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This is the first issue of a new magazine called *Library Resources and Technical Services*. To many readers there will be something familiar about it—and with reason. For it is an old friend in new dress—or a new friend in old dress, depending on the viewpoint. As part of the new ALA organization (outlined elsewhere herein) *Serial Slants* and the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* were discontinued with their October issues, and their substance becomes the basis for the new publication. Things have happened so rapidly (with this issue being put together from materials caught in mid-air, so to speak) there has been no time for getting all interests of the new Resources and Technical Services Division represented. This should shortly be corrected, and, as articles or news relating to acquisitions, book selection, etc., become available, they will be included.

*Serial Slants* was born at a Midwinter meeting of the Serials Round Table in 1950 when John Moriarty, suggesting that there was need for closer exchange of information, offered the services of the Purdue University Library to help get started a serial for Serials. For two years it was prepared at Purdue and edited by Jane Ganfield of that institution; in 1952 the operation was moved to Chicago with the John Crerar Library supplying much of the cost as well as the editor, Elizabeth Kientzle. Since July, 1955, Stephen Ford has edited it from his base, the University of Michigan. The publication immediately proved itself both popular (the first issue had to be run a second time almost immediately) and useful. During its six years of life it has made many friends throughout the world and has been a close bond among the members of the Serials Round Table.

The *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*’s gestation period was more prolonged, its birth more painful, its history longer. In 1944 the Board of Directors of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, under Lucile Morsch’s presidency, began the publication of *News Notes*, a record of the activities of the officers, committees, regional groups and members. Two committees (one pre-War, one post-War) with Marie Louise Prevost as Chairman, had been working assiduously and arduously toward the inauguration of the quarterly magazine. In 1948, following a suggestion of Margaret Ayrault, the Division approved the idea of gradually enlarging the scope of *News Notes* under a new title. An imposing board of contributing editors was selected, Arthur B. Berthold was chosen Editor, Anita Welge Circulation Manager, and the first issue of the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* appeared in the fall of 1948—retaining the volume numbering of *News Notes*, this was v.5 no.1. At the
end of the first year it became obvious that the work was too heavy for one editor, so the position of Managing Editor was established with Winifred A. Johnson serving in that post. When Mr. Berthold resigned in the spring of 1950, Miss Johnson filled both positions until the fall when Esther Piercy became Editor and C. Dake Gull Managing Editor. In the spring of 1953 Carlyle J. Frarey took over the Managing Editorship from Mr. Gull. Mary Gartland served as Circulation Manager from 1951 until 1954 when these responsibilities were transferred to the office of the DCC Executive Secretary, Mrs. Mahoney. The Journal has never been offered on subscription, thus restricting its circulation to DCC members and its financing to that membership. Even so, expressions of interest in it and its subject have come from places far and wide.

Both magazines have enjoyed unbelievable warmth, cooperation, encouragement and support from the officers and members of their respective organizations and from the profession at large. It is hoped and expected by all concerned that this good will will continue (even multiply, if such a thing is possible) for the new one. It is hoped that the great loyalty of members of SRT and DCC will remain unabated and that members of the newer sections joining the Division (such as acquisitions) who have not previously had an organ of their own, will welcome the publication as cordially as it welcomes them.

As with its parent division, LRTS is presently in a state of reorganization; an editorial board must be appointed whose members will then establish publication policies. At this point no one is prepared to discuss specific plans; but, generally speaking, the pages will be open to papers and discussion of all topics pertinent to the interests of the Division and its sections, both those general and inclusive in scope and those of specific questions or considerations. The magazine is planned as a quarterly with publication (after the tardy start) to be Winter, Spring, Summer, and Fall.

Many things are anticipated for the Division: that serials people, catalogers, order librarians, book selectors, and the others will not only have a forum for exchange with those of like interests, but also an opportunity to work closely with those of related interests (serials people and catalogers working together on the cataloging of serials, for instance) and as an entity working in ALA and the profession as an important segment of library planning and professional achievement. Great days are ahead, and Library Resources and Technical Services anticipates being a part of them!

DEWEY DECIMAL MEETING

At the October 18 meeting of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee in Washington, Lucile M. Morsch (LC representative replacing Verner Clapp) was elected Chairman to serve until the regular election of officers in October, 1957.

• 4 •
The Resources and Technical Services Division

THE Management Survey of the American Library Association originally proposed the establishment of a new Division of Acquisitions and Resources and the retention of the Division of Cataloging and Classification. In its first report, the Steering Committee on Implementation of the Management Survey proposed a combination of these two groups into one Division. However, this plan met with some opposition, and the recommendation was changed again to provide for separate divisions. Since there was still some divergence of opinion concerning the best form of organization, it seemed wise to give the membership an opportunity to express its opinion on this matter. Accordingly, a questionnaire was mailed in the Summer of 1956 to all members of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, to all members of the Serials Round Table, and to all those members of ALA who had indicated an interest in joining either an Acquisitions and Resources Division or the Division of Cataloging and Classification. The returns from the questionnaire showed a majority in favor of a single division, indicated that nearly half of those concerned were interested in more than one field that would be included in such a division, and failed to show strong support for a separate acquisitions division. Accordingly, President Shaw of the American Library Association appointed a committee, with representatives from each of the three major groups, to organize the approved Division. The personnel of the Committee is Benjamin A. Custer, F. Bernice Field, Bella E. Shachtman, Edwin E. Williams, Mrs. Avis G. Zebker, and Edwin B. Colburn, Chairman.

