



Manuscripts and Archives

FRANK G. BURKE

THE PROGENITOR of all bibliographies of manuscripts, and what one author describes as "the first separately printed institutional catalog of any kind," was Hieronymus Wolff's *Catalogus graecorum manuscriptorum Augustanae bibliothecae quem ea respublica ideo edendum curavit*, published in 1575 at Augsburg.¹ The concept of a union catalog was not realized until a quarter of a century later, with publication of Thomas James' *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigensis* in 1600, which listed both books and manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library, as well as in the libraries of several Oxford colleges.² Since the appearance of these early works, private and public institutions have issued catalogs of their manuscript holdings and occasionally have united in efforts to produce union lists.

It took many years before major manuscript collections in the United States migrated from private hands to public repositories.³ Although catalogs of individual collections pre-date even Jefferson's list of his magnificent library, it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that institutions began publishing guides to their own manuscript holdings. Some of the first lists appeared in journals, or among publications of professional papers, such as Robert W. Rogers' "A Catalogue of Manuscripts (chiefly Oriental) in the Library of Haverford College," which was published in *Haverford College Studies*, (4:28-50, 1950), or Charles H. Lincoln's "The Manuscript Collections of the American Antiquarian Society," which appeared in *Bibliographical Society of America Papers*, (4:59-72, 1909). The *Annotated List of the Principal Manuscripts in the New York State Library* (Albany, University of the State of New York, 1899) was an important milestone in archival publication but soon was in need of total revision as a result of the disastrous fire that destroyed almost the entire collection in 1911.

Frank G. Burke is Head, Preparation Section, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

Manuscripts and Archives

In the first decade of this century the Princeton University Library published a list of its Arabic manuscripts,⁴ and the Pierpont Morgan Library brought out its *Catalog of Manuscripts . . . from the Libraries of William Morris, Richard Bennet, Bertram, Fourth Earl of Ashburnham, and other sources, now forming part of the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (London, Chiswick Press, 1906).⁵ Since then the number of guides to or catalogs of institutional collections has grown in proportion to the number of collecting repositories, and in some cases second or third revisions of original guides are already appearing. If the scholar in search of a group of papers is patient enough, and has all of the published and unpublished guides to manuscript and archival collections available to him (an unlikely condition), he will probably find what he wants. But the task is arduous, and the modern scholar's patience thin.

Researchers have long felt the need for a compilation which would provide an accurate, convenient approach to relevant material. In the United States (to which this discussion will be limited) such a compilation required several preliminary conditions, among which a felt need of the scholarly community, extensive planning,⁶ pressures by professional societies, and adequate financial support were primary. Early attempts at a union catalog of manuscripts were largely unsuccessful because not all of these conditions existed simultaneously. Noteworthy and even precedent-setting attempts to produce one were made in 1918 and 1924 by the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, but they were not continued or the volumes regularly supplemented because the forces were not yet organized to demand their continuance or lend support. More than a quarter century elapsed before the volume of 1924 was superseded.

In order to prepare the 1918 catalog, the Library solicited information from 232 historical societies, university and public libraries, and other collecting institutions in the United States. Replies were received from only eighty-six, however, and these, together with reports of the Library's own holdings, were arranged and indexed. The result was a catalog containing some 1,100 entries, entitled *Check List of Collections of Personal Papers in Historical Societies, University and Public Libraries, and Other Learned Institutions in the United States*. (Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1918). More than half the volume consists of indexes, and the variety of index arrangement illustrates the various approaches that researchers make to original source materials. Since the *Check List* itself is in alphabetical order by name of collection, it

serves as a basic index to material. The *Check List* is followed, however, by a chronological list, divided into decades (a collection spanning more than one decade is included under each that it encompasses), and a depository list, which indexes the contributing depositories, followed by the collection titles submitted by each.

