



The Humanities—A State of the Art Report

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON

VOLUME, conditions of production, distribution, use, and bibliographical management of publications in all categories have become vastly more complicated in the twentieth century than ever before. Proliferation of research institutes and vastly increased financial support in all fields (but, last of all, the humanities) are striking phenomena of scholarship in our time. Problems this situation has created are both relieved and aggravated by the rapid development of mechanical technology such as microreproduction, sophisticated devices for composition and offset printing, and new systems for indexing and for compiling bibliographies. All are being constantly refined; in turn, the geometrically increasing volume of subpublication and the creation of new indexes generate new research and publication. Here is an apparently unending cycle, and the critical problem is bibliographical management of masses of material which might otherwise be lost, or at least become most difficult of access.

Methods of bibliographical control of the humanities did not change much between Konrad Gesner and Joseph Sabin. In the past monumental bibliographies have generally been the work of one man, e.g., Gesner, Hain, Brunet, Sabin, and Evans, although frequently their work must be continued by others (Sabin) or supplemented (Hain). In our time there are still the individual bibliographers, and they will, hopefully, always be with us; but there is a growing trend for major bibliographies to become "projects," undertaken only by teams and then only with the prerequisite of substantial funds and often elaborate technical equipment. This arrangement is just as well whenever it is practical, for it relieves the creative, imaginative bibliographer of chores of which he is not worthy, or releases him for those for which only he is competent.

Detailed, individual bibliographical scholarship is here to stay unless

Lawrence S. Thompson is Professor, Department of Classics, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

The Humanities

the whole definition of research in the humanities is changed. It would be as ridiculous for a textual scholar not to use a Hinman collator as for an administrative office not to use an offset machine; but the individual scholar's direct control over the whole process is essential. One egregious example (of many) is Matthew J. Bruccoli's *F. Scott Fitzgerald, a Descriptive Bibliography* (1972) requiring the concentrated effort of a single dedicated individual who is at once a scholar, a bibliographer, a collector, and a bird dog for minutiae buried in all manner of unlikely places. Indeed, monumental works such as the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* and the *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century Now in the British Museum* are largely the work of individuals pulled together by a single agency or library, a fact clear to any reader of bibliographical journals. The pages of serials such as *The Library* and the *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* are strewn with the timber from which the great catalogs of incunabula were built.

Always a special problem of humanistic and historical scholarship has been to identify quality or lack of it; and in no area is it so easy for the careless scholar to escape detection (for a while), or so easy for the superior scholar to be denied recognition he deserves in his time. One solution is to include everything in sight and let the reader make his own qualitative evaluations, the case with Hensley C. Woodbridge, *et al.*, *Jack London: A Bibliography* (1966), a work which even runs down often insignificant reviews and partial translations into obscure languages. Yet here is the material from which we can explain London's inflated reputation outside of North America. The other extreme involves a sovereign mastery of the field involved, identification only of cornerstone works such as we find in the late J. Christian Bay's masterful "Three Handfuls of Western Books." No mechanical device can make the decisions that Woodbridge or Bay faced.

A factor of increasing importance for humanistic bibliography is the official and private subsidy. Only the Lilly Foundation has made the *Bibliography of American Literature* possible; and many another bibliographical work acknowledges the assistance of foundations, great and small (not all of which spend their money as wisely as Lilly). UNESCO has aided very substantially in compilation and publication of bibliographies of translations, philosophy, history of religion, color reproductions of paintings, and other subjects; and, on a national level, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (much more poorly supported, relatively speaking) have had much the

same role. In general, however, funds are likely to go to individuals and groups which are most familiar with the routines, formalities, and verbal expression for making requests, not necessarily to the most urgently needed works. In the age of the welfare state there is a new meaning for Ovid's "inopem me copia fecit."

