

extent that it exposes him to the kinds of analyses that are possible when one applies the techniques of operations research and systems analysis to a library system. Such applications are long overdue, and the potential results should improve the effectiveness of libraries severalfold.

This book could be used as a beginning text in a course in library science in the area of library systems analysis. However, additional material would be needed to supplement it and to describe some of the other studies that have been done in libraries. A reviewer probably should make some critical comments even about a good book, and therefore my only comment would be that more material could have been included about other studies and models. For example, there are possible applications of non-linear programming to such inventory areas as journal and serial purchasing and selection. However, this is the kind of criticism that can be made of almost any book, namely, that it could have been more comprehensive.

An overall evaluation finds the book to be an excellent contribution to the field of library science which will undoubtedly help to bring more science back into the field of library science.—Richard W. Trueswell, *University of Massachusetts*.

Oregon Imprints 1845-1870. By George N. Belknap. Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1968. 305p. \$10.

Slowly, painstakingly, methodically, we are covering the nation. Someday the good work begun by Roorbach and Kelly, continued by the American Imprints Inventory, and advanced by the intrepid McMurtrie, will be complete, and thereafter we will know with ninety-nine per cent certainty the work of the early printers and publishers who peopled this nation's moving frontiers.

George N. Belknap's *Oregon Imprints* is the latest in a long series of volumes recording the early publications of the respective states, and it is a good one. Imprintophiles will relish the compiler's account of his own seduction:

About a year before Douglas McMurtrie's death

in September 1944, the manuscript of his *Oregon Imprints 1847-1870* was accepted for publication by the University of Oregon. As University Editor, I had expected that my part in the making of the book would be merely the routine checking of copy. But I did not know McMurtrie. Questions on some minor details sent me to the University of Oregon Library. A report to Chicago of two or three small errors in descriptions—probably with a transparent note of editor's oneupmanship—brought flattering thanks for my diligence and sent me back to the Library for further checking. And then I found an imprint "not in McMurtrie" and another, which, after an exciting exchange of letters, went into the manuscript. Now I was hooked . . .

Sound familiar?

During the subsequent fifteen years the compiler added 967 imprints to McMurtrie's original 589 and deleted thirty-five for a final total of 1,521 entries. His discoveries pushed the earliest known printing in the state back two years to 1845. The resulting volume will stand for a long time as the definitive enumeration of early Oregon printing, although one can imagine that somewhere the game has probably already begun of reporting a title "not in Belknap."

The introduction to this work records the adventures and trials of the compiler rather than the standard historical essay on the first printing in the state. The illustrations are well selected, clearly reproduced, and keyed to the text. The appendix comprises a list of 142 lost Oregon imprints. The indexes, both of subjects and of printers and publishers, are comprehensive and accurate.

Bibliographical description of the 1,521 entries is appropriately full, including main entry, title page transcription including line endings, printers' devices, pagination and size, frequent descriptive and historical as well as contents notes, and locations of copies. It is done in the best bibliographical and scholarly tradition and represents an important advance in our growing knowledge of our printing history. The volume is well designed and handsomely printed. May there be more!—David Kaser, *Cornell University*. ■ ■