The *Check List* was re-issued under a new title in 1924 in what was proclaimed to be a "new and enlarged edition."⁷ This was an understatement. In addition to more entries—a total of 2,500 collections from 131 repositories—the entire format of the catalog was changed. The new arrangement of the material was alphabetical by state, then city, then repository, then by name of collection. The only index is a cumulated list of all collections included, arranged alphabetically. The catalog refers not only to manuscript repositories and archives, but also to private collections, so that one finds entries for the manuscript collections of Oliver R. Barrett of Chicago, Charles Francis Jenkins of Philadelphia, George L. Shepley of Providence, and others. The preface also indicates that the catalog was produced "at the instance of the American Historical Association." The A. H. A. had shown a continuing interest in bibliographic tools for historical source materials through the work of its Historical Manuscripts Commission, which had been created soon after the founding of the Association in 1884. The initial interest of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress in producing a union catalog of manuscripts stemmed in part from its own activity in preparing a guide to the Division's holdings. The guide, the *Handbook of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*, appeared in 1918—the same year as the original *Check List*.⁸

Five years after the 1924 effort of the Library of Congress, another type of union catalog appeared, devoted to a regional survey. This was *A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800) in the City of New York*, by Evarts B. Greene and Richard B. Morris.⁹ Although specialized, the approach which the manuscript section of the Greene-Morris *Guide* takes to material is worth considering. The volume is a combined chronological and subject guide, arranged according to historical periods and then events. In essence, it is a union catalog of manuscripts in New York repositories. The method might be recommended for any undertaking of a local or regional guide to manuscripts and archives, and, indeed, it set a pattern that was to be followed in many instances by the W.P.A. Historical Records Survey of the late 1930's.

The Greene-Morris *Guide* dealt with books, newspapers, documents,

Manuscripts and Archives

pamphlets, archives, and historical manuscripts. In American usage, of course, the term "manuscripts" includes different forms of material. In the traditional sense, "manuscripts" means books in manuscript (codices). In the modern sense, the term includes personal papers, corporate records, literary manuscripts, and other writings which have not reached printed form.¹⁰ The demand for use of codices comes largely from classicists, medievalists, theologians, diplomaticians, paleographers, philologists, and sphragists, and has been relatively constant throughout the period in American history in which institutions have maintained collections of such material. Many, if not most codices could be described in terms comparable to those used for printed books, and the development of a union catalog of codices in the United States did not trail very far behind the development of union catalogs of printed works.

In the 1930's a number of major bibliographic projects for codices were completed. There had been a continuous demand from the scholarly world, and research emphasis was still being put on philology, theology, and classical studies. Many institutions had secured financial support for the foundation or augmentation of collections of Medieval and Renaissance manuscripts. If individual philanthropy was the major source of funds for purchasing collections, institutional philanthropy, through foundations such as the American Council of Learned Societies and others, provided the funds for the compilation of union catalogs. As a result of such support, two major works and a number of minor ones appeared. The first was the *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, compiled by Seymour de Ricci and William J. Wilson. This work was conceived in 1929 with a grant from the A.C.L.S., was sustained by the General Education Board, and was administered by the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. The completed *Census* appeared (published by the H. W. Wilson Company of New York) in two volumes in 1935 and 1937, with an index published in 1940. A supplement, prepared by C. U. Faye and W. H. Bond, was published in 1962 with its own index; the supplement was supported in part by the Bibliographical Society of America.

The body of the work which relates to the United States is arranged by states in alphabetical order, then by cities within the states, then by repository, following the pattern used in the Library of Congress 1924 union catalog. Under each repository the materials are listed alphabetically by main entry, followed by the formal or given name of the

work. If no main entry has been established, the materials are listed by title entry or name of the collection. Descriptive information follows, as well as any other identifying designations (such as a Gregory number). Provenance information is included where it has been supplied by the repository. Most of the material for the *Census* was gathered by the editors as they traveled from one end of the country to the other, seeking out and cataloging manuscripts.

The de Ricci-Wilson *Census* contains a multiple index, by name, title, and heading; scribes, illuminators, and cartographers; incipits; Gregory numbers; present owners; and previous owners. The arrangement of the material in the *Census* itself acts as an index to repository or geographical location.

