the classical country of antimonopolism the members of the bar enjoy a monopoly unequalled in most foreign countries where the privilege of the bar is limited to the representation of parties in court and anybody may engage in giving advice on legal matters and in drafting.

In a book of this kind, diversity of opinion on what to include and what to omit is inevitable. Farnsworth's selection is well justified throughout. In his presentation, he has, in spite of brevity, achieved the feat of indicating relationships between the legal phenomena and the underlying aspects of social, political and economic life. He has not shied away from pointing out controversies and incipient trends. In consequence, the book is not only informative but also stimulating. It is written primarily for foreigners. It ought also to be read by entering law students, by college students considering the study of law, by ordinary citizens, and, not the least, by members of the profession. They will find it refreshing to see their specialty placed in its proper niche within the totality of our complex legal order.[3]

MAX RHEINSTEIN*

[3] Such a reader may perhaps feel stimulated to look up Charles Szladits' bibliographical guide to the laws of France, Germany and Switzerland, GUIDE TO FOREIGN LEGAL MATERIALS: FRENCH, GERMAN, SWISS (1959), which, like Farnsworth's book, was published for the Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law, Columbia University.

* Max Pam Professor of Comparative Law, The University of Chicago.

ADDENDUM TO BOOK REVIEW, 30 U. CHI. L. REV. 784 (1963). **Lawyers on Their Own: A Study of Individual Practitioners in Chicago.** By JEROME E. CARLIN. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press 1962. Pp. x, 235. $6.00.

In my review, I criticized on a number of grounds the methodology employed by the author. One criticism was directed to the validity of the method of selecting the sample. As internal evidence that the sample was imperfect I cited the exceptionally high percentage of solo practitioners in the sample—77 per cent as compared with 55.6 per cent for Chicago.[1]

A letter from the author makes the point that I misunderstood his methodological note which stated:

> To obtain a sample of 100 lawyers, every *n*th *individual lawyer,* beginning with a lawyer chosen at random on the first page, was selected from the *Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory,* excluding lawyers over 70 years of age.[2]

[1] Book Review, 30 U. CHI. L. REV. 784, 789 (1963).

[2] CARLIN, LAWYERS ON THEIR OWN 212 (1962). (Emphasis added.)

A checking procedure using Sullivan's law directory and telephone inquiries to determine whether the names drawn were "individual practitioners" was then employed by the author. The author states that the term "individual lawyer" was intended to mean individual practitioner. I had assumed from the author's use of the term "individual practitioner" elsewhere in the note that the term "individual lawyer" included lawyers some of whom were individual practitioners and some of whom were not.

On the basis of the author's statement, it appears now that the figure of 77 per cent on which I relied was intended to refer only to the number of lawyers listing themselves as individual practitioners in Martindale-Hubbell who are in fact individual practitioners.

I regret the misunderstanding but it arises from an obvious ambiguity. I am glad to withdraw the specific criticism in question.

ALEX ELSON*

* Member of the Illinois Bar.