

adequate indication of the scope of the bibliography." It would be easy to give scores of examples showing that he often stops short of giving as much information as would be helpful.

*Scope.*—Besterman emphasizes the claim that his work "aims at completeness and internationality." Yet we find that he worked almost entirely in the British Museum and with the services of the National Central Library; and a glance at his pages reveals that they are very heavily weighted in favor of Great Britain. "Great Britain" as a topic takes 62 columns, "America," 17, "France," 14, "Germany," 7, and "Italy" 6. If he had gone in for indexes to government documents of the other countries as he did for his own country, the proportions would have been different. But not having visited the Preussische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, the Kongelige Bibliotek in Copenhagen, the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in The Hague, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Library of Congress, etc., he could not be familiar with their holdings—but then why make such a claim of "internationality?"

*Arrangement.*—The Introduction delivers a diatribe against the classified arrangement for a bibliography, with some good points and some weak ones. The main advantage to the alphabetical topical scheme used here is the avoidance of subjects in the index. But the topical plan involves ambiguities aplenty, an important one of which is the failure to associate kindred subjects. Some of the space saved is lost again when certain titles have to be repeated in a number of places.

*Miscellaneous comments.*—The work is handsomely done and has ordinary virtues not listed here. However, a few stray

reflections: The place of publication of an English work published in London is omitted, and of a French work published in Paris. This is explained in the Introduction; but it would not have added much trouble to have printed these small words where needed. Only one place is given: "Lipsiae," for "Lipsiae et Hamburgi." Publishers are not mentioned as a rule. The pagination methods are confusing. Accents on Greek words are omitted. Full names and dates of authors are not attempted. Numerous typographical (?) errors are evident. To save space, comments are omitted. Instead, the number of titles in each bibliography is indicated in square brackets. This has a value, but (e.g.) to give the information that a certain work has "[300.]" entries doesn't help much when it happens that that particular bibliography is practically worthless. The student would prefer that the space given to detailed collations for volumes of some long serial sets had been used for critical comments throughout.

Are abridgements of specifications for boxes, brushing and sweeping, casks, cement, chains, clocks, etc., really bibliographical material? Abbreviations are not explained; some are self-evident.

An exhaustive list of omissions would involve re-doing the job for Besterman. The reviewer made a list of scores of to-be-expected but not-found bibliographies dealing with religious subjects; but perhaps enough has been said to prove that this *World Bibliography of Bibliographies* lacks completeness as well as dependability.—*John Barrow, Berea College, Berea, Ky.*

*A Faculty Survey of the University of Pennsylvania Libraries.* Bibliographical Planning Committee of Philadelphia.

University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1940. 202p. \$3.

THIS survey was undertaken at the suggestion of the Bibliographical Planning Committee of the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area, a joint committee of the University of Pennsylvania and the Union Library Catalog of the Area. It differs from most surveys of the same sort, in the words of its Introduction, because "it was made, not by the distributors of books, but by the users of books; not by librarians, but by scholars. It represents an appraisal of the library collections of the university by the experts in the several fields of knowledge represented on the university faculties."

Because of this viewpoint, of the way the material is arranged—by departments of instruction, and of the compactness of phraseology and the excellent bibliographical judgment shown by most of the contributors, this volume will be not merely of interest but of very real practical use as a check list to other college and university libraries.

In general each department lists, boiled down to one or two pages, what it has, and what it thinks it needs, in the source materials, the secondary materials, periodicals, documents, and collateral materials in its field. But no cut-and-dried formula is followed. Each man plunges into his topic without delay, and tells a story stripped of unnecessary verbiage and unneeded bibliographical impedimenta.

