

# Embracing the Flood: Questions About Collecting Twentieth-Century Non-Literary Works

RICHARD LANDON

---

We are only too well aware of the voluminous records, in both manuscript and printed forms, which have been produced in this century and perhaps tend to assume that, because our own historical period is so well documented, we have made the task of providing balanced and reasonable historical interpretation easier. Yet there is not now, and may never be, a clear and generally agreed upon account of such a recent historical event as the assassination of President Kennedy. Events of the distant past often seem clear because our understanding is based on incomplete and over-simplified information, all of which raises an essential problem of perceived historical perspective. More information does not necessarily result in greater knowledge. In addition, implications for those who create, maintain and service the collections upon which historical research is based, if comprehended, are not often discussed. What are the real historiographical responsibilities and functions of collector/curators? How actively ought they to participate in the creation and use of their collections? What ought to be the relationship between them and professional historians, textual scholars, literary critics and biographers? These general questions, which pertain to collections of any period, seem particularly pertinent to the twentieth century and suggest that at the basis of all discussion is the necessity of defining "special collections" and relating that definition to historical and literary research.

---

Richard Landon is Director of The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library and also teaches in the Faculty of Library and Information Science and the Department of English at the University of Toronto. This paper was given in a slightly different form at the 1983 RBMS Preconference in Austin, Texas.

I presume it is unnecessary, and it is probably impossible in any event, to delineate the scope of a collection of twentieth-century civilization. Although it is true that if one collects everything one gets all the valuable material along with all the junk, but clearly one cannot collect everything. Collecting on this scale, although limited by national considerations, is the stated intention (the mandate, if you like) of institutions who seek to form what are called "national printed archives," but these national libraries, with the benefit of arrangements for copyright deposit, do not normally regard the bulk of their acquisitions as necessarily having anything to do with special collections.

Rare book librarians usually attempt to avoid the explication of what, exactly, constitutes a "rare book," although they can be positively eloquent regarding what isn't rare in the special bibliophilic sense. A satisfactory working definition of "special collections" would appear easier and thus I will suggest that a "special collection" is any concentrated group of books, manuscripts and other materials the intention of which is to provide exhaustive coverage of all aspects of a subject, and that the sum of the collection is greater than its parts. It is perhaps interesting to compare this definition with that put forward by a Consultative Group on University Research Libraries convened by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. "A special collection is one recognized by its own library and by the scholarly community as an important resource for research. Its aim should be to include all significant works of recorded knowledge in the defined field. It should be receiving special attention from its own library, insuring bibliographic and physical access as well as an adequate level of services."<sup>1</sup> This definition, it should be added, is intended as a guideline for a federal funding agency. How practical is either definition when applied to twentieth-century material?

No special collections librarian takes up his or her appointed tasks completely fresh. The individual may be fresh, but the slate upon which his/her mark is to be written will be sullied with the results of the activities of predecessors. For the twentieth century there will normally be a very large accumulation of material on the open shelves of a general research library, and any policy of collections development will necessarily be related to what is already there, even if the decision is taken to ignore it all entirely.

Imagine, however, that the slate is fresh and money is no object. Where would one begin? Perhaps the most famous book published in the year 1900 was Sigmund Freud's *Die Traumdeutung*. This work, of which there are thirteen editions, could be taken (and, in fact, has been) as the cornerstone of a special collection on the history of the psychoanalytic movement. Most of Freud's considerable number of works were produced in the twentieth century, as were those of his disciples and opponents. What ought this special collection to consist of? Obviously all the master's own works, to begin with, in all bibliographical

