

While most readers are likely to agree that *IEC*'s editors have made the right choices about its design, production, structure, and scope, any given reader will find disappointments in it, largely because that's the price one pays for being able to read in the first place. In this reader's case, and at the risk of quibbling in the face of a job so well done, I should note that, given the several audiences *IEC* addresses, I am uneasy about the variety of the contributors' approach and style. In addition to the inevitable stylistic differences among contributors, theoretical/thematic and chronological/factual treatments make for a vivid, unsettling contrast between "Museum," "Art," and "Avant-garde," say, and "Drama-History." "University" and "Culture" are lifeless, while "Margaret Mead," "Sigmund Freud," and "Ethnographic Film" do not mention recent controversy. Then, too, granting that the editors had to make difficult decisions about the list of entries and that the reader can create "missing" articles using the indexes, I wanted articles that weren't there, for example, thought, stereotype, theory, ethnicity, convention/meeting, prejudice, intellectuals, learned society, fan, and (academic) discipline.

It goes without saying that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. Indeed, the cynical might see *IEC* as simply another site where the lust for summary expertise conspires with the age of packaging. It successfully defends itself on these counts, however, with the novelty of the undertaking as package and the richly suggestive variety of its contents. Yes, it is a package, but then experience has to come in packages in order to be intelligible; the *IEC* summarizes, but then it also encourages the reader to read critically and to look beyond. As I see it, opening a package of encyclopedic brevity to find this kind of encouragement is something we librarians might reasonably cherish as knowledge tries to retabulate itself in the untabled litter of the information age.—*Robert Kieft, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania.*

*Integrating Library Use Skills into the General Education Curriculum.* Ed. by Maureen Pastine and Bill Katz. New York, London: The Haworth Press, 1989. 334p. \$44.95 (ISBN 0-86656-841-7). LC 89-31193.

A number of reports and books published during the 1980s severely criticized the American educational system because it did not prepare students for either active or lifelong learning. In their discussion of educational reform these critiques largely ignored the role of the library and of librarians. Maureen Pastine and Bill Katz have compiled twenty-four essays that attempt to explore the ways in which programs of library instruction can be integrated into the curriculum to promote active, critical, and lifelong learning.

Although the role of the librarian in the process of developing critical reasoning skills is the principal theme of this volume, only a few of the articles really focus on the kinds of research projects that would ideally replace the rote assignments typical of introductory classes that rely on textbook and reserve room readings. Among these are the articles by Patricia Senn Breivik, Paula Elliott, Alice Spitzer, and Susan Griswold Blandy. The last three describe librarians' involvement in the creation of general education core curriculum courses. Elliot and Spitzer at Washington State University and Blandy at the Hudson Valley Community College succeeded in integrating (one is tempted to write "infiltrating" in this context) what they considered to be more challenging library assignments into the core curriculum courses under development at their institutions. As they describe their experiences, the librarians express the view that instructors are generally ineffective and that librarians are better qualified to devise fruitful research assignments. Blandy writes: "Faculty may need advice on alternatives to research papers, and more important, they need advice on topics to assign and how to grade the results" and, further, "the librarian bears the responsibility for general education at the [community] college, having access to all

the information and resources necessary to enliven the class, extend horizons, and facilitate independent learning." Similarly, Spitzer and Elliot take credit for giving instructors "tips" on how to develop meaningful and open-ended assignments. These librarians may well have devised the kinds of assignments that bring the students into the library and engage their critical faculties, but their smug and self-aggrandizing tone does not serve them well.

The notion that the librarian should replace the instructor is unintentionally subverted in the very first essay by Patricia Senn Breivik. At the same time that she urges librarians to teach the research skills that will prepare students for "lifelong learning, active citizenship and risk-taking," she chides her colleagues, who presumably have these skills, for being passive, timid, and inward looking! Paula Elliot inadvertently emphasizes the price that some librarians pay for acceptance by the faculty. While serving on a curriculum committee, the two librarians, Spitzer and Elliot, "created a timetable, drew up a list of supplies and a checklist of preparations, arranged for refreshments, set up meeting rooms, reserved films, hung maps, posted posters of exotic places, provided the taping of lectures, and hosted a reception." Why would they not be invited to serve on every faculty committee in the world? The reality that bibliographic instruction librarians are often unwilling to face is underscored by Betsy Baker who notes that most library instruction in academic settings is confined to one-hour sessions, that students often have other, legitimate priorities than the submission of a well-researched paper, and that faculty often do research that bypasses the library. William Miller reminds us succinctly that librarians cannot be "the tail that wags the dog."