This Committee has been active since late September and has made plans which will be presented for the approval of members of the Division at the Midwinter Conference. The name chosen for the organization, subject to membership approval, is Resources and Technical Services Division. The Division of Cataloging and Classification offered the JCC as the basis for a publication for the new Division, and the Organizing Committee decided to accept this offer, merging Serial Slants with the Journal and expanding it to include all interests in the new Division. A committee led by Benjamin A. Custer, chairman, is currently working on a constitution and bylaws which will be presented for acceptance or modification by the members at Midwinter and at the Kansas City Conference. A Nominating Committee with Charles Mixer as Chairman is securing candidates for Division office to be elected by the members during the
coming Spring. A Program Committee is being appointed to coordinate the Division's programs at the Kansas City Conference. A Committee on Committees under the chairmanship of John Dawson is engaged in a study of the current committee structure and will make recommendations for action at Midwinter, including suggestions as to which committees should be divisional and which should remain with the sections.

The Organizing Committee has provided for sections in the new Division for Acquisitions, for Cataloging and Classification, and for Serials in the new Division. Other groups with interests which fall within the scope of the Division are being invited to join, either as sections in order to provide membership participation, or as committees if they feel that their work can be better carried on by such a group.

There are obviously many areas of overlapping interests in this field. As an example we can take the case of acquisitions and serials in which there is a great community of interest. It is hoped that the new Division will increase the opportunities for cooperation in those areas where it is possible and desirable. It is also hoped that the formation of this Division with its larger membership will give greater strength to those areas which it includes. It is anticipated by the Organizing Committee that the sections will remain strong and will continue their autonomy in their individual fields. We sincerely believe that this Division can be a source of greater strength for all of its component parts, and we earnestly urge the active support of each member toward that end.—Edwin B. Colburn, Chairman, Organizing Committee, RTSD.

IN THE MAIL:

In the July, 1956, issue of the Journal of Cataloging and Classification there were several papers discussing “The Training of Catalogers”, as seen from the point of view of the cataloging instructor or the head of a catalog department. I should like to make a few comments on these papers from the point of view of the practicing cataloger.

The papers just mentioned present forcefully the need of teaching cataloging and classification on the basis of principles and theory rather than on the practice of technique and laboratory work. As a result of this theoretical foundation (according to the contributors) the library school student should be able to see the catalog in a unified, rather than a fragmentary, way; which means he should be able to recognize the proper relationship of the card catalog to other bibliographic devices. Courses in cataloging and classification should give the student an understanding of the over-all pattern of library activities which lie beyond the immediate matters of cataloging expediency.

However, according to Maurice F. Tauber, “there were some reservations to be made in terms of the reduced amount of drill and concern with the failure to fit persons for particular jobs.”

(Continued on page 62)
Susan Grey Akers

EMERSON GREENAWAY,
Director, The Free Library of Philadelphia

"The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1956 to Susan Grey Akers, distinguished author and teacher, leader of cataloging activities in the Southeast and throughout the United States, consultant for Library Service in Japan and Iran, for noteworthy contributions to library service. By precept and example she has shaped the cataloging practices of thousands of small libraries throughout the country. We honor her accomplishments and name her as one who has practiced notably the high ideals of cataloging service upheld by Margaret Mann."

THE world for Susan Grey Akers is at her doorstep. Few are so fortunate and so favored as to like to live in various places, to enjoy people, to work hard and constantly, and to tackle problems which would floor an ordinary mortal. Miss Akers could not only wish for these things, but has been able to visit the far parts of the world, to accomplish her objectives, and to earn the admiration and respect of many peoples.

A compelling reason for my going to Chapel Hill in 1934 was that the author of Simple Library Cataloging was on the faculty of a new school of library science. I felt that anyone who could simplify cataloging had a head start on most library problems, and that a library school, under the direction of such a person, should have a sensible program of instruction. Here was, I reasoned, a new library school with a fresh point of view, founded and staffed by librarians who, by their careers, had won the admiration and respect of their colleagues.

Some may find incredible that fact that Miss Akers retired after twenty-three years as a member of the faculty of the School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina. It just hasn't seemed that long! But the record shows that she was first, for three years as Associate Professor; then three years as its Acting Director and six years as the first Director; and then thirteen years as the first Dean of the School. The University, the State of North Carolina, and the Middle Atlantic Region, are more than indebted for the hard work, the judgment, the integrity and the loyalty and devotion that Miss Akers gave in the development of this library school. It was not an easy task to get a new unit of the University off to a start in the midst of a depression, dependent on state funds which were badly needed for other ventures. Carnegie Foundation funds
were twice available to the school and I dare say without them the school
would not have survived. But survive it did, and I believe it was because
of the careful planning, faith in the future, recognition and application
of common sense administration by Dr. Akers, that the school made the
progress it did under her direction.

Carefully recognizing the needs of the state and knowing the temper
of a political body, great care was taken to make sure that the school
would first be directed toward preparing librarians for the needs of the
state—namely, school and university librarians and, as the need grew,
for public and special librarians. Attention likewise was centered on a
good and a strong relationship with the leaders of the Citizen's Library
Movement of North Carolina. The naive were often surprised at the
progress of library services in the state, but Miss Akers would ask, "Well,
why shouldn't this have happened? It was all planned in advance." And
so it was, for whether it was writing a book or establishing a library
school, a logical plan was evolved for each project.

More than with many people, Miss Akers has had a philosophy of life
that has enabled her to recognize that some things could be accomplished,
but that there was no point in worrying or fretting over what was impos­
sible. She is a person who has been able to keep her objectives in sight
and not be discouraged when fate sometimes decreed that "the plan" be
altered or delayed in its completion. Always, she has been able to replot
her course—and that takes a person with courage, imagination and an
understanding of the area involved.