In 1938 another A.C.L.S.-supported, Library of Congress-directed bibliography was published. This was the late Horace I. Poleman's *A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1938 [American Oriental Series, Vol. 12]). Work on the project had begun in 1933, with the expectation that some 3,000 to 4,000 Indic manuscripts would be located. The completed census of 107 institutions revealed the existence of nearly 8,000 manuscripts.

The introduction to Poleman's work explains that "the list is arranged by languages with sub-divisions by subject-matter, the main division coming between the Sanskrit and Vernacular texts. Within each class items are arranged following the Sanskrit alphabet in two separate groups: first by authors, then by works without authors."¹¹ It is obvious that the arrangement of the catalog assumes use by highly competent researchers. Over one-fifth of the volume consists of an index of authors and titles, an index of scripts, and an index of illustrated manuscripts.

About the time that the de Ricci-Wilson and the Poleman censuses appeared, conditions necessary for the preparation of a union catalog of modern manuscripts were developing. The needs of the scholarly community were growing as the college population and the number of graduate institutions both grew. Planning for a union catalog had gone far beyond the initial efforts made by the compilers of the Library of Congress *Check List*. The Historical Records Survey of the Works Projects Administration and its sister project, the Survey of Federal Archives, which was eventually combined with the Historical Records Survey (H.R.S.), contributed toward the compilation of a national union catalog because they surveyed much of the field and pre-

Manuscripts and Archives

pared inventories of many archives and historical manuscript collections in the United States.

The H.R.S., directed during most of its short existence by Luther H. Evans, accomplished a phenomenal amount of work in something less than four years—from establishment in November 1935 to dissolution (for all practical purposes) in August 1939. In that time it managed to produce 628 published volumes of county archival inventories, 584 of federal archives, 28 of state archives, 180 of municipal and town archives, 107 guides to manuscript collections, 164 volumes of church archival inventories, and 49 volumes of American imprints. The final checklist of publications, compiled in 1943, ran to 85 pages.¹²

Some things necessary for the preparation of a single, national guide however, were still lacking. Financing of large bibliographic projects was becoming increasingly difficult as the Depression continued, and no professional organization had yet assumed the support, philosophically or financially, for such a prodigious work. If the W.P.A. project had continued long enough, perhaps it would have resulted in a union list of some sort, but the end of the Depression put an end to the W.P.A. World War II created the ultimate diversion, and grandiose schemes fell prey to pressing realities.

If the war prevented interested persons from doing anything about a union catalog, it did not stop them from talking about one. The American Historical Association had established a Special Committee on Manuscripts in 1939, and it began to plan for bibliographic control of historical source materials. Herbert Kellar, Chairman of the Committee, had been a strong advocate and active advisor of the Historical Records Survey, and continued his interest in manuscript and archival bibliographic questions into the post-war period. By 1946 his committee had advanced their plans enough so that that year's Annual Report of the A.H.A. (Vol. 1, *Proceedings*, pp. 64-71) contained the Committee's outline of its specifications for a National Union Catalog of Historical Manuscripts. The next year's report made specific recommendations (including an estimated cost of a quarter-million dollars for a three-year project). The rest of the history of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* is well documented, and all of the historic details need not be repeated here.¹³

The post-war world brought phenomenal changes to scholarship. As a past president of the American Historical Association summed it up:

The explosive growth of historical scholarship in more than a

hundred institutions of higher learning throughout the nation, the sudden penetration of fields of knowledge and areas hitherto neglected, the remarkable growth of interest shown by other countries in American history, the realization on the part of government, philanthropy, and the business community that disciplined study of the roots of problems is necessary both to their solution and to the avoidance of costly mistakes, the enormous expansion in archival and library collections, the availability of many tools of scholarship hitherto unavailable—these and many other factors have multiplied the number of scholars . . . to a degree that few fully realize.¹⁴

In answer to some of the demands of the time, the experience gained from the *National Union Catalog* of books, as well as the census catalogs of the 1930's, interest on the part of professional societies, and the rise in foundation grants to further research, all culminated in the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*.

