UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

THE PROFITABILITY OF PROGRESSIVE THEOLOGY PUBLISHING IN LATE NINETEENTH-CENTURY SCOTLAND AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE EXPERIENCE OF T. & T. CLARK OF EDINBURGH IN THE 1880s AND 1890s

JOHN A. H. DEMPSTER

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SCIENCE

PhD

1987

Volume One

ABSTRACT

This study assesses the profitability of one particular Scottish theological publishing firm, T. & T. Clark, in the 1880s and 1890s. Its major concern is to investigate the tension which exists in any 'committed' publishing business between the profit motive, and the desire to further the cause espoused by the firm. Did considerations of profitability significantly influence the theological stance of material issued? Or, in the interests of furthering a theological position, was the profit motive kept in second place as far as was consistent with the continuance of the firm? Or, in reality, was there a complicated interplay between these two positions?

After a general survey which charts the history of the firm and attempts to assess the partners' motivation, there follows a highly detailed examination of the relative profitability of the different types and forms of publication handled by the Clarks: series publishing, translations, works of transatlantic origin, reference works requiring major investment, and general theological works. There follows an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the firm's promotional strategy and distribution, and an examination of the profitability of the Clarks' operations as a whole for the four financial years beginning 1895-96. There are several appendices, one of which features a biographical study of Dr James Hastings, editor of the Dictionary of the Bible and the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

The conclusion is reached that there was indeed a complex interplay between motives spiritual and motives financial: the Clarks' decision to publish moderately 'advanced' theology was not primarily determined by financial considerations, but by their commitment to

promulgating the truth as they saw it. This commitment was not opportunistic lip-service: they were frequently prepared to hazard investment on works of doubtful profitability because they considered them to be of theological value. However, the works they published were in general modestly if not spectacularly profitable, and the future growth of the business was assured. Had you put it to one of the principals that his firm seemed to be a living denial of Christ's asseveration that one cannot serve both God and mammon, he would probably have retorted that he was serving God and God alone, and that any financial success which accrued was to be interpreted as being a reward for faithful service.

Preface

There are several good reasons for examining the activities of T. & T. Clark in the nineteenth century. In the first place, it is always interesting to investigate the motivation lying behind the activities of religious publishers, the balance between motives spiritual and motives temporal. The Clark archives in the National Library of Scotland, the chief source for this study, provide a considerable amount of data which facilitate such an investigation. In the second place, the significance of T. & T. Clark as publishers has possibly been under-appreciated. The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics in particular is a major undertaking, perhaps ranking second only to the Encyclopaedia Britannica as the most significant, sustained achievement in Scottish publishing history. The present study examines the firm's growth towards the point where the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics became possible, both financially possible, and possible in terms of the Clarks' sense of vision and confidence in their own abilities and those of their editor. In the third place, while work has been done on several of the other publishing dynasties in nineteenth century Scotland - the Blacks, the Blackies, the Collinses - the dynasty of Clarks, no less competent, no less dynamic, no less socially involved, has been neglected. This present study redresses the balance.

I am very grateful to all those who, in various ways, have helped in the preparation of this thesis.

To Mr T.G.R.D. Clark of T. & T. Clark for his interest in the project, and for giving permission to use the firm's archives.

To the staff of the manuscript room of the National Library of Scotland for their unfailing help.

To all those who supplied specific pieces of information in response to my queries : Alice Langdaon of Edinburgh University Library; M.E. Townley, research assistant at the National Library of Scotland; Joyce M. Barrie of New College Library.

To those who helped in the preparation of the biographical study of Dr James Hastings: Angus Howat (formerly librarian at Elgin Public Library); Myrtle Anderson-Smith of the Special Collections Department at Aberdeen University Library; Stuart Mitchell, Assistant Headmaster of Hamilton College School; Dr James Wood and Professor David Cairns of Aberdeen; Dr C.S. Rodd (Editor of the Expository Times); Mrs Mildred Kirkcaldy (Sir William Robertson Nicoll's daughter) whom I interviewed at Auchterarder in May 1983; the Rev. Alasdair I.MacLeod of the Free Church Manse, Muir of Ord, who gave me permission to make use of his unpublished paper James Hastings and the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics; Trude Levi of the Mocatta Library, University College, London.

To the former staff at the Department of Information Science, University of Strathclyde who have been involved in the project: Dr. Graham Jones, who was my supervisor until his retirement; Miss Antonia Bunch, who succeeded him, and whose passion for semantic precision equals, if it does not exceed my own; the former Professor of Librarianship, W.E. Tyler, without whose encouragement I would never have begun.

On a personal level, thanks are due:

To my parents, as always, for their enthusiasm and support.

To my 'vaguely designated' aunt, Marion Brown, who, together with her husband John until his death, accommodated me in Edinburgh while I was researching there.

To Pam Rice and Mrs Dyson, who helped with the typing of the final text.

To all my friends - especially Liam and Christine Goligher, Tom and Elspeth Sargent, David and Karen Woodhouse, and Alison Hendrie - who have helped in so many ways during the prolonged gestation of this sprawling progeny.

J.A.H.D. 22 July 1986

Structure

List of Tables

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

A considerable proportion of the large number of books published in Scotland between 1801 and 1900 were on religious or theological subjects. The publishing houses responsible for these issues differed in aim, size, and specialisation; they can, however, be roughly categorised as follows. Some were businesses which entered the trade with the exclusive, or almost exclusive aim of publishing religious works: such were the firms of Collins, Blackie and Nelson. All of these, of course, later diversified into other areas of publishing. Others, such as Blackwood, were major general houses which established and maintained theological lists. Still others were predominantly local publishers, such as Alexander Gardner of Paisley, whose output included volumes of sermons and other religious material of local origin. Works were also issued by para-church organisations formed for the purpose of originating and distributing religious literature: such was the Religious Tract Society of Scotland and, later in the century, the Stirling Tract Enterprise. Finally, the Scottish denominations were all responsible for a limited amount of publishing: in the case of highly-centralised Churches such as the Church of Scotland, this was organised through Publications Committees answerable to the annual denominational Assembly; while in the case of decentralised groupings such as the Plymouth Brethren, the literary requirements of the denomination were met by privately established publishing businesses.[1] In a sense, the subject of the present study, T. & T. Clark does not fall into any of the above categories. The founder set up business as a bookseller and legal publisher, but he quickly diversified into the field of issuing theological works.

Unlike Blackie and Nelson, however, T. & T. Clark issued few works of a popular nature, concentrating instead on scholarly and academic theology. This single-minded commitment established the business over the years as the chief theological publishing firm in Scotland, which excelled the rest in the range and variety of material issued.

Two general observations can be made about this proliferation of publishing houses. In the first place, several of the most durable nineteenth centry firms were founded in the wake of the evangelical revival which had widespread effect at the start of the century. To the founders of these firms the desire to further this revival, and to meet adequately the literary requirements of those who had been spiritually awakened was it seems at least as important a motive as the accumulation of wealth.[2] An orthodox Christian faith, based on a traditional view of Biblical authority was a vital element in the lives of the founding fathers of the dynasties of Blackie, Nelson and Collins, and other similar firms, and this faith clearly had important implications for the kind of material which would appear in these firms' lists. The second general observation is that, while some of the firms springing from the revival rose, flourished and fell within a generation, several, due to visionary management, and a readiness to diversify, proved to have a remarkable longevity, surviving into the twentieth century.

The religious publishers of 1900 were servicing a very different marketplace than that which their counterparts of a hundred years earlier had known. It therefore follows from the mere fact of its survival that a firm founded in the first two decades of the nineteenth century which survived until 1900 had successfully contended

with, and adapted to these changes in the market. The altered conditions can be summed up in two propositions. In the first place, the orthodox view of biblical authority was increasingly questioned by scholars, and this questioning led to the market requiring material which had vastly different theological presuppositions than those which had obtained previously. At the start of the century, it would seem that apart from some scholars in Germany and elsewhere who were regarded as theological mavericks, the Bible was still held to be the inerrant and authoritative Word of God, the touchstone against which all theological constructs had to be tested. By the end of the century, the scholars were bringing the methods of what was known as the Higher Criticism to bear upon the biblical texts, emphasising the human-ness of their authors, and coming to regard the Bible as a vehicle through which God was pleased to speak, rather than a wholly inspired work. This new understanding of the status of the Bible had a considerable impact also on theology, encouraging the questioning of the old orthodoxy. In the second place, in the popular market place, there was a turning from the works of religious teaching and Puritan theology which were widely read at the beginning of the century towards the 'religious novels' which proliferated towards its close. This fact may well not be unrelated to the first proposition. It clearly takes time for scholarly attitudes to percolate downwards and influence the lay Christian, but there may be an element of cause and effect between on the one hand, the abandonment by many scholars of a full doctrine of biblical inspiration, and, on the other, this *turning from* popular theological reading towards the religious novel. Or again, it could simply be that both changes took place side by side in a general atmosphere of increasing scepticism. In any case,

the changing attitudes summed up in these two propositions would have had a great effect on the market for books. Hence there was, throughout the century, a declining demand for theological works. And hence the proportion of that demand which could be satisfied by works of a more orthodox nature also declined. Of the areas of publishing mentioned earlier, only the para-church organisations and the denominational publishers were relatively unscathed, denominational houses responding to the expressed needs of the Church to which they were affiliated which provided a guaranteed market, the para-church organisations supplying materials to promote social and spiritual change, the demand for which continued throughout the century unaffected by developments in the thinking of academic theologians.

If publishing were merely a matter of maximising profit, then we would have no difficulty in explaining how the firms mentioned earlier survived from their foundation at the time of the evangelical revival into the next century. We would have explained this survival in terms of the principals' management skill in responding to the changing demands of the market, and attempting to foresee future trends. But it is not as simple as that. We saw that some of these firms owed their existence in part to the motivating faith and missionary zeal of the founders, a faith and zeal directed and undergirded by an orthodox view of the Bible. True, by the end of the century, a second or third generation was at the helm of these firms, but, while the founder's fire and zealousness might not have been passed on, the successors were in many cases also men of faith who, in their publishing, held a sense of mission in tension with the demands of profitability. How did these men react to the output of

the scholars? Did they face a crisis of conscience because they were expected to publish material arising from a methodology whose presuppositions were foreign to them? Religious publishers were more committed than most to the position espoused by their publications. And while on the one hand the new ideas gained ascendancy within a working lifetime, thus demanding a professional response from a given publisher, on the other it must not be thought that they were universally accepted. As late as 1850, the main Protestant denominations in Scotland held to the orthodox position.[3] The advance of the new thinking, which was initially propagated in Scotland by Free Church scholars, can be charted by examining attitudes at the trials for heresy of William Robertson Smith between 1876 and 1881 (Smith was deposed from his position as a Free Church College Lecturer) and of Marcus Dods and A.B. Bruce in 1890 (the Assembly felt that there was no real case against either).[4]

A.C. Cheyne claims that as the century drew to a close, the new theology was 'appropriated' and 'proclaimed' by increasing numbers of ordinary ministers who came to see that literary and historical criticism were '<u>not</u> incompatible with loyalty to the Bible as the inspired Word of God and with a sincere adherence to the historic faith of the Church.'[5] But this view, that the Bible contained records of revelation rather than itself being revelation was by no means universally held by Scottish Christians. Whatever the scholars were thinking there were many, perhaps including publishers, who were reluctant to abandon the traditional position.

It is possible, therefore, that some publishers did face a crisis of conscience over the issue. There could be no such crisis for the

publisher of popular works, no matter how conservative his views, for the 'common reader', although switching as we have seen from a pabulum of Puritan theology to one of fiction and devotional texts, was reading works which by their nature were not directly affected by critical thinking. It is easy to conceive, however, that the publisher of serious theology might have experienced some agony of spirit, and indeed there is the occasional hint of this in the letter books of the various companies. Consider the possibilities. A publisher who was not in accord with the new approach of the scholars, and whose open-mindedness fell short of allowing him to publish with an easy conscience works with the methodology of which he had such fundamental differences, would be faced with the option of compromising his position, or else resting content with serving the diminishing market for conservative works as cost-effectively as possible. On the other hand, a publisher who saw where the scholars were going and wanted to further their views would have no scruples about publishing their works. These he would welcome to his list both on account of their contribution to the current debate, and because they would help to build up a valuable backlist which would turn over well in a theological climate where the new views had found general acceptance. He would still, it is true, leaven his lists with titles written from the old orthodox standpoint, both because of their inherent value, and because he would not wish to encourage the perception, which might affect sales and hence profits, that his was a radically progressive company. If he were publishing works for scholars, he would have few scruples about issuing titles of an advanced nature; he might well be cautious about issuing popular works containing advanced ideas, not wishing to threaten the faith

of those who did not have the theological training to marry their faith with the new ideas.

It would be extremely interesting if we had the data which would enable us to assess the thinking of some of the nineteenth century publishers with regard to their role, with regard to the delicate and complex balance between serving God and mammon, with regard to the far-reaching changes in attitudes to theology and biblical studies. How did they react to the changes? What motivated that reaction? Profitability? Or commitment to their view of truth? How did their company survive in the new climate? Which works were most profitable: those which supported the conservative position, or those representing the new theology? How successful could a theological house be in the decades of change? Could a firm's relative profitability or unprofitability be explained in terms of the theological position of the works on its list?

Very little work would appear to have been done in this area. But in the case of one firm, T. & T. Clark, we have enough data from the 1880s and 1890s to enable us at least to attempt to answer these and related questions. The chief evidence on motivation is drawn from the letter books, and from the mere fact of the kind of list which was developed by the firm. The evidence on profitability is extracted from the account books. As well as discussing issues of motivation and profitability, we will be able to construct a detailed picture of the ways of working of a small publishing firm at the end of the nineteenth century.

This study has at least two limitations. In the first place, it examines just one firm. Certain of the conclusions we reach may be

applied to other houses and to Scottish religious publishing in general, but there is a definite limit to the extent to which we are justified in doing this. In the second place, we can never claim that, without a shadow of doubt, we have isolated and described the motivation of these publishers of a century ago. For if it is never easy to know our own motives, let alone those of our friends, how much more complex it is to attempt to assign motive on the basis of limited evidence from the past. A publisher might claim to be serving God rather than mammon while all the time being totally controlled, perhaps subconsciously, by commercial motives. For serving God can sometimes be materially profitable, and even the best of motives are rarely unalloyed. However, our aim is to assess the Clarks' motivation as far as the extant data permits and to judge what impact their reaction to the work of the scholars had upon the profitability of the firm.

PART I : Background

PART I

Section A: T. & T.Clark - an outline of the firm's nineteenth century history and issues

1. 1821 - 1846

a) History

It would appear from the meagre sources which have bearing on this period of the firm's history that Thomas Clark founded his business in 1821.[1] He was then 22, and his previous experience included an apprenticeship served with David Brown of Edinburgh, and some years on the staff of Joseph Butterworth, a law bookseller of Fleet Street, London.[2] It is not surprising that the bookselling and publishing concern which he established in Parliament Square, Edinburgh, appears initially to have concentrated on issuing legal works.

Following the destruction by fire of these premises in 1823, Clark moved, first to 32 George Street and, a few years later, to 38 George Street[3] from where the business was to be conducted until the end of the century.[4] As well as his specialisation in legal works, Clark would appear to have cultivated an interest in foreign literature which led to his making several business visits to France, Holland and Germany[5] in the course of which he added to his knowledge of European literature and the European book market, and made the acquaintance of the leading booksellers in each country. This knowledge and these contacts he seems to have put to good use in importing foreign editions for sale in his Edinburgh shop, and issuing English translations of notable works, especially in the theological field.

The firm did not receive its present designation until 1846, when the founder's nephew, another Thomas Clark (1823-1900), was received into partnership, having completed his term of apprenticeship and having

spent some time working for the wholesalers Hamilton, Adams and Co. in London.[6] The younger Thomas Clark immediately began to make his mark and show his competence, and some years later his uncle left him responsible for the practical management of the firm, and retired to Heath Park, Blairgowrie, where he lived until his death on 22 December 1865.[7]

b) Issues

Due to lack of evidence, it is difficult to build up a picture of the development of Thomas Clark's business in its early years. Two trends can, however, be noted. There was, firstly, an increasing specialisation: although it began as a bookselling and publishing firm, the publishing side of the business came to assume increasing importance. And secondly, there was a change of emphasis: initially the stress was on legal works, but gradually theology came to dominate the list, as it was to do in the latter part of the century. This change of emphasis was noted by James Thin who, writing of the 1830s, described the founder[8] as 'beginning to develop a theological as well as law business in the publication of a series called the 'Biblical Cabinet''.

The Biblical Cabinet began to appear in 1832 with a volume of J.A. Ernesti's Principles of Biblical Interpretation of the New Testament being issued, together with a volume of Dr John Brown's Philological Tracts. Between 1832 and 1844, thirty works were issued, completing the Biblical Cabinet in forty-five volumes. The series consisted for the most part of translations of German commentaries and theological works. It is a tribute to the acumen of the founder that the majority of works in the Cabinet still featured in the firm's lists

in 1889 (in some cases having been re-translated).

The 1830s saw the issue by Clark of two other, not exclusively religious series, The Cabinet Library of Scarce and Celebrated Tracts, and The Student's Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts. His aim in issuing these, as stated in the 1838 Catalogue, was

> to publish a selection of the most useful, interesting and celebrated tracts ... The publisher proposes to confine them to no particular class of literature, and to exclude nothing that can fairly come within the designation either of polite letters or useful knowledge; and hopes thus to present a series of cheap publications, which will interest the Antiquarian, the Theologian, the Philosopher and the Scholar.

By 1838 there had been eleven issues in the first of these series, and thirty in the second, these thirty also being available collected in bound volumes.

Clark also issued some miscellaneous titles: editions of the classics, philosophical works, and a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament,[9] a fore-runner of the great works of reference which the firm was to issue at the end of the century. There was also a collection of children's books translated from the German of Christophe Von Schmidt. Schmidt (1768-1854) is perhaps best remembered for his Das Blumenkörbohen (The Basket of Flowers) which first appeared in 1823, and which Clark issued in translation. This work 'became the archetypal Sunday School book after its translation in 1833 .... It was one of the most popular Reward Books throughout the 19th cent.'[10] Clark was not the only publisher to be issuing English translations of the Schmidt works. It is a matter of speculation how financially successful his editions were. But it is interesting that this departure into reward book publishing was not followed up. As many other publishers found, the reward book market was a growing, and increasingly lucrative one throughout the century. Had Clark opted for

this line of development, the future story of the firm might have been very different. Another new departure which was not followed up was the issue of a novel. Little is known about this except that it was unsuccessful. Perhaps this failure is explanation enough as to why the experiment does not seem to have been repeated.[11]

It is worth noting in conclusion, as indicative of the founder's enterprise, that through his firm the first law magazine ever to appear in Scotland, the monthly Law Chronicle, was issued from May 1829. This, however, did not find a market, and was discontinued within five years.[12]

In becoming a partner in 1846, the young Thomas Clark was joining a business which had been built up with considerable originality and enterprise. A firm foundation had been laid, on which the new partner was to build by further developing the publishing side of the business and increasingly majoring on the issue of theological works, especially those of German origin. There is no data on the profitability of the firm in 1846, but if one of the founder's obituarists is to be believed, it was more than merely financially sound. Clark, he felt, was able to retire to the country 'having won, what all booksellers long for and we fear so few obtain, a considerable fortune.'[13] And the first Thomas Clark's will confirms the accuracy of this statement. His total moveable estate was £23,748 16s. 10d., and he also owned property and land. He owned Heath Park, Blairgowrie, a house at Rossness, Kinghorn, property at 38 George Street, Edinburgh, and various other properties at Pettycur and Edinburgh.[14]

2. 1846 - 1886

a) History

Over this forty-year period, the younger Thomas Clark was solely responsible for the consolidation and development of the firm which he joined in 1846. He would appear to have been cast in the same formidable mould as members of the other Scottish publishing dynasties - the Blacks, Blackies, Nelsons and Collinses. Like them he was able, despite heavy business commitments, to find time and energy for involvement in wide-ranging ecclesiastical and civic affairs.

Thomas Clark the younger was born in the burgh of Canongate, Edinburgh on 5 September 1823, and was educated at the High School.[15] It was said of his father, John Clark, that he was 'a man of great business capacity as well as of sincere Christian character'.[16] These were traits which would appear to have been reproduced in his son.

i. Business capacity

With regard to his business capacity, the strength of the Clark list in 1886 is, perhaps, sufficient testimony. Over four decades, 'he had to keep his eye on theology abroad, and on law at home, and anyone who wishes to see how he succeeded has but to look in at 38 George Street, or study the firm's catalogues.'[17] In order to do this, he had to develop an alertness to the requirements of his market, and a discernment as to which new theological writings would be considered to be of lasting merit. The Publishers' Circular attributed his success to the fact that 'he understood the tastes and appreciated the wants of his countrymen, who, almost without exception, are sticklers in theology.'[18]

Clark developed the links with the continent which his uncle had initiated. There are occasional references in the firm's letter-books to his continental visits, and personal friendships with eminent European theologians. But as English language writers both in Britain and in America to some extent seized the initiative from the Germans, so Clark was quick to cultivate relationships with the Unites States, in particular with the firm of Scribner and Welford, later Charles Scribner's Sons. This Edinburgh-New York axis was initiated to meet what Clark saw as an untapped transatlantic market,[19] but its development was both a response and a spur to the new British and American writers. Clark is said to have become the 'fast friend' of the first Charles Scribner.[20]

ii. Christian character

Clark's Christian character was seen by his contemporaries as providing the motivation not only for his church work, but also for his civic duties.

While James Harvey's In Memoriam Sir Thomas Clark is written in the fulsome style typical of such publications, it is valuable in charting the extent of Clark's involvement in church affairs, both at congregational and denominational level. He was associated throughout his life with Lady Glenorchy's Church, Edinburgh, which his father had joined the year before his birth.[21] He superintended the Sunday School, was treasurer of the Sustentation Fund in the congregation, and was noted for his generosity, and for the quality of his pastoral care. He was elected and ordained as deacon at the age of twenty (18 January 1844), and became an elder fourteen years later (28 March 1858). He was also active in the wider Free Church scene, serving on its committees, and supporting its funds and schemes.[22] He was enthusiastically

in favour of the Union of 1900, which he lived long enough to see: 'though in many respects holding by the old positions, he had broad and tolerant views on all questions, and kept an open mind to every new interest.'[23]

All the sources on Clark's public life are almost excessive in their praise for him. There would seem to have been virtually universal recognition that he was a good and just man. In entering public life Clark was following in the footsteps of his father, who had been a magistrate,[24] but James Harvey[25] discerns a religious motivation. Clark was involved in the Edinburgh Merchant Company, serving successively as Assistant, Treasurer and Master, to which position he was elected in 1883 or 1884[26] and re-elected the following year. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, a Curator of the University of Edinburgh, and one of the managers of the Royal Infirmary.[27] He first became officially connected with the Corporation as one of the City Auditors,[28] and in 1877 entered the Town Council representing St. George's Ward. He filled this seat for eleven years, in the course of which he served as Convenor of the Public Health Committee (for four years from 1881), as a Magistrate (from 1883), and as Lord Provost (from 1885). He was associated with a wide range of civic projects, the most spectacular of which was the 1886 Edinburgh International Exhibition, at which he was given his Baronetcy by the Queen.[29] Clark, it was said,[30] claimed to have 'entered upon his work having a high ideal to strive after.' There would seem to have been a general recognition that he had been a successful Lord Provost. The Scottish Leader was said[31] to have been 'expressing the public sentiment' in stating that'Sir Thomas Clark [had] filled with dignity an office that he demits with most honourable credit', and the Scotsman's

obituarist held that 'his name was associated with much good civic work ... as Lord Provost, he filled that high office with dignity, tact and forebearance, and generally managed the affairs of the city with no small amount of success.'

This, then, was the man who presided over the growth of T. & T. Clark. In 1880 he was joined in partnership by his eldest son, John Maurice Clark[32] and, six years later, retired,[33] although retaining an active advisory role in the firm for much of the remainder of his life. His was indeed an active retirement: we find him, for example, in 1897 as Honorary President of an Edinburgh association for Booksellers' Assistants.[34]

At the end of a year during which his health had steadily declined Sir Thomas Clark died on Christmas Eve, 1900, at his house at 11 Melville Crescent, Edinburgh.[35] He was survived by Lady Clark, and by two sons and two daughters.[36]

Sir Thomas, besides owning property at 38 George Street, 11 Melville Crescent, and various other locations in Edinburgh, left moveable estate totalling £202,183 16s. 6d. He had extensive investments in railways, banking and other concerns, and on the basis of the data we will be examining later, we can safely say that his income from these must have greatly exceeded his income from the firm's trading.[37]

b) Issues

A scrutiny of the list of works issued by the firm over the four decades between 1846 and 1886 reveals a pattern of almost continual growth.

The Foreign Theological Library appears to have been the first-fruits

of the younger Thomas Clark's partnership. A 'new and enlarged' series of the Biblical Cabinet had, however, been announced as early as 1844[38] and the F.T.L. incorporated early volumes issued in that series. It was planned to publish four F.T.L. volumes annually at a subscription price and the series was issued with great regularity until being wound up in the early 1890s. In this way many European theological writings were made available to an English-language audience.

The F.T.L. was soon joined by other series. The complete works of John Owen were issued in twenty-four volumes between 1850 and 1855: they must have sold well, for a re-issue was undertaken between 1862 and 1866. In 1859, Clark announced[39] that he had bought over the stock and copyrights of the series of works by Calvin, in fifty-one volumes, which had been issued by the Calvin Translation Society.[40] The imminent appearance of the first volumes in the Ante-Nicene Library was noted in the Bookseller for 30 September 1865.[41] This series was to be edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, with the object of presenting 'translations of all the Post-Apostolic Christian writings that appeared before the Council of Nicaea', with the exception of Origen's Commentaries. Twenty-four volumes were to be issued by subscription over six years. A series of translations of commentaries whose original appearance in German had been co-ordinated by J.P. Lange appeared in twenty-five volumes between 1868 and 1879. Later in the century at least, supplies of these volumes were imported by Clark from Scribner. In 1871, Clark began to issue a sixteen-volume series of the works of St. Augustine, edited by Marcus Dods. Four volumes were to be published annually on a subscription basis, although volumes were also available separately.

Clark claimed in a contemporary catalogue that 'the larger portion of those writings contained in this series [had] not been hitherto translated', and that the work contained in the first volumes, The City of God, had'hitherto only been accessible to the English reader in a very old and feeble version'. In 1873, the issue began of a translation of Dr. H.A.W. Meyer's Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Four volumes were to be published per annum on subscription. In 1879, the more popular Bible Class Handbook series was launched, and, five years later, the companion Bible Class Primer series was bought over from Macniven and Wallace, who were largely withdrawing from publishing. Another fruit of the American connection was the issue of Philip Schaff's History of the Christian Church, an American work which Clark published in this country, the first part being Apostolic Christianity A.D. 1-100 (Two volumes, 1883).[42] Further volumes were published intermittently until 1893.

What is notable is not only the fact that these series include such works, but also that, as a check against the 1901 catalogue readily shows, so many of them were still in print at the end of the century. It must be admitted however that in the majority of cases, this was probably not so much due to Sir Thomas' judgement in selecting them for his list as to the fact that sales were very slow to come. Clark refused to remainder poor-selling titles. Even so, a considerable number of titles were reprinted; in 1879, for example, reprints were undertaken of thirty-four volumes, while in 1889 the number reprinted was forty-seven.[43] These figures indicate that the backlist was reasonably live.

Throughout this period, Clark continued to dabble in periodical publishing, without any marked success. The formerly prestigious

North British Review was issued by him between 1860 and 1863. The monthly Interpreter survived only two years after its foundation in 1884, shipwrecked by the disastrously lackadaisical editorship of J.S. Exell. From 1885, an attempt which must be judged a failure was made to distribute the American Presbyterian Review in the United Kingdom. Sir Thomas Clark was therefore unsuccessful in fulfilling his obvious desire to publish a theological journal which was at once highly respected and commercially viable, if not profitable. It was only when the firm made contact in 1889 with an editor of the calibre and industriousness of James Hastings, who was to edit several major works for the Clarks, that such a periodical became a possibility. Sir Thomas had a lasting success, however, with a legal serial, the Journal of Jurisprudence. This was founded in 1857, and, drawing contributions from many of the best-known men at the bar, easily outshone the rival Scottish Law Magazine, which it absorbed in 1866. However, the Journal, which was originally marked by outspokenness, grew mellow in its maturity, 'for the good reason that contributors did not wish to imperil their chances of promotion at the bar by writing against the properly constituted authorities'. Mellowness gave rise to a decline in circulation: the new Scottish Law Review (founded in 1885) increased in popularity, and the Journal, then under the editorship of John Chisholm, was wound up in 1891.[44]

Over these years also, Clark issued a wide range of miscellaneous philosophical and theological works. Among the major Scottish ecclesiastical figures whose works feature in the Clark lists, Free Churchmen predominated. They included, from Free Church College, Glasgow, Professor A.B. Bruce, Professor J.S. Candlish, and Principal Patrick Fairbairn; from New College, Edinburgh, Principal William

Cunningham, Professor A.B. Davidson, and Principal Robert Rainy; and from Free Church College, Aberdeen, Professor S.D.F. Salmond. The young William Robertson Nicoll also published a book with Clark at the very end of the period in question. That these authors all issued work through the Clark firm is indicative both of the important role played by Sir Thomas in disseminating Free Church theology, and of the confidence which the Church clearly placed in his firm.

In this period, Clark also published some major works, from the 1855 five-volume edition of J.A. Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament, to the 1886 edition of the Grimm/Wilke Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, translated and revised by Joseph Thayer.

It will be apparent that in the decades following 1846, Thomas Clark built solidly and consistently upon the foundation which he had inherited from his uncle. It was said in 1882 of the list which he had built up that it formed 'a most remarkable monument of well-directed energy.'[45] During the thirty-eight years in which John Maurice Clark was senior partner in the firm, he in turn was to build with considerable flair and discrimination upon the foundation he inherited, and to lead T. & T. Clark into the third phase of its development, the most adventurous of all.

2. 1886 - 1900

a) History

Born in 1859, John Maurice Clark following an education at Edinburgh Academy and University had studied publishing in Leipzig in the late 1870s,[46] before being taken into partnership by his father in 1880. Like Sir Thomas, John Clark although deeply committed to publishing, was to devote considerable energy to matters military and civic.

His obituary in The Scotsman outlines these activities.[47] For many years (twenty-nine according to the Glasgow Herald)[48] he was associated with the Leith battalion of the Royal Scots, receiving his commission as Second Lieutenant in 1881, and becoming Colonel in 1905. As a subaltern he was present at a review by Queen Victoria of forty thousand Scottish volunteers in Edinburgh in 1881, and twenty-four years later he appeared as commanding officer at a review by Edward VI. He received the Volunteer Officers' Decoration, and contributed to the war effort in connection with the Territorial Force Association, being vice-chairman of the Midlothian Branch. He joined the Edinburgh Merchant Company in 1884, when his father was Master. In 1900 he was elected an Assistant, in which capacity he served for three years. In 1910 he was appointed Treasurer, and, the following year, Master. He fulfilled several responsible roles in connection with the Merchant Company, being, for example, a trustee of the Company's Widows' Fund. He was also chairman of the Scottish Life Assurance Company.

Like his father before him, John Clark was actively involved in church affairs.[49] In fact, he married the daughter of a Free Church minister, Henry Douglas of Kirkcaldy.[50] This was the man who, by his personal vision and dynamism was to guide the firm into new areas of development well into the new century. He was, however, no radical. He had, according to an obituarist 'a distinct liking for the old courtly ways associated with the publishing houses which have played an important part in the industrial life of Edinburgh since the time of Burns and Scott.'[51]

On Sir Thomas' retirement in 1886, John Clark became sole partner, a position he held for eight years until, in 1894, he received into

partnership his brother, Thomas George Clark.[52] James Hastings testified that the brothers worked together 'with singular unanimity',[53] but there is no doubt from the evidence of the letter books that John was the dominant as well as the senior partner, shaping the evolution of the firm. Virtually until his death, however, Sir Thomas continued to exert an influence. He visited the office daily,[54] and Hastings claimed in 1901 that 'his advice was until quite recently an important factor in all the great decisions.'[55] John Clark himself was ready to acknowledge his debt to his father, both in private - 'our father ... is still with us here, & gives us his valued advice'[56] - and in public - 'his advice is invaluable to me, and I trust I may long have it.'[57] John Clark's high estimation of his father is evident from the following, written when he was about to embark in 1896 upon an American tour, in the course of which he was to meet many of those who were contributing to the International Series.

'I am getting quite alarmed at the thought that all those distinguished people should be invited to meet me. I, personally, accept the honour as being my father's son, & I assure you that he is exceedingly gratified & touched by all your kindness.'[58] The esteem in which Sir Thomas was held by his sons, and the consequent heed which was given to his advice meant that the important decisions of the late 1880s and 1890s - the launching of the Dictionary of the Bible, and the two International Series, decisions which ensured that the firm retained its position as a leading publisher of theology - were taken in full consultation with Sir Thomas.

John Clark's major contributions to the firm would appear to fall into three areas.

Firstly, while not neglecting the firm's links with the continent of Europe, he worked hard to develop the transatlantic connection in which he considered the future lay. He visited both Germany, and the United States and Canada, making, for instance, the extensive transatlantic tour in the spring of 1896 principally to conclude negotiations with Scribners regarding the American rights in the Dictionary of the Bible. His itinerary included New York (where he stayed with C.A. Briggs), Yale, Boston, Niagra, Toronto (where he stayed with W.R. Clark), Chicago, Washington and Philadelphia. In response to Clark's transatlantic forays, Charles Scribner reciprocated by visiting Edinburgh, for example in the spring of 1887 to discuss the development of the International Series.

Secondly, John Clark would appear to have been committed to the development of major theological works which involved large investments and considerable risk. Because his judgements were mature, and because for the most part he was fortunate in his editors and contributors, these investments still further increased the size of the firm's live back-list. This policy of major investment is evident especially in the Dictionary of the Bible and the works which followed it, including the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Thirdly, and of major importance, Clark was successful in building a lasting relationship with James Hastings, whose editorial genius was to play such a considerable part in the firm's success. John Clark was seven years younger than Hastings, but the two established a positive working relationship. On hearing of Hastings' death in 1922, Clark wrote to W.R. Nicoll 'I feel that I have lost a very dear friend with whom I have always had the happiest business relations'[59]

and this view of the relationship is borne out by the letter books. For instance, in the course of smoothing out an area of contention in 1904, John Clark wrote to Hastings -

> My brother and I are most grateful to you for all the help and advice you so kindly give us. It is impossible, I suppose, that two, much less three, people can always see eye to eye, but I hope you will believe me that if I ever do write or speak in a way which surprises you, nothing personal is intended, that my sole desire is to act in the interests of all concerned, & that I am always grateful for your kind interest & advice. So far as I know there are only two instances in our personal intercourse where ever any hesitation on my part has occurred ....[60]

For his part, grateful for the commitment with which the firm issued his works, Hastings dedicated the last volume of the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics 'To Sir John Maurice Clark, Baronet, Publisher and Friend'. It is difficult to imagine how the Clark firm would have developed had it not been for the link with Hastings, for he not only brought major titles into its list, but also introduced to the firm a wide range of theological writers, and thereby greatly increased the prestige of the imprint.

Sir John M. Clark retired from the business in 1923 and indeed did not long outlive Hastings, dying on 27 May 1924 at 17 Rothesay Terrace, Edinburgh. His brother Thomas George Clark having also retired, in his case in 1919, Sir John was succeeded by his son, Thomas Clark, who was sole partner until 1930, when his cousin, Thomas George Clark, son of John Clark's brother Thomas George, and grandson of Sir Thomas Clark became a partner. In 1956, his son, T.G. Ramsay D. Clark became a partner.[61] Appendix E contains more information on the firm's twentieth century development.

b) Issues

The fourteen years from 1886 to 1900 were, as has been seen, a period

of preparation and expansion. In the sense that John Clark's active life in the firm continued until 1923, 1900 is an arbitrary cut-off point; but while it has been chosen largely because of the absence for the early years of the new century of such detailed source material as is available for the 1880s and 1890s, it is nevertheless true to say that by 1900 the major series had been initiated, and the important policy decisions made. Even the launch of the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics can be seen as a natural outcome of the policy of dictionary publishing initiated when the Clarks agreed to issue the Dictionary of the Bible.

Works continued to be added to three of the earlier series over this period. More Bible Class Primers and Handbooks appeared, and, until around 1891, volumes were added to the Foreign Theological Library. Thereafter, although foreign translations continued to be issued, the regular publishing of four volumes per year in the F.T.L. was discontinued. This is symptomatic of the continuing development of the Edinburgh-New York axis, and it is perhaps not co-incidental that, also in 1891, the first volume of the International Theological Library was published (S.R. Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament). This series consisted of pioneering works by British and American theologians, and, edited by S.D.F. Salmond of Aberdeen and C.A. Briggs of New York, was issued jointly by Clark and Scribner. A parallel venture was the International Critical Commentary series, also issued by Clark and Scribner. Edited by S.R. Driver of Oxford, A. Plummer of Durham, and C.A. Briggs of New York, the first volumes in this series appeared in 1895. Another American connection gave rise to the British publication by Clark of the Eras of the Christian Church series, which was produced by the Christian Literature Company of New York, the Clarks simply importing the works in sheets for binding

in Scotland with the Clark imprint. A series initiated by the Edinburgh firm, and indicative perhaps of a broadening of the subject-matter of their list, was the World's Epoch Makers series, edited by Oliphant Smeaton, the first volumes of which (including titles on Muhammad and his Power and William Herschel and his Work) appeared in 1900. Although not having a specific commitment to issue the material presented at any of the various endowed lecture series, the Clarks did intermittently publish the lectures given in a particular year in one or other of these series. For instance, the Cunningham Lectures appeared fairly consistently under the Clark imprint and the Gifford Lectures were published by the Clarks in 1890, the Hulsean Lectures in 1893, and the Kerr Lectures in 1900.

This period also saw the foundation of two periodicals which, whatever their success in financial terms (and this will be considered in depth in a later section) contributed largely to the prestige of the Clark imprint. The earlier of these was the Expository Times, commenced in October 1889 by James Hastings, who published the first three issues through William Diack of Aberdeen before Clark, recognising the potential of the journal and its editor, took it over from January 1890.[62] It has survived until the present day. Later in 1890, the first issue appeared of The Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature, edited by S.D.F. Salmond of Aberdeen. This quarterly, although it aimed at a catholicity of approach ('The Magazine will not be the organ of any particular section of the Evangelical Church, but will be conducted in the interests of all its branches')[63] and a non-specialisation of treatment, being directed both at clergy and intelligent laymen, was not a financial success, and passed out of the Clarks' hands in 1899.

Apart from a wide range of miscellaneous theological works, this period also saw the issue of several major reference tools including Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897), and the first three volumes of Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (1898,1899,1900).

By the 1890s, T. & T. Clark was a moderately-sized enterprise, operating from 38 George Street, but also having a warehouse in the Greenside district of Edinburgh. Most of the firm's printing was done in that city by Morrison and Gibb, with whom the Clarks had a close relationship. Paper was purchased from the Guardbridge Paper Company. It is difficult to assess the degree of risk borne by the principals: this risk was heightened by the fact that the firm was still not a limited company in 1900. Annual figures are available for some years in the late 1890s.[64] For example in 1896-97 (the firm's financial year ran from the middle of the year), when 674 titles were in print, 352 of them belonging to the various series, the total outlay on books was £7,145 10s. 4d. Turnover amounted to £10,036 8s.4d., giving a profit of £2,890 18s. 0d. before deduction of overheads. Twenty-four new titles were published in the course of the year, at an outlay, included in the total outlay figure quoted above, of £2,995 11s. 7d. Overheads, including the wage bill of £599 3s. 6d. for the staff of six, amounted to £1,286 3s. 8d. The profit on the year's trading was therefore £1,604 14s. 4d. These figures will be discussed in very much more detail in Part IV. Here they are introduced simply to give an indication of the size of the business and the extent of the risk involved.

This Section has examined the broad landscape of T. & T. Clark's development in the nineteenth century, and glanced at the personalities

with which that landscape was peopled. We may well ask whether this landscape unfolded arbitrarily, or whether it developed as the result of a vision shared by the principals. What was the relative importance to them of profit, and content, where there was a conflict between the two? In other words, to what extent were they prepared to overlook the profit motive because of their commitment to what they were issuing? And was the enthusiasm which we will find they had for mildly progressive theology a result of conviction, or of a perception of its likely present and future profitability, or indeed a combination of both these factors? Before we examine various areas of the Clark publishing programme in depth for answers to these questions, it will be helpful to look at such general statements of aim as exist, either voiced by the firm itself in advertisements and correspondence with authors, or perceived by outside observers. What was the firm's perception of its aims? The delicate balance in which mission and profitability were held, and the difficulty which faces us in trying to assess the Clarks' deepest motives in this area is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than by John M. Clark in his somewhat enigmatic comment to A.J. Gossip[65]

> 'I can't speak for Christ,' Sir John once said to me shyly, 'and I would like to do something for Him. Well, I can take this risk, seeking to help a little.' And then at once he added, 'But, with Hastings editing it, there is no great risk at all!'

Section B: Aims and motives

On the title page of the Clark letter book which was begun in June 1896,[66] someone has inscribed, with what degree of seriousness will never be known, the motto 'Nisi dominus frustra', a quotation from Psalm 127.1 - 'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it.' If this could be taken at all seriously as an unofficial motto of John M. Clark's, it would indicate that he ran his business in an attitude of conscious dependence on God, and with a corresponding sense of answerability to Him.[67]

The emphasis in this study of the apparent motivation of the firm in the 1880s and 1890s is on the theological output. Although a few law books were issued during John M. Clark's time with the firm there are for some reason few references to legal publications in the letter books.

There are three main classes of evidence which help to illuminate the Clarks' aims and motivation. Firstly, there are clear statements of aim by the principals, which can be assessed and evaluated according to the contexts in which they were made. Secondly, although the firm had no written selection policy, certain deductions as to the nature of their policy can be made from such letters of acceptance and rejection of MSS and of communication with commissioned writers and translators as have been preserved, and in turn some idea of the firm's aims can be formed from these deductions. Thirdly, there have survived some perceptions, from outside observers, of the firm's aims. It was more common for outsiders to remark on the Clark's achievement or influence, but if we assume that the firm achieved what it set out to achieve, such impartial assessments of its influence

will also help us to clarify the aims which lay behind the achievements.

The approach in this Section is to present from the letter books two texts which are of crucial importance in promoting an understanding of the firm's aims, and then to submit to a detailed examination, in the light of evidence from all the sources referred to in the previous paragraph, the key themes running through these texts.

1. Two key texts

a) In February 1900, John Clark wrote to Principal S.D.F. Salmond of Aberdeen regarding the recently-published Bible Class Primer, Historical Geography of the Holy Land. The outlay on this work had been considerable, and, priced at 6d. as were the other titles in the series, it had not proved to be profitable to date. The author, the Rev. S.R. MacPhail of Liverpool, had helped to finance some of the illustrations. A propos of MacPhail's involvement, Clark told Salmond:

> We should be very sorry ... if you thought that Publishers never make similar sacrifices ... we are sure it must have cost him much more than he is likely to get in return. Repeatedly we have published books either for the sake of the Author, or in the interests of Theological Study, which we were quite sure could never repay us, & we have lost heavily by them. We merely mention this because we fear it is generally supposed that Publishers are not superior to those considerations.[68]

b) Eighteen years earlier, when T. & T. Clark were considering issuing in the Foreign Theological Library a translation of Biblical Theology of the New Testament by Bernhard Weiss of Berlin, Marcus Dods wrote perceptively to the firm as follows:[69]

> I sympathize with y. perplexity about Weiss. It is similar to my own perplexity about the publication of the truth about Genesis. To publish Weiss will be a new departure for you as a publisher & will be at once recognised as such. And I have

little doubt there wd be a clamour agt. you & you wd lose subscriptions - At the same time I think you need have no fear of 'harming young minds' because young minds have already access to [illegible - names of two theologians]. You will do no harm save to yourselves, but only good by publishing it - that is my decided opinion. But unless you yourself see that & are prepared for the condemnation of the fanatical, I think you shd leave it alone. Other publishers can take it up without producing the slightest shock to any one.

2. Exposition

At least three major themes arise from these passages. The first is the concern which the Clark firm clearly had for its image as a conservative publisher - Dods obviously felt that to publish the work by Weiss would be, in certain quarters and in some measure, to tarnish that image. The second theme is the very obvious commitment which Clark, and indeed Dods, had to what they saw as 'the truth', and to their mission to spread it. The third theme is the relationship between the spiritual and economic value of a publication: both letters would appear to indicate that the Clarks put the emphasis on the former rather than on the latter. How did these three factors influence the conduct of business at 38 George Street?

a) The image of the firm

Distributors and the public tend to see an imprint in a particular light according to the values for which it is thought to stand. Potential customers may, indeed, each see a different 'image' of a given imprint, and, even when a perception is universally held, it is not necessarily the one which the publishers themselves might wish for. An imprint's public image involves a perception both of the kinds of works which the firm in question issues, and of the ethos which undergirds the publication of those works. An imprint image will tend to be self-perpetuating, as the publisher will issue works which further establish it, both because his list reflects his

philosophy, and because of the economic benefits arising from consistently publishing a particular class and 'colour' of work.

i. The books

It is obvious that the Clarks had a clear and positive conception, which they expected would be shared by booksellers and the theological fraternity, of what constituted 'a Clark book'. Although this kind of book might not be hugely profitable, the Clarks knew the market for it intimately, and knew also that each issue would further establish the customer's perception of the firm as a serious purveyor of academic theology. In general, therefore, the selection of MSS was influenced by the need to preserve this image.

Books outwith the Clarks' normal range of subject-matter were summarily rejected. Hence, for example, the firm wrote to the author of a scientific work which it had been asked to consider that 'a Volume such as you describe is completely out of our line ... Our publications are strictly confined to Theological & Philosophical works.'[70]

But works within the theological field might also find themselves rejected if they were not considered sufficiently academic to feature in the Clark list. Hence David Kerr of Greenock was told in 1887 regarding an MS which he had submitted that 'We fear ... that it is hardly in our line of publication, being, in fact too "popular" for our catalogue, which is mainly filled with German Theological & Philosophical Works'[71] while ten years later, the same view was held, as is evident from a letter to the firm's London advertising agent who was told that Clark books were 'not of a "popular" order'.[72] Another correspondent of the same period was informed 'Our publications are mainly confined to such works as may be, & in many cases are, used

as Theological Textbooks, Commentaries on the Bible, etc.'[73]

It is clear that from time to time that firm had experimented with the issue of more popular works, or at least of popular versions of academic works, and had discovered these to be uneconomic. Hence the firm wrote to an author who had proposed to prepare an abridged edition of an academic work 'we know from experience the difficulty of 'popularising' a scholarly work.'[74]

Occasionally, in rejecting works which were not 'Clark books', the firm mentioned other reasons for the rejection, but these reasons were closely linked to the fact that the MS did not harmonise with the Clark image. An author might be told of his work, for example ' we feel we could not do it justice'[75] which simply meant that the work called for a particular style of advertising and distribution which the Clarks were ill-equipped to give it, and that in consequence it would have been economically hazardous to them to publish it, and hazardous also to the success of the book which might not reach the wide audience it deserved.

It will be seen, therefore, that T. & T. Clark was reluctant to publish works which fell outwith the narrow category of academic theology which it claimed as its own field. This policy might seem unadventurous: in fact, the firm <u>did</u> take risks, but they were the risks of going forward into unexplored tracts of the same countryside, rather than the risks of diversifying into completely new territories.

ii. <u>The ethos</u>

The public's perception of the Clark imprint was rooted not only in the nature of the books it published, but also, and more intangibly,

in the ethos which lay behind their publication. The firm had, it would seem, a reputation for evangelical orthodoxy, and its continuing success could be said to have been dependent upon the maintenance of this reputation.

These points are illustrated in an interesting letter to Professor Charles M. Mead, of Berlin.[76] Mead had offered the firm an MS entitled Romans Dissected, a 'spoof' on the 'higher critics', to be published under the pseudonym of E.D. McRealsham. The Clarks were at first unenthuiastic about the work. The first point to be made was this:

> We think, that were we to publish it, 'the point of the joke' might be lost as considering the reputation of our firm, it would at once be apparent to many that the essay is not seriously meant.

