

with divergent alternatives in the use of catalog copy.

The book should be quite useful to library school students and new catalogers. For those catalogers with considerable experience, there is perhaps too much detail and tedious repetition, although many will welcome the handy reminder of the alternatives they face daily. Detailed discussion is provided regarding integrating the description, main entry, added entries, subject headings, and classification/call numbers into an existing system. The format consists of many questions, followed by alternative answers, each of which is accompanied by a list of the benefits and liabilities that will result from any decision made. A summary of the questions and alternative answers is provided at the end of each chapter, and then a comprehensive summary closes the entire work.

The author has provided a great deal of help to the novice in understanding the idiosyncrasies of Library of Congress practice. Several appendixes also provide useful information, such as a comparison of ISBD and pre-ISBD punctuation rules, a sample copy cataloging manual, and descriptions of commercial sources of equipment for photocopying entries from book catalogs, duplicating services, sources of catalog card sets, and processing sets.

The author effectively demonstrates that "it is possible to use outside copy exactly as it appears *only* if the library and its users are willing to accept the potential consequences: varying forms of entry; lack of some locally needed entry points; subject separation of editions and other related materials; errors or discrepancies that cause mis-filing or that convey misinformation; widely variant classification for the same subject, editions, or translations; and insufficiently complete call numbers" (p.231). A careful reading of *Cataloging with Copy* should provide any cataloger with a better understanding of the perplexities of copy cataloging.—*John L. Sayre, Director of University Libraries, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.*

Studies in Library Management. Volume Three. Edited by Gileon Holroyd. London: Clive Bingley; Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books, 1976. 192p. \$10.00.

ISBN 0-85157-213-8 Bingley; ISBN 0-208-01526-4 Linnet; ISSN 0307-0808.

The aim of this series of studies is to acquaint librarians and library students with the latest developments and trends in management theory and practice. This third volume in the series contains six studies drawn from both sides of the Atlantic and one from Australia.

The first study, by Ralph Blasingame and Mary Jo Lynch, looks at the work of the Public Library Association on defining new standards or guidelines for public library systems and is a rewrite of their contribution to the debate on this topic. For those, like the present writer, who are not fully conversant already with the debate this paper should be of considerable interest and value. The authors' analysis of the traditional public library and its setting is one which could be usefully applied to other libraries outside the public sector.

James A. Hennessy's study on urban information management requires very careful reading and a background knowledge of British local and national government to be fully understood, and this paper may be beyond the reach of many library students particularly in the U.S.A. Elizabeth Orna presents a clear and far-sighted view of the structure and inner workings of an industrial training board and the importance to the development of an effective service for an organization.

Patricia Layzell Ward's study of the career patterns of U.K. librarians is mainly of interest for its survey of trends over the past forty years. Gileon Holroyd's survey of the Maryland manpower studies, whilst making interesting reading, is also a valuable starting point for selecting parts of the Maryland project for reading in depth.

The study on finance and librarians deals with the financial background to British public libraries and universities. Whilst this background is only too familiar to practising British librarians in these sectors, the details are accurate and up to date and would make valuable reading for students specializing in these fields of librarianship. Colin F. Cayless' concluding paper on evaluating administrative effectiveness is as much a literature survey as an evaluation.

All the studies are very readable, and the majority contain a commendable lack

of jargon. Useful bibliographies appear at the end of each study. They should be of value to library students in both Britain and the U.S.A., not only for their insight into current problems in library management but also for the valuable background information they contain.

Practising librarians may well not wish to read every study in detail, but the majority should find something of relevance and value in this volume.—J. K. Roberts, *Librarian, University of Wales Institute of Science & Technology, Cardiff, Wales.*

Archive-Library Relations. Edited by Robert L. Clark, Jr. New York: Bowker, 1976. 218p. \$15.95. LC 76-18806. ISBN 0-8352-0770-6.

Expecting much from a book with such a title and from contributors of recognized stature, I was acutely disappointed. This volume, designed to explore the relationships that exist between the library and archival professions, is weak because it is devoid of analysis and without demonstrable historical perspective. The principal authors, Robert L. Clark, Jr., and Frank G. Burke, simply don't get to the heart of the matter.

For example, most major manuscript collections have developed within the context of libraries, more particularly within "special collections" units administered by those with a rare books orientation. In addition, early manuscript collecting was for reasons of institutional prestige, was inherently elitist, and did not attempt to be comprehensive in its documentary coverage of events and developments. Under these historical circumstances a rarities approach seemed to be suited. Not so for modern manuscript collections which seek comprehensiveness of documentation and which are becoming the repositories for corporate records and personal papers as quickly as they reach inactive status.

No heed is given to the fact that archives for public records are primarily extensions of administration and have only secondary value for research, thereby clearly differentiating them from manuscript collections which are assembled primarily for research. Historically, it was this same kind of confusion of purposes (and demonstrated here by Clark and Burke) which impeded the

development of archival theory and practice in the U.S. The writings of Margaret Cross Norton¹ and T. R. Schellenberg² point this out, but arguing cogently and convincingly against the appropriateness of applying library methodology to archives and manuscript collections. Neither Burke nor Clark shows evidence of any familiarity with the writings of Norton or Schellenberg, yet I'm confident they are.

If the above judgment seems unduly negative, it is, nevertheless, justified in light of the recent *Modern Manuscripts* by Kenneth Duckett.³ For all the good things about Duckett's book, it is absolutely archaic in its coverage of contemporary collection development and recommendations for "bibliographical control." Burke and Clark share his weakness, and all three look to technology to save us, Burke through Spindex and Clark through MARC.

Clark avoids the historical/institutional setting in dealing with the administrative placement of the management of archival and manuscript collections in libraries, believing the problem is a personality issue, not an institutional one (see especially p.157-60). As noted above, the placement of manuscript collections under special collections units has been damaging historically, impeding the development of an appropriate body of theory and practice to deal effectively with the management of manuscript collections. The placement of state archives under library administration as well confounds the primary function of a state archives which is an extension of state administration (see p.156-60).

If the above assessment of this book is harsh, it is intended to be just that. Both Burke and Clark act as though the differences of these disparate functions ought to be blurred if we are to nurture amiable relationships. But if that is their hope, we will continue in a miasma lacking the necessary historical perspective, and without that no analysis of these relationships will lead us out of the fog.

There are strengths in the book, however. Both Burke and Clark, despite their shortcomings, do describe (but do not "analyze") the archival and library "settings," methodology, education, collection, policies, and administrative relations. Miriam Crawford's sections on "legislation,