An element which always has and always will plague bibliographers is the matter of currency. Every bibliography is out of date the moment it stops at a *terminus ante quem*. The impatience of scholars for a bibliographical record often creates duplication through the compilation of "preliminary handlists" and splinter bibliographies for specialists in a narrow aspect of a larger field. Fortunately, current bibliography is much more common in this century than ever before. It was not sufficient for W. F. Poole to index nineteenth century periodicals, and it was necessary to set up the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* on a regular, current basis. In a subject field such as classical studies it was not satisfactory to have at hand only the sequence of noble bibliographies by Engelmann, Klussmann, Lambrino, and Marouzeau. *L'Année philologique* had to be created to assure scholars of comprehensive coverage of their field on a current basis. Most other fields of the humanities have also come under current bibliographical coverage in the twentieth century, although some, such as linguistics, are relatively late, e.g., the *Bibliographie linguistique*, beginning publication only in 1949 but, happily, covering 1939 to date. It seems unlikely and is probably not even desirable for any field in the humanities to aspire to immediate bibliographical coverage, imitating, for example, the bibliographers of the medical trades, since the quality of work in the humanities varies so widely.

We have noted that the eagerness of twentieth-century scholars for current bibliographical coverage of their fields and up-to-date reference books often results in duplication and overlap, but in many cases this situation is justifiable. Selective bibliographies for students and nonspecialists are necessary to help the inexperienced and to provide a point of departure for the old hands. Thus the classical scholar who needs to have a quick conspectus of some area with which he is not familiar need not wade through Pauly-Wissowa and *Der kleine Pauly* (1964-date), for he can generally find immediately needed references in the *Lexikon der alten Welt* (1965) or the second edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1970). Several decades ago the British Museum found that it was necessary to issue short-title catalogs of its pre-1601 imprints in various jurisdictions, a duplication of its general cata-

The Humanities

log and of its catalog of fifteenth-century imprints. Today this activity is being extended with V. F. Goldsmith's *A Short-Title Catalogue of French Books, 1601-1700, in the Library of the British Museum* (1969-date). On the other hand, Suzanne and Paul-Henri Michel's *Répertoire des ouvrages imprimés en langue italienne au XVII siècle conservés dans les bibliothèques de France* (1967-date) includes many titles and copies not in the Bibliothèque Nationale and recorded in its catalog. Hopefully Goldsmith and similar works can be expanded to or supplemented by a similar union catalog and show locations even beyond those in the book form *National Union Catalog* (currently being printed at a fantastic but justifiable price by Mansell of London).

A more reprehensible source of duplication is generated by scholars who publish books and accompanying bibliographies on the same persons or subjects. At times such duplication is proper when one study is patently inferior; but too many scholars are too stubborn to give up a research project even when they learn at an early stage that there is a competitor. Even a brief check of the bibliographies of bibliographies in various jurisdictions, language areas, and subject fields will show how widespread this situation is; but there is little that can or, indeed, should be done about it.

In the remaining parts of this article it will be possible to provide only a resumé of current trends in selected fields of humanistic bibliography and to indicate how they reflect some of the conditions noted in the earlier paragraphs. Older works will be noted only insofar as they are pertinent for the later twentieth century. Two previous issues of *Library Trends* have been put together as *Bibliography, Current State and Future Trends* (1967), edited by Robert B. Downs and Frances B. Jenkins, and provide much more detail than can be given here. Examples selected for discussion will be from genres of bibliography (e.g., dissertation and periodical indexes, bibliographies of homage volumes, comprehensive and partial library catalogs), technology and its effects on bibliographies (e.g., microforms and catalogs thereof, cheap reprinting in eye-readable form, and computers and related instruments), trends in humanistic scholarship (e.g., the newer textual criticism), and a few selected fields such as literary history, linguistics, philosophy and religion, and music which have been or may be affected by conditions (old and new) for humanistic bibliography and by recently developed methods and aids to scholarship.

