

E. Leary, "Diagnosis and Remediation," by Ruth Strang, and "Techniques of Appraisal," by J. Wayne Wrightstone, again concern themselves with the mechanics of reading. Finally, the eleventh study, entitled "The Library," by Edward A. Wight and Leon Carnovsky, "is concerned primarily with considerations of facilitating the union between the book and the reader." Here are discussed such familiar topics as "Functions of the Library," "Physical Plant and Equipment," "Library Content," "Instruction in the Use of the Library," "Stimulating Use of the Library," "Measuring Use," "Personnel," and "Technical Work," with reference, of course, to high-school and junior-college libraries.

As a treatment of reading *per se* the total effect of this series of studies is highly impressive. It is well, however, to go back to Mr. Anderson's study and let ourselves be reminded again that the art of reading is not an end in itself. In the final analysis how well or how much people, and particularly students, read, must always be subordinate to what they read and what they enjoy reading. Perhaps even an exploratory study might have given more attention to the latter question.—*John J. Lund, Duke University, Durham, N.C.*

Notes Used on Catalog Cards, a List of Examples. Olive Swain. American Library Association, 1940. viii, 11, 102p. \$1.25 (Planographed)

TO MOST catalogers, this carefully selected list of notes to be used on catalog cards will be a welcome addition to the small body of literature in their field, very little of which has been written concerning notes. One is reminded of the earlier lists, compiled by Robinson Spencer and

by the Twin City Regional Group of Catalogers, which have been so much in demand through the years. One can assume that this one will be even more generally used than the others.

The title indicates a broader scope than is actually covered by the list, which is a tool for the general cataloger and not for the specialist, and which excludes notes which would be used only in serial cataloging. The usefulness of the list would be increased considerably if notes for serials were included. The arrangement is an alphabetical one, by headings under which one might look to find notes describing features of a book; as, Cover-title; Dedications; Dissertations, Academic; Editions, etc. Under headings, a further alphabetic order is followed in listing the notes. The same note may be given under two or more headings, as "Part of thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Chicago, 1938," which appears under the headings "Dissertations, Academic," and "Source." Explanatory material, especially regarding the limitations of the use of some notes (as "For a device that cannot be identified," "For a diary," "For an oratorio") is given below the note itself, but sometimes it is omitted when it might well be there (as in the case of the note "Authority for author's name: Catalogue of the Library of the Harvard law school," which may need, for the beginning cataloger and student of cataloging, some explanation of the limitation of its use).

The compiler's explanation of the choice of terms, and of the use of some terms, as given in the preface and following some of the notes, will be invaluable to the beginners. In any future revision, an expansion of this feature will increase many fold the usefulness of the work.

In the list itself, the examples are good

ones—they are selected largely from notes on Library of Congress cards, from the earlier printed lists mentioned above, and from the University of Washington and Stanford University files (but unfortunately the source of each note is not indicated). It would naturally follow that they do not all have the same set form, even the simplest ones. This may be confusing to the beginner, who could probably use the list more profitably and more easily, could learn note terminology more readily, and follow one set form more uniformly, if the notes in "Library of Congress form" were so marked.

In order to reduce production cost, the compiler's manuscript, instead of the customary typed copy for planographing, was photographed. (It might be pointed out here that it was a little disappointing to find that so few examples of notes describing the various near-print processes have been included.) On examination, no typographical errors were noted in the entire work.

Miss McPherson states, in her *Some Practical Problems in Cataloging*, that "notes on catalog cards present at one and the same time some of the most difficult features of cataloging, some of the most interesting problems in handling a book technically, and some of the greatest outlets for self-expression which a cataloger may have the privilege of experiencing." Miss Swain's list should prove to be of decided value in all three regards, but particularly in the last, both for the cataloger for whom wording of notes is an unwelcome opportunity for self-expression, and for the cataloger who is inclined to be too wordy, or lacking in clarity, in his self-expression on catalog cards.—*Irene M. Doyle, Library School, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.*

The Rockefeller Foundation; a Review for 1939. Raymond B. Fosdick. The Foundation, New York, 1940. 507p. Distributed without charge.

Recent Trends in Higher Education in the United States: With Special Reference to Financial Support for Private Colleges and Universities. Trevor Arnett. General Education Board, New York, 1940. 80p. Distributed without charge.

Annual Report: 1939. General Education Board, New York, 1940. 171p. Distributed without charge.

SOME MAY ask why reviews of the reports of foundations such as those listed above make their way into the columns of *College and Research Libraries*. The answer would seem to be that college and university librarians cannot intelligently administer their libraries without knowing the research and instructional objectives of their institutions, which are attained in large part by the aid of the great foundations. The history of research and higher education in the United States and elsewhere is to a considerable extent the story of the vision behind the grants of a handful of foundations and corporations devoted to education and research.

The Rockefeller Foundation report for 1939 surveys the work of the Foundation in the five fields in which it concentrates its efforts: international health; the medical sciences; the natural sciences; the social sciences; and the humanities. There are at least four reasons why librarians and others interested in higher education should be acquainted with this report. The first is the method of reporting. Most librarians who have to write an account of their activities may study with profit the style of this report, which