Many of the other topics in library instruction treated in this volume have already been discussed elsewhere: teaching methodology and the structure of class presentations; public relations, especially in connection with administrators; chang-

ing demographics with more foreign and older students, especially at the graduate level; the necessity to establish connections with various levels of education and various types of institutions; and new definitions of what constitutes the "campus" as classes are beamed to remote stations. Although often written in undigestible prose (on page 205 the following phrase appears: "the availability of available 'user-friendly' IR system"), these essays do provide a panorama of what is being done in library instruction (mainly in the mid- and northwest, since that is where most of the contributors work).

On the whole it seems that librarians are still employing the same variety of instructional methods to reach their constituencies: library tours, workbooks, audio tape tours, and course-integrated or stand-alone class presentations. But coexisting with these traditional methods are computers of various levels of sophistication. These computers are being programmed to take over the function of bibliographic instruction. Although still expensive and unwieldy, computer-assisted instruction is on the march and, while CAI may solve some problems (personnel, for instance), it will surely create new ones. Instruction at the reference desk will soon change as well. In their essay, Judith M. Pask and Dana E. Smith describe a Purdue-developed computer program that will answer most of the types of questions asked at the reference desk; according to the developers, these programs can be easily adapted to local needs. As reference tools also become digitized, librarians will have to decide whether these new tools will be housed in the computing centers or in the library, and determine who will be responsible for teaching patrons how to use them. Modes of access are also changing. Rao Aluri notes that indexes will disappear and students will be able to access documents (both books and journal articles) directly from citations in computerized catalogs. Bibliographic instruction methods will have to reflect these changes. To this reader at least, the essays in this volume reinforce the belief that we

can teach students about the library as it exists now, and we can communicate the notion that libraries are organized systematically and that these systems can be learned, but we cannot pretend that the skills we teach will be valid for life.—*Eva Sartori, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.*

**Bristol, Michael D.** *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare.* London, New York: Routledge, 1990. ix, 237p. \$40 (ISBN 0-415-01538-3). LC 89-6057.

**Gibson, James M.** *The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story: Horace Howard Furness and the Variorum Shakespeare.* New York: AMS Press, 1990. viii, 308p. alk. paper, \$42.50 (ISBN 0-404-62293-3) LC 87-45801 (AMS Studies in the Renaissance; 23)

Shakespeare is one of the most successful products ever imported into America; so successful, in fact, that the international Shakespeare industry (comprised of scholarship, production, and tourism) is now largely supported by Americans, with the Japanese beginning to run a strong second. The history of America's adoption of Shakespeare is examined in two new books that complement each other in their coverage and style. Michael Bristol's *Shakespeare's America* explores the philosophical and cultural background that gave rise to Shakespearemania in the nineteenth century and that has supported its various manifestations down to the present day. James Gibson's *The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story* focuses on the life and work of one man who almost single-handedly shifted the responsibility of Shakespeare scholarship from the Old World to the New.

A professor of English at McGill University, Bristol approaches his subject with a degree of critical jargon that some outside the academy may find offputting. It is worth bearing with him, however, because his Marxist slant gives rise to a healthy degree of scepticism. His probing questions about the reasons for America's bardolatry impinge on the current argument about the canon, which has recently made its way out of the ivory tower and onto the pages of the popular press. Bristol points out that the term "Shake-

speare" is used in at least three different ways: to refer to the historic person, to "the man and his works," and "to some kind of socio-cultural or spiritual origin, source, or presence." The last of these he links with the nostalgic bent of much scholarship in the humanities. America's adoption of Shakespeare in the nineteenth century provided "an otherwise lacking depth of cultural tradition" for the new nation, "in relation to the European *longue durée*."

It was Emerson who most clearly voiced the American attraction to Shakespeare's "originality," "expressive autonomy," and "moral sentiment, a natural impulse towards higher forms of emulation or of self-interest," which seemed to coincide with the promise offered by life in the New World. Bristol goes on to show how Emerson's ideas were adopted and adapted by prominent American Shakespearean scholars, including George Lyman Kittredge, Arthur Oncken Lovejoy, and Hardin Craig, down to the present.

Emerson also had a profound influence on both Horace Howard Furness and Henry Clay Folger, and it is Bristol's chapter on "The Function of the Archive" that will most interest librarians. He begins by discussing the paradox of libraries: the conservative principles of their construction "as the expression of large monopolistic accumulations of wealth and power," which contrarily make possible "the creation of radical, action-orienting research programs." He touches on the funding of public libraries by the Carnegie Foundation during the later nineteenth century and explores in more detail the concurrent development of great private libraries, such as those of Furness and Folger.

Bristol shows how Furness's library and editorial project were tied to the social relationships among American and British intelligentsia at the time, and to the founding of the English Department at the University of Pennsylvania. This institutionalizing of literary study would provide the death knell to the gentleman scholar. Bristol then explores the relationship between Folger's private collecting project and the public politics of his library's Washington