**Book Reviews**


In the five essays which make up this monograph Professor Silver has traced the early development and emergence of American typefounding. Although by 1769 there were sporadic attempts at typefounding, it was not until the Revolution had ended that any real interest in a domestic industry appeared. When that time arrived the persons best qualified to direct the fledgling industry were European emigrants. Thus, Professor Silver has chosen 1787—the year that a Scottish typefounder was first known to be active in this country—to begin his chronological coverage. By 1825, the year with which this study closes, American typefounding was firmly established.

The first chapter, “Typefounding as a Permanent Industry,” focuses on the achievements of two other Scotsmen, Archibald Binny and James Ronaldson, who produced the first professional and cheap American type. Among the persons discussed in the chapter on “Some Minor Typefounders and Punchcutters” are the peripatetic Benjamin Franklin and his grandson, Benjamin Franklin Bache, who was trained by French typefounders. Unfortunately, neither established a permanent firm. Other minor typefounders were Francis Bailey of Philadelphia and Samuel Sower, whose Baltimore foundry turned out a large quantity of type from 1804 to 1820, including the popular “diamond.” The third chapter, “Growth and Expansion,” presents the achievements of such men as E. W. White, George and David Bruce, and William Hager. Hager enjoyed an international reputation in the industry as the owner of the Bruce Type Casting Machine. The final essays, “Inventions and Patents” and “The Importation of Type,” are closely related, for the developments outlined in the former chapter were to have an influence upon the importation of type. Type continued to be imported throughout the entire period covered by this work because of the persistent preference of American printers for European type, particularly that of Caslon, Fry, and Wilson. As a means of partial redress American typefounders turned to tariffs, and a sympathetic government laid duties on imported type. By 1825, American typefounding was sufficiently developed and protected to begin a period of rapid growth, but that, as Professor Silver notes, is another story.

The book is handsomely printed and designed. The thirty-six plates include a good selection of specimen sheets; students of the history of American printing will find this feature particularly useful. The index is comprehensive.

We are often confronted with evidence of the contributions of these early typefounders. For example, much of the type used in the text of this work is Monticello, the linotype adaptation of Binny’s elegant roman. One need look no further for another example than a recent issue of *Publishers’ Weekly* (September 5, 1966, page 72). The Mergenthaler advertisement on that page notes, among other facts about the Monticello, that it has been used as the text face in eight of the fifty Books of the Year of the past five years. Other individual examples abound. It is to Professor Silver’s credit that for the first time there is now available a comprehensive study of the contributions of early typefounders in America. —Robert D. Harlan, University of California, Berkeley.


How anyone could write a dull history of Harper’s University is difficult to understand, but Professor Richard J. Storr has done just that. As if in apology for some criticisms which surely will be leveled by his disappointed readers, the author notes “the circumstances of its founding, the names of the persons associated with it,
and its ambitious plan were bound to attract the attention and fire the imagination of observers . . .” (page 399). He further notes that his primary objective has been to set possibilities against evidence contained in the documents and other materials that survive from the period before Harper's death. Storr's implication is that he will separate myth from reality.

The setting of possibilities against evidence is perhaps the book's greatest strength and also its greatest weakness. With thoroughness and in great detail the author sets down almost every facet of the University of Chicago's first thirteen years: the faculty, the curriculum, the students, the extracurricular activities, the deficit financing, and the interaction of major figures involved: William Rainey Harper, John D. Rockefeller, Frederick T. Gates, and Thomas W. Goodspeed. The documentation from original sources is plentiful and the quoting from Harper's official pronouncements and private letters is extensive. This makes the book read like a doctoral dissertation, which it is not.

Despite all this one often has the feeling that Storr has not gone far enough. Only after I had gone back and read the relevant chapters in Allan Nevins' biography of Rockefeller (1940, 1953) did I really begin to appreciate Storr. To cite one case which would interest the readers of this journal, Storr mentions the Berlin library on page 67 without any description of its nature. Again on page 247 the author notes that Chicago could not meet the payments. Many librarians will know that Harper bought the entire book stock of the Berlin book shop of S. Calvary & Co. early in the eighteen-nineties for a large sum of money, but will the general reader know it? The same is true in a discussion of the Bemis case on academic freedom. A couple of interpretative paragraphs on the aftermath (page 85) would have added much to the sense of completeness of the volume.

Yet my real quarrel with Storr is that the flesh-and-blood William Rainey Harper never quite comes through. There is a page of description by the novelist Robert Herrick (page 236) and three pages from one of Harper's seminar students (pages 161-63) which indicate that he was indeed a giant of a man. Does one have to play down the colorful and interesting personalities and leave history devoid of a sense of excitement? Professor Nevins' Rockefeller biographies answer "no." One might well ask here why no one has ever tackled the biography of Harper?