A special plague of librarians and bibliographers from the sixteenth century to the present has been the academic dissertation. The problem

has been more aggravated in the humanities than in the sciences, since the results of doctoral research in the latter usually appear as journal articles, whereas a large proportion of those in the humanities are buried in manuscript form in the libraries of institutions where they were presented. There are, to be sure, national lists such as the *Jahresverzeichnis der deutschen Hochschulschriften* (1885-date) and, much more recently in other major countries such as the United States (1933-date), Great Britain (1953-date), and the U.S.S.R (1958-date). However until quite recently, dissertations as a genre have not been analyzed in detail by subject. During the last decade there have been several useful bibliographies which meet the needs of the modern subject specialist, although most of them have been confined to the United States, Canada or Germany. Such is not the case with one of the most recent, Leonard H. D. Gordon and Frank J. Schulman's *Doctoral Dissertations on China; A Bibliography of Studies in Western Languages, 1945-1970* (1972), the first number in a series initiated by the Association for Asian Studies. Hopefully there will be complementary volumes on pre-1945 titles and Chinese and Japanese titles. Other occidental lists would do well to include oriental, above all, Japanese doctoral work. Although works such as Gordon and Schulman pull together material that is otherwise recorded only in institutional or national lists, neither it nor most of the others are indexed in depth. Such is not the case with the present writer's *Bibliography of American Doctoral Dissertations in Classical Studies and Related Fields* (1968) in which there are four subject entries to each author entry. It was suggested to the compiler that a system such as KWIC be used for indexing, but it was soon ascertained that this device was only a quick way to avoid the scholarly bibliographer's primary responsibility for adequate subject indexing. To visualize the KWIC system's treatment of a title such as *The Elder Turtles of Aigina* (on numismatics) would be shock treatment for the imagination. Mechanical indexing has a rocky road ahead in most aspects of humanistic subject bibliography, but there is an undeniable potential.

A somewhat similar problem is posed by homage volumes, especially when they are not special numbers of periodicals or other serials indexed regularly in the appropriate organs. The older Festschriften provide a special challenge, and it has been met in several fields in recent years. Dorothy Rounds did the job for classicists with her *Articles on Antiquity in Festschriften* (1962), and Harry F. Williams did it for a subsequent period with *An Index of Mediaeval Studies Published in*

The Humanities

Festschriften, 1865-1946, with Special Reference to Romanic Material (1951). Herbert H. Golden and Seymour Simches did the same for French, Italian, and Iberian literatures and languages in a series of bibliographies published in the 1950s. Students of English, German, Scandinavian, Slavic, and Celtic studies need similar tools. Where, for example, can one find references to the treasury of studies on mid-American speech in Gordon Wilson, Sr., *Folklore of the Mammoth Cave Region* (1968), edited by Lawrence S. Thompson for the honoree's eightieth birthday?

Periodical indexing in the humanities has never been as satisfactory as it is in the sciences. Even a massive work such as *Chemical Abstracts* is reasonably sure to cover the great majority of the significant literature in the field, but no index in any field of the humanities can boast of the same adequacy. The sciences are measurable, subject to definition in precise terms, the humanities are not. Further, most serious journals in the physical and biological sciences are refereed, a policy adopted widely in the humanities only in recent years. There are literally thousands of serials which print articles, reviews, and notes at the whim of the editor. They are good, bad, and indifferent, mostly of the latter two categories. But how are they to be evaluated for purposes of the bibliographical record? The corpus is so vast that only students in specialized fields such as classical epigraphy or prototypography (both of which have their own bibliographies) can easily identify that which is essential and scholarly. In a field such as national literary history the way of the bibliographer is even more deceptive: a serious study of a regional author may appear in the organ of a local historical society, or a critical analysis of a composer of sectarian hymns could be encaved in the pages of the bulletin of a little-known theological seminary.