Presumably the point here is that were the work to appear under the Clark imprint, with its reputation for orthodoxy, it would be immediately obvious that a joke was intended, whereas if it appeared under an imprint with a less conservative reputation the reader might for a time be taken in by 'McRealsham' - a successful deception which would at once provide the author with more satisfaction, and prove his point. The letter is important for our purposes in revealing the conception that the firm had of its reputation for evangelical orthodoxy. The Clarks' second point in the letter to Mead indicates how vital it was to preserve that reputation:

> On the other hand, we naturally hesitate in case many do look upon it seriously. The book would get scattered round the world, and many readers might never hear that 'Mr McRealsham does not believe one atom of what he is ostensibly trying to prove!' In this way much harm could be done.[77]

But perhaps the most interesting example of the Clarks guarding their image as orthodox evangelical publishers is outlined in a series of

letters regarding a work published in the International Theological Library in 1897, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age by an American scholar, Arthur C. McGiffert. Proofs of the book had not been seen by the British editor of the series before publication, and John Clark wrote personally to Charles Scribner complaining about what McGiffert had said, or rather, not said:

> The Introductory Chapter is highly offensive to good Christian people, perhaps as much from what it does not say as from what it does say ... In the present case Dr Salmond finds his name subscribed as Editor to opinions diametrically opposed to those he himself holds, although he is by no means narrow in his views.[78]

Clark also wrote to C.A. Briggs, informing him of general, negative impressions of McGiffert and his work in Britain:

> A well-known London Editor wrote to me, privately, that he is amazed 'that the Presbyterian Church in America should have a man like McGiffert teaching their Students.' ... He has given cause for offence even among Scholars.[79]

To both men, he emphasised the harm that publishing the book could do to the firm's reputation: McGiffert's work, he wrote, had 'awakened a general feeling of indignation'.[80] A fortnight later he commented ' I fear there is to be trouble about the book .... People are saying hard things about us for publishing it'.[81] And even after the storm had passed, we find him writing to Scribner 'It is probably difficult for you to understand our position, as publishers, when new views are advanced in books issued by us.'[82]

Given the fact that the Clarks were thus aware of the reputation the firm had, and of the need to preserve that reputation, we would expect that decisions on the acceptance or rejection of MSS would be made in the light of that fact. This is one area illuminated by the letter from Dods to Clark on the subject of Weiss. Dods was certain that to publish the Weiss work would be a new departure, would undermine

confidence in T. & T. Clark, and would lay the firm open to 'the condemnation of the fanatical'. If the Clarks' reputation, and the need for its preservation,had been the sole criterion, it would seem to have been eminently more sensible not to publish the book. And yet the work was issued around 1882. It could well be argued that in taking this step the firm were putting a commitment to the furtherance of truth as they understood it before their own economic best interests, being prepared to risk denting their image in order to benefit theological science, as Dods was certain the work would do.

It would appear, however, that the truth was more complex. After all, had the Clarks followed Dods' advice and permitted the work to pass into the hands of a house with a reputation for publishing less orthodox works, theological science would still have been advanced without 'harm' resulting to their firm. It is probable that the ethos of T. & T. Clark involved both a commitment to reformed evangelical theology and biblical criticism, and a readiness to encourage those who, it was felt, were reverently extending the frontiers of theological science and critical studies (the firm's view of their role is considered below), while the general public perception of that ethos encapsulated only the commitment to evangelical theology, and not the commitment to progress. It was an example, in other words, of the public view of an imprint not matching the publisher's perception of the same imprint. In issuing Weiss, the Clarks were indeed maintaining and further establishing their list, consistent with their view of it, knowing full well that the public at large had a slightly different perception of what the Clark imprint stood for. No doubt they hoped that the public could be educated to a point where they would see the value of what T. & T. Clark was doing. It was probably the case that the

Clarks' more progressive works were increasingly accepted by their public in the closing years of the century.

b) The role of the firm

Closely allied to, but distinct from, a firm's view of its ethos is its perception of the role of its publications within their particular subject area. It is clear that the Clarks' view of the role of their output, at a time of theological development, would have had a major influence on the authors they commissioned, and the works they chose to publish.

Reviewing the final volume of Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, A.W. Fergusson commented[83] 'A work like this is not so much a business proposition as a great public service - the greatest of all public services - the furtherance of truth.' The Clark firm might well have been glad to apply this comment to their publishing activity as a whole, for it could well be said that they saw their role as being the furtherance of truth as they perceived it. Therefore we find them encouraging the development of theological science and speculation while guarding on the one hand against narrowness of a denominational or sectarian nature, and on the other against an irreverent radicalism. What was said in 1882[84] therefore remained the case for the rest of the century - that, depending on their viewpoint, 'some would say that Messrs. Clark's publications have been among the most orthodox series of books in the language; others would say that they have introduced a great deal of original and liberal, not to say latitudinarian theology.' We find T. & T. Clark, therefore, seeking to further truth. The discussion which follows aims firstly to illuminate more closely the Clarks' perceptions of where truth lay, and secondly to examine, as far

as possible, the influence of these perceptions upon the firm's selection policy.

1. Theological position

I) Evangelical orthodoxy

Traditionally, the Clarks saw their role as being the defence of evangelical orthodoxy. Thus, for example, when they took over the North British Review in 1860, the advertisement in the Bookseller[85] commented that such theological articles as the Review might contain would maintain 'the cause of Evangelical Christianity in opposition to the various phases of infidelity and error'.

Twenty-two years later, it was the opinion of the anonymous Wesleyan Methodist minister who contributed to The Publishing House of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh that 'Messrs. Clark have found it to their own advantage, as well as thought it their duty, to keep out all authors who would not be relished by the evangelical taste of Great Britain.'[86] The same author was happy to accept the even blunter comment that 'Clark have clung to their old evangelical tradition.'[87] He was glad to note, however, that while the firm continued to acknowledge the fundamentals of the Christian faith, it was refreshingly broad in its vision, giving place in its lists to different interpretations as long as these were consistent with reverent enquiry.[88]

It would seem that T. & T. Clark's broad adherence to evangelical principles continued to the end of the century and beyond. For example, in one of the regular letters to Scribners in New York, in which the Clarks attempted to persuade the American firm to agree to put more effort into the distribution of Clark titles on their side of the Atlantic, mention was made of William L. Walker's work The Spirit

and the Incarnation (1899).[89] Commented the Clarks:

> there is special interest in this book because it is the result of a severe struggle through which the author passed some years ago, & shows (in the hope that service may be rendered to others who may have similar difficulties, & to the Church at large) the special course of study which led him back to the full evangelical faith.

Even given the facts, firstly that enthusiasm for the work was called for in what was essentially a sales letter, and secondly that the 1899 definition of 'the full evangelical faith' might have been somewhat different in essence if not in terminology from a mid-century definition, the conclusion must be drawn that T. & T. Clark still saw their role as being the dissemination of evangelical works.

II) Reverent speculation

Discussing the Foreign Theological Library in a catalogue issued in the early 1890s, the Clark firm claimed to 'trust and believe that the whole series has exercised, through the care with which the books have been selected, a healthful influence upon the progress of theological science in this country and in the United States'. This view was quoted and endorsed in the Publishers' Circular [90] and it sums up the Clarks' commitment to the issue of carefully-selected progressive works.

A Wesleyan Methodist minister writing in 1882[91] would appear to imply that this attitude had been the hallmark of the Clarks' publishing from the firm's early days. Speaking particularly of the Foreign Theological Library, he drew attention to the importance of the firm's translation programme. It had, he commented, 'tended much to widen British sympathies, and counteract our insular narrowness';[92] it had played a major role in the development of Biblical exegesis;[93] it had introduced to Britain 'what was almost a novelty - the scientific examination of the various types of doctrine in the Scriptures themselves';[94]

it had given British theologians a broader point of view from which to consider church history.[95] It had, in short, 'been a very important factor in the formation of opinion and the direction of thought in religious matters'.[96]

It is obvious that this cautiously adventurous policy was continued in the 1880s and 1890s. There is the evidence, for example, of the Clarks' output: the contribution of the Weiss book to the development of theological understanding is one of the themes of Dods' letter. Other, similar works were issued, such as Nature and the Bible (1886), by a liberal Catholic Professor, Franz H. Reusch.[97] Then there is the evidence of the Clarks' statements of intent; it was said, for example, of the Monthly Interpreter (founded 1884) that in its pages, 'open discussion of topics [would] be permitted ... within reverent and reasonable limitations.'[98] And there is the evidence of the firm's instructions to the scholars who were to contribute to the International Theological Library.[99] The fourth paragraph of these instructions gives some indication of the progressive nature of the series:

> The library is international, interconfessional, and in the interests of Theology as a science. A catholic spirit should rule in all the work, and the authors should cultivate as far as possible an objective method, presenting a fair and complete statement of the results of theological science and the questions still at issue in these several departments.

Many twentieth-century observers have been quick to praise the Clarks for their balanced yet progressive attitude at the end of the nineteenth century. Writing immediately after Sir Thomas Clark's death, for example, at the very beginning of the new century, James Harvey praised the firm not only for giving the Free Church of Scotland 'a foremost place in the theological world of today',[100] but also for making a major contribution to the development of nineteenth-century Scottish theology

'in extending its horizon and shaping its course, and, to some extent, in moulding its character'.[101] Two of those who were most competent to assess the Clarks' achievements, Sir William Robertson Nicoll and Dr James Hastings, might even have regarded Harvey's view as an understatement. Nicoll felt able to speak of the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics and the other Dictionaries as the 'greatest achievement' of a firm which had always done 'immense service' for the cause of theology,[102] while Hastings commented of Sir Thomas that

> Scotland probably owes him more than can ever be acknowledged. For Scotland has passed through a great theological crisis with extraordinary ease and benefit, and the steady, evangelical, yet never intolerant hand that more than any other guided the theological reading of Scotland those trying years had not a little to do with it.[103]

Hastings admittedly owed a great personal debt of loyalty to the firm, and, further, was writing in the immediate, emotional aftermath of Sir Thomas Clark's death. But these facts should not be allowed to detract from the validity of his expression of what would appear to have been a commonly-held perception of the Clarks' aims and achievements.

III) Avoiding extremism

It is clear that part of the reason for the esteem in which the firm was held was that, while encouraging the development of theological science, the principals took great care to avoid extremism, largely, no doubt, from personal persuasion, but also out of a consciousness that it would impede the growth of the firm.

Although the Clarks were Free Churchmen, and the majority of their British authors belonged to that Church, they nevertheless managed to avoid the extremism of being identified with the Free Church of Scotland so closely as to be regarded as being the mouthpiece of that particular denomination. They consciously pursued a policy of breadth in their

publications: thus, the Monthly Interpreter was announced as being 'free from sectarian spirit';[104] thus, as we have seen, a spirit of objective catholicity was urged upon the contributors to the International Theological Library, and thus, too, it was said of the works in the International Critical Commentary series that they 'were entirely free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias, and splendidly served the purpose for which they were designed'.[105]

The other kind of extremism which the Clarks sought to avoid was an irreverent radicalism. The policy of avoiding 'destructive ... theology', noted in 1882,[106] was continued until the end of the century.

As we have seen, the Clarks did publish progressive works, such as that by Weiss, or, two years later in 1884, the book bought from Scribner despite the fact that the author's views were 'novel', so much so that the Clarks doubted 'how far they would receive acceptance.'[107] What was the nature of the progressive thinking which the firm eschewed?

There are some indications in the letters books. Some are vague, general comments. One work is rejected as being 'too advanced';[108] of another, bought from Scribner, the Clarks commented 'the rationalistic tone has damaged it.'[109] A more substantial indication lies in the fact that the firm were prepared eventually to publish 'McRealsham's' spoof on the higher critics, referred to earlier. John Clark clearly had little time for the more radical 'higher criticism': suggesting that some appropriate motto be included on the title page of 'McRealsham's' book, he momentarily put forward for consideration Proverbs 26.5 - ' Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit' - before deciding that 'perhaps that is too strong.'[110] We have also noted the Clarks' extreme disquiet over the work by

McGiffert. The way in which this disquiet was to some extent mollified sheds further light on the issues involved from the Clarks' point of view. McGiffert had visited 38 George Street personally in the summer of 1898. As a result of this visit, John Clark was satisfied, not only that the author had been misunderstood in Britain - 'He courteously admits that he may himself be in some measure to blame for this by a not sufficiently emphatic statement of his non-agreement with certain other critics'[111] - but also that he gave full assent to the Christian fundamentals. Clark recounted that, during McGiffert's visit, Sir Thomas 'put the question straight to him upon the two most important points in the Gospel Story - viz. the Incarnation & the Resurrection & that he expressed in the fullest manner his hearty & unreserved belief in both.'[112]

It would seem from this that T. & T. Clark were prepared to publish speculative work as long as it did not threaten or undermine what could be called the Christian fundamentals. This is precisely the point made in 1882 by the contributor to <u>The Publishing House of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh</u>. Discussing the diversity of interpretative opinion to be found in the <u>Foreign Theological Library</u>, he felt able to comment[113] 'Not a page has ever been issued from this press which failed to pay its homage to the majesty of divine revelation, to the person of the Redeemer, and the acknowledged fundamentals of the Christian faith.' Although John Clark's definition of some of the terms in this quotation might have changed by the end of the century, it would appear still to have delineated the firm's publishing policy in 1900.

There is considerable evidence that, in defining the role outlined above, the Clarks were not merely responding to a market, or to economic

imperatives, but acting out of a deep personal faith. If it was an act of faith to proceed with publication of the Weiss work when it seemed likely to prove damaging economically to the firm, it was no less an act of faith to hesitate over publishing the work (as it may be deduced from Dods' letter that the Clarks had done) in case it proved to be damaging, spiritually, to 'young minds' which might be 'harmed' by it. It would seem to have been recognised that this element of faith influenced all the firm's publishing decisions. Thus James Harvey[114] claimed that 'No formal religiousness or sectarian prejudice but personal faith and devotion to the truth have influenced the firm in the selection of authors and publications', while it was Dr James Hastings' opinion[115] that the Clarks conducted their business 'as "always in the great Taskmaster's eye" '.

ii. Selection policies

It will be obvious that the vision the Clarks had of their role as outlined above - the encouragement of reverent speculation, provided this was based on evangelical fundamentals and avoided sectarianism or radical extremism - would have had a major influence on the firm's selection policies.

I) The eminence of the scholar

In keeping with their policy of remaining in the van of theological science, the Clarks sought to attract the most eminent authors to their list. Thus it was announced that the Interpreter would contain work contributed by 'the ablest scholars of Britain, America and the Continent'.[116] Thus, too, contributors to the International Theological Library were assured that they and their fellow-authors had been 'chosen for their eminent ability in the department assigned to them'.[117]

On the other hand, we find individual authors being turned down by the firm because of their lack of experience, their circumscribed reputation, or their deficient or limited scholarship. For instance, C.A. Briggs was advised not to engage a particular writer[118] to contribute to the International Critical Commentary series on account of the deficiency of his previous performance. 'There is not the slightest doubt that his participation in the 1st vol. of the 'Popular Commentary'[119] was detrimental to its success, at least in this Country. We are sure the general opinion here was that his work was unsatisfactory.' And again, Alfred Plummer was advised not to engage another writer for the work on Hebrews in the same series: 'While we have great regard for Mr Milligan, we feel that he would scarcely carry sufficient weight for this work.'[120] It helped, of course, if an author combined reasonable scholarship with real popularity. We find the Clarks writing somewhat breathlessly to the Rev. James Stalker, whose Life of Christ (1879) and Life of St. Paul (1884) sold extremely well, to enquire whether there was any likelihood of his quickly completing a work on the Mind of Christ, which had been projected for some time. 'We hope you will allow us to have the pleasure of publishing it also for you.'[121]

How did the Clarks assess the competence of scholars and the merits of MSS? It would seem that they depended considerably on advice from James Hastings, Samuel Driver of Oxford, Stewart Salmond of Aberdeen, and others. There is no indication in the letter books as to whether every unsolicited MS was read externally; the Clarks were clearly well-versed in theology, and it is most probable that only works in the case of which they felt a second opinion was necessary would have been sent out for reading. Thus, for example, the firm sought J.A. Selbie's advice on a work being considered for publication, F. Konig's Deutero-Isaiah:[122] 'we should be glad to have your opinion of it, & whether, in

your opinion, it would be likely to attract attention.' Ten days later[123] we find that the firm was prepared to go ahead with publication of the work in translation, even though the venture seemed to be economically dubious, because both Selbie and Professor Skinner, who had also been consulted believed that 'the proposed book would have to be taken account of by Old Testament Students.'

Further, the firm was always open to suggestions from those whose opinions they trusted as to possible future publications. For example, although sales of the translated first volume of Bishop Hans Martensen's Christian Ethics (published by the firm in 1873) had not been high enough to induce the Clarks to proceed with the succeeding volumes, they nevertheless agreed to go ahead with these, having been urged to do so by the Bishop of Gloucester, 'in the hope that the completion of the work may call more attention to it'.[124] In another case, the firm was prepared to publish at great speed an uneconomically small volume Thomas Adamson's The Spirit of Power, the MS of which had been forwarded to them, presumably with a recommendation, by James Hastings.[125] However, it must not be thought that the Clarks invariably accepted books which were recommended to the firm. In a letter declining two MSS by other authors which Hastings had sent to him, John Clark commented 'It is a mistake to publish too many books.'[126]

Occasionally, too, the Clarks would make the acceptance of a work conditional upon 'editorial support' being obtained in the form of an introduction or preface from some well-known theologian or churchman. Thus, for example, in showing cautious interest in a proposed translation of a work by Nebe, the firm commented to the would-be translator 'it would require some authoritative introduction such as you hint at

from the Bishop of Bath and Wells.'[127] Similarly, when the widow of Professor James Candlish asked the Clarks to publish a posthumous collection of her husband's sermons, she was told that this would only be considered a viable proposition if Dr Denney could be persuaded to contribute a preface.[128]

It is clear that in seeking to be market leaders in the field of progressive conservative theology, the Clarks sought out the most eminent contributors. There were occasions, however, when another criterion - the desire to avoid denominational bias in the list - came into play, leading to certain writers being rejected irrespective of their scholarly qualifications. It is understandable that the firm would be extremely doubtful about an invitation being extended to a man with known Unitarian connections (Professor Crawford H. Toy of Harvard) by the American editor of the International Critical Commentary to contribute a volume to that series.[129] But it is interesting that, for all the preponderance of Free Church titles in the Clark list, the firm seems to have been eager to avoid over-emphasising the scholarship of any other denomination, however orthodox. Thus, when the possibility of appointing an American co-editor to assist J.H. Moulton in his preparation of a new edition of G.B. Winer's Grammar of New Testament Greek[130] was being explored, one likely candidate was passed over because he, like Moulton, was a Wesleyan Methodist, and, Moulton was told, 'it might be wiser to have some one outside your own Denomination.[131] Another factor which was influencing the Clarks in this was the impending publication of another work from the same denominational fold, W.F. Moulton's edition of A.S. Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament. 'Looking at the matter from a Publisher's point of view I am just afraid that if both of these important Works have Wesleyan

names only (however much we should like it) little jealousies may be stirred up.' And then, anticipating criticism from Moulton over this attitude, the Clarks continued 'You may think it absurd, but in any case you must not be vexed with me for mentioning it.'[132] Rejections of authors or works on denominational grounds were usually made in order to preserve the non-sectarian balance of the list. Sometimes, this policy involved passing over men of indubitable scholarship, as in the example above. Usually those who were passed over were men who, although they might be well-known within their own denominations, did not have the stature, or perhaps the breadth of vision, to command an interdenominational audience. Thus the Clarks felt that two authors whose names Alfred Plummer had put forward as possible contributors to the International Critical Commentary series 'must [be] set aside simply for the reason that they are not sufficiently known outside their own Church, & a name carrying weight, and confidence, is imperative for this Series.'[133]

In seeking to fulfil their role, therefore, the Clark firm clearly sought able, reverent, progressive authors who would command attention and respect from scholars of all denominations. It would appear that James Moffatt, whose Historical New Testament[134] was published by the firm in 1901 was the epitome of a Clark author. In trying to persuade Scribners to take an edition of the work, John Clark presented the testimonies of others to Moffatt's qualities.[135] It was, for example, Professor A.B. Bruce's opinion that 'Mr Moffatt is a scholar of high-standing, the peer of such men as Professor Denney, & this book will be a great credit to him for scholarship & be a real contribution on the subject ... Mr Moffatt is one of our coming men, likely to find his way into one of our Chairs.' And James Hastings had commented in the

Expository Times that the work of translating and re-arranging the books of the New Testament 'had to be done. It had to be done cautiously. It had to be done fearlessly. Mr Moffatt was the man for it. Our readers know how conscientious & how reverent is his scholarship, how deep also is his interest in the Word of God.' This was the kind of scholar whose works it delighted T. & T. Clark to publish.

II) The merit of the works

It is clear that the Clarks' view of their role demanded that they publish only works of the highest order. As we have seen, the firm sought eminent scholars to contribute to the various series, and it might have been expected that eminent scholars would automatically have produced sterling work. While in general this was the case, problems did arise from time to time, problems of language, taste and style, and problems with the accuracy and readability of translations. Problems in the first category were particularly prevalent in books written by American authors, for even in the 1890s there was a significant difference between what was considered good taste in Britain and on the other side of the Atlantic. These issues will be considered in later sections of this thesis, which deal in depth with the different categories of publications handled by the Clarks. It is enough to note here that the firm sought merit not only in what was being said, but also in the way in which it was said. Thus the authors of the International Theological Library[136] were instructed to 'aim at conciseness and compactness of statement', and to write 'in a clear and pregnant style'.

The same criteria were applied in the assessment of unsolicited MSS - here too, the Clarks sought quality of content and of expression.

Thus, on the one hand, we find the firm rejecting a work[137] which was found to be 'full of inaccuracies', 'totally uncritical', and 'inconsistent', while on the other a work of obvious ability, which had moreover been very favourably reported on by Professor Cairns, was rejected because it seemed to be 'much too dry.'[138] But in its rejections, the firm was always as positive and encouraging as possible. For example, Arthur Turnbull of Kirkcaldy was told[139]

> We have very carefully examined your MS and although the ideas are excellent and in many cases well wrought out, yet there is in our opinion a certain amount of immaturity and a deficiency in literary expression which would render it a necessity that it should undergo a careful revision.
>
> We would strongly advise that you should put it aside for a year or so and then go over it with a literary friend.
>
> We are sure you will excuse us speaking frankly, especially as we have a very high opinion of your endeavour in many respects.

It will have become clear from this discussion of the Clarks' vision of their role, and the single-mindedness with which they sought to realise that vision, that the firm, both under Sir Thomas and John Maurice, had a very real sense of mission. But in order to fulfil a mission, a firm must survive economically. We must therefore investigate next the extent to which economic factors played a part in determining the Clarks' publishing policy.

c) The profitability of the firm

In the letter to Charles Scribner alluded to above, in which John Clark complained of the apparent heterodoxy of McGiffert's History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age,[140] he made the following cryptic comment. 'It is certain that even from the lower point of success, this sort of thing will do great damage to the whole Series.' One possible reading of this sentence would suggest that, for Clark, there were two levels of success in publishing; a higher, the advancement

of theological science, and a lower, the making of a profit. Such an interpretation would certainly tie in with the letter of February 1900 from Clark to Salmond which was one of our key texts. In that letter, Clark seemed to be indicating not only that the firm virtually had a settled policy of publishing some uneconomic works - and not only from time to time, but 'repeatedly', which implies greater frequency - but also that the firm was 'superior' to financial considerations. A man holding such an attitude would clearly speak of profit as being 'the lower point of success'.

This sounds like a recipe for economic suicide, but the mere fact that the firm continued to survive and expand is an indication that while the Clarks set their sights on the higher level of success, they in no way neglected the lower. Such decisions as were made to publish works of doubtful profitability must have been reached only after very careful consideration. 'Caution is necessary',[141] wrote John Maurice and, indeed, there are many examples in the letter books of works being rejected on economic grounds.

How are we to understand the thinking which lay behind the Clarks' decisions when there seemed to be a conflict between the higher and the lower levels of success? How was it that some economically unviable books were published, while others were rejected?

The first point to be made is that John Clark indubitably knew his market. He claimed himself that 'we know exactly the class who buy our books.'[142] And knowing his market, he knew the type of books which it could absorb. Thus what the Publishers' Circular was able to claim of his father was true also of him. 'He understood the tastes and

appreciated the wants of his countrymen. who, almost without exception, are sticklers for theology.'[143] But Clark's vision of the market for the books he published was not limited to Scotland, and he was consciously publishing for an international audience. Now this, clearly, is the way every successful publisher works: aiming at a particular audience, and setting up an effective distribution system to ensure that the product gets from warehouse to marketplace. If this process is effectively costed and efficiently operated, it should result in profitability. And indeed it was a fact that the Clarks 'found it to their own advantage' to produce evangelical works for the evangelical market.[144] We have already noted that the founder of the firm was said to have been reasonably wealthy at the time of his retirement.

But the second point to be made is that John Clark did not allow the taste of the audience to squeeze his publishing programme into its mould. He sought to lead, rather than to follow. In this he was perpetuating the policy established by his father. Sir Thomas had published the work by Weiss because he believed in it, even although it was likely to prove a loss-maker both directly, through selling poorly itself and indirectly, through undermining the Clarks' reputation for orthodoxy. It would appear then, that the firm was always prepared to publish a work which the principals both believed in, and felt to be an important contribution to theology. In certain cases, they realised that such works would never be profitable; in most cases where there was a risk, they hoped that, if the work's value were recognised, and if it had been efficiently costed, it would break even through time.

Thus, while the firm, in meeting the needs of its market sought to

achieve both the higher and the lower levels of success, if there was a conflict between the two levels over a work of importance and merit, the Clarks were always prepared to sacrifice the lower level of success in setting their sights on the higher.

That this was in fact the case is borne out by the letter books, where letters of rejection pleading the exigencies of the economic climate rub shoulders with enthusiastic letters of acceptance. It will be helpful to examine some of the economic reasons given for the rejection of MSS, and to contrast these with the reasons given for accepting other works despite the economic objections.

i. Type of book

I) Subject material

However worthy their subject matter, some MSS were rejected because the firm felt it would be economically unwise to publish them, because similar works were already on the market, either on the Clarks' own list, or on the list of another publisher. Thus, for instance, Sir Thomas wrote to a translator who had sought a commission to translate a new work into English 'With regard to Koegel, from what you say of it, I would have liked very well to have asked you to undertake it, but we have so many commentaries on Romans ....'[145] Thus, too, another author was told 'Although there can be no doubt of the ability of your work, I fear it is also not sufficiently popular in its form to supersede Hodge's and Cunningham's which have already a firm hold here.'[146] Such decisions are completely understandable. It is equally understandable that, on economic as well as on other grounds, the firm would decline to publish a work which specifically criticised another title on the Clark list. (The work in question was a critique

by Professor W.P. Dickson of Glasgow, an old friend of Sir Thomas', of the work by Arthur McGiffert alluded to above.[147] But these decisions should be contrasted with, for example, the decision to proceed with a work which duplicated others in the Clark list, apparently not on the grounds of the book's high quality (which would have made the decision more understandable) but simply by reason of the close relationship the author had with the firm. The work in question was yet another commentary on Romans, by Friedrich Godet (1812-1900), which, wrote Sir Thomas, ' I was unwilling to undertake having Philippi, but, from personal friendship to Prof. Godet, I could not well help it.'[148]

II) Literary form of the material

MSS were frequently rejected because, although the subject matter was relevant to the Clark list, and the treatment at a suitable level of scholarly eminence, nevertheless the format in which the material was presented made the work unlikely to be commercially viable. Just as surely as the Clarks could expect good sales of most (though by no means all) of the commentaries they published, so they could anticipate that volumes of collected sermons, articles, or lectures would, in general, sell poorly. With regard to books of sermons: the firm frequently declined such collections claiming that the time when books of sermons could be guaranteed to recoup their production costs had passed.[149] One particular work was rejected in these terms: 'It is very good, but we fear it is too much in the form of sermons to have much prospect of success.'[150] With regard to collections of articles and lectures, the following specific example is typical of the Clarks' general response:

> Without exception I think, we find that collected articles on such topics which have already either appeared in Reviews, or have formed the subject of Lectures or addresses, never pay the cost of production ... we have published so much of recent years for which we have not been & probably never shall be, recouped.[151]

This is not to say that T. & T. Clark never published volumes of collected lectures or sermons. Such material did indeed feature in the firm's lists. But since the results of major theological researches were unlikely to make their first appearance in print in sermon or lecture form, it cannot be argued in this case that the publication of these uneconomic works is indicative of the firm's commitment to the higher level of success. In fact, many of these volumes of collected material were published on commission by the Clarks. Thus, a commission arrangement was offered to two of the three writers mentioned above, one of whom accepted it.[152] The Clarks' commission publishing and its economics will be considered in depth in the section in Part II dealing with Miscellaneous Theological Works. It constituted a very small part of their total publishing programme, but enabled them to publish works which they believed had some merit, at minimal risk to themselves.

ii. Physical format

Clearly, the length of an MS had economic implications. Books were frequently rejected as being too short to be economically viable. Thus one translator was told that 'our experience of small books on abstruse subjects has not been very happy',[153] while an author was given the following bleak comment on the prospects of small books generally:

> We have looked over your MS ... and, though it is very interesting, we do not see that it has any chance of a remunerative sale. The price would be small, and we very seldom can make a small book remunerative where there is not a large sale, as the cost of binding and advertising is out of all proportion.'[154]

And yet in other cases, we find the firm prepared to put small books into print even when there was no guarantee of a large sale. Thus, in writing to the author of a work recommended to the firm by James Hastings, while the Clarks outlined the difficulties - small books did

not pay; the printers were busy; the booksellers' shops were 'quite full to overflowing' so that they 'rather shun[ned] "Theology"' (it was a fortnight before Christmas, and the author had wanted the work published 'to catch the New Year if possible') - nevertheless they accepted the MS for publication and sent it to the printers on the same day.[155]

It would seem likely that in this, and in similar cases, sights were being set on the higher level of success.

Similarly, we find works being rejected on account of their inordinate length. Thus, for example, when a translation was proposed of a six-volume work by Nebe, the Clarks commented that, without 'grave consideration' they would be inclined to 'shrink from it',[156] while another proposed translation[157] was declined because it was the Clarks' opinion that the volume was 'much too large to prove acceptable to English readers, and would require to be published at a price which would be practically prohibitive.'

And yet the firm undertook many works of great length and complexity. In many cases - such as the Moulton/Geden Concordance to the Greek New Testament or the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible - these works were fulfilling obvious needs, and therefore were likely to succeed if properly costed, but this in no way detracts from the very real economic risks involved in publishing them. John Clark commented before publication of the Concordance 'it is undoubtedly an alarming undertaking for me.'[158] In issuing works such as these, the Clarks would seem to have been consistently living dangerously, to the extent that we may well conclude that, once again, the higher level of success was being aimed at.

iii. The firm's commitment to other works

A reason frequently given for rejecting MSS was that the Clark programme for the season in question was already complete, and that if it were expanded by the acceptance of new works, the firm's energies would be so widely spread that they would be unable to do full justice to any of the new titles on the list. Thus one writer was told 'at present our hands are so full that we are unwilling to undertake more at least in the meantime.'[159] And there are at least two clear statements of the reasoning which lay behind this limiting of the list. James Hastings was told 'It is a mistake to publish too many books. We are wiser to limit the list to such as we can give our whole attention to',[160] while Frank Ballard was informed

> If we undertake more than we can give our entire attention to, all books must suffer, & that is obviously unfair to Authors ... As we usually take the entire risk & cost of production ourselves, owing to the class of books we publish, it is impossible for us - certainly it would be unwise of us - to accept all that are offered to us.[161]

Although the reason usually given by the Clarks for their reluctance to add to an already full list was that any additions to the publication programme would over-tax the resources of the firm's editorial, production, and distribution departments, we are probably entitled to assume - an assumption borne out by the letter to Ballard quoted above - that at the heart of the reluctance to expand the programme was concern over the additional financial commitment which the acceptance of further works would entail. In the letter to Hastings, there is perhaps also an indication that the Clarks were afraid of overloading the market.

And yet, almost side by side with letters rejecting MSS on the presumably genuine grounds of pressure of work, are others, accepting equally unsolicited MSS which the Clarks must have felt to have had spiritual

or economic potential, or both. Once again, we see the firm despite its heavy commitment of financial and manpower resources, being prepared to add to this commitment in the case of works the principals believed in.

iv. The economic climate

A further reason occasionally given by the firm for the non-acceptance of MSS was that the economic climate generally was unfavourable, or the book trade specifically in a depressed state. If this was the case in 1885 - 'Everything is in such a depressed state that we are resting on our oars as much as possible'[162] - it was equally the case at the end of the century, particularly during the Boer War which seems to have had a deleterious effect on the book trade: 'Business is terribly depressed this year ...'[163] 'Business is very quiet at present, & no one seems to be reading Theology. When the War is over - as I hope it will be soon - we trust things may improve.'[164]

And yet, even in these times of economic uncertainty, the firm's publishing programme continued to develop. Admittedly, some of the major works issued in the difficult years of 1900 and 1901 - two volumes of the Dictionary of the Bible, for example, and additions to the two International series - had been planned long before the trade was affected by the economic difficulties which arose from the Boer War. But these years also saw the issue of several other important works, and the launch of the World's Epoch Makers series. This could well be seen as further evidence of John Clark's preparedness to live dangerously for the sake of what he was publishing, the same resoluteness which later brought the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics to a conclusion despite the intervention of the Great War, whose economic consequences were more far-reaching than those of the Boer War.

All this evidence, therefore, would seem to add support to our earlier deduction that, while each proposal was very carefully scrutinised and evaluated, where a work of major importance was concerned, the Clarks were always ready to sacrifice the lower level of success in setting their sights on the higher.

3. Conclusion

In this Section, we have attempted to reach a general understanding of the firm's aims and motivation in publishing. We would seem to be at liberty to conclude that, to the Clarks, a sense of mission was paramount, and that Sir Thomas and John Maurice Clark were in many cases prepared, as they claimed to be, to put profitability in second place.

Our next task must be to see how this policy worked out in reality. Was the firm as prepared to make a loss on certain specific titles as they claimed to be? How unprofitable were these publications? And how, if they were publishing manifestly uneconomic works, did the Clarks not only manage to keep in business, but also to expand their lists as adventurously as they did?

These questions will be considered, and answered as far as surviving financial and other evidence permits, in the following three parts of this thesis. Part II deals with the profitability of individual categories of Clark publications; Part III discusses the cost-effectiveness of the firm's advertising and distribution system, and Part IV investigates the profitability of the firm as a whole, including the law publishing side of the business.

But before continuing this examination, it might be helpful to glance at the limited evidence which has bearing on T. & T. Clark's relationship with other religious book publishers. To what extent does the

nature of these relationships support the picture of the firm's motivation which we have built up? We would expect that co-operation with those working for a common cause would have been emphasised more than competition. Was this in fact the case? This question is considered in the closing Section of Part I.

But in concluding this discussion of the firm's aims and motives, it is perhaps appropriate to quote Sir Thomas' expression of the high ideal which motivated his publishing, together with his hopes, which were realised, that John Maurice would come to share fully in this sense of mission. Writing on 14 November 1877 to 'My Dearest Boy' (John was then studying in Leipzig), Sir Thomas commented[165]

> I hope that my son may be spared to carry on the business in a bright and intelligent manner, and that he will endeavour always to have the fear of God before his eyes, and will remember that a publisher has a great responsibility, such as even few men in very responsible positions have, and that in his selection of publications he may do much for the advancement of God's cause in the world .... .

Section C: Relationships with other religious publishers

Where a small group of crusading publishers is engaged in issuing works within a limited subject field, tensions will almost certainly arise between, on the one hand, the desire to compete for authors and markets, and, on the other, the desire to co-operate in furthering the common cause. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find such tensions evident in the Clarks' relationships with other British publishers of similar material.[166] This Section aims to investigate the extent to which the firm's handling of these relationships, tensions and all, supports the conclusions which we arrived at earlier regarding the Clarks' vision of their role, and commitment to the furtherance of progressive theology.

To begin by stating the obvious, it is clear that the Clarks' greatest competition came from those houses which specialised in the issue of material aimed at a market similar or indeed identical to that at which the Clark list was aimed. Where a work was manifestly unsuited to that list, the firm was always glad to suggest alternative publishers which the author might approach more successfully. Thus, for example, Miss E. Wright of Müsselburgh[167] was told that while the Clarks could not 'do justice' to the translation of a work by Funke which she was offering them she might find either the Religious Tract Society, Nelson, Gemmell, Hodder and Stoughton or Elliot Stock willing to undertake publication of the book. Or again, in rejecting a work as being 'too "popular" for our catalogue'[168] the firm suggested that it should be re-submitted either to Elliot or Macniven and Wallace of Edinburgh. In these cases, the Clarks would appear to have been gladly co-operating with fellow-publishers by putting suitable material in their way.[169]

But, with the exception of Hodder and Stoughton, none of these publishers mentioned by the Clarks were operating within their specific corner of religious publishing. Competition with houses working within that area was much greater, in terms of attracting authors to the list, of planning new titles and serials, and of marketing the products.

1. Attracting authors

As we have seen earlier, T. & T. Clark sought to publish works of the most eminent scholarship within their field: this high standard inevitably limited the number of potential contributors to the Clark list, and equally inevitably brought the firm into competition with houses publishing similar material to attract and retain the services of these contributors.

Although theology publishing was, as we shall see, by no means highly profitable as a whole, the scholar who established a sufficiently eminent reputation would appear to have found himself in a sellers' market. Thus, for example, the Clarks found it necessary to increase the rate of payment to certain contributors to the two International series.[170] The payment initially agreed had been £200 for each 500-page volume, but the Clarks were aware of a feeling that this sum was rather small, especially in view of the fact that Longman were known to be paying £100 for each 200-page volume in their Epochs of Church History series. In the light of this, the firm had considered it 'wise & just' to make additional payments to certain authors. Quite apart from the fact that the Clarks felt that 'the success of their books fully [justified] it', it was their opinion that these payments were necessary 'if such authors [were] to be retained as contributors to future Vols.', and if potential contributors to the series were not

to be dissuaded from co-operating. This is a clear example of competition working to the financial benefit of the author.

From time to time, the Clarks had problems over attempts made by other publishers to issue works which, for one reason or another, the firm felt belonged on the Clark list. Hence, for example, when Hodder and Stoughton announced in the Publishers' Circular that they were about to issue a new translation, incorporating the author's latest corrections, of Franz Delitzsch's commentary on Psalms, the first edition of which had been published by the Clarks in three volumes in around 1871, the London publishers received an indignant letter from Edinburgh:[171]

> This is discourteous, and so different from the usual courtesy of trade, that we can hardly believe you are aware of our having published these works ... you announce our books for which we paid Prof. Delitzsch; and you even have actually secured the services of translators whom we first sought out and employed.

In the end, the Clarks had to accept that the situation had arisen due to misunderstandings and communication failures.[172] It would appear that Delitzsch had written to the firm in 1885 informing them that it had come to his notice that a certain committee in England intended to issue a new translation of the commentary, but that such an enterprise could not have his approval as he considered himself morally bound to stand by the Clark firm. At this point, Delitzsch, who had had a lasting and warm relationship with the Clarks, clearly hoped that the firm would negotiate with him and with the committee with a view to issuing the new edition under the Edinburgh imprint. But the Clarks made no response; Delitzsch assumed that their silence indicated lack of interest, and agreed to co-operate with the committee when they arranged to issue the work through Hodder and Stoughton. It is not clear how culpable Delitzsch was in all this - there was obviously a

certain want of frankness on his side - but the whole episode is interesting for what it reveals of the Clarks' jealous custodianship of their rights, and indeed the need for such vigilance in the face of competition. In the event, the firm had to conclude 'it cannot now be helped,'[173] but future work by Delitzsch appeared under their imprint. It may well have been that the Clarks' vigorous reaction in the case of Psalms would have made Delitzsch think twice about any future proposals from other houses: in any case an author might with some cause conclude that a publisher who vigorously defended his rights in a work would equally vigorously promote it in the market place.[174]

Problems could also arise where the Clarks felt that they had just claim to publish a lecture series in volume form because they had issued previous collections of lectures given under the same auspices. This happened, for example, in the case of the 1879 Cunningham Lecturers: again the culprit was Hodder and Stoughton.[175] The Clarks had published each series of Cunningham Lectures except for the first, and considered it less than reasonable that Hodder should have intervened: 'had the position been reversed I would not on any consideration have gone to any Congregational Lecturer and made an offer for one of a series of which you published the others.'[176]

Although the Clarks suffered in this way at the hands of other publishers, there would seem to be no evidence that they themselves attempted to attract authors to their list in any way which would have contravened their high standards of courtesy. On the contrary, they would seem to have been remarkably scrupulous. Hence, for example, the letter to Hodder and Stoughton about lecture series quoted above continues

> A few months ago a personal friend for whom I had published several books delivered the Baird Lectures, all of which had formerly been published by Blackwood. I declined to do it till Blackwood had been communicated with and had expressed their willingness that I should publish it.[177]

And there would seem to have been few valid complaints from other publishers against the Clarks on these grounds. When W.R. Nicoll suggested that the firm had been attempting to persuade an Expositor contributor, a certain Dr Cox (very possibly Dr Samuel Cox, the previous editor of the Expositor) to write for the Monthly Interpreter by offering any terms Cox chose to name, the Clarks countered by saying that any approach to Cox had been made by the editor of the Monthly Interpreter on his own initiative, adding that they had 'no communication whatever with Dr Cox.'[178] And when C.A. Briggs, the American editor of the International Theological Library complained that the Clark firm was diverting the energies of Library contributors into producing copy for the Dictionary of the Bible, the Clarks countered with a firm and detailed refutation of this charge.[179]

The Clarks' actions, therefore, would seem to have been in accord with their stated view that frenzied competition to sign up other publishers' authors was beneficial to no-one - 'I think this system of beating up for books is not healthy either for authors or publishers'[180] and that to act creditably was as important, or more important than seizing opportunities to add to the profits: 'We might adopt reprisals [to Hodder's issue of the new edition of Delitzsch's Psalms] which would probably not be profitable to either party, but we should think any such course beneath us, and we trust you may yet see your way to abandon what cannot redound to your credit; and very likely not to your profit.'[181]

2. Issuing similar works

If there was a measure of competition between publishers over the attracting of authors to their lists, there was most certainly competition when it came to producing work which would fill gaps on the theological library shelves. Very often, more than one publisher would recognise that there was a need for, or a demand for, a work of a particular nature or on a particular subject: the publisher who could secure the best author, and publish first would normally have the greatest success. The Clarks did not escape this kind of competition. For example, when Professor James Cooper of Glasgow suggested that the Clarks should issue a very specialist work in the Ante-Nicene Library - a translation of Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi - the firm suggested that the projected translation should be announced in the literary journals to alert other publishers to the Clarks' plans and thus, presumably, prevent them from launching their own translations which could hardly have proved to be profitable.[182] Very often also, where a publisher began issuing a manifestly successful series or type of publication, his competitiors would quickly begin publishing similar material. Thus, from the beginning, the Clarks were said to have had 'imitators and rivals'.[183]

Here, too, among their chief competitors was the firm of Hodder and Stoughton. This partnership had been formed in 1868, out of the previous firm of Jackson, Walford and Hodder, official publishers to the Congregational Union.[184] Over the next decades, the new company built up a strong religious list, by no means limiting itself to Congregationalist authors. T. & T. Clark was not the only firm to feel the pressure of Hodder's competition. Dr Norman L. Walker, the

editor of the Free Church Monthly, commented, for example, that the late Thomas Nelson had been anxious over 'the going away of our higher class books to Hodder and Stoughton', (when he used 'our' Walker was speaking on behalf of the Free Church) and had wanted to do something to 'stop the flow'.[185] In Walker's opinion, the issue of books of this nature had contributed greatly to the success of Hodder and Stoughton,[186] at the expense, it is implied, of Nelson. It is clear that if Hodder posed a threat to Nelson, in whose programme theology played only a small part, T. & T. Clark, with its major emphasis on theology publishing, might well have felt itself even more threatened by the London firm. And despite the fact that the Clarks commented that 'we have always looked upon Mr Hodder as a personal friend'[187] there were occasional grounds for friction between the two firms.

We have already noted that the Clarks took justifiable exception to Hodder's Foreign Biblical Library: their criticism was based not only on the fact that Hodder and Stoughton were re-issuing works already on the Clark list, but also on the fact that the series title selected by the London firm bore such a striking resemblance to that of the Clarks' long-standing series. They were also much aggrieved by the attitude of the Hodder editor, William Robertson Nicoll, to whom they reacted 'We regret that you should have written to us in the manner you have done. You will allow us to say that it was unworthy of any one, much less a clergyman.'[188]

Besides discussing the Foreign Biblical Library, the letter of Nicoll's to which the Clarks were replying also touched on another area of friction between the two companies. Hodder's monthly periodical the Expositor had been founded in 1875 under the editorship of Dr Samuel Cox of Nottingham. He remained in the editorial chair until the end of 1884, when, because certain of his personal views were causing

disquiet among the readership, he was replaced by W.R. Nicoll, who began a long-lasting and successful editorship with the January 1885 number.[189] This was a mere two months after the Clarks had begun publishing the short-lived Monthly Interpreter at the suggestion of J.S. Exell, its editor, and Nicoll appears to have felt that the Monthly Interpreter had been specifically launched to compete with the Expositor in general, and in particular with the Expositor as he shaped it during the early months of his editorship. In this case, it was the Clarks who were being accused of unfair competition, but their response was that the charge was preposterous. The idea for the Monthly Interpreter had originated with Exell, not with them (a somewhat weak point, one feels), and, moreover, it had been launched two months before Nicoll began to edit the Expositor.

> Besides, the two Magazines were not on the same lines, and you surely do not seriously mean to say that we are always to be excluded from the publication of a Magazine simply because yours happens to be in existence.[190]

It is difficult to understand why Nicoll made this charge in October 1886, by which time the last number of the Monthly Interpreter would have appeared. And, in any case, within a few years, Hastings' Expository Times was to prove that there was room in the market place for two similar (and similarly-titled!) periodicals, provided they were both of a sufficiently high quality.

But there was competition over particular works with other firms besides Hodder. For example, it became evident in the mid-1890s that a new Bible Dictionary was required, one which would incorporate the results of recent biblical scholarship. A revision of Dr William Smith's out-of-date work was abandoned after the first volume had been issued,[191] and thereafter two publishers attempted independently to fill the gap.

One was T. & T. Clark, who published the first volume of James Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible in 1898; the other was A. & C. Black, whose Encyclopaedia Biblica, projected by the late William Robertson Smith, and edited by T.K. Cheyne and J.Sutherland Black, began to appear the following year. It is clear that these works, both of which represented major investment on the part of their publishers, would have been competing for an identical market. Both were initially intended to run to four volumes (in 1899, the Clarks complained to the editor of the Daily News presumably in response to a review that while Black's volumes were actually smaller than Clark's, they in fact appeared larger because the rival publisher had used thicker paper, and had numbered the columns rather than the pages to give the illusion of greater length.[192]) Both were intended to represent modern scholarship although the Clarks did not see the aims of the two works as being identical: in 1896 they had written to Scribner

> As we are informed Black's one is not to include Biblical Theology at all, & the articles are to be written by a very limited number of scholars while our Dictionary will cover the whole range of Bible knowledge, including Biblical Theology.[193]

In the event, the reviewers, and the bookbuyers preferred Hastings' work, at least in part because although progressive, it did not share what was generally seen as the speculative radicalism of its rival. The Dictionary of the Bible enjoyed a long period in print both in the UK and in the United States, where Scribners agreed to distribute it in preference to the Encyclopaedia Biblica, even although they handled Black's other major reference work, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, in the USA.[194] There is no record of any correspondence with A. & C. Black over this issue. It would seem likely that each house discovered about the other's plans only when so many agreements with authors had been entered into that for either, abandonment of their project would

have been too costly to contemplate.

At one point, the Clarks would even seem to have been faced with the threat of competition from the Free Church itself. The Editorial Committee of the Church had received the impression that in issuing the Bible Class Primer series (for which the firm had been responsible since 1884), they had been profiteering at the expense of the Church: the Committee's response to this perception was to discuss making arrangements to publish a new series of primers through another publisher. The Clarks' initial response was pointed - 'we have our own opinion as to the expediency of any Church launching out into commercial undertakings'[195] - and in the end they agreed to publish the new primers themselves, on commission, the terms being that the Committee would meet all the literary expenses, and allow the publishers a 15% royalty on sales. The 1899 report of the Publication and Records Committee of the Free Church noted that

> arrangements [had] been completed for the issue of a new series of Primers for the use of Bible-classes which [would] henceforth be published on behalf of the Church, and under the direction of her Committees.[196]

T. & T. Clark, therefore, seems to have faced considerable competition from other houses over specific works and series it issued; in turn, it received the occasional criticism over allegedly unfair competitive practices; but while it may have had to share the market place with imitators and rivals, there is no evidence whatsoever that the Clarks themselves ever followed a deliberate policy of imitation or destructive rivalry.

3. Competition in the market place

Works from rival religious publishing houses, once issued, would compete

with one another in the market place,[197] and this competition would express itself in the areas of advertising, both to the Trade and to the potential audience, of representation and distribution, and of the attracting of support for a given work from influential figures within the various denominations. The Clarks' marketing operation will be considered in more detail in Part III: it is sufficient to note here that there would seem to be very little evidence with bearing on any specific strategies adopted by the firm in order to compete in the market place, other than ensuring the excellence of their product.

