literature so much. In fact, they not only liked books, but books about books. Cutter's retort was to agree with the statement, but also to add that in the end it was the drive to be of public service, "a feeling very strong in all Americans, except perhaps politicians."\(^1\) His statement reveals an earlier patrician optimism and it informed not only his appreciation of the catalog in question, but also his view of his own work at the Athenaeum and his view of the place of the Athenaeum in the library world. In fact, Cutter's views could be called an extension of the older ethic to its logical conclusion. That is, by means of scientific professionalism, the ideal could be approached. Because his library represented wealth and culture, its role would be to lead the way among libraries. And not only would it lead, but in the stewardship of its resources it could develop the best in open policies and the best in scientific applications to its own progress. Indeed, the

best that it could offer was to be truly professional in its approach to its mission. In that light one could surmise that Cutter saw the Bemis and Howes legacies as an enablement to fulfill the ideal.

But with the change in leadership came a reaction to Cutter's extension of an older ideal toward a narrower view of the role of the Athenaeum. Rather than this institution being involved in a mission of the ideal, the newer leaders give evidence of being much more protective towards it. The first sign of reaction came in the late 1870's when Cutter's policy of "maximum-use" was in full swing. Cutter's practice of soliciting the use of proprietors' unused shares by non-proprietors had been questioned but not absolutely forbidden. And even so ardent a trustee as Samuel Eliot had proposed the official authorization of the practice, although his proposal did not pass beyond the Library Committee.¹

In January 1881, however, the issue was raised again, but more forcefully. Howard Stockton presented to the trustees a letter written by Cutter that had "accidentally" fallen into the hands of Robert Hooper.² In the letter Cutter had solicited a member of the Massachusetts legislature for the transfer of his right to take books out for the use of a non-proprietor. It was a doubly bad situation for Cutter.

¹See above, pp. 160-63.

²Records of the Trustees, January 17, 1881.
While the idea of the transfer of a proprietor's rights to another person was allowable according to the rules and regulations of the Athenaeum, it had been the prejudice of the trustees that such a use of one's share would be the exception rather than the rule. More specifically, they had not intended that the practice be pursued by the librarian. Worse than that, members of the legislature had never been given the outright privilege to check out books. Rather they had been given a general privilege to use the books in the library. Cutter had apparently assumed that they had the privilege of circulation and since many of them did not use their privilege, he intended to make good use of it for others.

The minutes of the trustees' meeting for that session suggest a good deal of heat over the discovery. The trustees noted that members of the legislature had only limited privileges and that the limited privilege, being honorary, could not be transferred in the first place. Upon discovering that Cutter had been making such solicitations for several years, the trustees recorded,

There has never been any hinderance to the use of the library by scholars and they have been allowed to take out books whether proprietors or not, and books have even been sent to Chicago to be used for special work.

The Public Library supplies the demand for a large circulating library, the Athenaeum should rather be used for purposes of consultation. ¹

¹Ibid.
Cutter sent to the trustees in the form of a letter his own defense of his practice, a few comments of which are preserved in the minutes. The excerpt of his explanation contained an economic consideration. In 1880 the 185 non-proprietors that used the library were assessed through the ten dollar annual subscriber's fee a total of $1,566. That total was somewhat lower than the rate would have provided because some were charged for only part of the year.

"In 1881 I expect to have about 200 giving $2,000. All but one of the 185 of 1880 wish to continue, and some new persons have already applied."¹

The trustees were obviously not very happy with the situation. They voted to "not recognize the right of members of the legislature to transfer any privileges which they may have under the Charter of the Boston Athenaeum."² Furthermore, after committing to the Library Committee for special action the problem of what to do with those legislators who were currently checking out books, they censured the librarian by voting,

That the circular, issued by the librarian to the members of the General Court is not approved by the Trustees, and that no similar circular be issued in the future without the authority of the library committee.³

The situation was upsetting enough that Dr. Hooper moved in the next meeting to strike Cutter's written reply from the records of the meeting, but the motion did not carry.⁴

¹Ibid. ²Ibid. ³Ibid. ⁴Records of the Trustees, February 21, 1881. Unfortunately, Cutter's letter, which is noted in the Records as
An added bit of fall-out from the situation was the call for a new printing of the rules and regulations of the library. The new printing still included the clause that any proprietor could transfer his rights to a non-proprietor, but the trustees voted, "That whenever the librarian sends a request to any Proprietor—for the use of his share under the fifth rule, he shall also enclose to him a copy of said rules." By December 1881 the issue was in the air again. Charles P. Bowditch called attention to the increased costs of library operations. Hooper noted that 160 non-proprietors were still using the library. A motion was subsequently proposed by Henry Cabot Lodge aimed specifically at the librarian and was later inserted in the rules themselves. It was voted,

that there shall be no transfer of a Proprietors right to take out books except on the expressed wish and by the request of such proprietor, and the librarian is instructed not to solicit such transfers or assist in procuring them.

Curiously enough, when the above motion was finally approved in January 1882, the Library Committee also submitted another document which was entitled, "Rules for the Administration of the Library of the Boston Athenaeum." It too having been inserted, is missing.

1Records of the Trustees, March 21, 1881; Records of the Library Committee, March 22, 1881. R. W. Hooper and Charles Deane were appointed a sub-committee to prepare the rules, but Deane resigned from the assignment in April.

2Records of the Trustees, March 21, 1881.

3Records of the Trustees, December 19, 1881.

4Records of the Trustees, January 16, 1882.
was approved, and while it contained nothing new in the way of regulations, its significance perhaps lies in the fact of being drawn up in the first place. It was as if the trustees of the Athenaeum were asserting their prerogatives to control the librarian's work. Of special note in the document is the codifying of the various injunctions on what rooms and collections in the library were off-limits to various types of users, and what standards of conduct were expected from users in general.