There will always be a place for the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* in public libraries, and scholars in any field of the humanities will neglect it at their own peril. So too we need indexes of a national scope, particularly for smaller countries, such as the *Dansk Tidsskrift-Index* and the *Index to South African Periodicals*. Whether the monumental *Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur* justifies the expense of compilation and the cost to libraries for acquiring, shelving, and interpreting it to confused readers is questionable. A large proportion of the material is indexed elsewhere on a current basis, and specialists can find it. The general reader is easily satisfied with indexes of much more modest proportions and reviewing organs which are available in the average research library. Comprehensive indexing

of all material in serials, with adequate subject analysis, is a desideratum with a fairly low priority. It is not feasible with human and technical resources available at present, but it is not beyond possibility. An alternative, not beyond possibility either, is authoritarian suppression of unimportant serials.

The demise of the old *Bibliographie der Rezensionen und Referate* (1900-1943) was a blow of major consequence to humanistic scholarship. Reviews, however uncritical, brief, or apparently insignificant, are a fundamental key to the reputation of an author or the spread of an idea; and the critical reviews frequently add substantially to the subject matter at hand. The *Book Review Digest* (1905-date) and the *Le-topis' retsenzii* (1935-date) are national in scope; and the national periodical indexes and subject bibliographies are not consistent in listing reviews. There seems to be no practical solution at present for providing comprehensive access to reviews in the humanities.

The last quarter of a century has witnessed an enormous advance in the production of library catalogs, the fundamental bibliographical tools for students in the humanities and social studies. When the 167 volumes of *A Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards* appeared in 1942-46, it was not only a great accomplishment in itself but also a challenge to get other basic catalogs (above all, that of the British Museum) into print. G. K. Hall of Boston and Mansell of London have performed important services for humanistic scholarship in this field. Catalogs such as those of the Hispanic Society or the Wing Collection in the Newberry Library provide bibliographical information and much more direct access to these great collections than scholars have ever had before. The *Deutscher Gesamtkatalog* was perhaps the major bibliographical casualty of the 1939-1945 war; and, while there is little hope of its resumption (showing, *inter alia*, books recorded in the first fourteen volumes which no longer exist), the very useful German regional union catalogs might someday be interfiled and printed in book form. Perhaps more immediately practical are works such as the *Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoj pečati XVIII veka* (1962-1966), a well-nigh complete catalog of eighteenth-century Russian imprints. Eighteenth-century scholars in western Europe are urgently in need of similar works for their linguistic areas. Such a project has been widely discussed for several years by students of eighteenth-century English literature.

A category of library catalogs of particular interest to humanistic scholars are catalogs of incunabula. Frederick Goff's *Incunabula in*

The Humanities

American Libraries; A Third Census . . . (1964) is the third successful effort to record fifteenth-century imprints in North American libraries; and the strong backing of the sponsor, the Bibliographical Society of America, makes a fourth census a reasonable certainty in due time. On the other hand, the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* presents problems of considerably greater magnitude. Halted at the end of Lieferung 1 of volume VIII, the GW is now underway again with the valiant efforts of the staff of the Inkunabelabteilung of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek (East German torso of the old Preussische Staatsbibliothek). It receives relatively little support other than from libraries, individual scholars, and the publishers, Hiersemann of Stuttgart and H. P. Kraus of New York. The great foundations and the official agencies of all nations have invested far greater sums in projects of far less value.

A serious problem for humanistic scholarship is bibliographical control of microforms. When microforms became widely used in the late 1930s, they were produced in geometrically increasing quantities, with little thought of the problems of identification and cataloging. One major project, that of the microfilm edition of English books printed before 1640, based on A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave's *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of Books in English Printed Abroad to the Year 1640* (1926), was accompanied by catalog cards, but these cards were produced on the initiative of and by an institution, not the publisher. Fortunately, the film is identifiable by STC number and can be retrieved simply by checking a copy of the STC; but this is not true of many other microform projects of staggering proportions. One, with well over 10,000 titles, even attempts to remedy the deficiency of cataloging by printing a form card with the name of each author in the collection, indicating that all of his works published in the chronological and regional scope of the project are available in the collection! Today the gospel of providing catalog cards to accompany microform editions has still not yet penetrated to all publishers. Alone among microform publishers at this time, the Erasmus Press, Falls City Microforms, the Lost Cause Press, and General Microfilm provide catalog cards for all of their publications, without exception, running to some 8,000 titles in 1972.

