Problems in the Use of Manuscripts

By JEAN PRESTON*

The Huntington Library

THE USE of manuscripts presents the librarian or archivist, whose job it is to look after them and make them available, with problems different from those that face the historian or scholar who uses manuscripts to interpret them. This article considers the curatorial problems of controlling access to manuscripts, of encouraging scholarly and preventing irresponsible use of manuscripts, and of making materials available by means of microfilm or other copies.

Manuscripts differ from any other kind of material in that no two are precisely alike; their preservation is the prime concern of the curator, and the need of protection from thieves and vandals calls for a careful admission policy. As a basic, minimal requirement the potential reader of manuscripts must at least be asked to identify himself, with some proof of his identity, and to write his name in an attendance book provided. This is all that is asked in the Public Archives of Canada,[1] for example, and in most English county record offices,[2] where probably it would occur to none but the expert that there might be something of monetary value. At the British Museum and the Public Record Office readers' cards are issued, and each application must bear the signature of a householder, vouching for the applicant's honesty, not his academic prowess. Usually more is required. The applicant should know how to handle manuscripts properly, and sometimes there is an age requirement:[3] 16 at the Library of Congress, 18 at the Pierpont Morgan Library. Often letters of recommendation are asked for, to show that a responsible person, usually academic, considers the applicant capable of han-

* The author is on the staff of the Department of Manuscripts of the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, Calif. Her article is based on a lecture given at the University of Oklahoma's conference on manuscripts management, Sept. 6, 1963. Miss Preston is grateful to A. M. Gibson, head of the manuscripts division of the University of Oklahoma Library, for the opportunity to consider these problems.

[1] For this information I am grateful to Sam Kula of the University of Southern California Libraries, formerly of the Public Archives of Canada at Ottawa.

[2] Lilian J. Redstone and Francis W. Steer, *Local Records: Their Nature and Care,* p. 99 (London, 1953).

[3] Georgia C. Haugh, "Reader Policies in Rare Book Libraries," in *Library Trends,* 5:467 (April 1957).

dling manuscripts. At Yale[4] honor students are allowed to use manuscripts for certain purposes, with instruction on how to handle them. Everywhere there are rules to protect the manuscripts: do not use ink, do not write or press on the manuscripts, do not smoke.

The curator may be concerned not only with the physical well-being of his manuscripts but also with the purpose for which they are to be consulted, and he may want to protect his manuscripts from the idly curious and the sensation seeker. The potential reader finds considerable differences of practice here, ranging from those institutions where manuscripts are freely available to anyone with a serious purpose, to specialized research libraries where a policy of controlled use of manuscripts allows access only to the advanced scholar. Archives are open to all, subject only to the physical preservation of the collections; for, as T. R. Schellenberg explains in *Modern Archives*, "Since public records are the property of the state, all citizens, who collectively constitute that state, have a right to their use."[5] Similarly a State-supported library must open its doors to insistent taxpayers. "Serious intent" is usually sufficient qualification to use manuscripts, and rarely are readers refused. The private libraries have a wide range of policy. One western historical society interprets its laws to mean that the society must allow anyone to use its manuscripts under any circumstances.[6] The more usual policy is to open manuscripts to "any adult who has proper identifying credentials, can offer a satisfactory explanation of why he is interested, and can prove through conversation that he has performed preliminary research and is familiar with his subject."[7] Some private libraries actively sponsor research and are very careful to maintain high standards for the use of their manuscripts as they do not want to be associated with poor scholarship—or the lack of it altogether. The Huntington Library is an example of one of these. It is not for the undergraduate or beginner in research, but for the mature scholar. Readers are admitted to use manuscripts only when they have exhausted the secondary sources in their fields and are thoroughly experienced in manuscript work. It is a library of last resort. This is well known in the area, so that local professors do not send their students to work on term papers. Some other private libraries are equally

[4] Howard B. Gotlieb, "The Undergraduate and Historical Manuscripts," in *American Archivist*, 23:27 (Jan. 1960).

[5] T. R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, p. 231 (Chicago, 1956).

[6] Robert L. Brubaker, "Manuscript Collections," in *Library Trends*, 13:244 (Oct. 1964).

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

discriminating. At the Clements Library the donor stated that users of the books and manuscripts were to be scholars and not the lay public, and that these scholars were to be engaged upon research projects of sufficient importance to justify the wear and tear on the source material used.[8] The Folger Library has similar regulations. Only by rigorously selecting their readers can these libraries offer their accustomed good services; the ratio of staff to readers must be a good deal higher than would be possible in, say, a university library where students come in thousands. As sponsors of research, the Huntington and the Folger Libraries both offer grants to "established scholars" to come to work on their materials, and this is another reason why they feel some degree of responsibility for the research done in their libraries.

