undue demands upon the libraries of foreign countries, and that an effort toward American bibliographic self-sufficiency may be justified in view of the size of the United States and her distance from European libraries.

(5) Richard Mummendey’s description of public service aspects of American research libraries is based more on personal impressions gained during his visits to numerous libraries than upon a comprehensive study of the literature. His treatment is, therefore, somewhat unbalanced (e.g., he devotes too much space to circulation and interlibrary loan routines) and contains a few minor slips (e.g., he states [p. 179] that the University of Chicago has a professional library staff of 300, whereas the actual figure reported for 1955/56 was 120) and some omissions (e.g., it includes no discussion of reference service or the subject divisional system; and his treatment of the branch library problem is too sketchy). Nevertheless his contribution is not unacceptable. He covers service to undergraduates, reserves, open shelves, circulation routines, departmental libraries, regulations for off-campus users, hours, interlibrary loans, and cooperative storage libraries. He identifies aspects of American libraries that differ from their German counterparts: e.g., American libraries have to take care of the needs of undergraduates, some allow students access to the stacks, their loan periods are shorter, the connection between departmental and the general library of a university is closer, staff working hours are shorter but library hours longer, etc.

Although the account may lack comprehensiveness and critical sharpness, it has the virtue of being a little more vivid in style and somewhat less ponderous than some of the other accounts. From the point of view of immediate reforms called for in German libraries, it may well contain more useful information than other chapters in this volume.

(6) In the final chapter of the volume, Martin Cremer presents a succinct history of the development of the Library of Congress into a national library. This account is solidly factual and calls for no detailed critique.

The volume, which is well printed, but issued without hard-cover binding, comes equipped with a compact subject index prepared by Walter Bauhuis, one of the contributors.

It is evident throughout that the visiting librarians from Germany have been profoundly impressed by what they saw in American libraries even though they have been critical of certain developments that run counter to their tradition. As series-editor Carl Wehmer points out, no German librarian believes any longer that he can ignore the contributions of American librarianship in efforts at analyzing and solving professional library problems in Germany; in this connection, he says, superficial enthusiasm as well as superficial disdain are out of place. A knowledge of the facts is the first necessary step in deriving profit from the experience of American libraries. This commendable volume paves the way for the acquisition of such knowledge.—Robert H. Muller, University of Michigan Library.

University of Tennessee
Library Lectures


Each spring the University of Tennessee Library invites an outstanding librarian or teacher to give the annual University of Tennessee Library Lecture. These are published in groups of three lectures to a volume. Previous lecturers in the series have been Maurice Tauber, Louis R. Wilson, John Burchard, Robert Downs, Lester Asheim, and Lawrence Clark Powell, speaking either on the subject of the library in education or about the problems facing university and research libraries. In a series of this kind, through which the University of Tennessee Library may be considered to have joined the libraries of the University of Illinois and the University of Pennsylvania in instituting annual library lectures of a high standard, it would be expected that the lectures be general in appeal (with a
corresponding lack of novel information and ideas) and that the lectures be distinguished in their chosen field. The University of Tennessee Library Lectures conform to this pattern.

The lecture for 1955 is entitled "Liberal Education, Specialization, and Librarianship," by Jack Dalton, then librarian of the Alderman Library, University of Virginia. It is a brief, but well stated, argument for the important role of the librarian in lending assistance to a highly specialized society by helping its members to acquire a necessary but neglected liberal arts background.

Dalton proposes that the library assume responsibility, not only for assembling and preserving great books, but also for encouraging among intelligent specialists the reading of the world's notable statements, documents in which man's profoundest thought is recorded. There is no question here of the importance of specialization. Modern society depends on it. But the library can fill a vital role in correcting the faults of this necessary specialization by fostering the reading of great books among those specialists who have already an appreciation of the need for a liberal background but who have not taken time or opportunity to acquire it.

The eighth lecture, "The Research Library in Transition," was given by Herman H. Fussier in April, 1956. In order to examine the present state and future prospects of the research library, he brings together and summarizes many diverse facts and observations about libraries of this class. The skillful assembling of these facts indicates a broad acquaintance by the author with the literature of the research library. Even more impressive is the careful evaluation and analysis of these facts, demonstrating his wide experience in research libraries and the reflection he has given to their problems. In my opinion, this is the most thoughtful and perceptive analysis of the research library that has yet been published.