But the *N.U.C.M.C.* was not the only result of these influences. During the same post-war period a related project was under way, sponsored by the National Historical Publications Commission (N.H.P.C.). This Commission, reactivated by the Federal Records Act of 1950, was obliged to encourage the collection and preservation of historical source materials and, in certain cases, to edit and publish the papers of outstanding citizens of the United States. The commission felt that a major difficulty in carrying out its obligation was the discovery of the location of pertinent manuscripts and archives. Beginning about 1951, the Commission began accumulating the material for a guide to the location of archives and manuscripts in the United States. This, in a broad sense, was a logical continuation of the unfinished work of the Historical Records Survey, and there was some thought that the proposed guide might use the Survey's work as a base on which to build. The volume was to contain "not only the names and addresses of depositories but also a brief identification of their fields of interest and of their major holdings." The Commission also pledged support of the project for a "national register of archival and manuscript groups as a part of the [Library of Congress] union catalog activities."¹⁵ The culmination of the effort to create a guide came in 1961 with the publication of Philip M. Hamer's *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*.¹⁶

It was natural that Philip M. Hamer should be the directing force behind the *Guide*. Dr. Hamer, an official of the National Archives, had

Manuscripts and Archives

been detailed, beginning late in 1935, to serve as National Director of the Survey of Federal Archives, which led to the publication of the *Inventory of Federal Archives in the States*. In 1948, under his editorial leadership, the *Guide to the Records in the National Archives* was issued, followed in 1950-51 by the two-volume *Federal Records of World War II*. After appointment as Executive Director of the N.H.P.C. in 1950 and the organization of its new program for the publication of the papers of American leaders, Dr. Hamer began work on his *chef d'oeuvre*, *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*.

The genesis of this work could also be traced from the Claude H. Van Tyne and Waldo G. Leland *Guide to the Archives of the Government of the United States in Washington* (Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1904), which begat a family of other volumes, each by a specialist, for materials relating to American history in Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Russia, Switzerland and Austria, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and the West Indies. Logic dictated that a guide be prepared for the United States.

This was not to be a union catalog. As stated in the introduction, the *Guide* was intended "to be a guide that will assist a searcher in finding the particular groups of archives or manuscripts that contain the information he desires." The distinctions between Hamer's work and the *N.U.C.M.C.* were more than quantitative. The *Guide* is more of an annotated checklist (i.e., short-title entries, with a minimal amount of descriptive information), but its approach is also geographic—locating material and relating it to its surroundings and associated documents. The *N.U.C.M.C.* was intended to treat each collection as a discrete entity, revealing any interrelationships through a subject index. In a very broad sense, the Hamer *Guide* takes the archival approach to materials; the *N.U.C.M.C.* project, the personal papers approach. Development of the present format of the *N.U.C.M.C.* can easily be traced by examination of the proposals made by the Kellar Committee in 1946 and a plan of approach recommended by a group within the Society of American Archivists some five years later.¹⁷ The *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* today is essentially what historians and archivists said they wanted it to be, fifteen to twenty years ago.

Concomitant with the development of these two broad bibliographic aids was a more specialized project, directed by the Committee on Manuscript Holdings of the American Literature Group in the

Modern Language Association of America. The Committee was compiling a "check list of holdings in academic, historical and public libraries in the United States" of American literary manuscripts. This undertaking was supported by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., and provided with additional grants by the M.L.A., the Manuscripts Society, the California Institute of Technology, Indiana University, the University of Kentucky, and the University of Texas Research Institute. The checklist is obviously of smaller scope than either the *N.U.C.M.C.* or the *Hamer Guide*, but it is included for consideration here because it deals solely with manuscripts, and because the approach which it takes to materials is different from that taken by the other two. Of the three works, *American Literary Manuscripts* came off the press first, appearing in 1960 from the University of Texas Press of Austin.