and textual variants, including translations. This is easy to say, but how many are there (Grinstein contains 496 entries, but many editions are often listed under each entry),<sup>2</sup> and how readily available are they on the market? How many of Freud's works first appear, or appear only in periodicals? Does one require the whole run of a journal for the relevant years, to provide a context, or does one want the off-prints, or both? How much manuscript material would one attempt to acquire, given that most of it is already in two institutions? And then comes the hard part: how many of the "psychiatric" works which preceded Freud and may have influenced his discoveries are necessary for a real special collection? Richard Hunter and Ida MacAlpine<sup>3</sup> formed a fifty-five hundred volume collection on the history of psychiatry, mainly English, from 1535 to approximately 1900, without including very much Freud at all. The problem of the works of authors influenced by Freud is equally difficult. It is possible to identify, even for someone not specially trained, the principal books of the most important psychiatrists. But this is clearly not enough; and has anyone writing on the subject since 1900 not been influenced? What about the literary ramifications of psychoanalysis; what of psychohistory? Is it, in fact, possible to follow the concept of a special collection to its logical conclusion without collecting, or, at least, considering, everything; the twentieth-century equivalent of Konrad Gesner?

It was not Freud's intention to induce hysteria, nor is it mine. It is obviously possible to form and control collections in a limited way such that they are academically useful and still manageable. It is perhaps important to emphasize that no properly formed special collection exists in a complete vacuum, either in its own institution or in a national or international sense. It will always relate to, and overlap with, other collections and no one institution will have every work in any special collection of reasonable scope. Some find it comforting to remember that no collection of books is ever complete: real collectors find it challenging.

High-spot collecting, a notion fostered if not introduced, by Frederick Locker-Lampson through his formation of the Rowfant Library, has usually been discussed, and often condemned, in the context of literary texts.<sup>4</sup> Yet this fashion is at least as prevalent today for science, medicine, philosophy, economics, politics, theology and the whole host of subjects considered to constitute the humanities and social sciences. Encouraged by influential exhibition catalogues like *Printing and the Mind of Man*,<sup>5</sup> collectors, both private and institutional, eagerly acquire these cultural high-spots which represent, often, the touchstones of our civilization. Such books are wonderful for the purposes of public exhibition (and come with ready-made descriptive commentary), but how useful are they, by themselves, for research? How many institutions have copies of Max Planck's 1901 paper on quantum theory or Einstein's 1905 and

1916 papers on the special and general theories of relativity, or Minkowski's "Space and Time" (1909), or the Duc de Broglie's 1926 "Waves and Movements," all canonized in *Printing and the Mind of Man*, compared with the number of institutions with special collections based on modern theoretical physics? The same difficulties noted for a collection of works on psychoanalysis of course pertain to this subject as well. Do these works suggest one collection or several: e.g., quantum theory, relativity, and atomic theory as separate special collections? A practical corollary to the general question is how does the curator obtain the necessary expertise to make the decision at all? At the very least one can say that a copy of the first issue of the off-print of Einstein's famous paper does not constitute a useful special collection of modern physics.

Many, if not most, special collections of modern literature in North American institutions are based on individual author collections, a sensible and practical method of collecting, complicated only by the myriads of bibliographical "points" so beloved of dealers in modern firsts. There seems, on the face of it, no reason why such methods could not be employed for the collecting of non-literary material as well; the development of a series of author collections that would cover the most important twentieth-century works in the social sciences; but this kind of collecting has not, as far as I am aware, been much pursued. How many collections of Maynard Keynes, for instance, are there compared to W.B. Yeats?

There are, I think, some reasons for this neglect, apart from the obvious literary bias of most special collections departments and most special collections librarians. It is more difficult to isolate economists, philosophers and scientists from the context of their subjects than it is to isolate literary figures. There are many more guides, notably in the form of author bibliographies, available for the development of literary collections, and the expertise necessary to build properly and to service such collections is more easily procurable. There has also been more pressure from the literary bibliographers, historians and critics, whose concern with accurate and scholarly texts has required the formation of comprehensive collections. And yet the philosophical works of Bertrand Russell or Ludwig Wittgenstein are surely as textually complex as those of Kipling or Scott Fitzgerald. Moreover the accuracy of authorial intention may be more crucial to real understanding of a philosophical work. Perhaps it is the responsibility of the special collections librarians, in concert with private collectors and academics, to provide the initiative for such textual study by the active promotion of this kind of collection. One could unleash at least a minor flood: Bertrand Russell was a prodigious writer (there are more than ten thousand items in one collection). Again, what would a complete collection of the works of Winston Churchill look like? Ironically both these men received Nobel Prizes for literature.