Cutter's own views on the above happenings are not known, explicitly. The moves were in direct contrast to the freedom that he had enjoyed in his previous years. An indication of how he felt may perhaps be seen in a short "Communication" inserted in the January 1882 Library Journal. In an unusually cryptic manner but typical for its dry humor, he wrote,

You hope to see the ideal library? You are more sanguine than I. The ideal library, in a librarian's estimation, is the one in which he is able to carry out his own ideas. To that there are always two obstacles, one of them the want of money, and both usually insuperable.¹

But in May of the same year, in an editorial on the Astor Library in New York, he also reaffirmed his own type of library experience:

The libraries of private munificence--the Lenox and the Astor--may not be all that could be desired, but the library of public taxation, bringing a new element of

corruption into politics and controlled by bosses, is not a spectacle to which any friend of American libraries can look forward with pleasure.¹

Cutter's perceptive comment on the need for money was perhaps prophetic of the next sort of stricture that eventually overcame his work at the Athenaeum. Despite the special funds available, from 1880 to 1884 total expenditures were pushing to the limit, and at times exceeding, income. It was due in part to extra expenses for to the building itself, but also because of the reduction of subscription income from the stricures on non-proprietors. The trustees of course showed concern but saw the solution in cutting expenditures in the operation of the library. As early as January 1882, the Library Committee voted to get rid of the Athenaeum's printing equipment as soon as the catalog was completed and to contract the List of Additions to a local printer. To cut costs further they decided that the long annotations that Cutter was including in the list would have to be shortened, if not eliminated altogether.² That, of course, would have limited Cutter in one of his most esteemed innovations and favored projects. His own reaction was to include a counter-move in his annual report written one month later. He suggested discontinuance of the List altogether.

It is a good thing to have, and when accompanied with notes as it has been for the last 4 years I believe it to be worth its cost. But the Committee have ordered, to my great regret, that the notes be discontinued; and

¹C. A. Cutter, Editorial, LJ, VII (May, 1882), 79.
without notes its cost is really thrown away, for the simple reason that hardly any one looks at a barren list of titles. It was the observation of this fact during the time when we had no notes that led me to add them in the hope of making the list attractive and therefore of use.\(^1\)

His logic seems to have persuaded the Committee, for not only was the order to dispense with the printing equipment rescinded by the end of the year, but the List of Additions was continued with annotations.

The concern over the high cost of operations continued. In February 1883 at the annual meeting of the proprietors the treasurer presented a summary report of the cost of operations for each year since 1876. At the same time the Standing Committee of the trustees made its first report of what was to become in succeeding years a specific effort to budget the unrestricted funds. One week later at the regular meeting of the trustees it was voted to investigate the possible "re-organization" of the working force, in effect a move for economy. Henry Cabot Lodge and the Standing Committee were appointed a special committee to investigate the problem. Lodge reported in March 1883 after consulting with Cutter, that the only way to cut the force of nineteen women and one man would be to curtail services. He also reported that the pay for the women was generally lower than for similar work done at the Public Library or at Harvard.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\)Cutter, "Annual Report of the Librarian [for 1881]." His reference is to the earlier new book list that was begun by Poole and continued to the end of 1871.

\(^2\)Records of the Proprietors, February 12, 1883; Records of the Trustees, February 19 and March 10, 1883.
In the first of two letters written on the subject to Lodge for the trustees, Cutter outlined the simple alternative: reduce the amount of work to be done and the work force could be immediately reduced. It was a time of heavy book purchasing due to the Howes legacy. With a sort of coup de grâce to the issue, he added that in fact the staff was behind in its current work and would not catch up until the normal summer slump. In effect, no reductions could be made "without injury to the efficiency of the library."\(^1\)

In a second letter Cutter added a description of how work assignments were arranged and appended a list of workers and their primary jobs. The typical procedure was for any one assistant to interrupt his normal routine to help other assistants who had patron demands that they could not fulfill alone. Although the division of labor became somewhat intermixed, the efficiency of service to the users of the library was preserved. He could fall back on the argument that it was the amount of work to be done rather than inefficiency on the part of the work force. He stated, "No one is idle here."\(^2\) He won his case and the report by Lodge was accepted by the trustees.

At one point Cutter may have undercut his own project. He promised to cut the work force as soon as the amount of work was reduced. He also suggested as an example

\(^1\)Letter, Cutter to H. C. Lodge, February 21, 1883 (No. 1), BA.

\(^2\)Ibid. Letter, Cutter to H. C. Lodge, February 21, 1883 (No. 2), BA.
and in an off-hand way, "If we stop the rearrangement of the library I can send off five persons at once."\footnote{Letter, Cutter to H. C. Lodge, February 21, 1883 (No. 1), BA.} It was just that alternative that arose the following year. As a result of finding out that the general funds had been overexpended by more than $2,400 (due mainly to the cost of fitting out the upper rooms), the question of how to cut costs was again raised, this time with reference to the cost of arranging the library according to the new classification. The discussion had been raised in a special meeting, and at the next regular meeting one week later, Lodge again reported with another Cutter letter in hand.\footnote{Records of the Trustees, February 11 and 18, 1884.} In the letter, addressed to Howard Stockton, Cutter answered three explicit questions. How much longer would the rearrangement take? How much of the present allocation for attendants could be saved if the library were being arranged by the old system? And, would it be possible to stop the rearranging in mid-stream, leaving the library with a part of its collections under each of two systems?

His reply to the first query was to suggest two dates of seven or nine years depending on whether or not all of the periodicals and government publications were also reclassified immediately. His reply to the question of the cost of the actual work force necessary took the form of outlining the procedures necessary for the reclassification and
comparing them with the procedures necessary for classifying under the old system. He demonstrated that though the cost did involve two or three hundred dollars in excess of what would be normally needed, it would be saved in the long run by not having to rearrange a fixed system. In answer to the question as to whether the rearrangement could be stopped in mid-stream, his answer was, "Perfectly practicable, but not expedient." It was practicable because they were living with two systems during the process of re-classification anyway. In an aside he suggested, though, that it could not be stopped all of a sudden, for those classes that were more than half-done would need to be finished. It was far more inexpedient, however, because,

1. It defers putting the books into a more scientific and thorough classing than they are in now.
2. It defers marking the books by a better notation than they are marked by now, a notation which enables the examiners to examine the library in less time and the attendants to get the books more quickly and therefore less expensively than they can under the old system; that is, it prolongs a state of things which is both unsatisfactory to the public and costly to us.
3. The delay will make the change more expensive in the end, by the whole number of books added in the interval to that part of the library which is yet unchanged. The new books which are put into the new system are classified (in a majority of cases) once for all. Books put into the old system cost as much to incorporate as the others, and besides that they will cost hereafter an additional sum when they are either (a) put into the new system, or (b) moved under the old system, which moving is sure to become necessary, and judging by the past will be necessary several times in succession, say once in every 15 or 20 years.
4. We have now a corps of girls trained to do this work, namely two classifiers, two assistants, two markers,

---

1 Letter, Cutter to Howard Stockton, February 14, 1884, in Records of the Trustees, February 18, 1884.
and two letterers. If we turn these off there is no certainty that we would get them again, and if we did not we should have to train new persons, which is not economical.¹

In an addendum to his report Cutter added a bit more force to his logic. He compared the costs of operation for the Athenaeum with those of the Harvard College Library, exclusive of the book expenditures. The result was to demonstrate that the Athenaeum's expenditures on the work force were not out of line with those of a recognized library of comparative size.² Cutter's arguments prevailed and the trustees voted to continue the reclassification.

