

retical and philosophical ones by Marlene Manoff and Edward Shreeves. Manoff writes about the need to reconceptualize not only collection development, but also bibliographic control. She discusses the confusion that exists over the nature of the electronic object itself and asks how one can provide control over something that can be manipulated by the user to create a new object or that exists remotely and may change or disappear at any time. Manoff's observations concerning eroding boundaries and hybrid functions lead her to suggest that the future of the selector may lie more in creating paths to resources elsewhere rather than in building their own collections. Shreeves addresses what he terms "the acquisitions culture wars" and relates the current turmoil about the role of print and digital resources to the larger question of technology and its effect on society. He urges collection development librarians to affirm their commitment to collections and the values that librarians have been associated with in the past even as they communicate the reality, necessity, and inevitability of a digital future.

Because the present is but a moment in time on a continuum between the past and an uncertain future, the two review essays by Ruth Miller and Ann Okerson provide the context for asking what led up to the present environment and what the future might hold. Okerson echoes the sentiments of many of the authors when she states that the challenge for all librarians will be to choose the way they will navigate the "muddle" of the future, rather than attempting to manage and control the turmoil itself.

Central to success in navigating the complexity and confusion of the future will be the next generation of library and information science professionals. Virgil Blake and Thomas Surprenant round out this collection of essays nicely by suggesting that collection development and management professionals will need specialized course work and training more than ever in order to have the skills to function effectively in an electronic environment.

The topics and issues presented in this volume are not new; we have heard them all before. But the individual approaches, ideas, and solutions are creative, bold, and optimistic. This is not a volume to be read from beginning to end; it will seem too much like force-feeding. But taken singly, these thoughtful essays present the reader with real opportunities for an examination of one's own attitudes toward collection development and management in a digital world.—*Maija M. Lutz, Harvard University.*

**Garber, Marjorie.** *Academic Instincts.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Pr., 2001. 187p. \$19.95 (ISBN 069104970X). LC 00-56510.

"Marjorie Garber delights in drawing our attention to the uncanny (one her favorite words) connections that weave us into the web of our culture. Her methods and means of scholarship—not always easy to distinguish from one another—likewise range from philology to Freud, from puns to pundits, from the inexplicable alogic of the dream to the clear-thinking, quick-witted deductive/detective work of the traditional literary scholar."  
—<http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/garber>

Marjorie Garber is that much-envied phenomenon in the publishing world, or at least that part of it which inhabits academia, where she has become adept in writing crossover books. Originally a specialist in the literature of Elizabethan England, she wrote a number of important works in that field before finding a wider audience for her 1992 meditation on cross-dressing, *Vested Interests* (Routledge). Since then, she has also produced books on subjects as diverse as bisexuality, dogs, and houses. Though rooted in literary and cultural studies, Garber is aiming at, and appears to be reaching, larger audiences. In enthusiastic testimonials to *Dog Love* (Simon & Schuster, 1996), for example, readers posting reviews

to Amazon's Web site have described that book as "extraordinary" and "unputdownable." Still others found some of what she had to say about dogs disturbing and shocking, but apparently it all was grist for the best-seller mill. Chalk it up, perhaps, to Garber's tendency to go for the offbeat and not-entirely-expected. In the diversity of her subjects, and in the many bases she touches, she has a consistent sense of the uncanny; perhaps her dilatory and unsystematic approach can best be characterized as a series of *unheimlich* maneuvers.

Ostensibly about the state of humanities scholarship today, *Academic Instincts* has the relaxed and anecdotal style of the don writing for fun and profit: It seems more designed for the beach, the deck chair, or the backpack than the seminar room. But even though highly accessible in style, the subject makes it of doubtful interest to very many readers outside academe. If, at times, it seems to sacrifice substance for style, and analysis for word play, it nevertheless explores a wide range of serious issues and sheds some interesting light on the workings of academic life.

The methods are playfully philological and interpretive; as might be expected, the results are at best unsystematic. She puns, perorates, and pontificates authoritatively, like a salon hostess, on a wide variety of cultural materials including popular song lyrics, old etiquette and behavior manuals, contemporary scholarly studies, dictionaries, general encyclopedias, and newspapers and popular magazines. The whimsical narrative of the text is complemented by a humorous dust jacket illustration, also reproduced as the frontispiece in black and white, in which the author and two amiable golden retrievers appear inserted into a digitally retouched version of Raphael's famous painting, *The School of Athens*. (Readers looking for what might best be called a "materialist" approach, which situates academic life in a wider socioeconomic context, or who look at academic disciplines as parts of the complex occupational structure of late industrial societies, will not find it here.)