The published works of twentieth-century writers are only part of the prob-

lem of collecting the twentieth century, as every archivist and special collections librarian knows only too well. The extent of the flood of paper which descends into libraries and archives in the form of manuscripts and ephemera is literally incalculable and is being added to in exponential proportions, even as we speak of it. Most special collections librarians, I am sure, have a tale to tell of an enormous archive which has arrived unsorted, is of dubious research value (but one can't tell until it has been sorted and examined), every piece of which consists of paper in the death-clutches of acid and alum, and for which the owner requires a substantial evaluation for tax purposes.

The administrative problems posed by such a collection can perhaps best be illustrated by an example from my own institution. About three years ago we were offered, as a donation, the collection of Mark Gayn, who had recently died. He was a journalist who for almost fifty years covered foreign affairs in Eastern Europe and the Far East, most particularly for the *Toronto Star* but also for the *New York Times* and several other papers. He kept almost everything he committed to paper and collected voluminously the work of others as well. Thus the collection contains 10,000 monographs, 350 periodical titles, 35 linear feet of manuscripts, 8 filing cabinets and 20 cartons of ephemera, 1,000 posters and a great number of photographs, films, maps and what now seems to be called realia (there is, for instance, a Red Guard doll that fires a toy machine gun and I have a Chairman Mao lighter on my desk). In other words, a largish collection. The first problem presented was the one of research potential, and the basic question, "Do we want this stuff?" could only be answered initially (and reasonably quickly) by an assessment of the significance of Mark Gayn's career. It turned out that Gayn had been in China during the 1940s and had conducted exclusive interviews with Mao, Chou En-lai and Liu Shao-chi'i in 1947 in the Yen-an caves, had been an eyewitness to the Cultural Revolution (hence the posters which he collected on the spot), had managed to be in Japan in time to greet, and interview, General MacArthur, had been the only Canadian correspondent in Korea in 1946, had travelled extensively in Vietnam during the Vietnam War, had regularly visited the Soviet Union over many years and had managed somehow to be in Greece during 1948 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. The easy answer to the first question was "yes."

The second problem was practical: where to put it and how to arrange it roughly for analysis and appraisal, since we were committed to providing an evaluation to be submitted to a federal cultural property review board to secure a tax receipt. Space in the Fisher Library and in the main university library was found (space can almost always be found for the things one really wants), and the collection was unpacked. It quickly became apparent that a considerable investment in staff time would be necessary, over a number of years, to make the collection available to researchers in any meaningful sense, and further that the

commitment could not be drawn from the permanent staff. The implications of any collection as a factor in the administration of staff are not easy to calculate but cannot be ignored. The appraisal of the collection presented a whole series of problems, summarized by the questions: "What is it?" and "How much is it worth?" We turned, as we always do, to the professional antiquarian booksellers, and, since we required two appraisals to satisfy the regulations of the Cultural Property Review Board, were fortunate to find two dealers in Toronto willing to undertake the evaluation of unfamiliar material and to render an opinion. (In the end a third appraisal was required, also from an antiquarian bookseller.) The question of what we could provide as documentation to guide the appraisers was vexing. No list of any kind existed and to undertake a detailed one would be the work of months, yet we would have to provide a description of the collection for the Review Board. We decided to arrange the manuscript part of the collection roughly by geographical area and note the extent of each group and any readily apparent highlights. The monographs were separated, as were the ephemera, and each described briefly. We then conducted each appraiser on a detailed tour of every part of the collection, allowed him to contemplate them all for as long as he wished, and then had a lengthy discussion with each about the importance and scarcity of much of what he had seen. We also had compiled a short biographical account of Mark Gayn. One might say that we conducted a seminar on twentieth-century collections, modern European and Asian history, and on Gayn himself. The appraisers submitted their evaluations, and we submitted the application. The evaluations were substantial and a third appraisal was requested and supplied. Eventually the application was approved to the satisfaction of all parties.