Three years later in January 1887 another effort on the part of the trustees and the Library Committee to check into Cutter's administration of the work force arose because of complaints of inattention on the part of the attendants in the delivery room. It resulted in the order to keep a record of the work of the assistants, and particularly to check on how much time they were taking to retrieve the books that were requested. The record was made, but was discontinued by April of the same year.³

The above record of the questions put to Cutter concerning his administration in a certain sense demonstrates the effect that the gradual change in the makeup of the

¹Ibid.

²C. A. Cutter, "Comparison of Expenses, 1883 [between Harvard and the Boston Athenaeum libraries]," in Records of the Trustees, February 18, 1884.

³Records of the Trustees, December 20, 1886; Records of the Library Committee, January 3 and April 25, 1887.
trusteeship was having. The question, however, did not represent a serious conflict as much as legitimate differences of opinion. Cutter himself remained satisfied with his position. When Melvil Dewey proposed in 1885 that Cutter move on to another library, Cutter replied,

Your question was so entirely unexpected that I thought I must take one night to consider it. I have not arrived at a positive decision, however, today. But this is my feeling, just at present: My position here now is pleasant and promises to be permanent. I have $3500, am on good terms with the Trustees, to say nothing of friends among the Proprietors. So that I should not care to leave the Athenæum except for some decided gain. $4000 "to start with" as you say, is a temptation; $3500 is not. But I should not like now, without knowing more of the duties, powers, and possibilities of the place, to say that I would come.¹

Yet, the questions raised about his administration did indicate an unconscious attempt on the part of the trustees to regain a part of the authority they had lost in the earlier period when Cutter had for the most part free reign to do what he thought best. The trustees were asking questions that they had not asked for a long time. That it was due to the change in the makeup of the Board of Trustees is, of course, only conjecture. But it is significant that for the most part the moves for more trustee control came from the newer and younger members. If, however, the events recorded above represent a time when the trustees were again becoming conscious of their authority, the events of the period from 1888 to 1893 reveals their more complete

¹Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, March 25, 1885, CUL, M. Dewey Papers. Unfortunately, the new library position that Dewey suggested is not identified.
re-assumption of that authority, for it was a period in which whatever influence and prestige that Cutter may have had previously seems to have dissipated in a low-key struggle for control based on differing philosophies of the goals of the institution.

The first indication of moves to seriously limit Cutter's freedom in administration came in the area of book-purchasing. In January 1887 Edward J. Lowell was appointed a sub-committee with Cutter on the exchange of duplicates held by the library. By itself such a move may not have seemed significant, but the practice of dealing with other libraries in this matter was a practice that Cutter had conducted mostly at his own discretion since he had first come to the Athenaeum. It would seem significant also, therefore, that by June the letters between the Athenaeum and the American Antiquarian Society began to deal with the problem of settling the account between the two institutions in the matter.¹

In May the Library Committee ordered that once again all auction catalogs would need to come before the committee with the lots marked by the librarian in order that the purchases could be approved. From that point in the minutes of the committee the record of auction purchases approved ceases. In November following, the vote of April 1882 that gave the

¹Records of the Library Committee, January 31, 1887; Letters, Cutter to the American Antiquarian Society, particularly June 9 and August 11, 1887, Librarians' Correspondence, American Antiquarian Society.
Librarian authority to purchase books in the area of American history without restriction, was rescinded.¹ Then, in December 1887, a more explicit motion, introduced by Edward J. Lowell, was passed reverting to the older practice of having the Library Committee more directly involved in book selection. The resolution read,

That hereafter no book be added to the Athenaeum Library by purchase, exchange, or otherwise without being previously passed on by the Library Committee, with the exception of the books sent by Trübner & Co. under their general discretion.²

However, even the books from Trübner were to be submitted to the committee before being added to the library.³

In addition two other motions, also introduced by Lowell, but tabled, indicated the severity of the intentions meant. One provided that a list of all newly acquired books be listed and read at the next regular meeting of the Committee. The other provided that no bill for books be sent to the treasurer for payment until it had been approved by a member of the Executive Committee who could vouch for the fact that all the items had been passed on by the Committee.⁴

The following March another committee member replaced Lowell in working with Cutter on the exchange of duplicates.⁵

¹Records of the Library Committee, May 16 and November 21, 1887. It is of some interest to note that the rescission of the vote on American historical materials was made in the absence of Francis Parkman.

²Records of the Library Committee, December 5, 1887.

³Ibid. ⁴Ibid.

⁵Records of the Library Committee, March 26, 1888. John Chipman Gray was the appointee.
In April 1888 the Library Committee further expanded their resolution on book approval by giving directions on the matter of gift books. Though it dealt with exceptions to the Library Committee's approval policy, the exceptions were in a very real sense concerned with unimportant types of materials that did not require the librarian's judgment.

They voted,

That the following classes of gifts be excepted from the rule passed Dec. 5, 1887, requiring all books, pamphlets, etc., to be submitted to the Library Committee before they are incorporated in the library. (1) Continuations of works already in the library. (2) U. S. government, Massachusetts state and Boston city official publications. (3) Works relating to Boston, including reports of Boston societies (except reports of money-making corporations) and charitable associations. (4) New England general and local history.

Voted, that the following classes of gifts be rejected without reference to the Library Committee: (1) Reports and annual catalogues of colleges, libraries, and charitable societies outside of New England (with exceptions). (2) Reports of financial associations. (3) Town reports.¹

The stricture against collecting reports of libraries must have been a disappointment to Cutter, who, during his long career, had made it a practice to collect such items.

The fact that the Library Committee asserted its right to control the acquisition of books did not mean that Cutter no longer had any discretionary powers in the matter, or that the library was reverting to a book selection policy that had no guidelines. On the contrary, Cutter was still given authority to acquire items in some limited areas without committee approval. But the areas were of continuations,

¹Records of the Library Committee, April 30, 1888.
and of specific subjects that were well-defined by the committee in advance, such as English novels and books of fashion plates, and the above mentioned classes of gifts. Still, the change in procedure must have felt confining to him in contrast to the practice of previous years. In succeeding years control by the Library Committee increased even more.

