
In November 2000, following conferences in 1995 in Kansas City and in 1997 in Warsaw, Poland, the third GLOBENET conference was held in Sofia, Bulgaria. The Sofia conference, “Libraries in the Age of the Internet,” co-organized by the Department of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University (U.S.), and the Department of Library and Information Sciences, St. Kliment Okhridski University (Bulgaria), was intended to be a forum for discussion of future problems for librarianship in a globalized information society.

The conference drew participants from throughout Europe, and from diverse backgrounds. Represented were professors of library science, library and network administrators, special, public and academic librarians, publishers, and major vendors. Their papers covered several different general areas, which were grouped into sessions: “Perspectives in Library Education,” “Information Literacy and the Citizen,” “Information Management,” “Networking,” “Collection Development,” “Preservation,” “Libraries and the Information Society,” and “Electronic Information.” It is almost impossible to summarize the contents of each of the twenty-eight articles, most of which clearly and succinctly explore issues inherent in the topics of their sessions. Instead I will focus on a few sessions and their contents.

The presenters for the first session of “Perspectives in Library Education” focused on library and information science education. Both present-
ers described the restructuring of their curricula to suit the needs of those who aspired to become information management professionals. In one case a program had changed its focus to business information management; in the other, guidelines for all library science programs in one country were being developed. Both presentations noted that one of the reasons for redefining curricula was the effect that Internet access was having on information management.

The presenters in the session “Information Literacy and the Citizen” discussed the altered and dynamic nature of library clientele and, consequently, the nature of library service in general. All three papers referred to a digital divide, separating computer literacy from illiteracy, with the latter being characteristic of clientele who did not own computers. These patrons combine with those who are computer literate, and skilled at online research, to produce a much more heterogeneous clientele who exhibit a broader range of user behaviors. One paper confined itself to the definition of user behaviors and conformant librarian service. Another described the intensive European Commission’s e-Europe initiative, comprised of the PULMAN European Network of Excellence, ISTAR, and PSInet. The third presenter questioned the notion that use of the Internet and online services meant that user behavior had to be served differently. She saw access service to be the underlying concept, while changeability was characteristic of only some formats of information resources.

In the session “Information Management” all three presenters viewed information and knowledge management as the key to future service. All three saw the ultimate value in successful service as a combination of teamwork and communication: collaboration was more creative, and teamwork was more efficient. All presenters saw information managers as having a cognitive function: communicating information to clientele in an organized manner.

Graham Cornish’s presentation, “Do Not Spoil the Jigsaw Puzzle,” was not part of a session, but concerned information brokering. Until the advent of the Internet and electronic resources, copyright limited reproduction of intellectual property, but did not severely limit access to that property in libraries. Today, with the advent of the Internet and digital resources, those who have copyright to the latter determine access by regulating the price of information and how it can be used. Mr. Cornish advises the “buyer” to beware, because price-driven access is a reality.

The opportunities inherent in “Networking” were explored in another session. All presenters saw some form of value-added service in networking libraries on a national level. Libraries in Bulgaria developed the begin-
nings of a national network about ten years ago, but a declining economy and lack of grant support (excepting only the Open Society Foundation) made it difficult to maintain. Although close to one quarter of all Bulgarian libraries have closed, a national network once again has been initiated, and professional librarians have the support of one another in collegial library organizations. In addition to eliminating redundancy, a national network also can provide guidelines that serve as standards for all member libraries to follow. In this sense, as Dr. Krastev notes, it creates order out of chaos by organizing information, and this is, of course, what librarians do. In the same way, the “Fast Libraries of Serbia” project draws on the networked expertise of small NGO libraries in the Alternative Academic Educational Network to create a social, economic, human, and technical library infrastructure. This network is intended to be the groundwork for a national library network, using COBISS as its utility.

Bulgaria is home to ground-breaking work on the digitization of Old Slavic manuscripts, and its scholars have organized international workshops devoted to that work. One of the “Preservation” session papers focused on the necessity of creating a Virtual Scriptorium of Slavic medieval manuscripts. As noted, electronic texts of manuscripts serve many functions: multiple copies can be made, the original passes through fewer hands, a copy can be archived, and digitization provides the possibility of universal access. What remains unsaid, however, is that value can be added if manuscripts are not only digitized, but marked up and encoded, so that each character has a distinct value, and the text is formatted in a specific manner. With this form of digitization, texts can be machine-parsed, permitting unhindered and efficient scholarly analysis. Preservation very well might be the primary goal of digitization of manuscripts, but the new encoding can provide the basis for detailed and necessary research. Slavic librarians are very aware, however, that at present, not all printed items can be digitized. For example, a large percentage of Soviet publications on our shelves is brittle, and another presentation in the session presented a methodology for sampling a cross-section of books, testing them for acidity and brittleness, documenting the results, computerizing them, and routing the books for treatment. The strategy is efficient and effective, and the computer-formatted results are portable. The Slavic preservation consortium, SLAVCOPY, provides a means of photocopying brittle materials on acid-free paper, reproducing and binding them for other libraries. Because several consortium members purchase the copies together, the cost is reduced, and communications are facilitated by e-mail exchanges.
“Libraries in the Age of the Internet,” although uneven in spots, provides a rich analysis of today’s librarianship, as well as the tasks that lie before it. The diversity of papers and their contents clarify the need of libraries and information managers to adapt to changes in the nature of important resources, and the consequent nature of patron behavior. Proactivity is essential if we hope to keep pace with the rapid changes in the “Age of the Internet.” Against the backdrop of Bulgarian librarianship, struggling to keep abreast of current trends while managing to network, grow, and excel in certain areas, this does not seem to be such an insurmountable task.