In addition to providing catalog cards, each group should be accompanied by a list, and these lists should be cumulated, in full bibliographical detail, into book catalog with supplements as necessary. The first catalog of this type was that of G. William Bergquist, *Three Centuries of English and American Plays* (1963), recording some 5,000 ti-

ties in the project to copy on "microprint" British plays, 1500-1810, and United States plays, 1714-1830. The French, Spanish, and German plays issued by Falls City Microforms, much larger in scope in each instance, are represented by printed catalogs, and supplements are in preparation. Falls City's catalog of its English and American plays of the nineteenth century on microfiche is in press, and so too is its catalog of French revolutionary pamphlets on microfiche. A very important by-product of adequate catalog cards for microforms is that the way is then easy to inclusion of all titles in the *National Union Catalog of Microforms*. Bibliographical control of microforms on all fronts is a critical problem for libraries today; and, as one frustrated scholar faced by thousands of improperly indexed and cataloged rolls said, he would prefer the chore of *mulgere hercum*.

Along with microforms, the major technical development of our times is mechanized information retrieval. Although many devices such as edge-notched cards, see-through or "feature" cards, and related systems can often be applied to problems in humanistic research, we can discuss here, and then only very briefly, the impact of the high-speed digital computer and its offspring and elaboration in the last two decades. Its impact on the field of humanism has been mainly in the area of indexing and compilation of concordances, although it also has a potential use for detailed textual studies. Matters such as variant texts and readings, compositors' errors of all varieties, or all types of typographical problems might well be subjected to computer analysis; but only the human machine can identify ghosts, deliberate interpolations or deletions, or psychological conditions of the author and compositor.

The journal *Computers and the Humanities*, published at Queens College of the City University of New York in Flushing, has some highly suggestive articles. For example, a study of a project for a concordance to *Faust* (IV [1970], 161-171) by Theodore C. Hines, Jessica L. Harris, and Charlotte L. Levy offers a method which can readily be applied to other similar literary works. The series of *Deutsche Wortindizes* being issued by de Gruyter in Berlin has covered Büchner's works and Keller's *Die Leute von Seldwyla* and *Der grüne Heinrich* thus far. The machines have produced work that a Cruden or a Bartlett might have relegated to underpaid amanuenses, but with considerably greater accuracy. The final printout is not as pretty as a typographical job, but it is equally practical. On the other hand, no aspiring young scholar should view the editing of a computer-produced concordance as a quick road to fame. The editor must apply the same critical judg-

The Humanities

ment to the preparation and execution of the work as did Cruden or Bartlett. But he will not be responsible for routine chores of which the mind of man is unworthy, and can apply himself to greater refinement of the job at hand. Such has been the role of mechanical devices in the world of the intellect ever since the chisel was supplanted by the calamus.

The flowering and refinement of two older technologies, offset printing and photography, is the basis of the modern eye-legible reprint industry; but the great expansion of the reprint business in the last two decades has been due mainly to the proliferation of higher institutions and their libraries in Western Europe and America and the increased financial resources of the older ones. Again here, scientific works were the first to be reprinted; but in the 1960s there was a veritable deluge of reprints in the humanities and social studies, estimated to be equal to all previous reprints since Senefelder's invention was used by book publishers. In particular humanistic bibliography has benefited, and not simply by having back in print fairly recent books. Thus the 1755 edition of Liono Allacci's *Drammaturgia*, never superseded, tedious as it may be to use, has been reprinted by the Bottega d'Erasmus of Torino. Several of the invaluable bibliographies of nineteenth-century authors by Thomas James Wise are now available again, a situation about to trigger reprints of the Wise forgeries themselves! Medina's invaluable Hispanic-American bibliographies, nearly all on wretched paper, are now available in much more durable form. In general the reprinting of humanistic bibliographies has been more judicious than reprinting in most other fields, although there have been a few bibliographies that might better have been put aside for revision and expansion.