One of the best parts of the book is undoubtedly Harper's agonizing relationship with the major donor. Despite the university's relative wealth, there was never enough money during the early years to fulfill Harper's promises to the scholarly stars he attracted to the Midway. Most university presidents serving new and rapidly expanding universities will have little difficulty identifying themselves with Harper's problem. This may well be Storr's major contribution. He notes, quite correctly, that "had Harper been a cautious administrator, the university might not have had a brilliant beginning in which to cement the loyalties of its supporters; and had its principal supporters been Philistines, the university might not have survived the crisis [of lack of funds] without losing its distinctiveness." However, neither the chief donor, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., nor his agent, Frederick T. Gates, show up very well in this book. Perhaps they should not, but the cause of disagreement between Harper and Rockefeller was one of fundamental point of view rooted deeply within Rockefeller's character. On the whole one could wish for more such evaluations as indicated in the quotation above.

Although there is a lot about religion, its total impact upon the "Baptist university" is not brought out as much as one could hope. Harper, was, after all, a distinguished Old Testament scholar and one of the few times Rockefeller expressed himself publicly he gave the Lord credit for his wealth and asked if, under these circumstances, he could withhold it from Chicago. The relating of graduate work at Chicago to that of other institutions leaves something to be desired, despite the author's earlier work in this field. While he notes that Harper's plan of affiliating the Midwestern colleges with the University of Chicago failed, he makes little of Chicago's impact on the emerging Midwestern
state universities which Rockefeller and Gates thought was profound—another example of telling too much yet not enough.

Academic librarians will be further disappointed at the lack of attention to the development of the university libraries. Data certainly was available in the McMullen (1949) and Archer (1954) dissertations for a few paragraphs on this topic.

Storr does mention the fact that Melvil Dewey was offered the librarianship but turned it down. In a flash of interpretation he adds, “Harper never did find a first-class university librarian—and this perhaps was his greatest and most puzzling failure as an academic organizer.” Harper’s failure may not be unrelated to the fact that money for books and equipment was often at a premium. A central university library, named for Harper, had to wait until after his death.

No doubt Chicago alumni will want this book, as will most university libraries. College librarians and those with only a mild interest in the history of higher education can pass it up without much trauma.—Edward G. Holley, University of Houston.


Library cooperation, forever extending and developing, is the kind of topic on which a new book is always welcome. Mr. Jefferson himself remarks that since the War there has been probably more talk about library cooperation than about anything else in librarianship. In a larger sense, of course, cooperation among libraries is all part of the current world mood; politically, economically, and socially, it seems a matter of enlightened fact that “United we stand, divided we fall.”

Quite apart from any of this, Mr. Jefferson’s admirable survey is welcome in its own right. Following a general history of library cooperation (in three parts: from the beginnings to 1931, from 1931 to 1945, and postwar developments), he describes the present British national network for interlending, with its two-tiered pattern of national central library/regional library bureaus interlending, and direct lending through the national central library of university and special libraries. His next group of chapters deals with cooperative acquisition, cooperative storage, and exchange and redistribution. He then turns his attention to scientific and technical literature, treating first the national schemes for its cooperative provision, and then the local schemes. Mr. Jefferson is aware that in cooperative ventures the needs and problems of the various types of library differ widely; hence he goes on to devote a chapter to special libraries, another to academic libraries, and finally one to public libraries.

His remaining three chapters cover the tools of cooperation (such as bibliographies and union catalogs); international cooperation; and, in conclusion, plans and prospects for the future of library cooperation. He supplies a bibliography, the sections of which parallel his arrangement of chapters, and an index.

It is a pity that the American publishers of this book do not make clear in its title that Mr. Jefferson is really concerned only with British library cooperation. True enough, the Farmington Plan and the Scandia Plan and the activities of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft are described in the chapter on cooperative acquisition, and US schemes for cooperative storage are fully treated in the subsequent chapter; but this is only because acquisition and storage are such important aspects of cooperation, and Mr. Jefferson would not have been able to find much to say regarding either of these if he had confined himself to Britain’s less significant efforts.

Nevertheless, this book is a most creditable achievement. The material is succinctly marshalled and agreeably presented. The author is not concerned with exhortation or high-flying: just good sense, sound judgment; and above all, a conviction that “the interlibrary loan, like patriotism” is not enough, but that library cooperation must be regarded as having an everwidening connotation.—James Thompson, University of Glasgow.


This book is an introductory work for beginners and those with a little experience working in private law libraries. The em-