In April 1889, again at Lowell's suggestion, the Committee decided to divide the critical journals among themselves in order to accumulate book order suggestions. And in the early months of 1892 it was decided to go ahead with Lowell's earlier suggestion that all book purchases made within any one week be read to the committee at its next meeting, including the name of the person who ordered the item, and what decisions had been made about its acceptance or rejection. Finally, just before Cutter left the Athenaeum in 1893, a decision was made to submit even the continuation orders to the committee's scrutiny.¹

In another area, that of the needed changes in the building with regard to book storage, the trustees also showed their independence of Cutter's ideas, at least in part. The matter of the building, however, was not as severe an issue as book purchasing, for the trustees had more traditionally asserted their independence in this matter. As

¹Records of the Library Committee, April 15, 1889, January 18, April 25, May 23, 1892, and February 27, 1893. A continuation was an item that was published regularly, for example, an almanac.
early as 1880 Cutter had foreseen the need for additional space for the collections. His proposed solution at that time involved building an iron stack either on the third floor or in a new building. From 1880 through 1887, however, the only method of coping with the problem was to make periodic rearrangements of major groupings of the materials. In their annual report for 1883 the Library Committee reported on some of those moves and then summarized Cutter's own view of the matter.

The librarian reports that although some temporary relief has been gained by the removal and extension of the art department from the upper story he is already beginning to feel cramped. The second story had become so over-crowded before the third was shelved that a large part of the new space was at once filled by overflows; since then new books have been coming in rapidly, and there is not now in the building as it is at present shelved, enough room to properly arrange its contents and leave suitable space for growth. ¹

During the latter half of 1887 the Standing Committee of the Trustees began to make proposals for more shelving, and in February 1888 the Library Committee stated the severity of the problem:

The re-arrangement of the Library has always been conducted under great difficulties owing to the want of suitable places in which to put the books in their new order. The problem has been like that of making a house out of the materials of the old house, but continuing to live in the old house while the new one was building. The library is now rapidly approaching the time when there will be no room at all, convenient or inconvenient, for the annual additions. The Trustees have therefore been considering plans for an addition

and it is hoped that shelf-room will be provided before the next meeting for 60,000 more volumes, the growth of perhaps ten years.\footnote{Annual Report of the Library Committee, February 13, 1888; Records of the Trustees, July through December, 1887.}

Cutter had expressed for many years his own decided views on the needs of library buildings. The experience of working in the totally unsuitable Gore Hall at Harvard had undoubtedly affected his feelings for those needs. And the pronouncements of John Langdon Sibley must have certainly added to his early knowledge of what things were to be avoided as well as having indicated some reasonable alternatives. During the early years of the American Library Association his comments reflected especially the Harvard situation, namely in the matters of lighting and ventilation.\footnote{Cf. C. A. Cutter, A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, 1 (October, 1876), 124.}

After the Harvard iron stack was constructed and proved successful and after his own experience with the changes made at the Athenaeum during the years 1877 to 1880, Cutter's thoughts on the matter became more systematic. The total function of a library was to be considered basic to its design. The various requirements of "light, air, heat, space, convenience, economical administration, close-packing, and capacity of enlargement" were to be seen as a part of a total system, each requirement affecting the others.\footnote{C. A. Cutter, "Library Architecture," LJ, X (February, 1885), 35, an extract from his longer article, [Library Architecture], Nation, XL (January 8, 1885), 36. The index title in the Nation for the article is "Library Architecture No Joke."}
During the early 1880's when the profession was aroused over the proposals for a new building for the Library of Congress, Cutter turned more often to criticizing architects who did not appreciate the uniqueness of the library's functioning system of arrangements and who subordinated any considerations of function to aesthetics. In his view, a house was a house, a church a church, and a library was uniquely a library.\footnote{C. A. Cutter, Editorial, \textit{LJ}, IX (February, 1884), 23; Cf. his [Note on Library Architecture], \textit{Nation}, XXIX (August 21, 1879), 125-26.} He reported the 1883 annual Association meeting in the \textit{Nation} and very deliberately spoke to the issue, summarizing his own as well as the Association's views.

At Buffalo, last week, the Library of Congress was considered, as usual, and the Washington scheme (as it may be called) of making it a vast show-building was defended in a letter from the Librarian. The Association would like to see the national library housed in Washington in a building which should be a worthy representative of the three thousand libraries of the country. They have no objection to its being a monument to the glory of the architect and a symbol of the wealth of the nation; indeed, it is manifestly to their advantage that the importance of libraries to the country should be materially represented in the capital. They have no objection to seeing it associated with an art gallery, or with any other reasonably appropriate show-rooms; but they desire that it should be first and foremost a library, a place expressly made for the safe keeping and convenient use of books, a place where the library idea shall receive its best expression. If they can have this, they care not whether ten or fifteen millions are spent in ornament; but they do not wish the books to be subordinated to or made a part of the architecture, for they know by wretched experience what that always leads to. For the success of a building as a library it is absolutely necessary that the purpose of making a library be prominently and persistently put forward as the first, almost as the only, object; the plans must be made for that end only, and, when they are
complete, the architect may be permitted to design a handsome case for the machine. No other course ever prevents the books and readers being sacrificed to the stone and the gazers. This appreciation of the true object of a library may have existed in the various committees or commissions who have had the plans in consideration, but there has never been the slightest indication of it.¹

Following these comments Cutter mentioned three alternative plans submitted by librarians, including one by William F. Poole. He then summarized his own plan given in his conference paper, "The Buffalo Public Library in 1983." In that utopian scheme, he had described the need for the "stack" concept of book storage and for electric lighting which made the stack concept feasible. The stack concept was in his thinking the most economical method of storage. It would be good for the patron because it would reduce the walking time for the retrieval of books, whether by page or by the patron himself. Such a saving "would justify almost any expense, for nothing is more exasperating and more complained of in great libraries than having to wait for books."²

Cutter's insistence on function before form and, likewise, his insistence that librarians themselves were the best source for helping the architect to plan a library, perhaps made for him few friends among architects of libraries. But there seemed to be little love lost. He stated categorically at the 1888 conference in the Catskills from his presidential


position, "I think from our experience of architects' plans that we can safely say the architect is the natural enemy of the librarian."¹ As if to add exclamation points to the statement, the next year he referred to his own statement of the year before and further elaborated it.²

Meanwhile, the trustees wrestled with various alternatives for providing additional shelf space. Two original plans, one for building a steel stack of several levels in the west end of the building, and the other, for building a lighter stack on the third floor were discussed. In February 1888, however, a new plan was proposed in which the gigantic Sumner staircase would be torn out and a two-story iron stack would be constructed in its place. It was this plan that was eventually adopted. Changes began in June 1888 and were completed a year later at a cost of more than $30,000.³

While the idea of more efficient book storage was approved of by Cutter, the way it was carried out at the Athenaeum was not very satisfying to him. He informed readers of the Library Journal on one occasion of the progress being made in the change, and included a squib of local


²[C. A. Cutter?, American Library Association, St. Louis Meeting], Nation, XLVIII (June 13, 1889), 490. Cutter's authorship of this article is uncertain but probable. Regardless of that uncertainty, the article mentions the reiteration of his remarks.

newspaper reaction to the abandonment of the "glorious" Sumner staircase. The accounts complained that there were too many books anyway, and book purchasing should be cut to save the monument. Such reasoning probably amused Cutter. But his dissatisfaction with the plan that the trustees adopted showed up in his comments in the Association within the next two years. He indicated to his fellow librarians that the construction of that particular stack was not his choice, but he, of course, was forced to live with it. The new stack would provide space for approximately 70,000 additional volumes, but in the light of how fast the library was increasing, Cutter seems to have felt that the trustees were really selling themselves short in the long run.2

As a culmination to the whole problem he provided other librarians with a verbal description of how not to plan a library building, using the Athenaeum as his example.

