

philosophy, and theology, and may be regarded as one of the first attempts to apply a system of classification to printed books. Its interest is enhanced by its containing the price of the books advertised for sale. The increasing commerce in literature was at once a cause and a consequence of similar catalogues; and the example of Aldus was followed by the Stephens, and by Colines, Wechell, and Vascosan, and other French printers of the first half of the 16th century, whose lists are given in vols. ii. and iii. of Maittaire's *Annales Typographici*, the divisions of subjects increasing with the spread of printed literature. In England the earliest known sale-list of printed books was published by Andrew Maunsell, a London bookseller, in 1595, and contains the titles of many works now lost or forgotten. In 1554 or 1564¹ appeared the first printed catalogue of the Frankfort book-fair, published by George Weller, a bookseller at Augsburg; and in 1604 it was followed by the general Easter catalogue, printed by permission of the Government. These catalogues of the different book-fairs were collected together in 1592 by Cless—whose researches included all books printed since 1500—and by Draudius in his *Bibliotheca Classica* (1611). The same has been done by Georgi in his *Bücher Lexicon* (1758), a catalogue of all works printed in Europe up to 1750.

The growth of the book-trade naturally promoted the spread of collections; and towards the end of the 17th, and especially during the 18th century, book-catalogues of every description multiplied rapidly. Their progress is copiously treated of in Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, vol. iii. pp. 608-693.² Most private collections, at first, appear to have been bought and sold *en bloc*; and it was through the catalogues, compiled in many instances by learned and well-qualified librarians, that a more critical and discriminating estimate of their contents was formed. P. Garnier in 1678 prepared an excellent catalogue of the library of the Jesuit Collège de Clermont at Paris, using the materials, like other bibliographers after him, for a classified system of his own. Dr Johnson and Oldys were the joint editors of the *Bibliotheca Harleiana*, which they prepared for Osborne the bookseller, who bought the library of the earl of Oxford; and Maittaire drew the scheme of arrangement. The earliest catalogues of public libraries were simple inventories, disposed in alphabetical order, with, at most, a few biographical notices interspersed; yet they paved the way, in the hands of Conrad Gesner, for the study of "pure" bibliography. The compilation of catalogues raisonnés was deferred till the 18th century, when the labours of French librarians or booksellers, such as Piget, Prosper Marchand, Martin, Barrois, Baillet, and the De Bures, created by that means a public taste for books. The greatest work of this kind was the French *Bibliothèque Royale*, begun in 1739, and finished in 10 vols. in 1753. Part i., relating to printed books, was superintended by the Abbé Sallier and Boudot. In a perfect catalogue raisonné alphabetical arrangement is dispensed with; every work occupies its proper place in regard to the light it throws on the subject treated, and the ground traversed by the author. "Catalogues of this sort," says Dibdin, "are to bibliographers what reports are to lawyers;" and Maittaire terms them "proces-verbaux littéraires, servant à décider une infinité de questions qui s'élèvent sur la bibliologie." The consolidation of these detached catalogues was a consequence of the increased requirements of learning, and the *Bibliothecæ*, or registers of particular libraries, supplied the

¹ Le Mire (Miræus), as quoted by Fabricius, says 1554; Labbe, Reimann, and Heumann, quoting from the same source, say 1564.

² See also Cailleau's *Dict. Bibliographique*; Dibdin's *Bibliomania*, 95-193, notes; and the "Catalogue des Bibliothèques Particulières" at the end of *Bibliog. Universelle* (Manuels-Roret), Paris, 1857.