The M.L.A. Committee on Manuscript Holdings circulated to repositories a list containing some 2,000 names of American literary figures. Each repository was requested to indicate next to each name the approximate number of pieces in its collections to, from, or about the person named. This information, returned to the Committee, was coded by the editors, using *Union List of Serials* designations followed by a symbol indicating the amount and type of material. For example: sixty-four repositories reported James Russell Lowell material, and sixty-four repository codes appear after Lowell's name; after each is an indication of form and amount. No other descriptive matter is included, and no further indexing was supplied beyond the alphabetically-arranged body of the checklist and a list of the 270 contributing repositories.

A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States appeared in 1961 and also was compiled through the use of questionnaires, sent only to repositories in the United States to which the public or scholars had access. The completed *Guide* contained entries for more than 8,000 collections from some 1,300 repositories. In the case of some major institutions, N.H.P.C. staff members went personally to the repository to assemble the information. Each institution was to report its holdings of manuscript or archival material by providing the name of each collection, its size in items or boxes, the general subject matter, the time span covered, and the major vocation of the person around whom personal collections were formed.

This information, assembled and edited, was arranged in the same order for publication as that used in the de Ricci-Wilson *Census* and the 1924 Library of Congress catalog, that is: by state, in alphabetical order, then by city, then by repository. However, the list of materials

Manuscripts and Archives

in each repository is grouped under headings indicating vocation or profession, such as Congressmen, state officials, scientists, etc. There is an index to the names of collections, as well as to any other names that may appear in the collection list, including a very few major correspondents. The index also covers broad subject entries, such as slaves, pioneers, etc.

Publication of the Hamer *Guide* followed the *A.L.M.* checklist by only one year, and less than a year after the *Guide*, Volume I of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* appeared. The first volume of the *N.U.C.M.C.* took many years to produce because its preliminaries and goals were considerably more complex than those of either the Hamer *Guide* or the *A.L.M.* checklist.

The original plan for a catalog envisioned the initial form as that of a dictionary card catalog, which would provide information to answer specific reference questions directed to the catalog staff. In order to produce a uniform card catalog, some rules for cataloging manuscripts had to be established and agreed upon by curators and archivists throughout the country. The American Historical Association Committee on Manuscripts, in its initial proposal of 1946, also recommended the compilation of a glossary of terms for manuscripts and archives which could be agreed upon within the profession. As with the other projects, money had to be found and a staff assembled before any catalog could be started.

In 1954, the Library of Congress Descriptive Cataloging Division issued a pre-print of rules for cataloging manuscripts, which was circulated to repositories for study and comment. About ten years later the problem of a glossary of manuscript and archival terms was attacked by an independent researcher, and one is nearing completion at this writing.¹⁸ The entire project of a catalog was initially supported by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. Work was to be carried out by the Manuscript Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division in the Library of Congress. Unlike the Hamer *Guide* or the *A.L.M.* checklist, the *N.U.C.M.C.* was planned as a serial publication which would aim at describing all manuscript collections (including those in photocopy) located in institutional repositories, and all new collections as received and reported by the repositories. With the publication of the 1963-64 volume, the *Catalog* includes reports on more than 14,000 collections from 425 institutions.

The form of entry in the *Catalog* provides considerably more information than in any of the other catalogs, guides, censuses, or check-

lists mentioned so far in this paper. The *N.U.C.M.C.* has limited itself, with a few exceptions, to describing modern manuscripts. The *Catalog* entries provide the name, size, and inclusive dates of collections, as well as a "scope and content note" which includes subjects and correspondents in the collection, and brief notes concerning provenance, restrictions on use, finding aids, and the form of material. Although in the first two volumes the arrangement of entries was random except for card-number order (a number applied to each entry by the printer and used for an index reference), the 1963-64 volume provides some logical internal arrangement which may, in future volumes, work out to be similar to that used in other manuscript bibliographies. Any system beyond the present one would add effectively to the ease with which the volume may be used.

