its predecessors. We learn about handset and machine-set types, how hot-metal printing differs from later developments, how typographers should be sensitive to the differences in these worlds with respect to choices in typeface, paper, and inks, and what we should know about modern technology that will make our printing elegant, unobtrusive, attractive, and legible.

The appendices are useful and fascinating. The selection of sorts and characters which the author discusses, sometimes not always satisfyingly, is nonetheless illuminating. The glossary of terms is also informative, though a couple of the definitions here are insufficient or misleading. For example, the definition of folio ('In bibliography, a page or leaf,' p. 233) is unsatisfying. And to say that 'Solid' means 'Set without additional lead, or with the leading equivalent to the type size' (p. 238) is equally misleading (no pun intended).

We understand from reading this sensitive and wide-ranging text why so many people throughout history have been enamored of the tactile and aesthetic aspects of printing in its myriad manifestations. Anyone interested in typography, printing, book design, typefaces, or book production should read this enjoyable text. Maybe the Gideons should start placing copies in hotel rooms.

SIDNEY E. BERGER
University of California, Riverside


In a contribution to the recently created E-mail conference BIBSOCAN, I came across the phrase 'Boring and Ghastly,' a humorous but disparaging reference to Fredson Bowers's Principles of Bibliographical Description (1949) and Philip Gaskell's A New Introduction to Bibliography (1972). On 11 April 1991, a day in which he was scheduled to deliver a paper at the Society for Textual Scholarship, Fredson Bowers died at the age of eighty-six. A giant in the fields of bibliography and textual criticism, he was a scholar of international renown. At times Bowers's writing may seem ponderous, unnecessarily complicated, overly authoritative, and even polemical. To those who knew him, however, he was a vibrant man of many dimensions. He was a powerful presence and far from dull. Except for the last few years of his life when he suffered from bouts of depression and declining health, age was no impediment to his thoroughness, energy, dominance, and prolific output. Moreover, he had style and varied interests — dogs, stamps, fox-hunting, expensive automobiles, food, wine, classical music, contract bridge, the stock market, and, of course, books.

In various instructions and wishes that accompanied his will, Bowers requested that after his death, a checklist of his publications together with a chronology of
his life should be issued as a pamphlet for distribution to his friends and select libraries. It is coincidental that on the day of Bowers's death, G. Thomas Tanselle was asked to read Bowers's conference paper. It is not coincidental, however, that Tanselle should be Bowers's biographer, for if anyone has inherited Bowers's scholarly mantle, that person, most assuredly, is Tanselle. In works such as *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), *Textual Criticism Since Greg: A Chronicle, 1950–1985* (1987), and *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing* (1990), Tanselle has addressed similar and related issues that preoccupied Bowers — bibliography and library cataloguing, the importance of copyright records, colour identification, patterns of bindings, paper, authorial intention, editorial apparatus, and so forth.

Bowers's initial publications were not entirely successful. W.W. Greg whom he regarded as his model was also his sternest critic. Bowers's first bibliographical article, which appeared in *The Library* in December 1936, concerned the two London editions of Thomas Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604). With respect to Bowers's arguments in favour of a transfer of type from the shop of one printer to another, Greg pronounced them 'wholly irrelevant' (quoted by Tanselle, p. 25). Two years later in the same journal, another critic, James G. McManaway of the Folger Library, was equally dismissive of Bowers’s discussion of Dekker's *The Roaring Girle* (1611). By the 1950s when Bowers had secured his reputation with the launching of *Studies in Bibliography*, he was still not immune from Greg's censure. Bowers's book, *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (1955), which generously acknowledges his debt to Greg, was criticized by Greg for its lack of clarity and abominable style.

When Greg died in 1959, Bowers’s obituary notice in *The Library* paid tribute to his prominence and inspiration. A lesser man might have been silent or marked the occasion of Greg's passing with faint praise of his achievement — not Bowers. Greg remained his champion.