The next problem was a crucial decision regarding how much of the total collection would be kept in the Special Collections Department. We had made it clear to the representatives of the estate from the beginning that while the manuscripts and much of the ephemera would be kept together, we would not necessarily keep all the monographs. This distinction was an important one in this particular context because East Asian language material is not normally housed in the Fisher Library at all. Accordingly, most of the books will go into the main library stacks, the extensive clipping files will be sorted, and items not directly relevant to the collection will be discarded.

Most important was the question of manpower. We could not, for the foreseeable future, hope to sort and process the collection properly without assistance. We thus approached a private funding agency and succeeded in getting a grant of \$40,000 to hire a research assistant to catalogue the collection. We have undertaken to publish the catalogue, which will deal principally with the manuscripts. The Gayn Collection, of course, requires conservation, and we have tried to work parts of it into the constantly shifting list of priorities for our con-

servation laboratory. The posters will, for instance, be encapsulated in Mylar.

This collection has provided, along with the odd headache, considerable satisfaction and something of a lesson in historical perspective. Political events in China over the past few years have increased the research significance of the Cultural Revolution material immeasurably because, although collections of this kind no doubt exist in China, access to them is not of the kind expected by North American researchers.

The Gayn Collection does not present many of the problems (restricted access, confidential material or copyright) often found in collections of modern manuscripts and books. We will no doubt discover pieces of correspondence that will require restriction to protect the privacy of individuals. Permission to quote or publish material will also, of course, be required, but the collection in general is open and freely available to whoever wishes to use it. Its most obvious potential, for the moment, is as a resource for a biography of Mark Gayn, and an interest in doing one has been expressed.

This possibility raises the thorny problem of conflicting research projects and the question of whether collections ought to be held temporarily for the exclusive use of one person or group. It seems a relatively common practice on the part of certain universities to equate special collections directly with the academic prestige of the institution and thus reserve some collections for the exclusive use of their own faculty. The policies regarding photocopies of manuscripts vary greatly, but some researchers regard the practices of many institutions as roadblocks to scholarship. Any decent researcher will, of course, visit a major collection in his field, if only to learn at first hand what is there, but a series of subsequent visits may be impossible. I believe that all collections should be as open as possible; that it is not my business, in my role as a curator, to evaluate research projects, and that it does not essentially matter to me if three biographies of Mark Gayn are published on the same day. I do, however, feel some obligation to let people know what is going on and would certainly tell a prospective biographer that someone else was already working on it, in an attempt, if possible, to put them in touch with each other. The problem posed by a completely unsuitable researcher, particularly one who may wish to exploit the collection for pecuniary gain, is different and more difficult. It is very hard to judge accurately the intentions of anyone, but one ought to be reasonably certain that any written agreements entered into with a donor, an estate or an agent will not be violated. The institution is, in some sense, in a position of administrative trust, and the whole of that responsibility will not be expressed in legal documents.

This problem can be exacerbated by the passage of time since an institution will often find itself, *de facto*, acting as a literary executor. Writers have a distressing habit of appointing as literary executors friends of their own age

who sometimes predecease them, or don't designate anyone at all to act on their behalf. Sir Frederick Banting, the co-discoverer of insulin, died in an aeroplane crash in 1941 at the age of fifty. His papers, which included much that was (and is) controversial and confidential, were given to the University of Toronto and locked up in an administrative office. A presidential committee was appointed to govern their use. The papers themselves eventually migrated to the Special Collections Department and the committee, which had severely restricted the use of the most important part of the collection, succumbed to the inevitable process of natural attrition. Faced with a large restricted collection, parts of it mildly sensational, and an increasing number of requests for access to selected groups of manuscripts, members of the Department encouraged an interested historian to undertake a major critical work on the discovery of insulin (still controversial), and a biography of Banting. The results may be seen in Professor Michael Bliss's two highly acclaimed books,<sup>6</sup> one of which explicates, for the first time, as much of the story of the discovery as we are ever likely to know. These two works have, in effect, opened the collection to general use. The published results of any special studies, including those that wish to focus on the seamier aspects of Banting's personal life, can be read in the context of Bliss's authoritative published record. This rather convoluted solution to a delicate problem is probably only applicable to this particular case, but it does emphasize the responsibility, and initiative, that seem to me inherently part of the function of special collections librarianship and archival work.