In lieu of an internal arrangement, and for other reasons which will become apparent, the *N.U.C.M.C.* is extensively indexed. The index is not only to collection names, but also to subjects and correspondents mentioned in the "scope and content" notes, making it possible to locate material within collections, as well as collections themselves. Thus, the *Catalog* combines the methods of approach to material employed in the *Hamer Guide* and the *A.L.M.* checklist. Whereas the *Guide* provides information keyed mainly to collection titles, and the *A.L.M.* checklist provides data only on individuals, with no mention of the collections in which their papers are located, the *N.U.C.M.C.* provides both approaches and more. If one is looking for correspondence of Thomas Jefferson, for example, the *Guide* lists twenty-five collections of Jefferson papers, not indicating what Jefferson letters might be in the Adams, or Madison, or Washington, or other papers. The *A.L.M.* checklist records the fact that there are papers of Jefferson in eighty-one repositories, but does not indicate what collections these letters and writings are in, or give a qualitative analysis of the Jefferson material; thus, a cryptic note or simple autograph receives as much notice as the draft of the Declaration of Independence.

The *N.U.C.M.C.* index lists the five collections of Jefferson papers reported to it thus far, and also refers the researcher to ninety-nine other collections in which Jefferson material will be found. There is a hint of qualitative analysis, and sometimes special mention of historically important material. This, however, is not always the rule.

The *Hamer Guide*, because of its compactness (one volume, 775 pages) and the scope of the repositories it lists, is a handy quick-reference tool that will not soon be totally supplanted by the

Manuscripts and Archives

N.U.C.M.C. It continues to contain many entries which the *N.U.C.M.C.* has not yet picked up. For instance, most of the 3,000 collections in the Library of Congress Manuscript Division are listed in the *Guide*, but only one-quarter of that number are so far entered in the *N.U.C.M.C.* The reason for this disparity is that it takes a considerable amount of staff time to prepare a full entry for the *Catalog*, whereas the information required for the *Guide* was, by comparison, easier to assemble from existing catalogs in the Division. At the Library of Congress the National Historical Publications Commission had one of its own staff members do much of the compilation of data, which speeded the process of reporting for the *Guide*. The original plan for the *N.U.C.M.C.* by the American Historical Association Kellar Committee called for field workers to aid repositories (as in the Historical Records Survey), but it was never adopted.

The *A.L.M.* checklist was not intended to be as comprehensive in scope as either the *Guide* or the *N.U.C.M.C.*, and will not be compared with them on that point here. But one point to consider in any comparison is that the *Guide*, the *A.L.M.* checklist, the de Ricci-Wilson *Census*, and every other bibliography mentioned here was out-dated on the day of publication, because the holdings of repositories grow continuously, and none of these bibliographies made provision for issuance of regular supplements. The *N.U.C.M.C.* is the exception, because it is a continuing publication, now appearing on an annual schedule.

The *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* is not now perfect, and it was not perfect to begin with. A number of minor changes have been made in it to correct imperfections, and more are contemplated. It might best be compared with the Volkswagen automobile, in that it is basically a functional product that is not too fancy and looks almost the same, year after year. But to the experienced eye there are noticeable minor design changes which have been made to incorporate technological (i.e., professional) improvements.

All of the bibliographic aids mentioned here thus far have been produced by traditional methods of indexing, cataloging, and printing. Since they all deal with manuscripts and archives, perhaps a certain traditionalism is to be expected. It is more just to say, however, that when all of these projects began there was no other method in general use for doing the work.¹⁹ But archivists and manuscript curators are rapidly departing from traditional concepts in an effort to keep afloat in the flood tide of material that is sweeping down upon

them. Salaries and the number of positions allotted repositories have increased, but so have acquisitions, and the million-piece collection is no longer the extreme rarity that it was a generation ago.

In an attempt to cope with the problem, not only of bulk, but of a great increase in the use of source materials, curators and archivists are turning to electronic data processing. The I.B.M. Corporation, in its own archives, and the Hoover Archive at Stanford University are using computers for indexing individual collections. The Presidential Papers program in the Library of Congress Manuscript Division has been item-indexing the Library's Presidential manuscript collections since 1958 and has produced fifteen published indexes by automated data processing methods in conjunction with microfilm publication of the collections. At the Winterthur Museum (Winterthur, Delaware) and the Drexel Institute of Technology School of Library Science (Philadelphia) a joint program has been under way since 1961 in which the Jonker Optic-coincidence System, which is compatible with I.B.M. machine use, is employed for subject indexing of manuscript collections.

The Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, aside from the Presidential Papers program, has undertaken an automated approach for gaining better bibliographic control of its 3,000 collections. This project is being carried out in progressively sophisticated phases, which started some five years ago as a simple checklist, and has now grown to a master bibliographic record of collections, containing over sixty items of information about each. It is destined to become a complex of systems which, when interrelated by the computer, will list the collections, analyze and index the guides to them and, as a by-product, provide the Division with all of the statistics that it wants for each collection as well as for its total holdings. By the time this essay is printed, there will undoubtedly be more projects under way for the bibliographic utilization of record-keeping equipment. This is the tide of the future.

As the experience of the Library of Congress Manuscript Division is proving, it is now practical to apply machine methods to complex bibliographic problems. There is no reason to believe that such application could not be made on a larger scale than just the collection or repository level. The staff of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* has been investigating automation in indexing, for example, and is aware of the success obtained by the indexing staff of the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the direction of Father John P.

Manuscripts and Archives

Whalen and Sister M. Claudia Carlen, the index editor. The methods employed by a variety of abstracting services certainly cannot be ignored, since a bibliography of manuscript collections is, in reality, merely an abstract of registers, inventories, guides, and other finding aids to those collections. The future possibility of computer-connected libraries (perhaps along the lines of the computer-controlled reservation systems being used by the nation's airlines) also gives promise of a centrally located manuscript referral center, which could provide all of the information now in de Ricci-Wilson, Hamer, the *A.L.M.*, *N.U.C.M.C.*, and considerably more, on an idiosyncratic retrieval basis. Even a single automated center, with no remote affiliations, could effortlessly generate special bibliographies for professional journals and other publications, as well as for individual researchers.

For the present, the *N.U.C.M.C.* has pre-empted the field of union bibliographies of modern manuscripts and archives, although it cannot (and was not designed to) replace the repository registers and guides, which provide much more detailed information about collections than the catalog-in-book format allows. Bibliographies of special fields, such as for American literary manuscripts or scientific manuscripts, can still be of great assistance to the specialist and should be continued, preferably with wider scope and deeper subject analysis than previous efforts have supplied. That special bibliographies are being produced is evident, one example being the recent appearance of a continuation of the Greene-Morris *Guide*, this one for the nineteenth century.²⁰ It is an example of regional analysis going far beyond what any general catalog can do. The Case Institute of Technology's Archives of Contemporary Science and Technology, operating with a grant from the National Science Foundation, is preparing a regional catalog of manuscript sources for the history of science which will not only record the existence of scientific manuscripts in Ohio and parts of the Midwest, but the Archive also plans to gather microfilms of collections which are normally inaccessible to researchers and make them accessible.

Perhaps in the future all special bibliographies will be composed after initial selection of material from the *N.U.C.M.C.*, instead of throwing the burden of accumulation of data back on the already overburdened repository staffs. All of the abstracting, sorting, listing, and indexing could be carried out with automated methods that are currently in use, thus making the preparation of special bibliographies no longer a great burden demanding large staffs for long periods of

time. If the major union bibliographies were automated they could produce most of the material for special catalogs on request. *N.U.C.M.C.*, for instance, could easily supply an index, not only for all of its entries, but for the entries of each repository separately, which would be of great assistance to those institutions too small (or too large) to do this for themselves. Broad, sweeping compilations and checklists, such as the *Hamer Guide*, will continue to be heavily depended upon until the *N.U.C.M.C.* is more nearly complete. Both would probably benefit considerably from automated processes, since the machine approach is best suited to projects which call for continuous cumulation of data which will file with old material.