A significant trend in literary scholarship which is having a profound effect on descriptive bibliography are the methods of textual analysis developed by Walter Greg and Fredson Bowers and his school. For a half century now bibliographical scholars have been examining the texts of older English writers and bringing to bear every technique of typographical and other physical evidence, as well as circumstances of composition and transmission of the author's original, to establish reliable texts. There has been an especially strong emphasis on this variety of bibliography in the United States; and it has spread wherever Bowers's students have moved from its *fons et origo* at the University of Virginia. For example, a group of bibliographical scholars at the University of South Carolina has established a counterpart to *Studies in Bibliography* (organ of the Bibliographical Society of the University of

Virginia) in the form of *Proof, the Yearbook of American Bibliographical and Textual Studies* (1971-date). The "Pittsburgh Series in Bibliography" from the University of Pittsburgh Press has already produced noteworthy bibliographies of Hart Crane and F. Scott Fitzgerald in this new tradition. The Indiana edition of Howells and the Ohio State edition of Hawthorne have applied the Greg-Bowers methods to classic American authors with salubrious results as far as the establishment of a proper text is concerned. In the future historians and critics of literature will be treading on dangerous ground when they do not have reliable texts at their disposal.

The enumerative bibliography of current literary scholarship has been revised and reorganized substantially in the last quarter of a century. At the end of the 1930s only classical and German studies, among literary disciplines, had adequate current bibliographies in *L'Année philologique* and the *Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur* (1921-36/39). The expansion of the old *MLA Bibliography* to the *MLA International Bibliography* in the years after 1955 has been the most significant event of our time in the field of enumerative literary bibliography. It indexes well over a thousand serials as well as books, Festschriften, and other vehicles of scholarly publication. It is not difficult to find secondary or ephemeral work cited here, but what editor or editors can easily develop a better policy?

As we have noted before, the specialist is rarely satisfied by omnibus bibliographies covering all of his broad field on account of their tardiness, their lack of critical perspective in many cases, and their omissions. The Renaissance scholar, for example, has been nourished from his academic cradle on the annual bibliography of his field in *Studies in Philology* and is not eager to have to excavate his references from a massive work fifty times its size. The annual *American Literary Scholarship* (1963-date) states in the foreword that there is active collaboration with the *MLA International Bibliography's* editors, thus frankly admitting the need for some little duplication. On the other hand, *American Literary Scholarship* continues a long tradition of critical, narrative bibliography begun a century ago by Bursian's *Jahresbericht* (continued by *Lustrum*, 1957-date) for classical studies, the *Year's Work in English Studies* (1919/20-date), the *Year's Work in Modern Language Studies* (1929/30-date), and *Germanistik* (1960-date). Entries may be duplicated, but the critical analysis is an urgent need of serious scholars.

The Humanities

Much more distressing is the duplication of the biennial *Bibliographie der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft* (Frankfurt am Main, 1945/53-date) and the *Jahresbericht für deutsche Sprache und Literatur* (Leipzig, 1940/45-date). However, there are other equally grave duplications of bibliographies in the two Germanies, notably the national bibliography, and it must be recognized (with regret) that the bibliographer cannot influence the politician.