Once the reader has gained access to the manuscripts department, there may be further curatorial hurdles for him, designed to protect frail or valuable manuscripts. Fragile materials are to be used sparingly, and libraries often have photostatic or other copies made and encourage the use of these instead of the original whenever possible. Certain manuscripts, even when repaired, require very careful handling, and their use must be restricted or access must be denied for this reason. All libraries have their special treasures that need extra protection, including rules against their overuse. At the Huntington Library, for example, readers who ask for the Ellesmere Chaucer are given the published facsimile instead, except in the rare cases where a study of the original is essential for textual purposes, and even then the Curator himself has to turn the leaves. The Huntington's rarest manuscripts bear distinguishing marks and are supplied to readers only with the specific consent of the Curator; this procedure acts as an additional safeguard against readers who are observed to be casual in their handling of manuscripts.

There are also reasons of another kind why the qualified reader may not obtain free access to manuscripts. Their content may necessitate curatorial restriction: in archives, for example, it is usually considered against the public interest to have recent records available for all to see, especially when the officials concerned are still alive. There must be a measure of privacy; otherwise the recordmakers might become self-conscious or else overdestructive when leaving office. The characteristic of archives is their integrity, and there must be no suspicion of official tampering to produce a more favorable image for posterity. The record must speak for

[8] Clements Library *Leaflet* no. 53.

itself, impartially. Apart from personalities, some subjects are regarded as confidential for other reasons. Military information may still be relevant to national security; foreign affairs records may affect current policy; personal and financial facts are given in confidence to State or Federal Government, and their public release would have a deleterious effect on business. For these and other reasons there is a time limit, and recent records are not open to the public. In Europe this time limit used to be a hundred years. It still is in some places, such as Spain and the Vatican Archives, but most countries now have a 50-year rule. In England's Public Record Office records are normally open to public inspection 50 years after their creation, but there are exceptions in both directions. Certain classes are open with no restriction, but a few "whose disclosure could endanger national security or cause distress or embarrassment to the persons or the immediate descendants of the persons named in them"[9] are closed for a hundred years. These latter are certain records of the Home Office, the Metropolitan Police, the National Assistance Board, the Prison Commission, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Treasury, and the War Office. The United States has a tradition of greater liberality, and according to the 1950 Federal Records Act all restrictions on records in the National Archives are automatically void after 50 years unless specifically extended by the Archivist of the United States. In fact, archives less than 50 years old are often fully accessible, whether in the National Archives or the Presidential Libraries, and even where restrictions exist they may be lifted in individual cases (though this may involve some security checking). Of course official inquirers from governmental agencies have a right to see their own records as required, whatever rules there may be for historians or the general public.

Libraries also have these same problems. The British Museum made a new ruling in July 1964 allowing free access to all papers of modern statesmen not subject to donors' restrictions, except that those papers "which are clearly identifiable by their markings as being the property of H.M. Government will be reserved under the existing fifty-year rule as applied to Departmental records. This restriction is maintained in order to harmonize with the current Departmental practice and would be reviewed if there was any change in that practice."[10] Although such papers, according to

[9] *Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office*, 2:vi (London, 1963).

[10] Quoted in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 37, no. 96:255 (Nov. 1964).

strict Jenkinsonian archive theory,[11] no longer qualify as archives and will never go to the Public Record Office, the reasons for the 50-year rule apply equally to the content of ex-archives housed in the British Museum. There are other occasions too when libraries are wise to make their own restrictions to protect the persons concerned from distress or embarrassment. A writer or statesman might destroy his papers rather than have his private letters read by all and sundry immediately, and the curator's suggestion that his papers be closed for a fixed time may encourage him to make them available for research. These arrangements may originate with the donor or the curator, for despite the legal ruling that once a donor has accepted a tax deduction he can no longer put restrictions on the use of his manuscripts—they must be an outright gift—the curator can impose such restrictions if he so chooses. He has to balance the claims of privacy and research, and a wise man takes the long-term view: privacy for 50 years may vex the scholar today, but at least the papers may be preserved rather than destroyed and the scholar of tomorrow can use them.