There is the occasional hint that efforts were made to persuade Professors and lecturers to adopt a particular text as a course book either within a given theological college, or within the educational programme of a denomination as a whole; obviously official endorsement from such a body could materially influence the success of a work. For example, we find the firm writing to the Rev. Alexander Whyte[198] regretting that

> in the 'Welfare of Youth' Competition Syallabus 1887-88 ... under Division I Professor Lindsay's 'St Luke's Gospel' in our Bible Class Handbook Series is not even mentioned, - Blackie's 4d edition alone being prescribed as the Text Book. Do you not think this is rather unfair?
>
> We quite understood from Prof Lindsay - in fact he distinctly stated so - that the larger commentary was to be used and we therefore put extra pressure upon the printers to have the 2nd part ready in time for the Assembly. I have no doubt the Committee have acted as they thought best, but surely there could be no harm in at least mentioning our edition, especially for the Senior Section.
>
> It certainly makes a material difference on the sales. I understand that one firm in town stocked 1000 copies of the small edition, whereas two dozen copies of our edition was considered quite sufficient because, as they said, it was '<u>not to be used as the Text book</u>'. Pray excuse me writing thus frankly on the matter, but I am anxious to push the Handbooks as much as possible and it requires a large circulation to make them pay at all.

There is the occasional hint also, that from time to time the Clarks were willing to increase their sales by selling direct at a discount to

a specific client group, such as the students of a particular theological college, or the ministers of a given denomination. Although the main aim in this would appear to have been the altruistic one of assisting the somewhat impecunious ministers and students in question, there is no doubt that had such a policy been consistently followed, it would have boosted Clark's sales at the expense of its competitors' at no greater cost to the firm than selling through retail outlets. But, aware of the danger of antagonising the book trade, the Clarks made selling direct at discount the exception rather than the rule. This issue, too, will be considered in depth in Part III.

In the market place, therefore, as in the selecting of authors, and in the planning of works and series, the Clarks would not in general seem to have followed an aggressively competitive policy.

4. Conclusions

What conclusions may be drawn from this study of the relationship between T. & T. Clark and its competitors? In 1879, Hodder and Stoughton were told that, in the Clarks' view, mutual consideration by competing publishers 'would sweeten competition when it is unfortunately necessary'.[199] They clearly held that the necessity of competition should never be seen as invalidating or obstructing the benefits of co-operation and harmonious relations. If this were the Clarks' view, then it would indeed support our previous conclusions about the firm's conception of their role and commitment to the cause of furthering theological study.

How far do the facts which we have examined support this view? It must be said that the evidence is inconclusive. There is no doubt

that the Clarks had a clear sense of what they saw as the honourableness and gentlemanliness of their actions, but a cynic might argue from the evidence that the firm's own interests were paramount. They could be said to have co-operated when co-operation was in their own best interests and to have given competitive instincts their head when competition was in their own best interests.

However, it seems certain that T. & T. Clark was more competed against than competing, as we have seen. There is no evidence that the firm ever deliberately set out to invade another publisher's territory. This may be an argument from silence, but it is a reasonably convincing one in that it is consistent with our earlier conclusions regarding the firm's attitudes. We have no reason to doubt that the Clarks were voicing their genuine sentiments in stating that 'we ... have ever been most scrupulous in avoiding any injury to our co-publishers.'[200]

PART II: The Profitability of Individual Categories of Publication

PART II

It has been noted earlier that T. & T. Clark claimed to be willing to publish manifestly uneconomic works in the interests of furthering theological science. Our next step must be to test the validity of this claim by examining in detail such financial evidence as has been preserved. Is it in fact the case that a significant proportion of the firm's theological works made a loss? And, if so, to what extent were these losses cancelled out by profits reaped from more lucrative publications? How profitable, in fact, was the whole Clark publishing operation? This second Part investigates in detail the different categories of theological publications issued by the Clarks, and attempts to make an assessment of the profitability both of these categories as a whole, and of the individual titles which they contained. Profitability can be assessed in terms of the percentage of items in a category which made a profit; of the annual percentage return on investment ignoring generalised overheads; of the size of overall profit per item; and of the speed with which an individual item came into profit. Detailed figures relating to the firm's activities are available for four financial years only (1895-96, 1896-97, 1897-98 and 1898-99),[1] with the result that in many cases not all the data we would have wished to examine has been preserved. However, sufficient evidence does remain to enable us to make a reasonable estimate of the profitability of the different categories of publication issued by the firm in the late nineteenth century. In this Part, seven different categories of publication are distinguished and investigated. The following table lists these seven categories, and also gives details of the total number of items embraced by these categories in a representative year in the 1890s, 1896-97. It should

be particularly noted that these categories do not exactly correspond to those employed in Part IV, where transatlantic co-editions are itemised separately.

TABLE II: 1

The Clark list for financial year 1896-97		
Section in Part II	Description of Category	No. of Individual Titles (including those in series)
A	Series of British origin, and patriotic works	143
B	Translations	310
C	Works of US origin	68
D	Periodicals and part-publications	2
E	Standard reference works	1
F	Miscellaneous theological works	119
	[Legal titles]	42
		685

We now turn to a detailed examination of each of these categories with the exception of that including the firm's legal publications.

Section A: Series of completely British origin, and translations of Patristic works

1. Introduction: Series in the history of T. & T. Clark

In the historical introduction, we have already noted the crucial role which the issue of series played in the development of the firm. Its reputation, established by the Biblical Cabinet, was reinforced by the Foreign Theological Library, and until the end of the century and beyond, the majority of the firm's publications were issued as part of one series or another.[2]

It is easy to see why the concept of issuing works as part of a series appealed to the Clarks. Except in very unusual circumstances, a small work could only be published profitably as part of a series, where the cost of advertising could be divided among several works. The cost of independently advertising a small, cheap work which would yield a very small sum per copy sold was just as much as that for independently advertising a large, expensive work which, yielding a considerably larger sum per copy sold would, it was hoped, quickly recover the advertising expenditure. It was in view of this that the firm wrote to an author in 1890

> Unless small books of this nature are issued in some series it is extremely difficult to make them pay even cost of production the expense of advertising is so out of all proportion to the price of the book itself.[3]

But series publishing was important in the case of larger works too, for the series, especially if it were issued on a subscription basis, would build up and maintain customer loyalty to the Clark imprint.

> The confirmed book-buyer has an instinctive desire to own all the volumes of a series which he has begun to collect, and will continue to acquire them as they appear as long as his economic circumstances remain

the same, and as long as the quality of the succeeding volumes remains, in general, as high as it was in the case of the earlier ones. That this principle was very much to the fore in the Clarks' thinking, is demonstrated, for example, by their rejection of an MS on the grounds that 'An independent Commentary on Daniel (i.e. one not included in a Series) would, we are sure, have little chance of success at present. We fear the result would be disappointing.'[4] No doubt in making this comment the Clarks were motivated in part by a desire to sweeten a rejection letter somewhat, but the clear implication nevertheless is that a work which would on its own be unviable could be made to succeed as part of a series of repute. The problem arose, of course, when the reputation of a series was so badly undermined by one or more 'bad apples' - works of poor scholarship, or of a contentious nature - that sales of the series as a whole were affected. The Clarks feared that McGiffert's book, discussed earlier, would have this stultifying effect on customers' perceptions of the value of the International Theological Library. If, in October 1897, the firm wrote to Scribners that 'this sort of thing will do great damage to the whole Series'[5] seven months later they were able to report a fulfilment of their prophecy: 'We regret to say that we find the sale of the Series is fast diminishing. Dr McGiffert's Vol. has done a world of harm to it, & is causing the whole Series to be looked upon with distrust.'[6] However, this problem proved to be of a temporary nature, and the reputation of the I.T.L. survived. Indeed, it seems to have been the case that almost all the series issued by the firm were held in high esteem, an esteem which genuinely, if unquantifiably, affected the sales of each of the works of which these series were comprised.

This Section deals with those series which were of completely British origin, or which featured translations of Patristic and other earlier writings. It seems appropriate that the Foreign Theological Library, and the series of commentaries by H.A.W. Meyer should be discussed in the section on translations; while consideration of the two International series, the History of the Christian Church, the Eras of Church History series, and the series of commentaries written or edited by J.P. Lange (which, although of European origin initally, were purchased by the Clarks from Scribners) belongs properly in the Section dealing with the firm's dealings and relationships with transatlantic publishers.

2. Individual series

a) Works of John Calvin

In 1859, as we noted above, T. & T. Clark bought over the stock and copyrights of the works published by the Calvin Translation Society, which had been founded in Edinburgh in 1843. These works were kept in print at least until the turn of the century, all but five of the fifty-one volumes being still announced as available in the 1901 catalogue. We do not have figures for the performance of individual titles in this series between 1895 and 1899. However, a modest profit was shown by the series as a whole over these years. This amounted to £1 2s. 4d. in 1895-96, rose to £1 11s. 7d. in the following year, before falling to £1 9s. 2d. in 1897-98 and 17s. 6d. in 1898-99. The series may well have been successful in its day, but we are unable to reach any firm conclusions about its profitability on the basis of this limited evidence.

b) The Ante-Nicene Library

'From Presbyterian Scotland, of all places in the world the last from whence we should expect such a movement, we learn that an English

translation of the Apostolic and other early Christian Fathers is in progress.'[7] Thus the Bookseller announced the imminent issue of the first volumes in the Clarks' Ante-Nicene Library, which aimed to present a 'collection of all the works of the Fathers of the Christian Church prior to the Council of Nicaea.'[8]

It was planned to issue the Series on subscription at the rate of four volumes per annum, under the editorship of the Rev. Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson. Initially, it was intended that the Library would extend to sixteen volumes. In the event 'by the miscalculation of the Editors [accompanied, one supposes, by the supreme indulgence of the publishers], it actually turned out to be 24 volumes';[9] and an additional volume was later added.

The nineteenth century had seen a revival of interest in the writings of the early Church Fathers, spearheaded by the Tractarian movement. E.B. Pusey, one of the leading Tractarians, had, in 1836, initiated The Oxford Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of East and West (the first volume was published in 1838): the last of the forty-eight volumes in this series did not appear until after Pusey's death (he lived until 1882).[10] The Clark series was seen as 'supplementing' that of Pusey:[11] the Bookseller's surprise in announcing the Ante-Nicene Library arose from the fact that T. & T. Clark, a Presbyterian, evangelical publishing house, should thus choose to associate itself with, or to follow in the footsteps of, an ultra High-Anglican movement. It was no doubt a similar sense of surprise which prompted a later writer in the Bookseller to describe the Library as 'Perhaps the most remarkable outcome of Patristic Theology'.[12] The fact that the Clarks were publishing for a Presbyterian

and Nonconformist audience did to some extent restrict the scope of the series; 'It was necessary, as much as possible, to exclude not only the Roman novelties, but the Episcopal element also; hence the greater limitation, as compared with [the Oxford series] "to the works of the Fathers of the Church prior to the Council of Nicaea." (A.D. 325)[13] However, it could also be said of the Clark series 'we have never heard a word against the faithfulness of their translations; apparently no attempt was made to tone down any of the Fathers, although some of their writings must have been found extremely unpalatable to many of the subscribers.'[14]

It would seem clear therefore, that not only were the Clarks taking a considerable financial risk in launching this series, but also that they proceeded despite a full awareness of this fact. A letter written in 1884 commented of the Ante-Nicene Library 'we were the first to publish such a collected series, and we did so at a risk that no other Publisher has been found to undertake, at the outlay of many thousands of pounds and of very great thought and labour.'[15] There is no doubt that the market was limited, and indeed the same letter goes on to point out that penetration of the American market had been considered essential to the success of the project: 'undoubtedly we reckoned on a large sale in the United States: indeed without this the matter would have been hopeless.'[16] On the other hand, it was argued[17] that the fact that the series bore a Presbyterian imprint made it acceptable to the widest possible audience within the United Kingdom. Episcopalians would have been interested in the works it contained as a matter of course, while Presbyterians and Independents would accept from T. & T. Clark what they would have been most unlikely

to accept from Anglican publishers such as Rivington. Be that as may, however, the risk seems to have been considerable.

Regrettably, the only figures available for the years over which the series was being issued are the trade and retail prices. We have no record of the Clarks' outlay (apart from the vague 'many thousands of pounds' mentioned above), and as the sales figures have not been preserved, we have no means of calculating the firm's income. The Stock and Sales Book from the late 1890s[18] lists the expenses and income against each title on an annual basis only, no running balance being kept. Thus we have no means of being certain that the total outlay on the series had been recouped by the end of the century.[19] The twenty-four volumes were available at a subscription price of £6 6s. 0d., averaging 5s. 3d. per volume (the trade price being £5 14s. 0d., averaging 4s. 9d. per volume). Individual volumes were available at the non-subscription retail price of 10s. 6d., to which the Clarks' normal trade discount applied.[20] These prices remained in force for the rest of the century,[21] with the addition of the offer of a selection of any four volumes at the subscription rate of 5s. 3d. per volume.

More detailed figures are available for the four financial years beginning 1895-96.[22] In that year, four volumes in the series were reprinted, and it is possible to estimate the unit cost of these reprints.

TABLE II: 2

Unit cost of volumes in the Ante-Nicene Library reprinted 1895-96				
Volume	Tertullian Vol. I	Origen Vol. I	Tertullian Vol. III	Arnobius
Length of run	160	162	160	162
Printing Paper Binding*	£10 11s. 6d. £ 2 15s. 5d. £ 5 0s. 0d.	£10 0s. 3d. £ 2 12s. 9d. £ 5 1s. 2d.	£11 0s. 6d. £ 3 0s. 0d. £ 5 0s. 0d.	£ 8 12s. 5d. £ 2 4s. 4d. £ 5 1s. 2d.
Total cost	£18 6s.11d.	£17 14s. 2d.	£19 0s. 6d.	£15 17s.11d.
Unit cost	2s. 3½d.	2s. 2d.	2s. 4d.	1s.11½d.

* The figures for binding costs are notional in that they assume that the whole edition was bound. In fact, only 270 volumes in the Series were bound during the year in question, and not all of these may have been copies of the reprinted works.

The mean unit cost of reprinting these works was therefore 2s. 2¼d.

(The work by Arnobius was cheaper because it was significantly shorter.)

The Clarks' income from sales of these volumes was as follows: on works sold through retailers to subscribers - 4s. 9d., with no additional discount on this trade price: on individual volumes sold to the trade - 7s.11d., on which a further 2½% discount would apply if the bookseller's account was settled promptly, reducing the firm's income to 7s. 9d.; on individual volumes sold to a wholesaler - 6s. 9d. Although it is not clear from the accounts, there is the possibility that a proportion of the subscription sales would be made direct to the customer at the full subscription price of 5s. 3d. per volume. Given a mean unit cost per reprinted volume of 2s. 2¼d., the firm's ultimate return on its investment in these reprints ignoring generalised overheads would therefore have been:

on subscription through trade - 2s. 6¼d. = 117% return
on subscription direct - 3s. 0¼d. = 140% return
non-subscription through trade - 5s. 6¼d. = 254.28% return
non-subscription through wholesaler - 4s. 6¼d. = 208.57% return[23]

On the fact of it, these figures seem reasonable. But a different picture emerges when we consider the annual sales of the series. In 1895-96, for example, around 108 volumes were sold at subscription price (this figure would include both those sold direct, and those sold through the trade), and forty-six were sold at non-subscription price. Thus only 154 volumes or an average of 6.4 per volume in the series were sold. This was, in fact, a particularly poor year. Sales for the three succeeding financial years were as follows:

TABLE II: 3

Ante-Nicene Library: Sales 1896-1899

Year	Subscription Sales	Non-subscription Sales	Total Sales	Mean Sales per Volume in the Series
1896-97	226	49	275	11.45
1897-98	194	63	257	10.7
1898-99	143	32	175	7.29

It is obvious that some titles would sell better than others, and that it would be those which were most likely to require reprinting. But it is clear nonetheless even on the basis of the best of the above figures, that the reprinting represented a long-term commitment by T. & T. Clark to the series, that it would be some years before the firm saw even 160 copies sold, and that the annual rate of return on investment was unspectacular.

Over the financial year 1895-96, expenditure on the Series exceeded

income by £25 17s. 4d. Over the next two financial years, income from the Series exceeded expenditure on it, by £51 4s. 3d. in 1896-97, and by £29 16s. 1d. in 1897-98. This reflects the fact both that sales were higher and that less expenditure on reprinting was required in the course of those years: the firm was gaining a small return on a great investment.

There would seem to be clear evidence here that the Clarks were proceeding with the series because of its theological value, and almost in spite of financial considerations. That the Ante-Nicene Library was highly praised would no doubt have provided some consolation, but praise could not be guaranteed to ensure profitability.

c) The works of Saint Augustine

Closely related to the Ante-Nicene Library was the series, announced in 1871, which was to contain certain of the works of St. Augustine. Here too, the Clarks were complementing the work of the Oxford translators; although the Confessions appear in both series, the Edinburgh firm consciously avoided the Sermons and Commentaries on the Psalms which had already been issued from Oxford, and concentrated for the most part on works 'of first-rate importance' which had not yet appeared in English translation.[24] It was intended that the series, which was to appear under the editorship of Marcus Dods, would run to sixteen volumes. In the event only fifteen appeared, as Robert Rainy was unable to find time to complete a Life of St. Augustine which was to have formed the final volume.[25]

Once again, the series was issued on subscription, and once again also, the only figures available for the years over which the series was being issued are the trade and retail prices. It was announced that

the sixteen volumes would be available at a subscription price of £4 4s. 0d., averaging 5s. 3d. per volume (the trade price being £3 16s. 0d. averaging 4s. 9d. per volume). Individual volumes were available at the non-subscription retail price of 10s. 6d., to which the Clarks' normal trade discount applied.[26] In the event, the subscription price for the fifteen volumes was fixed at £3 19s. 0d. [27]

More detailed figures are available for the four financial years beginning 1895-96.[28] In 1896-97, two volumes in the series were reprinted, and it is possible to estimate the unit cost of these reprints.

TABLE II: 4

Unit cost of volumes in the St. Augustine Series reprinted 1896-97		
Volume	City of God Vol. I	City of God Vol. II
Length of run	270	270
Printing	£12 11s. 1d.	£13 1s. 0d.
Paper	£ 4 18s. 2d.	£ 5 0s.10d.
Binding*	£ 7 17s. 6d.	£ 7 17s. 6d.
Total cost	£25 6s. 9d.	£25 19s. 4d.
Unit cost	1s.10½d.	1s.11d.

* The figures for binding costs are notional, in that they assume that the whole edition was bound. In fact, only 210 volumes in the series were bound during the year in question, and not all of these may have been copies of the reprinted works.

Taking the average unit cost of reprinting these works as being 1s.11d., the Clarks' ultimate return on its investment in these reprints, ignoring generalised overheads can be estimated. The firm's income on the sale of volumes in the series was the same as on the sale of volumes in the Ante-Nicene Library. Hence the return on investment would have been:

on subscription through trade - 2s.10d. = 148%
on subscription direct - 3s. 4d. = 174%
non-subscription through trade - 5s.10d. = 304%
non-subscription through wholesaler - 4s.10d. = 252%[29]

On the face of it, these figures appear extremely good. But once again, a less satisfactory picture emerges when we consider the annual sales of the series as laid out in the following Table.

TABLE II: 5

St. Augustine Series: Sales 1895-1899				
Year	Subscription sales	Non-subscription sales	Total	Mean sales per volume in the series
1895-96	77	57	134	8.93
1896-97	46	30	76	5.06
1897-98	106	40	146	9.73
1898-99	45	14	59	3.93

It is obvious that some titles would sell better than others, and that it would be those which were most likely to require reprinting. Of all the works in the Series, the two City of God volumes sold better than the others when it came to the non-subscription market (subscribers, at least in the early days of the series, had to take it as a whole).[30] But it is clear nonetheless, even on the basis of the best of the above figures, that as in the case of the Ante-Nicene Library the reprinting represented a long-term commitment by T. & T. Clark to the series: it would be some years before the firm saw 270 copies sold, and the annual rate of return would be correspondingly reduced.

Over three of the financial years for which we have figures, income

from the Series exceeded expenditure on it: by £28 19s. 0d. in 1895-96, by £29 16s. 1d. in 1897-98, and by £6 5s. 6d. in 1898-99. Expenditure exceeded income by £26 1s. 3d. in 1896-97, the year in which the City of God reprint was undertaken. Where no reprints were required, the series could be relied upon to produce a modest profit, but once again we suspect that the Clarks were gaining a small return on a great investment. It may well have been, of course, that the Series was very much more profitable in its early days.

b) Bible Class Handbooks

The first volumes in the Clarks' series of Bible Class Handbooks would appear to have been issued around 1879, under the editorship of Alexander Whyte and Marcus Dods. The prospects for the series seemed favourable from the first: thus Thomas wrote to Whyte on 29 September 1879 'I think the series has done fairly well, and I have no doubt the sale will be largely increased as it proceeds.'[31] In 1879, the firm claimed that the first edition of each Handbook ran to 4,000 copies,[32] but by 1895-96 this had dropped, at least in the case of a work on Ephesians by J.S. Candlish, to 2,160 copies:[33] and this was a title which was likely to sell well.

Although the series does not appear to have been in any way officially connected with the Free Church of Scotland, nevertheless the bulk of sales may well have been made to members of that Church, and, as we have already noted in the section on T. & T. Clark and its competitors, the attitude taken towards a title by the Welfare of Youth Committee of the Free Church could either ensure or imperil its success.[34]

However, sales of the Handbooks were not confined to Scotland. Several were translated into Welsh,[35] and at least two titles, James Stalker's Life of Christ and Life of St. Paul, were given the accolade, a dubious one from the Clarks' point of view, of being 'pirated' on the other side of the Atlantic by the American firm of Fleming H. Revell.[36] There was very little that the Edinburgh firm could do about Revell's action, as they noted with some justified indignation:

> We understand that when Dr. Stalker was in New York, almost two years ago, he called at Revell's & got him to agree to pay the Author a small royalty, but the British Publishers have never been recognised, and as ... it is utterly impossible for us to undersell Revell ... we must just let the thing go. It is hardest of all for us.[37]

At least there was the consolation that Stalker's works continued to be the best-selling titles in the series, and sold well also in the more expensive 3s. 6d. editions.[38]

Detailed financial data for the series have only survived in the case of the four financial years beginning 1895-96. These data are summarised in the following table.

TABLE II: 6

Bible Class Handbooks: Analysis of Profitability				
	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
No. of titles in series at the start of the year	40	41	43	44
No. requiring reprints in course of the year	7(2)	12	6	16
No. of new titles issued during year	1	2	1	0
Surplus Total showing profit Total profit Average profit	38 £380 14s. 4d.(3) £10.02	24 £182 11s. 2d. £7.6	40 £449 8s. 5d. £11.24	39 £276 17s. 5½d. £7.09
Deficit Total showing deficit Total deficit Average deficit	3(4) £8 3s. 5d. £2.72	19 £118 17s. 0d. £6.25	4 £65 9s.11d. £16.37	5 £13 4s. 1½d. £2.64
Net profit	£372 10s.11d.	£63 14s. 2d.	£383 18s. 6d.	£263 13s. 4d.
Copies sold(1) Total-all titles Average Total-reprints/new titles Average Total-works not reprinted Average	15,710(5) 383(5) 10,175 (8 titles) 1,271 5,535 (33 titles) 167	14,205 330 9,464 (14 titles) 676 4,741 (27 titles) 176	14,360 326 5,035 (7 titles) 719 9,325 (37 titles) 252	12,396 281 8,295 (16 titles) 518 4,101 (28 titles) 146
% return on investment On reprints Example 1 Size of printing % return on edition No. of copies sold in the year No. of years required to sell printing % return per annum	3,240(6) 85.69% 2,029 1.6 53.55%	540(9) 91.15% 175 3.08 29.59%	540(12) 104.35% 144 3.75 27.82%	1,080(15) 103.23% 93 11.61 8.89%
Example 2 Size of printing % return on edition No. of copies sold in the year No. of years required to sell printing % return per annum	1,080 101.77% 677 1.6 63.6%	540(10) 71.02% 68 8.0 8.87%	540(13) 96.61% 371 1.45 66.62%	1,080(16) 137.11% 470 2.29 59.87%

Bible Class Handbooks: Analysis of Profitability (continued)

	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
% return on investment (continued)				
On new books				
Example				
Size of printing	2,160(8)	2,160(11)	1,080(14)	No new
% return on edition	34.19%	55.48%	-14.66%	
No. of copies sold in the year	1,687	1,087	358	titles
No. of years required to sell printing	1.3	1.98	3.01	issued
% return per annum	26.3%	28.02%	-	1898-99

Notes

(1) Excluding the '25th copy' which was given as a bonus to booksellers who ordered two dozen copies.

(2) When the series was launched, Thomas Clark's opinion was that it was the commentaries which were likely to do best.[39] Significantly, perhaps, four of the seven titles which required reprinting in 1895-96 were commentaries.

(3) Two titles out of the 38, however - the works by Stalker - made between them a profit of £136 13s. 7d. When this is subtracted from the total profit realised by profit-making items in the series, £244 0s. 9d. remains, an average of £6.78 having therefore been realised by the remaining 36 titles. Stalker's works made major contributions to the profits in the following years also.

(4) One of these three, Dods' book on Haggai, was reprinted during the year, and just failed to recover the cost of the reprint; another was the new title which did not break even within the financial year in which it was issued; the third was a work on the Irish Presbyterian Church: no copies of this were sold during the year, and credit was given on nineteen returns from booksellers. In two out of the three cases, therefore, the deficit was temporary, and did not reflect on the quality or marketability of the product.

(5) Once again, the average is distorted by Stalker's high-selling works, of which 6,729 copies were distributed. The remaining thirty-nine works in the series sold 8,981 copies between them, an average of 230 copies per title. Only six titles sold fewer than ninety copies in the course of the year.

(6) The work in question is Stalker's Life of St Paul. As an example, the calculations on which the figures appearing in the table are based appear below. It should be noted that the figures exclude any income from advertisements in the work which the Clarks might have received. It was apparently the firm's custom to sell advertising space in this series.[40] It should further be noted that the aim of the calculation is to arrive at the total cost of the edition: not all of this expenditure would be incurred at the time of reprinting. The editors' and author's royalties (Stalker received 1½d. per copy = 8.33% of the retail price), and the binding costs (the Clarks had copies bound as they were required) would be met as and when the edition sold out. It should be noted finally that advertising costs are excluded from the calculation. 7s. 2d. was set against the work for advertising over the year in question.

Stalker: Life of St Paul (Retail Price - 1s. 6d.)

Outlay (Reprinting: 3,240 copies)		Income	
		Sales of 3,240 copies at 1s. 0d.	
Printing	£ 7 19s. 6d.	per copy	£162 0s. 0d.
Paper	£ 14 5s. 4d.		
Binding	£ 28 7s. 0d.		
Maps	£ 2 5s. 0d.		
Royalty			
Editor	£ 12 3s. 0d.		
Author	£ 20 5s. 0d.		
	£ 87 4s.10d.		
Profit	£ 74 15s. 2d.		
	£162 0s. 0d.		£162 0s. 0d.

Unit cost = 6.46d. % return on investment = $\frac{£74\ 15s.\ 2d.}{£87\ 4s.10d.} \times 100 = 85.69\%$

(7) The work in question is Lindsay's The Reformation, which had a retail price of 2s. In this case, the size of the reprint was 1,080 - only in the case of Stalker's works was a larger number of copies printed when a reprint was required.

(8) The work in question is Ephesians by J.S. Candlish. As an example, the calculations on which the figures appearing in the Table are based are given below. The points made in Note 6 apply in this case also, and in the case of the other titles whose performance is analysed in the Table.

Candlish: Ephesians (Retail Price - 1s. 6d.)

Outlay (Printing 2,160 copies)		Income	
		Sales of 2,160 copies at 1s. 0d.	
Printing (casework and presswork)	£ 32 14s.10d.	per copy	£108 0s. 0d.
Paper	£ 8 11s. 9d.		
Binding	£ 18 18s. 0d.		
Royalty			
Editor (estimate)	£ 6 7s. 0d.		
Author	£ 7 15s. 5d.		
Stereotyping	£ 5 13s. 1d.		
Back-stamp	9s. 6d.		
	£ 80 9s. 7d.		
Profit	£ 27 10s. 5d.		
	£108 0s. 0d.		£108 0s. 0d.

Unit cost = 8.94d. % return on investment = $\frac{£27\ 10s.\ 5d.}{£80\ 9s.\ 7d.} \times 100 = 34.19\%$

The work was issued in October 1895. Between then and June, 1896, 1,266 copies had been sold, giving a rate of 1,687 copies per annum if the momentum were sustained.

(9) The work in question is The Confession of Faith by John MacPherson, which had a retail price of 2s., and was sold to the trade at 1s. 4d.

(10) The work in question is The Church, by Professor William Binnie, which had a retail price of 1s. 6d., and was sold to the trade at 1s.

(11) The work in question is J. Laidlaw's Foundation Truths of Scripture, which had a retail price of 1s. 6d., and was sold to the trade at 1s.

(12) The work in question is Romans by David Brown, which had a retail price of 2s. 0d., and was sold to the trade at 1s. 4d.

(13) The work in question is St Mark, by T. M. Lindsay, which had a retail price of 2s. 6d., and was sold to the trade at 1s. 8d.

(14) The work in question is J. P. Lilley's Principles of Protestantism, which had a retail price of 2s., and was sold to the trade at 1s. 4d.

(15) The work in question is St Luke (Vol. II), by T. M. Lindsay, which had a retail price of 1s. 3d., and was sold to the trade at 10d.

(16) The work in question is St John (Vol. I) by George Reith, which had a retail price of 2s., and was sold to the trade at 1s. 5d.[41]

It will be clear that T. & T. Clark had no grounds for complaint over the profitability of the Bible Class Handbook series. In the four financial years, a good proportion of the titles yielded a surplus, and in most cases where there was a deficit this was only temporary, as a reprint or a new title approached its breakeven point. The average annual profit per title varied considerably, as did the percentage return figure for individual works. In the case of the reprinted titles for which data is included in the Table, the percentage return figures range from 71.02% to 137.11%. In the case of the new titles for which data is included in the Table, the percentage return figures range from -14.66% to 55.48%. (Lilley's work was not costed to break even in its first edition. It would seem that a first edition of 2,160 was called for if a Handbook were to make a profit before its first reprint. The size of the work in comparison with others in the series clearly dictated the retail price and hence the Clarks' trade price. It says something for their commitment to the Series that they were prepared to face a loss on the first edition of a work.) There is some indication that the level of return was higher on 2s. titles than on 1s. 6d. titles. Although there were slow sellers in the series, and the figure for average annual sales was rather low, nevertheless most of the titles which were reprinted were selling at a steady rate, and, if they continued to do so, would produce an encouraging annual return on investment (It is interesting that the reprint of Stalker's best-selling work yielded a lower percentage return than the reprint of a slower seller, and, since fewer copies were printed of the second work, both titles would take the same time to yield their maximum return. In this instance at least, the slower selling title was thus more profitable.) New titles were added to

the series virtually every year, and all titles were still in print in 1900. Even slow-selling works were, when they eventually sold out, reprinted by the firm, which thus showed itself to be committed to the maintenance of the series as a whole. The Handbooks had, as a series, shown themselves to be both valuable to the Churches and profitable to the Clarks.

e) Bible Class Primers

In 1884 the Edinburgh bookselling firm of Macniven and Wallace, which had been founded in 1878 and had diversified into publishing the following year virtually abandoned the publishing side of the business. (See Appendix A for an outline history of Macniven and Wallace.) By 1884, the firm had some successful titles on their list, and attempts were made to sell these to other publishers. The Clarks, it is clear, expressed interest in the Household Library of Exposition, and the Bible Class Primers, two theological series published by Macniven and Wallace. They offered £300 for copyright, stock and plates of works in the first series, on condition that the series editor, William Robertson Nicoll, abandoned his right to a royalty of 1d. per copy sold. The Clarks were clearly aware that this was less than Macniven and Wallace had hoped for, but could not see the way to offer more because firstly, some of the works in the series had been in print for a considerable time and were coming to the end of their marketable lives: secondly, one work at least would definitely never be reprinted, a fact which rendered the plates valueless: and thirdly, heavy royalties were payable to the authors of volumes in the series.[42] In the event, Macniven and Wallace obviously declined the offer, and the Household Library of Exposition was taken over by Hodder and Stoughton in London. It is possible that they were more sanguine about the

prospects of the Series than were the Clarks. But it is very likely that they took over the Library at the instigation of Nicoll, who began what was to be a life-long connection with them in the same year, 1884, and with his influence being brought to bear on their behalf, they may not have had to pay any more than the Clarks offered.[43] In contrast, the Clarks' offer for the Bible Class Primer series was clearly accepted, but there would appear to be no record of the terms involved. However the Clarks wrote to Macniven and Wallace on 24 March 1884, acknowledging receipt of 22,173 copies of the works in the series.[44] It was fitting that the Primers should join the Handbooks on the Clark list: both series were begun in 1879, but it is not clear whether the similarity between their titles was as a result of competition between the two firms, or as a result of co-operation. The second possibility seems to be more likely: the series were aimed at different markets, the Primers being briefer and more elementary than the Handbooks, and this would lead us to suspect that there was some common purpose behind their issue.

As in the case of the Handbooks, there would seem to have been no direct official link between the Primers and the Free Church of Scotland, although the editor of the series was S.D.F. Salmond, Principal of the Free Church College in Aberdeen. The Primers were aimed at young people within the Churches in Scotland, however, and sales of a title could be greatly affected by the endorsement or lack of endorsement of the Youth Committees of the various Churches. The firm always was quick to point out that while the Free Church Welfare of Youth Scheme selected textbooks from the Primer Series, and that this inevitably affected sales, the fruits of Welfare of Youth recommendations accounted for 'nothing like the entire sales'.[45] But such Committees were

a useful scapegoat when sales flagged. On one occasion, Salmond was told that the 'real cause' of declining sales of Primers was to be found in 'the small support' which the Committees were giving. 'They certainly might give us more encouragement.'[46] It is perhaps ironical that, as we saw in Part I, the Free Church had formed the opinion by 1898 that, through the sale of the Primers, the Clarks were profiteering at its expense, and wanted to come to an arrangement with another publisher for the issue, on its behalf, of a new series of primers.[47]

But sales of the Primers were by no means limited to Scotland. Charles Spurgeon's favourable notices of them in the Sword and Trowel would no doubt have influenced the market south of the border;[48] a work on the Reformation was adopted as a textbook by the Presbyterian Church of Canada[49] and 500 copies of the one-volume edition of F.H. Stead's The Kingdom of God were sold to America in 1895-96.[50]

Accounts for the series are to be found in the Stock and Sales Book[51] but not as much detail is given as in the case of the Handbooks. Once again figures have survived only for the four financial years beginning 1895-96. These figures are summarised in the following table.

TABLE II: 7

Bible Class Primers: Analysis of Profitability				
	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
No. of volumes in series at the start of the year	30(2)	32	35	36
No. requiring reprints in course of the year	11(3)	7(10)	8(13)	10(16)
No. of new titles issued during year	2(4)	3(11)	1(14)	1(17)
Net profit	£148 10s. 4d.(5)	£208 8s. 4d.	£220 17s. 9d.	£223 5s. 8d.
Copies sold(1)	22,141(6)	29,112	23,119	24,089
% return on investment				
On reprints				
Example 1				
Size of printing	4,370(7)	3,200(12)	2,160(15)	3,240(18)
% return	169.34%	161.37%	161.36%	145.6%
Example 2				
Size of printing	1,080(8)	3,240(12)	1,080(15)	2,160(18)
% return	156.76%	172.90%	123.34%	145.28%
On new books				
Example				
Size of printing	3,200(9)	4,320(12)	5,400(15)	3,240(18)
% return	8.88%	60.94%	43.04%	-3.06%

Notes

(1) Excluding the '25th copy' which was given as a bonus to booksellers who ordered two dozen copies. A breakdown for individual titles is not available.

(2) Twenty-eight of these volumes were available at 6d. in paper, and 8d. in cloth. (Two works in the series, each consisting of three 6d. volumes, were also available in one-volume format.) The series was completed by two 'extra volumes', selling at 1s. 0d. each.

(3) Of these eleven, one work was reprinted twice. Hence there were twelve reprintings in all. In five cases, the print run was 1,080; in three, 2,160; in a further three it was 3,240; and 4,320 copies were reprinted of one title.

(4) In both cases, the print run was 3,200. Initially, the first printing of the Primers had run to 5,000 copies,[52] and it rose to this figure again in 1897-98.

(5) This net profit is calculated from the accounts, which may be summarised as follows:

Outlay		Income		
Printing	£ 95 10s. 0d.	Sales in paper covers		
Paper	£ 54 4s. 3d.	(excluding 768 '25th copies'):		
Cover paper	£ 12 6s. 9d.	1,542 doz. at 4s. 6d. per doz.		
Binding	£ 54 12s.11d.	= £347		
Advertising	£ 8 3s. 8d.	Less 7½%* £ 26		
Proportion of lists	£ 15 0s. 0d.	£321	£321	0s. 0d.
Payments to authors/editors	£ 30 0s. 0d.	Sales in cloth		
Samples	£ 2 8s. 2d.	(excluding 100 '25th copies'):		
Stereotyping	£ 7 11s. 4d.	207 doz. at 5s.11d. per doz.		
Maps	£ 6 7s. 6d.	= £61 4s. 9d.		
Miscellaneous	£ 0 3s. 2d.	Less 7½%* £ 4 11s. 9d.		
	£286 7s. 9d.	£56 13s. 0d	£ 56	13s. 0d.
		Sales of more expensive vols.	£ 54	4s. 1d.
Profit	£148 10s. 4d.	Miscellaneous	£ 3	1s. 0d.
	£434 18s. 1d.		£434	18s. 1d.

* This further discount was obviously universally offered to retailers.

(6) This averages out at 692 copies per title, and is strikingly at variance with the Clarks' claim to Scribners that about 30,000 Primers were sold annually in Britain.[53] Only in 1896-97 did sales approach this figure.

(7) The work in question is C.A. Scott's The Making of Israel. As an example, the calculations on which the figures appearing in the table are based appear below. It should be noted that not all the expenditure would be incurred at the time of reprinting, and that advertising costs, and the costs of '25th copies' have been excluded from the calculation. The binding costs is an estimate, as is the figure for the proportion of copies which would sell in cloth, as opposed to paper binding.

Scott: The Making of Israel

Outlay (Reprinting 4,320 copies)		Income		
Printing	£ 5 17s. 0d.	Sales in paper covers		
Printing paper covers	£ 2 10s. 0d.	3,802 = 317 doz. @ 4s. 6d. per doz.		
Paper	£ 7 0s. 1d.	= £71 6s. 6d.		
Binding (average ½d. per volume*)	£ 9 0s. 0d.	- 7½% £ 5 7s. 0d.		
Author#	£ 4 6s. 6d.	£65 9s. 6d.	£65	9s. 6d.
	£28 13s. 7d.	Sales in cloth covers		
		518 = 43 doz. @ 5s.11d. per doz.		
		= £12 14s. 5d.		
		- 7½% £ 0 19s. 0d.		
Profit	£48 11s. 4d.	£11 15s. 5d.	£11	15s. 5d.
	£77 4s.11d.		£77	4s.11d.

Unit cost 1.59d. % return on investment = $\frac{\text{£48 11s. 4d.}}{\text{£28 13s. 7d.}} \times 100 = 169.34\%$

* This figure is an estimate

\# Authors were paid £10 for the first edition of a work upon publication, and received £1 for each 1,000 copies sold thereafter. The editor received £5, payable upon publication.[54]

(8) The work in question is R. Winterbotham's The Life of Solomon. The unit cost was 2.38d.

(9) The work in question is Christian Character, by T. B. Kilpatrick. As an example, the calculations on which the figures appearing in the table are based appear below. The points made in Note 7 apply here also.

Kilpatrick: Christian Character

Outlay (Printing 3,200 copies)		Income		
Printing (including origination costs and cost of printing covers)	£21 11s. 2d.	Sales in paper covers 2,816 = 235 doz. @ 4s. 6d. per doz. = £52 17s. 6d. - 7½% £ 3 19s. 3d.		
Paper	£ 6 5s. 0d.		£48 18s. 3d.	£48 18s. 3d.
Binding (average ½d. per volume)	£ 6 13s. 2d.	Sales in cloth covers 384 = 32 doz. @ 5s.11d. per doz. = £9 9s. 3d. - 7½% £0 14s. 1d.		
Royalty Author	£10 0s. 0d.			
Editor	£ 5 0s. 0d.			
Stereotyping*	£ 3 10s. 0d.		£8 15s. 2d.	£ 8 15s. 2d.
	£52 19s. 4d.			
Profit	£ 4 14s. 1d.			
	£57 13s. 5d.			£57 13s. 5d.

Unit cost 3.97d. % return on investment = $\frac{\text{£ 4 14s. 1d.}}{\text{£52 19s. 4d.}} \times 100 = 8.88\%$

* This is an estimate: figures are not given for the cost of stereotyping individual works.

(10) One of these required reprinting three times in the course of the year. (Gloag's Life of St John)

(11) 4,320 copies were printed of each of these.

(12) The reprinted works in question were T.B. Kilpatrick's Christian Character and P.J. Gloag's Life of St John. (Only one of the reprintings of the latter is costed here.) The new title in question is The Miracles of Our Lord by J. Laidlaw.

(13) One of these, The Miracles of Our Lord, required to be reprinted twice in the course of the year.

(14) R.G. MacIntyre's Elijah and Elisha, of which 5,400 copies were printed.

(15) The reprinted works in question were P.J. Gloag's Life of St Paul and S.D.F. Salmond's The Parables of Our Lord. The new title is that by R.G. MacIntyre.

(16) Two of these works, The Reformation by T. Witherow, and MacIntyre's Elijah and Elisha required to be reprinted twice in the course of the year.

(17) R. Resker's Our Lord's Illustrations, of which 3,240 copies were printed.

(18) The reprinted works in question were Elijah and Elisha (one of its reprints only being costed here), and S.D.F. Salmond's Life of Christ. The new title was that by Resker.

It would seem that the series of Primers was highly successful financially. The percentage return on reprints was in all cases excellent. If a large enough edition were printed, new titles, too, gave a good return. The return was marginal or non-existent in the case of those titles whose first printing it was felt prudent to limit to 3,200. Thus the Resker work would have showed a loss of 3.06%. (Although it would have broken even had not the cost of stereos for the second edition been charged against the first.) We do not have figures for the annual sales of each individual title, and so we are unable to estimate the annual return on a title-by-title basis. But the frequency with which many of the works required reprinting - sometimes more than once in the course of a year - would indicate a very high annual rate of return. Over 1896-97 sales of the series as a whole amounted to 71.92% of the stock in hand at the start of the year (40,478): at that rate the stock would turn over every seventeen months. The annual return on investment from the series as a whole was also good, although these figures should be treated with some caution as the return was yielded by the series as a whole and not only by works which had required investment in the course of the year. The Primers produced the following return:

1895-96 - 51.85%

1896-97 - 63.41%

1897-98 - 99.35%

1898-99 - 93.3%

The fact that returns of this magnitude were produced in years in which the firm had to lay out capital on reprints of around a quarter of the titles in the series annually provides further evidence of the success of the Primers.

New titles were added to the series virtually every year, and all the titles were still in print in 1900.

f) World's Epoch Makers

The forthcoming launch of the World's Epoch Makers series was announced by the Clarks to Scribner in a letter dated 13 May 1899.[55] The Edinburgh firm felt able to comment 'many well-known Literary Men, in whose opinion and judgement we have every confidence, are agreed that there is a wide field for such a series, & they pronounce it excellently planned.' Oliphant Smeaton (who was already known as the editor of the Famous Scots series, which Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier published), was to be in editorial control of the new project which was to feature biographical studies of key figures in world history, the major emphasis being on religious thinkers. Hence, for example, while Smeaton himself contributed a volume on The Medici and the Italian Renaissance, the majority of the early volumes in the series dealt with individuals such as Cranmer, Buddha, Wesley, Luther Anselm, Mohammed and Origen.

In each case, Smeaton clearly sought to enlist the services of the most capable writer available. This is made clear, for example, in the letter to Scribner cited above, the Clarks claiming that while the authors might not all be well-known in the US, they had nevertheless all been carefully chosen. In the few instances where the W.E.M. volume would be the first book by an author Smeaton was confident that

excellent work would be produced.[55a] It is made clear also by the Clarks' willingness to pay generously in order to secure the services of the most able contributors. Discussing with Smeaton the case of two scholars who had declined to contribute to the series, John Clark commented 'in the case of such good men I think we should perhaps stretch a point,& (if the terms have to do with their refusal) offer them say a 12½% royalty.'[56]

By June 1900, three volumes in the World's Epoch Makers series had been issued, and arrangements made with authors for a total of almost thirty,[57] while eleven volumes are mentioned in T. & T. Clark's 1902 Colonial Catalogue, which had appeared by mid-November 1901.

Regrettably, because no figures have survived from that period, we are unable to assess the profitability of the Series. Despite Smeaton's apparently judicious editorial methods, it was clearly not an unalloyed critical success - the volumes on Buddha and Wesley were severely criticised[58] and this criticism may have influenced the sales of the other titles, in the short term at least.

In some respects, the World's Epoch Makers series may be seen as a new departure for the Clarks, for it was aimed at a wider audience than that which they were attempting to serve with their main-line output. The appearance in the Series of works on the non-Christian religions is indicative of a growing contemporary interest in the study of comparative religion. One of the greatest manifestations of that interest, Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics was also to appear on the Clark list.

g) Lecture Series

In the nineteenth century, there were, in Scotland as in England, several endowed lectureships which provided for the organisation of regular (very often annual) series of lectures on various theological topics. In many instances, these series of lectures found their way into print:[59] frequently a given publisher would be in the habit of regularly issuing the lectures given under the auspices of a particular Trust. Where this was the case, it might have been expected that the benefits of series publishing would come into play. What is the evidence on this issue from the experience of T. & T. Clark?

When the firm's list of issues is examined, it becomes evident that most of their lecture-publishing was done on a one-off basis, and not as part of an on-going commitment. For example, the Baird Lectures for 1879, Paton J. Gloag's The Messianic Prophecies, were published by the Clarks; the Baird Lectures, in fact, were normally issued by Blackwood. The Clarks published them on this occasion with Blackwood's approval because Gloag was not only a Clark author, but also a personal friend of Sir Thomas.[60] This work was still in print in 1901, and over 1895-96 five copies of it were sold, resulting in a deficit over the year of 14s. 5d.[61] The 1890 series of Gifford Lectures appears to have been the only series given under those auspices to have been published by the Clarks. The lecturer was James Hutchison Stirling, and the work Philosophy and Theology, which was still in print in 1901, having sold thirty-six copies over 1895-96, sales which resulted in a surplus for that year of £7 17s. 4d. The 1892-93 Hulsean Lectures were also issued from George Street. John Bickford Heard's Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted was also in print in 1901, having sold twenty-five copies over 1895-96, thereby

producing a surplus for that year of £3 16s. 5d. The Clarks also published the 1893-94 Kidd Lectures, which were given by James Kidd on Morality and Religion. Over 1895-96, this work sold 129 copies, a sale which resulted in a surplus of £38 18s. 9d. The book was still in print in 1901. The 1897 series of Kerr Lectures, David W. Forrest's The Christ of History and of Experience was also issued. Over 1897-98, a surplus of £93 13s. 6d. was realised. It was perhaps the success of this work which led the Clarks to approach the 1900 Kerr Lecturer, Robert James Drummond, inviting him to submit his lectures for publication, and offering him the alternatives of having the book published on commission or at the firm's risk. Drummond's series, on The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ was issued in 1900.[62]

We have figures in the case of the 1897 Kerr Lectures which sold very respectably. The first edition ran to 1,080 copies, almost all of which were sold within the 1897-98 financial year. The total outlay on the edition was £203 5s. 4d. (this included the author's royalty of 10% on the nominal retail price of 10s. 6d., the cost of advertising, the binding costs for the whole edition, and a payment of £9 15s. 8d. for the taking of moulds of the typesetting in case stereos were required for a second edition). The Clarks' average income per copy was 6s. 7d. Ignoring 110 presentation and '25th' copies, the edition would yeild £320 0s. 8d. gross, the net profit therefore being £116 15s. 4d., and the return on investment 57.44%. The unit cost was 3s. 9d. A second edition of 540 copies was printed in 1898-99. The total outlay on the edition (including the binding charges and royalties, not all of which were incurred in that year) would have been £106 0s. 8d., and the total return, ignoring

twenty '25th copies' would have been £171 3s. 0d., the net profit therefore being £65 2s. 4d., and the return on investment 61.41%. The unit cost was 3s.11d. (The return on the first edition was therefore lower than that on the second, not because of the basic costing, but because of the number of free presentation copies which were distributed when the work was published.) Only 171 copies of the second edition were sold over 1898-99, and the work showed a loss of £10 6s. 7d. that year. Demand for it must have continued, however, for a new, cheaper edition at 6s. was being advertised in 1901. The Clarks would have been well pleased with the performance of this title.

