

gles out as clear examples Pliny's "Historia Naturalis" and the great Byzantine Souda (or Suidas lexicon). He adopts the term "golden chain" to embody the links that have passed on great scholarship and traditions down to the present day, i.e., ". . . golden chain of written record" (p.26). In his chapter on Hellas he speculates on several reasons which may account for the noticeable lack of information about private libraries in Greece as compared with those of Rome. At the conclusion of his succinct history of Roman public libraries he poses a provocative query: what would have happened had Ovid not been sent into exile by Augustus but made head of the Palatine library instead? Chapter VI, "Classical Bibliography," with its handy compendium of informative data on such details as writing implements, papyrus, parchment, and indexes, is a good filler-in for the background to the picture Sir Frederick Kenyon has already depicted in his *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Other topics include: religious life and learning (a very fertile field—"the special character of Christianity involved an immediate interest in books, and therefore in libraries," p.21); the Oxford Greyfriars and S. Robert of Lincoln; Richard de Bury and his *Philobiblon*; parish libraries; and at the end a delightful little chapter on "The Study and the Sofa"—a capsule word portrait of "the social and domestic circumstances under which reading is done" (p.262). The list of sources is impressive; however, I miss a reference to Edward A. Parsons's *The Alexandrian Library*; and George Haven Putnam's *Authors and Their Public in Ancient Times*, though a trifle antiquated, is still interesting reading. There are misprints in the Greek and accents are occasionally butchered, but, all in all, this is a highly intelligent text with a wealth of information which spills over even into the footnotes. The book certainly points up the need for more research in this lucrative field.—Francis D. Lazenby, University of Notre Dame.

**Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century.** By Ruth Miller Elson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964. 424p. \$7. (64-17219).

To what extent is an individual influenced by his reading? Librarians and educationists

have pondered this question variously. In *Molders of the Modern Mind*, for example, Librarian Robert Downs described 111 books that, in his opinion, had shaped Western civilization. The late, deep-thinking educational philosopher, Michael Demiashevich, in his *The National Mind*, analyzed the cultural influences, including literature, that influenced the English, French, and German mentalities. But the present approach is a more basic one—to the ideas held by the ordinary man, and it is made through an analysis of a thousand or more schoolbooks to which the nineteenth-century American was exposed.

Because there was no competition from television, movies, and the countless recreations that confront today's children, schoolbooks undoubtedly influenced last century's Americans considerably. Furthermore, since libraries were almost nonexistent in schools there was no possibility of dispersal through reserve reading. Finally, the accent on memorization reinforced by the monitorial system and catechism-type learning guaranteed schoolbook influence beyond anything today, at least for those who attended school at all.

From their readers, spellers, grammars, arithmetics, and later, geographies and histories, our grand- and great-grandparents learned reading, writing and arithmetic, of course. But they gathered other things also, because textbook writers of the nineteenth century "were much more concerned with the child's moral development than with the development of his mind." Noah Webster prefaced his 1789 textbook with the purpose "to diffuse the principles of virtue and patriotism."

From Dr. Elson's absorbing analysis it is apparent that idealism dominated realism in last century's schoolbooks. In the study of nature, God's creation was nobly reconciled with biologists' evolution. Virtue was almost always rewarded and vice punished. Americans were God's latest "chosen people."

Other nations were something less. The English were good because they were our parents and their literature was the greatest. But the English were monstrous and cruel in the American Revolution. Other nations ranked below, with various characterizations. The Germans, on the whole, received the next most favorable treatment. Except

for LaFayette, the French were unenthusiastically described. Italians, although artistic, were degenerate, and reproached for housing the seat of the Roman Catholic Church. South European peoples were described as indolent; Asians generally as declining; and Chinese as cunning and deceitful. There was a smugness toward Latin Americans that complimented them for their good sense in revolting against cruel Spain, but warned them there was no salvation except under United States leadership.

These national misconceptions were only a part of the nineteenth-century schoolbook teachings. The rest included a hero worship register that put Washington at the top, followed by Franklin, Lincoln, Columbus, and Penn; and for contrast, Benedict Arnold personified villainy. Other instruction in economics, social, political, reform, and culture concepts appeared equally naive and contrasted sharply with contemporary sophisticated liberalism and realism as communicated by today's mass media.

It is a tribute to Dr. Elson's provocative writing that a reader is stimulated to ask: Is our century better because we relish a fare of virtue punished, vice rewarded? Does our passion for realism and pragmatism make us a greater nation now than when we naively welcomed fantasy, and "they lived happily ever after"?

Librarians of school, public, and college libraries have to select this book. For its list of nineteenth-century textbooks alone, it is bibliographically indispensable. For its contribution to our number one professional problem of censorship it merits an intellectual freedom award. For good writing and stimulating reading *Guardians of Tradition* deserves inclusion on all kinds of library reading lists.—Louis Shores, Florida State University.

**Classification and Indexing in the Social Sciences.** By D. J. Foskett. Washington, D.C.: Butterworth, Inc., 1963. 190p. \$6.95.

No one has ever devised a completely satisfactory classification scheme, and it seems unlikely that anyone ever will. This failing has always been apparent, but in recent years it has taken on increasingly urgent importance as scholarly literature has grown more complex and information re-

trieval more sophisticated. The library profession has long been aware of the difficulties created by the schemes available, but Foskett, librarian at the University of London's Institute of Education, has now examined the matter thoroughly in specific relation to the social sciences. He has written an immensely stimulating book, providing a perceptive critique of each of the existing classifications as well as new insight into possible solutions to the problems of classifying social science materials.

He is very much in the Ranganathan camp and believes that the "facet analysis" which Ranganathan devised can conceivably supply the key to a much improved classification. He is especially taken with the more refined versions of this approach found in the work of the British Classification Research Group, and particularly in the work of Barbara Kyle. A schedule fashioned along these lines, he believes, would reveal subject subdivisions and the relationships between subjects much more satisfactorily than any schedule used today. He would have a classification of such flexibility that any two concepts in the area of the social sciences could be related and this relation indicated in the notation of the material.

To reach this goal, Foskett, like Ranganathan and virtually all the librarians working in new classifications, proposes a change in the concepts by which an item should be classified. Thus, a book would be classified by whether it deals, say, with a personality or an activity and then subclassified by equally untraditional concepts, like Ranganathan's Matter, Space, Time, and Energy. The final result should present, he believes, a classification network which would show the interrelations of all categories of knowledge, general or specific, where they impinge on each other.

If the reader finds himself quarreling with any of these ideas, it is probably due more to the nature of the enterprise than it is to Foskett's analysis of it. There are, however, several obstacles standing in the author's way, as he readily admits. It seems fairly reasonable to suppose that no classification system is going to provide for precise relation of every concept to every other one. Foskett faces this limitation squarely, debating at some length whether "Cell" should be related to "Child," for example, and fi-