Janet Crayne
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V. P. Leonov’s intriguing roman-issledovanie is actually devoted to the history of St. Petersburg’s prestigious Academy of Sciences Library (BAN). Russia’s first national library was established as part of the Academy almost three hundred years ago, in 1724; it thus preceded the creation of national libraries in other countries—including France (1737), England (1753), and the United States (1800)—and constitutes a significant model (p. 7). As such, much has been written on the history of BAN, including the seminal Istoriia Biblioteki Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1714-1964, [authors S. P. Luppov et al.] (Leningrad: Nauka, 1964). But despite considerable attention from historians, no one, contends the author, has studied the real life of the Library—from the perspective of a librarian and long-time staff member. In addition, much has changed in the past thirty years in Russia, and additional sources are available.

But why the roman-issledovanie? The term is meant to convey the volume’s rather unorthodox presentation, consisting of “observations, docu-
ments, and commentary” (p. 12), which Leonov believes is justified by the three-hundred-year-old existence of the Library. This is not a simple description of historical events; it “touches on the lives of many people.” To follow the library’s development “through the subjective perception of one person” makes the work “interesting and appealing.” It also indicates that the author “bears a huge measure of responsibility and internal control over the presentation of the material.”

Be that as it may, the study’s eleven chapters are divided into two main sections. Chapters 1-3 provide the volume’s theoretical underpinning; chapters 4-11 cover historical developments at BAN from early times to the present. The first chapter deals with the beginnings of the “library process” in Russia, while the second discusses the idiosyncracies of Russian library culture, and the third sets forth the question of appropriate library periodization. In chapters 4-11, the study moves to its true focus, the historical growth of BAN. Leonov sees three stages in the Library’s development: the eighteenth century, when it was the only public and scientific library in Russia; the nineteenth century, when it was divided into Russian and foreign departments; and the period since 1921, which has seen perpetual structural transformations. Leonov describes the eighteenth century as BAN’s “romantic” period (p. 222), and devotes five chapters (chapters 4-8) to this era, obviously his preferred period.

Chapter 9 moves on to the nineteenth century (BAN’s “realistic” period), which followed the establishment in 1795 of the Imperial Public Library. The emergence of the Public Library adversely affected the future development of BAN, which gradually retreated into second place, while its division into two independent departments further aggravated its unstable position. Turning to the twentieth century, Leonov addresses the “Akademicheskoe delo” of 1929-1931 in chapter 10, and in chapter 11, the Soviet period as a whole, with significant treatment of events during World War II. The Library continued to experience financial and spatial deficits, and was threatened by physical disaster (floods and fires); in general, says Leonov, one can see BAN as one more cultural victim, not only of the Soviet period, but also of the country’s current transformations. Is this fate irreparable, he asks? One thing is clear: the value of the fact that the library was originally open to all readers cannot be overestimated even today (p. 11).

Leonov’s study has several virtues. First, it is full of interesting details. In chapter 4 he repeats (p. 105) from an earlier study a conversation between Peter the Great and his first librarian, I. D. Shumakher: Shumakher wanted to charge admission to the library, soon to become part of the Academy of Sciences. Peter not only refused, but also directed that visi-
tors be served (at his expense) coffee, wine, or other drinks. More seri-
ously, in chapter 9 Leonov discusses some fascinating details concerning
use of the Library by academicians and others in the early nineteenth cen-
tury. In particular he outlines (p. 224) the efforts of “average” readers—discus-
ssed, as Leonov notes, in Voennyi zhurnal of 1810—to gain access to the
collections, owing to their inability to buy books for themselves. He also
refers (p. 225) to the fact that notebooks were kept on every reader outlining
their reading choices over time. Alas, no clear source is given for this
statement, but one hopes that such documents are still available, for if re-
trievable they would constitute fascinating research material for the
scholar of Russian reading habits.

Second, the inclusion of such details is due in part to Leonov’s exten-
sive review of the scholarly literature on BAN, and related archival ma-
terials. His volume is obviously the result of a labor of love, and in this
respect his generally well-documented study is of considerable interest to
researchers seeking to assemble a comprehensive overview of BAN’s his-
tory. It is clearly useful to have so many sources either documented or
gathered together in one volume. As Leonov stresses, many of the
sources, though published, are difficult to obtain, and their inclusion ren-
ders this volume a rich compendium of research materials.