It must, however, have been an exception. In general, we find the firm complaining soulfully about the performance of one-off collections of lectures which it had undertaken. Indeed, in the light of their comments it is surprising how many such works the Clarks issued. The Rev. J. Cynddylan Jones was one of the recipients of negative comments on this issue from George St. He was told that the firm's experience of published lectures had not, in most cases, been encouraging,[63] while Professor E. Williams received the even more pointed comment 'Our experience is that lectures republished in book form very seldom meet with a demand sufficient to recoup even the cost of publication,[64] and in a letter discussing the possible issue of a series of lectures which had been given in America, the firm suggested that the book should be issued simply in chapters, to disguise its origin as a lecture series, the reason being given that lectures did not sell.[65] Perhaps we should differentiate between what is being discussed in this section, the issue of material which had been given under the auspices of one of the established Lectureships and the mere

presentation in book form of a college lecturer's notes. The first category would almost certainly be more profitable. But full financial details are available for few of the collections of lectures published by the Clarks, and if indeed the Forrest work was an exception and sales in general were as poor as the above quotations imply that they were, the fact that the firm continued to issue this kind of material is further evidence of its commitment to theology.

The only lectureship with which the Clarks were connected with any degree of consistency was that bearing the name of the former New College Principal, William Cunningham.[66] In 1879 Sir Thomas claimed that his firm had published all the series of Cunningham Lectures with the exception of the first,[67] but thereafter the firm would appear to have been less consistently involved with the Lectures. The following series of Cunningham Lectures were definitely published by T. & T. Clark:

10th Series, 1884
James Stuart Candlish's The Kingdom of God Biblically and Historically Considered. This work was still in print in 1901, having sold thirteen copies in 1895-96, thereby producing a surplus of £3 14s. 3d. for that year.

11th Series, 1887
David Douglas Bannerman's The Doctrine of the Church Historically and Exegetically Considered. This work, too, was still in print in 1901, having sold six copies over 1895-96, thereby producing a surplus of £1 17s. 6d. for that year.

12th Series, 1888
William Garden Blaikie's The Preachers of Scotland from the Sixth to the Nineteenth Centuries. This work was still in print in 1901. Forty-four copies were sold over 1895-96, producing a surplus for that year of £4 13s. 4d.

16th Series, 1897
David Somerville's St Paul's Conception of Christ. This work was still in print in 1901, and over 1897-98 produced a surplus of £8 0s. 1d.

The reason for the apparently only sporadic involvement of the Clarks with the Cunningham Lectures after 1879 is perhaps to be found in a

letter to W.G. Blaikie, dated 28 February 1888. Although they were prepared to publish Blaikie's Lectures, the Clarks pointed out 'Unfortunately our experience of the "Cunningham Lectures" has been by no means encouraging, many of them not having yet paid - & we fear never likely to pay - the cost of production.'[68]

This somewhat pessimistic view is borne out by the only full set of figures we have for a series of Cunningham Lectures. The work in question is Somerville's St Paul's Conception of Christ which was published in 1897-98. The Clarks risked printing an edition of 1,080 copies which, once the whole edition had been bound, would have cost £122 2s. 8d. (no payment to the author appears to have been involved). The firm's average income per copy was 5s. 6d., the nominal retail price being 9s. 0d. Ignoring 100 presentation and '25th' copies, the edition would yield £269 10s. 0d. gross, the net profit therefore being £147 7s. 4d., and the return on investment 120.66% The unit cost was 2s. 3d. These figures look encouraging, but in fact the work was only very modestly successful. Only 415 copies were sold in the financial year of issue, yielding a net profit of £ 8 0s. 1d. (only 540 had been bound: the outlay was therefore only £107 9s.11d.) The work yielded a net profit of £10 5s. 7d. in 1898-99. At least however, it had covered its production costs, which would appear to have been more than some of the earlier volumes of Cunningham Lectures had done.

It would seem from all the preceding discussion that the benefits of series publishing - among them the building up of consumer loyalty, the self-promoting qualities of the series, and the reductions in advertising costs which could be achieved by advertising these series

as a whole - did not come into play in the case of lecture series, in which volumes dealing with discrete and highly-technical theological matters were published at lengthy intervals. The publishing of lecture series does not, from the limited evidence available, seem to have been particularly profitable for the Clarks.

3. Conclusions

There is no doubt that the popular Primer and Handbook series proved profitable to the firm. In the case, however, of the more technical series, such as the Ante-Nicene Library, which involved a large initial investment, it is impossible to reach firm conclusions. The return on these series in the 1890s was certainly meagre to an extreme. But it may have been that when these series were new they yielded a reasonable profit.

Section B: Translations

1. Commitment to translations

A case could readily be made out to support the view that the theological side of T. & T. Clark's publishing business owed its very existence to the founder's desire to make available in English important works by contemporary Continental theologians. Certainly, from the earliest years of the firm's history until the 1890s, translations constituted a significant proportion of the Clarks' output. The majority of these translations appeared either in the early Biblical Cabinet series, or in the Foreign Theological Library which succeeded it.[69]

In this area also, the Clarks' commitment would seem to have been motivated and fuelled by factors other than the purely economic. Although some works were rejected because they were considered likely to be unprofitable - a new book by Weiss, for example,[70] or a major work by H.F.B. Jellinghaus[71] - where the firm was persuaded of a book's merit, publication of the translation went ahead, even if the Clarks could not be sanguine about its economic prospects. Hence, for example, the firm wrote to a correspondent in Leipzig offering to publish in translation a new work by Professor Christoph Ernst Luthardt even although his commentary on St John had been 'a very losing concern' to the Clarks.[72] Hence, too, the Clarks informed the potential translator of Bishop Lars Nielsen Dahle's Life After Death that although from a commercial point of view it might be better to let the matter rest - 'The present demand for English translations of even the most important Foreign Theological Works is so small that we have really no encouragement to undertake their publication. In fact, in several recent cases we have suffered serious loss by them.' - nevertheless

they would be glad to attempt to reach an agreement with him.[73] Perhaps the classic statement of the firm's readiness to undertake translations not justifiable on commercial grounds is to be found in the letter to Professor Friedrich Godet of Neuchatel, presumably from John Clark which we quoted earlier: 'My little disappointment about the sale of your "Epistles of St Paul" [1894] does not make me hesitate for one moment about the future Volumes [of the Introduction to the New Testament series], as I consider it a pleasure & an honour to publish all your books in English whether they succeed or not.'[74]

It is clear, however, that the firm could not continue to finance an endless series of loss-making translations. And, by the 1890s, the demand for translated works had declined considerably. The market had still been a large one in 1882 it would seem:

> As the study of German has been extending of late years, it might be supposed that there is less need than there was for such an institution as the Foreign Theological Library. But it must be remembered that the number of theological readers and students is increasing in a larger ratio than the number of German scholars. We have no doubt that there are more young ministers who must read German theology through a translation, if at all, than there were when this Library was started. Besides that, it is the honest truth that fair scholars in German would prefer a thoroughly trustworthy translation to the original itself.[74a]

Thereafter, however, a decline in demand gradually became noticeable.

The Foreign Theological Library was wound up in the early 1890s; by 1895 the firm, in the letter regarding Dahle's work referred to above, remarked on the infinitesimal nature of the market for translations; while in 1900, the comment was 'the demand for Translations of German Theological works has greatly fallen off during the past few years.'[75] This falling-off was due in part to the increasingly widespread knowledge of German: 'most students [were] now able to read the original'.[76]

But there was a profounder reason. More pioneering work was being done by Anglo-Saxon theologians: the field of theological innovation, for so long the exclusive province of the Continental scholars was now occupied by their English and American counterparts as well. Inevitably, 'students seem[ed] to prefer books by their own countrymen',[77] and there was less need to turn to works from Europe 'because there [was] more genuine scholarship in [the UK], as represented e.g. in the "International Theological Library", the "International Critical Commentary" & many other standard Works.'[78] This new progressiveness in English language theology was noted some years later in the great German rival of the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.[79] Commenting specifically on the E.R.E., the German work remarked that 'in it the Anglo-Saxons, who up till now have leaned so much on German theology, have emancipated themselves; not only so, they have surpassed us in wealth of material and the fulness of individual contribution.'[80] T. & T. Clark, although not solely responsible for this process of emancipation, nevertheless played a part in it by encouraging the publication of progressive Anglo-Saxon theology. The translation side of their output may therefore be said to have been a victim of the success of their programme of issuing works by English language scholars. This is symbolised by a letter written in 1897 regarding the commentary on Job by Delitzsch which was out of print. The Clarks had secured rights in the final German edition of this work with the intention of producing an updated English version. But since the death of Delitzsch, there had been very little demand for his books in general, and virtually no demand for Job in particular. Consequently, the Clarks had 'practically abandoned the idea' of a new edition of Job,

and they noted that, in any case, they had the volume on Job in the International Critical Commentary series in active preparation. Thus, the new area of publishing was supplanting the old.[81]

2. Factors affecting the profitability of translations

a) Translation right

The financial success or failure of a translation very often depended on the size of fee payable to the author or his original publisher for the Obersetzungerecht, as it was known in Germany, or Translation Right. According to Copyright Law in the 1880s, the original publisher had no legal claim to a fee for the right of translation unless an agreement were reached within one year of the initial publication; conversely, unless the Clarks had concluded an agreement with the original publisher, and issued a portion of the translation within a year of the initial publication, they could not expect to have the sole right of publishing an English translation, even if a fee had been paid after twelve months had elapsed since the initial publication.[82] And whereas the Clarks were usually quick to recognise the moral right of the initial publisher and the author to receive a fee, even after the twelve months had elapsed, there was always the danger that a less scrupulous publisher would rush into the market place with a competing translation. Thus, for example, the firm wrote to R.T. Cunningham, who was translating Professor Isaac A. Dorner's Ethics, to the effect that a rival translation of the work was being prepared:

> We certainly have the prior claim, having made arrangements with the Author & Publisher in Germany, but as there is no copyright ... after one year in this country for translations the principal thing is to publish first.[83]

i. Payment to authors

There are regular references in the letter books to the payment of sums to authors or publishers for translation right. Presumably, the author was paid if he held the copyright of the work, but payments to authors very often included an element to cover the revision and up-dating of the book prior to translation. Thus, Dr F.E. König of Leipzig received £10 for rights in his The Exiles' Book of Consolation, which sold at 3s. 6d;[84] thus F.H. Reusch received twenty guineas in payment for revisions he had made prior to the translation of his work Nature and the Bible, the two volumes of which sold at £1 0s. 0d.,[85] and Carl F. Keil was offered £20 for similar additions to his Biblical Archaeology, the two volumes of which appeared in the Foreign Theological Library at £1 1s. 0d.[86] (in neither of these cases was translation right specifically mentioned); thus Bishop Hans Martensen was offered £25 for permission to publish translations of the second and third volumes of his Ethics[87] the three volumes of which ultimately appeared in the Foreign Theological Library at £1 11s. 6d; thus Professor Bernhardt Weiss received £60 for rights in his Life of Jesus, which appeared in three volumes in the same series, at £1 11s. 6d., and, due to the size of payment made to the author, 'resulted in serious loss' to the Clarks.[88] They reported this loss on the Weiss work to Professor Emil Schurer, who was asking a very high figure for the right of translating one of his works, presumably the first two volumes of his History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, which appeared in the F.T.L. in 1885. (The work was later completed in five volumes, selling at £1 6s. 3d., the volumes presumably being smaller than the others in the series.) Schurer was apparently asking more than twice the highest figure which the firm had ever paid for

translation rights - by implication the £60 which Weiss had received - and he was told that the most the Clarks could offer him was £70, which they considered to be a 'fair and liberal' sum in the circumstances.[89] Such was their desire to issue the work, however, that upon a further communication being received from Schurer, they made him the even more liberal offer of £100 - a truly massive sum - for rights in his work.[90] We do not have figures for individual works in the F.T.L., but it is very difficult to see how this one could have made a profit.

Occasionally, presumably in the case of less desirable works, or those even less likely to succeed financially, authors were asked whether they would agree to permit the Clarks to issue a translation on the understanding that they would receive an honorarium only if their work sold adequately. Thus Professor G. Dalman of Leipzig, who appears to have approached the Clarks with a request that they publish a translation of his Die Morte Jesu, had explained to him the economics of translation publishing, and was told that, should the work succeed, the firm would be happy to 'recognise the Rights of the Author to the fullest extent'.[91] A fuller statement of this position had been given, on a much earlier occasion, to the publishing firm of Hertz in Berlin by Sir Thomas Clark:

> As I have to defray the cost of translation and run the risk of want of success I cannot promise a sum for right of translation, but if the work is successful I will not be wanting in recognising the author and publisher.[92]

ii. Payment to publishers

But there are many references also to payment for the Obersetzungerecht being made to the publishers. In a letter written in 1893, the firm claimed 'we generally have to pay German Publishers at least £50 per Volume, often more' for the right of translation.[93] In fact, however,

in the examples found in the letter books, the sums paid were significantly less than £50 per volume. (The Clarks can sometimes be caught out exaggerating, or quoting a 'best' figure as though it were a mean.) Isaac Dorner's publisher, Hertz of Berlin, received £35 for rights in his work Christliche Gittenlehre;[94] the same publisher persuaded the Edinburgh firm after some negotiation to pay £30 per volume for rights in the first two volumes of Dorner's System of Christian Doctrine, a work which eventually ran to four volumes, all of which were issued in the Foreign Theological Library at £2 2s. 0d. for the set;[95] while the publisher of a shorter work by Dr F.E. König (possibly his Religious History of Israel, which the Clarks published in 1885) was offered £5 for the translation rights.[96] And in one case at least, a work was refused because the Clarks felt that if they were to pay the £40 which the original publisher was seeking for English rights, the financial success of the translation would be jeopardised.[97] So it would appear that the sum paid for Obersetzungerecht could rarely have reached £50.

In fact, the firm was always, it would seem, keen to minimise the risk as much as possible. Where a work was out of copyright, its publishers might find themselves assured (as Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, publishers of Dr H.A.W. Meyer's works were assured)

> if it [the translation] is successful we will be most happy to pay you as you originally asked but it is a pure speculation and as you are aware that there is now from the lapse of time since publication no legal claim on your part for copyright of translation we must ask you to trust our honour in this matter.[98]

And in seeking to secure the rights for as low a figure as possible, the Clarks were always quick to point out the hidden benefits which the existence of an English translation would bring to the original publishers. Far from curtailing the sales of the original language

edition, as the initial publishers feared, it was the Clarks' almost invariable experience, they claimed, that the issue of a translation increased the demand for the original edition as more people who were competent to read it learned of its existence. One of the clearest statements of this view was given in the course of a letter to Hertz of Berlin:

> the fact of a translation greatly increases the demand for the original. It gives it a publicity which it would not otherwise have and it impresses on the mind of the English public who can read German that a work worthy of translation must be worth buying in the original by those who can read it.[99]

But the Clarks were not always successful in persuading publishers to accept a low figure for translation right: one of the reasons given for the decline of their involvement in translation publishing was the fact that 'some publishers in Germany ... [were] putting an impossibly high tag on the Obersetzungerecht.'[100]

(It is interesting to note the Clarks' reaction when they received requests from foreign publishers for permission to issue translations of works on the Clark list, as happened increasingly frequently in the 1890s. For example, in response to a request from a European publisher for permission to issue Professor S.R. Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, the Clarks offered to sell the translation right for £35, commenting

> This we consider a very moderate sum when the great importance of the Book is considered. It has already reached a 4th edn. in this country, and is still selling steadily. It is admitted to be the most important work yet published on the subject.[101]

Writing to the author, John Clark claimed 'I do not think we are asking too much in the case of so important a book', but he was grateful for a 'generous proposal' which Driver had made (presumably agreeing to waive or reduce his share of any payment), which would permit Clark to

modify the £35 claim should the German publisher state' that that sum is impossible'.[102] The Clarks responded differently in another case. When Professor König proposed issuing a German translation of Frank Ballard's The Miracles of Unbelief (1900), the firm, presumably because they did not want to burden the German publisher with too great a risk, the work being perhaps less certain of success than Driver's magisterial volume, proposed that a 10% royalty should be paid on the translation: 'we have no desire to put any obstacle in the way of this, especially as we think a German Edition might be of great service to the cause of Christianity.'[103] It is interesting to compare with these figures the sums charged by the Clarks to the Religious Tract Society, who had requested permission to issue portions of two volumes from the Edinburgh firm's series of Patristic Translations. Permission was granted, on condition that the R.T.S. paid £15 in respect of Tertullian's Apologetics, and £10 in respect of St Augustine's Enchiridion. The Clarks' Ante-Nicene and St Augustine Libraries were still in print, but there would have been no direct competition from the R.T.S. editions, which contained only sections from the respective Clark volumes, and were aimed at a more general market.[104] As much negotiation seems to have gone on in the selling of rights as in the purchase of them, and in all the negotiating the Clarks showed themselves to be fairly flexible. Naturally, they sought as much as a work was worth, but they were willing to compromise because of their desire to see translations issued. Their flexibility is to be seen in their discussions over both the work by Driver and that by Ballard. In contrast the fee charged to the R.T.S. is surprisingly high considering that the Clarks would face no direct competition, and that the works in question were very much backlist titles. The size of this

fee must simply be accredited to the pressure of market forces.)

The sums paid by the firm, either to author or publisher, therefore varied greatly. While the Clarks were quick to recognise the moral right of the original publisher and author to be recompensed, they were nevertheless always aware of the ruinous effect that a high payment for translation rights could have upon the profitability of a work. In general, therefore, they sought to minimise the risk to themselves as much as possible, and it is indeed surprising that they do not seem to have attempted to persuade original publishers to agree to a royalty payment rather than a lump sum paid upon publication, as they themselves proposed to a foreign publisher who wished to secure rights in one of their works. As always, however, where a work had the genuinely innovative qualities so dear to the hearts of Sir Thomas and John M. Clark, we find them willing and ready to offer sums which must have made it extremely unlikely that the translations would ever break even.

b) Payment to translators

'Our rate of remuneration for translators is at the proportion of Fifty Pounds (£50) per 500 pages.' Thus T. & T. Clark set out their position in 1893.[105] This general principle had been in operation fourteen years previously,[106] but even at that stage it had not been universally applied. On 20 March 1879, for example, a cheque was sent to the translator of Friedrich A. Philippi's Epistle to the Romans in respect of payment not at the rate of £50 per 500 pages, but at the rate of £1 11s. 6d. per sheet. As the work ran to fifty-three sheets, he received £83 13s. 6d.[107] In fact, however, the work ran to 850 pages (421 in Volume One and 429 in Volume Two): had Banks been paid

at the standard rate he would have received £85. The means of calculating the translator's remuneration which was used in this instance did not therefore produce a figure significantly different from that which would have been arrived at had the standard rate been applied. There are other examples of exceptions to the general principle: more might be paid if the translator were of an exceptionally high calibre. (One scholar was told, presumably in an attempt to persuade him to undertake a translation, that while the normal honorarium for those undertaking such work was £50 per 500 pages, in the event of his doing it the Clarks would increase the payment to £65.[108] On the other hand, less might be offered if a high fee to the translator were not considered to be economically practicable. Thus the firm explained to John A. Selbie that, on an edition of 1,000 copies, a translation of Dr F.E. König's Exiles' Book of Consolation would stand only £20 literary costs, and asked if Selbie would be prepared to accept half of this sum as his translator's honorarium, the other half going to König. König's work was a fairly short one, but even so, the fact that Selbie accepted just £10 was no doubt due in part to a gentle reminder from the Clarks that König was quite justified in expecting a share of the £20, especially as they believed he was 'miserably paid at Rostock.'[109] Thus too, Professor F. Crombie received only £55 for a translation of C.F. Keil's Biblical Archaeology, which he had undertaken in collaboration with a Mr Christie who was to share the fee. 'I am quite aware', he was told, 'that that is not at all commensurate to your labour, but it is really as much as we can afford.'[110] The work appeared in the Foreign Theological Library at £1 1s. 0d. for the two volumes.

Other examples of payment to translators are as follows. £10 to Miss Sophia Taylor of Eastbourne for a translation of E. Lehmann's

Scenes from the Life of Jesus (1 Volume, 3s. 6d., 1884):[111] the work ran to 229 pages. Hence Miss Taylor was paid at the rate of 10.48d. per page whereas, had the apparent standard rate of £50 per 500 pages been in operation, she would have received 2s. 0d. per page. £15 was offered to Dr C.H.H. Wright for the translation of an unidentified work by F.E. König.[112] £30 was paid to the Rev. Alex. Grieve of Forfar for translations of two works by Adolf Diessmann, his Bibelstudien and Neue-Bibelstudien, which the Clarks apparently published in one volume as Bible Studies (9s. 0d., 1901):[113] the work ran to 384 pages. Hence Grieve was remunerated at the rate of 1s. 6¼d. per page, less than the standard rate of 2s. 0d. per page. As will be seen later, however, the publication of Diessmann's work was a highly fraught venture for the Clarks, and it is possible that financial constraints did not allow for a higher level of remuneration to the translator. 40 guineas was paid to Mrs Kathleen Lyttleton of Cambridge for her translation of Nature and the Bible by Professor F.H. Reusch (2 volumes, £1 1s. 0d., 1886).[114] The work ran to 833 pages (461 in Volume One, and 372 in Volume Two). Hence Mrs Lyttleton was paid at the rate of 1s. 0d. per page, only half the apparent standard rate. £45 was paid for the first volume of F. Godet's commentary on Romans (Foreign Theological Library, 10s. 6d., 1880), and the same sum for a volume of an unidentified work by Dr Carl R. Hagenbach.[115] The Romans volume ran to 446 pages. Hence the translator, A. Cusin, was paid at a rate fractionally more than the standard rate of 2s. 0d. per page. £46 14s. 0d. was received by Miss Taylor of Eastbourne for her part in translating Emil Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ (the first two volumes of this work, constituting its first Division, appeared in the Foreign Theological Library in 1885 at

10s. 6d. per volume. Presumably Miss Taylor only undertook part of the work and in consequence we cannot accurately calculate the rate of payment per page).[116] £80 was paid to the Rev. John MacPherson for translating and editing J.F. Rabiger's Encyclopaedia of Theology (Foreign Theological Library, 2 volumes, £1 1s. 0d., 1884-85).[117] The work ran to 861 pages (430 in Volume One, and 431 in Volume Two). Hence MacPherson was remunerated at the rate of 1s.10¼d. per page, slightly less than the standard rate. On the basis of the figures for those works for which we have full documentation, we may conclude that the standard rate was by no means universally applied. No doubt as always, the Clarks acted pragmatically, feeling free to adjust the rate of payment to suit the particular case: the eminence of the translator, the complexity of the original text, and the economic soundness of the venture were all, no doubt, factors which influenced the firm's decision on the amount per page which the translator was to receive.

It is clear that fairly large sums were paid to the firm's translators, and also obvious that the larger the fee paid, the longer it would be before the work broke even. Some works, doubtless, came into profit quickly: Beyschlag's New Testament Theology, for example, first issued in around 1894, showed a surplus of income over expenditure of £230 5s. 4d. for the financial year 1895-96, over which 415 copies were sold. The translator of that work was paid at the standard rate.[118] But in the case of many works, reaching breakeven point must have been long delayed by the size of the translators' fees. We have no figures for the unit cost of the first printings of volumes in the Foreign Theological Library, but we may make the assumption, based

on the figures for the unit cost of reprinting F.T.L. volumes which will be discussed later, that the original unit cost would not be much less than three shillings per volume. The subscription price per volume to the trade was 4s. 9d., giving a profit of say 1s. 9d. per volume. In the case of a five hundred page work on which £50 had been paid, it would therefore take the not inconsiderable sale of 571 copies to recoup the cost of the translation alone. Small wonder, then, that in offering Professor Crombie £55 in respect of the work by Keil mentioned above, the Clarks commented that the sum was 'more than [they were] likely to see for many years'.[119] But it was no doubt necessary to pay as generously as possible in order to secure the services of translators of a suitable calibre, for an inferior translation would cause a work to fall dead from the press, resulting in financial loss to the firm, and, what was equally important, damaging its reputation. One translator, whose work had clearly failed to come up to the mark, received the following peremptory letter:

> We herewith enclose cheque for £9 sg for your translation of König's Religious History of Israel. It will be a dead loss to us & we heartily wish we had never undertaken it. All the reviewers are down upon the translation. Kindly acknowledge receipt.[120]

Given that it was necessary to pay well if the services of competent translators were to be secured, it is surprising that the firm does not appear to have considered paying a royalty to translators, thereby linking their reward to the financial success of the work. This would have reduced the degree of risk borne by the Clarks, and might have had the additional benefit of encouraging the translators to take as much care as possible over their work. Presumably, an agreement could have been reached whereby the Clarks, although paying a royalty,

could have had assigned to them the copyright in the translation. But this course was apparently never taken.

c) Other factors

i. Alterations at proof stage

As with the other works issued by the Clarks, the profitability of translations could be radically affected by costs incurred by the translator in amending his text once it had been set up in type. Although John Clark's advice to Neil Buchanan - that he should have his manuscript as much as possible finalised before it was placed in the printer's hands in order to keep down the charge for alterations on proofs[121] - was given to all the firm's translators, nevertheless most of them, either due to over-fastidiousness or to carelessness in the preparation of their copy, found it necessary to do some re-writing at proof stage, thereby incurring increased charges from the printer. The translator of R.H. Lotze's Microcosmus (1885) was clearly motivated by fastidiousness - 'The printing has been fabulously costly as the translator is particular in the extreme, and the corrections have been enormous'[122] - while in the case of work by the Rev. J. Beveridge, alterations to the proofs were necessary because of the less than professional quality of the manuscript which he had submitted:

> A considerable number of alterations were no doubt made upon Sir Thomas Clark's suggestion, but such alterations were absolutely essential, & had the translation been published as you sent it for press, it would, you will excuse us saying, have been creditable neither to you nor to us.[123]

In view of the financial implications of heavy corrections at proof stage, it is most surprising that the Clarks did not scrutinise the manuscripts of translations more carefully before they were sent to the printer. The letter to Beveridge continues by commenting that

'Even beyond these alterations Sir Thomas Clark found many cases in which the translation was far from good English.' Such stylistic infelicities should surely have been picked up and corrected at a much earlier stage.

ii. Sale to an American publisher

There was not in most cases a sufficiently large market for translations of foreign theological works in the United States to encourage an American publisher to negotiate terms with the Clarks for the production of an edition of one of their translations on American soil. The Clarks were, however, frequently able to sell a proportion of their edition of a work to a publisher on the other side of the Atlantic, thereby increasing the print run, lowering the unit cost, and guaranteeing the immediate sale of a substantial part of the edition, albeit at a price which would only produce the very minimum of profit. Thus, for example, the firm accepted Scribner's offer of eight shillings per volume for 250 bound copies of the translation of Lotze's two-volume Microcosmus.[124] The Clarks were willing, if Scribners wished, to add the American publisher's name to the title page and spine of these 250 copies. In the case of another work issued at that time, Reusch's Nature and the Bible, Scribners were offered an edition of 250 copies at eight shillings per set (not per volume, as was the case with Lotze's work).[125] It is interesting that for the Lotze work they were asked to pay exactly double what they would be charged the following month for that by Reusch. The British prices of these two titles were

> Lotze Retail price (before discount) £1 16s. 0d. Trade price £1 7s. 0d.
> Reusch Retail price (before discount) £1 1s. 0d. Trade price 15s.10d.[25a]

The Americans were thus paying 59.25% of the UK trade price in the case of the Lotze work, and 50.52% of the UK trade price on that by Reusch, on which they clearly had a better bargain.

d) Case studies

The following series of case studies illustrates how some of these factors worked out in practice. The fullest information is clearly available in the case of projects which did not go according to plan, and hence provoked detailed correspondence. These studies are therefore not good general examples. They are however of value in showing the firm at work, in demonstrating how its principles stood up under test, in illustrating the practical difficulties which could threaten the profitability of potentially successful titles, and in illuminating the relationship which existed between the Clarks and the translators; a large degree of trust was involved, and in desiring to be graciously forebearing, the firm did not always find it possible to avoid gullibility.

i. Nöldeke's Syrische Grammatik[126]

The initial proposal to translate the Syriac Grammar by Professor Nöldeke of Strasburg was made by the Rev. James MacDonald, who claimed to have secured the English translation rights from the author in June 1884. Although the Clarks felt that the demand for a translation of this work, the merits of which they recognised, was likely to be infinitesimal, they nevertheless agreed to proceed due they claimed to the intense pressure which MacDonald brought to bear upon them. This yeilding to pressure seems uncharacteristic of the Clarks. Perhaps, in looking with hindsight upon a decision they wished they had never made, they sought to lessen their responsibility for that

decision by emphasising MacDonald's pressurising activities. In any case, an agreement with him was signed on 19 January 1885, and was made on the understanding that MacDonald held the translation right, that Nöldeke had agreed to supply corrections and amendments, and that no payment to Nöldeke or his publishers would be involved, for the book could quite simply stand no further cost. MacDonald was to receive £30 for his translation, and, at his urgent request, quite contrary to the Clarks' normal practice, half of this sum was advanced to him.

In view of the terms of the agreement reached in January 1885, it came as a surprise to the Clarks that, in a letter dated 21 May 1886, MacDonald refused to proceed with the translation unless the firm paid an honorarium to Nöldeke. It can be deduced from later correspondence that MacDonald was conscious of the manifold deficiencies of his translation, and was hoping that Nöldeke might be persuaded to revise it for him upon the offer of a suitable sum from the Clarks. The Clarks were unaware of this on 24 May: they no doubt felt that MacDonald had deceived them with his claim to have secured the translation right, and held that the controversy was 'the most disagreeable [they had] ever had', but were anxious 'to end the matter amicably'.[127] Hence they offered to pay Nöldeke ten pounds on publication of MacDonald's translation, authorised, and corrected up to date, and a further fifteen pounds when 400 copies had been sold.[128]

The Clarks also wrote to Nöldeke, explaining the situation as it was seen from the Edinburgh end, and making an offer in the terms noted above. Nöldeke's reply opened up a new dimension to the controversy. Having inspected the manuscript of MacDonald's translation, he had been appalled by its ineptitude: it was clear to him that the translator

did not sufficiently understand either German or Syriac, and he refused to have his name associated with such a production. Further, he told the firm that if MacDonald's translation were to appear, he, Nöldeke, would take immediate steps to make it known, both in the UK and in America, that it was issued completely without his authority. It was obvious that the Clarks could not proceed with the work; consequently they asked MacDonald for the immediate return of the fifteen pounds paid in advance.[129]

It would seem that the Clarks' graciousness and restraint knew no bounds. Their letter to MacDonald apparently produced a reply from the translator insinuating that Nöldeke was not in fact against the translation, but against its being issued by T. & T. Clark. This contention would seem to have been completely unfounded; had it been accurate, it would have been a simple matter for MacDonald to take his translation to another publisher. What he in fact did, in order to salvage his agreement with the Clarks and so retain the advance paid by them, was to propose that the firm should accept a Syriac Grammar based on Nöldeke's work, claiming that he could get a favourable recommendation of this work from Professors Driver, Wright, and Davidson. In retrospect, it is easy to see that MacDonald was little more than a confidence trickster, but the Clarks gave due consideration to his letter. They rejected absolutely the claim that Nöldeke was against the firm as opposed to the translation:

> As to our having insulted the author, he does not say a word about this, & his letter is perfectly friendly as regards our firm ... You are mistaken in saying that Prof. N. refuses to allow us to publish his Grammar: it is your translation of it he refuses.[130]

Nonetheless, the Clarks stated their willingness to complete their agreement with MacDonald if he could produce a Syriac Grammar which

eminent authorities felt able to recommend.

The crisis point had, however, been reached. Professor Davidson refused to have anything to do with a translation which Nöldeke had condemned, or with a Grammar based on the German's work. And the Clarks' reputation was dented by a paragraph which had appeared in the American journal Hebraica in which Nöldeke expressed the view that the firm was determined to publish the translation in spite of his objections, and disclaimed any responsibility for it. Explaining this to MacDonald, the Clarks concluded 'The agreement must therefore be cancelled, & we leave it to your sense of honour to return us the Fifteen Pounds.'[131]

The Clarks emerge with great credit from this controversy. They may well have been more than a little gullible, but the fact remains that Nöldeke did authorise MacDonald to undertake the translation, as he admitted in the note in Hebraica.[132] He must bear at least some of the responsibility for the fracas for failing to guage MacDonald's competence as a translator before giving that authorisation. But throughout, the Clarks behaved with restraint, showing a willingness to compromise even when it threatened the profitability of the project. In no way can the firm be accused of lacking backbone; but to their business affairs they brought graciousness as well as decisiveness.

MacDonald's 'sense of honour' was clearly not great. The fifteen pounds had not been repaid by 25 June 1886, and eventually it was written off. There is an interesting footnote to the controversy in a letter written eight years later.[133] Once again, a translation of Nöldeke's work had been proposed: the Clarks' correspondent was given

an outline of the events of 1886, and told that MacDonald, who was not named

> not only turned out to be quite incompetent for the work, but acted most dishonourably towards us. We lent him, at his urgent request, an advance payment of £15 to account of his work. Almost immediately thereafter he left the country & we have not since heard of him!

The 1894 proposal to translate Nöldeke's work would seem, like its earlier counterpart, to have come to nothing.

ii. Dillmann's Genesis

The difficulties which arose over the issue by T. & T. Clark of a translation of C.F.A. Dillmann's two-volume work Genesis: Critically and Exegetically Expounded (published around 1897) illustrate the problems which German theological prose could present to the translator. Also illustrated are the related difficulties faced by the firm in securing the services of competent translators, and in properly scrutinising the manuscripts of translations so that inaccuracies and solecisms could be detected before the work went to press.

Dillmann's German prose style must have been particularly convoluted - it is not clear when the firm first began to consider publishing a translation of his works, but word of their intention must have reached S.R. Driver in Oxford by early August 1894. He would appear to have sounded a note of caution regarding the complexities of Dillmann's writings. John Clark replied

> I am very grateful to you for your opinion about Dillmann and I quite see the force of all your remarks and shall keep them in mind before deciding to translate the complete works. I fear however I am committed to go on with Genesis ...[134]

It was, however, not until three weeks later that the Rev. John MacPherson of Findhorn was finally authorised to proceed with the work

and in retrospect, John Clark may well have wished that he had taken Driver's advice. MacPherson had done work for the firm previously, work which was presumably of an acceptable standard, for Clark appears to have thought highly of his general competence. But the letter commissioning MacPherson acknowledges the complexity of Dillmann's style and it is difficult, with hindsight, to avoid detecting also some slight hesitancy on the firm's part as to the translator's ability with regard to the particular work in hand

> With your kind assurance that no pains shall be spared on your part to do every possible justice to Dillmann I have pleasure in asking you to proceed with his Genesis. I say 'possible' justice, because I am aware of the difficulties of the work, and how impossible it must sometimes be to give an elegant rendering of Dillmann's style.[135]

MacPherson proceeded with the translation between September 1894 and March 1895. There are indications that, early on, Sir Thomas Clark saw a sample of his work and questioned the accuracy with which the German text was handled, but John Clark was eager that the project should remain in MacPherson's hands. By March 1895, however, it was clear that MacPherson's work was seriously defective. From the reference to 'expense' in the following letter written by Sir Thomas to the translator in the absence of John Clark, it is obvious that part of the work was by then in type. 'It is impossible', wrote Sir Thomas

> that such a rendering can go out to the public; it would be at once condemned. ... It is a great disappointment, & will involve a great expense. Indeed, I am not sure but that it would be better to abandon the whole thing. I fear your ear has not been able to get over Dillmann's curt style, & that thus you have been led to a far too literal rendering.[136]

It was decided by 4 April that MacPherson should be responsible only for the first volume of the work, responsibility for the second being assigned elsewhere.[137] It is not clear what amendments were made to

MacPherson's translation in the Spring of 1895, nor what supervision there was of his work thereafter. But a scrutiny of his text in August revealed further errors. He was told 'in many cases you have gone grievously wrong, not to speak of lesser inaccuracies.' A major mis-translation on the very first page would 'necessitate the cancelling of the whole impression (800 copies) of this sheet, for it is already printed off, & the loss of the plates'.[138] Presumably this stereo-typing and printing off was done subsequent to MacPherson's revising the translation in the light of earlier criticisms: this July letter would lose much of its force if it were only elaborating on the cost to the firm of MacPherson's errors which Sir Thomas had dealt with so pointedly in March. The implication may well be that MacPherson revised his translation, that it was stereotyped, and then found to be still grievously defective.

It is open to question why, when the Clarks were fully aware of the complexities of Dillmann's style, and perhaps uncertain about MacPherson's competence as a translator, they did not ensure that the manuscript was not more carefully scrutinised before it went to press. It would seem to have been particularly foolhardy to have had the work stereo-typed before having been given such a critical reading. We have already seen that a similar foolhardiness in the case of a work trans-lated by the Rev. J. Beveridge resulted in considerable expense to the firm. These examples certainly indicate the degree of trust placed by the firm in its translators; perhaps it indicates too that, while the Clarks all knew the German language, their knowledge did not extend to unravelling the intricacies of German theological prose.

It is not surprising that, in the financial year 1897-98 Dillmann's

Genesis, eventually published in 1897, shows a debit balance of £256 5s. 1d.[139]

iii. Diessmann's Bible Studies

In May 1899, the Rev. Alexander Grieve of Forfar accepted the offer of a thirty pound honorarium for a translation of Professor Adolf Diessmann's works Bibelstudien and Neue-Bibelstudien.[140] The initial contact with Diessmann regarding the translation of the works had been made the previous year,[141] but Bible Studies was not published until 1901.[142] It would appear that the translation was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor W.M. Ramsay of Aberdeen, who was of the opinion that, although the work was important, it could only succeed in the English language market place if accompanied by notes and an introduction, both of which he undertook to provide. With such notes, he estimated the work could sell 2,000 copies. This illustrates the extent to which the Clarks relied on the views of specialists in selecting material for publication and in deciding the form in which it would be presented. Great problems could arise when a given scholar was mis-informed or frankly motivated by self-interest, if the Clarks were not sufficiently prudent to seek the views of a range of experts rather than being guided by one personality.

The production of this translation was fraught with difficulties. There was the sheer administrative complexity of shuttling proofs between Grieve, Ramsay, Diessmann (who was to edit his two separate works into a discrete text), James Hastings (who had a watching brief) and 38 George Street. There was also Diessmann's attitude: at the end of 1899 he asked for additional remuneration for the work he had agreed to do. But perhaps it was hardly surprising that Diessmann

proved to be irritable in view of the interminable delays which beset the project.

The chief source of difficulty was W.M. Ramsay himself, who behaved in an incomprehensible and curmudgeonly manner. Certainly physical illness coloured his judgement over the crucial months, but it is likely that there was some psychological instability as well.

The first, minor problem arose when he asked for a royalty on the translation. Initially it had been intended that, as well as providing an editorial apparatus, he would select the translator, and supervise his work. Involvement to this degree might have justified his expectations of receiving a royalty, but his chosen translator opted out, it was left to the Clarks to select Grieve, and they, uncertain how much work Ramsay intended doing on the project, felt that his avowed commitment to scholarship and friendship towards Diessmann would provide motivation enough for his work without payment being necessary. Ramsay thought otherwise, and insisted on a royalty, pointing out that his notes would be an important factor in the success of the English language edition. The Clarks, capitulating, offered him a royalty of 10% on the wholesale price.

Secondly, he insisted that the printing work should be done by Aberdeen University Press (A. King) rather than by the Clarks' normal printers Morrison and Gibb so that he could liaise closely with the printers. It later emerged that he had business links with that firm. He further insisted that he could not begin to write his notes until the work was in type. It had therefore to be set, and slip proofs produced before Ramsay could make any progress. The printers proved to be slow and less than satisfactory, and Ramsay took an unconscionable time to

compile his notes. Since the type had to be kept standing until these notes were ready, his delay led to the printers' running out of Greek type (they were also at work on a Greek Lexicon for another publisher), and this resulted in ill-feeling between printer and publisher, and further delayed the setting of the work.

Thirdly, Ramsay suffered a debilitating accident in September 1899 which hindered the work and dulled his perceptions. The Clarks' patience was tried to the limit as Ramsay criticised Grieve's perfectly adequate translation. John Clark wrote to Grieve

> in his [Ramsay's] present state of health, he says he finds it very difficult to explain to others even what he clearly understands himself, and doubtless he has, at present, similar difficulty in understanding other people, however clearly they may express themselves. We must just try to humour him, although I know it is not easy.[143]

Fourthly, his thinking impaired in this way, Ramsay who seems to have entered the project in a harmonious relationship with Diessmann, began to question the German's editorial work in linking the two books and, it would seem, some of his views. 'It is most unlucky' wrote Ramsay, 'that[Diessmann]has such a firm belief in the absolute perfection of his work, and won't take the chance of improving it, and adapting it to a wider audience than 100 German Professors.'[144] The Clarks shared the view that much of the work that should have been being done by Diessmann was being left to Grieve. They were more concerned however, that the final product might be a work which would appeal to only 100 <u>British</u> professors and, reminding Ramsay of his estimate of a potential market for 2,000 copies, they reminded him also of his responsibility to popularise the translation by means of his annotations. However, Ramsay remained at loggerheads with Diessmann. There seemed to be a real danger that this controversy between the author and the editor of

the English translation would spill over into the pages of the book itself, for Diessmann was understandibly reluctant to be slated in his own book without right of reply. The Clarks clearly felt that such a dualism of view would shipwreck the work's chances of success. They also, however, appear to have accepted that the success of the work would also be impaired if it appeared without notes for the English reader.

Fifthly, Ramsay delayed the project by lack of application, and apparent indecision as to exactly how much work he was to do. Was it to be notes only, or introduction, notes and appendix? If this was at issue in June 1899, it had still not been resolved by February 1900. In the end, following the tension with Diessmann (who clearly had seen some notes written by Ramsay), it was decided that notes would be sacrificed, and Ramsay would content himself with writing a short introduction.

In late June 1900, however, Ramsay's connection with the project was completely severed. The circumstances immediately preceding the taking of this decision were explained by John Clark to Grieve:

> I asked Prof. R. if he expected the royalty on every copy we may sell simply for the short Introduction he offers to write, and he replied 'certainly, it is a matter of business, and if I allow my name to go on the English edition it will enhance the value, and I am entitled to some recognition for it.' But he added that he would really prefer not to write an Introduction, and that if we think the book will not stand the expense, by all means to do without him. He is perfectly pleasant about this, and leaves it entirely to us to do as we think best. What do you think? He has behaved in such a strange way all along that I feel inclined to accept his proposal and let him off. I wonder, however, whether Diessmann would feel troubled about it. For all I know he might be immensely pleased![145]

The printing off of the work began on 21 July 1900, a year to the day after the first proofs had arrived. But that autumn saw further delay at the printers. In October, John Clark discovered that King

had become a limited company with Ramsay as chairman, and remarked laconically 'Well, one is always learning!'[146] The work, initially scheduled for publication in the autumn of 1899 did not in fact appear until early spring 1901. On 23 March that year, Clark wrote to Grieve with jubilation and relief 'At last! We have got some copies from our binders this morning.'[147]

Throughout this extraordinary affair, Grieve worked uncomplainingly and expeditiously. We have no figures relating to the year in which this book was published, but it seems extremely unlikely to have proved to be a profitable speculation for the Clarks.

iv. Riehm's Messianic Prophecy

A translation of E.C.A. Riehm's Messianic Prophecy by the Rev. L.A. Muirhead of Broughty Ferry had initially appeared in 1876. A new edition was issued in the late 1890s, and Muirhead took the opportunity of asking the firm for a royalty on each copy sold, to recompense him for his work in revising the book, rather than a flat-rate honorarium. This brought him a detailed statement of the economics of translation publishing, and, as a charitable afterthought, an increase in his honorarium from ten pounds to twelve guineas.

> You stagger us by your suggestion of a royalty of '2d. in the 1s. on the price of the book.' The impossibility of that may not have occurred to you, but we ask you to consider the following points:-
>
> The published price is 7s.6d., but, after trade discounts are deducted we do not get back much more than the half (in the case of America sometimes less than the half) of that sum, out of which we have to pay all costs of production, working expenses, etc. A royalty of 1s. 3d. per copy - which you suggest - deducted from that, would simply mean a dead loss to us, even supposing we sold the whole edition. That is proved by the result of the previous edition. It has left a small credit balance (although after 10 years), but had we paid you a royalty of 1s. 3d. per copy there would have been a very heavy debit balance against the book, & we should never have dreamt of facing another edition.

> We have already paid you for the Translation, & the only reason why we did not mention any definite sum for the revision, and the bringing up to date of the 'Literature' [Bibliography], was because we could not judge of the amount of trouble it would entail upon you. Frankly, we should have thought an honorarium of £10 an ample recognition of such work. ... We find on enquiry at the Printers that they are charging us about £10 for your 'alterations' upon the proofs. But we shall ask your acceptance of Twelve Guineas. That is really as much as it can stand.[148]

This interesting letter is indicative of the very narrow margins within which the firm was operating.

Having examined the Clarks' intrinsic commitment to the publishing of translations, and looked at the many factors, not all of them within the firm's control, which could seriously affect the profitability of such a publishing programme, we will now consider the extant financial evidence which has bearing on the translation side of the Clarks' output in an attempt to arrive at some tentative conclusions on the profit they were likely to make.

3. The profitability of the Clarks' translation publishing

a) Individual works

Until the Foreign Theological Library was wound up in the early 1890s, most of the translations issued by T. & T. Clark appeared as part of a series, the firm not being sanguine about the prospects of works issued on an individual basis. Hence the translator of Nature and the Bible by Reusch was told 'we do not think it would have any chance of success except in the series.'[149] This view that independent translations were unlikely to be profitable was still held after the firm no longer used the Foreign Theological Library as a vehicle for new translations. Hence the would-be translator of Dahle's Life after Death was told in 1895 that the likelihood of translations of foreign theological works making a profit was extremely remote, and that the Clarks had suffered

serious loss through several recent publications.[150]

That this lack of enthusiasm for publishing individual translations was soundly based is borne out by examples of such works which made a considerable loss. 750 copies of Isaac A. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology (particularly in Germany) from the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century were issued in 1871. By 1879, the firm had 'not sold nearly that number', and were left with 'a considerable loss'.[151] The remaining 458 copies of H.W.J. Thiersch's On Christian Commonwealth, issued in 1877, were sold off cheaply to a Mr J. Bosworth in 1883. The work had proved to be 'a considerable loss'.[152] Sales of Ernest Naville's The Christ (1880) and Gustave Tophel's The Work of the Holy Spirit in Man (1882) were poor. In 1885 the translator of these works, the Rev. Thomas Desprès of Malton, was told that neither was anywhere near covering its expenses, and that the firm had nearly 600 copies of the Naville work on hand 'besides what the booksellers [might] have'.[153] Over two years later, Desprès was told that there were still five hundred copies of The Christ left unsold, and that the firm had not yet recouped its outlay.[154]

Yet despite the lack of enthusiasm and the frequent losses, the firm persevered in the publication of translations outwith series. The only consecutive figures we have are from the Stock and Sales Book, Individual Titles,[155] which covers the four financial years beginning 1895-96. In this case as always, these figures have their limitations for they show whether or not a particular title made a profit or a loss within a given financial year, but not, except in the case of new works where we are given information about the origination costs, whether it had sold in sufficient quantities to approach, or pass, its breakeven point.

By the mid-1890s, a fairly limited number of translations was being issued. The following table shows the performance of a selection of these.

TABLE II: 8

Performance of some translations published between 1894 and 1897

Author/ Title	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Godet[1] Epistles of St Paul	Cr.£ 42 14s. 1d.	Cr.£17 0s. 1d.	Cr.£ 12 5s. 2d.	Db.£ 10 2s. 4d.
Beyschlag[1] New Testament Theology	Cr.£230 5s. 4d.	Db.£ 6 14s. 2d.	Cr.£ 93 2s. 2d.	Cr.£128 5s.11d.
Dahle Life after Death	-	Db.£70 8s. 9d.	Cr.£ 12 17s. 3d.	Cr.£ 24 16s. 8d.
Christlieb Homiletic	-	-	Db.£ 91 8s. 6d.	Cr.£ 8 12s.11d.
Dillmann Genesis	-	-	Db.£256 5s. 1d.[2]	Cr.£ 52 10s. 0d.

Cr. = Credit Db. = Debit

(1) Over financial year 1895-96, 130 copies of the Godet work, and 415 copies of that by Beyschlag were sold.

(2) The reasons for the size of this deficit have been discussed in a previous section. Of the sum quoted here, £107 8s. 0d. had been debited in an earlier financial year.

Detailed costings are available in the case of the works by Dahle, Christlieb and Dillmann.

1,080 copies of Dahle's Life After Death were printed. The total cost of the edition, once it was bound in its entirety would be £160 2s.10d.[156] The work had a nominal retail price of 10s. 6d., the Clarks' average income per copy sold was 5s.10d., while the unit cost of production was 2s.11½d. Around 100 presentation and '25th' copies were distributed.