Although born in the South, the world has been the laboratory and a
source of experience for Dr. Akers. Public libraries, college libraries, li­
brary commissions, consultants in librarianship—all have benefited from
her experience and knowledge. Kentucky, New York, Massachusetts,
North Dakota, Wisconsin, Washington, Louisiana, North Carolina, Japan
and Iran have been her scenes of activity. Each experience has been a
meaningful one to her and a remunerative one to the people with whom
she was associated. Her ability to bring into perspective all kinds of prob­
lems presented by all kinds of people has made her contributions in­
valuable, be they to the Japanese, the Iranians or the Americans.

Lucile Kelling writes of her predecessor saying, "I do think her love
of living and her interest and pleasure in everything new are among her
most attractive and endearing qualities. It is so evident now in her re­
tirement. She is so thrilled with each new experience and throws herself
into it with all the enthusiasm and lively interest of a youngster. She is on
her fourth job since Teheran." And so it is the world—that of books and
people—that fascinates and interests her. To this she has added the very
significant contribution of bringing order out of the chaos that is to be
avoided even if it is simple cataloging that is involved.

By precept and example, Susan Grey Akers has not only shaped the
cataloging practices of thousands of small libraries throughout the country
and the world, but has brought to thousands of people—librarians and
others—the quiet but forceful impact of a very real personality.
THE large research library has an especially difficult binding job. Complicated publishers' series, non-Roman alphabets, and complex titles are frequent—even routine—problems for the day's work. Though there is no final solution to such problems, libraries have perhaps not done all they might to simplify their binding routines and thereby reduce binding costs. This statement will present what one library, binding some seventeen thousand volumes each year, has been able to accomplish towards a more efficient binding procedure. While the new practices have particular interest in the handling of serials, most of them apply to any binding which is done.

Binding routines at the Harvard College Library's Widener building, which houses over two of Harvard's six million volumes, were not reviewed thoroughly for many years, until, in December 1955, a special committee was appointed by the Librarian. The composition of this committee was itself an important consideration. Since binding affects all the major divisions of the Library, the committee was to give full attention to the interdepartmental aspect. Thus, the appointed group included the heads of the Binding Section and the Serial Cataloguing Section, senior representatives of the Catalogue and Acquisitions Department, and the Assistant to the Director, who was responsible for relating the work of the committee to the requirements of the University's Bindery and of those departments not represented. After several meetings, the final report of this Committee presented answers to the following questions:

1. Where should collation be performed? 2. Should serials be bound by bibliographical volume or by convenient bulk? 3. Can cloth color be standardized? 4. How may location and form of lettering be standardized? 5. What can be done to abbreviate lettering? 6. How should the call number be treated?

The question of collation is not as simple as it may seem. At first there was sentiment for moving this responsibility from the Binding Section to the Serial Cataloguing Section or the Serial Receipt Section; this would in turn permit the Binding Section to be headed by a clerical person, rather than by a sub-professional assistant as at present. Discussion led back to the existing procedure as being the most satisfactory, in fact as being the only arrangement which would assure the professional control and systematic policy which was needed for consistent binding methods, pro-

* I wish to acknowledge the considerable assistance very generously provided during the preparation of this article by Robin F. Blaser, Assistant to the Associate Librarian for Cataloguing of the Harvard College Library—D.C.W.
fessional supervision over the section's staff and materials, and economical operation. Responsibility for collating thus rests in the Binding Section of the Library. (No actual collation is done at the Bindery.) The Periodical Room and Serial Receipt Section may arrange material in a preliminary way but have no final responsibility. There is no page-by-page or signature-by-signature inspection by any person, for in consideration of simplification and economical operation, it has been felt better to catch the occasional mistake after the volume has gone into circulation rather than to check all volumes meticulously during processing.

The answer to the question of binding serials by bibliographical or publisher's volume was not an easy one. In the past Widener tended to bind whenever there was a convenient accumulation of material. This often meant two or more bibliographical volumes within one cover. One result had been the disappearance of issues before the volume was bound, and there were also maintenance problems in the book stack. Therefore, a decision was made in 1954, as a basic principle, to bind all material by bibliographical volume. It was not then anticipated that the people doing the binding preparation work would feel a greatly increased work load; however, this was the result, and the total amount spent for binding appeared to increase about ten per cent. This was a matter of serious concern; and, although the ad hoc Binding Committee understood the advantages of bibliographical binding from the public service point of view, it was not convinced that such a policy was the best for a large research library with so many thin publications and material of perhaps ephemeral nature. The policy might hold in a small library receiving the common periodicals, but it was illogical to force it upon one receiving all manner of serials. It was therefore recommended that the decision be revised and the policy of binding by bibliographical volumes be considerably curtailed. This is theoretically unfortunate, but practically it has proved to be a sound and economical practice. Although it imposes an extra burden on the stack force and on those handling the completion of serial files, it is precisely in these areas that the work load can be most satisfactorily adjusted.

The long-standing use of serial binding instruction records, on which were maintained the rub number, the color of binding, and the form of lettering—together with the special practices they imply—was an obvious nuisance and a major factor in keeping the cost of binding at a high level. Several forms of simplification and standardization had to be adopted in order to obviate all use of the binding instruction records for serials.