Third, many primary sources are reproduced in their entirety. One ex-
ample is the body of documents illustrating the investigation in 1742-43
of Shumakher’s administration in the early eighteenth century (pp.
146-190), in which Lomonosov had a hand, or if he didn’t, “something
similar connected with the name of Lomonosov would have happened”
(p. 141). Another is the series of telegrams and reports connected with
the “Akademichesko delo” of the early 1930s (pp. 259-280). A third is an
extract from the memoirs of BAN associate E. I. Vintergal’ter, relating to
her wartime experiences in 1941-1942 (pp. 348-353).

However, Leonov’s inclusion of primary sources is not without disap-
pointment. First, the great majority are already published. Second, the ex-
tensive reproduction of these fascinating materials in the body of the text
(often with little commentary) constitutes a stylistic weakness of the vol-
ume, rendering it neither a historical study nor edited collection of pri-
mary sources. Leonov’s approach to the incorporation of large segments
of primary sources is also applied to secondary materials, with the inclusions of long quotations from earlier studies, especially in his earlier chap-
ters (see, for example, pp. 35-39).

Thirdly, the earlier chapters are also disappointing with regard to con-
tent. As noted, they represent the volume’s theoretical underpinning, and
Leonov is to be commended for his efforts to see the development of li-
braries through a more sophisticated lens than is the norm. His position is
that most histories of libraries in Russia have been limited to the intricate
details of a given institution, without seeing the institution, or even group
of libraries, as part of a system. A more satisfying approach, he affirms, is
to study a library as part of a societal system, both in Russia and world-
wide (p. 50). His theory involves seeing the history of a given library as a
“double life” (p. 48), one of them involving the concrete details of the li-
brary’s history, and the other involving the library’s place in a comprehen-
sive system of library development that is not so much imposed by
government directives, as based on an internal logic that is worldwide as
well as national in its scope. To illuminate his point further, Leonov de-
votes considerable space to an account of the development of the Library
of Alexandria in the third century B.C., and then draws parallels between
its development and that of BAN. Both libraries began as repositories of
foreign materials; both were first tended by foreign librarians. Is this a co-
incidence, he asks (p. 74)? Obviously he thinks not. But the presentation
in these chapters is not particularly engaging, or, in the final analysis, con-
vincing—at least to this reviewer: the author himself does not carry through
their proposal in the second half of his book.

In sum, this volume’s content would have profited from editing; it is not a
text one would recommend to those seeking a concise account of the place
of BAN in Russian history, or a definitive history. And besides its unortho-
dox presentation of primary sources, its conversational, first-person style
(the result of its self-professed status as a roman-issledovanie) is occasion-
ally jarring. But it has several strong points. The author’s approach in his in-
troductory chapters is thoughtful and innovative, one feels, and worthy of
exploration, and the volume itself includes a wealth of information and a
rich panoply of primary sources.

Miranda Remnek
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Vestnik Dal’nevostochnogo otdeleniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (Herald of
the Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences).
Vladivostok: Prezidium DVO RAN, 1992- ISSN 0869-7698.

_Vestnik DVO RAN_ was ahead of its time in 1990, when it was revived before the collapse of the Soviet Union, while many other journals followed this practice only after August of 1991. The first 33 issues of the _Vestnik_ (1932–1939) were published by Dalgiz, when the Far East became a filial of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The original cover is quite handsome, reflecting a broad regional interest by having the title in Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and English. Articles were summarized in English or German with a table of contents in English. The journal ceased when many of the contributors were swept away in the purges, and this branch of the Academy of Sciences was closed in 1939.

It seems appropriate in reviewing the past ten years, that the entire run of the journal be examined. The first 33 issues will be referred to as the 30s, and the last 54 issues as the 90s. The first issues in the 30s did not arrange articles into sections. Contributions vary, but concentrate almost exclusively on “safe” subjects in the hard sciences (for example: pine fungus, chemical make-up of soil, astronomy, the fat of bears and fish, plants, coal reserves, the features of stone). There is an informative article on the structure of DV filial AN. Only two articles are on history. One contribution (no. 26, 1937) includes sketches of what the architecture of the new Soviet city of Vladivostok would look like after replacing original buildings with very modern ones, small parks, and grandiose statues. It is fortunate that this plan was not implemented! Another detailed section is devoted to the work of the Far Eastern branch with scientific notes and a chronology. Issues are often combined; paper quality is poor. However, the English abstracts in the 30s are much better than the ones being done after 1990.