By the time the entire edition had sold out, the firm would therefore have received 5s.10d. x 980 = £285 16s. 8d., a profit of £125 13s.10d., or 78.48% on their investment. Only 239 copies were sold in the first year however, and even at that rate of sales the work would have taken several years to realise its full profit. In fact, however, sales decreased in succeeding years, and the work had still not recovered its costs by the end of the century.

810 copies of Christlieb's Homiletic were printed. The total cost of the edition, once it was bound in its entirety, would be £142 19s. 1d.[157] The work had a nominal retail price of 7s. 6d., the Clarks' average income per copy sold was 4s. 4½d., while the unit cost of production was 3s. 6d. Around eighty presentation and '25th' copies were distributed. By the time the entire edition had sold out, the firm would therefore have received 4s. 4½d. x 730 = £159 13s. 9d., a profit of £16 14s. 8d., or 11.7% on their investment. Only 195 copies were sold in the first year, however, and very low sales over 1898-99 lead us to suspect that the work would have recovered its investment, if at all, only after many years.

We have already discussed the problems with the translation which increased the firm's outlay on Dillmann's Genesis. 807 copies of this two-volume work were printed. The total cost of the edition, once it had been bound in its entirety, would have been £510 7s. 0d.[158] The work had a nominal retail price of £1 1s. 0d; the Clarks' average income per copy sold was 11s.11½d., while the unit cost of production was 12s. 8d. 71 presentation and '25th' copies were distributed. By the time the entire edition had sold out, the firm would therefore have received 11s.11½d. x 736 = £440 0s. 1d., a loss of £70 7s. 0d., or

13.78% on their investment 396 copies were sold in the first year, and over eighty in 1898-99. It would be several years before the edition sold out, and in this case, the work would not have recovered its costs even at that point. It is difficult to estimate the precise cost of the printing work which had to be written off due to MacPherson's ineptitude. It seems likely that, but for this additional expense, the work would have been costed to break even and no more. Even without the problems with the translation Genesis was in no way a financially profitable venture.

It might be deduced from the letter books that, by the mid-1890s, the Clarks were publishing only those translations which they considered likely to succeed financially on account of the quality of their scholarship. If their judgement were sound, we would expect these works to show a reasonable profit. But in fact this did not happen. The Beyschlag work was clearly a success, the deficit over 1896-97 being probably occasioned by the necessity of a reprint. But the Godet work seems to have been less successful, while the works by Dahle, Christlieb and Dillmann did not break even by the turn of the century. We must conclude either that the Clarks' judgement failed them, or else that, although conscious that little return could be expected, they nonetheless went ahead because of their desire to make available in English works which they considered valuable. The retail price of a book was to some extent dictated by its size, and the perceived value which it would have in the eye of the potential purchaser. But the fact that the Clarks fixed the retail prices of these works at a level which would at best produce only a very modest return on investment would indicate that, here again, they were motivated by a sense of mission.

We may formulate the general conclusion that translations issued independently of a series were almost invariably unprofitable.

b) Series

i. The Foreign Theological Library

> The Foreign Theological Library ... became at once an institution. To hundreds and thousands of young ministers, and candidates for the ministry, of every denomination, in England and its colonies, and America, - in fact, wherever the English language is read, - it has brought its annual or half-yearly relay of instructive and stimulating works with unfailing regularity.

Thus an unidentified Wesleyan Methodist minister, writing in 1882[159] described the Clark firm's longest-running series. As we noted in the historical introduction, the Foreign Theological Library was considered one of the first-fruits of the younger Thomas Clark's partnership. Four volumes were to be published annually at a subscription price of £1 0s. 0d.[160] The first issues appear to have taken place in 1846, and for the next forty-five years, 'with the utmost regularity',[161] four volumes were issued per annum, featuring English translations of major European theological works. 180 volumes were published in all: it is indicative of the firm's commitment to the series that at least 171 of these were still in print at the end of the century.[162]

At least part of the motivation underlying this commitment is to be explained in terms of the Clarks' enthusiasm for progressive theology discussed earlier. But to have survived for well over half a century the series must, one would expect, have been reasonably profitable. And one of the factors which surely affected the profitability of the Library was the quality of the works chosen for translation. If books were chosen wisely, and with discernment, bearing in mind the state of the market, the series would progressively establish its reputation,

and sales would be self-perpetuating. It is perhaps an indication that this had come about that the firm held that a book which was unlikely to break even if issued independently could be made to succeed as part of the F.T.L. Certainly, every indication is that the firm was extremely fortunate in the books it selected for translation. The Wesleyan Methodist minister was able to comment that it was in his opinion 'a rare thing - so rare as to have no example - for a bad book to be translated,'[163] and to praise the range of authors represented, and the influence of the series. Nor was he alone in his high estimation of the influence of the firm's translations. Professor W.R. Harper of Chicago University, for example, was quoted in a Clark catalogue[164] as saying 'The Foreign Theological Library has exercised a great influence upon the biblical studies in this country and in England.' But an influential series need not, ipso facto, be a profitable one. The works of C.F. Keil, for example, were held to be of great importance. Yet, as we have seen, in enclosing a fee to the translator of his Handbook of Bible Archaeology the firm commented that £55 was 'really as much as we can afford, and more than we are likely to see for many years'.[165] Volumes in the series, it would seem were long-term investments, even when their contents were of undisputed quality.

Another factor affecting the image of the series, and hence its sales and profitability, was the quality of the translations. As we have seen, the language of the German theologians especially could often be far from easy to translate.

> The difficulties of putting into readable English the extraordinary composite of German theological style which some of the best authors in the series exhibit, can hardly be exaggerated.[166]

Apparently, some of the earlier works in the series were ineptly translated, 'indeed, in a few cases, the version had to be put into new

hands and done over again',[167] but by 1882 it was the opinion of one commentator at least that 'Messrs. Clark's translators [had] greatly improved, and some of the later ones [left] hardly anything to be desired.'[168] Certainly, the firm was well aware of the supreme importance of accuracy. In the same year, they expressed the hope that a translator, albeit of a work not in the F.T.L., E.W.E. Reuss's History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament[169] would 'execute the translation with as much accuracy & elegance as possible, as in such a work so much [depended] on the translation being an exact transcription of the author's opinions'.[170] The Clarks would have been gratified by a comment on the translation of a work by I.A. Dorner;[171] 'the author ought to be grateful to his translators for making him much more readable and comprehensible than he made himself.'[172]

It is perhaps illustrative of the importance of the quality of translations that when an aggrieved American author, one J. Miller, wished to mount an attack on the firm he did so by criticising the quality of the F.T.L. translations: clearly this was a sensitive area where harm could be done. The attack appeared in 1880 in an issue of a New York periodical entitled The Christian, and was endorsed by the editor of that journal. Thomas Clark confessed to being 'astounded' by what he saw as amounting to a personal attack on him:

> ... nothing more unfair and ungenerous has ever been done to me - I do not profess that all the [F.T.L.?] translations are alike good and no doubt there are many errors, but as a whole I am not conscious of the truth of the charge and certainly I have had hundreds of reviews and private letters testifying the very opposite.[173]

Of the specific work upon which the attack was centred, Clark had this to say: 'I have never had a single complaint and I believe it is admirably done - it was translated by a most competent man and under

the care of Professor Davidson who is not the man to pass slipshod work'; and he concluded by commenting 'it is hard indeed to be abused in this way'.[174]

There is no doubt that both the quality of the original works and the quality of the translations affected the success of the series. But what conclusions about the profitability of the Foreign Theological Library can be drawn from the financial evidence?

Like the Ante-Nicene Library and the series of works by St Augustine, of which it was a forerunner, the Foreign Theological Library was issued on subscription. The benefits of this are obvious: subscribers paid in advance for the books, and there was a guaranteed market for a proportion of the initial print run. Subscription publishing ensured 'a large number of purchasers beforehand'.[175] The four annual volumes would appear to have been issued in two batches in the course of each year, and distributed to subscribers either direct, or through retailers who serviced subscribers for the firm. It is not clear whether the retailer, having received the subscription fee from the customer at the beginning of the year, had in turn to pay the firm in advance at the trade rate, or whether he was entitled to wait until the goods were delivered and invoiced before paying. If the latter were the case, the bookseller rather than the publisher would be benefitting most and we may perhaps assume rather that the bookseller too had to pay in advance.

Regrettably, the only figures available for the years over which the series was being issued are the trade and retail prices. We have no record of the Clarks' outlay, and as the sales figures have not been preserved, no means of calculating the firm's income. And once again

the figures which are available are limited in their value: we know from the Stock and Sales Book, Individual Titles[176] whether a given title or series made a profit or loss in a given financial year, but not whether that title or series had covered its origination costs. Thus we have no means of being certain that the total outlay on the series had been recouped by the end of the century.

There were a number of different ways in which one could subscribe to the F.T.L.[177] In each case, the subscription price was at the rate of 5s. 3d. per volume. The price to the trade was at the rate of 4s. 9d. per volume, a discount of 9.5%.[178] One could subscribe to the series on an annual basis. The output of previous years could also be obtained at the subscription price, but one had to order a minimum of two years' output. The series as a whole could be bought at the subscription rate, there being no further discount in respect of the size of the order. Thus, for example, it was announced at one point that the 137 volumes in the series could be had for £35 19s. 6d., at the rate, that is, of 5s. 3d. per volume. There were also a number of special offers. By the 1870s, a selection of any twenty titles was on offer at the subscription price, the only condition being that no duplicates could be supplied. By 1890, the minimum number of titles which one had to purchase in order to be supplied at subscription price was eight, and by 1901 it had been reduced to four. The point of these offers was, of course, that one was being supplied at the subscription rate without being committed to take the entire output of any given year.

It was also possible, of course, to purchase volumes from the series individually. In that case, with one or two exceptions (such as A System of Biblical Psychology, by Delitzsch, which sold at 12s. 0d.)

the nominal retail price was 10s. 6d., and the trade price 7s.11d. (a discount of 24.6%, on which a further 2½% discount would apply if the bookseller's account were settled promptly, reducing the Clarks' income to 7s. 9d.). When individual works were supplied to wholesalers, the rate was 6s. 9d. (a discount of 35.71%).

More detailed figures are available for the four financial years beginning 1895-96.[179] In that year, fourteen volumes in the series were reprinted, and it is possible to estimate the unit cost of these reprints. The following table presents the calculations for seven representative works.

TABLE II: 9

Unit cost of seven volumes in the Foreign Theological Library reprinted 1895-96							
Volume	Keil's Pentateuch Vol. 1	Martensen's Individual Ethics	Delitzsch's Psalms Vol. 1	Godet's John Vol. 2	Dorner's Doctrine Vol. 3	Schurer's Jews Div.I Vol.II	Godet's John Vol. 3
Size of printing	265	540	268	540	266	270	540
Printing	£11 1s.11d.	£10 15s.10d.	£10 0s. 0d.	£10 19s. 5d.	£ 9 11s. 9d.	£ 8 19s. 1d.	£ 9 14s. 0d.
Paper	£ 4 4s. 6d.	£ 8 11s. 0d.	£ 4 4s. 0d.	£ 7 4s. 5d.	£ 4 1s. 0d.	£ 4 4s. 6d.	£ 7 12s. 9d.
Binding*	£ 6 18s. 0d.	£14 1s. 1d.	£ 6 19s. 8d.	£14 1s. 1d.	£ 6 18s. 6d.	£ 7 0s. 8d.	£14 1s. 1d.
Total cost	£22 4s. 5d.	£33 7s.11d.	£21 3s. 8d.	£32 4s.11d	£20 11s. 3d.	£20 4s. 3d.	£31 7s.10d.
Unit cost	1s. 8d.	1s. 3d.	1s. 7d.	1s. 2d.	1s. 6½d.	1s. 6d.	1s. 2d.

* The figures for binding are notional ones, assuming the whole edition to have been bound. 4,177 volumes in the series were bound during the year in question, but it was Clark's policy only to keep a very limited number of copies of each work in stock in bound form. When these were sold, a few more copies would be bound up.

The average unit cost of reprinting these works was therefore 1s. 4d., considerably cheaper than the equivalent price in the case of the Ante-Nicene Library, although the retail price was the same in the case of both series. Given the trade prices noted above, the Clarks' return on the investment in these reprints would therefore have been as follows:

on subscription through trade - 3s. 5d. = 256.25% return
on subscription direct - 3s.11d. = 293.75% return
non-subscription through trade - 6s. 5d. = 481.25% return
non-subscription through wholesaler - 5s. 5d. = 406.25% return

On the face of it, these figures appear very healthy indeed. And over the financial year 1895-96 income from the series exceeded expenditure on it by £846 13s. 4d. (The total income was £1,173 15s. 9d; the total expenditure £327 2s. 5d.) But this figure may well be deceptive, for it takes no account of the fact that several titles in the series may not at that point have broken even. A different picture emerges when we consider the annual sales of the series. In 1895-96, for example, around 1,570 volumes were sold at subscription price (this figure would include both any sold direct, and those sold through the trade), and 355 were sold at non-subscription price (apparently all of them to the wholesalers Hamilton, Adams and Co. or to Scribners in America.) Thus, 1,925 volumes were sold. It would appear that 173 volumes were in print at that time, so the average sale per volume was only eleven copies, a better figure than the corresponding one for the Ante-Nicene Library, but still very poor. It is obvious that some volumes would have sold better than others. In fact, in 1895-96, no copies at all were sold at the non-subscription price of ninety-four volumes (the subscription sales of individual volumes are not itemised). One would have expected that the volumes requiring to be reprinted would be those which sold best. While this

was true in some cases - the first volume of Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ (Division I), which was reprinted, sold twelve copies over the year at non-subscription price alone - in others, sales of reprinted works were poor indeed. The first volume of Keil's Commentary on the Pentateuch sold only one copy over the financial year at non-subscription price (the reprinting was carried out at the beginning of the period, on 21 August 1895). It is clear that the reprinting represented a long-term commitment by the Clarks to the series, for it would be many years before the reprinted copies would sell out, and consequently, the annual rate of return was modest. (It is also true, of course, that it would improve the chances of selling out of the slower-moving titles if the series were kept 'live', and that to do this it was essential to reprint titles which had sold out. But the reprinting of slow-selling works such as that by Keil mentioned above can surely only be explained in terms either of the firm's overoptimism or of its single-minded commitment to theology.)

Over the next three financial years, income from the series again exceeded expenditure on it, by £882 19s. 1d. in 1896-97, by £636 7s. 0d in 1897-98 and by £622 12s. 3d. in 1898-99. (The total income was £875 12s.11d; the total expenditure £253 0s. 8d.) The Foreign Theological Library was certainly contributing to the firm's cash-flow although its sales fell off over the period. But once again the fact that titles in the series may not yet have broken even, and the fact that sales per volume were poor, would lead us to question whether the Library was as profitable as it appears to have been at first sight, or whether in fact the Clarks' prime motive in continuing it was a belief in the value of the works it contained.

ii. Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament

It was apparently in around 1873, in the wake of the issue of the Ante-Nicene Library, and before the edition of the works of St Augustine had been completed, that the firm launched yet another subscription series, featuring the Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament by Dr H.A.W. Meyer of Hanover, an author 'who [had] been long and well known to scholars as one of the very ablest of the German expositors of the New Testament', and who was hailed as 'the ablest grammatical exegete of the age'.[180] The translation was to be prepared under the editorship of Drs Dickson and Crombie, Professors in the Divinity Departments of, respectively, the University of Glasgow and St Mary's College, St Andrews. Although the firm did not commit itself in the initial advertising to issuing a specific number of volumes in the series, such volumes as did appear were to be published at the same rate as those in the other subscription series, that is at the rate of four volumes per annum. The Commentary was eventually wound up after twenty volumes had appeared, but it would seem that there was a delay in their issue, for the final volumes do not appear to have been published until 1882. Meyer had died in 1873, around the time at which the English translation began to appear. The work had been published in German in sixteen volumes between 1832 and 1852, Meyer himself contributing material on the Gospels, the Acts 'and most of the Pauline epistles'.[181] The Clark edition included all the commentaries written by Meyer himself: to these were added two volumes on the epistles to the Thessalonians and Hebrews by Dr Lünemann, and four volumes on the Pastoral and Catholic epistles by Dr Huther. At some point during the course of the publication of the series, a third editor, Dr Stewart of Glasgow University, joined the team who

were superintending the translation of Meyer's part of the work.

In this case, we are particularly short of financial evidence with bearing on the series. The volumes were issued at the firm's normal subscription price of £1 1s. 0d. per annum (5s. 3d. per volume; trade price 4s. 9d. per volume). Volumes could also be purchased individually at 10s. 6d. (trade price 7s.11d. less 2½% = 7s. 9d. or 6s. 9d. to wholesalers). When the series had been completed, it could be purchased as a whole at the subscription price of £5 5s. 0d., with no further discount. By the 1890s, a selection of any eight volumes of the series could be had at the subscription prive £2 2s. 0d., the benefit being that one was supplied at the subscription rate without being committed to take the entire output of any given year.

No further figures are available for the years over which the series was being issued. We have no record of the Clarks' outlay, and no indication of the level of sales which was achieved. There are suggestions, however, that the enterprise was far from profitable. In a letter to the German publishers of Meyer, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, the firm referred to 'the great outlay for translation and printing', spoke of 'realisation' (of the investment) as being a long way off, and in fact stated that they were proceeding with the series only with extreme reluctance: 'We have most unwillingly found ourselves obliged to announce the continuation of Meyer for the sake of some of our subscribers.'[182] This letter is revealing on two counts. Firstly, as noted above, it indicates that the series was not regarded as being potentially profitable, at least in the short term. (It should be pointed out however, that it was in the Clarks' best interests to take this line in the letter as they were hoping to persuade the German

publisher to give them permission to proceed with the translation without any down-payment of a lump sum for translation right. 'We hope that within three years we should be able to pay you the sum you asked', they commented, but pointed out firstly that the translation was 'a pure speculation' and secondly that since some years had elapsed since initial publication of the original the German publishers had no legal claim for a fee for translation right. In consequence the Clarks felt it right to ask the Germans to 'trust to [their] honour' in the matter. Secondly, the letter indicates that subscription publishing could sometimes work against the publisher's best interests. The acceptance of subscribers to a series of this nature virtually constituted an informal contract between publisher and customer. If the publisher had the right to expect an on-going demand for his series, the customer equally had the right to expect that volumes would become available as announced, and a publisher of moral vision would feel obliged to proceed with a series if it were at all possible, no matter how speculative it was proving. In fact the series was <u>not</u> completed: once again the views of the subscribers were taken into account. 'So few ... of the Subscribers have expressed a desire to have Dr Dusterdieck's Commentary on Revelation included, that it has been resolved in the meantime not to undertake it.'[183]

More detailed figures are available for the four financial years beginning 1895-96.[184] From the figures for the two volumes which were reprinted in 1898-99, it is possible to estimate the unit cost of these reprints. The calculations are presented in the following table.

TABLE II: 10

Unit cost of two volumes in the Meyer commentary series reprinted 1898-99		
Volume	Matthew (Vol. 1)	Mark (it is uncertain which volume was reprinted)
Size of printing	162	270
Printing Paper Binding* (7d. per vol.)	£ 9 18s. 6d. £ 2 12s.10d. £ 4 14s. 6d.	£ 8 2s. 6d. £ 3 16s. 4d. £ 7 17s. 6d.
Total cost	£17 5s.10d.	£19 16s. 4d.
Unit cost	2s. 2d.	1s. 6d.

* Notional figures, assuming the whole edition to have been bound. 480 volumes in the series as a whole were bound during the year in question.

The average unit cost of reprinting these works was therefore 1s. 9d., a similar figure to that for the Ante-Nicene Library (The Matthew volume was significantly larger than the Mark volume.) Given the trade prices noted above, the Clarks' return on the investment in these reprints would therefore have been as follows:

on subscription through trade - 3s. 0d. = 171.42%
on subscription direct - 3s. 6d. = 200%
non-subscription through trade - 6s. 0d. = 342.85%
non-subscription through wholesaler - 5s. 0d. = 285.71%

As in the case of the other series these figures seem, on the face of it, to be very healthy indeed. A different picture emerges when we consider the annual sales of the series, although in fact it seems to have been selling better than the other subscription series. In 1895-96, around 308 volumes were sold at subscription price, and a further forty-six at the wholesalers' discount price of 6s. 9d.

Thus, the average sale per volume in the series was around eighteen over the year. In 1898-99, around 332 volumes were sold at subscription price, and a further twenty-seven at the wholesalers' discount price. Thus, the average sale per volume in the series was again around eighteen over the year. It is obvious that some volumes would have sold better than others, and in fact, over 1898-99 for example, nine volumes did not sell any copies at all at non-subscription price (subscription sales of individual volumes are not itemised.) It is clear once again that the reprinting represented a long-term commitment by the Clarks to the series, for it would be at least a decade before the reprinted copies would sell out, and consequently, the annual rate of return was modest.

Over 1895-96 income from the series exceeded expenditure on it (which was limited to outlay of £14 18s. 6d. on binding and advertising) by £73 14s. 2d. Over the next three financial years, income from the series once again exceeded expenditure on it, by £63 12s.11d. in 1896-97, by £48 13s.11d. in 1897-98, and by £42 12s 6d. in 1898-99, when total income was £86 18s. 1d. and total outlay £44 5s. 7d.

If we presume, and it is by no means certain that we are justified in so doing, that the series had by then recovered the initial investment on it, a case could be made out that the Clarks were getting a satisfactory return on this investment, but given the slow rate of sale per volume it was a return which was very slow in coming.

It is clear that the competence and stature of the work was without question, however many doubts we may have as to its profitability. (The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church comments[185] that 'it was highly praised for its completeness and philological exactness,

and has been constantly revised and rewritten by a long series of distinguished scholars down to the present time.') At one point, a rival firm was considering issuing its own translation[186] and the Clark translation was sufficiently sought after in the US to be pirated there by Funk and Wagnalls.[187]

4. Conclusions

We may conclude therefore, on the basis of this detailed study, that while the occasional translated work, issued individually or as part of a series, could undoubtedly produce large returns, in general the firm's translation publishing was only modestly profitable, and in some cases, sizeable losses resulted. Series publishing was preferred by the firm, because a successful series could absorb the losses on any poorer-selling titles which it contained. In the whole area of translation publishing, certainly in the 1890s, the Clarks' commitment to the cause would seem to have been the dominating motive.

Section C: Transatlantic publishing

As the nineteenth century progressed, T. & T. Clark became increasingly involved in what might be termed 'transatlantic publishing.' Complex business relationships were evolved with several North American publishing houses, notably with Scribners and the Christian Literature Publishing Company. One possible approach to the study of the motives and profitability of these ventures would be to devote a separate section to the examination of the Clarks' dealings with each of these firms in turn. In all of the Edinburgh firm's transatlantic relationships, there were, however, three distinct, although inter-related dimensions, each with its own varied benefits and constraints. There was, firstly, the sale by the Clarks in the United Kingdom of works issued by US houses. Secondly, there was the sale by the Clarks to American houses of works and rights in works. Thirdly, there was the development of co-operative publishing between the Clarks and firms on the other side of the Atlantic, resulting in what would today be termed international co-editions. A company-by-company approach therefore, while it might have certain benefits, would fragment our understanding of the factors involved in these three discrete areas by denying us an overall picture of the Clarks' activities in each area. It would seem in the light of this most beneficial to deal with each of the three areas in turn, the more so as the benefits and constraints pertaining in each area were similar regardless of the company involved.

1. Sales of works issued by US houses

The general impression received from the Clark letter books is that the Edinburgh firm rarely found it profitable to sell in the United Kingdom works originating with North American publishers. In 1880, for example,

Sir Thomas Clark wrote to an American author 'I have been so unfortunate in my purchases of several American books that I have little encouragement to bring forward more.'[188] Three years later, the position was much the same: writing to Scribners, who had been offering British rights in a work by G.T. Ladd of Yale University, the Clarks commented 'we have not been very fortunate with most of our American purchases',[189] and the same year Scribners' London agent was told 'we have been ... unfortunate with almost every American book we have bought in quantities.'[190] All this begs at least two questions: precisely how unprofitable to the Clarks were these transatlantic works, and why, despite frequent protestations such as those noted above, did the firm persist in importing works issued by North American publishers.

a) Motivation

There is in fact little concrete documentary evidence to shed light on the Clarks' motivation in accepting and rejecting offers of works of US and Canadian origin. One would have expected that the dominant criteria would have been the stature of the author and the competence of his work on the one hand, and, on the other, the related factor of its likely sales potential. These factors were undoubtedly taken into consideration, and, as always, where a work, though of major importance was potentially only marginally profitable, the firm was prepared to take the risk in the interests of scholarship. Thus, for example, the Clarks agreed to take 200 copies of a second edition of Ernest De Witt Burton's Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, despite the fact that they had made only £5 on the copies they had sold of the first edition, which had been published four years previously. 'You will see that, commercially, it is scarcely worth our while, but we are

greatly interested in the book. ... It has a prominent place in our Catalogue.'[191] While these factors were never lost sight of, other pragmatic considerations frequently came into play when the firm was evaluating the offer of an American work. A book might be accepted simply because its author was on good terms with the Clarks and had done valuable work for them in the past. Dr Charles A. Briggs' American Presbyterianism, while no doubt a competent work, would be unlikely in the extreme to attract large sales in the United Kingdom because of the nature of its contents. Nevertheless, the Clarks expressed themselves willing to 'go a long way to oblige [their] friend Dr Briggs', and agreed to take 100 copies from Scribners 'if he [Briggs] cannot get or does not wish another Publisher to take it', promising to 'do all in [their] power for it'.[192] Presumably the motive here was not pure altruism, the Clarks no doubt hoping that this favour would lead to Briggs' being kindly disposed towards the firm when it came to future, more saleable works. And in fact many later works by Briggs of more general interest did appear in the Clark list.[193] But the major consideration governing the Clarks' acceptance of American titles was simply the fact that they hoped to sell editions of their works to American publishers, and indeed that the profitability of some of these works depended on the export of an edition to the US or Canada. If American houses were to be predisposed to purchase Clark titles - and Scribners were enthusiastically offered new titles on a regular basis - then the Edinburgh firm had to show a willingness to reciprocate. This, it would seem, was the key factor. It was vital to the creation of goodwill in North America that T. & T. Clark should show itself willing to buy regularly a certain number of titles originating there. It was in the selection of these titles that the other factors -

stature of the author, competence of the work, potential profitability of the work, relationship of the author to the Clarks, potential future contributions of the author to the Clark list - came into play.

b) Financial considerations

T. & T. Clark does not appear to have had (or indeed to have sought) the exclusive British agency for the entire output of any one North American publisher, preferring rather to select and arrange terms for books on an individual basis. While, infrequently, works were supplied in bound volume form with a cancel title page bearing the Clark imprint, in most cases the Edinburgh firm bought the works in sheets and had them bound by Morrison and Gibb on their arrival in this country. On occasion, the Clarks may perhaps have been supplied with a set of plates by the American house from which to print an edition in this country.

i. Terms

Documentation with bearing on the sums paid for the British agency in individual works is scanty. In 1887, the Clarks agreed to purchase from Scribners 250 copies of Professor Samuel Harris' The Self-Revelation of God[194] at a cost of 3s. 6d. per copy. For this sum Scribners would supply copies of the work in quires bearing the Clark imprint, and would assign the English market rights to the Edinburgh firm. The Clarks were to put a 12s. 0d. retail price on the book. The number of review copies which Scribners were to supply for distribution to British editors was not stipulated, the Clarks being content to ask for 'as many copies for Editors as possible'. No import duty was payable on books entering the UK,[195] but there were of course charges for shipping the goods across the Atlantic. These would be

paid by the exporting publisher,[196] who would take them into consideration in arriving at the unit cost at which the books were supplied to the Clarks. In one case at least, however, that of the Presbyterian Review, the Clarks clearly had to meet the bill for carriage for they wrote to Scribners on 1 March 1887 asking them to send the copies of the journal by the cheapest way possible. One batch had cost 16s.6d. to ship from America, while another shipment cost £1 13s. 6d., more than double the lower charge.[197]

ii. Additional expenses

The Clarks' importation programme seems frequently to have been beset by problems, which led to additional expenses on titles whose potential profit margins were already very low. Damage could easily arise in transit. The problems which arose over the Clarks' import of Funk and Wagnalls' edition of Johan J. Herzog's three-volume Religious Encyclopaedia, while no doubt frustrating at the time, have about them a real touch of farce. On receiving copies of the first volume in sheets in December 1882, the Clarks wrote to complain that some copies had been damaged due to poor packing.[198] 'A good many sheets have been destroyed by nails which were sticking up right through the sheets in numerous parts.' The problem was compounded by the fact that the sheets had not been gathered into copies before packing; had this been done, far fewer copies would have been damaged by the nails.

> We trust that when Vol II is ready you will send it gathered into copies - thus, if a nail damages, only one copy is destroyed, whereas if it goes through a gathering, fifty copies are rendered useless.

Funk and Wagnalls' response was to question whether, in fact, the offending nails had been inserted by Scottish customs officials.

Were the nails, they wondered, Scottish or American? The Clarks retorted 'we really cannot say.'[199] At least the Americans agreed to replace the damaged sheets, but the vexed question of the provenance of the nails continued to exercise their minds. The Clarks were obliged to agree that the nails originated on this side of the Atlantic (they were, however, English, and not Scottish nails), but refused to concede that they were inserted in the packing cases in Scotland.

> Although the nails may have been English in manufacture could they not have been imported [to America], or, could they not have been some which had been taken out of cases sent from this country.[200]

It is surely far more likely that English nails would have found their way into the hands of Scottish customs officials! Thereafter, thankfully, the matter of the nails is not raised again. In this case, no extra cost to the Clarks was involved as the American firm accepted the responsibility of making good the loss. When the third volume of Herzog's work arrived in Edinburgh in 1884, the consignment was once again found to be in an imperfect condition. The culprit on this occasion was not nails, but water. Once more the damage was compounded by the fact that, contrary to the Clarks' advice, the sheets had not been collated before packing, so that many more copies were affected than would otherwise have been the case.[201] It will be seen how this kind of problem could easily result in extra expense for the Clarks, and would certainly produce frustration, and a lack of enthusiasm for importing American works.

A further problem centred on differences in practice between American and British printers. Great difficulties arose in the binding of the first volume of the work by Herzog noted above because the printers had not put signatures on each sheet. This no doubt resulted in an

increased binding charge to the Clarks.[202]

Where profit margins were narrow, it was clearly in the firm's interests to sell as many copies as possible, and to give away as few as possible. The legitimacy of the occasional demands from the Copyright Department of the British Museum for deposit copies of works originating in the US was firmly refuted by the Clarks in terms of the Copyright Act.

> ... we quite understood that the former receiver admitted we were not liable for Lange [the series of commentaries by J.P. Lange] which it would be rather a serious matter for us to supply - the books, title page included are entirely printed in America and we simply purchase so many copies. The Act applies to books printed in Great Britain no doubt in whole or in part, but in this case there is no part. We cannot see that we are liable.[203]

In these ways, and no doubt in others, T. & T. Clark was threatened with additional expenses on top of those already agreed for the import of American works.

iii. Factors affecting sales

The Clarks' sales of works imported from the US were affected by two main factors, the state of the UK market and the quality of the product.

It was in the context of low sales of American works that the following comments were made in the 1880s about the depressed state of the UK publishing industry, the Clarks explaining their lack of success with imported titles by referring to the diminished vitality of the home market. 'Business is so dull' (1889);[204] 'everything here is at a complete shambles, at present, ' it really seems little use publishing anything'(1885)[205]; 'the fact is that the depression in trade has been so great that there has been no encouragement beyond what people really want, and we very much fear there is no prospect of any change for a considerable time' (1886).[206]

But if low sales of imports could sometimes be blamed on marketing problems in Britain, more often it was the quality of the product which was seen to be at fault. And here the blame must be laid at the Clarks' door for allowing themselves to be persuaded to purchase works which could, with hindsight, be seen to have had little appeal to the UK audience. Very possibly, of course, the firm was once again promoting works it believed in, and hoping thereby to create a taste for books of American origin in the UK market and to make members of the British theological fraternity number American works among those they 'really wanted', to adapt a phrase from the letter quoted above.

But while this may have been the general aim, there is no doubt that the firm, prompted perhaps by its desire to accommodate transatlantic publishers, did make mistakes. The Clarks came to realise, for example, that the purchase of George T. Ladd's two-volume The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture (1883) had been 'very unfortunate'. His prolixity had made the work 'a dead weight' ... which the Clarks wished had been condensed; and his inconsistency had undermined the authority of what he had written.[207]

But if Ladd's work in common with some others failed because of literary obfuscation, its progress in the market place was also impeded by the theological position it took up: 'above all the rationalistic tone has greatly damaged it.'[208] On another occasion, the Clarks rejected a book which was offered to them by an American publisher because it was 'too advanced'[209] while in another case the theological audacity of a work and the resultant uncertainty as to its market was used by the Clarks as a lever to obtain copies at a lower price that the American publisher had wanted. The work in question was Arnold H.

Guyot's Creation: or, The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science, of which the Clarks commented 'Guyot's views are novel, and we doubt how far they would receive acceptance.'[210]

Problems arising from literary style and theological position could affect all Clark publications, and not simply those which were imported from America. But other problems, unique to the transatlantic publications, arose because the US and the UK, while sharing a common language, were culturally distinct. And even though the language was nominally shared, in fact differing semantic nuances on either side of the Atlantic could impede the transmission of the author's meaning, give rise to misunderstandings, and hence affect sales. In this area of language, difficulties arose, for example, in the case of Clinton Locke's volume on The Great Western Schism in the Eras of the Christian Church series. It was criticised for its style and vulgarity of expression: Locke had used the unfortunate phrase 'The Pope commenced dickering'.[211] Sales would, of course, be affected by such adverse criticisms. In the area of subject matter we have already seen that C.A. Briggs' American Presbyterianism failed to sell because its content was of a too exclusively US interest. And the cultural orientation of a work could also give rise to criticisms. For example the firm pointed out to Philip Schaff that a book they had handled was 'rather too American in tone e.g. in the article on "Divorce" which a High Church Bookseller in London pointed out at once.[212] Faced with problems such as these, it is understandable that the Clarks would write of the Eras of the Christian Church series

> we wish the editor would kindly keep in view the advisability of suiting, as far as possible, the taste of readers on both sides of the Atlantic.[213]

As the letter books show, other difficulties arose in individual cases which in some way affected the quality of works and hence limited their sales. For instance, in the case of The Six Days of Creation by Taylor Lewis (1879), the Clarks were duped by the American publisher into buying what they thought was a revised edition, but which was in fact merely a reprint of the first edition. To this duplicity the Edinburgh firm responded with incredible charity:

> We will remit Mr Shaw the amount of your a/c - but had we understood that the 'Six Days of Creation' was a mere reprint without a single line of addition or alteration we would not have had to do with it - you should certainly have informed us of this - The Reviews have all taken this up and the result is we have not sold over about a score of copies. If we do not sell the 250 within a couple of years we will certainly ask you to allow for the unsold copies.[214]

Sales could be affected adversely, then, by a variety of factors which had bearing on the quality of the product. When mistakes were made, the Clarks seem to have been willing to accept responsibility. 'We are to blame ourselves for it', they said of the work by Ladd,[215] and their whole attitude towards the problems we have been discussing is probably expressed by a phrase used in the context of that work: 'Publishers must just bear the fortunes of war.'[216]

c) Case studies

How did all these factors work out in real terms? How much evidence is there with bearing on the profitability of the Clarks' imports?

i. Individual works

There follows financial data on some of the works of North American origin which were published by T. & T. Clark on this side of the Atlantic. Once again, the only figures available are those for the four financial years beginning 1895-96, so in most cases we do not have any financial information with bearing on the year of publication.

Once again also, the figures record only whether a work produced a profit or a deficit over the financial year in question and we have no means of knowing whether in fact it had covered its initial costs.

George T. Ladd's somewhat contentious two-volume work The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture sold at a retail price of £1 4s. 0d., while the price to the trade was 18s. 0d. The book does not appear to have sold any copies over 1895-96 or 1897-98, no credit or deficit being recorded for those years, but, over 1896-97, the work realised £2 8s. 8d., and over 1898-99, £2 6s. 0d.[217]

For copies of Arnold H. Guyot's work on Creation[218] the Clarks offered Scribners 1s. 6d. per copy[219] and sold the work to the trade at 4s. 2d., the nominal retail price being fixed at 5s. 6d. The difference between the Clarks' buying price and selling price would therefore have been 2s. 8d., but their profit would have been reduced by other expenses such as binding and advertising costs, and additional discounts to retailers who paid their accounts quickly. Unfortunately, we do not know the size of the edition bought by the Clarks. In 1895-96, on sales of seven copies, the work realised 11s. 4d. Over 1896-97, £1 4s.0d. was realised, over 1897-98, 14s. 4d., and over 1898-99, 3s. 7d.

For copies of C.A. Briggs' American Presbyterianism,[220] the Clarks offered Scribners 3s. 0d. per copy on an edition of 100 copies,[221] and sold the work to the trade at 5s. 8d., the nominal retail price being fixed at 7s. 6d. The difference between the Clarks' buying price and selling price would therefore have been 2s. 8d,,but once again their profit would have been reduced by the factors noted above.

A realistic profit per copy sold would probably have been around 1s. 8d. For the edition of 100 copies, the Clarks would have paid £15; sales of the complete edition would have realised around £8 6s. 6d. profit for the firm, a percentage return on investment of 55.5%. Taking the Clarks' income per copy sold at around 5s. 6d. (5s. 8d. less additional 2½% discount), the breakeven point can be estimated as being 55% of the edition. These figures are interesting in that they are probably representative of those aimed at by the Clarks in arranging the import of American works. The Briggs title was not, however, a success. The firm recorded three years later that their experience with it had been 'by no means encouraging',[222] and while the work still appeared in the Clark catalogues until the end of the century, no figures are given for it over the four financial years beginning with 1895-96. This is very probably because no copies were sold over those years.

The Self-Revelation of God by Samuel Harris[223] was also bought from Scribners, the Clarks offering 3s. 6d. per copy on an edition of 250 copies,[224] and selling the work to the trade at 9s. 0d., the nominal retail price being fixed at 12s. 0d. The difference between the Clarks' buying price and selling price would therefore have been 5s.6d., but their profit would have been reduced by the factors noted above to, say, around 4s. 6d. For the edition of 250, the Clarks would have paid £43 15s. 0d; sales of the complete edition would have realised around £56 5s. 0d. profit for the firm, a percentage return on investment of 128.57%. Taking the Clarks' income per copy sold as being at around 8s. 9d. (9s. 0d. less additional 2½% discount), the breakeven point can be calculated at 40% of the edition. These are clearly much healthier figures than in the case of the Briggs book.

The Self-Revelation of God was still in print and selling modestly towards the end of the next decade. It realised 10s. 4d. over 1895-96, £3 16s. 8d. over 1896-97, 7s. 8d. over 1897-98, and seems to have sold out by 1898-99. Unless, of course, the Clarks had ordered further copies from Scribners in the interim, this indicates that the edition was relatively slow to sell out. A return on investment of 128% looks reasonable until it is divided over a decade.

But the most unambiguous figures relating to works imported by the Clarks from the US are those for Henry Clay Trumbull's The Threshold Covenant; or, The Beginning of Religious Rites (published 1896), and God the Creator and Lord of All, by Samuel Harris, which was issued in two volumes in 1898. Neither of these titles was a success in economic terms.

The Threshold Covenant, indeed, was issued at a nominal retail price of 6s. 6d., and a trade price of 4s. 2d. At this level of remuneration, the edition could not cover its costs. The accounts for the edition as a whole would have been as follows:

Outlay		Income	
243 copies in folded sheets at 2s. 0d. per copy[1]	£24 6s. 0d.	240 copies at 4s. 2d.[3]	£50 0s. 0d.
Carriage and packing	£ 2 18s. 0d.		
Back Stamp	£ 2 2s. 0d.		
Binding 263 copies	£ 7 11s. 3d.		
Proportion of lists	£ 0 10s. 0d		
Advertising[2]	£11 5s. 3d.		
Prospectus	£ 1 0s. 6d.		
	£49 13s. 0d.		£50 0s. 0d.

(1) A further twenty copies for presentation were supplied gratis by Scribners.

(2) £9 of this sum was expended on advertising in the Critical Review and the Expository Times. These were, of course, only paper transactions. This total was the amount spent on advertising the work in its first year.

(3) Twenty-three presentation copies were distributed.

A profit of some 17s. 0d. on the edition was therefore in theory possible, even given the high level of expenditure on advertising the title. The above accounts, however, do not include the costs of distributing the review copies and the prospectus. Further, certain booksellers clearly ordered a sufficient number of copies to earn extra discounts under the '25th copy' arrangement (which extended to supplying thirteen copies for the price of twelve and a half, and, apparently, seven copies for the price of six and three quarters). In the case of Trumbull's work, the Clarks' income was reduced by the extent of the value of 5¼ copies by this arrangement: they received 234¼ x 4s. 2d. = £48 18s. 1½d.

In fact, the work sold reasonably well, only eighteen copies being left at the end of 1896-97, one year after publication. At that stage, it showed a loss of £4 10s. 0d.[225] Over 1897-98 the remaining copies were disposed of: further outlay on advertising reduced the profit over the year to £2 7s. 8d. Very few Clark titles, imported or home-grown, sold out as quickly as this one did. Nevertheless, there was an overall loss on the undertaking of £2 2s. 4d. It could have been made profitable only if less had been expended on advertising, or if the retail (and hence the trade) price had been increased. Clearly the Clarks felt that either course of action would have jeopardised the sales of the work.

God the Creator and Lord of All was issued in two volumes at a nominal retail price of 16s. 0d., and sold to the trade at 10s. 3d. In this case the problem was not so much the costing of the work as its poor

sales. Had the edition sold out, a modest profit would have been realised, but in fact by the end of the century sales were reduced to a mere trickle. The costing of the edition as a whole was as follows:

Outlay		Income	
250 copies in sheets at 6s. 0d.(1)	£ 75 0s. 0d.	242 copies at 10s. 3d.(3)	£124 0s. 6d.
Carriage and packing	£ 3 14s. 9d.		
Back Stamp	£ 0 12s. 6d.		
Printing 'Titles + Advts.'	£ 1 8s. 5d.		
Folding and collating	£ 0 18s. 0d.		
Binding 270 at 1s.0½d. (6¼d. per volume)	£ 14 1s. 3d.		
Proportion of lists	£ 0 5s. 0d.		
Advertising(2)	£ 12 0s. 1d.		
Prospectus	£ 0 9s. 0d.		
	£108 9s. 0d.		£124 0s. 6d.

(1) A further twenty copies for presentation were supplied gratis by Scribners.

(2) £6 4s. 6d. of this sum was expended on advertising in the Clarks' own journals. The total figure given here is the actual outlay on advertising the work in the financial year in which it was issued. Further outlay would have been required in succeeding financial years.

(3) Twenty-eight presentation copies were distributed.

In this case, the estimate of the Clarks' income if the edition were to sell out is reasonably accurate: due to the number of copies ordered by the booksellers being small, the '25th copy' arrangement came into play only once over the financial year of issue. The unit cost per copy available for sale was $\frac{£108\ 9s.\ 0d.}{242}$ = 9s. 0d. The Clarks' profit per copy sold was therefore 1s. 3d. A return on investment of 13.88% was therefore possible were the edition to sell out quickly without further promotional expenditure being required.

In fact, however, over 1896-97, only seventy-eight copies were sold.

Clearly anticipating that orders would be low, the Clarks had only had 150 copies bound up. The loss on the year's trading on the title amounted to £62 14s. 9d. Over 1897-98, a further thirty-seven copies were sold. Thirty further copies were bound up, and the work showed a profit on the year of £15 14s.11d. Over 1898-99, only eighteen copies were sold, and the profit on the year's trading was just £7 2s.6d. Both 1897-98 and 1898-99, of course, saw additional advertising expenditure. By July 1899, 133 copies had been sold, 109 copies were on hand, and the net loss was £39 17s. 4d.

A small profit on the edition was still, therefore, a possibility: 109 copies could have yielded £55 17s. 3d., which would have cleared the loss and produced a profit of £15 19s.11d. In fact, given that sales were so low and that further advertising would have been virtually essential, it seems unlikely that the work ever recovered its costs.

It would seem that very few of the imported individual titles proved to be profitable in the UK market. Even in those cases where the terms agreed seem to have been favourable, poor sales, and additional promotional expenditure appear to have markedly eroded or indeed wiped out the Clarks' profits. It is small wonder that they felt, as we noted earlier, that most of their American purchases had proved to be unfortunate speculations.

ii. A periodical: The Presbyterian Review

T. & T. Clark was granted the British agency of the American quarterly periodical The Presbyterian Review with effect from January 1885. Prior to that date, the periodical, which was issued by Scribners under the editorship of C.A. Briggs, had been supplied direct to

British subscribers by the American publisher.[226]

It was recognised from the first that the prognosis for the magazine was not good, and its initial performance in the UK did little to encourage more sanguine expectations. 'We fear we cannot as yet give you a very favourable report,' wrote the Clarks to Briggs in February 1885:[227] only forty copies had been sold by then, and over a month later not more than a further nine or ten had been disposed of.[228] Nevertheless, although recognising that the British market was 'so flooded by magazines that a new one must have a hard struggle', the firm hoped that shortly they would be able to send Briggs 'a more encouraging report'.[229]

Despite this cautious optimism, the situation does not seem to have improved to any great extent. In December 1885 we find the Clarks reporting to Scribners that they had a considerable number of unsold copies of the October 1885 issue still in stock, and that consequently a supply of 200 copies of the January 1886 number would be 'quite sufficient'.[230] In point of fact however, due in part to a general depression in the Trade, only eighty or ninety copies of that issue had been sold by late February.[231] The reports back across the Atlantic continued in much the same vein. 'We very much regret that circulation on this side is not increasing' was the assessment of the 1887 sales.[232] Earlier, writing to Professor Salmond, the Clarks had been blunter 'The Presbyterian Review has not been a success.'[233]

What reasons were given to account for the poor sales? The quality of the product is never mentioned, and does not seem to have been open to question. Had there been any doubt as to Briggs' competence, the Clarks would have certainly given up the agency much sooner than they

did. They considered that there were at least five reasons for the low level of sales, and of these only one is in any way connected with the journal's transatlantic origins. There was, firstly, the general lassitude of trade, referred to above. Secondly, also alluded to earlier, was the magazine boom, the proliferation of journals making it difficult for a newcomer to find a foothold in the market. Thirdly, there was the existence of a specific rival: 'The Free Church Students [were] starting a Magazine of their own'[234] (a reference, this, to the journal which later became the Critical Review of Theological Literature). Fourthly, there was the fact that most, if not all of the College Libraries took copies, thereby obviating the need for students to take out personal subscriptions. And finally - this is the point where the journal's American origin is relevant - the Review, having to be shipped across the Atlantic, arrived in the bookshops, and, more importantly, on the review editors' desks, much later than did the home-grown quarterly reviews. Since the 'Quarterlies' were often reviewed together in one long article in reviewing journals, the Presbyterian Review, on account of its late arrival, was often overlooked altogether. 'We do wish it could be in our hands [?by] an earlier date.'[235] This lack of exposure in the reviewing journals would undoubtedly have cost the magazine sales.

How did T. & T. Clark react to the poor prognosis for the Presbyterian Review? In the first place, they launched into an enthusiastic inaugural and on-going promotional campaign. When the January 1885 issue was received, seventy review copies and 3,000 propectuses were distributed, and some judicious advertising was undertaken.[236] A year later, the firm reported that they had circulated between ten and

fifteen thousand prospectuses (this, presumably, is the total for the twelve months) 'amongst Clergymen of all denominations'.[237] And in January 1888, the Clarks were able to comment

> Each number is regularly advertised, we have issued special circulars, & have in many cases asked present subscribers to try to induce their friends to take the Review but this apparently without [?result].[238]

The Clarks' second reaction to the poor sales of the journal was a dogged commitment to perseverance (albeit one which was reviewed on an annual basis). Thus they wrote in January 1887 'we have done all we can to work it up, and we are not without hope that we may yet be more successful.'[239] And a year later 'if you are still willing to leave the Agency for this country in our hands we shall continue to do all we can to push the sale.'[240]

It is uncertain when the commitment to perseverance was abandoned. Certainly, the journal still appears in the Trade Catalogue for 1889,[241] but there would seem to be no references in the letter books after 1888 to this venture which, even allowing for the fact that Scribners would have given credit on unsold copies is unlikely to have been a profitable speculation.

iii. Series

I) Lange's Commentaries

The Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Old and New Testaments had been produced by J.P. Lange with the assistance of several leading European theologians. There were twenty-five volumes in all: fourteen on the Old Testament books (of which Lange himself contributed three), one on the Apocrypha, and ten on the New Testament books (of which Lange bore the entire responsibility for three, and collaborated

on a further two.) Scribners produced an edition of this work, 'translated, enlarged, and revised under the general editorship of [the] Rev. Dr Philip Schaff, assisted by leading Divines of the various Evangelical Denominations',[242] and it was this edition which T. & T. Clark began to issue on this side of the Atlantic from around 1868 onwards.

