

and library is sketched rather well. It is interesting to pursue the fortuitous dance of atoms that led Clements to Randolph Adams, a noted librarian.—*Ted Grieder, Fales Library, Elmer Bobst Library, New York University.*

Lubans, John, Jr., ed. *Educating the Library User*. New York: Bowker, 1974. 435p. \$14.50.

All a reviewer's hoary clichés apply to Lubans' collection of essays—it is uneven, contains too much material, has rather fuzzily defined objectives, and even lacks an index. Nevertheless, *Educating the Library User* is one of the most useful and at times inspiring state-of-the-art books to come along in quite awhile.

Lubans has brought together some forty original essays on every facet of library instruction, from the elementary school to the technological university and from the library tour to videotape. Essentially descriptive, the work pretends to be a bit more; the first two sections, half the book, supposedly present a rationale for instruction and a discussion of faculty involvement in library-use education. In fact, however, the best essays in these sections are straight-forward descriptions of programs at specific schools or educational levels. A mention of rationale or faculty involvement seems incidental to the thrust of the essays. In any case, Farber's essay on library instruction at Earlham College is brilliant and humbling; equally good are essays on instruction in undergraduate libraries by Passarelli and Abell and in four-year-college libraries by Kirk.

The second half of the book describes the implementation and evaluation of library instruction programs. Included are both overviews of particular instructional techniques (tours, computer-assisted instruction, etc.) and descriptions of particular programs. Many of the essays are excellent, especially so given the seeming dryness of the subject matter. Lynch on library tours and McCormick on handbooks should become required reading for those wanting to improve their library's approach to such orientation techniques. Rader's "helpful hints" are an accurate summary for those

planning credit courses in bibliography.

The most noticeable failures in the book are the essays by teaching faculty, both from library schools and from outside the field. The essay by Starkey ("Library-Use Instruction: A College Teacher's Viewpoint") unintentionally shows us how far we have to go in faculty relations. The author, a professor of education, mentions the word "librarian" only once—and in the sentence "Have one librarian escort each group of five people on a guided tour of the library." A history professor writes on the intriguing topic, "The Lecture-Textbook Syndrome and Library Use," but uses his space to offer a diatribe against "our ludicrous system of mass education," as he puts it. Wondering why Lubans included such material, one supposes that having cajoled a faculty member into submitting an essay, it would take considerable temerity to leave it out.

The two essays from library school deans are not much better. Goggin on library instruction at universities does only a superficial survey. Breivik writes on library instruction and the library school, a worthy enough topic, but seems to have little conviction that library instruction has a place in the professional curriculum. She winds up plumping for her school's course on "the non-user in an urban setting" and for changing the name of library instruction to "Individualization of Communication Controls" (!)

One should not emphasize the book's failings, however, because it contains so much that is useful. It should become *the* basic work for beginning research in library instruction; it includes both a bibliographic essay and a nine-page selected bibliography, and most articles contain extensive notes. Every library instruction practitioner will want it nearby for its description of successful programs and lists of dos and don'ts. And it would be eye-opening auxiliary reading for librarianship students taking reference courses.

Lest we feel smug about American accomplishments, Earnshaw's essay on the cooperative production of audiovisual bibliographic aids in the United Kingdom shows how much could be done if our national organizations—and the directors of university

libraries—took greater interest. There is still far too much needless duplication of library instruction effort in the U.S. However, the recent news that the Council on Library Resources has funded Project LOEX (the Library Orientation/Instruction Exchange at Eastern Michigan University) is encouraging. Lubans' book should help create a common information base for library instruction librarians nationwide.—Allan J. Dyson, *Head, Moffitt Undergraduate Library, University of California, Berkeley.*

Jones, John Bush, ed. ***Readings in Descriptive Bibliography.*** Kent, Ohio: Kent State Univ. Pr., 1974. 208p. \$9.00.

Liebert, Herman W. ***Bibliography Old & New.*** (Bibliographical Monograph Series, no.6) Austin: Humanities Research Center, Univ. of Texas, 1974. 25p.

Readings in Descriptive Bibliography will never find a place on "Fritz" Liebert's bookshelves. With the exception of two or three of the essays comprising the *Readings*, all the others are anathema to Liebert's way of thinking of bibliography. And the former director of Yale's Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library does have some definite feelings concerning the "new" bibliography. I choose the word *feelings* intentionally, because it is precisely the absence of this quality in most contemporary bibliographers—such as those collected here—which Liebert laments.

"Bibliophily is the parent of bibliography," Liebert reminds us at the close of his volume comprising the Third Annual Lew David Feldman Lectureship in Bibliography. As such, "writing about books and discriminating among them came later, and its vitality still depends on love of the book." Careful to place the master—Fredson Bowers—above reproach, Liebert reproves those of his disciples whose investigations relate solely to the physical aspects of the book without revealing anything substantive about either its contents or the author. "But the book is only a physical container," he chides, "and the recitation of the facts of its production, when they reveal nothing about its contents, belongs to the history of technology."

Technology is quite pronounced in a number of the essays in Jones' anthology. They total fourteen, and all have appeared before. The editor has brought them together to update and consolidate much of the work done in descriptive bibliography since the publication of Bowers' *Principles of Bibliographical Description* twenty-five years ago. Jones envisions the readers to consist of practicing bibliographers, graduate students in literature (he himself is on the English faculty at the University of Kansas), and a third category consisting of professional librarians, printing historians, collectors, and dealers.

The scope is broad, both in terms of content as well as objective. The essays are arranged in two groups—those of a general nature which touch on all periods of bibliographical study; those with a more specific orientation, ordered chronologically according to the modes of book production to which they apply.

It would serve no practical purpose to describe and analyze (no pun intended) critically the essays themselves. After all, half of them first appeared more than ten years ago. And as for Jones' selections—well, one man's meat is another man's poison. Surely, even Herman Liebert would find palatable Bowers' familiar arguments in the latter's "Purposes of Descriptive Bibliography, With Some Remarks on Method," as he would William Todd's piece showing how descriptive techniques, coupled with the study of book reviews, can aid in the discovery of hidden editions and impressions of eighteenth-century texts. And certainly one would have to be a clod, pure and simple, to quarrel with Allan Stevenson's brilliant detective story on the dating of books through the study of watermarks and their variant states.

Two of G. Thomas Tanselle's entries, however—one, a minutely detailed and highly technical proposal for a methodology for the description of paper, and the other a survey of techniques for recording press figures, including a comprehensive and systematic set of tables—assuredly would be more difficult to stomach. David Faxon's "On Printing 'At One Pull' and Distinguishing Impressions by Point Holes," too, would unquestionably cause some distress. Quite