The basic problem of the research library is its rapid growth, a recent phenomenon brought in the train of the current preoccupation of the university with research and the extension of research into all areas of everyday life. But in a characteristically shrewd observation, Fussier notes that "growth, per se, is not in itself alarming; it becomes alarming only as it may create intellectual difficulties in relation to use, and space or financial demands that are beyond the reasonable capacities of the library's parent institution." The approaches thus far suggested to the problems of growth may be reduced to four: (1) the curtailment of publishing which Fussier dismisses as an impotent approach, (2) a more selective collection of materials, (3) more compact storage, and (4) interlibrary cooperation. In spite of a lack of general agreement on what particular material may be discarded from the research library, greater selectivity of research materials would seem to be possible in some areas. Compact storage and the reduction of materials to the form of microfilm and microcards, already used in limited measure, have not yet been developed to a point where these means offer anything like a general solution. Two types of interlibrary cooperation have been tried: the regional center for the infrequently used books from several libraries in the same region, and subject specialization by which the several cooperating libraries each assume responsibility for separate subject fields. Both types present difficulties which will be resolved only as we obtain much additional information about the nature of printed information and about the manner in which the scholar seeks and uses information. Some objective studies have already been made in these directions, and the tentative conclusions indicate the great importance of this kind of study.

While any predictions about the future development of research libraries must be highly speculative, and the modesty of the author forbids his making any claim of special insight, nevertheless the picture drawn by Fussier of the future research library seems to be based on sound interpretation of the information already at hand. It is reasonable to assume that bibliographies of all kinds will play an increasingly important role in the library of the future. The dependence on more adequate bibliographies than we have known until recently (e.g., the National Union Catalog and the proposed subject index to the National Union Catalog) will allow libraries to satisfy readers' needs with a smaller proportion of the universe of print.
available in their own collection than is now believed necessary, to be less dependent on expensive shelf arrangement of books based on subject classification, and to require less local cataloging. There will have to be greater selectivity both in the acquisition and preservation of material. Finally, in spite of the glibness with which uninformed prophets are wont to solve all library problems through the development of electronic "brains," still several of the devices and techniques already developed are certain to have great effect on research library organization.

In this logically constructed and thoughtful essay on the research library and its future, it seems that one matter has not received adequate consideration; the distinction (if it exists) between the ways in which scholars in different disciplines must use books in their research. Admittedly this is one of the areas in which considerably more study is needed. In fact, I know of no objective study on precisely this point. But until we have more information about research use of books, we cannot rule out the possibility that the nature of discovery in the various humanistic and social disciplines requires that the scholar and all of the books which might conceivably have any bearing on his study be brought together. In these areas there are at least certain types of inquiry which require the examination or browsing among so many hundreds of articles, books, documents, and other writings in widely diverse subject fields, that physical removal of the infrequently used materials from the scholar may effectively stifle his creativeness, no matter how great a corpus of bibliographies he has at hand. If this should be true, it is evident that regional storage of materials in these subject areas would not be feasible. While Fussler acknowledges that removal of infrequently used material must proceed with caution until we know more about scholars' needs and that interlibrary cooperation depends on the scholar's ability to establish probable relevancy of material to his study through use of bibliographies and similar lists. Still it seems that a distinction in the use of material by scholars in various disciplines, or at least in different types of research, might be made, and that cooperative storage plans might be based on this distinction.