A further distinction can be made between those papers that are completely closed to research and those that are open but the contents of which cannot be published for a stated time. These latter may be looked at, but their use is strictly limited—no notes or copying. This demands close supervision by the curator, and the distinction is not always easy to administer if the reader is at all uncooperative. A test case in 1960, however, shows that a library can and will enforce such conditions.[12] Some 30 years ago the New York Public Library received the letters of John Quinn, patron of writers and artists, on condition that the letters were not to be published before 1988, and the library accepted them on these terms. In the late 1950's one Peter Kavanagh was admitted to the manuscript department to see these letters but was not allowed to take notes or copy them. Secretly determined to publish them, he memorized their content, working with the manuscripts for an hour at a time and then leaving the building to make his notes outside. He was an amateur printer, and in defiance of the no-publication order of the library he brought out his own edition of Quinn's letters. The library decided to show, in the words of its director, that "no one can with impunity violate conditions which the library has agreed to honor"; it sued Mr. Kavanagh in the New York

[11] See Hilary Jenkinson, *Manual of Archive Administration*, especially p. 9–11 (2d ed., London, 1937).

[12] Mentioned in *American Archivist*, 23:233 (April 1960); fuller account in *Library Journal*, 85:740 (Feb. 15, 1960).

Supreme Court, demanding that he be enjoined from distributing his book. In court in January 1960, Mr. Kavanagh had to tear up 117 copies of his book, leaving half of each with the judge. Two copies he was allowed to keep for his private use, but the court warned him that he could not "dispose of them or exhibit them to anybody" without the consent of the New York Public Library. This case shows that, in one State at least, a donor's restrictions must be taken seriously and that readers cannot assume that nothing will happen if they disregard a library's regulations in this matter.

More recently there was an example of a scholar who needed to use material not yet publishable, but in this case the scholar and the librarian cooperated to find a *modus vivendi*. Phyllis Grosskurth was writing a biography of John Addington Symonds[13] and was therefore interested in Symonds' memoirs, a very personal manuscript bequeathed to the London Library in 1926 by Symonds' literary executor, Horatio F. Brown, on condition it should not be published for 50 years. Brown had used the memoirs for his *John Addington Symonds—a Biography* (2 editions, 1895 and 1903), printing those parts that he considered suitable for Victorian England but completely omitting the personal aspects essential to any understanding of Symonds the man. Although she had full access to his letters housed in other collections where no testamentary restrictions hampered her, Mrs. Grosskurth naturally needed Symonds' own memoirs to write her biography. A nice ethical problem was posed for the London Library, which had accepted the bequest and the 50-year embargo on publication. The Librarian decided that Mrs. Grosskurth might read Symonds' memoirs and use the facts she found there, but that she could quote only those (innocuous) passages already published in Brown's biography. This decision was a compromise between the pressing claim of the biographer and the legally binding condition of the bequest. But like all compromises it provoked opposition: correspondence in the *Times Literary Supplement* expostulated on both sides of the issue—either the London Library was "to be congratulated on not placing pedantic obstacles before a responsible scholar"[14] or "the showing of material, even to discreet scholars, is, in effect, a kind of premature publication . . . a violation of the spirit of the gift even while there has been faithful adherence to its letter."[15] As Mrs. Grosskurth says in her preface, "The story of Symonds's inner life

[13] Phyllis Grosskurth, *John Addington Symonds* (London, 1964).
[14] Letter from Ian Fletcher, in *Times Literary Supplement,* Nov. 5, 1964.
[15] Letter from Leon Edel, *ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1964.

cannot be revealed in Symonds's own words until 1976."[16] Some librarians would consider 10 years not too long to wait for the full story to be published freely; a curator who hopes to attract the papers of sensitive writers must not only respect but be known to respect their wishes for privacy.

Some donors prefer a contingent time limit rather than a fixed date for opening their papers. For example, the Public Archives of Canada received the Mackenzie King papers[17] on condition that they were not to be open to the public until the official biography was completed. No date for this was mentioned. A political opponent interested in King had to be refused access to the papers because of the condition. Meanwhile the biography took far longer than originally anticipated. As the years went by the stipulation, which seemed at first so reasonable, became increasingly difficult to administer, and there were charges of partisanship from historians of different political hue. This is an awkward position for the archivist who is bound by the condition yet must appear impartial politically. But perhaps even this condition is easier than having no time limit at all, as is the case with many writers.