In retrospect we can see that in 1937, the journal begins to show signs of the impact that the purges were having in the scientific community. In the chronicle section of no. 23 (1937), there is a denunciation by the DVFAN workers of the anti-Soviet acts of the former Academicians Ipat’ev and Chichibabin, chemists who had gone abroad in 1927 and 1930. Their crime seems to have been that they did not return from abroad after falling into the capitalist camp. The bibliography section is dropped in issue no. 24 (1937); issue no. 27 (1937) is smaller than usual. By issue no. 29 (1938), the rendering of the journal title in English, Japanese and Chinese disappears, and by no. 32 (1938), the contents are given in Russian only.
After a fifty year hiatus, issue no. 34 (1990), under the main editorship of Academician I. M. Makarov, announces its four goals: (1) to report scientific findings and encourage discussion among scientific workers in the Academy’s twenty-six institutes, (2) not to be exclusively oriented to any one specific science, (3) to highlight the works of the Presidium through its reports, conferences, and expeditions, and (4) to provide critical bibliographical materials and letters to readers.

The past ten years (nos. 34-87, 1990-1999) have produced a scholarly professional journal that is of use to a wide variety of researchers. There are six issues a year, with each issue having about 150 pages; the contents are also in English. The last issue of each year contains an annual index.1 In 1992, the quality of paper improved dramatically and usually several color photos appear in each issue.

The contents of each issue are varied. One can find articles on economics, nature, ecology, history, ethnography, resources, philology, geology, and so on. Since 1994, regular, broadly-named sections begin to appear; the most common ones are News from the Presidium, Economics, Resources, Ecology, Nature, History. Another regular feature, begun in the 30s, called “In the Institutes,” features scientific reports and a chronology. In 1996 an excellent section on the life and work of prominent scholars of the Academy appears, called “Scholars of the Far East,” which is later called “Curriculum Vitae.” In reviving a feature from the 30s, the first obituary appears in no. 4 (1994) of Academician Il’ichev; one other remembrance is in no. 4 (1998).

Editorship of the Vestnik DVO was understandably checkered in the 30s, as the purges went into full swing. The editors were: M. N. Meisel’ (no. 1-2, 1932), V. I. Kudriavtsev (no. 3-4, 1932), V. L. Komarov (no. 1, 1933-no.1(8), 1934), A. E. Kitaev (no. 9-10, 1934), IU. A. Onishchenko (no. 11, 1935-no. 17, 1936), A. S. Poretskii (no. 18, 1936-no. 22, 1937), V. V. Suslennikov (no. 23-25, 1937), and I. I. Sidorishin (no. 26-33, 1937).

The 90s have shown much more stability. The editor of issue no. 1(34) was Academician I. M. Makarov. It would be interesting to know the history of why and how A. I. Krushanov becomes the editor for the rest of the year (no. 2-6, 1990). Although he had passed away, the single issue for 1991 lists him as editor; the deputy editor was G. IA. Voloshin. By 1992, Academician A. V. Zhirmunskii assumed the editorship, a position which he still holds. With issue no. 1-2 (1992), the name of the Academy changes from DVO AN SSSR to DVO RAN. This issue also begins to identify the institutional affiliation of the authors. The articles are more interesting, especially in the social science fields. Issue no. 1 (1993) begins to have English abstracts of all articles.
The most outstanding feature of the Vestnik in the 30s was the contributions by two excellent scholar/librarians—Zotik Nikolaevich Matveev and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Marakuev. Matveev begins in issue no. 1-2 (1932) with a bibliography on the Far Eastern krai (DVK) from 1922 to 1932; in the next issue (no. 3-4), he adds more material to this DVK bibliography, and includes a new one, “Literatura o Kras. Armii v DVK.” In issue no. 10 (1934), a bibliography “Po Khingano-Bueinskoi probleme” is published, and in issue no. 15 (1935), his last work appears—an article on the history of Sakhalin, as well as a bibliography entitled “Literatura o sovetskom Sakhaline.” Throughout the first fifteen issues, Matveev is a frequent reviewer of new books, and in the combined issue no. 1-3 (1933), he writes a letter to the editor complaining about the mistakes made in printing his bibliography in no. 1-2. With issue no. 9 (1934) a bibliography section appears, that continues to be present in most issues until no. 24 (1937). Matveev reviews two books in no. 9 and one in issue no. 11 (1935). In addition, issue no. 9 begins a feature that lists new foreign books received at the DVFAN Library. These books reflect broad scholarly connections and are from such places as Tokyo, Philippines, USA, China, India, and Germany.

Marakuev contributes a long review of the first edition of P. E. Skachkov’s Bibliografiia Kitaia (no. 1-3, 1933); his other articles are on economic topics. His name is not as frequently seen as Matveev’s, but the reviews in the bibliography section are often of Harbin (KVzhd) publications. This might have been because Marakuev was an honorary member of OIMK and a member of ORO–both in Harbin, where he lived from 1923 to 1924 and again in 1927. Matveev’s fate was to be arrested on 27 November 1937 and shot 20 April 1938. Marakuev was arrested in 1928 and detained for 3 years; his second arrest was in November 1937; he spent 5 years in prison (1940-1945) and died in 1955.