first materials for a general dictionary of reference. Bibliography, thus represented, is the *codex diplomaticus* of literary history, with a field of research co-extensive with the innumerable productions of the press. But a universal dictionary of this kind is but a dream of bibliographers; nor would any single compiler be equal to the task. The *Bibliotheca Universalis* of Gesner in 1545 is the earliest and almost the only effort of this nature. His work professed to include the titles of all known books, existing or lost, but he confined himself to those in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The first volume is classed alphabetically, according to the authors' names; the second contains a distribution of subjects, and is divided into nineteen books. Balthazar Ostern, in 1625, published a *Bibliothèque Universelle*, or catalogue of printed books from 1500 to 1624. A general survey of printed literature might be made to the end of the 16th century; but the idea is now wholly chimerical, since the number of books surpasses all human calculation. The *Bibliotheca Britannica, or General Index of British and Foreign Literature*, by Dr Watt of Glasgow, published in 1824, 4 vols., is perhaps the nearest modern exposition of Gesner's idea. All so-called general dictionaries are, in fact, written on a selective principle of some kind, the only means, as Baron de Reiffenberg remarks, of achieving utility and completeness. Ersch, the founder of modern bibliography in Germany, published his *Allgemeines Repertorium der Literatur* in 1793-1809; but the first really comprehensive work in that country was Ebert's *Allgemeines Bibliographisches Lexicon*, Leipsic, 1821-1830, an English translation of which was published at Oxford in 1837, 4 vols. 8vo. Kaiser's *Vollständiges Bücherlexicon*, and Heinsius's *Allgemeines Bücherlexicon*, with the continuation by Schultz, are useful works of reference; but their contents, as might be expected, are far from justifying the epithet of universal. Osmont, Cailleau, and other French compilers on a large scale, limited their notices to rare and remarkable books; and De Bure in his *Bibliographie Instructive* only included productions of inferior repute, because his original materials were too scanty to illustrate all the divisions of a complete system and comprise what he termed a "Corps de Bibliographie choisie." Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire* was the first work which embraced in alphabetical order what was most precious in the literature of all times and nations. It was first published in three volumes, 8vo, in 1810, and has since passed through several editions. It is far richer in English and German books than any of the preceding compilations, and its plan is such as to afford all the advantages both of a dictionary and a classed catalogue. As a practical work of reference, whether to the bibliographer or the student, it is the most complete dictionary yet published on a scale so comprehensive. The *Bibliographie Universelle* (Manuels-Roret), Paris, 1857 contains a copious list of the leading works on the different subjects of learning, which are arranged in alphabetical order, and a succinct summary of the principal editions of an author's work, including the ancient classics. Among works avowedly devoted to special bibliography, some are limited to the productions of certain epochs. The first century of printing has been an attractive subject of research, as has been noticed above in the chapter on early printed books. The *Bibliographie de la France* was the first trustworthy compilation of annual literature in that country. Of more immediate value for purely literary purposes are those dictionaries or catalogues which are restricted to particular branches of knowledge; and they have the advantage of being able to ensure greater fulness and accuracy, from the limited scope of their contents, than is available in a work professedly general. "Through the want of such," said Oldys, "how many authors have we who are consuming

their time, their quiet, and their wits, in searching for either what is past finding, or already found." A catalogue, in short, might be made of superfluous writings by authors who have dug in mines of literature already exhausted. The tendency, however, of modern bibliography is fortunately to subdivide the field of literature; and the student of any special department of learning need be at no loss for authorities to consult. Bale's *Illustrium Majoris Britannicæ Scriptorum Summarium* (1458), John Pits's *De Academicis et Illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus* (1619), Bishop Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (1748), and Nicolson's *Historical Libraries*, 4to, 1776, are the earliest catalogues, on a large scale, of our national literature. A list of Saxon writers, by Wanley, forms the second volume of Hickes's *Thesaurus. A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors*, by S. A. Allibone, 3 vols., 1859-1872, is an industrious work. The *Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*, by W. T. Lowndes, is indispensable to the collector; and for a first attempt of the kind, displays a singular degree of accuracy and research. His *British Librarian, or Book Collector's Guide*, 1839, purported to give a classed catalogue of books on English literature printed in Great Britain; he lived, however, to complete only six numbers of the division—*Religion and its History*. Dr Adam Clarke's *Bibliographical Dictionary*, 6 vols. 1803, is restricted to works in the learned and Eastern languages; his *Bibliographical Miscellany*, published in 1806 as a supplement, contains, among other matter, a full account of the English translations of the classics. To foreign literature belong, among others, Quérard's *La France Littéraire*, and the *Bibliothèque Historique* of Le Long; the *Bibliotheca Belgica* of J. F. Foppens, 2 vols., 1739; *Bibliotheca Hispana, Nova et Vetustæ*, by Nicholas Antonio, 1783-88; Haym's *Bibliotheca Italiana*; Worm's *Danske, Norske, og Islandske Lærde Lexicon*, 1771-84; Nyerup and Kraft's *Almindeligt Litteratur Lexicon*, 2 vols., 1820; Georgi's *Allgemeines Europäisches Bücher-Lexicon*, 1742-58; and others which space forbids us to enumerate.