Unfortunately, no figures have survived from the years in which the work was first published. It is just possible that, like many other Clark series, it was issued initially on a subscription basis. The retail price in the c.1894 Catalogue is given as a 'Subscription price', although according to the terms then prevailing, this seems rather inaccurate, for the price quoted held good whether one was purchasing the whole series, or merely one volume. In 1889[243] the trade price per volume was 12s. 9d., and the retail price 15s. 0d. By 1895-96,[244] the trade price had dropped to 12s. 0d. per volume, although the retail price remained the same. It is not clear whether Scribners had dropped their selling price to the Clarks between 1889 and 1895-96, when they charged 5s. 0d. per volume of the work in sheets. We cannot speculate on the profitability of the work as it was making its initial appearance, but by 1895-96, it would seem to have been proving moderately successful. The series sold steadily, if modestly, and the Clarks had only to keep a small quantity of stock in hand.

For example, at the start of financial year 1895-96, the Clarks held in stock a total of 146 bound copies of the volumes in the series, an average of 5.84 copies of each title. The largest number of bound copies held of any one title was eleven. More copies were ordered from America as they were required. Unless they were responding to a bulk order from a customer, the Clarks ordered no more than six copies of a given title at a time.

There is some mystery over the Apocrypha volume. It would appear that the Clarks held a sizable number of copies of this volume in sheets, and indeed periodically sold some of these sheets to Scribners. The Clarks' sheet-stock of this volume is not mentioned explicitly until 1897-98, but fifty copies in sheets appear as from nowhere in the 1895-96 accounts, so we may assume that copies of the work in sheets were being held in Edinburgh at that time. Possibly that particular title had been originated by the Clarks in collaboration with Scribners. Or again, the Clarks might have bought large quantities in sheets upon publication, discovered that there was no demand for that volume, and negotiated with Scribners to sell the stock back across the Atlantic as the American publisher required it. Certainly, in 1895-96, copies were sold to Scribners at 5s. 0d., the same price as the Clarks paid when purchasing copies of works in the series from them. This would tend to support the second explanation for the Apocrypha aberration. Further copies were disposed of in 1898-99 at 2s. 6d., however. One assumes that Scribners were the recipients in this case also.

How profitable, then, was the series? On the face of it, volumes being bought at 5s. 0d. and sold at 12s. 0d., we would expect a reasonable profit. In fact, however, the margin was greatly reduced, firstly by the cost of binding copies at 8½d. per volume, and, secondly and most significantly, by the outlay on such advertising and promotion of the series as was considered to be necessary, which amounted to around £4 0s. 0d. per annum. It would take the sale of seven copies to cover this promotional outlay. On an annual basis, therefore, the series would break even if the Clarks were successful in selling seven copies plus 47% of the total number of titles purchased from Scribners

in the course of the year, 5s. 8½d. being around 47% of 12s. 0d. The following Table shows how the series in fact performed over the four financial years beginning 1895-96.

TABLE II: 11

Lange's Commentaries: Stock and Sales 1895-1899					
		1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Stock at start of year	Bound	146	150	186	177
	Unbound (Apocrypha)	204	154	154	154
Bought during year		30	56	57(4)	12
No.of titles of which copies were bought		5	9	6	1
Sold during year	Bound	30	33	54	54
	Unbound (Apocrypha)	50	-	-	50
No.of titles of which copies were sold		15	12	13	25
Stock at end of year	Bound	146(1)	173(1)	177(5)	135
	Unbound (Apocrypha)	154	154	154	104
Outlay		£12 1s. 9d.(2)	£20 17s. 4d.(3)	£21 1s. 4d.(6)	£ 6 4s. 9d.(7)
Income		£30 10s. 0d.	£19 16s. 0d.	£32 8s. 0d.	£38 13s. 0d.
Profit/Loss		+ £18 8s. 3d.	- £1 1s. 4d.	+ £11 6s. 8d.	+ £32 8s. 3d.

(1) A stocktaking error by the Clarks. These figures should be 150 for 1895-96, and 186 for 1896-97.

(2) The annual accounts are as follows. Some minor discrepancies in the Clarks' figures have been corrected.

Outlay		Income	
30 copies @ 5s. 0d.	£ 7 10s. 0d.	30 Bound copies @ 12s. 0d.	£18 0s. 0d.
Binding 30 @ 8½d.	£ 1 1s. 3d.	50 Apocrypha sheets @ 5s.0d.	£12 10s. 0d.
Proportion of Lists/ Advertising	£ 3 10s. 6d.		
	£12 1s. 9d.		
Profit	£18 8s. 3d.		
	£30 10s. 0d.		£30 10s. 0d.

(3) The annual accounts are as follows. Again, some minor discrepancies in the Clarks' figures have been corrected.

Outlay		Income	
56 copies@ 5s. 0d.	£14 0s. 0d.	33 Bound copies @ 12s. 0d.	£19 16s. 0d.
Binding 26 @ 8½d.	18s. 5d.		
Proportion of Lists Advertising	£ 4 10s. 0d.		
Miscellaneous	£ 1 8s.11d.	Loss	£ 1 1s. 4d.
	£20 17s. 4d.		£20 17s. 4d.

Not all the copies bought in the course of the financial year had been bound by the end of it. This stock is included in the 'bound stock' figure in the Table, however, to avoid confusion.

(4) This figure includes twenty-seven copies of the volume on Job.

(5) Again there had been errors in the Clarks' figures. This stock total is twelve fewer than the figure at the start of the year would have led us to expect.

(6) The annual accounts are as follows:

Outlay		Income	
57 copies @ 5s. 0d.	£14 5s. 0d.	54 Bound copies @ 12s. 0d.	£32 8s. 0d.
Binding 56 @ 8½d.	£ 1 19s. 8d.		
Proportion of Lists	£ 3 0s. 0d.		
Miscellaneous	£ 1 16s. 8d.		
	£21 1s. 4d.		
Profit	£11 6s. 8d.		
	£32 8s. 0d.		£32 8s. 0d.

(7) The annual accounts are as follows:

Outlay		Income		
12 copies @ 5s. 0d.	£ 3 0s. 0d.	54 Bound copies @ 12s. 0d.	£32	8s. 0d.
Binding 33 @ 8½d.	£ 1 3s. 5d.			
Proportion of Lists	£ 2 0s. 0d.	50 Apocrypha in sheets @ 2s. 6d.	£ 6	5s. 0d.
Miscellaneous	£ 0 1s. 4d.			
	£ 6 4s. 9d.			
Profit	£32 8s. 3d.			
	£38 13s. 0d.		£38 13s. 0d.	

In this instance the price charged for copies of the Apocrypha volume in sheets fell to 2s. 6d.

Taken as a whole, therefore, the Lange commentary series was reasonably profitable. Certain individual titles were less successful: some volumes were extremely slow moving. Around 20% of the bound stock in hand was sold each year. The series as a whole would therefore turn round once every five years. The profitability of the series would have been severely shaken, however, if the Clarks had been responsible for originating the Apocrypha volume, and if a reprint of that volume had been required.

We can estimate the annual percentage return on investment in the series. At the start of 1895-96, the stock was valued at approximately £62 1s. 6d. (146 x 5s. 8½d. + 204 x 2s. 0d. The value of the sheet stock is estimated as being 2s. 0d.) Between August 1895 and July 1899, £60 5s. 2d. was invested in the series. The total capital outlay on Lange over the years in question was therefore £122 6s. 8d. The profit on the series over the same four-year period, ignoring general overheads, was £61 1s.10d. The return on investment was therefore 49.93%, an average of 12.48% per annum. The Clarks would be reasonably satisfied with this level of return on such a series.

II) History of the Christian Church

Although T. & T. Clark issued a three-volume History of the Christian Church by Philip Schaff in 1870, the same author's multi-volume series bearing that title did not begin to appear until 1883. The series was issued in six 'Divisions', each containing two volumes:

1 - Apostolic Christianity, A.D. 1 - 100
2 - Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100 - 325
3 - Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 325 - 600
4 - Medieval Christianity, A.D. 590 - 1073
5 - The German Reformation
6 - The Swiss Reformation

The c 1894 Clark Catalogue, although published after Schaff's death, carried a note to the effect that a work on the remainder of the Medieval period, covering the years 1073 - 1517 was 'in preparation', but this does not seem to have appeared.

Each Division had a retail price of £1 1s. 0d. and was sold to the retail trade at 15s.10d. The Clarks' income on most of the copies sold was, however, 13s. 6d. Clearly, most of their trade in these works was done with the wholesalers. Bearing the recommendation of no less a figure than Robert Rainy - 'No feature of the book has struck us more than the way in which it combines learned accuracy with popular writing'[245] - it is not surprising that the work seems to have sold well and to have been reasonably profitable. Detailed figures for the financial years 1895-96 to 1898-99 are available in the Stock and Sales Book - Individual Titles.[246]

Copies of individual titles in the series were bought from Scribners, usually in batches of fifty, at a cost of 4s. 6d. in the case of the works on Apostolic Christianity and Ante-Nicene Christianity and 5s. 0d. in the case of the others.[247] Further outlay was necessary to prepare

titles for sale and to promote the series. Each work cost 1s. 0d. to bind (6d. x two volumes); the unit cost of miscellaneous expenditure on carriage, folding and printing new title pages amounted on average to approximately 6d; the contribution of each volume sold to the amount assigned to the firm's overall promotion strategy could be as high as 10d.[248] The Clarks' total outlay per unit could therefore be as high as 6s.10d. in the case of the first two titles in the series, and 7s. 4d. in the case of the others.[249] The Clarks' profit was therefore 6s. 8d. in the case of the early titles, (a return on investment of 97.56%) and 6s. 2s. in the case of the rest (a return on investment of 84.09%). These are good figures, especially since the series as a whole sold reasonably briskly. In the case of most titles, the Clarks could expect to sell a batch bought from Scribners in between two and three years. The annual return on investment would therefore have been good.

The History of the Christian Church series performed well as a whole. The following table itemises the sums it realised over the four financial years beginning 1895-96. And this series, unlike many of the other Clark publications, had (with the possible exception of the Swiss Reformation volumes) covered all its costs by 1895-96. The figures shown are therefore clear profit.

TABLE II: 12

History of the Christian Church: Credit/debit balances 1895-1899				
Division No.	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
1	+£15 1s. 0d.	+£ 5 11s. 9d.	+£10 3s. 9d.	+£10 8s. 0d.
2	+£ 3 3s. 0d.	+£23 14s. 8d.	+£ 1 17s.10d.	+£19 3s. 7d.
3	+£12 15s. 6d.	+£11 2s. 6d.	+£12 7s. 9d.	+£15 2s. 6d.
4	+£ 7 12s. 6d.	-£ 2 7s. 6d.	+£ 4 15s. 9d.	+£ 6 7s. 0d.
5	+£ 7 3s. 9d.	+£ 3 15s. 6d.	-£ 8 2s.10d.	+£ 7 14s. 0d.
6	+£12 3s. 0d.	+£ 9 1s. 6d.	+£ 6 2s. 9d.	+£ 5 13s. 6d.
Total p.a.	+£57 18s. 9d.	+£50 8s. 5d.	+£27 5s. 0d.	+£64 8s. 7d.
Average per Division	+£ 9 13s. 1¼d.	+£ 8 8s. 0¼d.	+£ 6 10s. 6d.	+£10 14s.10d.

III) Eras of the Christian Church

The series entitled Ten Epochs of Church History was issued under the editorship of John Fulton by the Christian Literature Publishing Company of New York. There were in all ten volumes, each focussing on a different period of Church History.

T. & T. Clark were approached in August 1896 regarding the possibility of their taking an edition of the work for sale in the United Kingdom. By then two volumes had been published in America,[250] probably The Ecumenical Councils by W.P. Du Bose, and The Age of Hildebrand by M.R. Vincent.[251] A copy of the Vincent work was sent as a sample to the Clarks.[252]

Their response was mildly enthusiastic, the enthusiasm tempered by the negative tone with which the British Weekly, to which a copy had been sent for review, dealt with the Du Bose work.[253] They agreed to take five hundred copies each of the as yet unpublished titles, but only three hundred each of those which had already appeared, as copies of these seemed to have been reaching Britain through some other channel. Their acceptance of the Du Bose work was conditional upon a revised edition being sent.[254] In the event, five hundred copies were purchased of all titles except that by Du Bose.[255]

All did not go smoothly in the implementation of this agreement; the history of this series illustrates all the pitfalls of transatlantic publishing noted earlier. The problems which arose are detailed in a letter to the American firm dated 15 December 1896.[256] There were, first of all, problems occasioned by distance: the Clarks complained that the steamer had taken sixteen days. There was, secondly, a battery of miscellaneous production problems which added to the Clarks' expense:

a new title page had to be printed, changing the series name to Eras of the Christian Church to avoid clashing with a Longman series which used the word 'Epochs' in its title; inaccuracies in a list of translators had to be corrected; the sheets having arrived with no signatures had to be bound by the pagination, causing the binders additional work, with the result that their bill to the firm was correspondingly higher. The Clarks announced their intention of passing on the additional charges to the American firm. A third cause of difficulty was the apparent deviousness of the Christian Literature Publishing Company; possibly lack of communication was largely to blame. There was on-going debate about the number of copies of the Du Bose work which had reached Britain. The American firm claimed that none had been sent to the UK (except, presumably, the British Weekly review copy): the Clarks counter-claimed that a copy had been bought in Edinburgh and that a review copy had been sent to the Expository Times.[256a] Even more seriously, a letter sent by the Clarks on 26 September 1896 complaining that succeeding volumes in the series were one hundred pages shorter than the sample volume which had been sent, and suggesting that a smaller sum should be charged for these shorter volumes, appears to have been completely ignored by the American firm. And on top of all this, the Christian Literature Company had made errors in rendering their statement. The American firm proved conciliatory on these points, giving a reduction on the smaller volumes.[257]

A fourth type of problem, which arose later, centred on the quality of the product. Clinton Locke's volume on The Great Western Schism was, as we noted earlier criticised for its vulgarity of expression and infelicitous style. And a contributor to the Critical Review had pointed out 'graver faults than these'. Such criticism was seen as undermining the reputation, and hence, of course, the profitability of the series

as a whole. 'It is a great pity that what might be a most valuable Series should be marred by such blemishes.'[258]

An interesting attempt was made, at the instigation of the American publisher, to promote sales of the series in the United Kingdom. The American author who had contracted to write the volume covering the earliest period, The Apostolic Age, had died, and the Christian Literature Publishing Company wrote to the Clarks 'we have felt that if an English scholar could be secured for this first volume it would help the sale on your side.'[259] In consequence, the Clarks wrote on behalf of the American firm to the Rev. Henry Gee of Highbury Training College, inviting him to undertake the volume while explaining that the series was an American enterprise, and that financial arrangements would be concluded with him from the other side of the Atlantic.[260] In fact, Gee declined to accept the commission, but the volume was undertaken by a British scholar, J. Vernon Bartlet of Oxford.[261] Whether or not his participation increased the prestige of the series in the British market is open to question.

All ten volumes had been published by the Clarks by 1901,[262] at a retail price of 6s. 0d. Detailed financial information is available for the three financial years beginning 1896-97. It is possible to estimate the return which the Clarks could expect from their investment in the series. The costings for two representative titles, assuming the sale of the whole edition in each case, are given overleaf.

The Age of Hildebrand (Published 1896-97)

Outlay		Income	
500 copies @ 50c	£51 13s. 3d.	500 copies @ 3s.10d	£95 16s. 8d.
Carriage	£ 3 0s. 0d		
Collating and arranging	£ 1 10s. 6d.		
Contribution to cost of prospectus	£ 0 15s. 0d.		
Side stamp (contribution to cost)	£ 0 5s. 3d.		
Printing title pages etc.	£ 0 19s. 0d.		
Binding	£11 2s. 6d.		
Advertisingand proportion of lists (the actual 1896-97 figure)	£ 4 4s. 5d.		
	£73 9s.11d.		
Profit	£22 6s. 9d.		
	£95 16s. 8d.		£95 16s. 8d.

The Anglican Reformation (Published 1897-98)

Outlay		Income	
500 copies @ 50c	£53 9s.10d.	500 copies @ 3s.10d.	£95 16s. 8d.
Carriage	£ 2 14s. 0d.		
Electro.	£ 0 3s. 6d.		
Binding	£11 2s. 6d.		
Advertising and proportion of lists (the actual 1897-98 figure)	£ 4 16s. 0d.		
	£72 5s.10d.		
Profit	£23 10s.10d.		
	£95 16s. 8d.		£95 16s. 8d.

If these two titles had sold out, therefore, the Clarks would have received a return on their investment of 30.39% in the case of the work on Hildebrand (the breakeven point being 76.6% of the edition) and 32.56% in the case of the work on the Reformation (the breakeven point being 75.4% of the edition). On the strength of these figures, therefore,

we might assume that the series was reasonably profitable. Unfortunately, however, the market for the works in the UK was simply not large enough to produce a profit for the Clarks. Table II: 13 lists the sales of titles in the series in the year of publication and in the succeeding years.

TABLE II: 13

Eras of the Christian Church: Sales figures 1896-97 - 1898-99			
Title	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Age of Hildebrand	158	5	46
Great Western Schism	137	11	0
Age of the Crusades	150	30	17
Ecumenical Councils*	68	55	28
Age of the Renascence	-	138	34
Anglican Reformation	-	154	46
Age of Charlemagne	-	74	13
Post-Apostolic Age	-	-	76
* The Clarks bought an edition of only 300 copies of this work.			

Clearly, some titles sold better than others. But even the best-selling of these works, the Hildebrand volume, was still 174 copies short of its breakeven point by July 1899. It must be doubtful whether the series as a whole ever showed a profit: if it did, the return averaged out per annum would be derisory. Table II: 14 shows the financial performance of the series between 1896-97 and 1898-99.

TABLE II: 14

Eras of the Christian Church: Annual performance 1896-97 - 1898-99			
Title	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Age of Hildebrand	-£ 36 18s.10d.	+£ 0 17s. 5d.	+£ 6 19s. 8d.
Great Western Schism	-£ 36 13s. 1d.	+£ 2 2s. 2d.	-£ 0 15s. 0d.
Age of the Crusades	-£ 35 10s. 4d.	+£ 4 3s. 0d.	+£ 1 14s. 4d.
Ecumenical Councils	-£ 24 0s.10d.	+£ 0 9s. 5d.	+£ 3 14s. 7d.
Age of the Renascence		-£ 40 7s. 2d.	+£ 3 15s. 7d.

TABLE II: 14 (Continued)

Title	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Anglican Reformation Age of Charlemagne Post-Apostolic Age		-£ 36 11s. 6½d. -£ 52 17s. 8d.	+£ 5 7s. 9d. -£ 1 1s. 2d. -£50 5s.10d.
Total per annum Average per volume	-£133 3s. 1d. -£ 33 5s. 9¼d.	-£122 4s. 4½d. -£ 17 9s. 2¼d.	-£30 10s. 1d. -£ 3 16s. 3d.

Motives other than the hope of financial gain were clearly at work, otherwise the Clarks would have abandoned this manifestly unprofitable venture, rather than continuing to add new titles.

d) Conclusions

The Clarks' attempts to sell works of American origin on this side of the Atlantic were almost uniformly unsuccessful financially, whether they involved individual titles, a periodical, or series. Exceptions to this general principle, such as the History of the Christian Church series, by the very fact that they are so infrequent only serve to highlight the problems which the Clarks had with this area of publishing. The most that can be said is that these transatlantic agreements allowed them to develop and maintain the relationships with North American houses which would lead to the co-operative ventures which were so essential if some of their more ambitious projects were to succeed financially.

2. Sales of works and rights to North American houses

This section deals with the sale of editions of and rights in theological works and periodicals to publishers in North America. Excluded from consideration here are major theological works, such as the Dictionary of the Bible, which will be dealt with in a later part of this study.

In considering the Clarks' transatlantic dealings of this kind, we will be attempting to assess the profitability of these ventures; we will be investigating whether it was essential for the overall profitability of a given work that the print-run be increased by the number of copies required to fulfil the American publishers' order, thereby reducing the unit cost, or that the investment in the work be offset by the income from the sale of rights in that work to a transatlantic house; we will be considering whether the firm pursued the goal of appointing a single North American agency to handle its publications, or whether the Clarks felt it to be equally profitable and desirable to let several American publishers distribute their output, the main emphasis remaining, albeit, on the Scribner firm.

It is extremely difficult to unravel the complexities of the Clarks' transatlantic exports.

There is, first of all, a geographical complexity. In the case of many, or indeed most works, blanket North American rights (that is, distribution rights in the US and Canada) would appear to have been sold by the Clarks. This was the case with many of the sales to Scribners, and the Christian Literature Publishing Company's agency in the Ante-Nicene Library and the St Augustine series, although most reluctantly granted by T. & T. Clark, as will be seen later, nevertheless was specifically stated to include the Canadian market.[263] On the other hand, separate Canadian franchises would seem to have been granted on occasion: the Willard Tract Depository, for example, was given the Canadian agency in the Expository Times.[264]

But the major complexity arises from the confusing nature of the Clarks' business relationships with the various transatlantic companies which

were handling their works. The issue of a Clark title by an American publisher fell into one of three categories. Firstly, the issue might be the fruit of pure piracy, undertaken with no thought of obtaining permission from, and little if any thought of remunerating the Edinburgh firm. Secondly, the work might be issued with the Clarks' reluctant blessing: this kind of situation arose where an American publisher had a sufficient sense of business morality to announce in advance his intention of proceeding with the issue of an edition with or without the Clarks' consent, and offered some (usually paltry) terms, which the original publisher felt compelled to accept, or at least to enter into negotiations over. A cheap American reprint was certain to undercut the exported product sold through the official US agent for the work, thereby drying up demand through that channel, and hence reducing the Clarks' income from the book. The Clarks, it appears, attempted to make the best of the situation by endeavouring to conclude as favourable terms as possible with the pirate. Thirdly, the work might be issued through the agent chosen and appointed by the Clarks. An edition bearing the agent's imprint might be shipped in sheets to the US or alternatively, and much less frequently, the American publisher might be sold a set of plates from which to produce his own edition. Bound copies were not usually exported.

All this would be relatively simple if a given American publisher had always stood in the same relationship to T. & T. Clark, consistently issuing Clark books as pirate, reluctantly-authorised agent, or selected franchise-holder. But there are further complexities.

In the first place, there would in some cases seem to have been a

discernible growth in the Clarks' relationships. The out-and-out pirate, prepared to offer some kind of terms to the Edinburgh firm, would become the reluctantly-authorised agent, and, as time passed and the relationship developed, might eventually find himself offered rights in another Clark title. This progression is understandable.

In the second place, however, we find the Clarks willingly doing business with firms with regard to certain works while at the same time those firms were responsible for pirating other Clark titles, and giving an inconsequential remuneration. It is difficult to comprehend the Clarks' motivation in maintaining this dual level of relationship with the US firms.

There is no questioning the fact that the problem of piracy added greatly to the complexity of T. & T. Clark's transatlantic dealings in the decades under consideration. A convenient model could be constructed which would portray the Clarks in the 1880s as eager to have Scribners as their sole agent in the North American market over a decade which in fact saw the percentage of Clark titles handled by Scribners reduced as works were pirated by other houses with which the Edinburgh firm, however reluctantly, was forced to reach agreement. The model, however, portrays this trend as being offset by another - that of increasing co-operation between T. & T. Clark and Scribners on joint ventures, notably the International Libraries - so that the firms were very possibly closer in 1900 than they had been in 1880. Convenient though this model might be, however and worth bearing in mind as we proceed, it does not seem to tie in fully with the facts.

We will look first of all at the North American firms with which the Clarks were involved, and then consider the financial implications to the firm of piracy, reluctantly-authorised agencies, and grants of franchises to selected firms.

a) The companies

'We wish to be on good terms with every one' wrote the Clarks to Funk and Wagnalls.[265] In the field of nineteenth-century international publishing, this aim was virtually unattainable. In practice, the Clarks tended to favour Scribners wherever possible.

i. The major agency: Scribners

The American publishing house which was later to be known as Charles Scribner's Sons was a slightly younger firm than that of T. & T. Clark. Charles Scribner I (1821-1871) had established the business in partnership with Isaac D. Baker in 1846, interestingly the same year in which the future Sir Thomas Clark, two years Scribner's junior, joined his uncle's firm.[266]

It is uncertain when the first links were forged between T. & T. Clark and Scribner's firm (Baker died in 1850), but initial contacts were probably made through Charles Welford. An Englishman who ran a bookshop in New York, Welford joined Scribner's staff, and set up a London office from where he established relationships with all the leading British publishers, and, with a fine intuitive tact, arranged the export of their books to America. At a time when the American market was inundated with such imports, Scribner wanted to keep his main list distinctively American, and so established a separate imprint, Scribner and Welford, to handle books from this side of the

Atlantic. This imprint was used for almost four decades until Welford's death in 1885 by which time he represented the Scribner firm in all its affairs abroad.[267] Welford certainly knew Sir Thomas, and introduced him to the first Charles Scribner:[268] although there were many differences between the two, there was also an identity of interest, for both majored on publishing philosophical and theological (mainly Presbyterian) books.

In the last years of the century, however, John M. Clark's dealings were with Charles Scribner II, and with the colourful Lemuel W. Bangs, Welford's assistant who succeeded him on his death. Born in 1854, Scribner was five years older than Clark. He had two brothers, John Blair (1850-1879), and Arthur Hawley Scribner (1859-1932). The first Charles Scribner died in 1871 before his middle son had completed his education at the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University), and John B. Scribner headed the business, then known as Scribner, Armstrong & Co. until he was joined by Charles II in 1878: it was presumably then that the firm became known as Charles Scribner's Sons. John Blair died in 1879, leaving the young Charles as head of the firm. He was to be its president until 1928, when he became chairman of the board, a position he retained until his death on 19 April 1930.[269]

According to the historian of American book publishing John Tebbel, the major contribution of the second Charles Scribner was

> to enlarge [the firm] from the narrow scope developed by his father, specialising in philosophy and theology, until its list was as comprehensive as any other publisher's, and then to make that list a symbol of high literary quality.[270]

A similar broadening of the list is discernible in many contemporary British theological publishing houses: John Clark's development of

his firm's list, however innovative, was in contrast firmly rooted in his father's policies. But this did not stop a friendship from developing between the two men, and the relative mutual loyalty of the Clark and Scribner firms may be said to have been rooted in this relationship. The friendship was not without its problems. By all accounts Charles Scribner II was a forceful personality,[271] and his 'Stateside' ways of conducting business sometimes grated on John M. Clark who, for his part, could be equally forceful. But there would seem to have been enough good will on both sides to overcome these difficulties. John Clark has left on record his attitude towards Scribner, whom he met on several occasions. The relationship had been somewhat ruffled by a minor transatlantic misunderstanding in which James Hastings had been involved. Clark wrote to Hastings trying to restore calm, and encouraging him to see the matter form the American firm's point of view. While he said 'If Mr Scribner should every say anything "strong" about <u>you</u>, you may rest assured that I shall not fail to let him know that I resent it', Clark's general attitude towards Scribner seems to have been positive and understanding:

> Well, as to Mr Scribner, you are quite right in saying that something must be set down to 'American ways of doing business'. They are certainly very different from our methods; & yet when one meets American friends personally, no people could be kinder or more courteous.
>
> I have known Mr Charles Scribner (the senior Partner) for many years, & altho' I recognise that his business ways are not always our ways, they are less estranged from British methods than those of any other American Publisher I know - & I have met a number of them. We cannot help those differences of nationality, & I have no doubt that the Americans think (in fact I know they do) that we 'Britishers' are just as peculiar.
>
> But as a friend, no one could be kinder than Mr Scribner. We were very happy together & I am anxious that the old family friendship should be maintained.[272]

Perhaps because of the strength of this relationship, and because they felt that Scribner's business methods were, of those of all other American houses, most akin to their own, the Edinburgh firm dealt extensively with the New York house. In 1884 the Clarks expressed the hope that the two firms might 'long continue [their] pleasant connections',[273] and, the following year, the American firm was assured 'as you know, there is no house with whom we desire that our books should be placed compared with yours.'[274]

At no time however was Scribner's firm the sole American agent for Clark publications in either of the two meanings of that term. Scribners was never the only firm to handle Clark books in the US, and, except in the case of a few titles where they were assigned sole rights, did not have the exclusive franchise in individual works, the Clarks being free to supply copies to other firms in America. That Scribners was never the only firm to handle Clark books in the US is made quite clear, for example, in a letter to the Christian Literature Publishing Company dated 20 December 1884.[275] The Company, under the impression that Scribners was indeed the Edinburgh firm's sole agent, had asked if that agency could be transferred to them. This suggestion was, of course, declined, and it was pointed out that Scribners was only one of several firms handling Clark works in the US. There were sound reasons for not giving the sole agency to one firm. There was the pragmatic reason that the Clarks had to be free to come to terms, however reluctantly, with firms which were pirating their works. But there were further sound business reasons. Other firms gave valuable support to Clark works, support which the Edinburgh firm was reluctant to lose. And again, however

congenial the Scribners might find it to handle Clark titles, they would in all probability not have prosecuted their sale so zealously under a sole agency arrangement as under an agreement by which new titles would not come to them automatically, and could be with-held if the Clarks were less than satisfied with their conduct of the agency.[276] For instance, the American agency in the Expository Times was transferred by the Clarks from Scribners to the Christian Literature Publishing Company because the larger house was not, in the Clarks' view, devoting sufficient energy to promoting the periodical in the US.[277] That, except in the case of a few titles Scribners did not have the exclusive franchise in individual works is made quite clear by a letter to an unknown American firm in which the Clarks stated that although their New York agents were Scribners, 'this [did] not (except in the case of a few books) prevent [their] having business relations with any other firm.'[278] And on one occasion at least, we find the Edinburgh firm selling direct to a retail customer in the US. The Clarks, on the evidence of the Letter Books, had a very highly developed sense of business ethics, and it was probably infrequently that they wrote as follows:

> Messrs Charles Scribner's Sons, of New York, are our agents for the States, but we think you would get these books much cheaper by ordering direct from us. You would have to pay carriage, of course ...279

It would appear that on at least one occasion the American firm sought to be appointed the Clarks' sole US agent, both in the sense of handling all titles and in the sense of being the sole US outlet for all the works it did handle. This elicited the following response, which sums up the Clarks' position:

> With regard to our giving you the exclusive sale in America, it is quite possible that this might result beneficially to both parties, as has no doubt been the case in [the Ante-Nicene Library] with you, and Lange's Commentaries with us. But this we fear must be confined to particular books, for we would otherwise lose powerful support from some houses for other books for which such an arrangement had not been made. So we prefer to allow things to remain as they are.[280]

And so Scribners remained only one of several houses handling Clark titles in the US.

In fact, however, the Clarks sought to channel most of their new titles to the US market through Scribners. In a letter to another New York publisher, Putnam, they appear to assert that all new titles had to be offered to Scribners as a matter of course:[281] while in fact there was no obligation in this it would appear to have been their normal practice. For instance, in seeking an American publisher for the Monthly Interpreter, T. & T. Clark invited the co-operation of Scribners. 'We make the first offer to you as our old friends.'[282]

In view of all these issues, how satisfied were the Clarks with the efforts of these 'old friends' on their behalf, and what volume of business was done? Apart from the doubts mentioned above over Scribners' commitment to the Expository Times, the Edinburgh firm seems to have been reasonably contented with their activities, although there were frequent suggestions that more extensive advertising could be undertaken. Hence, for example, a letter written in July 1894 wished Scribners well in their new premises, hoped 'that with the Autumn Season [they would] find an encouraging revival of business,' gently remonstrated that Scribners' purchases for the period January to June 1894 were down by £500 on the total for the

corresponding half of 1893, expressed understanding 'of the difficulties[they] must have had owing to the great depression of Trade in the States [that] season', reassured Scribners of the Clarks' certainty that'[they had] been doing all [they] could for [Clarks] titles in the circumstances', and suggested more extensive US advertising of these titles, offering to pay half the cost of this and pointing out in passing how much advertising of Scribner-originated titles was undertaken by the Clarks in the UK.[283]

Scribners increasing sales of Clark titles are shown in the following Table. These figures probably include sales of works produced on a co-edition basis, which are considered in a separate section.[284]

TABLE II: 15

Sales to Scribner 1881-1900

1881	£ 172 2s. 9d.
1882	£ 212 5s. 0d.
1883	£ 282 9s. 6d.
1884	£ 198 2s.11d.
1885	£ 611 7s. 7d.
1886	£ 489 7s. 1d.
1887	£ 570 13s. 4d.
1888	£ 299 0s. 0d.
1889	£ 584 16s. 5d.
1890	£ 656 3s.10d.
1891	£1,099 5s. 4d.
1892	£ 951 1s. 1d.
1893	£ 647 15s. 9d.
1894	£ 800 17s. 5d.
1895	£1,233 7s. 9d.
1896	£1,109 10s. 1d.
1897	£1,454 0s. 7d.
1898	£1,291 16s. 0d.
1899	£1,374 6s. 7d.
1900	£1,493 8s. 1d.

The figures for 1891 and 1892 are corrected to exclude unpaid invoices carried over from the previous period. In most cases, the calculations were made in mid-December, an exception being the 1892 figure, which was calculated at the end of November that year.[285]

The Clarks' amicable relationships with the New York firm can therefore be seen to have produced concrete results in terms of steadily increasing sales. Over the financial year 1895-96, for example, the Edinburgh firm's total turnover amounted to £11,042 3s. 7d.as will be seen in Part IV. Over those same months (July 1895-June 1896) total sales to Scribners reached £1,483 18s. 6d.,[286] a surprisingly high figure in the light of the annual totals in Table II:15. Sales to Scribners therefore accounted for 13.43% of the Clarks' turnover. The Edinburgh-New York connection was clearly a successful one, at least as regards cash flow.

ii. Other agencies and pirates

Apart from their business with Scribners, T. & T. Clark's American dealings were largely with three firms, the Fleming H. Revell Company, Funk and Wagnalls, and the Christian Literature Publishing Company.

I) Fleming H. Revell

Fleming H. Revell had been born in Chicago in 1849, and, according to John Tebbel,[287] combined the talent of salesmanship with that of managing money. It is not surpirsing therefore that he went into business: the firm which bore his name was founded in 1869, initially to publish the periodical Everybody's Paper. The character of Revell's rapidly-expanding publishing operation was shaped by the religious revival which swept the United States following the Civil War. With this revival movement Revell was personally associated, and indeed his sister married one of its prime movers, the evangelist Dwight Moody. This link with Moody proved useful to Revell as he sought new markets. Although his house, while specialising in evangelical works, was itself non-denominational, Revell nevertheless attempted to conclude co-publishing agreements with the denominational

houses. The material he published was much more 'popular' in tone than that issued by the Clarks, and his inventive exploitation of the mass religious market led to his firm's continued growth. Edinburgh and London branches were founded in association with the Edinburgh firm of Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier. And in the financially difficult years of the 1890s, Revell was to discover that 'one of the virtues of religious publishing was its imperviousness to depression.'[288]

It is difficult to date Revell's first contacts with the Clarks, although a letter sent to him in April 1883 is couched in such terms as to indicate that the relationship was then only just beginning.[289] This relationship was a tempestuous one. Some of the storms arose over the American firm's unauthorised reprints of Clark titles. A further, intriguing problem arose in 1893, the year which saw the trade depression reach its lowest point. Revell, in that year, bought over a Canadian firm, the Presbyterian News Company of Toronto. John M. Clark owned fifty shares, worth $500, in that Company. These shares he had accepted for whatever reason in lieu of payment for stocks of Clark publications supplied to Toronto in November 1892. The news of the takeover reached the Clarks via the Revell representative, and the Edinburgh firm wrote at once to the Presbyterian News Company, taking it to task for not informing its shareholders of the change in ownership, expressing the hope that the arrangement had been a satisfactory one, and that the interests of the shareholders had been fully taken into account, and pointing out that, as the stock of Clark publications had now presumably been sold to Revell, John Clark expected his money to be paid to him

in full[290] This, however, was not to be. The Clarks' summary of the outcome was that they had 'suffered financially to no small extent.'[291] It is easy to see how these problems would have caused tension in the Revell-Clark relationship, and yet, in other matters, the two companies continued to co-operate, the Clarks dealing both directly with Revell, and also with the Willard Tract Depository in Toronto, which came under the umbrella of his organisation in 1893.

II) Funk and Wagnalls

Funk and Wagnalls, another firm which co-operated with the Clarks on the one hand while issuing unauthorised reprints on the other, had been launched as a business in 1877.[292] Isaac K. Funk provided the editorial direction, while his partner, Wagnalls, a lawyer, brought his administrative gifts to bear upon the firm's operations.

Funk had been born in Ohio in 1839. After graduating from Wittenberg College in Springfield, Ohio in 1860, he entered the Lutheran ministry the following year, and held several pastorates between then and 1872. That year saw his resignation from the pastoral ministry: a European and Middle East tour followed, and then, on his return to the United States, Funk became involved in periodical editing, first for others, and then on his own account. His periodical The Metropolitan Pulpit (later the Homiletic Review) was launched in October 1876.

Funk and Wagnalls began business 'on the smallest possible scale',[293] but Funk, with the dynamism characteristic of many nineteenth century publishers on both sides of the Atlantic, presided over a rapid expansion. Although it was later to develop a general list, the firm began as an almost exclusively religious house. Funk subscribed to

the view (commonly held in the UK also) that what he saw as the negative effects of 'bad cheap literature' could be offset by 'good cheap literature', and, so much were his views in tune with contemporary perceptions, and so effective was his advocacy of those views, that large quantities of his firm's titles were sold, and Funk and Wagnalls prospered. A London office had been opened by the late 1880s.

Although some works of more academic theology did appear in the Funk and Wagnalls list, it is evident from the foregoing that the firm was aiming at a very different corner of the religious book market place to that in which the Clarks habitually traded. We may safely assume that in most cases the American firm would be interested only in the most 'popular' works on the Clark list, works which, by definition, would be most susceptible to piracy.

III) The Christian Literature Publishing Company

John Tebbel[294] characterises the Christian Literature Publishing Company as 'a highly specialized religious house, but important in its own way.' The firm was founded in Buffalo in 1884 for the specific purpose of producing a perfectly legal, but in the Clarks' eyes most morally reprehensible reprint of the Ante-Nicene Library. Although the reprint was issued under the nominal editorship of Bishop A.C. Coxe his editorial work, as we shall see, seems only to have been cosmetic. According to Tebbel, the new edition proved to be 'an immediate success.'[295] If this was so, it was presumably at the Clarks' expense.

In 1888, the firm moved to New York, and thereafter also reproduced the T. & T. Clark translation of the works of St Augustine, and issued

other translations of patristic works, some in collaboration with James Parker and Company of Oxford and London.[296] The firm also published the series Ten Epochs of Church History, which, as we have seen, was handled by the Clarks in the UK as Eras of the Christian Church. The Christian Literature Publishing Company was later bought over by the Scribner firm.

Unfortunately the Trade Ledger 1895-1901[297] does not include details of the extent of the Clarks' dealings with Fleming H. Revell, Funk and Wagnalls and the Christian Literature Publishing Company so we are unable to estimate the proportion of their total turnover which was contributed by this business.[298]

b) Financial implications

Having outlined the history of the principal firms which handled Clark works in the US, we turn now to look at the financial implications of the different arrangements under which these firms worked, varying from outright piracy to pre-authorised reprinting. As noted earlier, however, none of these categories is completely watertight. Due to the volatile nature of this aspect of the Clarks' transatlantic publishing, a project which began as outright piracy could end up in a different category.

i. Piracy

For the purposes of the present study, the term 'piracy' is used in the very broad sense in which it was employed in the nineteenth century, defined thus by Simon Nowell-Smith: 'any appropriation by a publisher with no substantive right to it of a piece of writing to which its author or his assign claimed a title whether by statute,

by natural law or in equity.'[299]

Nowell-Smith also discusses[300] the complex procedures (constantly varying throughout the nineteenth century) which had to be implemented by the British and US publishers if a work was to be copyright in both countries. It is not always easy to be certain which of the many Clark works sold to US publishers were legally copyright in America through these procedures having been followed, but in general, at least until the 1890s, it would seem that few Clark titles had been copyrighted in this way. Consequently, in the cases where the Clarks refer to piracy, they use the word in the broad sense defined above, their moral indignation coupled with impotence at the realisation that legal redress was impossible.

There is no doubt that the unauthorised reprinting of works in the US had serious financial implications for T. & T. Clark.[301]

In the first place, it inevitably reduced the Clarks' US sales of their own editions of the works which had been reprinted without authorisation. Sales of the original edition did not always come to a complete halt, for some customers preferred the higher production standards of the imported edition, and were prepared to pay more for it than for a home-printed copy on cheaper paper. But there was bound to be a reduction in the demand for the Clark edition. Commenting to Philip Schaff on the Funk and Wagnalls piracy of several of their titles, the Clarks commented that it was a 'great nuisance', the sales being 'small enough' as it was:[302] in other words, small enough already without further reductions due to the existence of unauthorised reprints.

But, secondly, when faced with the unauthorised reprinting of a work in the US, or with the potential unauthorised reprinting of a work, the Clarks felt obliged to sell their edition to the official American agent at the lowest possible price, so that he could in turn sell the product very cheaply into the US market-place, thereby, it was hoped either, as the case might be, effectively competing with extant piracies, or deflecting the attentions of would-be pirates. But this policy, of course, inevitably reduced to almost zero the Clarks' income (and the author's income) on American sales. An example of sales being made to the US at a low price with the object of deterring would-be pirates is provided by the case of J.P Lilley's work on The Lord' Supper (1891). The author was informed that his royalty, normally 10%, would be reduced to 5% in the case of sales to the US as the Clarks were selling to the States at less than half price (presumably less than half the UK Trade price) in order to prevent piracy there.[303] And there are numerous examples of the Clarks dropping their selling price to US agents after a piracy had appeared. This was their normal practice, although it was not always feasible. In the case of James Stalker's Life of Christ (1879) and Life of St Paul (1884), both issued in unauthorised editions by Revell, the Clarks found it 'utterly impossible' to supply copies to America at a price which would compete with that at which the piracies were offered. Revell's copies were selling at twenty-five cents. The Stalker volumes were part of the Bible Class Handbook series, and on every copy sold, including those to North America, the Edinburgh firm had to pay a royalty, not only to the author, but also to the two editors of the series. Consequently, the price of copies sold across the Atlantic could not be further reduced.[304]

But this was the exception rather than the rule. For example, when the Clarks learned from a publisher named A.C. Armstrong that he had issued a pirated edition of A.B. Bruce's The Humiliation of Christ (1876), and had in preparation a similarly unauthorised reprint of the same author's work on The Training of the Twelve Apostles (1871), they responded, despite an attempt by the American publisher to reach an agreement with them on his terms, by offering a US agent (presumably Scribners) copies of the work in sheets at a price designed to enable the Edinburgh-produced edition to undercut the piracy in the American market-place. The price at which the sheets were on offer to Scribners was 3s. 6d. per copy if five hundred were ordered, or 3s. 3d. per copy if one thousand copies were ordered. The British trade price per bound copy was 7s.11d., and the UK retail price 10s. 6d.[305] Again, when Funk and Wagnalls proceeded with an unauthorised reprint of the series of commentaries by H.A.W. Meyer, the Clarks responded similarly by selling sets of their edition to the official US agents at competitive prices. Once again, the reprinting publisher sought to impose an agreement upon the Edinburgh firm, and in this case the Clarks seem to have seriously considered the possibility of coming to terms, albeit reluctantly with the pirates: their views on this issue will be discussed in the next section. It is sufficient to notice here the reduced prices at which the Clarks were prepared to sell the work to the official agents. Scribners were offered the twenty volumes bound as ten volumes, in cloth, at £3 0s. 0d. per set, if they agreed to take between 150 and 250 sets. They could, if they wished, have the work in sheets at £2 15s. 0d. per set: again the stipulated minimum order was 150 copies.[306] The British trade price per set (in twenty

volumes) was £4 15s. 0d. and the UK retail price £5 5s. 0d.: these are the subscription prices. Certain other US and Canadian publishers were also offered competitive terms on the Clarks' edition of Meyer. Provided they ordered at least one hundred sets, these would be supplied at the rate of £3 5s. 0d. for twenty volumes bound as ten, or £3 0s. 0d. for the work in sheets.[307] It is obvious that the Clarks were making a minimum of profit on these sales. The thinking behind this move was clearly stated in a letter to Scribners: 'We think we can undersell them [Funk and Wagnalls] especially as a preference will always be given in the States to books well and legibly printed.'[308] Undercutting operations such as these must have significantly reduced the profitability of Clark works, and the most that can be said for them is that they guaranteed that there would still be a demand in the US for Edinburgh-originated copies of the work in question. The initial print-run would have been determined with the likely requirements of the US market in mind. This lengthening of the run by the number of copies it was expected to sell in America would bring the unit cost lower than it would otherwise have been, and so produce a marginally larger profit on sales in the UK. If a pirated edition threatened to make the original edition unsaleable in America, however, the overall profitability of the work would be in danger. It therefore became an attractive option to sell copies to the US at little more than cost in order to undercut the pirates and ensure some return at least from the copies printed with the transatlantic market in mind.

A third factor to be taken into consideration in any discussion of the financial implications of unauthorised reprinting is that in the

majority of cases, because of their specialised nature and complex type-setting, Clark works were proof against the pirates. As the firm commented to Scribners

> our publications are not usually of a 'popular' kind in the ordinary [illegible] of the word, and ... we have to a large extent, a guarantee against re-printing on account of the expense arising from the quantity of Greek and Hebrew.[309]

But if this were the case, then it follows that the works which were most susceptible to unauthorised reprinting were the more 'popular', and least 'academic' of those on the Clark list: precisely the works, in fact, which were likely to form the bulk of the firm's exports to the US. In other words, although only a minority of Clark titles may have been affected by piracy, it was a minority from which the bulk of the Clarks' profit on exports was likely to come. The economic impact of the piracies upon the firm, therefore, would be out of all proportion to the percentage of titles on the list which were affected.

It is clear from all this that unauthorised reprints had a large and serious, if unquantifiable, effect on the Clarks' profitability. The Edinburgh firm responded with a mixture of irritation and resignation, laced with a remarkable tolerance. At the same time as Revell was provoking irritation in George Street with his reprints of James Stalker's works, the Clarks were giving his subsidiary, the Willard Tract Depository, the Canadian franchise in the Expository Times.[310] And at the same time as Funk and Wagnalls were pirating the Meyer series and other works, the Clarks were acting as UK agents for one of their publications (J.J. Herzog's Religious Encyclopaedia), and considering their firm as a possible US distributor of the Monthly Interpreter if Scribners proved unwilling to

handle it.[311] What was the reason for this tolerance? Given the character of the Clarks, Christian grace was certainly involved. But allied to this was a shrewd commercial pragmatism which sought to make the best - financially and theologically - of every situation which presented itself.

ii. Unwilling accords

Having produced, or announced his intention of producing, an unauthorised reprint, the US publisher would very often make an attempt at persuading the Clarks to bow before the inevitable fact of its existence, and come to some kind of agreement. He was presumably eager to conclude terms so that his edition could be announced as appearing with the consent of the British publisher, and also, and more importantly, so that the flow of copies imported from Edinburgh could be staunched.[312] In some cases, the Clarks were forced to accede to this transatlantic arm-twisting and reluctantly reached unwilling accords. What was the return from these, and did this return in any way offset the loss to the Clarks of the income from US sales which they would have otherwise received? The extant evidence with bearing on these issues is considered in the three case studies which follow.

I) A.C. Armstrong

We have already noted that when A.C. Armstrong notified the Clarks of his issue of an unauthorised American reprint of A.B. Bruce's The Humiliation of Christ, and of his intention to reprint a further work by Bruce, on the Training of the Twelve Apostles, he offered to conclude an agreement with the Edinburgh firm on his terms. In doing this, he claimed that it was his desire to 'deal fairly' with

the original publishers, but the Clarks clearly, and, in the light of the circumstances and of the terms which were on offer probably, justifiably, viewed this claim with considerable scepticism. Armstrong proposed either to supply the Clarks with a set of plates of his typesetting of one or other, or both of the works in question, or to pay the author or the original publishers a royalty of 5% on sales of the US editions after the first thousand copies had been disposed of. These proposals were unacceptable to the Clarks. 'The first ... we shall certainly not agree to.' Surprisingly, in view of the popularity of the works, the firm does not seem to have produced stereos of its editions, and so presumably was having to reset the type in order to produce the reprints which were required around the time the letter from Armstrong was received. But they would obviously have been unenthusiastic at the prospect of (presumably) resigning from the US market in exchange for plates of what might well have been an inferior American setting. With regard to Armstrong's second proposal, the Clarks commented 'we are very unwilling to consider [it] as it really amounts to nothing.' A royalty of 5% on the low retail price which unauthorised reprinting permitted, and that only payable on sales over one thousand copies, would have realised only an infinitesimal sum. And so, presumably feeling that the undercutting operation we discussed earlier would prove more lucrative than Armstrong's paltry terms, the Clarks declined his offer.[313]

II) Funk and Wagnalls

Altogether more complex than the blunt rejection of Armstrong's terms were the negotiations which followed the unauthorised reprinting by Funk and Wagnalls of the series of commentaries by H.A.W. Meyer.

