issue, that it would add greatly to the cost of the undertaking. What one misses even more is a guide to the length of the reviews which ought not to be prohibitively expensive either from the editorial standpoint or production costs.

In spite of its modest format and the brevity of its entries, the Review Index should prove to be a useful and inexpensive addition to the bibliographical apparatus of college, university, and the larger public libraries.—Harold Russell, University of Minnesota Library.


The second edition to the Guide to Bibliographies follows closely in scope and arrangement the first edition of 1936. Part I is again a short list of those American bibliographies which are not restricted to one institution or field of interest (7 titles); Part II is a very brief list (65 entries) arranged by subject or “field.” It is hard to understand the erratic choice of subject headings, the termination of the list with “Speech,” and the uneven inclusion of titles found later in Part III, but for practical purposes the last part is the more important section, and we proceed to that.

In the division called “Institutional Lists” there are approximately 330 entries. Twenty-five per cent, which consist of references to college catalogs and presidents’ reports, have not been investigated. An additional 12 per cent refer to manuscript lists which must also be passed over. An inconsistency in the form of entry used for supplements, and a confusion between checklisting technique and cataloging practice result in the cumbersome inclusion of another 8 per cent of entries. Of the remaining 150 titles, 11 were out of date last August. These are: Clark University, George Washington University, University of Florida, Louisiana State University, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State College, Southern Methodist University, Stanford University, University of Southern California, Tulane University, and Vanderbilt University. A few omissions of old titles were noted. In the series called “Masters Essays” for Columbia University, 1934, 1937, and 1938 are strangely missing. The Wisconsin Abstracts of Theses, v. 1, 1917, is omitted. A consistent practice for the arrangement of series notes and for the use of brackets would have been helpful since most of the outright errors were apparent in that connection. Obviously, the Guide is useful, but it is a great pity that such a compilation was not made to conform to the professional standards for either order, cataloging, or reference departments.—Isabel Howell, Vanderbilt University Library.


The monumental Milkau-Leyh Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft was completed last year with the publication of the third volume, which is devoted to library history. The consummation of this invaluable work represents the crowning effort of continental librarians to endow their profession with the status of a science standardized by its indispensable Handbuch. Petzholdt, Graesel, and Dahl had attempted the task with a degree of
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success corresponding to the current state of the profession; but they lacked the background of the expansion and great advances in technique which reached a climax in the thirties. Milkau-Leyh is a symbol as well as an exposition of one of the most significant cultural phenomena before the outbreak of World War II.

A basic distinction of the German *Handb"ucher* is that they are usually a combination of encyclopedia, textbook, and monograph, frequently presenting articles which are unique in the field concerned and which represent the best secondary sources. Such is the case with Milkau-Leyh; and of greatest interest to us is the first scholarly history of English and American libraries, written by Dr. Albert Predeek, director of the Technische Hochschule Bibliothek in Berlin-Charlottenburg. Like all other sections of the *Handbuch*, it is a full-fledged monograph and might well be reissued as a separate, possibly in translation.

Dr. Predeek’s work is in two sections, one for Great Britain and one for America. He maintains a basic unity between the two parts by such devices as emphasis on the mutual influences between the libraries of the two great English-speaking nations. Thanks to extensive travels in both countries and previous research, he reveals a fine sense of proportion in organization of his material. Documentation from library literature as well as that of ancillary fields is abundant, and future investigators of problems in our library history will find a good starting point here.

The section on English libraries is especially noteworthy for its sketch of the British Museum and the concise summary of Panizzi’s work as administrator and cataloger, based on Dr. Predeek’s more extensive study in the *Festschrift Georg Leyh*. In many details he reveals himself as an authority on the English national character as reflected in the development of English libraries. Thus, for example, he points out the time lag between material prosperity and social progress as illustrated in the tardy appearance of the popular library in England; and very sensibly he interprets its rise as a manifestation of the general demand for cultural opportunities rather than conscious Americanization. On the whole, it would be difficult for an American to find fault with Dr. Predeek’s treatment of English libraries. One might perhaps wish for as extensive an account of the Library Association as there is of the A.L.A.; but the excellence of the latter might be traced to Dr. Predeek’s associations in this country, where he was visiting when much of the work of reorganizing the A.L.A. was in progress.

Throughout the American section of the work Dr. Predeek displays a warm sympathy and fine understanding for American culture, particularly as revealed in his own field. He does not betray the unmitigated conviction that all is good in American libraries. Like Dr. Munthe, he sees that, while the terrain is fertile and well tilled, results are considerably short of perfection. Dr. Predeek’s association with leading American librarians gave him an insight without which his work would be much less valuable. For example, he does not accept at face value the popular superstition entertained abroad that early American research libraries, like our graduate schools, were inspired exclusively by German models, pointing out rather that German influence on American universities had only a secondary reaction on their libraries.

His treatment of the Library of Congress is quite as good as that of the British
Museum, but no American university library is treated so extensively as the Bodleian. The discussion of the American public library is not so suggestive as Dr. Munthe's brilliant essay on the pessimist and the public library; but it is a sober, informative description based on the best primary sources. On the other hand, he sometimes tends to misinterpret the work of the liberal arts college library, especially in its relation to research. He gives full credit to the role of philanthropy in the growth of American libraries, and there is a brief but sound account of the work of the Carnegie Corporation.

Two peculiar aspects of American librarianship are exceptionally well treated. In dealing with the growth of the early research libraries Dr. Predeek shows the importance of acquisition of the private libraries of great European scholars. This subject which he has outlined so well deserves greater attention than it has hitherto received from library surveyors. The material on education for librarianship shows a deep-rooted understanding of our problems. Dr. Predeek does not look down his nose in pious contempt for American colleagues simply because most of them could not qualify for the Prussian höherer Dienst, but he discusses our problems intelligently and offers many helpful suggestions.

Dr. Predeek's treatise should be read by every American librarian who commands the minimum essentials of German.—Lawrence Thompson, Iowa State College Library.


This little volume, although a later and separate publication, may seem at first glance to be merely an introduction to the author's Medieval Libraries (1939), which was reviewed by Prof. Curtis H. Walker in this journal, June, 1940. Actually there is no formal connection between the two books. Even the identity of authorship is deceptive; as a medievalist Prof. Thompson is an expert, as an orientalist and a classicist he is an amateur. Moreover, there is little historical connection between his two subjects; although medieval librarians may have reassembled some volumes which had once been in Greek or Roman libraries, the medieval institutions, as institutions, were autochthonous. In the interim the very idea of a library had perished and it had to be reinvented.

Yet despite their independence some comparison is inevitable between these two books in the field of library history which bear the same name on their title pages. Here in many points Ancient Libraries has the advantage. It is lucid and logical, not only in sentence structure but also in organic composition. Its style is infused with the enthusiasm and vitality of the author. As one reads one can almost see and hear Prof. Thompson in person. Medical Libraries, on the contrary, is turgid and heavy, but that was the work of many collaborators whose rhetorical infelicities were perhaps heightened rather than tempered by editorial attempts to bring them into unison.

In the matter of content, however, the present work is inferior. It is too brief for its theme. In fifty pages an attempt is made to summarize our knowledge concerning Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Greek, and Roman libraries; in forty-eight pages there is a discussion of "various technical matters . . . such as the format of books, library architecture, cataloging and clas-