Other useful contributions in the 30s include a bibliography of foreign literature on trade, chemistry, geology, oceanology, etc. (no. 1(8), 1934), and a bibliography on the geology of Sakhalin by R. L. Merklin (no. 15, 1935). By issue no. 17 (1936), the bibliography section lists only new books received in the DVFAN Library; in issue no. 18, the bibliography section has a review of a Japanese report on plankton by K. A. Brodskii. The section changes names in issue no. 19 (1936) to “Referaty. Kritika. Bibliografiia”; however, only two more books are reviewed (in nos. 22 and 23, 1937).

With the Vestnik’s revival in 1990, the chronology section of the very first issue showed encouraging signs of devoting space to library/bibliographic issues by including a list of new books published by DVO. By is-
sue no. 4 (1990), a new section appears called “Knigi,” containing three book reviews. To date, thirty-five reviews have appeared, including, most interestingly, in 1995, reviews of two books published abroad (John Stephan’s *The Russian Far East: A History* and Amir Khisamutdinov’s *The Russian Far East: Historical Essays*), as well as a review of a Russian publication by doctoral candidate Tony Kaliss. Systematic attention has been lacking, however. A list of new books by Izd-vo Dal’nevostochnogo universiteta appears in some free space at the end of an article (no. 5-6, 1992); throughout issue no. 1 (1998) announcements of ten new books with abstracts are scattered at the end of different articles; in issue no. 3 (1998) seven new books are announced. In issue no. 4 (1998), the geology section contains a series of articles that are book reviews and replies by authors to earlier reviews. One of the reviews is for a new collection of biographies of repressed geologists. There is a short article by Raisa Sorochanova (no. 4-5(50-51), 1993, p. 153), “Gift of the Royal Society,” that appears in a section called “In Scientific Libraries.” A. I. Bukreev and T. V. Kuznetsova write on “Dal’nevostochnaia gosudarstvennaia nauchnaia biblioteka,” (no. 3, 1999, p. 143-146) in a section called “Biblioteki.” Finally, V. M. Serov writes on “Biblioteka Vostochnogo instituta,” (no. 4, 1999, p. 141-49) in the “Knigi” section.

To further enhance the quality of the *Vestnik*, I offer these suggestions. The sections should become more stable; the reader is never sure what will be in each issue. Although issue no. 5 (1999) had a ten year review of the work being done on the geography of Siberia and the Far East, it would have been nice to feature additional ten year reviews for other subjects during the anniversary year. For example, what new directions have appeared after the collapse in the fields of history or economics? In the hard sciences, how has the lack of money affected research capabilities? Is there more scholarly contact with the West now? It is noticeable that the same people write over and over again. Perhaps the *Vestnik* could find different contributors. Certainly, in this era, it would be most interesting to see articles or reviews from colleagues abroad. It might be useful to have a section in which one topic is discussed from two points of view. While there have been some historical articles, one in issue no. 3 (1998) had almost no references. The topic of new textbooks for high school and university students needs to be discussed. Have new ideas appeared or previously forbidden topics been incorporated? A critical review of a new textbook on the history of Russia did appear in no. 5 (1998). One would expect to find something about V. L. Larin’s book *Kitai i Dal’nii Vostok Rossii* . . . (Vladivostok, 1998), which apparently stirred up enough controversy to cause official intervention. There are some indexing problems;
for example, reviews are listed under both “Retsenzii” and “Knigi”—why not combine them or use one term? The “Curriculum vitae” section that featured Zhirmunskii is indexed under “General” articles in the year end summary of contents, but why is it not also under “Scholars of DV”? The journal could further distinguish itself by trying to fulfill its goal of providing critical bibliographical materials and letters to readers. Issue no. 1 (1999) did carry a response to an earlier review; this is a good format for scholarly dialog. Are there no modern-day Matveevs or Marakuevs who could contribute to the Vestnik?

Academician Zhirmunskii and his staff are to be congratulated for completing the past ten years. The Vestnik is now longer-lived than in the 30s. The journal has shown promise and broken ground as the premiere academic journal in the Russian Far East. Only two other efforts come to mind. There is the excellent work being done on Sakhalin in the Kraevedcheskii biulleten’ and the Vestnik Sakhalinskogo Muzeia. The other publication, Rossiia i ATR (Russia and the Pacific), from the Institut istorii, arkheologii i etnografii narodov Dal’nevostochnogo otdeleniia, has many deficiencies and deserves to be reviewed on its own. Every academic research library in Russia and the USA should subscribe to the Vestnik DVO RAN.

Patricia Polansky
Russian Bibliographer
Hamilton Library
University of Hawaii
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, HI 96822

NOTES
1. In the 30s, only 1935 and 1936 carried annual indexes.
2. All three have a University of Hawaii connection–John Stephan is Professor of History; Vladivostok historian Amir Khisamutdinov is a frequent visiting researcher; and Tony Kaliss received his Ph.D from the university in 1999.