Discussion first centered around the standardization of cloth color as a means of eliminating the necessity for checking the shelves time and again to match the various volumes of a set. Schemes which would use one color for a particular subject, one color for a certain height of book, or one color for a given form of material were investigated. It was finally decided that a single color would serve the purpose, for objections to inconsistency of color within a set are easily met by looking at the shelves.
of a very old library where one sees that binding colors have changed every decade or so, whether from fading, soil, or changes in the manufacturer's color stock. Accordingly, all Widener books, when they are bound in full cloth covers, receive a standard, dark red binding. Since so many sets already have been bound in several colors or shades and since there will always be a certain percentage of our acquisitions received in publishers' bindings or bindings of previous owners, it was felt there need be no fear that the shelves would be a blaze of one color; and, in the event that a tendency toward monotony was found at some later date, the color could be changed or a different color scheme adopted. Discussion with faculty members quickly dispelled any lingering fears the librarians might have had.

Standardization of the location and form of lettering has been tried in many ways for many years; in California, a form of standardization was adopted by its Library Association in 1924. Perhaps the best known statement on this matter of lettering was published in the Library Journal of September 1, 1949. Harvard wished to carry standardization much further. Rather than space out the title, volume number, dates and other information in certain locations along the spine, the Harvard practice, adopted in 1950, was to group all of the lettering near the top of the spine. A major saving results here from the fact that the "finishers" at the University Bindery can set all of the lettering in one pallet and make one rub-off on the spine without moving the book in the vise and without changing the heated metal in the pallet. Now, moving toward further standardization, the lettering is placed two inches down from the top of the spine on all volumes. In the case of the few short volumes which require a large amount of lettering, the binder must be left to judge the best position of the lettering. In all instances, the size of type and the type face are left entirely to the discretion of the Bindery.

A standard order for lettering was also decided upon: call number, author (in an abbreviated form if approved for corporate authors), short title, (break line), series, volume and parts, (break line), year, month, and the Harvard University Library seal. Placement of the call number at the top of the spine has been a long-standing practice. The Library seal was discussed at some length, and, although some members of the Committee felt strongly that it could be eliminated, it was finally decided that this was one step which should not be taken at the present time. The seal is therefore retained at the bottom of the spine.

Abbreviation of lettering is still another way to reduce costs, not so much in library staff time as in the expense of the binding operation itself. Certain general principles were outlined by the Committee and adopted by the Library administration, so that new examples could be dealt with without lengthy discussion. Unnecessary information is eliminated from the spine, such as the issuing body or corporate name when the title is distinctive or self-explanatory. Initial articles are dropped from titles in all the well-known languages except those where omission of the article changes the inflection. Corporate names are being abbrevi-
ated whenever the initials would be clear to a person looking for material of a particular corporate body, e.g., UN, BM, BN, NYPL, LC, ALA, ACLS, AAUP, etc. The word "volume" is not ever included, and "parts" are indicated by superscript figures. Series are now abbreviated, "N.S." for new series, "R." for Reihe, "N.F." for neue Folge, and "SER 3" for third series. The Committee did not recommend but thought it probable that "Zeitschrift," "journal," "quarterly," and similar words, common in serial titles, could be abbreviated to the initial letters. And it was also noted that the word "bulletin" is so frequently used that it might well be abbreviated to "Bull." But, as the committee pointed out, discretion is needed in the use of these abbreviations; it is clear that "LCAR" is probably going too far if we intended by those letters to designate the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress. In the general direction of abbreviation, there are some helpful guides, such as the list of abbreviations printed in the Check List of Books and Pamphlets in the Social Sciences, published by the New York State Library last year, and, for library periodicals, the abbreviations given in Contents in Advance.

The principle here involved is that, since any abbreviation will be unintelligible to some people and since the binding cannot provide a full form of catalog entry for the user, a catchword or symbol will satisfy the user who knows what he is looking for. It is of small importance that "ALA" may mean Automobile Legal Association as well as American Library Association. How far this principle can be taken is not yet clear. For the moment, the Widener decision is limited to the most common names and titles, and the move towards the use of abbreviations will be made slowly and with consideration for the users of our collections. Abbreviation in the long run must be a compromise between full lettering and complete initialism.

The last problem to be discussed by the committee was the treatment of the call number. While most libraries use an electric stylus or stamped lettering, the Widener practice has always been to use white labels on which the numbers are lettered by hand in black India ink. After a thorough check of the costs involved, it was determined that labels of this kind are still more economical than the lettering done by the Bindery, and the black and white combination is far more legible to the eye of a person walking down a range of stacks. Another advantage is, of course, the ease of reclassification of materials—an important point in a collection completely filling the building and thus requiring continual transfer of books to other units of the University Library and to the Library's space in the New England Deposit Library.

These new procedures have been in effect since March 2, 1956. It can already be demonstrated that money is being saved and that no excessive simplifications have been adopted. Figures taken in January of last year, before the new practices went into effect, showed an average periodical binding cost of $3.95 per volume. Figures showing the effect of the new practices indicate that the same volume now costs $3.05. New books and rebinds have also shown a decrease of eight per cent and five per cent, re-
spectively, in the average cost per volume. Perhaps the most important saving—and one which cannot be accurately measured at this time—is apparent in the preparation performed by the Binding Section of the Library. The efficiency and speed of the preparations work, since the new practices went into effect, have been clearly demonstrated in that the number of volumes sent to the Bindery in years past will now, with the same staff, be accomplished in some nine months. Staff members doing this work have had the unprofessional part of their work reduced by a very considerable degree.

