

# Reviews of Books

HENRY P. BEERS, *Editor*

*National Archives*

---

## SPECIAL NOTICE

The list of reviewers for the *American Archivist* is being revised, and all members of the Society who wish to receive books for review are asked to complete the form appearing on the last page of this issue and to mail it to the address indicated.

## BIOGRAPHY

*Un Bourgeois sous trois républiques*, par Charles Braibant. (Paris, Buchet-Chastel, 1961. 435 p. 16.50 fr.)

The chief interest of this autobiography by France's distinguished archivist emeritus lies not in its archival content but in its reflection of a witty, thoughtful, and humane personality and its account of growing up, going to school, and becoming politically conscious in an intelligent middle-class French milieu during the period from Boulanger to de Gaulle. It is a pleasure to read, also, for what seems to this barbarian reviewer to be its easy and vivid Gallic style. (M. Braibant's Gallic quality is illustrated by his confession that he is a complete blockhead about other languages except Latin, "which is the oldest form of French.")

Among his nonarchival achievements are four novels (one of which won a literary prize); a collection of short stories; five miscellaneous books of memoirs, essays, and wartime diaries; and the creation of an organization for the fostering of international good will.

On the professional side, he tells us—all too briefly—about his own, French, version of records management, the "mission des archives": how, in a particular case, because of a failure to preserve properly, he entrusted such a mission at the Ministry of Finance to an archives agent or emissary who was "an excellent archivist experienced in the study of economic and fiscal problems." He revitalized the archives of the French navy and merchant marine, reorganized the network of naval reference libraries, and created or re-created a number of naval and maritime museums. He developed a system for ready reference to administrative issuances while in the navy's historical

---

The editor of the *American Archivist* announces with regret that Dr. Beers, after more than 8 years as reviews editor, has resigned from the editorial staff. Books for review and related communications should be addressed hereafter to Geneva H. Penley, Room 303, Library, The National Archives, Washington, D.C. 20408. Miss Penley succeeds Dr. Beers as reviews editor effective with our April 1965 issue.

service and—on a larger scale—a method for an almost automatic subject-indexing of “dossiers.” He adopted the policy of making France’s regional depositories “centers for contemporary documentation” for the use of the citizen as well as the local official. He worked tirelessly to increase the number, pay, and prestige of archivists in the government; and he broke down a prejudice against women archivists.

It is to be hoped that he will give us a systematic book on archival theory and practice. In any case, we should welcome the publication of a collection of M. Braibant’s technical and theoretical professional papers, of which there must be many of great general interest.

Arlington, Va.

PAUL LEWINSON

#### MANUALS

*Elsevier’s Lexicon of Archive Terminology Compiled . . . by a Committee of the International Council on Archives.* (Amsterdam, Elsevier Publishing Co., 1964. [viii], 83 p. \$4.)

According to the preface by Jean Herbert, general editor of the Elsevier Lexica, one of the first tasks assumed by the International Council on Archives was “de préciser et de normaliser la terminologie et d’en déterminer les correspondances dans diverses langues.” French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, and Dutch were the languages selected at the Second International Archives Congress (1953), and a committee under the chairmanship of Herman Hardenberg of the Netherlands has worked for 10 years to produce the lexicon under review.

The bulk of the book consists of 175 definitions given in clear and simple French, each entry being completed by the equivalent term or terms in the six languages. The entries are arranged under six main headings, which may be translated as “documents,” “structure of archives,” “descriptive methods,” “preservation,” “administration,” and “use and reproduction.” The first heading is broken down into six sections, and one of these is further subdivided into “documents stitched” and “documents unstitched.” Although this general pattern works up to a point, the basis of arrangement is sometimes obscure and there are a few surprises. Thus it is open to question whether “box” or “skippet” is really at home under *Documents non cousus*: do they not rightly belong under *Conservation des archives*, which deals with all aspects of physical care from shelving to lamination? One regrets that in this latter section no room was found for any mention of the terms relating to the physical characteristics of records (such as parchment, watermarks, inks, and seals) or to the basic repair materials used over the centuries. There is some overlapping between sections III and V, *Instruments de travail* and *Opérations techniques du traitement des archives*, owing probably to the apportionment of topics among committee members in the early days and to difficulties in fusing entries in the final stages. Since the volume is based on French terminology one may perhaps be permitted to ask how many terms commonly

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

used elsewhere have been omitted simply because the French haven't a word for them. Noticeable omissions seem to indicate a bias in favor of medieval and midmodern times, for the records manager will look in vain for his letter books, tags, registries, and manuals of procedure. If the bias is accurately judged, however, there seems no good reason for the omission of "codex" or "chancery." "Weeding" appears as the English equivalent of *triage*, but there is no mention of "stripping." Don't the French have a word for it, archivally speaking?