*Principles of Bibliographical Description*, the book that greatly changed the practice of bibliography in this century, was dedicated to Greg. Greg had read Bowers's manuscript prior to publication, and he had pointed out errors and suggested improvements. Taking his lead from R.B. McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (1927) and Greg's article 'A Formulary of Collation' [published in *The Library* in March 1934], Bowers rigorously developed a system of description and identification that is now regarded as the standard. It is sometimes forgotten that descriptive bibliography, as we know it today, was not always on a sure footing when it was first delineated and defended by Bowers. Tanselle recounts how descriptive bibliography was taken seriously for the study of early printed books. However, for machine-printed books, especially with respect to the collecting and description of modern first editions, the sentiment was widely held that a more humanistic, genteel appreciation was required. The latter approach to bibliography found its expression in Geoffrey Keynes's Presidential Address (entitled 'Religio Bibliographici') to the Bibliographical Society in 1953. When a member of the audience, John Hayward, rebuffed Keynes's friendly attack on descriptive bibliography, Bowers was too gracious to join the fray and only remarked on the felicity of the title of Keynes's talk.
Tanselle's narrative is systematic and well researched. Notwithstanding his obvious admiration and fondness for Bowers, his tone is measured and sympathetic, never reverential. In the first four chapters, Tanselle's pattern of analysis is to provide context and biographical background prior to delving into a major aspect of Bowers's career and thought. The last chapter is a general assessment of Bowers's contribution, influence, and achievement in areas such as scholarly editing and analytical bibliography. Bowers's colleague at the University of Virginia, Martin C. Battestin, has appended a checklist of Bowers's publications and a useful chronology. Throughout his critical biography Tanselle continually inserts helpful references and allusions to enrich his account. Consider, for example, Edmund Wilson's angry characterization of Bowers as 'the great Demiurge,' (quoted by Tanselle, p. 102) and Roy Stokes's evocative phrase, the 'grey eminence in Charlottesville' (quoted at p. 144). These allusions, even though they betray evident hostility, are in themselves revealing of Bowers's commanding stature.

This review began with a reference to the two well-known books of Bowers and Gaskell. These classics are usually paired together as required reading for the novice bibliographer, in spite of the fact that newer books on the subject have subsequently appeared. In comparison to his customary penetrating commentary elsewhere, Tanselle gives short shrift to Bowers's long review article of Gaskell's book ('McKerrow Revisited,' *PSSA* 67 [1973]: 109–24). Gaskell had regarded his own work as a successor to McKerrow's. Bowers, however, was relentless in denying Gaskell's claim to succession. His review article praises Gaskell's discussion of the materials and implements of printing and their uses (the tables of paper and type sizes and the description of hand-printing presses). Otherwise, Bowers's review is scathing. Among other things, he laments the absence of any discussion of post-1950 methods of printing, Gaskell's apparent distrust of the procedures of analytical bibliography, the inaccurate account of printing during the Elizabethan period, and Gaskell's rejection of Greg's theory of copy-text. In one paragraph of Bowers's review devoted to Elizabethan printing, there are fifteen instances of sentences with the phrase 'it is not true.' Bowers was frequently generous to his opponents, and he even encouraged their work and published it. Sometimes, however, as in the case of Gaskell, he was uncharitable, and went overboard in his criticism.

The life and work of a scholar are difficult to portray in an interesting light. There is often the temptation to wander off into arcane alleys and to get bogged down in detail. The emphasis on work and scholarship, quite understandably, tends to overshadow the life, often to its detriment. Here, however, the account is nicely balanced and deftly handled. Tanselle's book is a testament to Bowers's enduring legacy. The bulk of Bowers's publications is extraordinary. According to Tanselle (p. 125), it comprises 172 volumes:

[his eight books and six pamphlets, sixty-eight volumes of scholarly editions, forty-five volumes of *SB* [Studies in Bibliography], and thirty-three anthologies and twelve editions to which he contributed], plus two hundred issues of periodicals containing pieces by him.
This does not include the million and a quarter words that Bowers wrote on music, dogs, and stamps. In a different way Bowers’s influence was even greater than his scholarly productivity. His students, for example, included Charles Hinman, Matthew J.Bruccoli, and David J. Nordloh. He was an inspiration to others. The torch has been passed to future generations of bibliographical scholars.

CARL SPADONI

McMaster University Library