Robert Vosper with characteristic facetiousness, called the ninth lecture "A Rare Book Is a Rare Book." Its thesis is that since 1938 librarians have increasingly recognized the importance of rare books to scholarship, not simply for their text, which can be provided equally well in reprints, but also for their appearance, design, errors, and other qualities which are not reproduced in reprints. Since this time, librarians have also exhibited increasing willingness to provide the care and special treatment which rare books require and thus have excused themselves from the earlier merited denunciation by Randolph Adams of "librarians as enemies of books." The line between the pre-1938 attitude of librarians and scholars toward rare books and the current recognition of their value in the university program is not as clear and marked as it is drawn by Vosper, although no one can deny that there has certainly been a change of attitude from that commonly held in the 1920's. To me it seems fairly clear that Pierce Butler in 1931, in his condemnation of "the cult of rarities" and of "bibliophily," was referring to the collection of the kind of books we now call "collectors' items," meaning books that are expensive by reason of points important only to the collector or to the antique dealer, not to the scholar or student. It is also possible that Arlt and Lund were referring only to purchases of this kind, in complaining about the use of the library budget for this purpose. Vosper admits these "difficulties in the definition of terms" in order to explain several recent denials by scholars of the importance of rare books to scholarship. Recognition should also be made that Arlt and Lund were undoubtedly influenced in their views by the general scarcity of library book funds in the 1930's and could hardly be expected to have the liberal attitude toward expensive acquisitions which could be enjoyed in 1957.

In our fear of becoming engulfed by the rapidly rising flood of print, not even the most reactionary library administrator could ask for the discontinuance of this publication. Rather we can only regret that these lectures cannot be published soon after each has been delivered. It is unfortunate that administrators and others interested in the
The Great EB


When John Lehmann, in The Whispering Gallery, writes briefly of his great-grandfather and the firm which launched Chambers’s Encyclopædia, readers for whom reference books are stock-in-trade may well wish for a fuller account. Upon reflection, however, one realizes that the history of an encyclopedia is perhaps less suited to Mr. Lehmann’s literary style and talents than to more journalistic abilities such as are exhibited in Herman Kogan’s The Great EB. That is not to depreciate Mr. Kogan’s abilities, for they are considerable. In this story of the Encyclopædia Britannica he presents a colorful and highly readable narrative of the birth and development of one of our great reference tools.

With a liberal sprinkling of anecdotes and interesting sidelights, Kogan traces the progress of the Britannica from its Edinburgh beginnings and the labors of William Smellie to its present big-business status with editors employing the mechanical assistance of “the Robot.” He tells of the men who guided the encyclopedia’s destinies; of the financial crises which so often attended a change of ownership; and of the EB’s affiliation with the London Times, with Cambridge University, with Sears, Roebuck and Company, and with the University of Chicago. He has contrived to make the account move smoothly and rapidly from edition to edition, relating the growth of the enterprise to the events of the times, and suggesting the changes and advances which influenced that growth.

The whole is spiced with names of famous contributors and quotations from their articles and correspondence; with excerpts from reviews of and contemporary comments on the various editions. If there are moments when the reader feels unduly “quoted at,” he should remember that the opportunities for quotation must have been boundless: Mr. Kogan has undoubtedly exercised admirable restraint.

Only in the final chapter, “The Modern EB: How It Is Sold,” does the reader’s interest flag. Since sales methods and promotions figure prominently in the narrative, it is altogether appropriate that modern methods, too, be considered. It is unfortunate, however, that this last chapter is padded out with banal sales stories and bits of company lore, proving an anticlimax to an otherwise absorbing history.

The work includes a bibliography which lists books, magazine and newspaper references, as well as unpublished master’s essays. Regrettably, a single explanatory note in the bibliography is made to suffice for all editions and subsidiary publications of the Encyclopædia Britannica. Thus, for the work under consideration we are denied immediate access to dates and other bibliographical details—information not readily gleaned from an indexed text. A full bibliographic listing (or a tabular summary) of all the editions and subsidiaries of the Britannica would have been a very desirable and valuable addition to the book.—Eugene P. Sheehy, Columbia University Libraries.

Information Indexing and Subject Cataloging


“It is not easy for writer or reader to disentangle the entanglements of indexing with false science, vain philosophy and misused or unnecessary logic, and doing so makes for controversy and criticism, of the locusts who have eaten the years. But for them these studies would hardly have been needed . . . and indexing and its students would be better off if there were few if any other authorities accepted now, besides Dewey and Cutter of 1876, and Kaiser and Hulme of 1911. But others are accepted as authorities, and with their panaceas, conflicting metaphysics, inconsistent jargons,