---


2C. A. Cutter, A.L.A. Conference Discussion, LJ, XIII (September/October, 1888), 319. Cutter's views are also noted in Addison Van Name, "Report on Library Architecture," LJ, XIV (May/June, 1889), 164. Cf. also Letter, K. Linderfelt to W. F. Poole, September 7, 1889, Newberry Library, Poole Papers. Linderfelt knew that the Newberry Library would soon be building and went on at length with his dislike of the Harvard stack system. He suggested that Cutter did not like the stack system either, but that would seem contrary to Cutter's published views. However, with regard to the particular adaptation of the stack concept to the Athenaeum, Linderfelt reported, "You know my deputy went East last winter for some weeks and she tells me Mr. Cutter showed her this room with the melancholy remark, that 'he wanted her to learn how not to do it.'"
Coming in for the most severe of his criticism was the alcove system and the size and placement of windows in relation to lighting needs. He also criticized its floor plan as inefficient for administration; that is, it had long galleries but stairs only at one end so that there was a lot of walking by the attendants.¹

Regardless of Cutter's dissatisfaction, the plan accomplished its goal of providing needed space. The trustees were pleased with it and noted that the changes had won with approval from the readers. But Cutter was not greatly pleased with the trustees. In a curious addition to his previous statement on the antipathy between librarians and architects, he added a new roadblock between the librarian and a useful building; that is, trustees themselves. At the same meeting in which he described the problems of the Athenaeum's building, he suggested that trustees along with architects were really interested in the appearance of the building, and not in the efficiency of its design. He stated,

They do not feel what we feel strongly, that the success of the library, in a very great degree depends upon the adaptation of the building to its purpose. They do not understand that the cost of running the library will depend largely upon whether it is suited to its purpose, and whether it is constructed so as to admit of economy of administration.²

By the end of 1889 the administrative situation at the Athenaeum was the opposite from what it had been ten


years earlier. In the intervening years the general philosophy of the role of the library held by Cutter on the one hand and the trustees on the other hand had come into opposition. Cutter had been motivated by the ideal of the Athenaeum as an example of the best in libraries for the library mission in general. While it is true that it was owned by proprietors, it was also to be of the greatest possible service to the wider community and its library system needs. The trustees, especially as their official body changed its constituency, seemed to see the library in a different light. It existed more for its proprietors than for any ideal example that it might afford to the national library scene. That this was the case seems to be indicated by a conversation that Cutter reported to Melvil Dewey at the time of his resignation in early 1893. A trustee was reported to have issued a sharp rebuke over the librarian's running "a universal system of libraries." The Boston Athenaeum's primary interest was in its own existence, rather than in being a public library. The privileges of the proprietors were to be zealously guarded and promoted first of all, and if there was a residue that it provided for the community at large, then that was to be considered an added but not absolutely essential benefit. Book selection seemed to become narrowed in its scope and not related to the whole library system. Cutter's suggestions for a cooperative

1Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, March 1, 1893, CUL, M. Dewey Papers.
acquisition program among the Boston area libraries seems never to have materialized.\(^1\) The reforms of an overzealous librarian were to be balanced by the financial ability of the institution itself. And if some of the reforms, while perhaps good in themselves, were too expensive and not essential to the well-being of the proprietors, then they could be dispensed with, or at least not carried out in full. In short, the trustees were insuring that an overzealous interpretation of the public role of the Athenaeum would not undermine the institution itself.

Whatever the full nature of the conflict of philosophies, by the end of 1889 the situation seems to have taken a turn for the worse. In the 1889 annual report of the Committee for the Examination of the Library given in February 1890, Cutter received a rather severe censure. Since the innovation of Cutter's new charging system in 1878, this committee had had comparatively little to do. Circulation records arranged by the call numbers of books had made the annual recall of books unnecessary, and the work of the committee consisted in simply following an attendant around to check the various alcoves with the records at hand. The 1888 annual report had suggested that the work of the committee was not a popular assignment.

\(^1\)Cutter's 1880 suggestion for a cooperative acquisitions policy with other Boston area libraries seems never to have materialized or at least by 1890 was defunct. He reported, "But the fact remains that the three great libraries and five or six important special libraries clustered around the Massachusetts State House, make practically no effort to avoid duplication." Editorial, _LJ_, XV (February, 1890), 36.
This committee annually consists of twelve proprietors, but it is well known that the co-operation of the majority of them is, as a rule, purely nominal, and it seems only just to record that, during the past year, the most irksome part of the work has been voluntarily assumed by two of its members, Mr. Minns and Mr. James M. Hubbard.¹

During the 1889 examination the approach to the committee's work was altered. First, the committee hired a special auditor to do the "irksome" work of checking the shelves to determine what books had been lost during the year. Second, the committee examined the physical appearance of the books themselves and wrote out an extensive report. They noticed several serials that were incomplete and recommended that they be filled out. They also reported on the conditions of the book bindings and recommended that special attention needed to be paid to that problem. They found "far too many volumes soiled and torn, far too many where the binding needs renewing or repairs, to say nothing of those serial works where completed volumes have stood for years unbound upon our shelves."² By their own count 868 volumes needed repair or rebinding in the delivery room, the reading room gallery and one other room. Using that figure, they extrapolated for the entire collection and estimated that 8,000 volumes in all may have been in such a state of disrepair. They concluded,

¹Annual Report of the Committee on Examination, February 11, 1889.
²Annual Report of the Committee on Examination, February 10, 1890.
That so large a number of books should be at any one time in such a state seems to your Committee to indicate either an unwise economy in the administration, or a want of proper care and oversight on the part of the person in charge of the library. The Committee recommend a greater expenditure and much more vigilant supervision in this direction. ¹

They also suggested a policy of weeding the shelves, in order to get rid of valueless items such as school books.

