

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

makes the peregrinations of a malaria-carrying mosquito as exciting as the latest war communiqués.

The second point of relevance to libraries is the concentration of the Foundation upon a few problems in each of its fields of interest. Although the Foundation has made some grants for research and teaching in various fields of medicine, it has thrown most of its weight in the medical division of its program into psychiatric research. In the natural sciences its support has been concentrated behind research in experimental biology. The theory behind this policy is that the resources of even so large a Foundation would be dissipated to little purpose were they to be used for research in all parts of even the five fields mentioned. On the other hand, because of the interconnections of all fields of knowledge, significant research in any restricted area is bound to advance knowledge in related subjects. That such a policy of concentration upon a few fields might profitably be applied to library programs was clearly stated by Mr. Munn in his presidential address at Cincinnati.

The radio research financed by the Foundation is a third activity which should be of great interest to librarians. One study contrasts radio's present service with that of the printed page. It was discovered that those who listen to the radio least are those who most readily find satisfaction in what they read, and that the percentage of radio listeners is greater among high-school graduates than it is among college graduates, and still greater among those who did not reach high school. Yet this latter culture-level group that listens most in point of time, listens least to radio's more serious offerings. Radio seems as yet not to be extending the

interests of those members of its audience who find more satisfaction in listening than in reading.

The sections on the claim of the social sciences and the handicaps of the social sciences cannot be skipped by any librarian interested in the widest implications of his profession as a social science.

In *Recent Trends in Higher Education*, Mr. Arnett is interested in the financial problems confronting privately supported colleges and universities. His report considers the implications of a series of statistical studies of the current receipts and expenditures, receipts for capital purposes, enrollments, and tuition fees of approximately two hundred representative institutions. From the data presented three trends stand out:

1. Decreasing gifts to private institutions
2. Decreasing returns on invested endowment
3. Increasing competition for both funds and students from state institutions

The study indicates a need for a comprehensive study of the total resources of the United States for higher education, and the subsequent need for intelligent coordination and cooperation.

The areas of interest to which the General Education Board is now directing its attention in its program for Southern education are defined in the following headings:

1. The fuller development of the economic and social resources of the South by means of educational and research contributions, especially in the fields of the social and the natural sciences.
2. The development of selected college and university centers, with particular attention to improvement of personnel, of library service, and of collaboration among

institutions favorably located for cooperation in meeting regional needs.

3. Undertakings in elementary and secondary education, chiefly in cooperation with state departments of education, teacher-education institutions, and agencies engaged in studies or experiments of region-wide import.

In its program in the field of general education, the Board in recent years has taken a special interest in efforts to improve provisions for the care and education of young people aged twelve to twenty. Out of studies and thinking generated by this interest has come a new conception of secondary education for a new kind of secondary school student, namely the student who will become one of the great ordinary run of wage-earners and housewives. The Report summarizes the work towards these objectives through subsidies to such organizations as the American Council on Education, American Youth Commission, Association of School Film Libraries and numerous others.—*Neil C. Van Deusen, Fisk University, Nashville.*

More About Thompson's Medieval Library

TO THE EDITOR

COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES
SIR:

Your reviewer¹ of James Westfall Thompson's book *The Medieval Library* seems to have missed several errors in that volume, which should be called to the attention of the prospective purchaser.

On page 21 we read: "Cyprian seems to have known little of books outside of the Bible." The notes of Baluze on Cyprian in the Migne edition would

¹ *College and Research Libraries* 1:281-83, June 1940.

show how serious a misstatement this is.

On page 65, Dr. Thompson has mis-translated from the great work of Manitius on Post-Classical Latin Literature. Manitius had written about Paschasius Radbertus (i, 407): "Sehr seltene Kenntnisse sind bei ihm die Irenäusübersetzung und Tertullian de pudicitia." Misreading this sentence, Thompson makes Paschasius Radbertus a translator of Irenaeus and of Tertullian. But Radbertus never translated Irenaeus, and Tertullian wrote in the same language as Radbertus did, so there was little need to translate him.

On page 21, we are told that Tertullian "died ca. 200." Actually, he did most of his work after 200 A.D.

On page 127, Dr. Thompson quotes three prose lines from Bernard of Chartres. His ear for verse misled him here, as they are three hexameters.

Usually, historians of culture deplore the destruction of books which took place during the sixteenth century. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to read on page 371 in Dr. Thompson:

The monasteries could not meet these new conditions and interests; nor, indeed, did they endeavor to compete with them. Instead they sank into sloth and lethargy, idly living upon their properties and indifferent to the new ideas of a new age. . . . In the end, the monasteries—and their libraries—were doomed to spoliation and dissolution for their sin against the light of the time. *The retribution was deserved, however much one may regret the ruthless and senseless way in which it was enforced.*

The italics are my own. I am grateful to you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness in allowing me this space to dissent.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev.) Joseph F. Cantillon, S.J.,
Loyola School, New York City