Standardization and other methods of simplification result in the same, or greater, amount of work for the Bindery, fewer library staff hours spent in binding preparation, and more material bound within the same budget. Methods of simplification have come gradually as binding techniques have developed and as economic pressures have increased. In 1910/11, the Widener Library changed its binding style for the typical volume from half-leather covers to all-buckram covers with leather overlays on which the lettering was placed. Twenty-five years later the leather bands were finally discontinued, but gold lines were used on the buckram as decoration and in imitation of the leather bands. In 1948 all decorative lines were omitted, and in 1950 all lettering was grouped near the top of the spine. The several 1956 simplifications in the Widener binding procedures have gone a number of steps further.

Keeping Serials Cataloging Costs In Check

C. SUMNER SPALDING, formerly Chief, Serial Record Division; now Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Library of Congress

THE intrinsic nature of serials makes their cataloging expensive enough without our compounding the cost by failing to treat them *sui generis*. Thinking about serials in the same terms as we are accustomed to thinking about monographs may be easier on the mind, but it is bound to be hard on the budget. Actually, serials are significantly unlike monographs. They are unlike, not only in their intrinsic characteristics, but also in the way in which they are used in libraries. Full appreciation of these two facts will lead us to see that what works well for monographs may sometimes be quite unsuited and unreasonably expensive for serials.

Whereas monographs are normally received in their fully-developed form, physically static, ossified, and dead, so to speak, serials are generally received alive, growing, and subject to various unpredictable meta-
morphoses. The problem of describing something which is alive and which may at any time in the future assume relationships with others of its kind that will closely resemble the relationships shown by a family tree is of a different order from that of describing something which can be counted on to lie still and not move while we take its measure and describe it characteristics once and for all.

Less immediately obvious, but no less important for the purposes of our consideration, is the different way in which serials are used. When a reader seeks a monograph, his focus of interest is ordinarily the monograph itself; but when he seeks a bound volume of a serial, it is rare that his focus of interest is the serial itself. Ordinarily he is looking for a particular article or section of the publication to which he has been referred by a citation in a book, journal, or index. The cataloging significance of this fact is that most uses of serials entries require only the elements of findability, adequacy of identification, and shelf location indicia. Since detailed description of the serial itself is required relatively infrequently, its provisions on any or all catalog entries ought to be conditioned by the factors of the cost involved and the availability and adequacy of alternative sources of information.

In most large libraries there is another source of information in the form of a serial record. This record will vary from library to library in the way in which it is organized, the kind of information it contains, and its accessibility. Nevertheless, the existence of this record is a significant fact to be taken into account in all considerations concerning serials cataloging. In fact, it would be just as well to think of the serial record as a special kind of serials catalog. Its role and that of the card catalog should be planned together so that duplication of effort may be avoided and so that maximum usefulness may be obtained from any given amount of cataloging effort.

Perhaps the first problem to be faced in serials cataloging is when to catalog. Serial record people say, "As soon as the first piece is identified as an issue of a new title." They need a record entry right away so that the next issue can be handled in a routine manner. Reference people will give the same answer. They want the reader to be able to learn that the library has the title and to find his way to it with a minimum of staff attention. Catalogers feel it is better to wait until the first volume is bound. The bound volume will provide a better basis for sound classification, and the title may cease publication after the first issue or perhaps it will have changed title by the time the first volume is completed. In the former case, cataloging could be eliminated entirely; in the latter, recataloging could be avoided.

What to do? Compromise? One library kept everybody happy by having a person in the serial record prepare an entry for that record immediately, a cataloger prepare a temporary entry for the catalog immediately, and another cataloger prepare a full entry after the first volume was bound. This way lies bankruptcy! My suggestion is radical—don't compromise. Catalog immediately from the first issue and let the entry
serve both the serial record and the catalog, unbound as well as bound volumes. Immediacy of cataloging is essential to this plan because accumulation of backlogs will raise hob with recording operations. However, if the present serials cataloging arrangements are not well coordinated, the chances are that enough manpower can be saved by cutting out duplication of cataloging effort to assure currency of original cataloging of serials.

What about classification from the first issue? Assuming one must classify (we will take up this question later), classification from the first issue will probably present problems in only a very limited number of cases and these will probably be confined to the category of collected sets of monographic series. Serial publications generally cover broader subject fields than monographs, and classifying them is less exacting and less susceptible to error. In the category of collected sets of monographic series, however, the problem can be more acute since it is the set that is to be classified and all that is available for this purpose is a single monograph. Even in these cases, a list of the other monographs may be available to indicate the subject of the series, or perhaps it will be clearly defined in the series title. But in case the series title is of no help and there is no list of other monographs, or in any case where there is insufficient basis for adequate classification, a temporary entry, without class number, can be made to serve until classification is possible and a more permanent entry can be made. Some libraries which catalog from the first issue automatically review the classification when the first volume is bound. Assuming that most of the problem cases can be spotted in the first instance and that classification is postponed in such cases, automatic review of all classification at a later date should not be necessary.

But what about putting cards with call numbers in the catalog when there is nothing yet on the shelf under the number? Assuming that a record of bound holdings is not maintained on the catalog cards for current serials, is it not true that at any given moment you have a large number of volumes of serials (and many times that number of issues) which are not on the shelf under the call numbers appearing on the catalog cards? Actually, this is the situation: only the non-current volumes are on the shelf, the current ones are still unbound in a service reading room or else are being bound. The newly-cataloged serials fits right into this standard pattern. The reader is no more likely to go to the shelf for its current issues than he is for those of the Saturday Review. If the first issue received is old, cataloging should be postponed until the fill-in back numbers are received and volumes can be prepared for binding. If the first issues received constitute an unbound volume or run, the situation is no different from that of an unbound monograph when it is cataloged.

