

The Culture of Print may most readily appeal to literary and cultural historians, philosophers, and sociologists—those conversant with the revolution in thinking about the transmission of texts that began in 1958 with the publication of Febvre and Martin's *L'Apparition du livre*. Those less familiar with the topic might wish first to seek out editor Chartier's synthesis and explication of its evolution in his "Frenchness in the History of the Book: From the History of Publishing to the History of Reading," delivered as the 1987 Wiggins lecture at the American Antiquarian Society and published in the Society's *Proceedings* 97: 299–329 (1987).

Chartier's prolific and provocative scholarship will soon be encountered even more often in the citation indexes—thanks to its being made accessible in English by translator Lydia G. Cochrane and by Princeton University Press in this and in Charter's 1987 collection, *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*. A well-designed volume, *The Culture of Print* includes the twenty-four plates from the French original, although much reduced in size. The subtle arguments and linguistic nuances typical of contemporary French scholarship suggest that careful scholars may wish to consult the original text.—Elizabeth Swaim, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

Theories of Science in Society. Ed. by Susan E. Cozzens and Thomas F. Gieryn. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Pr., 1990. 264p., acid-free, \$25 (ISBN 0-253-31471-2). LC 89-45476.

There have been a number of recent changes in the focus of studies on the impact of science on society. The field has moved away from an emphasis on internal aspects of science, in which studies have dealt with the processes of research and the relationships among scientists. There is also a lessening of interest in specialized studies of small scientific groups and individual disciplines. Currently, the field is taking a social constructivist turn and looks at the methods by which knowledge is being produced, leading to an analysis

of the social nature of scientific knowledge.

This collection of essays by a group of established scholars in the sociology of science deals with a number of theoretical questions about the role of science in society. It is aimed at specialists in the sociology of science; at sociologists with interests other than science and technology; and at readers concerned about the interrelationships among science, technology, society, and government.

Cozzens, on the faculty at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Gieryn, who teaches at Indiana University, had originally intended that there would be a discussion of the papers and the development of a set of common issues and differences in the various theoretical agendas of the participants. While this never materialized, a set of common issues emerges, although there are clearly many disagreements in approach and in the use of core concepts.

In their introduction, the editors identify and comment on several sets of convergences and divergences in the papers. Although no one has attempted to define where science ends and society begins, most of the papers reveal a concern with the boundaries of science. There are questions of borders between science and politics, between pure science and applied science, between social science and natural science, between good and bad science, and between science and its popularization. Another common theme is the relationship among power, patronage, and autonomy. Several authors discuss the "uncheckability" of scientific performance, which means that patronage relationships are sustained by presumptions of trust between sponsor and scientist. Among the divergent aspects of the several papers are questions about the appropriate level of abstraction for theories in the sociology of science; the place of the investigating subject—the author—in inquiry into science and technology (invisible and detached or vocal and involved?); the problem of whether to view science as structure or action; and, finally, the relationship between the technical content of science and social structure and behavior patterns.

All of the papers are provocative and complex. They all require careful reading and presuppose some background in sociology and science. Academic and research librarians may be particularly interested in "Ingredients for a Theory of Science in Society: O-rings, Ice Water, C-Clamp, Richard Feynman and the Press," a paper by Gieryn and Anne E. Figert (Indiana University). This paper uses the 1986 *Challenger* disaster as its context. "Scientific Malpractice and the Contemporary Politics of Knowledge," by Daryl E. Chubin (Office of Technology Assessment, United States Congress), covers not only scientific fraud, but also "pork barreling" as a means of funding scientific research and capital construction.

The essays are well written, and an excellent introduction ties them together. The references that accompany each paper together serve as a thorough bibliography of current research in the sociology of science.—Jay K. Lucker, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

Smith, Eldred. *The Librarian, the Scholar, and the Future of the Research Library.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1990. 119p. \$35 (ISBN 0-313-27210-7). LC 89-25665.

This essay addresses a wide range of concerns of academic research librarians in its argument for "a complete, unified electronic record of scholarship." Smith contends that maintenance of such a record and its means of access, which he calls bibliographic apparatus, will respond both to the scholar's requirements of convenience and reliability and to the librarian's need to preserve and control. He doubts the success of attempts to promote self-sufficiency on the part of the scholar, essentially because those skills are not the natural province of scholars; he doubts the success of microform as a vehicle for preservation, essentially because it constitutes a regression to a format that is less controllable than the electronic format; and he doubts the success of library cooperation, understood in its traditional sense, essentially be-

cause it is almost antithetical to some of the librarian's driving principles. The author devotes several pages of this brief book to an interesting analysis of the debate about the once-proposed National Periodicals Center.

Smith envisions the successful research library service of the future as functioning with a central, complete, electronic scholarly record as its nucleus. Its major activities will be "gathering, organizing, and maintaining the record as well as the bibliographic apparatus." The clientele of this center will be research librarians from other institutions, thereby ensuring a high quality of communication pertinent to maintenance of and access to the record and its bibliographic apparatus, while the role of these research librarians at local sites will be to mediate between local scholars and the information structure of the scholarly record.

Smith's book presents a stimulating vision of how things should and could be at some unspecified time in the future. He advances his argument with a rigid logic that is bolstered, however, by bold statements that are as debatable and unsupported as they are quotable. In discussing traditional media of scholarly communication (books and journals), he claims that "electronic copy is now produced for all of this material, as part of the printing process." Surely, this is not true of Third World publication or even of some pockets of technologically more advanced nations. The book does not incorporate documentary notes, but includes, instead, a concluding "Bibliographic Essay." This unconventional practice has the advantage of allowing the author to intermingle impression and fact without notes that might distract from the tight logic of his argument. This practice also has the disadvantage of leaving the reader a little insecure, a condition that is aggravated by the fact that the "Bibliographic Essay" is not a review of the literature on the book's topics in general, but, instead, an essay describing only sources that support aspects of the preceding arguments. These are not minor quibbles, for this unconventional style may mean that the fruits of Smith's excel-