The last quarter of the book is occupied by alphabetical tables in each language and thus directs one to the main entries in the text. Because the volume is slender, the compilers were right—at the outset—to decide against having cross-references in these tables: yet this original policy might have been tempered somewhat in favor of bringing in a few alternates and synonyms as soon as it became obvious (at the proof stage, if not earlier) that not all the space allotted to each table would be filled. Many an English-speaking user may well be baffled until he recalls the synonyms for bays (racks), schedules (lists), signatures (quires), and leaves (pagination).

On the whole, however, these criticisms slip into the shade if one reminds oneself that this lexicon is after all the first of its kind for archivists and that the compilers had no archival precedents to draw upon. Communications between archivists in the Western World will be greatly facilitated by this publication: for the first time they will know exactly what their colleagues in other countries mean by such specialized terms as *une analyse*, *an act*, or *een plakkaat*, for instance. From this first lexicon it may be hoped that a more comprehensive work will one day emerge that will be truly international and representative of its time. The policy of the Elsevier Lexica is to select languages "in which substantial literature is available on the subject." Is this truly the reason for the choice of the six languages, or were they selected because of their obvious usefulness to archivists in lands that have achieved independence from West European domination in the past 188 years? (If this be so, then the absence of Portuguese is inexplicable.) One has an uncomfortable feeling that the absence of Slavic terms underlines the presumption that Western Europe remains the cradle of archival techniques! When a second edition is prepared one would like to know more about the reasons for selecting the languages and to learn something of the compilers' aims and the main stages in the evolution of the lexicon.

All in all, however, the lexicon is good value for money, and it represents both scholarship and good intentions. Every archivist should have a copy alongside his Schellenberg and Jenkinson.

McGill University

ALAN D. RIDGE

Great Britain, Public Record Office. *The Preparation of Records for Transfer (Revised) Supplementing Paragraphs 70-80 of A Guide for Departmental Records Officers (Revised)*. ([London], 1964. 26 p.)

In my review of *A Guide for Departmental Records Officers (Provisional)* (see *American Archivist*, 22: 340-341; July, 1959), I expressed the belief

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1965

that that work would be likely to meet British needs for a considerable time. This opinion was presumptuous. Not only was there a revision as early as 1962, but we now have a supplement to the "Revised" manual dealing exclusively and in detail with the preparation of records for transfer to the Public Record Office, a subject that was accorded only 14 brief paragraphs in the 1962 *Guide*.

This supplemental publication contains notes, instructions, and examples for arranging, listing, numbering, packing, and labeling archival items and series far more precise and exacting than any existing for the National Archives of the United States, or, so far as the writer knows, for any American State archives. At the national level, the NARS Records Management Handbook, *Federal Records Centers* (revised Jan. 1963), containing detailed instructions for transfer of records from our "departmental" offices to intermediate records centers, is simply not comparable to the work under review in either purpose or scope. Regardless of some basic differences in archival organization, nature of records, and criteria of selection, we in the United States might well produce a comparable set of instructions to guide both records centers and archives staffs in their detailed work of selecting permanent records for transfer to the National Archives. Only general guidance is provided by the "files retention plans" now being developed by the records appraisal staff of the National Archives.

The British system continues to place the burden of cost of selection and preparation of archives for transfer to the Public Record Office on the office originating the records. The exacting nature of the requirement is justified on the grounds of diversity of records and the large number of offices dealt with. Records officers are warned that "much needless waste of time, labour and materials can be avoided if the Public Record Office is consulted before any work has begun . . ." because the guidance given in the booklet "can hardly cater for all eventualities."

*National Archives*

SHERROD EAST

"A Proposal for the Management of Judicial Records in Illinois," by John W. Metzger. (In *Illinois Libraries*, 46: 393-445; May 1964.)

