

elaborate cataloging, and a manual for reference for catalogers confronted occasionally

with difficult cases.—*Isabella K. Rhodes, Columbia University.*

Bibliographical Papers

Papers of the Bibliographical Society, University of Virginia. Vol. I, 1948-1949. Edited by Fredson Bowers. Charlottesville, Va., 1948, ii, 204, [3]p. \$3.50.

Wherever students and scholars in the fields of descriptive and analytical bibliography gather for off-the-record discussions, the need for additional resources for publishing the results of their research is a favorite topic. The rumblings have grown plainer of late, as investigators have picked up the strands of projects that were deferred perforce during the war years. For obvious reasons (other than the usual one of inertia) not a great deal has been done even yet to relieve the situation, what with printing costs at their present levels. Students of bibliography and of textual criticism will therefore be glad to hear of the decision of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia to publish a series of its "papers." The first volume has just appeared under the editorship of Fredson Bowers, associate professor of English at the University of Virginia, himself an able tiller of bibliographical fields, being at present engaged in writing a descriptive bibliography of the post-Restoration English drama, 1660-1700. The new publication is to appear annually.

Although the first issue has a strong local representation, with the results of work by members of the faculty and graduate student body of the University of Virginia predominating, important contributions have been drawn from scholars working at a distance, and even more general participation is invited for future issues, without reference to membership in the sponsoring organization. This fact sets the venture apart from the majority of such journals, which tend to devote themselves to the publication of studies performed at, or by the members of, a given institution. It is to be hoped that this policy will be continued and further emphasized, so that the scholar who is not working under the aegis of a specific institution, or whose institution does not have a medium suited to the publica-

tion of his investigations, will have one more source of help.

In the present issue appear 11 major articles and six notes. Of the articles, several concern themselves with various phases of the history of printing and publishing, others relate to technicalities of printing procedure which have been applied to particular bibliographical problems (often with wider implications), and one deals entirely with a specific problem in textual genealogy. In the first category are articles by Joseph M. Carrière, of the university faculty: "The Manuscript of Jefferson's Unpublished Errata List for Abbé Morellet's Translation of the *Notes on Virginia*"; by Jessie R. Lucke, a graduate student: "Some Correspondence with Thomas Jefferson Concerning the Public Printers"; by C. William Miller, of the faculty of Temple University: "*In the Savoy: A Study in Post-Restoration Imprints*"; by James G. McManaway of the Folger Library: "The First Five Bookes of Ovids Metamorphosis, 1621" (an account of a hitherto unrecorded edition); and by Rudolf Hirsch of the Library of the University of Pennsylvania: "The Art of Selling Books: Notes on Three Aldus Catalogues, 1586-1592." An article by Giles E. Dawson of the Folger Library: "Three Shakespearian Piracies, 1723-1729," should also perhaps be included in this category, as it identifies the true nature of the pamphlets under discussion and makes a fair case against William Feales as the probable pirate.

New lines of approach to bibliographical problems are supplied in articles by Philip Williams, graduate student: "The Compositor of the Pied-Bull Lear"; by Curt F. Bühler of the Morgan Library: "The Headlines in William de Machlinia's *Year-Book, 37 Henry VI*"; by Gerald E. Eberle of Loyola University of the South: "*Nosce Teipsum* (1599) by Sir John Davies: a Bibliographical Puzzle"; and by Allan H. Stevenson of the Illinois Institute of Technology: "New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence." A paper by George B. Pace of the university

faculty, "The Text of Chaucer's *Purse*," traces the genealogy of the 11 known manuscript versions of that well-known poem.

Among the briefer bibliographical notes is one by Fillmore Norfleet, head of the French Department at Woodberry Forest, correcting the ascription of the subject of one of St. Memin's engravings, and otherwise supplementing published data regarding that artist. Another, by Guy A. Battle, graduate student at Duke University, deals with the study of progressive changes in box lines as a means of determining the order of printing of the various forms in certain early books. A third note, by James A. Steck, graduate student at the University of Virginia, makes use of the center rules between text columns for the same sort of analysis. George W. Williams, also a graduate student at Virginia, draws attention to the cruciform structure of Crashaw's "Upon the Bleeding Crucifix," as revealed in progressive changes by the author. A bibliographical ghost is laid by Mary Virginia Bowman, graduate student, in her note on "The Hallam-Tennyson *Poems* (1830)." Finally, the editor, Fredson Bowers, making use of variations to be found

in the running titles of late seventeenth century English books, suggests "a form of truly bibliographical evidence which can be utilized with confidence under certain conditions to determine whether two half-sheets were printed together or separately."

The publication of the present volume was "aided by two generous grants from the Research Council of the Richmond Area University Center, and from an anonymous donor." Perhaps that may account for the somewhat selfconscious typographical format selected for this number. Certainly (in one man's opinion) the volume would be the gainer in general appearance if the use of rather cumbersome half titles for the individual articles were discontinued—although in all fairness it must be admitted that these doubtless lend dignity and attractiveness to authors' offprints. In any case its scope, standards and usefulness having been demonstrated in its first incarnation, the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia* will be welcomed in all future issues by bibliographers and librarians.—*Roland Baughman, Columbia University Libraries.*

Books for Catholic Colleges

Books for Catholic Colleges: a Supplement to Shaw's "List of Books for College Libraries." Compiled under the auspices of the Catholic Library Association by Sister Melania Grace, S.C., and Gilbert C. Peterson, S.J. Chicago, American Library Association, 1948, x, 134p. \$3.75.

It is axiomatic that the implementation of the instructional and research programs of a college requires that its library's collections support the curriculum. While it is true that the subject matter covered in the general college curriculum is essentially the same in most American colleges, each of them differs in its emphasis. This difference, subtle in most cases, is the expression of an individual philosophy of education. In Catholic colleges the emphasis is clear-cut. Here is presented the Catholic point of view, as it is applicable and pertinent to subject matter, character training and the like. This follows from the fact that the Catholic point of view is basic to Catholic education. It is obvious therefore

that a segment of the collections of Catholic college libraries must reflect this emphasis. It appears logical that that segment should play a valid role in the accrediting process. As a core collection of works for the Catholic point of view, it would not supplant but should supplement the Shaw list which has come to be the basis of the accrediting associations' qualitative evaluation of library materials. Perhaps it was just the absence of an authoritative Catholic list comparable to Shaw's which prevented the accrediting agencies from attempting any evaluation of materials other than in Shaw which present the Catholic viewpoint. The list under review is meant to fill this need.

The exigencies of war and changing personal responsibilities forced postponement of compilation of the list in 1942, and brought in a new set of compilers in 1946. The methods and procedures which were set up with the approval of Charles Shaw and the Department of Library Science of Michigan