When Žižka (1866-1969) began his series of articles titled “Paměti a osudy” in the trade journal Československý knihkupec (Czechoslovak bookseller) on 15 December 1933, he had over five decades of experience in the Prague book trade. He was also director of the Czech booksellers’ and publishers’ vocational school since 1914, a teacher there from its inception in 1898, and editor and contributing author of its textbook series “Knihkupecká bibliothéka” (Bookseller’s library) (see pp. 453-454). Žižka’s memoir of booksellers and bookselling in Prague during the early constitutional period of imperial Austria (1860-1918) ran to 146 installments by its conclusion on 10 October 1941, in the Czech bookseller and publisher association’s renamed journal *Knihkupec a nakladatel* (Bookseller and Publisher). For its volume, detail, and breadth, and for the significance of its author, Žižka’s memoir is a leading source on an early phase of the modern Czech book trade. It is also a contribution to the history of a period when Czech cultural and socioeconomic development quickened and Czech-German rivalries in Bohemia intensified. Editor Aleš Zach (b. 1941) and publisher Jan Kanzelsberger, a recent president of the revived Svaz českých knihkupců a nakladatelů (Association of Czech Booksellers and Publishers), have salvaged Žižka’s forgotten memoir with this first monographic edition. Moreover, Zach’s thoughtful editing has greatly increased the reference and documentary value of the original text.

Zach earned a doctorate (1969) in librarianship from Prague’s Charles University. In 1982 he joined what is today the Czech Academy of Science’s Institute of Czech Literature as a librarian, and today Zach serves on the staff of the Lexikon české literatury as editor for Czech publishing history, which he also teaches at Charles University. His publications in this field include *Kniha a český exil 1949-1990* (1995), a dictionary of Czech émigré publishers with complete bibliographies of their editions, and *Stopami pražských nakladatelských domů* (1996), a guidebook of historical Prague publishing houses based on walking tours for his university classes. As editor of Žižka’s memoir Zach preserved the author’s original summary titles of individual installments and passages as italicized margin notes and thus maximized their reference value. He also wrote a historical afterword on Žižka and his text (pp. 451-459), de-
scribing how he edited it (pp. 461-465), and added explanatory notes to Žižka’s numerous obscure and incomplete references (pp. 466-470), in a list of Prague street name changes and an index of firms and persons. For the latter Zach added their occupations and also supplied the birth and death years of most of these now obscure people, which required considerable research. Finally, he illustrated Žižka’s memoir with period photographs and renderings of personalities and establishments and with examples of the book trade’s bibliographies, catalogs and internal documents.

Žižka portrays the bookselling establishments throughout Prague individually, discusses developments within the trade as part of a Czech struggle against German predominance, and describes the book stock, working methods, and social conditions in one typical shop as he experienced them as an apprentice, all in a highly desultory manner that makes Zach’s enhanced index and the margin notes all the more welcome.

Žižka began to make the rounds of bookshops as a small boy when he accompanied his father, who was a postal money carrier on Old Town Square and Jezovitská (now Karlova), the street leading to Charles Bridge, one of Prague’s most famous landmarks. This square and street were the center of Prague’s book trade, which then had, by Žižka’s count, forty-five booksellers, including just ten Czech ones. (However, he never makes clear in his book whether he distinguishes Czech booksellers from German ones by their names, birth, reputation, book stock, employees, working language, clientele, some combination of these or by other criteria.) In the brief introductory chapter titled “Around 1871,” Žižka describes these establishments in turn as he might have visited them from his home on nearby Hus Street. He revisits them in the same “strolling” narrative style in the next chapter, “Years of Childhood and Boyhood (1871-1880)” (pp. 45-152), but he devotes more space to apropos digressions. Thus, he discusses juvenile literature from the perspective of a consumer assessing how booksellers and publishers competed for this market by offering various authors and series (pp. 70-75).