Such a report could not help but to trouble Cutter in his role as librarian. He himself had made extensive recommendations concerning binding ten years earlier, but the concern with other matters had pushed the matter into the background. At the same time, it was probably true that Cutter was much less interested in the physical appearance of the books than in other matters of administration. The matter only served to show how far apart the librarian and the trustees had moved in the consideration of what was important in judging what was a 'good' library.

A year later the same sort of a report was again presented by the Committee on Examination, this time chaired by Barrett Wendell. They recommended that attention to binding be continued and that the volume of book requests of proprietors be especially consulted by the Library Committee. They also, however, came down hard on the classification that Cutter had made for the library.

The committee is of the opinion that the subdivision of classes in the new arrangement of the library has been carried so far as to be in some respects confusing. It recommends that in the classification of those parts

¹ Ibid.
of the library not yet rearranged, subdivision of classes be restrained as far as possible.1

As far as it is recorded those are the only two years of Cutter's tenure that the Committee on Examination produced reports on the overall administration of the library. Their recommendations in the matter of binding resulted in an extensive rebinding program that cost several hundred dollars beyond what was ordinarily spent for that item. It is unlikely, however, that they affected the classification, as it was already nearing the final stages. Besides, to alter the minuteness of the subdivisions would have made necessary a major overhaul of the classification itself.

Meanwhile, Cutter was turning more and more to his activities outside the Athenaeum in order to express his philosophy of librarianship. He busied himself in working out still a different classification system, publishing the first six parts of his Expansive Classification between 1891 and 1893. He helped to founded and became the first president of the Massachusetts Library Club in 1890.2 Within the American Library Association he became more vocal upon the subject of the relationship of the trustees of a library to their librarian. In his Nation report of the 1890

---

1Annual Report of the Committee on Examination, February 9, 1891.
2The original organizational meeting of the Massachusetts Library Club is described in "State Library Associations," LJ, XVI (January, 1891), 19.
American Library Association meeting he supported wholeheartedly the move to establish a trustees section in the Association. It would not only help to gain trustees' support of the Association's bibliographical ventures, but would also help to convince libraries to send their librarians to the annual meetings. A more important purpose of the section, however, was to provide an education for trustees in library economy.

We said, when the Library School was established, that it would be worth while to have a school for trustees as well as for librarians and their assistants. The ignorance of trustees about library matters is necessarily great. When appointed, they generally know absolutely nothing of library management, and sometimes very little of literature; and yet, because they have been elected by the town meeting or appointed by the City Council, and have the power, they at once feel themselves qualified to decide everything. If they are wise enough to secure a competent librarian and let him run the library under criticism, not as to details, but as to results, perhaps the less they know the better; for sometimes a little knowledge in a trustee is a dangerous thing. Competent librarians are not always to be had, though, thanks to the Library Association, and especially to the Library School, they are becoming more common. To select a librarian well, however, requires some knowledge of library affairs, and at least the feeling that the selection is a serious matter, and not to be governed by party association, or personal friendship, or charitable feeling. Then there are broad questions of management on which the best librarian may be glad to have advice. Whatever, then, interests trustees in the science of the library, enlarges their views of its possibilities, and familiarizes them with the questions under discussion, will be in the end a great gain; and this will be the effect of the new movement.¹

The above comments were, of course, especially applicable to a public institution. Cutter's primary interest,

¹C. A. Cutter, "Librarians in Convention," Nation, LI (October 9, 1890), 282.
however, was in expressing the librarian's plight in the face of trustee control. In his presidential address to the second meeting of the Massachusetts Library Club in January 1891 he generalized about one's philosophy of librarianship and the reason why a local professional association could be useful. He surmised that librarians came to a professional meeting from a selfish motive that had an altruistic end. That is, they wanted to make their own libraries the best in the country. They wanted to achieve the greatest economy of operation in order to arrive at the greatest ends. Reality indicated, however, that on the one hand librarians did not always have enough money to do so, and even if they did, they could not always get their own way in its use. If on the other hand what a librarian was doing was unwise, the interaction of a professional meeting could help him correct his methods.¹

Finally, in January 1892 Cutter editorialized in the Library Journal even more explicitly on the issue of the proper roles of librarians and trustees. He wrote ostensibly on the situation that had developed at the Boston Public Library where for eighteen months the library had been run by the trustees without a chief librarian. His comments, however, are reminiscent of his own views in his letter of acceptance to his own post in 1868. He stated that if the delay meant that they were carefully searching for,

¹Cutter's remarks are summarized in, "Massachusetts Library Club," [Report of the 2d Meeting], LJ, XVI (February, 1891), 47.
a competent man to whom a certain latitude of action shall be left, and who shall be judged by results, but not hampered in detail ..., there may be some reason in the demand; but if it only looks to the appointment of a head clerk with a high salary, tied down by rules which take away all authority, unable to do anything without asking permission; if the library is still to be run by one of the trustees, as in the last librarianship, it is not easy to see what is gained.

A librarian, to be of much use, should be fully, and without restriction, the executive officer of the library; he should have practically, if not in name, the power of appointing and dismissing his assistants. He should have large discretionary powers in the interpretation and application of the regulations of the library; his advice should be sought and considered in regard to its policy; he should be in fact its manager. And if, after fair trial, he proves unable to make the library a success, either through ignorance, indifference, indolence, irascibility, an illiberal spirit, ill-judged measures, or other incompetence, he should be asked to resign and a better man chosen in his place. In truth, the chief office of trustees is to choose a librarian and watch over him—not themselves to manage the library, but to see that he so manages it that it produces the greatest possible amount of good.1

If Cutter's words seemed like a challenge to the Athenaeum's trustees, they were not long in acting on them. In February they referred the question of the appointment of a librarian to the Library Committee.2 That action by itself was significant. The election of the librarian at the Athenaeum had always been an annual affair, but for twenty-three years it had been a pro forma matter, usually accomplished by the time of the annual meeting of the proprietors in February.3 The trustees had simply re-elected

1 Editorial, LJ, XVII (January, 1892), 3-4.

2 Records of the Trustees, February 15, 1892.

3 The annual meeting was held in January through 1881 and in February thereafter. That a question was raised at this late point suggests that some hurried, perhaps less than deliberate actions, were being taken.
Cutter without any questions being raised about searching for a librarian. Cutter confided to Melvil Dewey the seriousness of the problem.

Strained relations between me and my trustees are reaching a point at which it may be more comfortable for me to be somewhere else. You have I know not been unwilling to say a good word for me in times past. Will you again bear me in mind when you [missing word] of boards seeking an experienced and not unindustrious librarian.