Willa Cather was a writer who desired privacy. She stipulated in her will (she died in 1947) that her letters were to be kept private, and never to be published in whole or in part in any form whatsoever.[18] There is no time limit on this ban, and her publishers have the reputation of being prepared to defend her wishes. She is a literary figure, and her personality as well as her opinions come across very vividly in her letters. Her prohibition must be respected, and it is binding on curators, but must we be bound forever? We have no qualms about reading—and publishing—a 16th-century letter marked "Burn this"; in fact such an admonition rather adds to the interest of the letter. Should present-day wishes command more respect, or when a manuscript is "old" do different principles apply? These are ethical issues, but an examination of the legal position proves Willa Cather's right to make such a prohibition. And this raises the vexed question of copyright.[19] For it is the un-

[16] Grosskurth, *Symonds*, p. ix.

[17] W. Kaye Lamb, "The Archivist and the Historian," in *American Historical Review*, 68:385 (Jan. 1963); supplemented by information from Sam Kula.

[18] Prohibition against publication "in any form whatsoever of the whole or any part of any letter or letters written by me." This extract from the will of Willa Cather is quoted from E. K. Brown, *Willa Cather*, p. xxiii (New York, 1953).

[19] Various sources include: Ralph R. Shaw, *Literary Property in the United States* (Washington, 1950); Margaret Nicholson, *Manual of Copyright Practice* (New York, 1945, revised 1956); and Seymour V. Connor, "The Problem of Literary Property in Archival Depositories," in *American Archivist*, 21:143–152 (Apr. 1958).

deniable right of any writer, in common law, to decide when and how his writings are to be published and even if they are to be published at all. This covers letters as well as literary works, and there is no time limit. On an author's death his heir inherits this right of first publication, and the addressee of a letter, or his heir, has no rights in the letter apart from physical possession of the paper and ink. Here are all sorts of problems, aggravated by the lack of legal definition. As a matter of common law, it is protected by State, not Federal, courts, so that precedent in one State is not necessarily good in another. This literary property right terminates only with publication, when the manuscript enters the public domain or acquires statutory copyright protection. This last is available only for printed works, and of course it does have a time limit, expiring at present after 28 years, or 56 if copyright is renewed. What constitutes publication has never been adequately defined in the courts. It has been questioned whether a public institution, such as an archive or a State library, can accept a collection of letters from an addressee, who has no authority to transfer the literary property right, or whether this making-them-publicly-accessible puts them into the public domain and so constitutes publication. Even the microfilming of such manuscripts is questioned. And on the practical side it is often hard to trace the heir of a letterwriter of a hundred or more years ago.

Some of these and other questions have happily remained hypothetical, but it is hoped that the proposed general revision of copyright law will clarify the whole position. The 1961 report of the Register of Copyrights[20] suggested that statutory copyright protection be made available for writers of unpublished manuscripts, if they so choose, by voluntary registration in the Copyright Office. This new protection would replace the ill-defined common-law copyright; it would be defendable in the Federal courts, so that the situation would be the same all over the Nation, and it would have a time limit. The copyright owner would be more easily identified by search in the Copyright Office. As for microfilming, it was suggested that libraries be allowed to supply any applicant with one photocopy of a manuscript for his own use and research, and that this would not infringe on any literary property rights. It was suggested that manuscripts be subject to the doctrine of "fair use," which allows "reasonable" quotation without infringing on the

[20] *Copyright Law Revision; Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law* (Washington, 1961).

right of publication. These are all practical and helpful changes, supporting and clarifying present practice. The biggest change suggested was the proposal that manuscript material should enter the public domain, that is, be freely available with no restriction, when it is 50 years old and has been 10 years in a library, unless the owner of the literary property right has chosen to register claim to statutory copyright. The 1964 bill[21] presented by the Librarian of Congress was rather different, providing protection for unpublished manuscripts for 50 years after an author's death or 100 years from the creation of a work; this was similar to the projected changes for printed books and was part of an attempt to establish a single system of statutory protection for all works, published and unpublished. Either of these proposals, now abandoned, would have eventually brought a lot of material out of the dark area of uncertainty into the light of scholarly research and free publication. Like the 50-year rule in archives, the proposals aimed at striking a balance between the claims of privacy and scholarship. It would have meant, for example, that Willa Cather's letters would eventually be available to literary critics and editors.

At present there is no time limit. This was proved when the manuscript of Mark Twain's unpublished story, "A Murder, a Mystery, and a Marriage," written in 1876, unexpectedly came up at auction in 1945 after a long disappearance, and the purchaser wanted to publish it. The Mark Twain trustees refused their permission, and, when publication took place, they brought suit and won their case.[22] They unquestionably still had the right of first publication, despite the lapse of 70 years, the disappearance of the manuscript, and its sale at public auction.

