

either wholly lacking or seriously deficient in description and evaluation."

The worth of a new journal cannot, obviously, be intelligently evaluated on the basis of a single issue. The "unique characteristics" of *Library Trends* which presumably justified its birth, were announced as reviewing, synthesizing, evaluating and predicting the future of current developments in librarianship. Each issue will have an editor chosen because of his or her competence in the area to be covered by the issue and the guest editor will be responsible for the selection of the contributors. The idea of limiting each issue to a single topic, patterned after the *Annals of the American Academy* should make it possible for librarians to have at hand in a single source an up-to-date analysis of those subjects covered by *Library Trends*. Volume I, number 1, stands up rather well to these announced criteria. No one could question the competence of issue editor, Robert B. Downs, Director of the University of Illinois Libraries, and Director of the School of Library Science at the same institution. Likewise, the roster of contributors to the initial issue promises the authority demanded of a professional journal.

The question may be raised, however, as to whether both college and university libraries should have been included in one issue. The contents are definitely weighted on the side of the university library. Swank and Vosper explicitly limit their discussions to university libraries and McAnally's paper on organization and Coney's on management deal primarily with developments in the large library. In his résumé of the financial support of college and university libraries, McCarthy illustrates his text with ten tables, nine of which present data almost exclusively for university libraries. In several papers, of course, the topics themselves dictate this emphasis—for the problems of administrative organization and management presume an institution of a certain size. Without impugning the objectivity of the writers, it also seems plausible that the fact that ten of the eleven practitioners come from the university library field might contribute to the issue's preoccupation with the university library.

Future numbers of *Library Trends* will cover major types of libraries, including special libraries, school libraries, public libraries. These publications will lay the foundation for later treatment of more

specialized topics, such as education for librarianship, library personnel administration, cataloging and classification, among others. Such subjects are of constant interest to librarians, and re-evaluation of practices and the basic assumptions underlying them and their future developments will be valuable. It is hoped, however, that where feasible, the analyses will draw upon literature relevant to, though not necessarily produced by, librarianship. For example, the library problems of personnel selection and administration, and work simplification, to name but two, could certainly benefit from knowledge of some of the fundamental and operational research done in business and industry. The library profession needs access to such information and *Library Trends* should be an excellent medium to supply such information.—Robert T. Grazier, *University of Florida Libraries*.

## Notre Dame Survey

*Survey of the Library of the University of Notre Dame*. By Louis R. Wilson and Frank A. Lundy. Chicago, American Library Association, 1952. xiii, 195p. \$2.00.

This report, prepared by two experienced librarians and surveyors, cannot fail to help both the administration at Notre Dame and the library professional elsewhere who is faced with similar problems.

The *Survey* is comprehensive in its view and coverage of the Notre Dame situation; it is even repetitious, although this is probably more a precaution than a fault. As we all know, administrators who must read and use such surveys, inevitably have to skim and skip about among the sections.

This review of the *Survey*, however, is directed toward librarians, who will rightly want to use it as part of our professional literature. As such, the survey deserves attention for the long and generalized comments on the essentials of a university library program, the government of a university library, and its means of serving a campus community. These cover four chapters (II-V) and extend over fifty pages, which make clarifying and down-to-earth reading for any campus librarian. For example, what are those elements of its library's government which should be spelled out in a university's basic statutes? Repeatedly throughout the *Survey*, similar administrative theories and problems are

simply, even bluntly stated, for use as a work pattern and in a style no librarian-to-librarian exposition would use. Usually the statements however are the clearer for this type of wording, and make good reading, even when setting the reader to arguing with the surveyors.

Chapters VI to XII cover specific recommendations for reader services, technical services, finances and building. Your reviewer feels that only the library staff and university administration at Notre Dame can know the ultimate worth of these, but they seem generally judicious, except for one item. The book funds would have to be more generous than those named, especially in the sciences, to achieve the goals for the collections which the faculty described and the surveyors accepted.

Although ALA surveys follow a necessarily set form and the Notre Dame survey is properly standard in this respect, it does offer an unusual number of *obiter dicta* of much general professional worth to librarians. In some cases, as for example on the page about Catholic censorship of books, the survey gives an explicit statement on the issue involved which your reviewer believes may be unique in general library literature.—*John H. Moriarty, Purdue University Library.*

## Problems in Bibliography

*Nineteenth-Century English Books. Some Problems in Bibliography.* By Gordon N. Ray, Carl J. Weber and John Carter. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1952. 88p. \$3.00.

These third annual Windsor Lectures in Librarianship exhibit three different answers to the perennial question, Should lectures be printed? Professor Gordon N. Ray's paper on "The Importance of Original Editions" was surely the most enjoyable to hear. His knowledge is not limited to Thackeray, with whose name he threatens to become synonymous. In answer to one of this century's stupidest dicta: "Thou shalt not covet . . . to have the largest number of unused books in your library," as reported in *Newsweek* as coming from Dr. Ernest C. Colwell, Professor Ray outlines some of the scholarly uses to which a collection of original editions of English nineteenth-century books can be put with a most interesting example from the English translations of Zola; authors' own revisions are cited from George Moore; and a plea is

made for the ephemeral material occasionally surrounding or only quoted by acknowledged literary works of art. After hinting that university libraries should buy what is temporarily unfashionable and hope for the rarities as gifts from collectors, Dr. Ray ends with one delicious quotation from the never consciously amusing Mr. F. R. Leewis and another from the pen of Mr. Wilmarth Lewis, who never deviates into nonsense. The lecture must have been most agreeable to hear and is all too short to read.

John Carter ends the group with a series of penetrating, though fairly miscellaneous suggestions for further discussion, called "Some Bibliographical Agenda." These topics range from innovations in printing technique to the need for "a modern McKerrow." On the way there are glances at binding in cloth, definitions of the word *edition*, the need of better author bibliographies, original boards, books issued in parts, cancels, binding variants, inserted advertisements, and dust-jackets. The examples are chosen as only Mr. Carter could choose them, but I feel sure the audience left with its collective head swimming. There are not too many dates—but there are surely too many questions for one lecture. These are questions the author—and thousands more—want answered and we should all be glad to have this list set down in print. Let us hope that in fifty years it will seem incredible how little we know today about book production in the last century.

The central essay in the volume and the one with most material to hear and to read is Professor Carl J. Weber's on "American Editions of English Authors." Professor Weber's name has been most frequently linked to that of Thomas Hardy, but here are fascinating examples from Browning, Dickens, Scott, Byron, Wordsworth, Thackeray, Fitzgerald and Housman as well. The horrors of a world without copyright, flagrant alterations of the authors' texts, changes of illustrators, the beginnings of the cheap paperback novel, altered endings, retitled poems and rewritten lines all add to the pleasures of this essay. This seems far better read than heard, although the hearing must have beguiled the hour. It seems quite sure that the audiences will be among the first to buy this handsome volume. Anyone else interested in nineteenth-century English books will do well to follow them.—*Donald G. Wing, Yale University Library.*