Special collections, according to the definitions I have suggested, must, if they are to thrive, be intimately related to the institution of which they are a part. I am aware that a great many collections exist in desolate isolation for which no context is provided, but this situation is surely most often the result of historical accident. Those of us fortunate enough to be responsible for special collections in large universities usually have a subject context into which almost any collection of books or manuscripts can be fitted, especially in the case of twentieth-century material. The basic principle of collection development, "building on strength," remains valid, but should not prevent library collectors from boldly stepping forth to embrace new fields: the twentieth century offers infinite possibilities.

In the Autumn of 1968 we had the opportunity to acquire, through newly-arrived refugees, some of the material produced by underground presses in Prague during the Czechoslovakian uprising and the period of the Soviet invasion. These pieces were ephemeral, obviously rare and intriguing: genuine examples of "samisdat" publishing. Since there have been some quite close connections between Toronto and Czechoslovakia, partly through the University's graduate Centre for East European Studies, and since it did not seem likely that

a large financial commitment would have to be made, we established a Czechoslovakia 68 collection. The collection grew slowly at first but took on an added significance and excitement with the acquisition of our first *Petlice*. This series of works (the Padlock series) consists of books written by authors in Czechoslovakia who are prevented from publishing there. The books are physically produced by typing, in one operation, as many carbon copies as will fit into a typewriter and then binding them. The copies are circulated through an underground lending network, the whole activity being, of course, both illegal and dangerous. With assistance from many sources, we were able to acquire copies of some titles which had been smuggled in diplomatic pouches (and by other means) into West Germany. We now have a collection of over two hundred titles, and two foundation grants to acquire more. The circumstances of their production mean that we can, in effect, commission new works. If we can supply money to writers in Prague, it may encourage them to write novels, poems, and essays. This raises, it seems to me, an interesting problem: does a special collections department have a responsibility to foster the work of dissidents in a repressive society? Our Czech collections assumed a greater lustre with our acquisition, through gift, of the papers of Josef Skvorecky, one of the most famous Czech writers-in-exile, who teaches in the English Department at the University of Toronto. We also received all the manuscripts, pamphlets and books collected by Professor Gordon Skilling for his book on the 1968 uprising and the collection is now very large indeed. Researchers from several countries have used the collection already and it was this collection René Wellek most wished to see the last time he visited Toronto. It is almost true to say that the only item in the collection I have had to pay real money for is a tape which purports to be an eyewitness account of Dubček's arrest, made as the Soviet police entered his office. This kind of collection, which can establish any institution as an international resource for research in a special area, requires imagination, commitment and staff time, but not much money, and the number of possibilities is almost infinite. We have, for instance, also embarked on a collection of Polish Solidarity material.

I have mentioned the word ephemera several times. Like many words with specific historical meanings it has, through increased usage, acquired connotations and shades of meaning such that it no longer conveys a very precise image. What is a collection of ephemera? The word means, I think, "for a day," and refers specifically to a type of insect which, in its winged form, lives for only that period. It obviously also has a secondary meaning of "something which has a transitory existence." Applied to the products of the printing press, ephemera presumably denotes those works which disappear quickly, whether by design or accident, and thus do not last in the way we like to think that normal books will. There is an unfortunate tendency to apply the concept of ephemera only to the forms of printed works and thus to assume that ephemera are single sheets or

small pamphlets (which, indeed, many are); but surely a telephone directory can be as ephemeral as an election poster? The form of a printed work is certainly a crucial factor in its chance for survival, and the more ephemeral the form the more likely it is to disappear. The contents of a work may be ephemeral too, but this aspect is more likely to be influenced by attitudes: the first quarto of *Hamlet* was ephemeral, in both form and content, in 1603.