The works devoted to special branches of knowledge form a host in themselves, and we can only mention a few of them, by way of illustration. To theology belong such works as Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1723, and the *Bibliotheca Theologia Selecta*, by Walchius, 1757, as well as his *Bibliotheca Patristica*, new edition, 1834. Judaic literature is represented by Fürst, and Hebrew writers by Wolfius, 1715-33. Lipenius, a learned German divine of the 17th century, devoted separate *Bibliothecæ* to theology, law, philosophy, and medicine, which were collected in his *Bibliotheca Reulis*. His *Bibliotheca Juridica* has received several supplements by other writers, and is much the most valuable of his series. Bridgman's *Legal Bibliography*, and the valuable work of M. Camus, *Lettres sur la profession d'Avocat et Bibliothèque choisie des Livres de Droit*, deserve especial notice. The *Bibliotheca Historica* of Meusel relates to historical works of all ages and nations. An excellent catalogue of books of voyages and travel is given in the *Bibliothèque Universelle des Voyages*, by M. Boucher de la Richarderie, 6 vols., Paris, 1808. Dr Young's *Catalogue of Works relating to Natural Philosophy*, the *Catalogus Bibliothecæ Historiæ Naturalis Josephi Banks*, by Dr Dryander, and Engelmann's *Bibliotheca Historico-naturalis*, Leipsic, 1846 (supplement, 1861); the *Bibliotheca Mathematica* of Murhard, Lalande's *Bibliographie Astronomique*, and the *Bibliographie Agronomique*, are leading works, written on the same principle of selection. British Topography was treated by Gough in 1780, and by Upcott in 1818. Nisard's *Histoire des Livres populaires, ou de la Littérature du Colportage*, 1854, a curious and amusing work, may also be mentioned. Ottinger's *Biblio-*

graphie Biographique contains a copious catalogue of purely biographical works.

For a comprehensive work of reference on special biographies we cannot do better than refer our readers to the *Bibliotheca Bibliographica*, by Dr Julius Petzholdt Leipsic, 1866. Part i. relates to works on bibliography; part ii. to the bibliography of different nations; and part iii. to works connected with special branches of learning, which are classified into leading divisions. The *Répertoire Bibliographique Universel* of M. Peignot is a useful but ill-arranged work; it dates back, moreover, to 1812. The progress of knowledge and research, especially with regard to scientific subjects, obviously throws works of this description soon out of date to the student, who desires to be acquainted with the most recent as well as the earlier authorities. As landmarks, however, of the state of knowledge at different epochs, they are full of interest to the literary bibliographer.

VIII. On the Classification of Books.

The different methods, adopted from time to time, of classing books according to their subject matter, has occasioned a variety of so-called systems of bibliography, which it is important to notice, but which space forbids us to describe in detail. A distinction must be observed between a scheme of arrangement applied to a particular library, and limited therefore by its contents, and one which embraces in its divisions and subdivisions the entire range of literature. Nothing, on either head, is learnt from the Greeks and Romans; the classed catalogue of the library of St Emmeran at Ratisbon, compiled in 1347, and containing twelve divisions, is cited as the earliest specimen of its kind. (See LIBRARIES.) The most ancient system, in the wider sense of the term, is ascribed to the Chinese, who in the 13th century distributed the field of human knowledge into classes numbering from fourteen to twenty, with sectional subdivisions to each.