To the plea that if cataloging is delayed, the publication may cease or oblige by getting in a change of title before the time of cataloging, it may be answered that in cataloging from the first issue received we are taking a reasonable business risk. After all, can we wait until each serial ceases before cataloging it simply because this would be the most efficient way to
catalog? We have a much greater obligation to display our wares to our customers.

Now, what about classification? Is it really necessary? It seems to me that the cost of classifying and shelving serials together with monographs (and reclassifying and reshelving them, if necessary) is hard to justify unless there is a consequential amount of serious research on relatively precise topics specifically covered by the classification scheme by persons who have and use direct access to the material in the stacks. In such cases it is distinctly advantageous to have monographs and frequently-referred-to serials in close conjunction. Even with close contiguity of serials and monographs on particular topics, however, it is to be pointed out that research needs will also generally require access to other serials located under different classification numbers—some perhaps far distant. Classification is a tool which, by the very nature of things, can only approximate in practice that aura of lovely perfection which seems to surround its theory.

If, on the other hand, such intensive use of serials and monographs at the same time by the same person is not frequent, the advantages of alphabetical arrangement (convenient for readers in open stack set-ups) or of size arrangement (economical of space) together with the saving from not having to classify would seem to outweigh any benefits to be had from classification.

It is possible to decide not to classify certain types of serials but to continue classification of other types. For example, a stronger case can be made for classifying annual reports than for classifying periodicals. A different type of instance occurs when only official serials are not classified, because they have special indexes and are given special handling and servicing.

In considering cataloging policy for serials it is useful to distinguish the essential cataloging requirements from the non-essential. The former include (1) the necessary entry approaches to lead readers to the material, (2) sufficient information for positive identification, and (3) a statement of the location of the bound and unbound holdings. Beyond these essentials are items of secondary importance—secondary in the sense that they will be of use in only a minority of cases. These fall into two categories: first, items of description that will help the reader who is using a subject approach to make a useful selection from among the serials entered under the same heading, principally information bearing on the scope and authority of the serial's contents; and second, items of description of major importance to the reader who is interested in the serial per se—principally its bibliographical history and a statement of the library's holdings.

Since it is perfectly possible to make a "once and for all" description of a serial which has ceased (just as for a monograph), it would seem reasonable to include in the entry the items of secondary importance to a degree consistent with the established policy for cataloging monographs. For live serials, however, the data of secondary importance can, in some instances, be more costly to include than is warranted by their expected
use. For example, the statement of holdings: can we afford to record on
the catalog entries every issue that is received? If not every issue, then
every volume that is bound? even if this information can be obtained
from the serial record when needed?

It would be better if we would regard our open entry for a live serial
as essentially a finding entry, providing the necessary approaches to the
serial but supplying additional information only to the extent that it can
be conveniently obtained at the time of cataloging. Since the entries will
be used primarily for the purpose of locating the files, we should indicate
the location of the bound volumes (call number) and the location of the
unbound issues (custodial reading room). If we do not attempt to keep up
a full record of holdings on any catalog card, we should refer to the serial
record for the complete record of holdings.

The worst feature of serials from the cataloging point of view is their
pervasive tendency to belie what we have said about them on our catalog
cards. If we said the serial is issued quarterly, it will change frequency to
three times a year; if we entered it under title A, it will change title to Z;
if we said agency X is the author, the administration will change and
agency Y will become the author; what are now separate will unite; and
what is now one will split in two. At least, that is the way it seems when
one in confronted with the volume of changes that occur in serial publica-
tions. Actually, the statistical likelihood that changes of this sort will
happen to any particular serial is not very great; but when this likelihood
is multiplied by the total number of serials currently being received, it
results in a work problem of serious proportions for any library with a
sizeable collection.

The cost of keeping the catalog abreast with changes that affect entry
is a function of the method used. The method that results from the strict
application of the ALA rules of entry is probably one of the most ex-
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method. It involves a new entry, new reference(s), multiple card extraction and card filing operations, and, perhaps, remarking all the volumes on the shelf. If this method must be followed, there are two respects in which the expense may be reduced. In one of these the method itself will be made more effective.

To take the latter first, references from earlier forms of the title may be abandoned in favor of added entries under these forms. Added entries are much more satisfactory since they will have the call number, and anyone looking under an earlier title need go no further in his search. If unit cards are reproduced, these unit cards will then supply all card requirements, and the cost of making and reproducing references will be obviated. Finally, making an added entry instead of a reference is only being consistent with what is done for variant forms of title appearing on a monograph. In short, added entries should be used because they are more useful, may be less expensive, and are more consistent with other cataloging practice—an almost insurmountable combination of virtues!

Consideration should also be given to retaining the original call number permanently unless the class number must be changed. Changing call numbers of multiple-volume sets is a fairly expensive business, and the question should be asked, “Is it worth it?” To change the call number so the set will shelve in the alphabetical position of Air Power will at the same time put it in the wrong position for Royal Air Force Quarterly, yet readers will continue to follow up index references and other citations to Royal Air Force Quarterly and, to the extent that they look for the volumes directly on the shelves, they will probably be unsuccessful in finding them. Obviously, unless the set is split, every direct user of the shelves can’t be satisfied. Would it not be better, therefore, to make the choice that will save some processing time which, in turn, could be devoted to some purpose of more obvious value?