This report was prepared and paid for by the Illinois Local Records Commission. The commission employed John W. Metzger, assistant dean and associate professor of law at the University of Illinois, to supervise the study and write the report, which will soon be available under separate cover from the commission's office in Springfield.

In his introduction, Dean Metzger expresses a knowledge and insight of government operation that few academic men possess:

No, the public official has not neglected his duty in attempting to solve his records management problems. To the contrary, he has ordinarily done his best to find workable solutions. But, unlike his counterpart in the business world, he has not had the advice of experts in the field. Neither has he had the financial resources to develop sophisticated business methods and techniques. Unlike the business executive, the

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

public official must operate within an atmosphere where political judgments override business judgments. And, unlike the business executive, the public official cannot exercise his own discretion without first securing the approval of some legislative body which is not really equipped to deal with a problem essentially administrative in nature.

Dean Metzger also reveals an unusual understanding of modern recordkeeping by stating that the length of time a document should be retained depends upon its administrative use and archival value and that it is incongruous to require that records be kept but then not to provide proper and adequate space and staff to preserve and service them. He recognizes, however, that such is the case in many instances; his purpose is to stimulate Illinois officialdom into corrective action. He has produced a report that should accomplish this purpose not only in Illinois but in other States too.

The study is based upon an examination of existing statutes in Illinois and other States—notably Colorado, North Carolina, and Maryland—plus an actual physical inventory of court records maintained by several counties. The advice and comments of several organizations representing local officials were also obtained. A basic problem (“the general confusion over what actually constitutes the ‘record’ in Illinois Courts”), which had presented itself from the outset, was not resolved. Some thought that the original file was the “record copy,” some designated the record books made up by the clerk, and a few thought both were involved. Dean Metzger suggests that the legislature or the supreme court solve this problem and states that the greatest single fault of the present records system is duplication.

In a recommendation that will no doubt cause controversy, Dean Metzger gives a sweeping endorsement to microfilm by stating: “The advantages afforded by microfilming are so numerous and so compelling that we recommend it as the finest available solution to the overcrowded court house. Indeed, it is so far superior to present methods that it is certain to become the commonly accepted method of maintaining public records.” He does caution public officials to seek advice and aid from those having extensive experience in microfilming procedures, and he reports that in Illinois the Local Records Commission has adopted regulations controlling microfilming.

In part V, entitled “Some Miscellaneous Recommendations,” Dean Metzger comments on the use of flat filing, the type of file folder, the format of court documents, looseleaf binders versus bound volumes, and maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of court records. He also mentions that some court records may have unusual historical significance and should be preserved even though they would be disposable under law.

Parts VI, VII, and VIII contain the major recommendations and the proposed retention and disposal schedules. Although the recommendations are not presented as the only solutions, they do represent the distillation of considerable data and thought and could serve as a sound basis of action by the legislature or the supreme court not only in Illinois but also in other States. They are not simply a remodeling of the existing system but a complete new method of court recordkeeping procedures. They are designed to reduce the amount of “copy work” the clerk must now do, to reduce the duplication of data, to

reduce the amount of time spent to refer to the record, to improve the availability of the record, and to do these things in less space, with less costly equipment, and with less risk of the loss of records either through misfiling or destruction.

The Illinois Local Records Commission is to be commended for its sagacity and Dean Metzger for completing his assignment with such understanding and resoluteness. Let us hope that his work will help to achieve a more efficient, less costly, and yet sound court records system in every State.

*Michigan Historical Commission*

BRUCE C. HARDING

#### FINDING AIDS

*A Guide to the Manuscript Collection of the Rutgers University Library*, comp. by Herbert F. Smith. (New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1964. xi, 179 p.)

This guide to manuscripts in the Special Collections Department of Rutgers University Library on the New Brunswick campus is designed to aid "any searcher, amateur or professional, who is capable of using" the resources of the department.

Dr. Smith has produced an excellent piece of work, bound to be invaluable to any user of the fine collection built almost entirely within the past 35 years. The 1,309 listings of groups and collections encompass a total of more than half a million items, a sure indication of rapid growth of the collection, which has come almost entirely from generous donors.