Classified systems suggested by or devised for particular libraries after printing had multiplied their contents, originated chiefly with librarians or compilers of catalogues. In 1587 Jean Baptiste Cardona wrote four treatises on the principal libraries of his day. His description of the library of the Escorial was followed in 1635 by Arias Montanus, whose catalogue divided the books there according to languages, separating MSS. from printed works, and distributed the whole into sixty-four classes. Their number was reduced by Casiri in his *Bibliothèque Arabico-Espagnole de l'Escorial*, Madrid, 1760. In 1631 John Rhodius proposed a scheme for the arrangement of the university library at Padua, which has been recently published in the *Serapeum* by Dr Hoffman, from a manuscript found in the town library at Hamburg, under the title of *Ein bibliothekarisches Gutachten abgegeben im Jahre, 1631*. His method is very similar to that of Claudius Clement, in his *Musei sive Bibliothecæ tam privatæ quam publicæ extractio, instructio, curæ usus*, 1635. A catalogue of the library of the Canon de Cordes, which was purchased by Mazarin, was compiled in 1643 by his librarian, Gabriel Naudé, whose *Addition à la vie de Louis XI.* contains much curious matter on bibliography, but who is best known, perhaps, from his defence of the massacre of St Bartholomew. His *Dissertatio de instruendâ Bibliotheca* had previously appeared in 1627 in a French version, entitled *Avis pour dresser une Bibliothèque*, an English translation of which was published by John Evelyn in 1661; it was followed by several treatises of the same kind, containing minute instructions to librarians.¹

¹ David Köller's *Sylloge aliquot scriptorum de bene ordinandâ et ornandâ bibliotheca*, 1728, contains a full account of authorities up to

F. Rostgaard published in 1697 a *Projet d'une nouvelle méthode pour dresser un catalogue*, which serves to illustrate the difference between arranging a catalogue and a library. Naudé finds fault with the far-fetched refinements of his predecessors, and his divisions have the merit of being more simple and precise. "It is certain," says Mr Edwards, "that a good catalogue will require a much more minute classification than would be either useful or practicable in the presses of a library."¹ A confusion between these two distinct objects has largely pervaded the "system" of even later writers, who have supposed the same nicety and exactness to be equally necessary and equally practicable in both. Where there is a classed catalogue, the grand objects of a systematic arrangement are sufficiently provided for, independently of the location of the books on which so much fanciful lore has been expended. If there be no classed catalogue, it is tolerably clear that, for purposes of convenient and ready reference, a minute classification of books on the shelves, however accurate, may tend only to bewilder and confuse. Simplicity is the readiest means to aid the memory and abridge the labour of the librarian; and this object can be attained by a much more elementary division of books than could be tolerated in any classified catalogue extending to details.