Initially, the Clarks seem to have been content to accept a royalty of 5% on sales of the Funk and Wagnalls editions of Meyer works, even although, given the low retail price of the US reprints, the return would be very small. They certainly accepted the royalty in the case of Meyer's work on the Acts of the Apostles, at the same time complaining to Philip Schaff that the work, which had cost them a great deal, would be 'reprinted for a mere trifle', on which their 5% would be 'next to nothing'.[314] The return must, however, have been even less than the Edinburgh firm had envisaged, for three months later they commented caustically to Funk and Wagnalls 'We regret the royalties are so small, it would seem as if the reprinting had done you no good whilst they [sic] undoubtedly do us much harm.'[315] The Clarks had presumably stopped exporting copies of the work on signing the agreement. They had no doubt hoped that the royalty would go some significant way towards off-setting the loss of income on sales of the British edition. With the apparent lack of success of the Funk and Wagnalls edition their income from the work had virtually dried up, and the fact that Funk and Wagnalls were suffering also offered but small consolation.

It would seem to have been only then that Funk and Wagnalls announced their intention of reprinting the whole of the Clarks' edition of Meyer's commentaries, paying no heed to remonstrances from the original publishers. The first title could not have been so unprofitable to them after all. Mindful, no doubt, of the small yield from the earlier royalty agreements, the Clarks in this instance refused to come to terms with the Americans, and instead offered sets of the series at reduced prices to Scribners and other North American publishers as was discussed earlier.[316]

Funk and Wagnalls clearly reacted to the Clarks' undercutting operation with surprise. The Edinburgh firm responded by asserting their right to defend themselves ('You cannot suppose we are to lie dormant'), and by commenting that they were always ready to consider the question of granting reprint rights on a royalty basis, but reserved the right not to offer or accept such terms in the case of certain works, one of which was the Meyer series. (This was presumably due to their large investment in that series. It is odd, however, that the firm had earlier accepted a royalty agreement on the Acts volume.) Having made this assertion, the Clarks proceeded to tender an olive branch which surely stood little chance of being accepted:

> we are willing, if you withdraw your reprint for say two years to engage not to send our cheaper edition after that time, and then to work on the 5% royalty plan, we say this very unwillingly, but do so to meet your views.

The letter concluded with a barbed comment. Funk and Wagnalls had clearly threatened to produce their own, rival translation in the US, and to this threat the Clarks responded as follows:

> We think on consideration you will regret the threat with which your letter closes but we need only to say that in every case in which it would be worth your while to do anything of the kind including Meyer we have secured the sole right of translation.[317]

But Funk and Wagnalls far from holding back their reprint in fact audaciously announced it as being published 'with the full understanding of the English Publishers.' What they did attempt to hold back was the payment of any royalty to the Clarks even although five months after the preceding letter was written they had evidently decided that a 5% royalty was better than nothing, and sought a truce. The American firm however (and one can feel some sympathy for them,

for the Clarks' cheap edition was presumably still in the market-place) were most reluctant to agree to this.[318]

What this study shows most clearly is that the Clarks had to accept that they could do nothing to prevent US reprints, and that when these appeared, all they could do to protect their interests was to respond pragmatically in the way which seemed to ensure the greatest return. Hence, despite their misgivings, they were prepared to experiment with a royalty agreement over the work on Acts; when this was palpably unsuccessful they refused to accept similar terms for the Meyer series as a whole, instead attempting to undercut the US firm; when they realised that this was not going to stop sales of the Funk and Wagnalls edition, they continued to supply their cheap edition, but also sought the 5% royalty which they had previously spurned. The study thus shows a somewhat desperate financial pragmatism, summed up in the Clarks' phrase 'we must reserve the option though we cannot hinder you from reprinting of doing our best for ourselves.'[319] Unfortunately, we have none of the figures pertaining to these transatlantic deals.

III) The Christian Literature Publishing Company

The best documented 'reluctant accord' with a US publisher is that governing the Clarks' relationship with the Christian Literature Publishing Company (hereafter referred to in this section as 'the Company'). The first mentions in the Clark letter books of the Company's unauthorised edition of the Ante-Nicene Library date from the autumn of 1884. The American reprint was to be edited by the Bishop of New York, A.C. Coxe, and it was to him that the Clarks

directed a strong letter of remonstrance on 25 September,[320] in which they attempted to persuade him that the proposed edition would not only be seriously disadvantageous to them, but also that it was morally indefensible.

The American edition would do 'serious injury' (presumably financial injury) to the Clarks. The series was the fruit of considerable investment on the part of the Edinburgh firm, and it was considered that a large sale in the United States was essential if the work were to succeed. The appearance of a rival edition would reduce or obliterate the Clarks' transatlantic market for the series, and hence jeopardise its profitability.

This moral case against the Company's reprint was strengthened by a number of related contentions. In the first place, it was argued, it could not be said that the reprint was justifiable in that it was making the work freely available in the US, for there had never been any problems of supply, the series having been constantly available in America through Scribners. In the second place, the reprint was, although nominally a revision issued under the editorship of Coxe, in fact a reprint pure and simple.

> You purpose to deprive us of our reward, by quietly appropriating our labours, with some slight changes which are not worth speaking of, and which we could ourselves easily carry out as the work is stereotyped and a change in the arrangement is all that is required.

In the third place, the Company's action seemed to be all the more reprehensible in that they claimed to be motivated by a desire to further the interests of International Copyright. In the absence of the other side of the correspondence, it is difficult to envisage how the Company imagined that their reprint would promote International

Copyright: their viewpoint seems to have been as incomprehensible to the Clarks at the time as it is to us now. The fact that the Company was aware of the need for an international copyright agreement made their flagrant denial of the Clarks' rights in the Ante-Nicene Library all the more indefensible in the Edinburgh firm's eyes.

> You do all this under the guise of a desire for an International Copyright. We are unable to see anything in this but the most obvious non sequitur.
>
> You are zealous for the protection of property and to prove this you seize our publications! We must say it is uncommonly like the Police force failing to protect private property, and, in order to remedy the matter making a raid upon it for their own benefit.

This firm letter concluded with a warning:

> We hope to hear that the matter is abandoned and that we shall not be forced to publish a correspondence which shows a state of matters altogether indefensible as between honourable men.

As was usual, therefore, when an unauthorised edition seemed to be under consideration, the Clarks' initial response was to write in high moral dudgeon in an attempt to persuade the American publisher to abandon his plans. In fact, of course, the Clarks were powerless, and in this case too, their letter had little effect. The Company did not withdraw its edition, and its only concession was to offer an honorarium to the Edinburgh firm after one thousand copies of the reprint had been sold. The Clarks viewed this offer as being 'so small as to be altogether valueless',[321] but even in using that phrase they showed that they were accepting the inevitable: the reprint would go ahead, they were in a negotiating position, and all they could do was to put their case as forcibly as possible in order to secure the most advantageous terms. They expressed this position themselves in a letter to Scribners: 'finding we had no escape from

anyone who chooses to pirate all we could do was to make the best bargain we could.'[322]

Once the Clarks had accepted the inevitability of the reprint, negotiations proceeded. On 22 November 1884, while still pointing out 'that it would be far more to our interest that you should not go on at all with this series', they expressed their willingness to accept a royalty of 5% on the selling price on all the Company's sales of the series, and in return to offer the Company sole US rights in the work. A further condition was that the Company should purchase from Scribners (if that firm were in agreement) the copies of the Clark edition which they had in stock, sales of which were already drying up as potential American purchasers awaited the appearance of the Company's edition which had been announced. This clause was intended to prevent Scribners being financially embarrassed through being left with unsaleable stock on hand.[323] The Company accepted the Clarks' terms,[324] but the conclusion of an agreement was complicated by the reaction of Scribners. They wanted to continue on the old footing, and refused to sell their stock to the Company. In response the Clarks pointed out that they could not continue to supply Scribners after reaching an agreement with the Company, stressed that they had considered that they were acting in Scribners' best interests in inserting the clause which required the Company to buy over the stocks they held and agreed that it was ultimately entirely up to Scribners to decide whether or not to retain their stock of the series.[325] In the event, Scribners did hold on to their fairly modest stock (amounting to some two hundred volumes[326]), and this fact weakened the Clarks' bargaining position with the Company, who

argued that as their sales were being threatened by Scribners' sales from stock of the original edition, it was inappropriate for them to pay the full 5% royalty to Edinburgh. In any case, although these complications were to arise, the basic agreement had been reached with the Company by the end of 1884. But while the Clarks' letters to the Company were amicably businesslike, it was indeed a reluctant accord. For as the firm wrote in a private letter to Philip Schaff, 'We cannot understand how Christian men - with Bishop Coxe at their head - could do such a thing. It is sheer robbery.'[327]

In May 1885 the Clarks wrote to the Company, expressing the hope that 'the royalty [would] amount to something considerable to make up for [their] loss of sale in the States.'[328] What were the financial implications of the agreement with the Company, and to what extent was the Edinburgh firm compensated by payments from the Company for loss of sales of its own edition in America? The Clarks originally expected to receive a 5% royalty on all the Company's sales of the American reprint. However, when Scribners insisted on holding on to their stock, the Company used this as an excuse to substitute a down-payment for a royalty agreement. This, to the Clarks, was patently ridiculous:

> To say that the small number of vols which Messrs Scribner have on hand - equal to about nine sets - could have damaged you in any way is absurd.[329]

But the Clarks had little bargaining power. The down-payment on offer would total $800 for the set of twenty-four volumes. This, the Clarks pointed out, equalled £160, and as such was only at the rate of around £7 per volume. Had a 5% royalty agreement been in operation, the Clarks would have received £7 by the time 640 copies of a volume had been sold, and as sales were anticipated of far more

copies than this, the down-payment proposed by the Company compared very unfavourably with the previously-agreed royalty arrangement. This unfavourable comparison prompted the Clarks' comment that they considered the Company's change in the terms of their offer to be 'exceedingly unfair.'[330]

Some interesting calculations can be made on the basis of the data in this letter. Had a 5% royalty agreement been in operation, the Clarks would have received 2.62d. on each copy sold.[331] The US selling price of the Company's edition was therefore the equivalent of 4s. 4d.,[332] which compares with the Clarks' UK price of 5s. 3d. to subscribers, and 10s. 6d. on non-subscription sales. Unfortunately, we have no indication of the price at which the Clarks sold copies of volumes in the series to Scribners (normally, they received a 50% discount, but were granted a larger discount certainly in the case of the Foreign Theological Library and probably in the case of the other subscription series also,[333] and so we cannot compare the Clarks' income from sales to Scribners with their postulated income from sales of copies of the Company's edition under the proposed royalty agreement.

The Clarks were eager to persuade the Company to revert to the previously accepted royalty agreement, and in an attempt to achieve this objective, they tacitly threatened to abandon their side of the earlier agreement by continuing to supply copies of their edition to Scribners. They also held out the bait of the US rights in the St Augustine Library which they offered to assign to the Company if they would accept a 5% royalty agreement on both series.[334]

The Company, however, refused to pay a royalty, but instead offered a much higher down-payment on each volume, apparently amounting to $125 per volume. To this the Clarks had to agree.[335] It was certainly a much healthier offer than had been previously made, for the earlier $800 for the twenty-four volumes would have amounted to only $33\frac{1}{3}$ per volume. Although not a royalty agreement, this offer was therefore a substantial improvement from the Clarks' point of view, being the equivalent of a royalty of 5% on sales of 2,400 at the US selling price.[336] In some ways, this may even have been a better arrangement than a straight royalty from the Clarks' point of view. The $125 was to be paid on publication (although the Company proved to be dilatory in sending payment: in the case of the first two volumes they were at least three months late,[337]) and it must remain a matter of speculation whether the US market could have absorbed an edition as large as 2,400 copies.

This arrangement seems to have been continued. On 13 November 1885 $125 was received in respect of the Company's edition of Volume 3 of the Library,[338] and similar payments continued to be made in respect of succeeding volumes. The Clarks also conceded to the Company the right to issue the St Augustine Library in the United States. While they would have preferred a 5% royalty agreement, they once again agreed to accept a one-off payment of $125 on each volume.[339]

A further factor affecting the Clarks' income from these arrangements was the rate of exchange between the pound and the dollar. Although the pound/dollar exchange rate was controlled by the gold standard, one pound sterling being the equivalent of $4.8665, there would appear to have been in fact minor fluctuations in the rate of exchange.

These fluctuations meant that the Clarks' level of income was affected in a small way by the time at which payment was made. It is not clear how payment was made: possibly it was by means of post-dated bills. According to the Clarks' letters of acknowledgement, $125 was worth around £25 0s. 0d. in May 1885, £37 9s. 1d. in November 1885, £25 10s. 9d. in May 1886, £25 15s. 5½d. in November 1886, and £25 11s.10d. in June 1887. The figure for November 1885 is presumably erroneous.[340]

This case study shows that, faced with the inevitability of an unauthorised reprint, the Clarks had, once again, no alternative but to come to terms with the American company, attempting to conclude the most advantageous agreement. And the figure finally agreed upon, $125 per volume, seems a not unreasonable sum: it was certainly far greater than that which the firm could have earned from sales to Scribners, at least in the short term. So while the Clarks' return per unit sold may not have been so high as from sales through Scribners, their overall income from US sales may not have been adversely affected, and may even have been increased.

T. & T. Clark and the Company had an identity of interest, and it was no doubt because of this that a relationship which began so frigidly developed into a warmer and closer co-operation. In the very early stages of the relationship, the Company felt able to offer the Clarks the UK agency in a series they were producing of works by Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Much of the material in the first seven volumes of this series was in fact reproduced from Clark publications, and the Clarks felt that 'their introduction into this country would greatly interfere with our Series.' But, nevertheless, they

were prepared to take fifty sets of the series as an experiment on sale-or-return.[341] And in later years we find the Clarks willing to consider the Company as a possible distributor of the Expository Times in place of Scribners.[342] Towards the end of the century, T. & T. Clark, as we have noted, distributed the Eras of the Christian Church series, which had originated with the American firm. By then, the companies were functioning as partners rather than as competitors.

An interesting footnote to the fracas which arose over the Company's reprinting of the Ante-Nicene Library is provided by an event which occurred in the mid-1890s. The Clarks were in the habit of printing on Scribners' behalf a catalogue of all Clark titles which were distributed by Scribners in the US, containing American trade and retail prices. In 1897 the Clarks included in this catalogue, apparently completely by mistake, the Ante-Nicene and St Augustine Libraries which, of course, were the responsibility of the Company. However, seeing these titles in the catalogue, Scribners ordered some copies from Edinburgh. Either accompanying their order, or, most likely, in a letter which reached T. & T. Clark just after goods to meet that order had been shipped to the US, Scribners made some comment about the Christian Literature Publishing Company which alerted the Clarks to their mistake.[343] Immediately they realised what had happened, they wrote to the Company. According to this letter, the two Clark series had appeared in the Scribner catalogue as a result of a pure and simple mistake: 'we quite forgot about our arrangement with you.'[344] But we are led to question whether or not the Clarks' action was as ingenuous as they sought to make it appear. For having, as they claimed inadvertently, inserted the two series in

the US catalogue, they were most anxious to keep them there. John Clark pointed out that it was 'of some importance' to the firm as publishers that 'those series should not be omitted' from their catalogues. He pointed out also that if they had been guilty of 'a slip of the memory' then it had perhaps been occasioned by a longer-standing slip of the memory on the part of the Company, from whom the Clarks had received no payment in respect of the two series since 1890.[345] Having made these points, they attempted to persuade the Company to let the two series stand in the US catalogue. In support of this they pointed out that since the Company's editions 'were very much cheaper' than Clark editions sold through Scribners, the two editions would not 'interfere' (or be in direct competition) with one another. They were so keen to have the Company's agreement that they enclosed a Credit Note in respect of a commission on the copies ordered from Edinburgh by Scribners, and promised to pay a similar commission in respect of all Scribners' future purchases. It was presumably with this commission in mind that John Clark told the Company that it would be 'to [their] advantage too' to let the Clarks sell their edition through Scribners. But this payment of commission, sent out of a desire, it was claimed, to 'act honourably'towards the Company might be said, in the circumstances, to smack less of honour than of an attempt to persuade the Company to accept a fait-accompli, similar to that which they had presented to the Clarks in the 1880s. A strong case can be made, therefore, that the alleged forgetfulness was part of a carefully-planned strategy to win back a section of the American market for the series. For even supposing that the Scribners' query regarding the appearance of the two series in the Clark US catalogue did not accompany their

order, but reached Edinburgh after the goods had been despatched, it seems incomprehensible that John M. Clark (who certainly knew about the order, and indeed in despatching it had suggested that Scribners offer special terms on the series[346]) would not have recalled the arrangement with the Company. The 'honourable' course of action, surely, would have been to refrain from despatching the goods.

On balance, however, it would seem that we would be wrong to question the Clarks' basic sincerity in this issue. In the first place, they took the initiative in writing to the Company. In itself, this is not conclusive: the fact that they initiated the correspondence no doubt gave them a stronger hand. But had their desire been to present the Company with a fait-accompli, they would have been better advised to sell as many copies of the series as possible through Scribners before the Company discovered what was afoot. In the second place, had there been malicious aforethought, the Scribner firm would almost certainly have been involved. And yet they were not. The Clarks assured the Company that the submission of an order from Scribners was 'innocently done on their part as they presumed ... that our agreement with you had expired.'[347] And even more decisively, the firm's letters to Scribner bear witness to the fact that there had been a genuine mistake. Thus John Clark wrote to Scribner 'It was quite a slip of memory on my part.'[348] In the third place, the Clarks were willing to pay commission to the Company. In the light of the Company's unilateral actions in the 1880s, there would seem to have been no moral imperative demanding this course of action. Fourthly, whereas, in despatching the order to Scribners, the Clarks had suggested that they offer their cus-

tomers special terms on sets of eight volumes, once the error came to light John Clark wrote 'I fear we must ask you to adhere to the present terms, and not to offer 8 Vol. selections as I previously suggested.'[349] That the Clarks were prepared to rescind their previous suggestion is clear evidence that they had genuinely forgotten about the arrangement with the Company when the goods were despatched. But fifthly, and most conclusively, the Clarks were willing to stop supplying Scribners if the Company wished. This was made clear even in the letter of 22 February in which the Edinburgh firm made their strongest bid to win the Company round. In fact, the American firm did object, airing, it would seem, a suspicion that Scribners had been consciously seeking to regain control of the series, and the Clarks responded thus

> whilst we naturally greatly regret that you should insist upon such a course, we shall delete from [the] next impression of our American Catalogue all reference to our own editions [of the two series][350]

Given that the Clarks were acting out of basic sincerity in this issue, how are we to explain the reasoned persuasiveness which so readily moved John Clark's pen on 22 February when he attempted to persuade the Company to permit him to go on supplying the two series to Scribners? It can be explained only in terms of the pragmatism which, as we have seen, characterised so many of his actions. He had made a mistake. He acknowledged the fact and attempted to capitalise on it.

In the late 1890s, therefore, relations between the Company and the Clarks were still not perfect, although the correspondence over this issue remained at all times amicable and honest. Given the

history of the relationship between the two firms, John Clark must have viewed the situation somewhat wrily. What is certain is that he behaved with a great deal more decorum than the Company had done in the 1880s.

Unwilling though these accords may have been, the Clarks sought to extract the maximum benefit for themselves in difficult situations, and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that, in the main, the agreements were reasonably favourable to the firm. While we do not have as many figures as we would wish, the extant evidence suggests that the returns which the Clarks received as a result of these accords would have substantially offset, certainly in the short term, the loss to the firm of the profit on US sales which they would otherwise have made.

iii. Willing liaisons

Although a considerable proportion of Clark works appearing in North America did so as a result of piracies or reluctant accords, it was clearly in the Edinburgh firm's best interests that as large a proportion as possible of their works appearing in the US should do so as the result of negotiations with a publisher who would accept terms favourable to them. The Clarks without doubt viewed the American market as being of great importance to the profitability of individual titles. In the case of the Ante-Nicene Library, for example, the firm commented as we have seen not only that they had 'reckoned on a large sale in the United States', but also that 'without this [sale] the matter would have been hopeless,'[351] while stating in general terms that they depended on the American market to a very great extent.[352]

When a Clark work was to be issued by an American firm, there were in theory three strategies which could be followed. The Edinburgh firm could export a set of stereoplates of the work from which the American company could print their own edition. The American firm would pay for the stereos, and remit a royalty on each copy sold. In practice, this was not normally done, except in the case of some of the major reference works which will be considered in a separate section. In most cases, the potential American market for the work was too small to make a US reprint from stereos a viable proposition. Secondly, the Clarks could authorise an American firm to issue a reprint of the work printed from type set in the US, a royalty on each copy sold being payable to Edinburgh. Although the firm claimed, as we noted earlier that they were 'always ready to consider the question of republishing with a royalty',[353] in fact agreements of this kind seem to have been relatively infrequent and to have been prompted in most cases by the threat of piracy. As typesetting would be more expensive than printing from stereos in the US, the size of the potential American market would have to be considerable for this expedient to be justifiable financially under normal circumstances. The third and most common way of issuing a Clark work in the US involved the sale to the American firm of an edition printed in Edinburgh. The presses were simply run on after the number of copies the Clarks required for the UK and Colonial markets had been printed, the American publisher's imprint being substituted for that of T. & T. Clark in these additional copies.

This section sets out to examine how these arrangements with US publishers were organised, and how terms were agreed upon; and to

consider whether there is evidence to back up the Clarks' view that the US market was essential, presumably in that it guaranteed that the viable print run would be sufficiently long to make the unit cost acceptably low.

I) The publishers

Although as we noted, Scribners were not the Clarks' sole agents in the US, in fact most new Clark titles were offered to them. When the Clarks were preparing new works for the spring and autumn publishing seasons each year, a long and enthusiastic letter would inevitably be despatched to Scribners, extolling the virtues of the books in question, quoting favourable comments from James Hastings and others who had read the MSS urging the American firm to agree to take editions, and pointing out the need for haste in placing an order before the works had to go to press. Similarly, new Clark periodicals were offered to Scribners. Thus, for example, they were told in September 1884 regarding the new Monthly Interpreter 'we make the first offer to you as our old friends.'[354] Thus, too, they were offered the Critical Review in 1890.[355]

Considerable benefits were derived from a close working partnership of this kind. It was, as we noted previously, a double-sided relationship: if the Clarks were eager to sell works to Scribners, the Americans were equally eager to sell their works to Edinburgh. A judicious, regular purchase of the other's products made it more likely that one would, in return, receive regular orders for one's own productions. Seeing the benefits inherent in this kind of trade-off, the Clarks, while not limiting their US sales exclusively to Scribners, nevertheless dealt for the most part with them.

A letter dated 24 February 1885 shows the subtlety with which the Clarks attempted to persuade Scribners to take on their works. The Americans had evidently expressed an interest in having exclusive rights in R.H. Lotze's Microcosmus, a work which had been 'fabulously costly'[356] to print. The Clarks responded by agreeing to offer the American firm the exclusive rights, and used three subtle arguments to ensure their continuing interest in the work. Firstly, in expressing the hope that Microcosmus would be a great success in the US, they added in parenthesis 'much greater, we trust than we regret to say Ladd has been on this side', thereby reminding the Americans that they, the Clarks, had been willing to take copies of a US work of dubious UK sales potential and had suffered accordingly. There is the implicit suggestion that Scribners should regard themselves as being under obligation to take a similar risk. Secondly, the Clarks pointed out that due to the large quantity of Greek and Hebrew type used in the work, Scribners could rest assured that no pirate would touch it since an unauthorised reprint would be too expensive to produce at a competitive price. Thus the Clarks cushioned themselves against any complaints the American firm might make about the expense of the work, and pointed out that in fact its expense was a virtue, rendering it unlikely to fall prey to the pirates. Thirdly, the Clarks reminded Scribners of their willingness to consider assigning to the American firm the US rights in any Clark works for which they felt disposed to submit an offer. This was in a sense a bait to encourage in Scribners a favourable disposition towards the work currently on offer. The letter concluded with the sentence quoted earlier: 'As you know, there is no house with whom we desire that our works should be placed compared with yours.'[357] This

letter illustrates the benefits of the close, co-operative relationship which existed between the two firms. It is not surprising that most of the Clark works which were legitimately issued in America appeared with the Scribner imprint.

II) The publications

A. Periodicals

The Clarks attempted to find American outlets for all their theological periodicals, the Monthly Interpreter, the Critical Review, and the Expository Times, and in fact offered all of these to Scribners. Most of the available documentation relates to the Expository Times for which Scribners had the US rights from the time the Clarks assumed responsibility for it in January 1890.

Although the Expository Times did not make a profit in its early years, it was a prestigious periodical, and a valuable platform for Clark advertising, and it was clearly in the Edinburgh firm's best interests to see it circulated as widely as possible in the US as in this country. Over a number of years the Clarks were less than enthusiastic about Scribners' efforts on behalf of the periodical, and, as early as August 1893 entered into negotiations with the Christian Literature Publishing Company to transfer the Expository Times franchise to them. These negotiations are of interest for what they reveal of the terms governing the export of Clark periodicals.

In the autumn of 1893, the Company clearly offered to be responsible for the Expository Times in the US. This offer was favourably received by the Clarks, who were concerned at Scribners' lack of

dynamism in promoting a magazine for which they were certain there was a large potential Stateside market:

> if better known and properly pushed, the magazine would have a very large circulation in the States. You have no other Periodical on the same lines, & the Editor has received letters from many American Subscribers enthusiastic in their appreciation of it.[358]

In principle, then, the Clarks were in favour of giving the franchise to the Company. But the offer which they had made - 1d. per copy - was not viable from the Clarks' point of view. The Expository Times was expensive to produce, and the size of each issue had recently been doubled from twenty-four to forty-eight pages, the retail price having been increased accordingly from 3d. to 6d. The Clarks could not afford to supply the periodical to the States at less than 2d. per copy, although even that figure was 'much below the actual cost price'.[359] The Clarks therefore proposed to supply the Company with the periodical at 2d. per copy, on condition that they undertook to promote it vigorously in the US, and to take a minimum of two thousand copies per month.[360] They would be permitted to raise extra revenue by printing their own advertising pages, the rest of the magazine being supplied in sheets from Edinburgh. Three further conditions were laid down: the agreement would be subject to Scribners' acquiescence at the transfer of the agency; the Clarks would be entitled to one free page of advertising in each issue; and Scribners were to be permitted to retain any of the current subscribers who were their regular customers.[361] This offer was made on 17 August 1893. The Company clearly did not reach a decision immediately, for on 10 November 1893 we find the Clarks writing to them, urging them to make up their minds, and regretting that the Canadian market could not be included in the

franchise on offer as this had recently been taken over by Revell's Willard Tract Depository where the staff were 'pushing [the Expository Times] all they [could] with great success.'[362] At that point, however, the Company must have decided against accepting the Clarks' terms, and the franchise remained with Scribners.

Negotiations were resumed four years later, however, when a representative of the Company, a Mr Bagley, visited the Clarks in Edinburgh, undertaking to 'make a great effort to establish the Magazine on a firm footing in the States'[363] if suitable terms could be decided. An agreement was concluded, in which both sides made some concessions on their 1893 position. It seems, however, that the Clarks conceded more than the American firm. They agreed to supply the Company with the periodical at the rate of 1d. per copy for the first six months, provided 2,500 copies of each issue were taken. Thereafter, the Company agreed to pay 1½d. per copy, but was to be free to reduce its order to no fewer than two thousand copies of each issue. Once again, the Clarks were to be entitled to one page of free advertising in each issue. The Company also attempted to influence the editorial content of the periodical proposing that additional material with a US bearing should be inserted in America. James Hastings had strong objections to the magazine appearing with additions to it, promising only that it would in future be 'a little more representative of American scholarship.'[364] In the end, however, the Company won the right to make minor additions to the periodical: 'Provided its general character is not affected, & the Editor's writing is not tampered with, we do not think he will raise any serious objections to such slight additions.'[365] A major

difference between the agreement proposed in 1893 and that finally concluded in 1897 lay in the attitude towards Scribners. The 1893 proposal had been conditional upon Scribners' consent; in 1897 the American firm was merely informed of what was happening, and that at very short notice. The new agents were to take over from the issue for October 1897. It was not until 27 August that the Clarks wrote to Scribners, notifying them that their Expository Times franchise was being withdrawn, and continuing as follows:

> We should of course have preferred that the E.T. remained in your hands if you had found it worth your while to make a special effort with it ... but we quite understand that, amid the large number of your own important publications that is hardly to be expected.[366]

It is uncertain how many copies the Company actually sold in America. But clearly sales were not as high as had been anticipated, for, contrary to the terms of the agreement, they ordered 2,500 copies per issue for the first three months only, and thereafter two thousand copies. But the Clarks, although not compelled to by the terms of the agreement if the Company's order fell below 2,500, supplied the magazine for the first six months at 1d. per copy, thereafter raising the price to 1½d. per copy. The Company continued to take 2,000 copies of each issue.[367]

In 1897-98, the Expository Times was still trading at a loss, and the Clarks were heavily subsidising each issue exported to the US. (The total cost to the Clarks of each copy produced was now around 5.69d.[368]) This, then, is another example of the Edinburgh firm being willing to face financial loss in order to promote a product they believed in, although here the loss was offset by the value to

the Clarks of the periodical as a prestigious shop window. The sequence of events also reminds us that, committed as the Clarks were to Scribners, theirs was not a mindless commitment; with their characteristically pragmatic approach they were willing to withdraw the franchise from Scribners when they felt that better distribution could be achieved elsewhere.

B. Individual titles

When selling copies of individual titles to American houses (usually, as we saw, to Scribners), it was the Clarks' normal practice to supply an edition on publication, usually shipped in sheets for binding in the US. If the American publisher sold the whole of his edition, further copies could be supplied from Edinburgh in smaller quantities. How profitable were these sales?

Unfortunately, in none of the cases where it is possible to ascertain the level of discount offered to Scribners is it also possible to calculate the unit production cost of the work in question: in consequence we are unable to estimate accurately the percentage of profit received by the Clarks on their American sales. On the face of it, their discounts were generous, but frequently they sold to America at a cut-throat price in order to deter would-be pirates. Scribners' normal rate of discount would appear to have been 50% on the (presumably trade) UK Price. This is confirmed by the Clarks' comment to Professor Laidlaw of Edinburgh 'Owning to Duty, etc. we have to supply our American Agents at just about half price'.[369] It is confirmed also by comments made to Scribners themselves, in which the Clarks expressed regret that they were unable to give them

a straight 50% discount on all their purchases, thereby implying that 50% was the norm.[370] Even larger discounts might be given in the case of works which the Clarks felt were particularly worth promoting, or where special distribution factors were involved. For example, Scribners were given special terms on some titles which they wanted to include in their Christian Literature Club.[371] Although these discounts were considerable, they were arrived at willingly by the Clarks in full recognition of the importance of the American market to the profitability of individual works. We may therefore assume that they would have given the firm an adequate return.

We can speculate at the percentage of profit which the Clarks would have made on their US sales. S.D.F. Salmond's work on The Christian Doctrine of Immortality was published in 1895 at a nominal retail price of 14s. 0d., the price to the trade being 10s. 6d. Excluding advertising and other incidentals, the total cost of the first edition of 1078 copies was as follows:[372]

Printing	£132 13s. 3d.
Paper	£ 28 10s. 2d.
Binding (pro rata)	£ 33 13s. 7d.
Royalty	£ 75 1s. 1d.
	£269 18s. 1d.

The unit cost to the Clarks was therefore $\frac{\text{£269 18s. 1d.}}{1,078}$ = around 5s. 0d. If copies of this work were sold to Scribners at a discount of 50% on the UK trade price, the American firm would have paid 5s. 3d. for each copy they purchased, yielding a very small return to the Clarks. Probably, however, the work would have been sold at this price in sheets: the unit cost to the Clarks of unbound copies was $\frac{\text{£236 4s. 6d.}}{1,078}$ = 4s. 4½d. Therefore, on these approximate figures,

sales to Scribners would have produced a return of 20% on the investment: not a spectactular figure, certainly, but a useful source of income, particularly as it would be paid at the first settlement date after publication.

In certain specific cases in the letter books there are details of terms concluded with Scribners and others. Examples of these are given below, and they confirm that US purchasers normally paid 50% of the UK trade price. We may conclude that, in these cases, the Clarks gained something like a 20% return on their investment in the copies sold.

In 1888, Thomas Whitlaker of New York was offered copies of Robert Watt's The Reign of Causality: A Vindication of the Scientific Principle of Telic Causal Efficiency. This work had a British nominal retail price of 6s. 0d., and was on offer to the UK trade at 4s. 6d. Whitlaker was offered an edition of the book in sheets at 2s. 3d. per copy provided he purchased four hundred copies. (He could also opt for an edition of 250 copies in sheets at 2s. 6d. per copy.) In other words, he was offered 50% discount on the UK trade price, or 62.5% discount on the UK retail price.[373]

In 1893, Scribners were offered copies of James Hutchison Stirling's Darwinianism. This work had a nominal British retail price of 10s.6d., and was on offer to the UK trade at 7s. 0d. Scribners were offered an edition of the book in sheets at 3s. 6d. per copy, provided they purchased five hundred copies. (They could also opt for an edition of 250 copies in sheets at 4s. 0d. per copy.) In other words, they were offered 50% discount on the UK trade price, or 66.66% discount

on the UK retail price.[374]

In 1885, Scribners were offered copies of the Microcosmus of R.H. Lotze. This work had a nominal British retail price of £1 16s. 0d. and was on offer to the UK trade at £1 7s. 0d. Scribners were offered an edition of the book in sheets at 7s. 6d. (or bound at 8s. 0d.) per copy, provided they purchased 250 copies. In other words, they were offered 72.16% discount on the UK trade price, or 79.16% discount on the UK retail price.[375]

In the same year, Scribners were offered copies of a translation of Nature and the Bible, by F.H. Reusch. This work had a nominal British retail price of £1 1s. 0d., and was on offer to the UK trade at 15s.10d. Scribners were offered an edition of the book in sheets at 7s. 6d. (or bound at 8s. 0d.) per copy, provided they purchased 250 copies. In other words, they were offered 52.63% discount on the UK trade price, or 64.28% discount on the UK retail price.[376]

In 1887, Scribners were offered copies of J.T. Beck's Pastoral Theology of the New Testament, which had been published in around 1885. Clearly the work was selling slowly, and the Clarks were attempting to dispose of their stock in sheets. Scribners were offered copies of the book in sheets at 2s. 6d. (or bound at 2s 9d.) per copy. The work had a nominal British retail price of 6s. 0d., and was on offer to the UK trade at 4s. 6d. In other words, Scribners were offered 44.44% discount on the UK trade price, or 58.33% discount on the UK retail price.[377]

These examples confirm that US purchasers were normally offered a discount of somewhere in the region of 50% on the UK trade price.

This figure should, as our earlier calculations demonstrated, have ensured a modest return.

T. & T. Clarks' sales to Scribners were not limited to large editions at the time of publication. Once the American publisher's original edition had sold out, smaller quantities of the title could be purchased, no doubt at terms less advantageous to the importer. And it seems likely that, from time to time, Scribners ordered small quantities of works from the Clarks which they were unwilling, or never had had the opportunity, to purchase in large editions. For example, over the financial year 1896-97,[378] Scribners bought quantities of forty-eight Clark titles including new works, but excluding sales of works in series. The total number of copies of works purchased was 1,702, producing an average of 35.45 copies of each title. Of the forty-eight titles, only fifteen were purchased in bulk (that is, in quantities of fifty or over). Of those fifteen titles, a total of 1,306 copies were purchased from the Clarks, the average order per title being therefore eighty-seven. Of the remaining thirty-three titles, purchased in smaller quantities, a total of 396 copies were supplied by the Clarks, the average number of copies per title being twelve. While the bulk of the Clarks' trade with Scribners involved sizable editions, therefore, a not insignificant part of it consisted in smaller orders for a wide range of titles. Sales of titles in the series such as the Foreign Theological Library which the Clarks were able to sell to Scribners are difficult to quantify. They would, however, have contributed significantly to the Clarks' income.

It seems clear that the trade done with American publishers such as Scribners as a result of willing liaisons was reasonably profitable to the firm. Although the evidence falls short of proving that the US market was essential to the success of Clark titles, it indubitably provided a welcome source of return on investment.

c) Conclusions

It would seem that the sale of works to US houses proved to be reasonably profitable to the Clark firm. Although the profitability of these transactions was on occasion threatened by the irksome activities of the unauthorised reprinters, the reluctant accords which the firm pragmatically reached with these pirates were frequently not unfruitful, while direct sales as a result of willing liaisons were, as we have seen modestly successful and profitable. We have noted earlier that the Clarks were frequently willing to put theological considerations before financial ones, to risk loss in order to promote titles in which they believed. This was certainly the case, but had the furtherance of theology been their sole aim, they would perhaps have been content to acquiesce at the activities of the pirates in the interests of achieving the widest possible circulation for the works in question. But there was a limit to the Clarks' altruism: the twin concerns of theology and profit had to be held in tension, and the firm was not prepared to sit back and watch others reap where they had sown. In any case, if they were to continue furthering the interests of theology, an assured profit from previous ventures was essential. And so, as regards the American market, they sought to ensure that profit was forthcoming by extricating as large a royalty as they could from the pirates, and by entering into

willing liaisons based on agreements which were as favourable to their interests as was possible.

3. Co-operative publishing

There was a third dimension to the Clarks' transatlantic publishing. Not only did they distribute in the UK books which had originated with American publishers, and arrange for the US distribution of certain of their own titles, but also, increasingly as the nineteenth century drew to a close, they moved into the area of co-operative publishing with North American houses, producing what would today be called co-editions. Our aim in this section is to examine their activities in this field.

What prompted their entry into co-operative publishing? Firstly, there were the undoubted benefits of sharing the production and editorial costs of a work or a series with another publisher: such co-operation made possible more extensive and costly publications than could have been undertaken had each publisher been working on his own. Secondly, international products would presumably be more attractive to an international market than would works originating in one or other of the two countries. Thirdly, major co-operative ventures such as the International Theological Library were prompted by the increasing importance of English-language as opposed to German theological scholarship. It was natural that English-language scholarship, which was international in scope, should seek an international forum for the expression of its views. The standing which the two International series achieved in turn stimulated the growth and prompted the recognition of English-language theology.

What problems faced these ventures, and how successful did they prove to be in theological and financial terms? These questions are, given the nature of the available evidence, probably best answered through a series of analytical case studies of T. & T. Clarks' involvement with co-editions.

a) History of the Sacred Scripture of the New Testament

One of the Clarks' earliest co-operative ventures was the production, in co-operation with the American publishers Houghton, Mifflin and Company of Boston, of a translation of a History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament by E.W.E. Reuss. The agreement was concluded in the summer of 1882, and the work had been published by 1884. The translation was undertaken by a Mr Houghton who was possibly a member of the US Company. There is no record of the terms concluded by the two firms, or of the success of the title. Three copies were sold in the financial year 1896-97 and the work was still in print in 1901.[379] It is clear that the American firm took the initiative in this venture.

b) Religious Encyclopaedia

In general, however, the Clarks' early experiences with co-operative publishing seem to have been anything but propitious. In 1879, the American theologian Philip Schaff proposed that T. & T. Clark should issue in collaboration with an apparently yet-to-be chosen US publisher a translation of J.J. Herzog's Religious Encyclopaedia. It was thought initially that the work, which was to include some new material would run to four volumes. Thomas Clark the Younger was willing to agree to this proposal, subject to certain conditions. Firstly, the American publisher had to be one 'of substance'.

Secondly, that publisher had to be prepared 'to run half the cost of literary production, of composition and a set of plates'. Thirdly, the sum expended on commissioning additional material must not exceed that mentioned by Schaff in his letter. Fourthly, a time limit of four years should be set on the project. Fifthly, and most importantly from Clark's point of view, all the work had to be done in Edinburgh where he could oversee it. He foresaw no difficulties in the arrangement, since proof sheets could be forwarded regularly across the Atlantic to Schaff.[380] In fact, Clark showed himself willing to compromise on the final point. Three weeks after his first letter he wrote to Schaff agreeing that, supposing the work were to run to four volumes, two could be set in Edinburgh, and two in America, the two publishers exchanging sets of plates. But in agreeing this, he insisted that a straight exchange should operate, the cost of plates received being set against the cost of those supplied: he envisaged that if it were done otherwise, disputes might arise due to the differing costs of typesetting and stereotyping on each side of the Atlantic.[381] In fact, the Herzog work ran to only three volumes: these appeared in 1882, 1883 and 1884, the US publishers being Funk and Wagnalls.[382] There is no record of the production costs of the series, but its sales were clearly very poor, for in January 1885, the work was still showing a debit balance of £518.[383] However, it does not appear in the Clark catalogues in the 1890s, by which time it had presumably sold out. Given firstly that it had been properly costed, and secondly that it was not in any way remaindered (a course of action which the Clarks abhorred), it should have covered its costs, and yielded a fair return on the investment.

c) Commentary on the New Testament ('Illustrated Popular Commentary')

The issue of the Commentary on the New Testament prepared under the editorship of Philip Schaff would seem to have been the earliest significant co-operative venture between T. & T. Clark and Scribners. This work was issued in four volumes, published in, respectively, 1879, 1880, 1882 and 1883, and would seem, in the short term at least, to have been an unmitigated disaster from the viewpoint of profitability.[384]

It would appear from the letter books[385] that the initial plan was for an eight volume work, four volumes to be devoted to the Old Testament, and four to the New. The work was to be edited by Schaff, who would write some of the material himself, and commission the remainder from scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. The production arrangements were similar to those which Thomas the Younger had laid down for the Herzog work: each of the two publishers was to be responsible for an equal number of volumes, and would supply a set of stereoplates to the other. These were to be supplied on an exchange basis, with no money changing hands until the work was completed, when 'a final adjustment' would be made.[386] It would appear that each publisher was responsible for paying the authors on his side of the Atlantic, the British contributors receiving one pound per page from the Clarks.[387] Although contributions were commissioned for the Old and New Testament volumes, the New Testament section began to appear first.

The whole project was beset by difficulties, the most serious being the Scribners' sudden withdrawal from involvement in the Old Testament

section of the work. This was due, apparently, to 'changes in the Scribner firm and other reasons on their side of the Atlantic':[388] the remote possibility remained that Scribners might be willing to proceed with the Old Testament section once the New Testament volumes had been issued. One reason for their reluctance to proceed was the impending appearance of the Revised Version of the Bible which it was considered would replace the King James Version. Scribners clearly felt that by waiting, they could base the Commentary on the new translation rather than on the old.[389] The Scribner decision left the Clarks in a difficult position: they could not afford to proceed with the Old Testament section on their own, and so were forced to extricate themselves from arrangements already made with British scholars who had been commissioned to contribute sections of the Commentary. Some of these scholars agreed to withdraw: Bishop Ellicott was preparing a work on the Old Testament and could use their material. And Clark was able to use material prepared by Principal Douglas and J.G. Murphy in the Bible Class Handbooks series.[390] But, not surprisingly, he was aggrieved, commenting of the Old Testament section 'whilst it is a relief to have it off my mind, yet the blame is not mine, had Scribner gone on I would but it is now too late.'[391]

A further problem arose over alleged infringement by the Clarks in Volume One of the Commentary, of the copyright of the Revised Version of the New Testament, which had at that point not yet been published,[392] but to which Philip Schaff appears to have been privy. In responding to the letter of complaint from the Secretaries of the University Presses, Messrs Price and Clay, the Clarks pointed out that they had

frequently warned Schaff, both orally and in writing, to be 'exceedingly careful not to infringe upon any rights in [the UK]'; indicated that as the work had been stereotyped in America they had not seen it until it was complete; and reminded the Secretaries that, as they, the Clarks, were not privy to the deliberations of the A.V. Revision Committee, they could not possibly have known what alterations had been suggested by the Committee, or identified them in the text. They further pointed out that the alleged infringements could not in any way affect the sales of the Revision. All these arguments were aimed at persuading the Secretaries not to put an embargo on the first volume of the Commentary. The second volume, prepared by British scholars who would most certainly have avoided infringing the Revisers' copyright, was almost ready for publication, and an embargo on the first volume would seriously affect sales of the second also. The letter concluded

> We have not the slightest doubt that the matter will be amicably arranged, and we are sure that ... the ... gentlemen of the Revision will not desire to injure a firm which has done so much to aid them in their labours through publications on similar subjects.[393]

Those pleas were contained in a letter dated 16 December 1879: they seem to have fallen on deaf ears, for we find that the Secretaries wrote two days later to the Clarks requiring them to withdraw the volume from circulation. This was a major blow:

> not only is the annoyance and pain very great, both to Dr Schaff and myself, but the loss and damage caused by the paralysis which your letter has given rise to, is very serious to me ... [394]

The Clarks never seriously doubted the integrity of Schaff, who sent a circular letter to the English Revisers, explicitly denying the

charges they had made. He claimed that in dealing with the New Testament text he had been careful to eject from his mind what was peculiar to the Revision, but that nevertheless, evaluating the textual evidence, he had arrived at readings identical to those established by the Revisers.[395] It is difficult to see how Schaff could have thus compartmentalised his mind, but Clark was convinced of his sincerity. More importantly, so too were the Revisers, who accordingly lifted their embargo, clearly agreeing with Thomas Clark's assessment of the situation:

> In no possible way can I see that those (what I must call) undesigned coincidences can damage your rights, but rather do them good by showing the unanimity of scholars in the changes.[396]

Of course, the Clarks took even greater care in the future to avoid a repetition of this problem. Accordingly some changes had to be made on the plates of Volume Two, and the firm contacted Price and Clay to ask on what terms the emendations and marginal references of the Revisers could be used by the Clarks and Scribners in the volumes of the Commentary which were still to be issued.[397]

All these problems irritated the Clarks:

> This Commentary has been a source of perpetual vexation to us, and we suppose to you and our friend Dr Schaff also, & we heartily wish we had never had anything to do with it.[398]

And the work was manifestly uneconomic, particularly in the short term. The fourth volume was published in 1883: by February 1884 only two hundred copies had been sold by the Clarks, who commented 'We still hope that the work may take a start, but it has been a very great failure as yet.'[399] Despite this lingering optimism, the position had changed little a year later, and the work was showing a massive deficit of £1,485.[400] The Commentary was still in print in

1901. Over the financial year 1896-97, seventeen copies were sold of Volume One, twenty-five copies of Volume Two, nineteen copies of Volume Three, and twenty-three copies of Volume Four. So sales did not dry up entirely, and, in the long term, the firm may have recouped its investment. But in the light of these experiences, it is small wonder that the possibility of proceeding with the Old Testament section was not alluded to again.

The production of this Commentary was a complicated exercise in co-operation. But more complicated by far, and also more successful by far, were the two major co-published series which began to come to fruition in the 1890s, the International Theological Library, and the International Critical Commentary. The same problems of co-ordinating production schedules, and balancing the interests of the two co-operating firms which had made the production of Schaff's Commentary exceptionally difficult would inevitably be present in these larger and more complex schemes. In the light of the poor profitability of earlier ventures, the courage and vision of T. & T. Clark (and Scribners) in proceeding with the new series is truly remarkable.

d) The International Theological Library

It is not certain whether the International Theological Library was proposed by T. & T. Clark or by Scribners, but if, as seems most likely, the idea originated with the American firm, it met with an enthusiastic response in Edinburgh. One of the earliest mentions of the Library in the letter books is in a letter to S.D.F. Salmond, who had accepted an invitation to be British editor of the series: 'we are delighted to hear that you heartily approve of the [illegible - ?plan] & are willing to co-operate.'[401] The Clarks' earliest

perceptions were that fourteen or fifteen volumes should be commissioned initially until it was seen how successful or otherwise the series proved to be,[402] but in fact only nine volumes had appeared by the turn of the century. The commercial and theological success or failure of the series hung on a number of crucial issues, which we will now consider in turn.

i. Unity of purpose

If the series were to succeed, the two collaborating publishers had to share a substantial unity of vision, while at the same time preserving the security of their own financial interests by producing material which would be acceptable in their respective market places. And, by and large, the two companies did have an identical vision of the role of the series, at least in general terms. In the autumn of 1887 a document was drawn up and approved by both T. & T. Clark and Scribners which aimed at advising potential contributors to the International Theological Library of the nature of the series.[403] The document dealt with the range to be covered by the Library - it was 'designed to cover the whole field of Christian Theology'; it mentioned the target audience - the Library would provide a series of text books for students of theology, and would also be aimed at 'scholars of every class who [wished] to have a systematic and thorough exposition of the several departments of theological science'; it discussed in detail the approach which the authors would be expected to follow

> The Library is international, interconfessional, & in the interests of Theology as a science. A catholic spirit should rule in all the work, and the authors should cultivate as far as possible an objective method, presenting a fair & complete statement of the results of theological science & the questions still at issue in these several departments;

and it gave guidelines as to the depth of treatment which was to characterise the series - the treatment of each subject was to be 'exhaustive', and was to 'adequately represent the [current] stage of investigation in Great Britain and America'. In general terms, therefore, both Scribners and the Clarks had a common perspective on what they were about.