The material is presented in three rather different, and at best loosely linked, sections. The first chapter, which focuses on the complex and elusive relations between amateurs and professionals, introduces a key theme: the difficulty, in highly professionalized and bureaucratized places such as modern universities, of preserving the amateur's love of the subject from the deforming tendencies of careerism, to say nothing of the stultifying cynicism endemic in large organizations. Inevitably, most of us begin our academic careers out of passionate devotion to some branch of learning, but as we make our way through the organizational labyrinth, and simultaneously climb the ladder of age, we often lose the very emotional energy that made our involvement and much of our progress possible in the first place. Professor Garber quite rightly points out that the love of the amateur must somehow be preserved if scholarship is to retain any fresh appeal for us or for anyone else. Perhaps this is why a significant number of professionals in academia, perfectly capable of working in that sober and serious medium, nonetheless revert to amateur innocence at some point in their careers. Think of it as faculty development.

The second chapter, "Discipline Envy," takes off from that well-worn Freudian allusion to female insufficiency. If women can feel this lack, she characteristically suggests rather than directly argues, this must be because, in some way or other, all of us are lacking much that we desire, and as creatures of need we constantly look elsewhere for models to imitate. Thus, just as we can covet our neighbor's popularity or income or publication record, we also may covet her discipline. Thus, many fields, particularly those trying to move up a few rungs on the academic status ladder, can be said to envy something about neighboring disciplines. Philosophers, for example, have long idealized mathematicians and physical scientists; literature scholars, to take a different example, have recently looked longingly over the blurred line separ-

ing them from neighbors in fields such as philosophy, law, and anthropology. Briefly touching on another Freudian insight having to do with what the master referred to as “the narcissism of small differences,” Garber shows how these often lead to unpleasant rivalries and bad feelings, just as they often do in family life or in intergroup or interethnic relations.

Here the word play takes off nicely, eventually suggesting a brand of academic Marxism having more in common with Groucho and his vaudevillian colleagues than with Karl and his philosophical friends. By the time the whirlwind tour of envy is over, our guide has spotted and identified a number of species belonging to the genus: vagina (rather tediously obvious, one wants to add) and breast envy (Bruno Bettelheim, and Melanie Klein, respectively); pulpit envy (Ann Douglas); the scarcely indelible pencil envy; Venus envy (one that several writers have found, perhaps understandably, irresistible); and pianist envy (one that all but the most hardened and incorrigible punsters would instinctively resist). Finally, Garber’s personal favorite in the *Neidkatalog*, a wine store promoting a shipment of burgundies by placing in its display window a large sign announcing Pinot Envy.

The final chapter, “Terms of Art,” is about jargon, “that most ridiculed of all academic habits.” And the tendency to pick on one’s opponent’s language, particularly where it tends toward the neologistic, has been with us at least since the time of John Locke, when he and other early modern writers wrote dismissively of the obscurantist language of scholasticism. Today, much the same critique is sometimes leveled against early twentieth-century philosophers such as Martin Heidegger and later postmodern philosophers such as Jean Baudrillard and Jacques Derrida, and perhaps in a different way is also aimed at Michel Foucault, whose key concepts are sometimes given labels that are vaguely familiar, yet disturbingly elusive.

The word itself has a rather interesting history, as the author points out in a

discussion of various meanings listed by the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Among the earlier meanings of the term in English are poetic passages in which Chaucer, Gower, and Coleridge refer to the twittering “jargon” of birds, a usage that in ordinary language became obsolete by the fifteenth century. It was also used to refer to the artificial cipher languages of spies. In German, the term *jargon* was used by Franz Kafka in reference to the Yiddish language and, by extension, to the Yiddish theater (*Jargontheater*). Of course, the *Oxford English Dictionary* also lists some of the more familiarly contemporary meanings of the term: unintelligibility, meaninglessness in speech and writing, nonsense, gibberish, and other verbal gestures of contempt, particularly where the language in question is characteristic of some identifiable set of practitioners, occupations and professions being among the more obvious examples of these. Thus, as Garber points out, “to resist jargon is to protest against professionalism, professionalization, professions—and, not incidentally, professors.”