These remarks apply largely to the ordinary system of modern French bibliographers, the origin of which is variously ascribed to Bouillaud, Garnier, and Martin. Priority of date appears to belong to Bouillaud, for his *Bibliotheca Thuana*, or sale catalogue of the famous library of De Thou, had existed in MS. some time before it was edited by Quesnel in 1679. His system embraces five classes, theology, jurisprudence, history, philosophy, and literature,—the last including heterodox and miscellaneous works. The catalogue by P. Garnier of the library of Clermont, entitled *Systema Bibliothecæ Collegii Parisiensis Societatis Jesu*, was published two years previously. The headings embrace 461 subdivisions, of which 74 belong to theology, 88 to philosophy (a class clumsily and confusedly arranged), 227 to history, and 72 to jurisprudence. In 1709 appeared Prosper Marchand's system, developed in his *Catalogus bibliothecæ Joachimi Faultrier*. In his preface he attacks the system of Naudé, and; after treating of the different methods, viz., the order of nature, of nations, of languages, of time, and alphabetical, sums up his divisions into theology, or divine knowledge; philosophy, or human knowledge, separated into belles lettres and sciences; and history, or the knowledge of events. Bouillaud's system, as modified by Marchand, was adopted by Gabriel Martin in most of the catalogues, amounting to nearly 150, which he published between 1711 and 1760, and, afterwards, with some enlargement of subdivisions, by De Bure in his *Bibliographie Instructive*. The result of their successive labours, which is known as "the system of the Paris booksellers," is the one commonly adopted in France, and consists of theology, jurisprudence, sciences and arts, literature, and history. Some changes, it is true, were afterwards proposed. M. Ameilhon, in a paper published in 1799 in the *Memoirs* of the French Institute, suggested as primitive classes,—grammar, logic, morals, jurisprudence, metaphysics, physics, arts, belles lettres, and history,—his Revolutionary sympathies inducing him to discard theology from the list. But the system, finally elaborated by Martin, survived to govern the classification of the principal libraries in his country. Of

that date. A chapter of Morhof's *Polyhistor* is devoted to the same subject. See also Leibnitz, *Op. Omn.*, ed. 1763, vol. v.; and Bannet's *Jugens des Savans*. Aimé Martin's *Plan d'une Bibliothèque Universelle* appeared in 1837.

¹ E. Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries*, ii. 763. See his chapter on "Classificatory Systems."

the various innovations, the system of Daunou in his *Mémoire sur la Classification des Livres d'une grande Bibliothèque*, 1800, is frequently cited as the best. Since then the Paris scheme has been modified by bibliographers like Barbier, Achard, and Brunet; by M. Merlin in his catalogue of the library of Baron Silvestre de Sacy (1842); and by M. Albert, in his *Récherches sur les principes fondamentaux de la classification d'une Bibliothèque*, Paris, 1847. Olenin's system (1808), for the Imperial library at St Petersburg, separated sciences from arts, and introduced philology as a distinct class. Dr Conyers Middleton in 1723 submitted a scheme to the senate of Cambridge for the classification of the university library; the classes proposed by him being these—theology, history, jurisprudence, philosophy, mathematics, natural history, medicine, belles lettres (*litteræ humaniores*), and miscellaneous. Hartwell Horne's *Outlines for the Classification of a Library*, based on the Paris system, were submitted about the same time to the Trustees of the British Museum. A serviceable "Scheme for Town Libraries" is embodied in the chapter of Mr Edward's book previously quoted.

Of the more general "systems," based on a survey of the field of human knowledge, and not immediately directed to the requirements of a library, a brief notice must suffice. The earliest system, in this sense of the word, is commonly ascribed to Conrad Gesner, the founder, as Dibdin calls him, of pure bibliography. Yet he was, in fact, preceded, however feebly, by Alexo Vanegas, whose work, published at Toledo in 1540, forms the first imperfect type of future efforts of that kind. His divisions are fourfold, viz.: "Original—of the harmony between predestination and free will; Natural—of the philosophy of the visible world; Rational—of the function and use of reason; Revealed—of the authority of the Scriptures." Gesner's, however, was the first comprehensive attempt at a general encyclopædia of literature, constructed in the form of a catalogue. His system was first published in 1548 as an index of matters to his *Bibliotheca Universalis*, under the title of *Pandectarum sive Partitionum Universalium Libri XXI.*² Florian Treffer, a Bavarian Benedictine, published at Augsburg in 1560 a *Méthode de classer les Livres*, which Peignot describes as "plus que mediocre." In 1587 appeared the *Tableaux accomplis de tous les arts libéraux*, by Christophe de Savigny, which Brunet asserts was the model of Bacon's "Encyclopædical Tree," but which was substantially the system of Gesner. The well-known speculations of Bacon as to the genealogy of knowledge were embodied by D'Alembert in his *Discours préliminaire à l'Encyclopédie Méthodique*, Amst., 1767. They were also made the basis of other schemes by Regnault-Warin, Laire, Ferrario, and especially Peignot, whose system was divided into three primitive classes, viz., history, philosophy, and imagination, with the addition of bibliography, as an introductory class. Girard's system was embodied in an *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des Sciences, des Arts, et des Métiers*, edited in 1751 by Diderot and d'Alembert, the latter of whom undertook the part relating to mathematics. Camus in 1798 took man in a state of nature, and then classed his library in the order in which this "man of nature" is supposed to form his impressions of the universe. The divisions of Thiébaud in 1802 comprised—(1), Connaissances instrumentales; (2), Connaissances essentielles; and (3), Connaissances de convenances, and were founded on a somewhat similar principle to that adopted in 1822 by the Marquis Fortia d'Urban, in his *Nouveau Système de Bibliographie alphabétique*, who prefaced his classes with

