

tains few footnotes, no bibliographies, and no conference discussions.

This book is a useful contribution to international library science but has no pretention to being a comparative library science study. Hopefully, useful and scholarly Japan-U.S. university library research will be carried on in the future. The book can be recommended for libraries interested in international library science, particularly in Japanese libraries. It updates existing English literature on the subject and is attractively printed and durably bound.—*John F. Harvey, Dean of Library Services, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.*

Szigethy, Marion C. **Maurice Falcolm Tauber, A Biobibliography, 1934-1973.**

Foreword by Jack Dalton. (Beta Phi Mu, Nu Chapter, Columbia University School of Library Service Publications, no.1) Metuchen, N.J.: Published for Beta Phi Mu, Nu Chapter, Columbia University School of Library Service, by Scarecrow, 1974. 121p.

This small book is an alternative form of a *Festschrift*. To honor Professor Tauber's long service as a teacher, colleagues, students, and friends have put together an *opus* composed of five appreciations, a chapter by Tauber on his main claim to fame ("Survey Method Approach to Library Problems") and an extensive bibliography. The appreciations take up twenty pages and, of course, are appreciative. The twenty-three-page survey chapter by Tauber is an original contribution which sums up his philosophy and methodology. The bibliography of fifty-one pages is divided into nine parts: Papers; Monographs; Contributions to Other Works; Forewords and Introductions to Other Works; Library Surveys; Contributions to Conferences, Institutes, and Meetings; Course Outlines; Journal Contributions; and a section "About Maurice Falcolm Tauber." The remainder of the book comprises data about the contributors and an index which is interesting in itself. This review will be limited to the bibliography, since this is the main part of the book.

The term "biobibliography" describing

Tauber's output is used in an archival sense in that the material listed includes a number of items to show the fullness of activity undertaken by Tauber rather than being limited to that scholarly output which normally is found in a faculty member's bibliography. For example, the first section notes an archive of 30,000 papers (1939-1965) given to the Columbia University Library. The thoroughness of the bibliography offers a field day to anyone interested in bibliometrics.

The second section, "Monographs," for instance, consists of eight pamphlets, a dissertation, one long committee report, one circulated draft, twelve monographs in the standard definition of the term, and ninety-four reviews of these monographs. Of the twelve monographs proper, eight were written and four were edited collections of the works of others. Of the written works, two were done alone and six with a collaborator or, in one case, with several. One of the joint efforts (Wilson and Tauber) went into a second edition and was also translated into Spanish. Of the edited items, one was done alone and three with collaborators. One of the joint edited efforts (*Book Catalogs*) went into a second edition. Of the ninety-four reviews, forty-eight were of books by or about Louis Round Wilson.

The section, "Library Surveys," includes surveys of all kinds of libraries: Australian, five (twenty-five reviews or news items); university and college, forty-six (eleven reviews); public, five (three reviews); state, nine; and special, twelve. Of these, thirty-two surveys were made by Tauber alone and forty-five jointly or in a team (his preferred method). Also included are nine articles about making library surveys. Tauber's own chapter in the book, on the subject of survey-making, distills the experience of thirty years in evaluating libraries by this method.

More sophisticated techniques may be applied to such an extended corpus of data. Not only will the future biographer of Tauber be well served by this collection, but also the historian of the era covered by his work will find in it sources for a study of what was considered important and why it was thought to be so. Further studies by

unobtrusive measures, such as citation studies and more refined methods yet to be discovered, will indicate both the influence of Tauber upon his contemporaries and the status of library operations of various types in the period covered.

Finally, one trusts that his biobibliography will not mean that Tauber's work has come to an end. There is still much to be done, particularly in the improvement of survey methods towards more objectivity, better measurement activity, and less obtrusiveness in the surveyors. Tauber's unique experience makes him an extremely valuable asset in aiding such future development.—*Phyllis A. Richmond, School of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.*

Maxwell, Margaret. *Shaping a Library: William L. Clements as Collector*. Amsterdam: Nico Israel, 1973. 364p.

After reading *Shaping a Library: William L. Clements as Collector* by Margaret Maxwell, I decided to set it aside for a couple of weeks and see what came through after. I am afraid not a great deal, although I recall the physical format (and I am not looking at it here) as rather ugly: the first part of the title in white not very clear against a light-tan jacket, the covers in a nondescript dark green, and the stitching showing in the pages throughout. So much for aesthetics.

The book itself reads like a doctoral dissertation, which I believe it was—with the usual earnest stance, mishmash of purpose, etc. I think the problem here is a falling between several stools: biography, antiquarian book collecting, and room-at-the-top academic hanky-panky. I was interested to note that Clements was an all-American boy who sprouted via his father's firm and his own admitted industrial talent, into the manufacturing big-time of heavy machinery. At the beginning of the book, biography is heavy; thereafter it is spattered throughout, but with little relation to its subject as collector.

To me, the academic jockeying over the true research value of the library—the collector of Americana versus the “what-can-it-do-for-my-research?” boys in history and

the trustee versus the university librarian (a very unfair match indeed)—was of considerable interest. I am myself ambivalent in the matter of the obvious monetary and bibliographical value of rare books and manuscripts as contrasted to the evident research worth of aesthetically drab and relatively inexpensive photographic reproductions of such material. My own feeling is that any collector, and Clements was indisputably one of the greats, has the absolute right to spend his money as he pleases, just as he has a right to build what he fancies to house his collection. What the value of a collection of rare Americana as source material for research may be over the long haul is another matter. Maxwell speaks of rivers, I believe, of written research pouring forth from the Clements Library, and I would have liked to see some current use, research, and acquisitions figures. That the Clements Library structure provides shelter and its contents titillation for visiting luminaries and, I presume, eminent Michiganders seems largely unrelated to scholarly endeavor and perhaps a sign of the decay of the times.

I think Clements' insistence upon the proper use and treatment of his library is admirable, as is his creation of the kind of library housing that appears less and less frequently in this age of multimedia and hardware. But, then, I am not sure that the tone and ardor of his collecting really live in the book in hand. However, few great bookmen have been so fortunate in memory as Dr. Rosenbach, who buys, plots, and lives in every page of Wolf and Fleming's fine biography.

What do we have if we ask the following routine questions: (1) What is the author trying to do? (2) How well does she do it? (3) Is it worth doing? Certainly Clements as a collector and, really, librarian is worth study; and this is done passably. All in all, then, the book seems a not unworthwhile effort to treat a subject that commands some attention. Bibliographically, the presentation is not very sturdy; but the book itself is well researched. Biographically, the strokes at portrayal are determined but not particularly effective. However, the academic background which sets off collector