ranging from Latin texts of the eighth century to vernacular texts of the seventeenth century, is not without its problems. In her introduction, she divides her notices into five parts: heading, content, physical description, provenance, and bibliography. In practice it is not always clear that the same kinds of details are pertinent to books confected under diverse circumstances. While it seems appropriate to give a complete collation for manuscripts of the eleventh or twelfth century, for the information such data may ultimately yield for identifying the output of a particular scriptorium, the potential use of such data taken from a Lutheran sacramentarium of the seventeenth century is far less clear. Similarly incipits are useful for confirming the identification of classical and medieval texts and Shailor usually has provided them, but incipits of documents and fragments really tell us very little. For example, to give the incipit of MS 193, a fragment of a Bible, said to be from Luxeuil, tells us information which is of no apparent use. On the question of secondfolios, Shailor herself seems to have silently adjusted her format to the different kinds of materials that she has treated, and they are not given for the postmedieval items. Presumably, the second folio incipits are useful for identifying entries in medieval library catalogs citing books now at Yale, but out of hundreds of second folio incipits, including those of defective codices, what percentage will be of use to subsequent scholars? Experience indicates that it will be very low. Indeed of four or five codices for which she has identified a specific medieval provenance, for none did a correspondence in the second folio play a role in confirming the identification. If there are other good reasons for providing second folios, Shailor has not provided them.

In examining the data provided by the Shailor catalog, we have not only the right to question the potential use of the data recorded, but we may also ask whether data of equal or greater import has been ignored or suppressed. Thus while recording capitalization, the u/v distinction and the long j form in the incipits may be of some value to students of philology or the history of reading (even where these distinctions reflect rigid conventions, imperfectly reflected in modern print) we may ponder the total absence of the cedilla for the ae and oe diphthongs, especially in humanistic texts, and the lack of consideration to accenting, essential for tracing the distinction between the accented i and the dotted i and the revival of tonic accents in the fifteenth century. These features are not recorded, and yet they, along with punctuation, may be of great significance. For the books of hours, the rubrics, which are an important source for the documentation of reading habits, are frequently not transcribed. In summation the Shailor catalog reflects the interests that are fashionable in the world of codicology, while relatively little attention is given to the evidence that medieval manuscripts contain for the study of philology and the manner in which medieval books were read.

A third level on which a catalog may be read is that of accuracy. Although this reader did not have the opportunity to read the catalog against the manuscripts, the author’s zeal is in itself an assurance that a very high degree of accuracy has been achieved. The catalog is enriched by very useful and economically prepared tables and plates.—Paul Saenger, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.


Stephen A. Roberts notes that the practice of costing library and information operations is a weak area in the repertoire of library management. Also lacking in many cases is economic management of libraries and information services based on the application of accepted accounting and costing techniques. Why do libraries differ from conventional business enterprises in these respects? The reasons given are familiar to most library managers: there is usually no requirement for public accountability; large portions of the actual accounting work are carried on outside the library; there is no need to justify specific programs to funding agencies;
and there is no easily definable product to measure in an objective fashion.

Although libraries are generally not required to provide cost accountability or to justify the costs and benefits of providing services and materials, Roberts proposes that libraries, as closed systems, should be treated as normal corporate enterprises with respect to financial management and accounting. He recognizes the difficulty in attempting to fit the essence of professionalism within constraints of cost accounting, but he does provide a framework within which to evaluate operations and conduct fiscal planning. The language of this book has a definite accounting flavor, with jargon unfamiliar to most librarians; reading through will require some investment of time and concentration. The glossary at the end is a needed and useful feature, as are the copious footnotes and references for further reading.

This volume naturally discusses library budgets, but it is not a book describing how libraries allocate funds. Neither is it a "cookbook," offering several budget models from which library managers or budgeters may select. Rather, Roberts discusses the factors upon which library cost management should be based. This logical and informed approach is not the method many libraries employ to make cost decisions. While detailed costs analysis would seem to be a profitable avenue to pursue, it requires an expertise that may not be resident in most library staffs. There is a chasm between what this work suggests (management decisions based on formal cost studies of tasks, activities, and service levels) and what actually happens in many libraries or other public service agencies. Since most libraries do not have readily available even the grossest cost information (What does it cost for an ILL transaction? What does it cost to catalog a volume?), the recommendations here for analyzing costs through rather sophisticated accounting techniques would be large steps indeed for a majority of libraries.

Moreover, if one considers that the essence of service to library clientele is not merely the hours of operation or the availability of a book on the shelf, but also the degree of professional service a user receives, then costing of library services becomes even more difficult to quantify. All of this does not suggest that libraries could not profit from the type of cost management analysis and decision making suggested in this work. What it may suggest is that an accountant's approach to providing library service may offer sound and pragmatic methods for decision making, even if that approach may not be used for all areas of library management and decision making.—John Vasi, Library, University of California, Santa Barbara.
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This report describes efforts by three academic libraries to develop a model instructional program for online catalog users that could be adopted in other academic libraries. A key component of the research included the exploration and development of a methodology for utilizing online transaction logs to evaluate user performance. The four project objectives were to develop a model for online catalog instruction based on a set of systematic and generalizable.