² For a full account, see the article "Gesner" by Cuvier in the *Biographie Universelle*. His *Bibliotheca* was reprinted, and greatly enlarged, by Simler, in 1574. Conrad Lycosthenes afterwards published an abridgement, and a supplement was added by Verlier.

encyclopædia. Ampere, in 1834, in his *Essai sur la Philosophie des Sciences*, has disfigured his system with a needlessly technical nomenclature.

Much unnecessary refinement has been expended by German-writers on this subject. The system of Leibnitz, however, in 1718, is well suited to practical purposes. His leading classes are these—theology, jurisprudence, medicine, intellectual philosophy, mathematics, natural philosophy, philology, history, and miscellaneous.¹ The scheme of the *Jena Repertorium*, published in 1793, contains 16 primitive classes, and no less than 1200 subdivisions. The system of Denis, formerly keeper of the imperial library at Vienna, was developed in his *Einleitung in die Bücherkunde*, 2d edition, 1795; he classifies learning into theology, jurisprudence, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, history, and philology. Krug's system followed in 1796, and Schleiermacher's in 1852. Wuttig's *Universal-Bibliographie*, 1862, aimed at embracing in a systematic survey the collected literature of the current time.

In England the classification of learning has been treated as a branch of philosophy rather than of bibliography. Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding* contains, in book iv. c. 21, a "Division of the Sciences," and Bentham has an "Essay on Nomenclature and Classification" in his *Chrestomathia*, though it does not appear that he intended it to apply to the distribution of books. Coleridge, in his *Universal Dictionary of Knowledge*, 1817, aimed at combining the advantages of a philosophical and alphabetical arrangement, and adopted four leading classes, viz.,—pure sciences, mixed sciences, history, and literature, including philology. Lord Lindsay's *Progression by Antagonism*, 1845, contains another method, based on his theory of the divisions of human thought.

For further information on this branch of the subject the reader is referred to Peignot's article on "Système" in his *Dictionnaire de Bibliologie*, and especially to the chapter on "Bibliographical Systems" in Petzholdt's *Bibliotheca Bibliographica*, Leipzig, 1866. Many of the above-named schemes, particularly those of high, philosophical pretensions, are fanciful in theory, and quite unsuited to the practical requirements of a catalogue of reference. The seven classes of Denis were based on the words of Solomon, "Wisdom hath builded a house; she hath hewn out her seven pillars;" and Naudé mentions a writer who proposed to class all sorts of books under the three heads of morals, sciences, and devotion; and who assigned, as the grounds of this arrangement, the words of the Psalmist, *Disciplinam, Bonitatem, et Scientiam doce me*. There are obvious objections to all bibliographical systems which aspire to follow the genesis and remote affinities of the different branches of knowledge. The truth is that, when bibliographers speculate in this field with a view to catalogue-making, they entirely forget their proper province and objects. The compilation of a good catalogue of an extensive library is quite difficult enough, without indulging in refined abstractions on the genealogy of human knowledge.