Before considering the earliest entry and the multiple entry methods, it should be pointed out that, whatever the method used, achievement of economical handling of changes in entry is dependent upon the following general approach to the cataloging of live serials: (1) that holdings and bibliographical history will be recorded in the serial record; (2) that the catalog need contain only: (a) necessary author, title, and subject approaches, (b) necessary identification information, (c) location information for bound and unbound holdings, (d) reference to the serial record for bibliographical history and holdings. In short, the serial record and the catalog should be used as complementary tools rather than as tools which are largely mutually duplicative. The urge to change the information already in the catalog should be repressed in favor of simply providing necessary additional information. It should be recognized that when a serial changes its title, for instance, the cards in the catalog do not thereby become erroneous. They are still correct as far as they go—they only become incomplete (just as they are probably already incomplete in respect to holdings). If economy is a prime consideration, this general approach can be effectively applied even after the cessation of serials.
the other hand, once a serial has ceased, it is in as good a position to receive permanent cataloging as is any monograph. Should one do less for a serial than for a monograph? There are good arguments for each side of this question: the need for economy versus the need for full description in the catalog.

Turning to a consideration of the earliest entry and the multiple entry methods, it will be seen that the former is more or less a reverse image of the latest entry method. It utilizes the entry originally made as the base entry for the serial. If the serial changes its title, an added entry is made for the new heading. The main entry need not be changed except to add a tracing for the new added entry. It will be useful, however, to show the relationship of the new heading to the old by adding at the end of the added entry heading either "originally:" or "formerly:". The beginning year of publication under the changed name may also be included in the heading. Thus, when the Country Gentlemen changes to Better Farming a card such as this would be added to the catalog:

Better farming, 1955—formerly:
Country gentleman . . .

Should Lubetzky's proposal to treat corporate bodies with newly-changed names as new bodies be accepted, the same method would provide a simple and effective way of taking care of those serials which persist through various administrative reorganizations of their corporate authors. For example:

U. S. Foreign Operations Administration.
Mutual defense assistance control act of 1951; report to Congress. 1953—originally:
U. S. Mutual Security Agency.
Mutual defense assistance control act of 1951; report to Congress. 1st- . . .

and again:

U. S. International Cooperation Administration. Mutual defense assistance control act of 1951; report to Congress. 1955—originally:
U. S. Mutual Security Agency.
Mutual defense assistance control act of 1951; report to Congress. 1st- . . .

Whether all information on the main entry card should be included on the added entry card is open to question. The minimum requirements, however, are that the entry must adequately identify the serial, show the location of the bound and unbound holdings, and refer to the serial record for bibliographical history and holdings.

A drawback of this method is that there will be no entries for the new heading under the subjects or the other added entries. This drawback can be eliminated only by the device of superimposing the desired subject or added entries on additional copies of the added entry for the serial in
its latest form. If several cards must be made for the serial in its new guise, then the multiple entry method of handling the change may be the preferable one. If, however, a supply of unit cards is available (hardly ever the case), this device of superimposed subject or added entries can be used quite simply by preparing the requisite number of cards with the new heading as added entry and drawing a line (preferably in red) from the beginning of the new heading to the underlined subject or added-entry tracing under which each card is to be filed.

The multiple-entry method involves a new and additional set of cards for each new title or author-title under which the serial appears. To realize economies from this method the original set of cards should be left unchanged. The new set should be kept reasonably brief but should bear a note relating the new form of entry to the old. This method will provide full display under subjects and added entries.

The multiple-entry method provides an opportunity to put each phase of a serial in an alphabetical shelf position corresponding to each form of the entry. If this is done, however, the serial is definitely being treated as several separate publications. The catalog entries for each form logically should be recataloged definitively with the appearance of the next one. This will result, finally, in one original cataloging and one recataloging or closing operation for every form in which the serial appears. This will amount to more work than the latest entry method which requires a single original cataloging operation plus a recataloging or closing operation for each form.

When a serial that has undergone changes affecting entry finally ceases and definitive cataloging is to take place, it should be catalogued under its best title or author-title with added entries under the other titles or author-titles. The best title or author-title is determined by the duration and relative significance of the serial in its various manifestations. Only now, after its death, can the job of describing the serial be done thoroughly, efficiently, and permanently.

Regardless of the acceptability of any specific suggestions I have made, there is surely agreement that serials present very special problems that monograph cataloging techniques are ill-fitted to solve. These problems challenge one's ingenuity and invite an intrepid exploration of the new and untried. Better solutions than we now have may be just around the corner awaiting discovery.

**LOST ALUMNI**

The New York State Library School (Albany) alumni association is revising its biographical Register: 1887-1926 and is most anxious to secure information of the graduates, particularly present whereabouts. Any information helpful in locating them will be appreciated and may be sent to: Karl Brown, Box 44, Butler Library, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
The Divided Catalog, A Reappraisal

Edited by Kay Harris,
Cataloger, Sullivan Memorial Library, Temple University,
and Audrey Smith, Cataloger, Free Library of Philadelphia

DURING the winter of 1955-56 a series of three meetings were held by
the Philadelphia Regional Catalogers Group to discuss various aspects of the divided catalog. There had been an indication of continuing interest in this method of making the catalog more usable, and several libraries in the area were contemplating or had recently made a change. It was decided that if this ancient topic was to be discussed at all, it should be done in such breadth and depth as to bring as much as possible of the thinking and experience on the subject to light so as to refract new rays.

Since we knew of no public libraries that had divided catalogs, we were unable to have them represented in the second program devoted to practical experience.