A more detailed review of a single section, Professor Leach's "Middle English," will perhaps show more clearly the scope and purpose of the work. He first notes that the library's materials have been checked against the standard bibliography of the field, Wells' *Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, and also

against Loomis' new *Introduction to Medieval Literature Chiefly in England*. He then states that the library possesses most of the important periodicals in the field, and specifically lists ten of them, *Speculum*, *Medium Aevum*, *Novi Studi Medievali*, etc. He notes the possession of all the standard bibliographies (listing six) and of all the printed catalogs of medieval manuscripts. He remarks that medieval paleography and printing are less well-represented, but lists eleven works which the library has, also citing its incunabula in this field and remarking on the possession of complete sets of the Facsimile Text Society, the Bibliographical Society, etc. In medieval folklore, he says, the library is rich, such basic sets as *Folk-Lore Fellows Communications*, *Frazer's Golden Bough*, and *Thompson's Motif-Index to Folk-Literature* being cited. Of dissertations he says the library has a full representation, but that it lacks German ones in this field between 1880 and 1900. Of texts and critical works the library has: Early English Text Society (330 vols.), Camden Society, Percy Society, Surtees Society, etc., complete, and much of the Roxburghe, Maitland, and Bannatyne Club publications. Also such scholarly texts and monographs as *Bonner Beiträge*, *Palaestra*, *Acta Sanctorum*, etc., and the *Columbia*, *Yale*, and *Harvard Studies in English*.

With eighty-one faculty members contributing, there naturally would result a more than usually finely subdivided departmentalization. Thus "History" is divided into eight categories, "Languages and Literature" into twenty-two. "Middle English" and "Elizabethan and Jacobean Literature," for instance, receiving independent attention. That is why the

treatment, though condensed, is not trivial or sketchy.

Although prices are not generally noted, they are occasionally in the case of long and expensive sets. Bibliographies are listed in some cases; and in almost every case there is a final paragraph appraising the strengths or weaknesses of the library in the field being discussed.—*Fremont Rider, Olin Library, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*

*Report of a Survey of the University of Florida Library* for the University of Florida, February-May, 1940, by a committee of Louis R. Wilson, Chairman, A. F. Kuhlman, and Guy R. Lyle, on behalf of the American Library Association. American Library Association, 1940. 120p. \$2. (Mimeographed)

THE FLORIDA University Library survey is one of three surveys of university libraries prepared and published recently under the auspices of the American Library Association. A forerunner of these was Raney's *The University Libraries*, Volume VII of the University of Chicago Survey (1933). One of the authors of the present volume, A. F. Kuhlman, contributed various chapters to the Chicago survey. The other two authors, Dean Louis R. Wilson and Guy R. Lyle were associated with Branscomb and Dunbar in one of the other American Library Association surveys, *A Survey of the University of Georgia Library* (1938).<sup>1</sup> The Florida survey is thus the work of a committee of men who have already helped to set the pattern in this important new trend in university library administration.

In its own words,

<sup>1</sup> The third A.L.A. survey is *A Survey of the Indiana University Library* by Coney-Henkle-Purdy (1940).

The committee has undertaken (1) to set the Library in the perspective of the history of the university, state, and region; (2) to discover ways and means of enabling it to improve its organization and administration as a part of the general administration of the university; (3) to formulate a plan of library development designed to promote the effectiveness of the university's general program of instruction, research, and extension; and (4) to indicate means by which the library resources of the university may be more effectively related and integrated with the libraries of Florida, of the Southeast, and the nation.

Starting with introductory chapters on the "History and Background" and the "Essentials of a Library Program in a State University," the survey takes up in order the government of the library, its integration on the campus, in Florida, and in the Southeast, financial support, use, administration and organization, holdings, personnel, and physical plant. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in each section of the survey, and these are summarized in a final chapter of "Recommendations."

The committee followed the plan of stating general principles, describing the situation, and making recommendations in each section of the report. Standards were indicated occasionally by the opinion of the committee alone, but more often by the familiar comparative method, with data on other institutions and references to publications in point. In view of the Florida University Library's many needs, the survey includes extensive detailed recommendations and requires some painstaking effort to read and digest. To facilitate practical use, it would help if conclusions and recommendations were sorted out and clearly labeled in each section, and if some of the tables—of a total of twenty-nine—were eliminated or