As regards works and collections which cannot with propriety be limited to any one division of knowledge, it would be advisable to refer them to an additional or miscellaneous class, as has, in fact, been done by some writers. Camus proposes to enter such works in the class in which their authors most excelled; but this plan would obviously produce much confusion. While, however, a miscellaneous class might properly indicate the collective editions of an author's works, yet his separate treatises should be entered under the subjects to which they belong. A system of cross-reference is in many cases unavoidable,

Idea Leibnitiana Bibliothecæ Publicæ secundum classes scientiarum ordinandæ (*Works*, vol. v.)

if completeness of general design is to be combined with the cardinal object of a classed catalogue, namely, that of showing what has been written by the authors specified therein on the different branches of knowledge as they may be best arranged.

IX. Bibliography in General.

It has been our object in this article to institute such a division of the subject, as should enable us to point out the best sources of information in regard to all its branches. Some works still remain to be noticed which treat generally of all matters relating to bibliography, though their scope and purpose differ according to the view of the science adopted by the writer. A comprehensive and judicious digest of bibliographical lore is still wanted, but there are several works which may be consulted with advantage. Cailleau's *Essai de Bibliographie*, appended to his *Dictionnaire* of 1790, is an interesting treatise. The *Einleitung in die Bücherkunde* of M. Denis, 1795-96, is an excellent work divided into two parts, the first of them relating to bibliography, and the second to literary history. The *Traité Élémentaire de Bibliographie*, by S. Boulard, Paris, 1806, was intended to serve as an introduction to all works on that subject written up to the date of its appearance. The labours of Peignot, besides his works on suppressed and rare books already noticed, include—(1), the *Manuel Bibliographique, ou Essai sur la connoissance des livres, des formats, des éditions, de la manière de composer une Bibliothèque, etc.*, 1801; and (2), the *Dictionnaire raisonné de Bibliologie*, 2 vols. 8vo, 1802. The plan of this work, as Brunet admits, is well conceived, and furnishes a convenient mode of reference. Bibliography is certainly indebted to this industrious compiler, but his details have in many respects been rendered obsolete by subsequent research, and his vague notions of the scope and objects of his study have frequently led him into confusion and extravagance. A *Manuel du Bibliophile*, by the same author, appeared at Dijon in 1823. The *Cours Élémentaire de Bibliographie*, by C. F. Achard, Marseilles, 3 vols. 8vo, 1807, derives its chief value from its excellent summary of the different systems of classification applied to books. We learn from the introduction, that M. François de Neufchâteau, when Minister of the Interior, ordered the librarians of all the departments to deliver lectures on bibliography, but that the plan, which indeed appears fanciful, entirely failed, the librarians having been found quite incapable of prelecting upon their vocation. The *Introduction to the Study of Bibliography*, by Thos. Hartwell Horne, 2 vols. in 1, 8vo, London, 1814, is perhaps the most useful book of this kind in the English language, though the compiler would have done better to restrict himself to printed books, instead of ranging discursively over the whole field of MS. literature. His book is chiefly translated and compiled from French bibliographical works, and will be found useful to those who have not access to them. Besides some excellent specimens of early typography, it contains full lists of authorities on bibliography and literary history, and a copious account of libraries both British and foreign. The *Studio Bibliographico*, by Vincenzo Mortillaro, Palermo, 1832, is an Italian treatise of considerable merit. P. Namur's *Bibliographie paléographique-diplomatique-bibliologique*, Liège, 1838, embraces many subjects outside the province of bibliography proper. The *Librarian's Manual*, by Reuben A. Guild, New York, 1858, is a compendious book of reference for the student in search of authorities. Enough has been said to show that the different branches of bibliography have been treated with considerable industry; but there is room for further effort, if bibliographers will recognize the chief value of their science as the handmaid of literature. (E. F. T.)