Undoubtedly the greatest concentration is in papers pertaining to New Jersey and records of their various activities left by New Jerseymen. There is no means of determining the exact proportion of New Jersey material to the whole, but a check of the 15 groups of personal and family papers listed on pages 50-51 reveals that 12 of them are New Jersey-related papers. Other varied non-Jersey materials include the large Kriendler Memorial Collection of literary manuscripts and typescripts of works by recent American and British authors and the papers of Theodore Stanton of Ithaca, a European literary agent for Harper Brothers and the *North American Review*.

The book is handily divided into sections as follows: Personal and Family Papers, 717 groups in alphabetical order, by far the largest section and more than half the total of groups; Churches and Other Religious Bodies; Business, 168 groups; Military Organizations; Miscellaneous Societies and Clubs; Schools and Educational Bodies; Groups Concerned With Social and Welfare Problems; Governmental Bodies and Agencies; Transportation; Court Records; Literary and Musical Bodies; Monographs and Compilations; and Rutgers University Archives, 70 groups.

The detailed data of each entry include the name of the person or organization who accumulated the group, location, inclusive dates, description of the material, size of the group, whether cataloged, and the accession number. If material has been described or used as source material for an article, the

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

reference is given. In his introduction the compiler states of his book, "It is not and it is not intended to be an index to individual items in the collection." There is, however, an alphabetical index of entries.

Turning the leaves of the section on Personal and Family Papers, one may perceive the scope and quality of the collection. There are papers of the Boudinot and Frelinghuysen families, the Washington A. Roebling papers, the Henry Rutgers collection, the John O. H. Pitney collection, and papers of Philip Freneau, Washington Irving, Anthony Walton White, Walter Rutherford, and Woodrow Wilson. The value of such records is greatly enhanced for scholars by this carefully prepared compilation by Dr. Smith. By referring to this fine guide researchers everywhere can come to know these papers sufficiently well to decide on consulting them. It is a real aid to scholarship.

*New Jersey Historical Society*

ROBERT M. LUNNY

*Picture Sources*, ed. by Celestine G. Frankenberg. (2d enlarged and revised edition; New York, Special Libraries Association, 1963. viii, 224 p. \$6.75.)

This reference tool for the users of pictorial materials, particularly photographs, fulfills a promise of the Picture Division of the Special Libraries Association, made in 1959, to publish another edition of its *Picture Sources; an Introductory List* within 5 years. (See *American Archivist*, 23: 196-197, Apr. 1960, for a review by Hermine M. Baumhofer of the first edition.)

The new edition is similar in organization and in scope to the first, but it contains almost twice as many concise descriptions of sources of pictorial materials available in libraries, historical societies, professional organizations, chambers of commerce, museums, commercial and industrial firms, and other depositories including many sources in Government agencies and a few in collections located outside the United States. In all, some seven hundred pictorial collections are described.

Each entry descriptive of a source provides the name and address of the institution and the name and telephone number of the person on the staff most likely to be able to provide immediate reference service, together with a summary of the subject content of the collection, the period covered, and directions for ordering reproductions. Each section, such as "Transportation" or "Fine, Graphic, and Applied Arts," is followed by an excellent bibliography of related picture-finding tools. New features of the book are an alphabetical and a geographical list of sources, essential because of the grouping of entries in sections representing general subject areas.

*Picture Sources* is the result of the combined endeavor of members of the Picture Division of the Special Libraries Association to make their collections more easily available to professional users of pictures, particularly advertising agencies, picture editors, script writers of television productions, and commercial artists. It does not seek to provide teachers or educators with sources of

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1965



visual-aid materials for use in the schools. Its coverage of New York City depositories is particularly strong, and its index refers to descriptions of pictorial material on more than 750 subjects.

*National Archives*

JOSEPHINE COBB

*The Béla Bartók Archives: History and Catalogue*, by Victor Bator. (New York, Bartók Archives, 1963. 39 p., illus. \$5.)

This handsome publication, devoted to the papers left by one of the most important composers of modern times (and a giant among musicians of all times), reflects great credit upon its author, who is also in charge of the materials it describes. It includes a history of the Béla Bartók Archives, a well-arranged checklist of its contents, an indication of its gaps, and examples of the descriptive devices employed to make its contents accessible. One may regret only that there is no discussion of the procedures governing the use of these devices. They appear on their face to have possibilities in connection with the description of other small or moderate-sized collections of the papers of artistic and creative personalities. Perhaps such a discussion would be more appropriately published separately; it might make an interesting and valuable article in our own professional press.