Libraries have not, traditionally, collected ephemera, except by accident or with the benefit of an historical perspective that has removed desirable items from the realm of ephemerality. Archives, however, have collected ephemera extensively because, I suspect, they treat it as if it were manuscript material. I believe it is one of the primary responsibilities of special collections departments to collect and preserve ephemera, if for no other reason, than that no one else will do it. One will always be able to view a copy of the first edition of *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*<sup>7</sup> in most special collections departments, but how often will one be able to study the printed flyer for the July 5, 1934, meeting of the Council of the Royal Economic Society of which Maynard Keynes was then Secretary? The very word ephemera implies that, to collect it successfully, one must seize it as it comes off the press; but to form coherent collections which will be useful some form of discrimination must be applied. The most sensible way is to use the same discrimination one applies to everything else one collects, for it seems to me that ephemera are most properly an integrated part of a special collection in the same way that books and manuscripts are. The presence of carefully selected ephemera can, in fact, render a collection uniquely valuable, even though its essential books may be duplicated in many institutions. The question of historical perspective is again relevant. As we contemplate the research potential of what we have been able to gather from the past, the question of what material of the present will be required by the future inevitably arises. We can have some inkling of what researchers will wish to see in 2084 based on what today's scholars want from 1884, and much of what they find most exciting, I suggest, is what was considered ephemeral in its own time.

How are collections of twentieth-century material regarded by institutions now? In the interesting survey conducted by William Matheson for his chapter in *Rare Books 1983-84: Trends, Collections, Sources*,<sup>8</sup> he asked special collections librarians in the United States to report major gifts, purchases, exhibitions and celebrations in 1983. In the published responses twenty-seven twentieth-century items and collections are mentioned, which far outnumber the items mentioned for any other century. They are almost all, however, literary in nature, reflecting, one suspects, the bias mentioned earlier. It is obviously unfair to attach too much importance to reports of highlights from institutions whose range of acquisitions in any one year will cover many subjects and centuries, but

it may be useful to reflect briefly on the various methods used by special collections departments to make their collections known to the scholarly community. Articles for journals of various kinds, reports of the sort compiled for *Rare Books 1983–84*, and exhibitions, are three of the most commonly used methods, and if the literary bias is reflected in all of them, how effectively are institutions publicizing their non-literary twentieth-century collections? How many exhibitions, for instance, featuring these collections, were held in North America in 1983? In a section devoted to library exhibition catalogues entitled “Books about Books” for the same volume, Daniel Traister<sup>9</sup> points out that although he has been able to see only a mere fraction of the total number produced, only three of those mentioned deal with the kinds of collections I have been discussing, and two of those were produced by the Fisher Library. I suppose I am suggesting that modern non-literary collections are not very well understood or appreciated by special collections departments, and I am also suggesting that the potential level of interest in such material among scholars is high, although the evidence for this interest is more difficult to cite.

The age in which we live has its cultural fads and fashions, as every age has had, and we have developed an amazing ability to become nostalgic for even the recent past. To yearn for a return to the 1950s, the most culturally deprived decade of the past four hundred years, seems absurd, but can we understand what happened in the fifties (or any other decade of the twentieth century) without collecting the records of what it produced? To attempt to establish a Fifties Collection per se is also absurd, for only collections focused on individuals or specific subjects are likely to be very useful academically. The only way that real coverage of any broad subject can be achieved is for many institutions to specialize on different aspects of the subject, as delineated by different writers, and to pay close attention to the ephemera of the period. Yet how does one ensure that all the institutions don’t concentrate on the same aspect? The question of the archival responsibility of those who actually produce the material is also raised (I refer specifically to government agencies). How much duplication of resources and time can we tolerate?