The third chapter, “Years of Apprenticeship (1881-1884)” (pp. 153-403), which is five-ninths of Žižka’s entire text, contains substantial portraits of Prague booksellers and publishers. By this time they abandoned Jezovitská and followed the growing city’s commercial life to other streets, which Žižka specifies (pp. 164-165). As an apprentice seeking titles ordered by his employer’s customers and running other errands, he now visited establishments throughout Prague proper, its Josefov Jewish quarter (pp. 397-400) and its working-class Czech suburbs of Karlín and
Vinohrady (pp. 376-377, 389-390). Among the most noteworthy establish-
ments and their proprietors that Žižka portrays here are (as given in the
index) Kober, Grégr a Dattel, Vilímek, Šimáček, Stýblo, Pospíšil and es-
pecially Řivnáč and Otto. The Řivnáč firm, inaugurated 1847 in the origi-
nal National Museum on Na příkopě, where it remained until the edifice
was torn down in 1893, was respected for its age and close association
with this hearth of the Czech national revival. (See illustration on p. 320.)
The young Žižka still saw the venerable founder František Řivnáč
(1807-1888) on visits to the firm and describes his impressions of this
dean and temple of Czech booksellers. He also discusses the firm’s role as
an unofficial, productive national school of the book trade and describes
many of its employees and their later careers as its “graduates.” Jan Otto
(1841-1916) brought both Czech mass market and scholarly publishing to
a new level and scale after 1871, with such series as the Laciná knihovna
národní (Affordable national library) and the national encyclopedia Ottův
slovník naučný (1888-1909), second largest in the world after the Britan-
nica. (See encyclopedist Josef Tomeš, “Encyklopedie a doba,” in České
země a Československo v Evropě XIX. a XX. století, eds. Jindřich Dejmek
and Josef Hanzal [1997], 516 n. 3.) The OCLC Online Union Catalog cur-
cently includes at least 1,600 records (and possibly many more) for Jan
Otto imprints. Žižka worked for Otto in the years 1896-1921 and de-
scribes Otto’s career, employees and successive premises in detail.
Pospíšil, Šimáček, Vilímek and above all Otto are also the subjects of
Derek Sayer’s Princeton University Press book on Czech cultural history,
The Coasts of Bohemia (1998), which is probably the first introduction to
these firms in English.
Žižka’s memoir is rich in geographical and chronological details on the
development and relocations of firms and on the careers of their owners
and employees, as well as various other observations about them. His
memoir is also valuable because even the most promising firms chroni-
cally failed and their archives were lost. After plumbing the demise of the
house of Ignác Leopold Kober (1825-1866), publisher of the first Czech
encyclopedia, Žižka laments, “. . . what remains of the pride of great firms
and the work of their founders?! Besides personal misfortunes it is a spe-
cifically Czech lack of business fortitude. . . . While in neighboring Ger-
many the bookseller’s firm was a matter of family pride and every effort
was made to carry on its tradition, here firms that once showed the way
and stood as examples decline and fail” (pp. 126-127). Below the margin
note “Publisher archives” Žižka mentions some firms whose papers are
lost (pp. 243-244). Incredibly, Jan Otto’s “large archive was mostly
burned,” while two prominent memoirs, Josef Richard Vilímek’s (1835-1911) Ze zašlých dob (1908) and Jaroslav Pospíšil’s (1812-1889) Z dob vlasteneckých (1885), say nothing about their authors and others as publishers and booksellers (pp. 66-67). Karel Nosovský’s (1881-1935) Knihopisná nauka a vývoj knihkupectví ceskoslovenského (Bibliography and the development of the Czechoslovak book trade) (1927) of seven hundred pages remains as a rich source on individual firms, but it is long out of print.

Žižka writes in less detail about Prague’s majority German booksellers, but his partisan preoccupation with the Czech-German rivalry in the book trade yields some details on this period of transition to Czech predominance. Žižka’s employer, František Augustin Urbánek (1842-1919), happened to be the most zealously Czech member of the Prague booksellers’ gremium, the German term for the association which the Czechs used for decades after they took control of it in 1887. (Urbánek was also the leading Czech bibliographer of his time.) Hermann Dominicus (1827-1889) presided over the gremium as its last, but longest-serving German chairman from 1866, and Žižka writes more about this dynamic patriarch of the trade than about Prague’s other German booksellers. In this connection Žižka describes and quotes from the gremium’s bulletins, which Dominicus wrote by hand in Kurrentschrift (pp. 77-92). (For a history of the gremium based on its archive see Žižka’s predecessor as director of the booksellers’ and publishers’ school, Josef Miroslav Hovorka [1848-1914], Dějiny Gremia knihkupců a nakladatelů pražských [1920], which Žižka edited.) Dominicus, a native of Thuringia, came from the famous Leipzig firm of J. A. Barth, began his Prague career as an employee of Řivnáč in 1851 and established his own firm four years later (p. 334). Žižka writes about Dominicus with grudging respect but faults him for never learning to speak decent Czech, a point on which he evaluates other German booksellers. Thus, he resents the use of German at the state textbook publisher’s Prague branch, where most of the employees are Czech (p. 385). (On this controversial institution see the index under “C. K. Knihosklad.”)