Mr. Bator is eloquent on the importance of preserving the manuscripts and other documentary memorabilia of creative personalities in the arts, not only on "sentimental" (deplorable word!) but on practical grounds: origins, intentions, interpretation, performance, etc.

The worlds of music and of archivy may be grateful both to Bartók himself for the pains he took to form his archives and to Mr. Bator for the intelligence and zeal with which he has labored on their preservation and enlargement. Archivists in particular will be gratified by the evidence that this publication gives of Mr. Bator's awareness of archival literature bearing on his problems.

*Arlington, Va.*

PAUL LEWINSON

U.S. National Archives, *Preliminary Inventory* [no. 157] *of the General Records of the Department of State (Record Group 59)*, comp. by Daniel T. Goggin and H. Stephen Helton. (Washington, The National Archives, 1963. ix, 311 p. Processed. Free on request.)

This letter-size paperback is the first systematic guide to those records of the State Department held by the National Archives. Compiled primarily for use by Archives staff members, this volume will also prove invaluable to anyone bent on research in American diplomatic history or in the institutional history of the Department of State.

The *Inventory* divides logically into two main parts. Part I describes the central files of the Department, *i.e.*, diplomatic, consular, and miscellaneous correspondence. Part II describes the records that, for historical or adminis-

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST



trative reasons, are not part of the central files. Order has been made out of chaos by listing these latter subgroups in alphabetical sequence.

Two outstanding features of this work are its nine appendixes and a comprehensive index (usually missing from such inventories). The 51 pages of appended material list such items as diplomatic instructions and despatches, notes to and from foreign missions, and consular despatches, in each case giving the inclusive dates and number of volumes.

In all, *Inventory*, no. 157, assays well. It is guaranteed to yield high-grade nuggets to the skimmer and a mother lode to the serious searcher. Nor are the records themselves beyond reach. At the end of each series the reader is told if the items are obtainable on microfilm. Most of the important series are. In sum, this finding aid should be in every university library worthy of the name.

*George Washington University*

PETER P. HILL

*Roster of the Confederate Soldiers of Georgia, 1861-1865*, comp. by Lillian Henderson. (Hapeville, Ga., Longino & Porter, Inc., 1959-64. 6 vols.; \$7.50 per vol. [Order from Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Ga.] )

In publishing the records of the American Civil War it has been the desire of historians and researchers to see published for general use the rosters of the men who served. Soon after the war the Northern States had the rosters of their men published through the offices of their State adjutants general. Since copies of the muster rolls were available, this was a relatively simple task. The Southern States, however, initially lacking the necessary funds, found that the needed records were not easily available when they undertook to publish rosters of the men from their States. Many of the records that had survived the ravages of war were captured by the victorious Federal troops and sent to Washington, where access to them was restricted until they could be properly arranged. Several of the Southern States did publish rosters, but these proved to be inadequate because of numerous errors and their limited scope.

Volume I of the six Georgia volumes already published pertains to the infantry regiments from the State of Georgia that served in the Confederate Army. It covers 12 regiments, which are arranged into field and staff, band, and line companies, usually 10, but occasionally 12. The officers, listed first according to rank, are followed by the noncommissioned officers and privates, listed alphabetically. Each man's service record includes his rank, date of enlistment, and pertinent information concerning his military service. With the exception of the 1st Confederate Infantry there is no attempt to introduce the regiments by a brief organizational-historical sketch. At the end of the roster for Company K, 4th Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, is information recorded in the record of events on the company muster rolls. This was not a standard practice adopted for each company, however, as many company clerks failed to record anything on the rolls.

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1965

In style the editor adopted the paragraph as opposed to the column. This form saved space and allowed the inclusion of more material. Sources for the work include State pension applications, original muster rolls, compiled military service records in the National Archives, other original records, and secondary sources.