Keep this to yourself for the present, unless you have occasion to suggest my name to some. Nothing may come of the present disagreement.1

Indeed, the problem was solved for the present. The Library Committee finally recommended in March that Cutter be re-elected and the trustees approved their report unanimously. But for Cutter the situation had become too severe. Within a week of his re-election he again wrote to Dewey that he was looking for another position. "My election this year (for the 24th time) was unanimous but I shall not be a candidate for another year."2

Dewey's reaction to Cutter's situation took the form of a proposal. He had already been in correspondence with William Rainey Harper, the president of the newly formed University of Chicago, concerning Harper's desire that Dewey come to the University in order to head the libraries and establish his library school there. Their talks had broken down by the end of January 1892 when Dewey withdrew his

1Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, February 24, 1892, CUL, M. Dewey Papers.

2Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, March 27, 1892, CUL, M. Dewey Papers; Records of the Trustees, March 21, 1892.
initial positive enthusiasm. Harper persisted, and during February and March, Dewey claimed to be reconsidering the offer.¹

In a move that had other overtones of a more involved nature, Dewey wrote to Cutter in the beginning of April about an alternative plan.² He spoke to Cutter of the Chicago situation and although he noted that he had no authority for his proposal, asked Cutter whether he would consider joining him at the new university as the university librarian. Dewey himself would be the head of the entire university library system. His proposal carried with it two explicit conditions, however. First, although Cutter would oversee the day-to-day operations of the library, Dewey, as his superior, would be involved in all policy decisions. Dewey suggested that that would present little difficulty for he felt that their ideas were so alike they could easily work together. Second, only the Decimal Classification could be used and promoted, a matter Dewey

¹The negotiations between Dewey and Harper are contained in the correspondence between them and can be found in the CUL, M. Dewey Papers and in the Presidents' Papers (Harper) at the University of Chicago. Dewey at first seemed very enthusiastic but by the end of January was attempting to withdraw from his tacit agreement by claiming that New York was not easy to leave and by demanding a salary greater than the one originally offered.

²The other overtones had to do with a conflict between Dewey and Cutter (with Justin Winsor) over the rewriting of the A. L. A. constitution and the purpose of the Association. For its implications, see ahead, Ch. VIII, pp. For the details of his alternative proposal, see Letter, M. Dewey to Cutter, April 6, 1892 (Letterbook copy], CUL, M. Dewey Papers.
thought absolutely necessary for making Chicago "the library center of the world."¹

Cutter responded to Dewey's request for a frank reply in two short notes a week apart, each of which bore evidence of his cautiousness. In the first, written immediately upon receipt of Dewey's proposal, he asked for time to consider it. He assured Dewey that he would be willing to work with the Decimal Classification, although he thought his own to be better. He also expressed his feeling that they could indeed work together despite their differences. In the second note, Cutter responded at somewhat greater length, but in even more measured tones. He spoke of his desire to do more work on the Athenaeum's classification. He claimed that he would leave the Athenaeum immediately for a very good position, but he felt that Dewey's Chicago proposal had some bad features as well. He also added what he would expect in the way of a salary, that is, $5,000 a year inasmuch as living in Chicago was more expensive and he would have to give up the editorship of the Library Journal.²

In the end the grand scheme failed to materialize and any chance for Cutter to have come to the University of Chicago vanished. One possible reason was that Dewey seems not to have been convinced about going to Chicago in the

¹Ibid.

²Letters, Cutter to M. Dewey, April 8 and 14, 1892, CUL, M. Dewey Papers.
first place and his letters to Harper suggest that his reconsideration was not serious. He could have suggested to Harper at an early point that Cutter be considered in his place. In fact, Charles C. Soule, an acquaintance of both Dewey and Cutter, had suggested to Dewey as early as March 29 that he do just that, if he [Dewey] did not want the position. But Dewey did so only in May when he wrote to Harper and very explicitly made known his intentions to remain in New York. He did at that time, however, recommend Cutter highly, stating that he was "one of the best and most famous librarians in America." Others also wrote to Harper on Cutter's behalf and Dewey himself reiterated his recommendation of Cutter to Harper in both June and August. But Harper, apparently having become disenchanted with Dewey, showed no further interest in Dewey's ideas or recommendations and turned to a local person for the position.

It is probably quite certain that in the succeeding months Cutter let the trustees know of his impending action. In October 1892 they raised the question of who would be

---

1 It should be noted that although Dewey's letters to Harper convey the attitude mentioned, Cutter's letters to Dewey show that he received quite an opposite impression.


3 Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, May 5, 1892, CUL, M. Dewey Papers, in which Cutter mentions that Soule and Samuel S. Green (Worcester) were the other two correspondents on his behalf. See also Dewey's letters to Harper, June 3 and August 8, 1892, Presidents' Papers (Harper), University of Chicago, in which he reiterated Cutter's qualifications.
elected librarian and directed the Library Committee to again report on the matter. The following February Cutter announced his decision to decline and it was determined that he would remain until the end of April when the new candidate, William C. Lane, Harvard's assistant librarian, would take over.\footnote{Records of the Trustees, October 17, 1892, February 20, 1893.}

Cutter's decision was accepted by the trustees with little recorded comment. It could hardly have been otherwise, of course, for Cutter's decision was final, considering the circumstances of the previous months. The matter struck at least one of Cutter's close friends as a tragedy. In the February issue of the \textit{Library Journal}, Richard R. Bowker inserted a signed editorial in which he took the trustees to task and made known Cutter's need for another position.

The \textit{Journal} announces elsewhere the resignation from the Boston Athenaeum of Mr. C. A. Cutter, whose association with that library during the present library generation has made the name of the library and the name of its librarian almost convertible terms. His retirement emphasizes the change which has come over library affairs in Boston since the start of the American Library Association and the \textit{Library Journal}. . . It is to be regretted that the willingness of the trustees of the Boston Athenaeum to accept the resignation of this veteran librarian--veteran, not in years, but in service--emphasizes a weakness which the library profession shares with the ministerial calling--a willingness to let tried servants go after long years of service, because of what are commonly known as "differences in the congregation.". . . It is the intention of our associate to spend some time in a well-earned vacation abroad and not to resume library work until the fall. That library will be fortunate which secures his services, for his
name is to the library calling a synonym of scholarship and effective administration; but there are few libraries adequate to provide sufficient field for Mr. Cutter's great knowledge and ability.  

Cutter responded to the editorial with a note to Bowker that had he been consulted he would have advised against printing it, "but if anything was to be printed it couldn't have been put more neatly."  

Others, however, found the editorial to be disconcerting. For Dewey, who was the current president of the American Library Association, the editorial only served to emphasize that one of the Association's top librarians had come to loggerheads with his trustees over the issue of control. In reality, Cutter's case was not that unusual. Other librarians were regularly experiencing the same difficulties, and even one so renowned as William F. Poole was currently involved in a similar problem.  

