book's authors are highly sensitive to the use of the word information throughout the text. Not surprisingly, the foundation has praise and great expectations for the value of the RLG Conspectus for the sharing of resources nationally; the foundation also considers the recent efforts of the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries as a useful prototype for cooperation.

So, what, in the final analysis, will be the model for scholarly communication in the future? The authors word the answer to this question with such great care that it is worth citing verbatim: "It is extremely unlikely—we would say almost inconceivable—that any alternative model will completely supplant the existing one at any point in the foreseeable future. Rather, we envision a situation where incremental modifications to the current model will be made. We would also argue, however, that it is equally inconceivable that there will not eventually be a more-or-less complete transformation of scholarly communication." We were right all along.

This excellent study is accompanied by more than the usual scholarly apparatus, with foreword, introduction, bibliography, three appendixes, a glossary, and even a fifteen-page synopsis, contributed by Ann Okerson, director of the ARL Office of Scientific and Academic Publishing. Unfortunately, it has no index. It is quite evident that the Mellon Foundation has a genuine desire to help the scholarly communication system grow stronger, healthier, more effective. It has distributed many copies of its study to university presidents, academic vice presidents, and library directors free of charge and is making other copies available for wide distribution at nominal cost. The foundation sees that the future of scholarly communication is not a library issue, but an institutional issue; that it is not just an institutional issue, but a national issue. The Mellon Foundation has done much to advance scholarly communication and the cause of academic libraries by producing and disseminating this study.—*Charles B. Osburn, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.*

Glazier, Loss Pequeño. *Small Press: An Annotated Guide.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1992. 123p. $49.95 (ISBN 0-313-28310-9). LC 92-15482.

Bibliographies are not usually recommended as entertainment. But then can there be any more charming annotator than Loss Glazier? As incisive and informative as one might wish, he never resists an opportunity to gloss, adding a bit of background or a reference, a passing opinion or an illuminating quote. The result is that this shortish list (174 items) may well be the elegy of the Mimeo Revolution, that Indian summer of literary Modernism. Glazier likes his subject too well ever to be dry, and has shown cleverness at a postmodern way of writing history. Self-confident, limited, not totalizing, not transcendental, thoroughly entertaining.

This is not a comprehensive book. It is restricted to the period since 1960, and to American materials only. It concerns itself not with single authors or presses, nor regional publishing, nor reviews, how-to-books, vanity or subsidy publishing, or fine presses. It is strictly literary—a significant limitation—and includes current information, coresources, and supplementary materials (catalogs, lists, bibliographies). The standard histories and other sources covering the period up to 1960 are concisely dealt with in the preface. While I can't think of anything missing, Glazier's purpose is not to be the last word, and he has not dug out obscure material (except for one master's thesis, and some letters to editors). Though not exhaustive, this is a well-done list. Its glory is all in the annotations.

Glazier begins with an introduction mostly devoted to characterizing the small press, where we learn that the "mimeo revolution" was actually made more on offset presses. I suspect Glazier would like to believe that the "spirit of mimeography, that of the small publisher, has produced an important legacy; it enters the nineties not only with a proven record of the production of literary texts but with an increasingly visible presence in the publishing industry." Yet, as with the term *hacker*, there has

been an important shift in thirty years that begins to come out as Glazier tries to return the term *small press* to its original meaning. Little magazines (increasingly a misnomer) have received most of the attention while the volume of publishing has shifted largely to books. "Academic quarterly," "alternative" and "underground press," or "independent publisher" are all too astigmatic or wide-angle to serve as descriptive terms, including as they do, the nonliterary, the too-commercial, and the insufficiently independent. The problem is that there has been a culture shift, and what Glazier chooses finally to call *small press*, numbering about 700 at the beginning of his period, has been overwhelmed by small, independent publishers of New Age books, cookbooks, and self-help books. While the small press has tripled in size, these other publishers have gone from nothing to some 12,000 in the same period. The noncorporate, locally based, small scale press of limited readership and uncommodified cultural ideals (described here as the epitome of the species) has become a minority force even on its home ground. Nowhere is this revealed more clearly than in the sequence of COSMEP catalog listings (items 167–170), from the first (a "who's who" and a "vital record" of the mimeo revolution at a crucial moment) to the last (a "disappointment" and captive of the "commercially expedient"). In between, we have the lavishly designed and illustrated Whole COSMEP Catalog in reverse alphabetic order and the microfiche third version, innocent of editing. The fourth is thoroughly professional, typeset, paginated, edited, and vetted—and soulless. Well, this is the history of the boomers themselves, who made this movement and now have come to middle age and power. I hope that Glazier's optimism is justified. One thing is clear: small presses (and literature, and we, too) are not what they were, whatever they are to become.

Meanwhile, I've spent hours browsing through the entries, and all that familiar, funny, laughable, confused, wonderful time again. Don't put this book on the reference shelves. Let people check it out and take it home with them.—*Charles W. Brownson, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.*

Euro-Librarianship: Shared Resources, Shared Responsibilities. Ed. by Assunta Pisani. Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 1992. 605p. $49.95 (ISBN 1-56024-266-3).

This volume documents the proceedings of a conference held in April 1988 in Florence under the auspices of ACRL's Western European Specialists Section (WESS). Weighing in at a hefty 605 pages, it comprises some fifty individual contributions offering in their totality an impressively diverse collection of topics, approaches, languages, and potential readerships. According to the brief introduction by Assunta Pisani, the purpose of the conference (and presumably of the volume) was to foster an exchange of information between Western European specialists in North American libraries and their Old World counterparts, centered on the relatively conventional theme of efforts to "collect, organize, and preserve materials that support research" and a potentially more controversial "examination of both the needs for research on Western Europe and of the programs underway to support these needs."

So far, so good. Few library collection managers with responsibilities that include Western Europe would dispute the need for a cogent and detailed examination of these topics. And yet, many potential readers of this volume will be both attracted by the topics and repelled by their presentation in the uneven, redundant, and diffuse format of this lightly edited collection.

The compilation's problems are at least threefold. First, the spread and distribution of topics defy clear description. The papers are distributed among fifteen rubrics, but the intended meaning of these rubrics is muddied by their application. At least one paper, Herbert Lottman's smooth "A Library User's View," stands outside these categories altogether; another category ("Access: Cooperative