Bibliographies of manuscripts, unlike bibliographies of books, rely almost solely on the information supplied by the repositories themselves, since each collection is unique. The future of manuscript and archival bibliography, therefore rests with the curators and archivists of the Nation's collections. But there must be a controlling force, a coordinator of effort. Although de Tocqueville was writing about governments, one of his aphorisms seems applicable to the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, the National Historical Publications Commission, the Library of Congress, and similar organizations:

Whenever a power of any kind is able to make a whole people cooperate in a single undertaking, that power, with a little knowledge and a great deal of time, will succeed in obtaining something enormous from efforts so multiplied.²¹

References

1. Taylor, Archer. *Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses*. Chicago, Newberry Library, 1957, p. 53.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.
3. Kane, Lucile. "Manuscript Collecting." In William B. Hesseltine and Donald R. McNeil, eds., *In Support of Clio: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*. Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1958, p. 33.
4. Princeton University Library. *A List of Arabic Manuscripts in Princeton Library*. Comp. by Enno Littmann. Princeton, The Library, 1904.
5. For a recent bibliography of catalogs of manuscripts in institutional libraries, see the appropriate section of Robert B. Downs, *American Library Resources: A Bibliographical Guide*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1951; and *Supplement, 1950-1961*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1962.
6. See, for example, the ideas expressed by Ernest C. Richardson, *A Union World Catalog of Manuscript Books*. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1933-37, Vol. 6, pp. 3-11.

Manuscripts and Archives

7. U.S. Library of Congress. Manuscript Division. *Manuscripts in Public and Private Collections in the United States*. Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1924, p. iii.
8. U.S. Library of Congress. Manuscript Division. *Handbook of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*. Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1918.
9. Greene, Evarts B., and Morris, Richard B. *A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800) in the City of New York*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1929. A revised edition appeared in 1953.
10. For a very recent review of the use of the terms "archives" and "manuscripts," see Dellene M. Tweedale, "Procurement and Evaluation of Materials for a University Archives," *College and Research Libraries*, 26:518-519, Nov. 1965.
11. Poleman, H. I., comp. *A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*. (American Oriental Series, Vol. 12). New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1938, p. xiii.
12. Smiley, David L. "The W.P.A. Historical Records Survey." In *In Support of Clío: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-28.
13. See especially: Robert H. Land, "The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections," *American Archivist*, 17:195-207, July 1954; David C. Mearns, "To Be Enduring," *College and Research Libraries*, 20:341-346, Sept. 1959; Lester K. Born, "The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections: Progress," *American Archivist*, 23:311-314, April 1960.
14. Boyd, Julian P. "A Modest Proposal to Meet an Urgent Need." Presidential address before the American Historical Association at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, December 29, 1964, published in *American Historical Review*, 70:342-343, Jan. 1965.
15. U.S. National Historical Publications Commission. *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents. A Report to the President*. Washington, 1954, pp. 30-31.
16. U.S. National Historical Publications Commission. *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*. Ed. Philip M. Hamer. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1961.
17. This plan was outlined in the report of the Joint Committee on Historical Manuscripts of the Society of American Archivists and the American Association for State and Local History, dated October 1, 1951. Members of the Joint Committee were Edith M. Fox, Dan Lacy, Clifford Lord, Colton Storm, and Lester J. Cappon, chairman.
18. This was done in fulfillment of the requirements for the M.S. degree in Library Science at Catholic University. A preliminary draft was prepared and multilithographed, then circulated to curators and archivists for comment. It appeared as: Edwin A. Thompson. *A Glossary of American Historical and Literary Manuscript Terms*, Washington, Privately printed, 1965. At this writing the *Glossary* is being revised and is scheduled for publication late in 1967.
19. The first electronic computer was not unveiled until 1946; the versatile IBM 1401 and similar machines were introduced less than a decade ago.
20. Carman, Harry J., and Thompson, Arthur W. *A Guide to the Principal Sources for American Civilization, 1800-1900, in the City of New York: Manuscripts*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1960.
21. de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Henry Reeve, trans. New York, Vintage Books, 1954, Vol. 2, p. 57.