Although the scholar bears ultimate responsibility for copyright clearance of any manuscripts he wishes to publish, the curator of those manuscripts cannot be a mere spectator. It is highly desirable that the library own the literary property right in addition to the actual paper and ink of the manuscripts; only then does it have any control or any authority to grant permission to publish. Many problems can arise if the library does not own these rights, for the owner of the literary property rights has tremendous powers; he controls which, if any, letters are published and by whom and when. He may sponsor unscholarly publication plans to which the library objects but which effectively block work by scholars in the library.

[21] "Proposed New U. S. Copyright Law," in *Antiquarian Bookman,* Aug. 3, 1964, p. 363.

[22] Philip Wittenberg, *Law of Literary Property*, p. 68 (Cleveland, 1957).

He may give his permission to publish to somebody who does not qualify as a reader in the library—a journalist for example. He may refuse his permission to publish to somebody highly approved by the library, and there is nothing the library can do about it. He may charge such high rates that publication becomes prohibitively expensive. Rarely does a literary property owner exercise all these powers so uncooperatively, but all these actions are within his rights, so that at least in theory such conflicts can arise. Separation of the literary property right from possession of the manuscripts affects, for example, the research value of Browning manuscripts. A third party is always between the library and its Browning readers, and the curator has no control over the use of these papers. For this reason a research library may even feel it must refuse good material offered it for sale.[23] But with many writers it is possible to acquire the literary property rights along with the manuscripts, and such surrender should be requested at the time of purchase or donation. It is surprising how few libraries regularly make a point of trying to obtain these rights when acquiring a new collection.

If he has this control, the curator can do much to smooth the scholar's path in addition to reducing copyright headaches. The Huntington Library always tries to inform its readers of other scholars working on the same material and encourages them to consult each other to see that their work does not overlap. When the library's permission to publish a manuscript is given to one person, it is not given to a second without written clearance from the first. This is a service valued by the scholar; it not only warns of duplication of effort but can lead to fruitful exchanges of information or to cooperation on a joint project. This policy has raised some difficulties in the past, particularly if the firstcomer took a dog-in-the-manger attitude and there was danger of manuscripts' being monopolized and virtually removed from circulation. To prevent this the library now has a limit of 3 years on the reservation of manuscripts, and this limited protection is usually long enough to tell whether or not a project will materialize. Such a policy can bring criticism, especially from one who is refused permission to publish material reserved for another, but the time limit is intended to balance the protection of the first scholar's work against the claims of other scholars to use all material.

A policy of controlled use of manuscripts is constantly challenged by the increasing demands for microfilm. Most libraries are glad to

[23] The Huntington Library decided against an attractive Browning purchase for this reason in 1962.

make microfilm for scholars who know what they want copied: individual arrangements are made, the reader knows the conditions on which the film is supplied, and the library knows the purpose for which the film is wanted, particularly whether it is for reference or publication. The library does not, however, know the ultimate destination of the film. The reader may dispose of the film as he wishes, for it is his personal property and he may well make it available to people who do not know the conditions on which it was supplied. The library owning the original manuscripts begins to lose control over the film, and sometimes even the location of the originals is forgotten. Institutional requests add to the complications, for these orders are often placed for the purpose of adding to the institution's reference stock and not for the specific needs of an individual researcher. Libraries respond to these problems in different ways. Some insist on the return of film immediately after use. The Bancroft Library does not sell but only lends microfilm of its manuscripts; the film is made at the requester's expense, unless it is already available, and it must be returned to Berkeley afterwards. Other libraries refuse as a rule to film whole collections, whether for an individual or an institution, unless arrangements can be made to allow control. The Huntington Library provided microfilm of its illuminated manuscripts before 1400 for the Princeton Index of Christian Art, with the stipulation that it be used for reference only and that copies be made only with the consent of the Huntington Library. Princeton respects this request, and the Huntington Library is therefore aware of the use being made of these manuscripts. A flexible policy will allow exceptions; for example, when a group of papers is divided between two or more institutions it is clearly in the interests of both to exchange microfilm. Similarly the Huntington Library was glad to send copies of its 64 Upton Sinclair letters to Indiana's Lilly Library, to add to the 8 tons of Sinclair material already there. The 64 letters are of more significance in relation to the massive Sinclair archive at Bloomington than they could be on their own. In this case an exchange was arranged, the Huntington Library receiving copies of the Lilly's Jack London letters, to add to the London archive already in San Marino. Sometimes a library refuses to send film of its collections to another institution for other reasons. It likes to be known as the owner of its manuscripts; not only does this give it status, but often for economic reasons it needs readers to come to the library, it needs figures to prove to Trustees and Friends that expensive acquisitions are worth while. Scholars have been known

to give credit in their publications to the institution with the microfilm copy, without mentioning the whereabouts of the original manuscripts.[24] Naturally this practice does not encourage a library to have its collections microfilmed for use elsewhere.