Garber leaves us with three general types of distinctions, corresponding roughly to the material covered in each of the three chapters: the amateurs versus the professionals; the disciplines versus neighboring disciplines, or fields of study in relation to other fields; and finally the kind of inclusive versus exclusive uses of language that we most readily associate with occupational groups jealously guarding the territories they lay claim to, sometimes with legal support and sometimes with next to nothing to restrain the competitive edge. In this last category, Garber focuses on the example of the kinds of linguistic behavior most likely to draw lines, establish and maintain jurisdictions, define who is in and who is out. Thus, the focus in the third chapter on “jargon.”

When applied to academic life, Garber believes that appreciating the potential creative force inherent in these distinctions pushes us toward a dialectical view of inquiry. If the lines between amateur and professional, or between literature

and history, or between philosophy and physics are not entirely clear, this is because the fields distinguished can only be grasped in relation to each other and because understanding the one requires some understanding of the other. Each is, as it were, simultaneously the affirmation and denial of the other. Similarly, if the line between professional language, that which includes and that which excludes, is sometimes hard to find, this is largely because inclusion and exclusion can only be understood in relation to one another.

I think Garber is right about this, but there is something more. Today, academic work involves to an unprecedented extent a commitment to original research and simultaneously a focus on passing the new knowledge that research sometimes generates on to students. Pedagogy without inquiry easily falls into a settled routine undisturbed by the kind of boundary-crossing and discipline-raiding that occurs in pursuit of new ideas and approaches. Like consumers always on the lookout for a new gadget or a new service, academics pursue novelty out of a kind of necessity that flows from the highly complex disciplinary and interdisciplinary division of labor they inhabit.

Now, of course, innovation sometimes creates brand-new disciplines, but for obvious reasons this will not happen very often. Far more likely, because it is much more efficient in accumulating an impressive list of accomplishments (and successful scholars are ruthlessly efficient) is the kind of innovation that involves connecting a small part of a topic belonging to one discipline with a small piece of another topic lying in a different intellectual jurisdiction. Thus, bridges are built, boundaries are crossed, and controversy inevitably occurs. On the other hand, if one assumes that the main job of the university is to pass on a more or less settled body of fixed knowledge, the whole job is very different because, in that case, innovation is not much required. But today's academic bailiwicks are not isolated in this way; they are much more reminiscent of the stock market than of

the legendary quiet of the academic halls of yore.—*Michael F. Winter, University of California, Davis.*

**Gorman, Michael.** *Our Enduring Values: Librarianship in the 21st Century.* Chicago: ALA, 2000. 188p. \$28, alk. paper (ISBN 0838907857). LC 00-27127.

Michael Gorman's published contributions to librarianship must total several hundred by now. Nearly all are sprightly, thoughtful, provocative, and many downright argumentative. Already a prominent expert, Gorman first achieved status as a cataloging and technical services "guru" after serving as joint editor of the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (ALA, 1978). His administrative and/or cataloging colleagues labeled *AACR2* either as "genius" or as "a self-inflicted wound," to quote two of them.

Now dean of library services at the California State University, Fresno, Gorman is carving out guru status in what we've been calling the "core values" of librarianship. His forays into library values gained wide attention when the guru bravely promulgated "Five New Laws of Librarianship" in the September 1995 *American Libraries*. Publishing the laws in the "official organ" of the ALA gave them the protective cover and imprimatur of the world's largest library organization. He also has argued for and enumerated the profession's values in *Library Journal* ("Technostress and Library Values," April 15, 2001, 48–50).

Gorman served on an ALA task force that grappled its way to a draft "core values statement" that was, fortunately, scuttled by the ALA Council. No blame should accrue to Gorman for either the content of the draft statement or its fate. Suffering from committee compromise, it lacked the guru's fine turn of phrase and intelligent argument.

Synthesizing his own take on four of the profession's great thinkers (Ranganathan, Shera, Rothstein, and Finks), Gorman has again dared to enumerate, if not codify, our "enduring" core values. Again, the guru gets the ALA imprint, but this time he has