what skews the presentation of reference tools, but it is a far more effective teaching method than mere discussion of each tool one by one. Furthermore, concentration on American history as a sample topic keeps the book to a manageable size for the student.

Occasionally the author does not generalize from the tools examined for the specific search topic to a search strategy useful for other topics. For example, on pages 6–7, specialized book bibliographies are introduced, but the relationship between the three cited bibliographies and a search strategy for any other topic is not drawn. Presentation of such general and peripheral tools as PAIS Bulletin and Social Science Citation Index before specific history tools appears to be in reverse order. Neither does Frick’s work solve the problem, exhibited by other guides to reference sources, of isolating abstracting services as a distinct form, and thereby inadequately emphasizing their function as current bibliographies. Here the most comprehensive current bibliography in American history, America: History and Life (AHL), is relegated to the end of the list of tools considered, a weakness made more noticeable by the absence of the AHL Index to Book Reviews from the discussion of book review indexes and the omission of the AHL American History Bibliography from the earlier section on history indexes.

The text is generally well designed, clear, and amply illustrated (37 figures). There are, however, several instances of references in the text that are not clear in the illustrations; one of the illustrations on page 28 is in reverse order of the text’s discussion, for no useful reason; and several captions need more complete information for accurate identification. The list of basic reference sources inexplicably begins, following its initial outline, without even a heading or generous space division, in the last two inches of the inside column of a verso page.

This useful, attractive guide to history research may be used effectively by bibliographic instruction librarians and history professors, and it is priced for student purchase.—Joyce Duncan Falk, American Bibliographical Center, Santa Barbara, California.


This reviewer likes books, and in particular he likes books about books. How-somever, as someone once said, he does not like this book.

The book contains a number of excellent biographical sketches of printers and publishers who were active in the Town of Boston, Massachusetts—particularly those by Mary Ann Yodelis Smith, J. P. O’Donnell, R. E. Burkholder, John B. Hench, Charles E. Clark, and a few others who did some original research. Madeline Stern contributed a tour de force that overwhelms sketches of persons in the trade who were much more important to it than was Joseph Nancrede. The primary yardstick for determining the length of the entry allotted to a person appears to be his significance, but nowhere is “significance” defined, except in an indirect way, such as the number of imprints in which the subject’s name appears. Thus, “less important individuals” are defined as “generally those appearing in fewer than twenty-five imprints.” The emphasis on imprints and the editor’s device of attaching to each sketch lists of “Major Authors” and “Publishers Served” has caused authors of the sketches to emphasize highlights and milestones in their subject’s lives which sometimes obscures a balanced view of the whole. The narrative style decreed for all sketches makes the briefest ones appear ludicrous. A telegraphic “Who’s Who” style of entry might have been more appropriate for those. The majority of the sketches are based on common secondary sources (or no sources) and add little to the sum of our knowledge. The best that can be said about this compilation is that it lists in one convenient place the known members of the Cambridge-Boston book trade in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

This reviewer dislikes saying such critical things about a book put together by someone carrying as distinguished a name as Benjamin Franklin V. But! . . . It begins with an illustration of a “Ramage Press as used by James and Benjamin Franklin.” Ramage made his first press about the year 1795. The sketch of Isaiah Thomas contains the amusing, but apocryphal, story of Thomas’s printing of Fanny Hill. The manufacture of this book about printers is all but a disaster, although
one could say that the typewriter typeface is "nice" and "open." The reviewer's copy of the book is coming apart at the front inner hinge.

Condolences to the editor, contributors, and publisher! This is not a very good book and is not recommended to any but the most basic reference collection—Marcus A. McCorison, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts.


Although the title is a misnomer, University Library History is an interesting book and well worth reading by the academic librarian. It is not, strictly speaking, a history, nor is it an "international review." Among the fifteen essays, three might be regarded as history but the majority can only be regarded as perceptive observations of the growth of academic libraries in the United States and Great Britain from the twenties to the present, with great emphasis upon the emergence of the academic library as a large complex organization of relatively recent origin.

Anyone like the reviewer, who has only modest knowledge of the growth of British academic libraries, will be struck by the parallel growths in collection development, processing, staffing, buildings, and financial support in the two countries. The British university libraries grew as collections of collections (there is a very interesting first chapter on the University of Manchester by F. W. Ratcliffe), they were often starved for adequate support for materials and staff salaries, and they did not secure funds for buildings until theirs were crowded and inefficient. These problems are similar to those of this country, but with a time lag of perhaps twenty-five years. After the American universities "flight to LC" in post-World War II, some librarians may be surprised to learn that over 50 percent of the British university libraries use the LC classification scheme (p.4, 153). Indeed Alan Jeffreys asserts that "British university libraries are almost totally reliant on American schemes of classification and show almost no signs of being directly influenced by any other school of thought." (p.134). There are good comparative tables on a variety of topics: collections, p. 12-17, 49; staffing, p.112, 121-24, and facilities, p. 248-49. Moreover, the battle within the Library Association among university librarians and public librarians which ultimately resulted in the formation of the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL) bears striking resemblance to the love/hate relationship of ALA and its siblings, ARL and ACRL.

The essays were written by thoughtful British and American academic librarians, including such well-known persons as David Kaser, Jerrold Orne, and John Y. Cole from the U.S., and R. O. MacKenna and Norman Roberts from the U.K.

In addition to the Ratcliffe essay, this reviewer found the following essays of particular interest: J. M. Smethurst on library staffing in the United Kingdom since World War II, MacKenna on library organization, Norman Roberts on library financing, and T. H. Bowyer on SCONUL.

Two other essays warrant careful reading by the American academic librarian: Geoffrey Briggs on university library development in Canada and a superb essay by Harrison Bryan on university library development in Australia and New Zealand with accompanying statistical tables, (p.306-14). Aside from these two essays, the only other essay dealing with non-U.S. and non-U.K. university libraries is a dull essay on Italian university libraries in the past century. Thus my comment that this is not truly "an international review."

There are useful references to various reports, e.g., the University Grants Committee, and the Robbins (1963), Parry (1967), and Atkinson (1976) Reports, etc., which may provide thoughtful comparisons as one sorts out the future of American academic libraries as they relate to the U.S. government. The essayists show familiarity with the monographic and journal literature as well as the report literature. There are a few typographical errors, e.g., citing Wilson beginning at GLS in 1938, and a few inaccuracies, but the work as a whole is free of such impediments.

In comparing U.S. and U.K. university libraries one notes a real difference in the edu-