Some libraries take the opposite course and have a policy of initiative, microfilming their manuscripts and making them freely available to anyone who wants them, for whatever purpose, and whether or not the user knows how to interpret them. The Library of Congress is an example; its Presidential Papers Program aims to make the complete papers of 23 Presidents available for sale or on interlibrary loan anywhere, with no restrictions at all.[25] It can be said that these papers are part of our national heritage and should be available to all Americans. And the Library of Congress, being virtually the national library, has educational responsibilities to the general public that extend beyond those of the small specialized research library. Not only can manuscripts be multiplied by means of microfilm, but microfilm itself is regenerative. According to Richard Hale's comprehensive *Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials*, standard policy of most institutions regarding microfilm is to allow copies to be made freely from the master negative and to lend positive microfilm on interlibrary loan.[26] No reference, apparently, is made to the institution owning the original manuscripts. It is the owner of the master negative who has become the key figure, as the source of limitless copies. This is a fundamental change in the nature of a manuscript: it is no longer unique, available in one place only. And as more and more manuscripts are available every year on microfilm, it becomes more and more difficult to control—or even know—the uses being made of them.

Many libraries now feel bound to buy microfilm as part of their general acquisitions policy, to add to their collections of published reference material. Microfilm is an invaluable means of obtaining ancillary manuscripts; it is a convenient way of making privately owned manuscripts available to scholars without having to bother the owner every time. It is a means of gathering together related material scattered in several different repositories, or even in different countries. It can be used to preserve manuscripts about to deteriorate and as a precaution against possible future disaster.

[24] Robert L. Brubaker, "Manuscript Collections," in *Library Trends*, 13:248 (Oct. 1964).

[25] Fred Shelley, "The Presidential Papers Program of the Library of Congress," in *American Archivist*, 25:429 (Oct. 1962).

[26] Richard W. Hale Jr., *Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials in the United States and Canada*, p. xx (Ithaca, N.Y., 1961).

But sometimes an institution seems to collect microfilm rather more actively than original manuscripts. It announces that it is becoming the headquarters of John Doe research and invites all libraries with John Doe material to send copies of their holdings, whether or not it has much itself. It is somewhat cheaper to collect microfilm than original manuscripts. There is a story of an expensive collection of rare materials being refused by libraries A and B, but when library C raised the money and bought it, both A and B at once asked for microfilm.[27] Passion for microfilm can go too far, and one can imagine a new generation of historians who have never seen an original manuscript. The curator's job is to collect and preserve manuscripts, real manuscripts made of paper or vellum and ink. Let microfilm supplement our resources where it suitably can, but not replace our primary concern.

In all these problems of use, the curator's first duty is to his manuscripts—to keep and preserve them. But he keeps them for a purpose, and his policy for their use must depend on the function of his particular institution. Controlled use of manuscripts goes with deep scholarship for the few and with the special services that only a small research library can offer. A large library with different responsibilities can spread scholarship widely, so that all may benefit as they are able. There is room for both policies, as libraries of all kinds cooperate to handle the proliferation of source materials and to provide for an ever increasing number of readers.

[27] Howard H. Peckham, "Policies Regarding the Use of Manuscripts," in *Library Trends*, 5:355–356 (Jan. 1957).

". . . *in truthe entyere* . . ."

The use of the term 'register' for the office was general at this date and persisted at least to the mid-seventeenth century, when the civil 'registers' for births and deaths were created under the Commonwealth. With regard to the duties of the 'university register', inscribed in the fly-leaf of Grace Book B is a short poem:

> Who deue wilbe a Register
> shulde holde his pen in truthe entyere
> Ensearch he ought recordes of olde
> the dowte to trye; the right to holde
> The lawes to know he must co[n]tende
> Olde customys eke: he shulde expende
> No paynes to wright he maye refuse
> His offyce ellys: he dothe abuse.

—Heather E. Peek *and* Catherine P. Hall, *The Archives of Cambridge: An Historical Introduction*, p. 10 (Cambridge, Eng., 1962).