who most influence the unsophisticated, there is always a danger that their mannerisms, whether of taste or method, will be imitated (and usually exaggerated) while their underlying purpose remains unrecognised: just as many an architect who slaps on a swag here or a cupola there fondly supposes himself to be thereby qualifying for comparison with Wren or Brunelleschi. (pp. 88-89)

The rhythms of this paragraph, the placement of its pauses, leading toward the summarizing simile, make it a characteristic performance.

The personality that comes through is learned and humane—to use the adjectives that Carter applied on the first page to A. W. Pollard's great essay on book collecting in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Carter's scholarly temperament, and his consequent concern with history, are evident throughout, epitomized perhaps in his insistence that any "restoration" of a book be accompanied by a statement in which "the nature of the repairs made to it" are "recorded indelibly" (p. 185). He insisted that scholarly bibliographical analyses have "a strong claim on the attention of the average collector" (p. 114), and he recognized the role of collectors as scholars: "the ultimate value of the bibliophile to pure scholarship depends on his recognition as an active entity, not a mere appendix" (p. 99). In his discussion of Sadleir's Bibliographia series, Carter observed that it was "marked by a scholarly appreciation of the importance of book-structure and publishing practice to the intelligent collector, whose acquiescence in this proposition was enlisted by being taken for granted" (p. 61). There could be no better description of Carter's own book.

The same mind is obviously at work in his journalism of the 1940s. For example, in reviewing J. D. Cowley's *Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing*, he said, "The *principles* of bibliography are valid for books of all periods, and even the chronicler of a living author is the better for having learned how to collate an incunable" (*Publishers' Weekly*, 16 March 1940). And after the war, when he described the great Yale convocation of October 1946 to "mark the return of the University's collections to peacetime use" (*Publishers' Weekly*, 23 November 1946), he concluded his highly laudatory account with these important reflections:

Objects—books, pictures, or bones—are part of the stuff of scholarship, of culture, of ideas. It is axiomatic that it is the duty of institutions to acquire, preserve and catalog them; generally agreed, though not everywhere achieved, that they should be readily available to those who need to study them; but much less often recognized that they require to be actively injected into the thoughts and studies of the academic, and also of the wider, world outside their glass cases. Every year museums and libraries get fuller and the problem of exploiting their resources more formidable. The methods by which this can best be done vary with the circumstances; but the amount of imagination and enterprise being devoted in this country [the United States] to making such collections as Yale's not a mere adjunct but an integral and living part