

Interestingly, the topic of money was introduced only in the discussions. The library administrators note that the identification of new roles for libraries and librarians begs the question of where increased resources to support innovation will be obtained. The only course of action recommended during the panel discussions was to gain the support of the CEO and the trustees of the institution, and thus more politics.

Sadly, the recommendations provide confirmation of the existence of University Standard Time. To make possible self-directed, independent learners, "information and evaluation skills need to be mastered at the undergraduate level, and learning opportunities should be integrated within the existing departments, analogous to 'writing across the curriculum,' rather than stand-alone bibliographic instruction programs." In 1960, Patricia Knapp's Monteith Library Program sought "to stimulate and guide students in developing sophisticated understanding of the library and increasing competence in its use. To achieve this end, [the project] proposes to provide students with experiences which are functionally related to their course work."

Obviously, our libraries and our campuses have made frustratingly little progress toward the objective identified thirty years ago. Even in University Standard Time, this is exceedingly slow.—Ellen Hoffmann, York University, Ontario, Canada.

**Lancaster, F. Wilfrid.** *If You Want to Evaluate Your Library . . .* Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1988. 193p. \$34.50 (ISBN 0-87845-078-5). LC 88-091-099.

Unrelenting pressure on library budgets is forcing administrators to look not only at those programs that can be reduced or eliminated, but also at the efficiency and effectiveness of mainline services. Toward this end, *If You Want to Evaluate Your Library . . .* arrives at a most opportune time.

Covering much of the same ground, albeit in a highly condensed manner as in his standard 1977 work *Measurement and*

*Evaluation of Library Services*, Lancaster begins with an excellent chapter that defines the evaluative process and then ties this definition to libraries via Ranganathan's Five Laws of Library Science. This is followed by chapters on the evaluation of document delivery and reference services.

Interestingly, the author prefaces this work by contending that the earlier *Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services* was "never . . . completely satisfactory for use as a text. . . . It is a review and synthesis of earlier literature rather than a practical guide to the conduct of evaluations within libraries." This clearly raises a classic "theory versus practice" issue, typically waged over the teaching of cataloging. Should courses stress the theory behind the process or practical technique? Ideally both. Evaluation without a theoretical base will leave the reviewer unable to utilize the results intelligently, while a theoretically sound review conducted inappropriately will render unreliable data from which to proceed. Fortunately, this volume exhibits a workable balance between theory and practice and should prove an excellent basic primer for students and practitioners alike.

Unfortunately, the mix of various types of libraries and areas within libraries is not so balanced. The overwhelming focus is on collection development and public services, to the virtual exclusion of technical services, and on issues that relate primarily to academic research libraries. If, for example, "your library" is a small public library interested in evaluating its technical services department, this volume will be of scant utility. In short, the title suggests a general guide to evaluation, while the content is much more narrowly focused.

Beyond the minor issue of the title, the volume should serve as a logical capstone to coursework in collection development and public services, and as a suitable guide for librarians contemplating their first evaluative process. The select bibliography will serve to guide those desiring more than an introduction, although identification of desired citations would have been facilitated by bibliographic listings at the end of each chapter, as was the case in the earlier *Measurement and Evaluation of Li-*

brary Services, instead of a consolidated list.

In summary, Lancaster's earlier work on this topic was considerably more thorough and comprehensive and one cannot help but wonder why an updated second edition of that work was not produced instead of this pared down version. Still, this is a solid treatment of a timely topic from one of the leading experts, if not the leading expert, in the field, making this a logical source for students and librarians alike who are interested in the evaluation process.—Clifford H. Haka, *Michigan State University, East Lansing.*

**Shailor, Barbara A.** *Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Beinecke Rare Book Room and Manuscript Library, Yale University.* Volume II: Mss. 251-500. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1987. 578p. \$36 (ISBN 0-86698-030-X (alk. paper v.2) ). LC 84-667.

Barbara Shailor's catalogue is the second of presumably three volumes to describe the holdings of the Beinecke Rare Book Room and Manuscript Library at Yale University (for a review of Vol. I in these pages, see *C&RL* 47:518-20 (1986)). It catalogues 250 manuscripts, a group of books that date from the ninth to the nineteenth century and were made in diverse centers ranging from Europe to Central America.

Because of their disparate nature, these manuscripts pose problems of presentation on both the levels of organization of the book as a whole and of individual entries. First, how does one structure such a varied group of entries in order to give them coherence? Shailor discusses the books in numerical order rather than selecting thematic divisions as organizing principles—divisions, such as country of origin (as is being done in the ongoing catalogue of manuscripts of the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, whose French volume has just appeared), or type of text (literary, historical, devotional, etc.). She offsets the random nature of the presentation by providing at the end of the volume a series of indices intended to aid the reader in

placing the manuscripts in appropriate geographical, chronological, artistic, and social contexts. These aids to the reader give some coherence and shape to the collection.

Following the indices, however, are a sequence of plates whose organizational structure is not immediately apparent. These illustrations are labeled with manuscript number, folio citation, and an indication of scale which notes whether the pictures are of natural size, enlarged, or reduced. Nothing in the list of plates or their captions makes clear that these images are arranged geographically and chronologically (showing in plates 3-23 German, French, and Netherlandish manuscripts, in plates 24-27 English manuscripts, in plates 28-41 Italian manuscripts, in plate 42 a later German example, in plate 43 a Central European manuscript, in plates 44-53 Byzantine manuscripts, and in plates 54-61 Greek texts written in Italy). Such clarification would enhance the utility of the illustrations. Indeed, the catalogue as a whole would benefit from the inclusion of an introduction to volume II which specifies how the book was structured; as it stands, the reader has to consult the introduction to the first volume for such information.

A second problem that a cataloger faces is how to discuss individual manuscripts. Shailor has opted for a traditional structure that she fleshes out with carefully observed detail that is particularly rich in the treatment of texts. Within each entry Shailor provides a description of the manuscript's contents, including incipits for unpublished texts and citations of critical editions for published ones. This is followed by a physical description (discussions of support, ruling, collation, script, artistic concerns, and binding), discussion of provenance, and bibliography. The length of her entries and their attention to details of concern to historians, literary scholars, art historians, and codicologists are impressive and will make the catalogue a very useful research tool. However, the resultant fragmented structure detracts from the reader's experience of the individual manuscripts themselves. In some ways this catalogue presents so