That is not to say, however, that the companies always saw eye-to-eye on every issue. In the 1890s, for example, Scribners complained, possibly with some justification, that the Clarks were delaying the appearance of volumes in the Library by enlisting Library contributors to write for the Dictionary of the Bible, and thereby diverting their energies away from their work on behalf of the series.[404] Then again, there was some dispute between Scribners and the Clarks over the relative priority of the International Theological Library and the International Critical Commentary. The idea of the I.T.L. had probably originated with Scribners, whereas, as one of the Clarks wrote, 'the Commentaries were my suggestion'.[405] The Clarks, although totally committed to the Library, felt that the I.C.C. series was likely to prove to be more successful financially, especially as it included less controversial matter, and considered that there was no question of the two series directly competing with one another.[406] Scribners saw things differently: they viewed the two series as being in competition, declined at least for the present to become involved with the I.C.C., and questioned the genuineness of the Clarks' commitment to the Library. A compromise solution was reached,[407] which involved the Clarks' affirming their commitment to the I.T.L., and agreeing to proceed with the commissioning of volumes

for the I.C.C. on their own initiative, it being stipulated that no volume in that series should be published for two years. Before that time, Scribners would have the opportunity of opting either to co-publish the series with the Clarks, or merely to act as their US agent. Should Scribners decline both these options, the Clarks would be free to enter into negotiations with another US publisher over the series. In the event, Scribners did join forces with the Clarks in co-publishing the Commentary series. And so a potentially difficult situation[408] was defused, and an amicable settlement reached.

The two companies were therefore essentially of one mind as we have seen, a fact which augured well for the success of the series. It is interesting to notice how this unity was strengthened rather than weakened at a time of grave tension in Anglo-American political relations in the mid-1890s, which might have been expected to have implications for trading links. The tension had arisen in the latter part of 1895 over a boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela. President Cleveland and Richard Olney, his Secretary of State, intervened on Venezuela's side; Britain resented this interference, but ultimately came to accept the American action, and submitted the boundary dispute to an arbitration panel which substantially accepted the British case.[409] Throughout these events feelings ran high on both sides, especially in America, but John Clark, who was planning a US trip, was able to write to Briggs ex-

pressing the hope that both governments would be 'guided to an

amicable settlement'

> your President has hurled a thunderbolt which I fear will do much harm. Every one here is astonished at the bitter feelings which so many Americans seem to have against us, as we cherish nothing but friendship and affection for your nation.[410]

Despite political storms such as this, co-operation between the two companies on the International Theological Library continued apparently unabated.

ii. Selection of authors

If the Library were to succeed, it was vital that the best possible authors - men whose scholarship was on both sides of the Atlantic held to be impeccable - should be enlisted as contributors. The editors of the series were C.A. Briggs in America, and S.D.F. Salmond on this side of the Atlantic: in general, T. & T. Clark were prepared to accept their professional judgement on the wisdom of featuring a particular subject in the series, or of inviting a specific scholar to contribute a volume 'If a first class man can be got for a subject which commends itself to you both we shall not stand in the way.'[411] Initially, the Clarks had sought a veto for both parties upon both subjects and authors,[412] but while this veto may have been available, it does not appear to have been used. There were disagreements over authors and subjects, but these seem to have been settled amicably, with give-and-take on both sides. The two editors did not always see eye-to-eye: a somewhat illegible letter from C.A. Briggs has been preserved in which he complained about a commission which Salmond had given of which he disapproved.[413] But normally, give-and-take produced mutually acceptable solutions.

I) Criteria for Selection

There were four main criteria involved in the selection of authors.

Firstly, the writer had to be a man of impeccable scholarship. Speaking of the series the publishers claimed that authors had been 'chosen for their eminent ability in the department assigned to them'.[414]

But secondly, since it was important that the series as a whole did not appear to be biassed towards the scholarship of any particular denomination, the editors had to bear in mind the denominational affiliations of the scholars they were commissioning. There was, indeed, some apprehension that the Free Church was too strongly represented in the series since both A.B. Bruce and A.B. Davidson had been invited to contribute volumes, but the Clarks felt that they were 'so popular and so highly esteemed in all denominations that [they did] not believe [their contributing would] prejudice the series. It [was] very important that they both take part.'[415] This leads neatly to the third criterion involved in selecting authors: they had to be popular within the target market as Bruce and Davidson certainly were. It is interesting to see an example of what amounts to putting popularity before scholarship. The firm was considering commissioning a volume from Dr John Watson, who, as 'Ian MacLaren', wrote popular fictions such as Beside the Bonny Briar Bush. Watson's name, it was felt, would 'popularise the Series', and in the interests of scholarship he might be persuaded to undertake the volume in question, The Christian Preacher. 'There can be no doubt as to his popularity, & as regards his scholarship, I suppose this Volume would be the most suitable one for him.'[416] It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Watson's popularity counted for much more than his scholarship in the Clarks' eyes. The final criterion brought into play in the selection of authors was a practical one, involving an assessment of the competence of a scholar in preparing his work for the press. Authors were told that the MS of each volume had to be complete before printing was begun, to avoid expensive alterations to type,[417] and Salmond was advised that a

potential contributor was not suitable because of his inability to abide by this condition:

> His method of preparing his work is ruinous. He seems to find it impossible to revise until it is in type, & those Volumes simply cannot stand that sort of thing.[418]

Having selected contributors, it was not always easy to get a completed MS from them. At least one, A.B. Davidson, threatened to withdraw from participation in the series, while several in fact withdrew, among them Principal Fairbairn, who provoked considerable consternation by reneguing on his agreement to contribute the volume on Comparative Religion.[419] Sometimes pressure of work was given as the reason for these withdrawals. Sometimes, too, men threatened to withdraw because of dis-satisfaction with the level of remuneration. The Clarks realised that it was necessary to pay well in order to enlist the services of 'the best scholarship of the day', a goal which was of the greatest importance to them.[420]

II) Financial inducements

What financial inducements, then, were on offer to contributors? It was accepted as a basic principle that a generous level of remuneration was essential if the best scholars were to be attracted. It was agreed that the authors would be paid an honorarium, at the proportion of two hundred pounds ($1,000) for a volume of five hundred pages, this cost to be shared equally by the Clarks and Scribners. This two hundred pounds was to cover the cost of up to two minor revisions by the author for later printings. The Americans, while accepting this basic principle, held that prolixity would be encouraged if an author felt he had to stretch his subject matter to the

full five hundred pages in order to gain the maximum remuneration, and proposed that each author should be paid two hundred pounds irrespective of the length of his work:

> indeed we would rather pay more to the author who kept well within the maximum number of pages it [sic] would be very unwise to encourage him to expand.[421]

In fact, the Clarks seem to have had their way, payment being made proportionately, according to the length of the work. Scribners also had one other recommendation to make. They regarded it as vital, if squabbles over international copyright were to be avoided, that the initial payment should be clearly understood and stated to be for international rights in the work in question. 'Indeed', they wrote, 'we make this a necessary condition of procedure for the English author must understand that we do not steal their work.'[422]

This basic rate of payment seems to have been frequently increased by the Clarks at their own expense to secure key contributors, to retain their services, or simply to reward those whose works had sold especially well. For whereas two hundred pounds per volume had seemed a 'liberal' payment in 1887,[423] by 1898 it was felt to be rather low, and a payment of 10s. 0d. per page (i.e. £250 per volume) would, it was considered, be more realistic.[424] The Clarks therefore felt obliged to increase the level of remuneration. When A.B. Davidson threatened to withdraw from his agreement to contribute a volume to the series, he pled pressure of work, but made it clear that his main difficulty concerned the honorarium. He considered that it was hardly fair thus to put all the contributors on equal footing, irrespective of the subjects they were dealing with - some subjects, after all, would require far more time and effort to deal

with than others - and suggested that he would prefer a royalty agreement. Being very eager to secure his co-operation, the Clarks were willing to make an exception in his case and accede to his wishes, and they wrote to America seeking the approval of Briggs and Scribners.[425] Again, once volumes in the series had appeared, the Clarks occasionally gave additional remuneration to authors whose works were selling well. A letter written in 1898 speaks of

> subsequent payments which we have thought it wise and just to make ... it is necessary, if such authors are to be retained as contributors to future Vols. Besides, we feel that the success of their books fully justifies it.[426]

Thus, the co-publishers aimed at making the series as successful as possible by securing the services of the most gifted scholars, and by offering a level of remuneration which would provide them with the necessary incentive.[427]

iii. Selection of subjects

Although the International Theological Library comprised a series of independent volumes on different subjects by a variety of authors, it was intended that these volumes should form an organic whole which would present the totality of contemporary theological thinking.[428] It was therefore of vital importance for the commercial and theological success of the series that the subjects should be wisely selected. Once again the Clarks seem to have been willing, in most cases, to rely on the judgement of the editors;[429] once again, disagreements were smoothed out by the exercise of give-and-take on each side; and once again some mistakes were made. It was necessary not only to select the most appropriate subjects, but also to ensure that, as far as possible, the manner of treatment which these subjects received was appropriate to the transatlantic market.

I) The subjects

It was important that the subjects selected should come under the umbrella heading of 'theological science'. Severe doubts were expressed, for example, over the inclusion of Washington Gladden's US-originated volume on The Christian Pastor, for not only was it a subject upon which much had been written, but, more importantly, it did not seem 'to lie within the lines of such a series'.[430] Salmond supported this view, submitting that the volume and others like it had 'no claim to have a separate place at all in what professes to be a Scientific Series'.[431] The Gladden volume did appear, but the disquiet which it provoked only serves to illustrate the importance placed, on the UK side at least, on selecting subjects which lay within the field of strictly scientific theology. The dispute over the Gladden volume also points to the second criterion which was held to be vital in assessing the suitability of subjects to be treated in the series: the topics dealt with must, if the Library were to be an international success, be those which were unaffacted by cultural differences between the UK and North America. Doubt was expressed over the wisdom of including a volume on Church and State,[432] and Gladden's book, when it eventually appeared, was criticised because of the extent to which it was rooted in American culture:

> The whole tone of the book is so thoroughly American ... methods of Pastoral work are so different in the two countries[433] - we feel now that the subject 'The Christian Pastor & the Working Church' should scarcely have been included in the Series.[434]

Once again these works were exceptions which proved the rule, that in general, subjects selected for treatment in the series had to be unaffected by cultural differences.

By December 1887, a draft list of the projected first twelve volumes in the series had been prepared. It is interesting to compare this with the list of volumes which in fact appeared first: a comparison of the two lists demonstrates how dependent the editors of such a series were on their contributors' continuing co-operation and health. The death of one commissioned author and the dilatoriness of another in delivering his MS could completely upset the planned structure of the series. What had been envisaged as an organic whole could easily become a heterogeneous diversity, and consumer perceptions of the series and its sales potential affected accordingly. The first twelve volumes, as initially proposed, were as follows:[435]

1	Driver	Literature of the Old Testament
2	Davidson	Theology of the Old Testament
3	Sanday	Literature of the New Testament
4	Brown	Contemporary History of the Old Testament
5	Hatch	Contemporary History of the New Testament
6	Fisher	History of Christian Doctrine
7	Schaff	Symbolics
8	Flint	Religious Philosophy
9	Fairbairn	Religion of the World
10	Bruce	Apologetics
11	Brooks	Homiletics
12	?Broadus	Pastoral Theology

Only three of these twelve proposed volumes appeared among the first nine volumes in the series which had been issued by 1901. These nine were:[436]

1	Driver	Literature of the Old Testament
2	Smyth	Christian Ethics
3	Bruce	Apologetics
4	Fisher	History of Christian Doctrine
5	McGiffert	History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age
6	Allen	Christian Institutions
7	Gladden	The Christian Pastor and the Working Church
8	Steven	The Theology of the New Testament
9	Rainy	The Ancient Catholic Church (AD 98-451)

It is clear that this list is much less structured than that which had been originally planned. No matter how carefully subjects were

selected, problems of one kind or another prevented treatments of those subjects appearing as planned in the order which had been intended.

II) Treatment and style

Even where the editors selected the most appropriate subjects, and the most competent scholars, problems could still arise. A scholar's style and treatment of his subject had to be acceptable both theologically and linguistically on each side of the Atlantic if the work were to sell well in its own right, and contribute positively to the image of the series of which it formed a part.

Contributors were given guidance as to the style and treatment expected of them. The treatment had to be catholic and objective, yet orthodox, and the style 'concise', 'compact', 'clear',and 'pregnant'.[437] Yet in practice, what proved to be acceptable on one side of the Atlantic sometimes proved to be less so on the other; there was perhaps insufficient liaison between the British and American editors when works were in their early stages. With regard to treatment, the major problem, already discussed in an earlier section, arose over the supposed unorthodoxy of McGiffert's work. The Clarks felt that parts of the book were 'highly offensive to good Christian people'; it had been adversely reviewed in an influential newspaper, and this review had, as we saw, 'awakened a general feeling of indignation'. It was difficult to see, the Clarks held, how the work had passed the press: we may conclude that Salmond, the British editor, was either not sufficiently involved in scrutinising the American contributions to the series, or else was not adequately safeguarding the Clarks' interests.[438] It was inevitable that

scholars would disagree with one another on some issues, but their virtual unanimity in dissenting from many of McGiffert's conclusions indicated that there was something suspect about his scholarship.[439] The visit by McGiffert to Edinburgh alluded to earlier mollified the Clarks as they were assured by him of his essential orthodoxy,[440] but undoubtedly damage was done to sales of the volume in the UK and to perceptions of the standing of series on this side of the Atlantic. It was clearly vital that, if the Library were to be an international success, the boundaries of reverent speculation should not be over-stepped. Problems arose too over the style and language of some of the American contributors. (There is no evidence, apparently, as to whether or not the literary style of the British contributors provoked any complaints on the American side of the Atlantic.) These problems arose with volumes in both the I.T.L. and I.C.C. series, and specific examples were given by the Clarks in a letter to Scribners regarding Washington Gladden's volume on The Christian Pastor:

> at p.44 the expression 'on its own hook' is used. Such a word would be looked upon as a vulgarism here, & we do trust the Author will kindly seek to avoid such expressions as may give opportunity to critics. You will remember that no small indignation was aroused - & harm was certainly done to the sale of the book - by such expressions in Dr Gould's 'St Mark' as 'Jesus charged him sharply, "Shut up."' We are sure that you will agree with us that such things are objectionable.[441]

Once again, the problem seems to have arisen through lack of proper supervision by the British editors, who either were not given the opportunity of seeing the works at a sufficiently early stage, or else did not make the most of the opportunity they were given. This is made clear in a letter to one of the British editors of the I.C.C: 'The style of our American friends is occasionally so awkward that

I do think there should be some supervision from this side.'[442] It is clear that the style in which a work was written, no less than the manner of treatment, could affect both its sales, and perceptions of the series of which it was part.

We may assume from all this that although the publishers and their editors endeavoured to select the most relevant subjects, and to ensure that they were given an acceptable stylistic and theological treatment, nevertheless problems did arise which to some extent hindered the success of the series. One of the reasons for these problems was poor liaison between the British and American editors, and a lack of supervision at MS and proof stages of work produced on one side of the Atlantic by the appropriate editor on the other.

iv. Technical arrangements

The technical arrangements involved in the production of a series on this scale were exceedingly complex, and it was obviously crucial to the financial success of the series that they should proceed smoothly. Each publisher was to be responsible for commissioning and overseeing the typesetting of a stipulated number of volumes. The authors were instructed to supply their MSS ready for press, and accompanied by a concise and useful index.[443] Once the work had been set, the originating publisher would supply a set of stereoplates at cost to his partner, who would pay carriage on these. He would then be free to print his own edition, and would pay the originating publisher half the cost of the typesetting, and half the honorarium due to the author.[444] There is apparently no indication in the letter books that these arrangements went other than smoothly.

But if the series were to be a financial success on both sides of the Atlantic, it was obviously important that an equal number of works should be seen to be appearing from each of the two participating publishers. This was recognised from the first: 'We are glad you propose in the first instance to publish two volumes simultaneously, one by an author in each country', wrote the Clarks to Scribner in April 1887.[445] But problems arose with this programme, and of the nine volumes which had been produced by 1901, only three were of British origin.[446] This is all the more surprising in that initially it would seem to have been Scribners who were lagging behind in the production of their tally of works: of the first three volumes to appear, two were British in origin. Driver's Introduction was published in 1891, and Bruce's Apologetics in 1892. The first work of US origin, Smyth's Christian Ethics appeared in the same year. No volumes in the series were published between 1893 and 1896, when the second American volume, Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine, was issued. In April 1895 C.A. Briggs wrote to the Clarks explaining the delay in the appearance of volumes of American origin. He himself had been asked to undertake a different title from that which he had initially agreed to write; two of the commissioned contributors had died; and yet another had been beset by serious health and family problems.[447] But soon, far more volumes had appeared from the American side than from the British, and this was causing consternation in Edinburgh in that it inevitably affected the impact and standing of the series in Britain. Thus the Clarks wrote to Salmond 'It is of very great importance that the British contributors should be pressed on',[448] and two years later, the problem not having been resolved, to Scribners, requesting that they delay

the publication of further volumes until the Edinburgh firm could catch up. The implication of the letter is that the success of the series in the UK was being affected both by the very fact that US-originated titles proliferated, and by the closely-related fact that these US titles had in themselves provoked adverse criticism of the Library in the UK, criticism which would have been less damaging to the series had it contained more books of British origin to which UK critics would have been more favourably disposed.[449] It seems likely from these comments that the success of the series in the UK at least was to some extent impaired by the failure of the Clarks to spur on their dilatory contributors and so match the Scribners' rate of output. The third British volume, Robert Rainy's Ancient Catholic Church did not appear until 1901.[450]

v. Financial considerations

That the International Theological Library was a financially risky venture was recognised from the outset. Prospective contributors to the series were reminded that 'the moderate price at which the volumes [were] to be sold [made] it necessary to spare the Publishers all avoidable expense of production'[451] and there is no doubt that the Clarks' comments regarding the International Critical Commentary could equally well have been applied to its sister series: 'The whole undertaking is a very considerable speculation for us, & it will take a very large sale to reimburse us.'[452] Indeed, in their early negotiations over the Library, the Clarks wished to stipulate that, if the series were clearly not a success after the publication of, say, eight volumes, either party should be completely free to withdraw from their agreement.[453]

How successful in fact did the series prove to be? Unfortunately, because of the problems discussed earlier, all the works published during the four financial years for which we have figures were of US origin. We do not therefore have detailed costings for a UK-originated title. One of the works for which figures are available is G.P. Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine, which was commissioned and typeset in America, and published in the spring of 1896.[454] An edition of 802 copies was printed by the Clarks from plates supplied by Scribners. The total cost of this can be calculated as follows:

½ cost of composition; cost of plates etc. (Paid to Scribner)	£141	3s.	4d.
Printing	18	12s.	7d.
Prospectus	1	14s.	9d.
Carriage from USA (of plates)	3	15s.	0d.
Stamp for spine		12s.	6d.
Paper	17	5s.	0d.
Binding(1)	20	15s.	7d.
Proportion of Lists	3	0s.	0d.
Advertising (Expenditure in first year)	4	2s.	4d.
½ fee to author(2)	100	0s.	0d.
	£311	1s.	1d.

(1) This figure is calculated pro rata. Only 702 volumes were bound up when the work was first printed.

(2) Surprisingly, the figures for the first edition do not include this sum. In fact payment was not remitted to Scribners in respect of the author's fee until the financial year 1898-99. (Presumably the author would have been paid upon publication by Scribners.) The editor's royalty is excluded from these figures. It was paid as the work sold out. For example, the editor received £10 6s. 0d. over 1896-97 in respect of a 2½% royalty on sales of 687 copies.

The unit cost of each copy of the book was therefore $\frac{£311\ 1s.\ 1d.}{802}$ = 7s. 9d. The nominal retail price of the work was 12s. 0d., and the Clarks' income per copy sold was 7s. 8d. It therefore follows that the work would not have shown a profit had the author's fee been included in the costing of the first impression. Excluding that

fee, the unit cost would have become $\frac{£211\ 1s.\ 1d.}{802}$ = 5s. 3d. and on that figure a profit of 2s. 5d. per copy would be shown, representing a not inconsiderable 46% return on investment. But it would seem that the work was not costed to break even on the first impression.

A subsequent reprint would in theory have been much cheaper to produce, as plates and typesetting costs, and other one-off expenses such as the cost of carriage of plates and the cost of the spine block had been set against the first edition. Given a print run of the same length, the unit cost of reprinted volumes would have been $\frac{£65\ 10s.\ 3d.}{802}$ = 1s. 8d., and on that figure a profit per copy sold of 6s. 0d. would have been shown, representing a sizable return on investment of 360%. How did the work perform in practice? Sales were good, only 192 copies remaining at the end of financial year 1895-96. Over that year, the work showed a loss of £5 16s. 9d., but of course, the Clarks had not yet made their contribution to the author's remuneration. A second impression of 810 copies was ordered in financial year 1896-97, at the end of which there were 685 copies in hand. Despite the cost of the reprint, sales of over three hundred copies had produced a profit of £46 7s. 4d. Over 1897-98, sales of a further 150 copies produced a profit of £42 18s 10d. Ninety-eight copies were sold over 1898-99, but that year saw the payment of £103 7s. 8d. to Scribners in respect of the author's fee, and the work in consequence showed a loss of £78 4s.11d. over that year. Fisher's Doctrine therefore yielded a net profit over the four years of just £5 4s. 6d. More than 430 copies remained in stock, however, and if these continued to sell, there would be a satisfactory return of at least a further £164.

The work was announced as being in its second edition in the 1901 catalogue: this probably refers simply to the second impression. Clearly, the remaining copies were selling slowly. But although in the short term the book was a dubious speculation, in the end it almost certainly produced a satisfactory return.

Another representative title for which we have figures is Washington Gladden's The Christian Pastor, which was also originated in America and appeared in 1897.[455] An edition of 810 copies was printed by the Clarks from plates supplied by Scribners. The total cost of this can be calculated as follows:

½ cost of composition; cost of plates etc. (Paid to Scribner)	£80 1s.10d.
Printing	14 16s. 7d.
Carriage from USA (of plates)	2 4s. 6d.
Stamp for spine	0 10s. 6d.
Paper	14 12s. 5d.
Binding(1)	18 4s. 6d.
Proportion of Lists	3 0s. 0d.
Advertising (expenditure in first year)	4 19s. 6d.
½ fee to author(2)	103 7s. 8d.
	£241 17s. 6d.

(1) This figure is calculated pro rata. Only 500 copies were bound at the time of publication.

(2) This sum was remitted to Scribners at the end of the financial year 1898-99, probably around two years after publication. The £3 7s. 8d. may well have been paid in respect of royalties to the editor.

The unit cost of each copy of the book was therefore $\frac{\text{£241 17s. 6d.}}{810}$ = 6s. 0d. This was one of the minority of works in the series (three out of the first nine) which had a nominal retail price of 10s. 6d. The Clarks' income per copy sold was 6s. 9d., which yielded a profit of 9d. per copy. The return on investment would therefore have been 12.5%. Breakeven point would have been reached when 717 copies, or 88.51% of the print run had been sold.

A subsequent reprint would have been even more profitable. Given a print run of the same length, the unit cost of reprinted volumes would have been approximately $\frac{£55\ 13s.\ 0d.}{810}$ = 1s. 4½d., and on that figure a profit per copy sold of 5s. 4½d. would have been shown, representing a sizable return on investment of 391%.

The Clarks were not sanguine about the prospects of Gladden's work, but in fact it seems to have sold steadily if unspectacularly, 226 copies being disposed of over 1897-98, and a further 297 copies over 1898-99. By the summer of 1899, therefore, sales of the edition were within 154 copies of the breakeven point, and the Clarks were on target to reap a modest return.

We will consider a third example, as the evidence relating to the works by Fisher and Gladden has been somewhat in conflict. Arthur C. McGiffert's History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age was originated in America and published in the UK in 1897.[456] In the case of this work, 1,080 copies were printed by the Clarks from plates supplied by Scribners. The total cost of this edition can be calculated as follows:

½ cost of composition; cost of plates etc. (Paid to Scribner)(1)	£154	5s. 3d.
Printing	23	18s. 2d.
Stamp for spine		16s. 6d.
Paper	23	7s. 9d.
Binding(2)	23	16s. 6d.
Proportion of Lists	3	0s. 0d.
Advertising (Expenditure in first year)(3)	15	3s. 6d.
½ fee to author(4)	103	7s. 8d.
	£347	15s. 4d.

(1) Cost of the carriage of plates is included in this figure.

(2) This figure is calculated pro rata. Only 850 copies were bound at the time of publication.

(3) More was spent on advertising this work than on the other works we have examined. The edition would, as well, have to cover the cost of advertising in subsequent years, which seems to have been high also. £10 8s. 5d. was spent on advertising the work over 1898-99.

(4) Remitted to Scribners at the end of the financial year 1898-99. The £3 7s. 8d. may well have been paid in respect of royalties to the editor.

The unit cost of each copy of the book was therefore $\frac{\text{£347 15s. 4d.}}{1,080}$ = 6s. 5d. The nominal retail price of the work was 12s. 0d., and the Clarks' income per copy sold was 7s. 8d. This would have yielded a profit of 1s. 3d. per copy, the return on investment being 19.48%. Breakeven point would have been reached when 907 copies, or 83.98% of the print run had been sold.

A subsequent reprint would have been more profitable. Given a print run of the same length, the unit cost of reprinted volumes would have been approximately $\frac{\text{£83 5s.11d.}}{1,080}$ = 1s. $6\frac{1}{2}$d., and on that figure a profit per copy sold of 6s. $1\frac{1}{2}$d. would have been shown, representing a sizable return on investment of 391%.

If the Clarks were doubtful about the prospects of the Gladden work, they were even more doubtful about the reception which would be given to that by McGiffert. Sales in the first year totalled 560, but only 124 copies were sold over 1898-99, and it would clearly be several years before the work broke even. If the Clarks continued to spend extensively on advertising over those years, the first edition of the work may in the end have done little more than cover its costs.

On this evidence, it would seem that while a shorter, 10s. 6d. title in the series could be made to show a profit in an edition of

around eight hundred copies, if a 12s. 0d. title were to break even, a print run of over one thousand copies was required. It was probably because they realised this that the Clarks printed 1,080 copies of both the 12s. 0d. titles published in 1897-98.(Allen's and McGiffert's) The fact that a shorter work would show a profit on a smaller edition demonstrates the wisdom of the Americans' contention that authors who kept well within the maximum number of pages should be given greater reward. However, given the sales figures of these books it is difficult to see how profit on the first editions could have been other than modest. If second printings, or second editions were required of course, the return on investment would have been considerable. By 1901,[457] of the nine works issued, four had gone beyond the first edition: Driver's work was in its seventh edition, Fisher's in its second, and Smyth's and Bruce's in their third. In the medium term, therefore, the series as a whole may have been successful despite the poor performance of individual titles.

Indeed, according to the Stock and Sales Book - Individual Titles,[458] the firm's annual return on the Library was not inconsiderable. The figures, of course, merely give the profit or loss on the year's trading, and do not indicate whether the work in question had broken even.

TABLE II: 16

International Theological Library: Annual Credits/Deficits 1895-96 - 1898-99

Author	Date published	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Driver	1891	+£ 74 4s. 6d.	+£ 86 11s. 6d.	-£ 32 7s. 1d.(1)	+£281 3s.10d.
Smyth	1892	+£ 48 3s. 4d.	+£ 54 5s. 7d.	+£ 43 4s. 8d.	-£ 40 2s. 0d.
Bruce	1892	+£ 97 5s. 8d.	+£101 11s.10d.	+£ 24 19s. 7d.	+£132 13s. 2d.
Fisher	1896	-£ 5 16s. 9d.	+£ 46 7s. 4d.(2)	+£ 42 18s.10d(2)	-£ 78 4s.11d.
McGiffert	1897			-£ 26 14s. 6d.	-£ 66 15s. 5d.
Gladden	1897			-£ 41 18s. 3d.	-£ 33 2s. 1d.
Allen	1898			-£ 63 14s. 3d.	-£ 66 14s. 5d.
Steven	1899				-£142 19s. 0d.
		+£213 16s. 9d.	+£288 16s. 3d.	-£153 12s. 0d.	-£ 14 0s.10d.

(1) Clearly, a reprint was undertaken this year.

(2) These figures show profit where our earlier analysis would have led us to expect a loss because, for some reason, the author's fee had not been remitted to Scribners. Six of these volumes had nominal retail prices of 12s. 0d; the others sold for 10s. 6d.

From a commercial point of view the series was therefore a finely-balanced venture in the mid 1890s. At first, due to the quality of the work produced, it would appear to have been reasonably successful: thereafter, due to errors made in the selection of subjects and contributors, to a lack of supervision by both the editors, and to other factors, its financial success would seem to have been at least temporarily jeopardised.

There would seem to be little doubt, however, that the International Theological Library was widely regarded as a solid success from a theological point of view, and that it contributed to the international esteem not only of Scribners and T. & T. Clark, but also of English language theology as a whole. We saw earlier that, in a neat turning of the tables, a German publishing firm applied to the Clarks for

permission to translate Driver's work into that language, and, as we observed then, the Library was not only made possible by the increase of 'genuine scholarship' in the US and Great Britain,[459] but also contributed to the growth of that scholarship by providing an international forum for first-rank scholars.

e) The International Critical Commentary

The International Critical Commentary was a sister series to the International Theological Library, and there were considerable similarities in the planning and execution of both series. The I.C.C. was issued under an editorial triumvirate. C.A. Briggs was responsible for commissioning and overseeing the publication of all works in the series, both on Old and New Testament books, which originated in the US. S.R. Driver of Oxford had editorial responsibility for works on the Old Testament books originating in the UK; he was initially to be assisted by William Sanday, who was to be British New Testament editor. Sanday, however, declined the offer, and was replaced by Alfred Plummer of University College, Durham.[460]

i. Unity of purpose

As we noted earlier, the International Critical Commentary was begun at the suggestion of Sir Thomas Clark, It would appear that he had approached C.A. Briggs inviting him to participate as American editor of the series, and that he was confident that the scheme would meet with Scribner's enthusiastic approval.[461] Clark, in fact viewed the I.C.C. series as a potentially more successful venture than the I.T.L., and for him, to launch out on a commentary series in no way involved a commitment to publish a work on every book of the Bible:

> as each volume would be sold separately ... we do not think the selection of 10 vols on the more important books of the Old Testament and a few on the New Testament would be a very great risk even if it were resolved to go no further.[462]

In fact, however, as we saw, Scribner's greatest enthusiasm was directed towards the I.T.L., and he was initially reluctant to commit his firm to participation in the Commentary series.[463] However, the situation was resolved, the Clarks agreeing to continue on their own initiative with the commissioning of works for the series; nothing, however, was to be published for two years, by which time Scribner would have had the opportunity to assess his position. If he wished, he could join the Clarks either as co-publisher or as agent.[464] Because of the possibility that the Clarks might have to bear the entire risk of the I.C.C., they initially commissioned only twelve volumes in order to test the market.[465] It was no doubt with considerable relief, especially as the copyright protection of the works in North America was at issue[466] that the Clarks learned of the Scribner firm's willingness to co-operate with the I.C.C. series on roughly similar terms and conditions as applied in the case of the I.T.L. From the moment that decision was made, the two firms seem to have shared a unity of purpose which could only have contributed to the success of the series.

ii. Selection of authors

As was the case with the I.T.L., it was crucial to the commercial and theological success of the series that the co-operation of the most competent scholars should be sought and won. It was Briggs' responsibility to commission American scholars to write works on both the Old and New Testament books which it had been decided would be

allocated to authors on his side of the Atlantic. In Britain, Driver was to commission scholars to comment on the Old Testament books which it had been decided would be dealt with by UK authors, while Plummer was to enlist contributors for works on the New Testament books which were to be handled from this side of the Atlantic. It might have been more practical to decide first which scholars in Britain or America were best equipped to deal with which books, and then commission accordingly, but the Clarks and Briggs appear to have decided to apportion Biblical books between the two countries, and only then look for suitable contributors.[467]

As in the case of the other series, the Clarks seem to have put considerable trust in the judgement of their editors, whom they anticipated would act as a panel - 'it is expected that the British and American Editors confer with each other as to the selection of contributors'[468] - but they occasionally made suggestions of their own. For instance, when Briggs proposed a certain Henry P. Smith as author of one of the volumes, the Clarks, ever mindful that an international series had to have international sales potential, commented that Smith was 'almost quite unknown in this country', conceded that Briggs had a 'high opinion of his scholarship', but posed the question 'Do you really think he is the best man you can get for this subject[?].'[469] Again, the Clarks warned Briggs against commissioning an author whose participation in an earlier co-publishing venture, Schaff's Popular Commentary, had undoubtedly been detrimental to its success, at least in Britain. 'We are sure the general opinion here was that his work was unsatisfactory.'[470] Yet again, as we noted in an earlier section, Driver and Briggs were

warned to consider carefully before commissioning a work from an American scholar who, if not a Unitarian himself, certainly had Unitarian connections, and whose participation, even although his work was to be on the book of Proverbs where there would be little conflict between Unitarian and orthodox Christian views, might be detrimental to the standing of the series as a whole. The Clarks, writing to Driver, diplomatically suggested that he might care to take no notice of their advice, or else to discuss the matter with Briggs: clearly they hoped he would take the latter course.[471] So while for the most part relying on the judgement of their editors, the Clarks who, over the years had built up a formidable acquaintance with Biblical scholars and scholarship and who, moreover, were more aware than their editors could ever be of the commercial implications in the international market place of the selection of one author as opposed to another, were not slow to make their opinion known. And such was the esteem in which they were held by their editorial panel (who, besides, would not forget who held the purse-strings) that their comments were always carefully evaluated, if not inevitably followed.

As with the International Theological Library, publishers and editors alike agreed that what was wanted was the best scholarship. It was agreed that the earlier volumes in the series should be contributed by other authors than those who were working on the early I.T.L. volumes,[472] but apart from that the field was open. They were looking for 'the best man' for each subject;[473] it was their aim to secure the services of'the best scholars of the day',[474] for they felt that 'a name carrying weight, and confidence, [was] imperative for this Series'.[475]

The Clarks seem to have been reasonably satisfied with the scholars who were enlisted. Once again, scholars of weight would expect adequate remuneration, and in fact they were paid on the same terms as were co-tributors to the sister series, at the rate of £200 for a 500-page volume. For that sum, they were selling the copyright of their work, and agreeing to undertake two minor revisions (merely emendations on the existing stereoplates[476]) for no additional fee.[477] No doubt an additional sum would be paid if a major revision became necessary; and if a work were especially successful, the Clarks would not be found wanting in their generosity to the author, as they showed in the case of some of the I.T.L. volumes. The editors were remunerated by means of a royalty on sales. Briggs received 2½% on all US sales; Driver received the same amount on all UK sales of the OT volumes, and Plummer earned a similar royalty on sales of the NT volumes in the same market place. It would seem that in their commitment to locating, commissioning and adequately reimbursing the best possible scholars within their theological tradition, the Clarks did all they could to ensure the success of the series.

iii. Selection of subjects: treatment and style

Unlike the I.T.L., the I.C.C. posed no problems to the publishers over the selection of subjects. It was simply a matter of dealing first of all with the major books of the Bible. By 1901, ten volumes had been published, dealing with the following books:[478]

1. Deuteronomy (Driver)
2. Judges (Moore)
3. The Books of Samuel (Smith)
4. Proverbs (Toy)
5. Romans (Sanday and Headlam)
6. St Mark (Gould)
7. St Luke (Plummer)

8. Philippians and Philemon (Vincent)
9. Ephesians and Collossians (Abbot)
10. Peter and Jude (Briggs)

As with the I.T.L., however, the financial success of the series was to some extent (probably less than in the case of the Library) jeopardised by difficulties in the areas of treatment and style. With regard to treatment, for example, the volume on Judges by Moore was criticised by an influential reviewer (Professor Ryle, writing, embarrassingly enough, in the Clarks' own Critical Review) for practically omitting any discussion of the religious element of the book in question. The Clarks agreed with his criticism. If sales of volumes in the series to a wider public than the academic coterie pure and simple were to be encouraged, it was vital, they felt, that the religious value of the book being commented on should not be ignored. Moore's volume had sold a paltry four hundred copies. It was clearly important that the scholars should keep the commercial imperatives in mind.[479] But sales of individual volumes and perceptions of the series as a whole could also be affected by the usual problems of style arising from the differences between what was acceptable on each side of the Atlantic. We have already seen that some expressions used by Gould in his volume on St Mark - notably his 'Shut up', put into the mouth of Jesus in the context of his addressing the unclean spirit - caused offence.[480] The Clarks recognised that the critics had grounds for taking offence at passages such as this - 'Our American friends put a different construction upon many expressions which are to our minds offensive'[481] - and attempted to ensure that the series was not jeopardised by transatlantic language differences. And in the main they seem to have succeeded, for there

is no evidence to indicate that sales of the I.C.C. were adversely affected by disquiet on stylistic and linguistic grounds.

iv. Technical arrangements

The arrangements arrived at between T. & T. Clark and Scribners for the production of the I.C.C. were similar or identical to those covering the issue of the I.T.L. Once again, these arrangements would appear to have proceeded relatively smoothly. The only technical difficulty referred to in the letter books concerns complaints made by the American printers over the quality of plates shipped from this country. These plates had been made by the Oxford University Press, who had been entrusted with the typesetting of the volume in question, perhaps so that S.R. Driver of Oxford or A. Plummer of Durham could personally supervise their work. The Press prepared a defence of the quality of their platemaking, and the Clarks sent a copy of this statement to Scribners. It was not the plates which were at fault, they held, but the American pressmanship. There were differences between British and American ways of 'making ready'; the Americans had been lax by British standards, and this had resulted in the inferior product of which the Scribners had complained. This incident, relatively minor in itself, highlights another area - that of technical compatibility between the two countries - which made co-operative international publishing a hazardous venture.[482]

The issue of the International Critical Commentary proceeded, in marked contrast to that of its sister series, at the same rate on both sides of the Atlantic: of the ten volumes which had appeared by 1901,[483] five were American in origin, and five British. The fact that this harmonious balance was maintained no doubt encouraged

positive perceptions of the International Critical Commentary on the part of potential purchasers and thereby enlarged its sales.

v. Financial considerations

The Clarks clearly felt that the International Critical Commentary series was less of a financial risk than was the International Theological Library. How successful, in fact, did the I.C.C. prove to be? Detailed figures are available in the cases of several works. S.R. Driver's volume on Deuteronomy, published in 1895, was originated in the UK, and had a nominal retail price of 12s. 0d., being sold to the British trade at 7s. 8d. The first edition of 1612 copies (significantly larger than the first editions of I.T.L. volumes) cost as follows:[484]

Typesetting etc.(1)	£ 73	8s. 3d.
Stereoplates for British edition	23	17s. 7d.
Printing	28	7s. 0d.
Binding (whole edition bound on publication)	36	11s. 6d.
Stamp for spine	1	6s. 0d.
Paper	39	5s. 2d.
Promotional material	6	5s.11d.
Advertising	25	2s. 1d.
Proportion of lists	3	0s. 0d.
Author(2)	200	0s. 0d.
Editor(3)	24	3s. 7d.
	£461	7s. 1d.

(1) The total cost of typesetting, etc. was £165 3s. 6d., of which Scribners paid £91 15s. 3d. They also bought an additional set of plates for the US edition.

(2) This sum was the author's total fee. Clearly each publisher paid the total fee to the author of books appearing on his side of the Atlantic, rather than paying half the fee of every contributor to the series.

(3) This figure is an estimate - the editor received a royalty of 2½% on, presumably, the retail price of each copy sold. (1,612 x 12s. = £967 4s. 0d., of which 2½% is £24 3s. 7d.)

The unit cost of volumes in the first edition was therefore $\frac{£461\ \ 7s.\ 1d.}{1,612}$ = 5s. 8d., giving 2s. 0d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment was therefore a reasonable 35.29%. Breakeven point would be reached when 1,203 copies (74.62% of the run) had been sold. Were a second edition to be required, the percentage return on it would be much higher. The total cost of a second edition of the same size as the first, including advertising, would be £156 9s. 4d. The unit cost of volumes in that edition would therefore be $\frac{£156\ \ 9s.\ 4d.}{1,612}$ = 1s.11d. giving 5s. 9d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment would be very high, at around 300%. And in fact the work did sell well, to the extent of having reached its second edition by 1901.

G.F. Moore's volume on Judges (also published in 1895) was originated in the US, and had a nominal retail price of 12s. 0d., being sold to the British trade at 7s. 8d. The first edition of 1,000 copies cost the Clarks as follows:[485]

½ cost composition; plates; packing	£195 13s. 5d.
Carriage of plates from US	3 12s.11d.
Printing	20 2s. 4d.
Paper	25 4s. 8d.
Stamp for spine	0 3s. 6d.
Binding (whole edition bound on publication)	22 15s. 0d.
Proportion of lists	3 0s. 0d.
Advertising	24 14s.11d.
	£295 6s. 9d.

The unit cost of volumes in the first edition was therefore $\frac{£295\ \ 6s.\ 9d.}{1,000}$ = 5s.11d., giving 1s. 9d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment was therefore a

reasonable 29.57%. Breakeven point would be reached when 770 copies (77% of the run) had been sold. Were a second edition to be required, the percentage return on it would be much higher. The total cost of a second edition of the same size as the first, including advertising, would be £95 17s.11d. The unit cost of volumes in that edition would therefore be $\frac{\text{£97 17s.11d.}}{1,000}$ = 1s.11d., giving 5s. 9d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment would, at the same level as that for the second edition of the Driver work, be very high, at around 300%. And in fact, like Driver's work, Moore's was into its second edition by 1901.

W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam's volume on Romans, published in 1895, was originated in the UK, and had a nominal retail price of 12s. 0d., being sold to the British trade at 7s. 8d. This work sold exceptionally well, a second edition being required nine months after its first publication. The large first edition of 1,596 copies cost as follows:[486]

Typesetting and printing costs(1)	£108 15s. 5d.
Stereoplates for British edition	28 13s. 3d.
Paper	39 9s. 3d.
Binding	36 5s. 4d.
Stamp for spine	0 4s. 6d.
Author	250 0s. 0d.
Editor	21 0s. 0d.
Proportion of lists	3 0s. 0d.
Advertising	27 14s.11d.
	£515 2s. 8d.

(1) The total cost of typesetting and printing was £231 14s. 9d., of which £122 19s. 4d. was chargeable to Scribners. This covered the cost of their set of plates, half the cost of typesetting, and other miscellaneous charges.

The unit cost of volumes in the first edition was therefore $\frac{\text{£515 2s. 8d.}}{1,596}$

= 6s. 5d., giving 1s. 3d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment was therefore 19.48%. Breakeven point would be reached when 1,344 copies (84.21% of the run) had been sold. The return on the second edition, required the same year, was much better. That edition totalled 1,080 copies, and cost as follows, there being no additional expenditure for advertising or contributions to the firm's general promotional expenditure:

Printing	£27 4s. 0d.
Paper	26 16s. 0d.
Binding (Pro rata)	24 10s.10d.
Editor (Estimated	16 4s. 0d.
	£94 14s.10d.

The unit cost for volumes in this edition was therefore $\frac{\text{£94 14s.10d.}}{1,080}$ = 1s. 9d., giving 5s.11d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. A 338% return was therefore yielded. Breakeven point would be reached when 247 copies (22.87% of the run) had been sold. This was clearly a most profitable book, for it had reached its fourth edition by 1901.

E.P. Gould's volume on St Mark, published in 1896, was originated in the US, and had a nominal retail price of 10s. 6d., being sold to the British trade at 6s. 9d. The first edition of 1,080 copies cost as follows:[487]

½ cost composition; plates; packing	£108 14s. 8d.
Carriage of plates from US	1 19s. 7d.
Printing	13 9s. 3d.
Paper	19 17s. 6d.
Binding (Pro rata. Only 750 were bound on publication.)	24 9s. 7d.
Stamp for spine	1 9s. 6d.
Proportion of lists	3 0s. 0d.
Advertising	24 14s.11d.
	£197 15s. 0d.

The unit cost of volumes in the first edition was therefore $\frac{£197\ 15s.\ 0d.}{1,080}$ = 3s. 8d., giving 3s. 1d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment was therefore much higher than on the first editions of the volumes priced at 12s. 0d., reaching 84%. Breakeven point would be reached when 586 copies (54.25% of the run) had been sold. The percentage return figure would be even greater were a second edition to be required. The total cost of a second edition of the same size, including advertising, would be £85 11s. 3d. The unit cost of volumes in that edition would therefore be $\frac{£85\ 11s.\ 3d.}{1,080}$ = 1s. 7d., giving 5s. 2d. profit on each copy sold at the normal trade price. The return on investment would accordingly reach the excellent level 326.31%. But, as we saw, the Clarks had doubts about the saleability of this work, doubts reflected in the fact that initially they had only 750 copies bound up. In fact, their caution proved to be justified: a second edition had not been required by 1901. While a percentage return of 84% on the first edition looks favourable, it appears much less so when spread over five or more years.

All the preceding calculations, of course, assume the sale of the whole of each edition, and ignore factors such as the distribution of review and presentation copies, and the practice of giving retailers twenty-five copies when twenty-four were ordered, and allowing an additional discount of 2½% for prompt payment. But it would seem that the Clarks were correct in assuming that the series would be successful. Of the ten volumes in print by 1901, four had gone beyond a first edition by then, and the firm's annual return on the series, according to the Stock and Sales Book, Individual Titles[488]

was considerable. Six of the first ten volumes were priced at 12s. 0d., three at 10s. 6d., and one at 8s. 6d. On the basis of the evidence we have examined, it would seem that, as was the case with International Theological Library titles, smaller volumes, though selling more cheaply than full-length ones, could nevertheless be costed to yield a larger return than them. The following Table presents the figures from the Stock and Sales Book. These figures, of course, merely give the profit or loss on the year's trading, and do not indicate whether the work in question had broken even.

TABLE II: 17

International Critical Commentary: Annual Credits/Deficits 1895-96 - 1898-99					
Title	Date published (approx.)	1895-96	1896-97	1897-98	1898-99
Deuteronomy	1895	+£355 8s. 8d.	+£ 28 9s. 7d.	+£ 82 7s. 8d.	+£168 8s. 0d.
Judges	1895	-£ 36 17s. 9d.	+£ 64 4s. 4d.	+£ 21 9s. 7d.	-£ 79 17s.11d.
Romans	1895	+£ 47 3s. 5d.	+£207 1s. 8d.	+£ 43 12s.10d.	+£263 15s. 7d.
Mark	1896	+£ 10 16s. 1d.	+£ 79 4s. 6d.	+£ 30 3s. 6d.	-£ 43 18s. 8d.
Luke	1896		-£ 88 9s. 6d.	+£108 3s. 9d.	+£159 6s. 5d.
Philippians	1897			+£ 66 9s. 3d.	-£ 41 15s. 4d.
Ephesians	1897			+£ 44 11s.11d.	+£128 2s. 3d.
Samuel	1899				-£115 15s. 2d.
		+£376 10s. 5d.	+£290 10s. 7d.	+£307 14s. 8d.	+£438 5s. 2d.

According to all this evidence, therefore, the International Critical Commentary would seem to have been a highly profitable venture, much more so, as the Clarks had anticipated, than its sister series.

The Clarks' early experiences in the publication of transatlantic co-editions were not encouraging; nevertheless, they persevered, and their ventures in this field at the end of the century, particu-

larly the International Critical Commentary, were successful and profitable. This success was due to the wisdom of the editorial panel, to the competence in most cases of the scholars selected to contribute, to the relatively harmonious working relationship which existed between the two publishers, and perhaps above all to the theological awareness and commercial astuteness of T. & T. Clark, to say nothing of that firm's patience and tact, laced, when it was necessary with firmness.

4. Conclusions

The Clarks' transatlantic publishing ventures thus made a significant contribution to the late nineteenth-century development of the firm. The name of T. & T. Clark became more widely known, and its international standing was increased. The firm played a significant role in furthering the cause of English-language theology, and the principals came into contact with many leading scholars of international repute. This reputation and these contacts helped to give the Clarks the necessary pulling-power to draw together the contributors who were to make James Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible and Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics the international successes they were. In purely commercial terms, the transatlantic publishing operation was perhaps less successful; only modest sums were to be realised by selling in this country works originating in the US; and the sales of works to the US, sometimes at very low cost to deter unauthorised reprinters, brought in equally small amounts. After difficult beginnings, it was the programme of co-publishing in co-operation with Scribners which proved, speaking both commercially and theologically, to be the most fruitful part of the firm's transatlantic dealings.