The six published volumes of Georgians in Confederate service cover only the infantry regiments. The cavalry, artillery, infantry battalions, and State and local units are not included. An index, necessary in this type of publication, is conspicuously absent. There is no index for the entire set either, and the failure to provide a foreword to each volume leaves the researcher without any guidelines for the publication itself. Nevertheless, the series is a definite contribution to the Civil War history of Georgia.

*N.C. Confederate Centennial Commission*

LOUIS H. MANARIN

#### REPORTS

Great Britain, Public Record Office. *The Fifth Annual Report of the Keeper of Public Records on the Work of the Public Record Office and the Fifth Report of the Advisory Council on Public Records 1963*. (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1964. 22 p. 2s. net.) [Also predecessor reports: the second, 1960 (pub. 1961, 22 p., 1s. 9d.); the third, 1961 (pub. 1962, 28 p., 2s. 6d.); and the fourth, 1962 (pub. 1963, 24 p., 2s.).]

Anyone who wishes to learn how the Public Record Office is operating under the Public Records Act of 1958 may find most of the answers in these four latest annual publications. As the duality of title indicates, each pamphlet contains two reports, both to the Lord High Chancellor: one from the Keeper of the Public Records, who from October 16, 1960, has been S. S. Wilson; the other from an Advisory Council of seven appointees of the Lord Chancellor, whose office in turn simultaneously transmits both reports to Parliament.

The Keeper's report averages about five-sixths of the terse pages in each capsule and the Council's report about one-sixth. The Keeper deals in the main with practice, statistics, and administration; the Council tends to echo these matters but rather more on a policy level.

Several key people have passed from the scene, and the constantly growing workload has necessitated an increase in staff to more than two hundred. During the latest report year, letter inquiries from the public amounted to 5,400, a fourth of them from overseas. Extra accommodations in the way of searchroom facilities have been added but have not yet reached a sufficiency to take care of peak usage.

A feature of the Keeper's report for 1963 is a list of over a hundred places of deposit "appointed under Section 4(1) of the Public Records Act 1958, instead of the Public Record Office, for particular classes of Public Records." All records of the British Museum, for example, are in the custody of the Museum itself. Certain classes of records of quarter sessions and other local

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

courts, hospitals and collieries, and probate records may be expected to go to designated county or borough record offices. As many as 634,000 linear feet of departmental records have reached intermediate repositories at Hayes and Yeading. The Public Record Office itself directly controls 260,000 linear feet of records, three-fifths at Chancery Lane and two-fifths at Ashridge.

The Keeper's report for 1962 gives a breakdown to show for each group of P.R.O. records the figures on foot-run (linear feet) and productions (services).

The Keeper's 1961 report tabulates and analyzes the results of a questionnaire to which all readers (searchers) for a considerable part of that year were invited to reply. A continuing effort is being made to find out what the users of the Public Record Office think about the institution and how it can better serve the needs of today.

An outstanding event of 1963 was the appearance of the two-volume *Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office*. Since the *Guide* describes holdings only to August 1960, a very real function of the pamphlets here under review is to provide annual summaries of newly transmitted, or in a few cases subtracted, records.

*National Historical Publications Commission*

H. B. FANT

**“. . . for this offence . . . a pecuniary penalty.”**

For several years I have made it a point to insist upon full analytical indexes to all our public documents but notwithstanding this our indexes are most miserly. It would be money well spent if the Government could by the payment of half a million dollars secure a complete analytical index of the papers published by the United States since the foundation of the Government. To show you that I have been thinking on this subject, I copy an entry made in my memorandum book two years ago, when I had some correspondence with Mr. Allibone on the subject—In his letter to me he quoted these passages:

So essential did I consider an index to every book, that I proposed to deprive an author who published a book without an index, of the privilege of copy-right and moreover to subject him, for this offence to a pecuniary penalty.

Lord Campbell's Lives Chief Justices, Vol. III, Preface.

If I had my own way in the modification of the copy right law, I think I would make the duration of the privilege depend materially on its having such a directory (an index).

Hon. Horace Binney.

Now I am ready to do all in my power in this direction and wish we could put you in charge of the work. Will you accept it?

—J. A. GARFIELD, Washington, to Dr. Francis Lieber, New York, May 8, 1868; letterpress copy of an autographic letter in Letters Sent, 1868, May 1 to Dec. 30, p. 28-29, James A. Garfield papers, Library of Congress.