Coming as it did, the editorial did little to help the Association in its conscious drive to enlist the support of trustees in the library movement. Accordingly, Dewey sent a circular letter to various librarians concerning whether or not the new trustees section of the Association should meet with the librarians at the upcoming annual meeting to be held at the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in the summer. Justin Winsor replied to the query sternly:

1R. R. Bowker, Editorial, LJ, XVIII (February, 1893), 35.  
2Letter, Cutter to R. R. Bowker, February 21, 1893, NYPL, Bowker Papers.  
3Williamson, William Frederick Poole, pp. 161-81.
It is a ticklish business, and I am not wise enough in the [service] of such things to have very definite ideas of what is best. Such articles as Bowker wrote in the last Library Journal about Cutter leaving the Boston Athenæum will do more mischief than a score of conversations can patch up. Bowker ought not to have [delivered] himself in such a way on what he would call, I suppose, "general principles." No one could write a proper notice for such an event without full knowledge and I know no way in which Bowker cd have had full knowledge. Cutters record can take care of itself. It would have been well to let that of the trustees be equally free from gratuitous imputations.¹

With regard to Cutter's specific situation, Winsor wrote to Poole in Chicago,

Cutter needs sympathy to help him get another place, for I fear if enquiry is made about him of the Athenæum trustees, a recital of their experiences, as they would put it, would not strike the ear pleasantly. Cutter would be entitled to tell his story, and it is to be hoped it will help him. He wants, as I understand, a place in the autumn. He goes abroad for a short run about May 1. I thought Bowker's paragraph in the Library Journal an unfortunate one, in as much as there was the best possible opportunity in Cutters behalf of saying nothing. Bowker simply told everybody that the trustees got rid of their librarian for incompatibility. The question every one will ask is what is this incompatibility which made a large board of trustees a unit.²

The decision to leave the Athenæum having been set, Cutter needed to put matters in order before he left, find another position, and finish the various other professional projects that he had been involved in. Letters of sympathy came in abundance, not a few of them suggesting other places he might consider. Dewey suggested first that the Boston Public Library might be a possibility. But Cutter discounted

²Letter, J. Winsor to W. F. Poole, March 20, 1893, Newberry Library, Poole Papers.
the idea with the suggestion that if they had wanted him
they would have already contacted him. Besides, he wrote,
"I shd have preferred Crerar to any now possible because
I'd rather have a learned libry than a city libry. But
beggars must not be choosers."\(^1\) Bowker's suggestion was
for the Lenox Library in New York City, but Cutter dis-
counted that suggestion also, not only because he thought
his bibliographical acumen not quite up to the qualifica-
tions needed, but also because of the same conflict of li-
brary philosophy that had caused his leaving the Athenaeum.

I want to make books useful to the greatest possible
number. If my Trustees couldn't stand that at the Athe-
naeum how would the Lenox trustees like it. I haven't
the slightest sympathy with the spirit that made Mr.
Lenox send word to Henry Ward Beecher who wanted to
consult one of his treasures that he didn't know Mr.
Beecher. I don't think I could stand a library founded
and carried on in such a spirit.\(^2\)

Dewey also suggested that he make application for
the Newberry Library in Chicago but with Poole still there
Cutter would do nothing to jeopardize the older man's posi-
tion, even though Poole himself was in administrative dif-
ficulty. Poole and his assistant, Charles Alexander Nelson,
together decided that either the Crerar or the University
of Chicago libraries would be the best place. Nelson com-
municated the idea to Cutter and Cutter thought it a good

---

\(1\) Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, February 27 \([1893]\),
CUL, M. Dewey Papers. The year is not indicated on the
letter, but the context strongly supports 1893.

\(2\) Letter, Cutter to R. R. Bowker, March 2, 1893,
NYPL, Bowker Papers.
idea, especially the Crerar. The Crerar legacy which had recently been settled made that proposed library something of a plum. It was talked of in the professional library circles and many men aspired to the position. For the library scene as a whole, several of the largest libraries needed librarians during the years 1893 and 1894, producing an atmosphere of hopeful opportunity for many of the more energetic and aspiring librarians to move up. These libraries included the Crerar, the Newberry, the University of Chicago, the Tilden trust in New York City, and the proposed Forbes Library in Northampton, Massachusetts.

For Cutter, however, all of the hopeful suggestions produced little solid results. He wound up his work at the Athenaeum and in an effort to get a rest traveled to Europe for the months of May and June 1893. He had already made several commitments for the summer meeting of the American Library Association, and he had to make arrangements for those. He had fortunately completed his work on the catalog exhibit in February. For that project he partially displayed his new Expansive Classification. Of the papers he had promised to deliver in the summer he withdrew from the one on cataloging and classification and the work was done instead by his successor at the Athenaeum, William C. Lane.

1Letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, March 1, 1893, CUL, M. Dewey Papers; Letter, Cutter to R. R. Bowker, March 2, 1893, NYPL, Bowker Papers, in which Cutter related the action of Nelson and Poole.

2A notice of his plans appeared in, "Librarians," LJ, XVIII (February, 1893), 60.
He reconsidered another paper—on the subject of proprietary libraries—that he at first asked Dewey to be released from and wrote it hurriedly before he left for Europe.\(^1\) In the short summary of his thoughts he portrayed the relationship between proprietary libraries and public libraries as that of a matter of cooperation and emphasis in the total library resources of the nation. Proprietary libraries had been parent to the public institution but in the process of the growth of the library movement had often been absorbed by public libraries. But where the proprietary library was strong enough to survive, it was good to have both institutions. The proprietary library could serve scholarly needs that the public institution could not. In doing so, however, he suggested that the proprietary library needed to see itself as a branch of the whole public library system. That would be its necessary rationale for existence.\(^2\)

Cutter prepared enough material for the *Library Journal* to care for the April and most of the May issues and left the editing in Bowker's hands. He had already decided by the time of his return in the beginning of July, however, to return to Europe after the summer meeting of the Association.\(^3\) At the end of the summer, therefore, he regretfully

---

\(^1\) On his preparation of papers for the summer A. L. A. see letter, Cutter to M. Dewey, March 7 and 8, and April 23, 1893, CUL, M. Dewey Papers.


\(^3\) Letters, Cutter to R. K. Bowker, March 6 and August 4, 1893, NYPL, Bowker Papers.
relinquished the editorship of the periodical that he had held since January 1881. With his business cared for he set sail for England in October 1893 with no other position in hand and not knowing for sure when he might return.