One of the major improvements in coverage of current publications on a national literature is Otto Klapp's *Bibliographie der französischen Literaturwissenschaft* (1956/58-date). There was, of course, the useful bibliography in the *Revue de l'histoire littéraire de la France* (1894-date), but it was far from being as extensive in coverage as the work established by Klapp. Presumably the *Repertorio bibliografico della letteratura italiana* (2 vols., covering 1948-1953) will be continued, just as it continues Prezzolini; but a current bibliography is needed urgently. Hispanic studies are in a much worse shape. If the old *Bibliographie hispanique*, issued annually from 1905 to 1917 by the Hispanic Society, could be revived on a broader basis to include all Hispanic and Luso-American areas, a serious lacuna in modern literary bibliography would be filled. The splintering of Hispanic culture and the lack of a recognized metropolis is a deterrent. In the Soviet Union *Novaia sovetskaia literatura po literaturovedeniiu* and *Novaia inostrannaia literatura po literaturovedeniiu* not only cover Russian literature adequately but also pick up a great deal that is missed by the MLA.

Linguistic bibliography was largely confined to works for students of single language or groups of languages until the *Bibliographie linguistique* (1948-date) began to appear annually in 1951, supplementing the two volumes of the *Bibliographie linguistique des années 1939-1947* (1949-1950). It covers the languages of the world, thus overlapping to some degree the *MLA International Bibliography* and bibliographies of national literatures and languages. Most appropriately, it has been supported by UNESCO. From 1913 to 1948 there was adequate critical bibliography of Indo-European languages in the *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*, a serial continued by *Kratylos; kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionsorgan für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* (1956-date). Linguistics, perhaps as much as any discipline, needs a current critical review of the literature, particularly in view of the uncertainty and divergence among scholars about such matters as the language of Linear B or the languages of Asia Minor in the second millennium B.C. Further, linguistic bibliography needs to expand to coverage

of related literature in biological and behavioral sciences, areas which have not always had the full respect of linguists in the older tradition.

Philosophy is another field which has enjoyed the budgetary favors of UNESCO. The useful *Répertoire bibliographique de la philosophie* (1949-date), published quarterly in Louvain by the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie indexes virtually all important philosophical journals and also picks up pertinent articles in other journals. There is a list of book reviews in the November issue of each year. The *Bibliographie de la philosophie* (1937-1958; superseded by a quarterly of the same title, 1954-date) is now an abstract journal covering books only. Section 19 of the *Bulletin signalétique* of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (C.N.R.S.) covers philosophy and indexes journals from the entire world, giving brief abstracts in French. Despite some duplication, the current bibliography of philosophy is in good condition, certainly much better than it was a half century back when the philosopher had to depend on Ueberweg and several current sources of bibliographical information.

UNESCO has also favored a related field by subsidizing the *International Bibliography of the History of Religions* (1954-date), issued under the auspices of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies and the International Association for History of Religions. It records journals and books and includes all major religions, ancient and modern. Unfortunately, it is quite tardy in appearance, a factor which limits its usefulness as a current tool. Since 1949 the American Theological Library Association has been issuing the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*, a work which has grown considerably in scope but is still far from providing adequate coverage of the field. Retrospective bibliography of the history of religion and of theology in general must be picked up from a variety of sources; but the best points of departure are the third edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1956-1962) and the second edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (1957-1966). There is considerable overlap in the bibliographies of philosophy and religion, but it would be difficult to avoid. Scholars in both fields need their own bibliographies, current and retrospective.

The bibliography of music and musicology is rich, although it faces several problems, especially the matter of being up to date. Both the *Bibliographie des Musikschritftums* (1936-date) and the *Music Index* (1949-date) are quite late in appearance. The latter indexes some 200 periodicals, but the former also includes books, reviews, and essays in

The Humanities

sources other than journals. A subsidy from some official source might help both to be more prompt. Retrospective music bibliography must be gathered from various sources, but *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1951-1968) will get the scholar off the ground in most subjects. The bibliography of music itself is generally covered adequately on a national basis.