I have asked a considerable number of questions in this paper and have, I suspect, provided very few answers. Significantly, I will end with another series of questions. Last year we acquired a small collection (about 1,000 items) of books of World War I literature. It consists mainly of poetry, with some fiction; is mainly British, with some Canadian and U.S. content, and, although assembled with the theme of the Great War in mind, is rather amorphous. Do we have the basis of a special collection? We have been interested in the subject of World War I for some time because of its profound effect on the history of Canada and have collected material on the military aspects of Canadian involvement, but that is rather different from launching forth on a full-scale collection. What considerations might

influence the decision we must make soon? First, I think, what other collections exist? The fifth edition of Lee Ash's *Guide to Subject Collections* lists several, but only the Hoover Library at Stanford and the New York Public Library (for which a G.K. Hall catalogue exists) have really large comprehensive collections. More pertinent, perhaps, is the collection at the Metropolitan Toronto Public Library (11,000 volumes) which does not contain literary material, and a small but interesting collection including manuscripts at MacMaster University. Most important, but not, of course, listed separately, is the World War I material in the main library stacks of the University of Toronto. How does one discover what is there, scattered as it is by the Library of Congress Classification, and what does one do with it? Second, what should be the scope of the special collection? Could one confine it to Canadian material? to literary works? to ephemeral productions? Is it possible to define a special collection on such a vast topic? Third, what kind of financial commitment will be involved, for now and for the future? What is the commitment for staff, for space, for conservation? Finally, and most important, is this the kind of special collection that scholars who work at the University of Toronto now and in the future are going to want to use? Could it make a real contribution to research?

I have asked myself these questions and now I am asking them of you. Would this collection be worthwhile, and, if so, would the collecting of it be possible? It is the kind of question which must be answered as we pursue the records of the twentieth century.

#### NOTES

1. *Support to Specialized Collections: Guidelines* (Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1983), 2.

2. Alexander Grinstein, *Sigmund Freud's Writings* (New York: International Universities Press, 1977).

3. Richard Hunter and Ida MacAlpine, *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963). This work is not a list of the collection (now at Cambridge University Library), but a bibliographical guide to the field.

4. Frederick Locker-Lampson, *The Rowfant Library: A Catalogue* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1886), and *An Appendix to the Rowfant Library* (London: Charles Whittingham & Co., 1900).

5. John Carter and Percy H. Muir, comps. and eds., *Printing and the Mind of Man*. 2d ed. (Munich: Karl Pressler, 1983). First published by Cassell and Co. in 1967.

6. Michael Bliss, *The Discovery of Insulin* ([Toronto]: McClelland and Stewart [1982]), and Michael Bliss, *Banting: A Biography* ([Toronto]: McClelland and Stewart [1984]).

7. John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1936). See Carter and Muir, *Printing and the Mind of Man*, p.423.

8. William Matheson, "Institutional Collections in the United States," in *Rare Books*

1983-84: *Trends, Collections, Sources*, ed. Alice D. Schreyer (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1984), 33-52.

9. Daniel Traister, "Books About Books," in *Rare Books 1983-84: Trends, Collections, Sources*, ed. Alice D. Schreyer (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1984), 81-92.



*The*  **BOOKPRESS, Ltd.**

SPECIALISTS IN

The History and Making of Books, including works on color printing, bookbinding, papermaking, and calligraphy.

Examples of Victorian Printing and Bookbinding techniques.

Techniques in the Applied Arts until the end of the Nineteenth Century.

Books in Eighteenth Century American Libraries.

Social and Intellectual history.

Americana.

CATALOGUES ISSUED

*P.O. Box KP • Williamsburg, Virginia 23187 • (804) 229-1260*



*Priscilla Jewelis*

---

*Rare Books*

*Livres d'artiste*

*Illustrated Books*

*Autographs & Manuscripts*

*Literature*

*Catalogues Issued*

We are always interested in purchasing  
fine books or manuscripts.

*150 Huntington Avenue, S.D.-L  
Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

*By Appointment (617) 424-1895*