By 1880 sales of German books in Prague were in decline, as Vienna’s Österreichische Buchändler-Correspondenz lamented (p. 136), but Czech booksellers and publishers still faced formidable German competitors in Prague and remained dependant on German innovations. Historian and national patriarch František Palacký’s (1798-1876) publisher remained Friedrich Tempsky (1821-1902), who held exclusive rights to his works until 1893 and never bothered to become “Tempský,” all to
the annoyance of bookseller Urbánek, who also failed to lure philanthropist and book collector Vojta Náprstek (1826-1894) away from Dominicus. Even in the 1880s, Žižka observes, “innumerable ultra-Czech families bought Goethe and Schiller in Prachtausgaben as a matter of bon ton,” “school textbooks . . . followed German models,” “maps were all German-made,” and “music was engraved and printed in Leipzig” (pp. 159-160). Sigmund B. Bensinger (1825-1896) of Mannheim introduced Prague to publishing and pushing trashy novels in 1861 before building his empire in Vienna after 1875, while the German Wltáek brothers introduced Prague to modern newspaper marketing in 1876, and Heinrich Mercy (1826-1912) dominated law publishing and bookselling until 1885. For the Czechs, bookseller František Kytka (1845-1898), gremium chairman in 1890-1898 and delegate to the provincial diet, established a beachhead across the river in Malá strana or Kleinseite, the German-speaking bastion of the government, aristocracy, officer corps, and clergy.

However, the subject at the heart of Žižka’s memoir is the life of a bookseller’s apprentice, described with his usual digressions, chiefly on pages 165-289. Žižka served a standard three-year unpaid apprenticeship in Urbánek’s firm, where his widowed mother presented him on 6 September 1881, and his principál gave a “grand lecture on an apprentice’s duties (no rights).” Urbánek doubtless spoke in the spirit of Friedrich August Credner (b. 1806 in Gotha, Germany), former chairman of the gremium, whose oppressive regulations, published at the start of the 1860s, were then the Prague standard governing apprenticeships. It was a regime of “grinding work, long hours, Sunday work, often including the afternoon, not to mention holidays, with no medical insurance and no vacation, no vocational school education . . . a working life on the level of a common servant, at least during the first year.” The praktikant was reduced to an education in “groping . . . slavish imitation of even handwriting, the mindless doing of what one’s seniors were seen to do, an unthinking shuffle down well-trod paths.” Successful apprentices developed capacious memories by constantly making, using and updating personal book lists, because they were expected to “know not only the book stock and titles, but also the issues and contents of periodicals and the store price of every book, all from memory.” Urbánek always had two or three apprentices, and during his ten years with the firm Žižka counted over twenty of them. Žižka also describes the premises, business operations and the personalities and work of the staff, from Urbánek and his younger brother Velebín (1853-1892), who specialized in music, to the
packer and courier in what amounts to a detailed portrait of the Urbánek firm as a typical Prague bookseller of the 1880s. The margin notes offer easy reference to passages on the following subjects: window displays, the arrangement and maintenance of the book stock, anecdotes about memorable books and articles, the annual 30 March late-night accounting sessions (“Remitendní noc” and “Remitenda a V.T.,” pp. 205-208), rents, orders from Czechs in America and Russia, early post cards, statues, paintings, photographs, early public transport schedules, early fashion magazines, daily revenues, St. John’s 15 May pilgrimage as the premier annual bookselling season (“Svatojanská pout’,” pp. 288-289), playing cards, and prayer books. Žižka concludes his memoir with brief chapters on provincial Bohemian and Moravian booksellers (pp. 404-433) and on memorable authors who frequented the Urbánek firm with their manuscripts (pp. 434-445). Žižka was also an accomplished general memoirist of Prague life whose Praha před osmdesáti lety (1960) was a primary source for historian Pavla Vošahlíková’s recent monograph on everyday life in the era of Franz Josef I, Jak se žílo za časů Františka Josefa I. (1996).

Žižka’s Paměti a osudy, caringly edited and handsomely published, joins Hovorka’s and Nosovský’s 1920s monographs (see earlier) as a major rediscovered source on the Prague book world in the late nineteenth century. Alas, the book is but a fragment of a larger and reworked manuscript memoir. As editor Aleš Zach discovered in the papers of Václav Mikota (1896-1982), last chairman of the abolished Association of Czech Booksellers and Publishers in the late 1940s, recently donated to the renewed association, Žižka continued to write his memoir after its run in Knihkupec a nakladatel ended. Wartime censors rejected a two-volume version for Žižka’s anti-German tone and lost the second volume. By 1950 he completed a final version in five parts and 890 pages, described in the Mikota papers, but again it was unpublishable: the world he memorialized was discredited by a new regime, which nationalized booksellers and publishing firms in 1949. A reworking of the serialized text now published as Paměti a osudy accounted for only the first two parts and 392 pages, or just 44% of the entire manuscript! Parts three through five covered the periods 1884-1900, 1891-1921 and 1921-1945. Zach lost the trail of this manuscript in the Mikota papers and other sources some time after 1961, when it was allegedly deposited in the Památník národního písemníctví. However, this major Prague literary archive has no trace of such a receipt. Thus, Zach concludes his afterword with a three-part appeal to today’s Association of Czech Booksellers and Publishers: “to find
the missing definitive text of Žižka’s memoir, to professionally establish and develop an archive as a research center, and to inaugurate the systematic study of Czech book trade and publishing history.”
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