significant aspect of the multifarious field is omitted. Experienced surveyors and those planning any type of survey will find in the compilation a variety of helpful discussions on the methodology, purposes, limitations and uses of the library survey in its many manifestations.—R. B. Downs, University of Illinois.


The life of Antonio Panizzi, the volatile Italian who set the British Museum on its road to greatness in the mid-nineteenth century, has fascinated practitioners of the biographic art for the last ninety years. In addition to Louis Fagan’s major two-volume work which appeared in 1880, a year after his mentor’s death, there have been numerous articles and several monographs treating some aspect of his life. If he was not the “Prince of Librarians,” as his admiring young staff member William B. Rye called him, he surely approached such distinction more nearly than anyone else.

Panizzi began his long association with the British Museum in 1831 when he was appointed Assistant Keeper of Printed Books. Upon his appointment Panizzi discovered that, despite its rich collections, the Museum was grossly inadequate as the national library and that it was presided over by a group of elderly clergymen who had neither the dynamism nor interest to make it worthy of the English nation. What others lacked, it was quickly apparent that Panizzi had. He was a scholar whose editions of Boiardo and Ariosto were even then coming from the press, and this background in bibliography and literature fitted him well for his task. Beginning with cataloging, a problem which would plague him during his entire stay at the British Museum, Panizzi demonstrated his capability to the trustees and subsequently to a whole series of Parliamentary committees. He was promoted to the position of Keeper of Printed Books in 1837 and finally to Principal Librarian in 1856, but throughout all the intervening years he was a major force behind the Museum advancement.

When one reads of the disorganized collections Panizzi inherited, the necessity to establish a strong collecting policy, to assemble staff, to argue for better book budgets, and to plan additional space, he can feel right at home in nineteenth-century England. Few administrators accomplish their tasks in eight-hour days, and obviously Panizzi did not. As an administrator he drove both himself and his staff hard, but he was always fair and argued constantly that such service deserved reward in the form of higher salaries. For this reason most of his subordinates admired and respected him; but some, especially the incompetent, had occasion to experience his ruthlessnes. As biographer Miller notes, Panizzi was not one to suffer fools gladly.

In reading the biographies of nineteenth-century librarians one is struck by their continuous problems with trustees. Strength of character was needed in abundance and Panizzi had that. His legal background was helpful in marshalling arguments and those who entered the fray against him could be assured a worthy opponent. Having had to endure long years of misrepresentation and pettiness Panizzi might have been expected to respond in kind.

In presenting all the controversies in which Panizzi was engaged, Miller has tried to be fair to all parties and has generally succeeded. Yet he obviously has sympathy with his subject—a prime requisite for a good biographer. He does not hesitate to make generalizations reflecting his apparently low opinion of administrators, perhaps best characterized in his summary of Panizzi’s contributions: “He was forced early in life to abandon the delights of academic research for more arid pastures, but, even there, he was able to leave his mark” (p. 321, cf. 131). Occasionally one wishes for a better revelation of the personality of the man. Still there is a chapter on “Friends and Acquaintances” and throughout the book one gets glimpses of Panizzi’s association with the Italian revolutionaries and the leading Whig officials of his day.

On the whole this is a well written and interesting book. Typographically it is undistinguished which seems unfortunate for such a substantial contribution to library history.—Edward G. Holley, University of Houston.