A few broad conclusions may be drawn about the current status of humanistic bibliography. Due to the proliferation of publication in all fields, bibliographers have had to expand their activities greatly, often with financial assistance from governments and foundations on a scale unprecedented before the middle of this century. The expansion of current bibliographical coverage to several fields which have not hitherto enjoyed it is an encouraging sign; but there are still areas which do not have current bibliographies relating especially to these subjects. The development of monumental bibliographies covering many fields, notably the *MLA International Bibliography*, is a source of some duplication and overlap, but much of it is justified. Political conditions have influenced scholarship as never before, and, in the case of the two Germanies, have been responsible for much wasted effort in the form of duplication of work. One area of partial duplication is in the form of the critical narrative resumé of current research such as *Lustrum* or *Kratylos*; but these organs serve a useful purpose in pulling out the truly relevant material. The coverage of material other than periodical articles and books, notably essays in homage volumes and dissertations, has improved substantially in the last quarter of a century, and the problem now is to keep such bibliographies up to date or to insure that the material appears in other current organs and is adequately indexed. Some fields still suffer from the tardiness of their current bibliographies, but this is an old complaint that extends to all varieties and genres of humanistic scholarship.

It may properly be asked whether existing bibliographies, both serial and nonserial, in the humanities reflect trends in scholarship or even meet the needs of humanistic scholarship today. The answer is, in general, negative. It may safely be stated that no bibliography has ever been universally satisfactory, and this situation is particularly true in the humanities for reasons already indicated. But it is not too difficult to identify areas where improvement is possible, if only time, energy, and funds are available. Perhaps the greatest need is subject indexing in depth. No index can be too detailed. A classified arrangement of a bibliography or an encyclopaedia with only an index of names is rarely

satisfactory. To identify the varied trends in modern textual criticism, to pull together all the outgrowths of the Chomsky school of linguistics, to identify new techniques of programming computers for indexes and concordances is not possible without the expenditure of needless hours or days of effort to wade through a monolithic work such as the *MLA International Bibliography*. The ideal for many specialists is a narrative critical bibliography of the "Year's Work" genre, currently exemplified in such organs as *Lustrum* and *Kratylos*. Even bibliographies without annotation but confined to narrow fields will reflect trends and methods of research to the specialist who knows the field well, but not to the outsider. The "Checklists" in *Studies in Bibliography* mean relatively little to the scholar who is not already *au jour* with the rapid changes in this field that are taking place today.

Perhaps one of the gravest deficiencies of bibliographies of fields international in scope is the failure to cover all countries and all languages with equal effectiveness. There is still a vast corpus of Soviet literature in all fields before the 1960s which was not identified and recorded by bibliographers in western Europe. A cursory examination of *International Bibliography of the History of Religions* and the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* and of the *Répertoire bibliographique de la philosophie* reveals serious lacunae in coverage of the literature in oriental languages. Such gaps are partially filled by specialized bibliographies of Islamic studies, Indology, Japanology, and so on; but many of these bibliographies are closed books to the student of the history of philosophy or religion on account of the lack of annotation of work in non-European languages. The linguistic arrogance of the European from the Alexandrians on has forced the Oriental to read or even write in Greek, Latin, French, German, or English in different ages. In the meanwhile, those who read only in the latter three languages, or understand bibliographies only in these languages are committing grave errors of omission. We will only know how grave this situation is when the coverage of each "international" bibliography is examined with careful attention to detail.

Humanistic bibliographers can look back with some pride on their achievements since 1945, but the challenge of the future is grave. Above all, the humanities must seek a larger share of government and foundation funds. As long as they are available, they should be divided equitably among the various fields of human endeavor. More international cooperation, particularly in fields that are not limited to national interest such as literatures and language, will provide the bases for bet-

The Humanities

ter planned bibliographical control and make humanistic projects more attractive to those who give financial aid. A careful watch must be kept on technological developments and every effort made to take advantage of them to cut down on drudgery and to expand bibliographical coverage of all varieties. The bibliographer still needs to remind the nonbibliographical scholar that our work provides the sinews of any discipline. To paraphrase Seneca, *Biblioteca sine bibliographia mors est, et librorum virorumque sepultura.*