A few points that emerged from the discussions were: (1) The catalog is no longer an obvious tool, and it is indicated that that arrangement which makes teachable its use may be of most importance to catalogers and librarians. (2) Division of the dictionary catalog is not a difficult procedure physically. Prethinking in cooperation with the public departments is the most important prerequisite. Upkeep need not be more expensive and may even result in lowering of some costs, such as filing. (3) Division may allow for better study of the use of the catalog, for revision of catalogs, and for easier approach to the catalog.

The participants in the three meetings were Rudolf Hirsch, Assistant Librarian, Preparations Division, University of Pennsylvania; Margaret C. Brown, Chief, Processing Services, Free Library of Philadelphia; Anne Flannery, Assistant Librarian, Technical Processes, Lehigh University; Brother Edmund Joseph, Librarian, La Salle College Library; Gilmore Warner, Librarian, Lock Haven State Teachers College; and Robert E. Kingery, Chief, Preparations Division, New York Public Library. Their remarks are given here in abridged form.

Historical Resume and Implications of the Literature

Rudolph Hirsch

The purpose of a catalog is to exhibit the resources of a library to users. Since the approach of readers is by names or entries (i.e. authors, co-authors, editors, compilers, translators, series, or any other person or body) and by subjects, both these approaches have to be satisfied by some means. The usefulness and aim of a catalog must be judged in terms of a library's particular resources and groups of readers: in that perspective even the medieval library was quite acceptable. Resources were small, and
most of the users of libraries were literate in the advanced sense (i.e. more than just able to read); catalogs were essentially shelf lists and presumably served the character of these libraries rather well.

The most important contribution of the Renaissance was the development of the author approach. The increase in the number of available texts and copies and in the number of libraries and readers resulted in a large number of bibliographies. The first universal bibliography, Conrad Gesner’s Bibliotheca Universalis (1545), with its subject supplement Pandectarum Libri XXI (1548) could be used in lieu of a library catalog by the addition of shelf marks.

In the following centuries the printing of library catalogs became a common procedure. By the 1870’s we have the author catalog, sometimes with inclusion of titles; the alphabetically arranged catch-word catalog; the classified catalog in a number of variant forms: fully classified, alphabetico-classed or some hybrid form; the alphabetically arranged subject catalog; the name catalog; and the dictionary catalog (the earliest of which was 1815).

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the somewhat haphazard, limited or divided catalog in book form was adequate. Resources were brought together on a most selective basis, usually for a clearly defined group of readers. The public library of today was in its infancy, and higher education was open only to the socially or intellectually limited elite. The divided catalog, most frequently an entry and a classified catalog with an alphabetical index, lost out to the dictionary catalog during the latter part of the nineteenth century, at least in the U. S. The size of American libraries increased very rapidly and correspondingly also their dictionary catalogs; these catalogs now begin to worry librarians because of their size and cost. One major remedy proposed was the abandonment of all subject entries and the use, instead, of existing and prospected bibliographies. The battle is still on but is inconclusive. The divided catalog is no way out of the dilemma; it will save no space and little, if any, money; it may simplify filing and solve some of the readers’ troubles.

The history of catalogs teaches us that some form of the divided catalog worked well and still works satisfactorily in many European libraries and in some U. S. libraries. The dictionary catalog arose from, and flourished with, freer access to ever growing collections. The alphabetical rigidity of the dictionary catalog satisfied, and still placates those groups of readers most diversified in attitude and aptitude. Its most severe critics here and abroad are the advanced readers who have little use and need for the detailed but perhaps unscientific subject analysis provided in library catalogs.

Margaret C. Brown

In examining the literature we find two categories of relevant material: (1) comments on the possible forms a divided catalog can take and
reports of current developments in our field that affect the type of divided catalog, if any, a given situation might require.

Usually by divided catalog we mean one which has author-title entries in one alphabet and subject entries in another, but there are many other ways of dividing a catalog. Andrew D. Osborn has pointed out that the portions of the Widener catalog which give the greatest concern are those representing the so-called voluminous authors. These entries constitute one-quarter of the public catalog at Harvard and are responsible for most of the problems related to filing and maintenance. His recommendation that these headings be made available through printed bibliographies would certainly result in a kind of divided catalog. The Duke University catalog is divided into three parts: author-title, subject, and serial. Duke also has a separate author-title catalog for Federal and State documents, a separate catalog for manuscripts, and a catalog in the Newspaper Department for newspaper entries. The classified catalog is still another kind of divided catalog. Separate catalogs for adult and children’s material are frequently found in public libraries.

While we have not discovered just what the best arrangement is, there are developments in at least three areas that carry implications related to this subject: (1) a tremendous increase in the variety and amount of material available for the storing and distributing of information; (2) the growing interest in recent years in studying the use made of our catalogs; and (3) the increased cost of catalog maintenance.

Technological changes have resulted in many new forms of material: phonograph records, microprints, tape recordings, all pose problems of organization. At one time it was suggested that microcards be filed directly into our card catalogs, but I doubt if anyone would seriously make such a proposal today. Many of those who have expressed themselves in print concerning phonograph records advocate a separate catalog for this material. Certainly, form as well as content will influence the decision to divide or not to divide. An increase in serial publications has caused some librarians to recommend removal to separate catalogs of all author cards for serials. Increasingly larger amounts of material in non-Roman alphabets and the accompanying problems in transliterations have led occasionally to separate foreign language catalogs.

Another major development which is related to the question of catalog arrangement is the growing interest, as evidenced by completed studies and studies in progress, in learning about the use made of our catalogs. Through these studies it has been observed that (1) readers failed to distinguish between title and subject; (2) filing practices were confused and confusing; (3) readers failed to understand the concept of specific entry; (4) readers consulted a subject catalog to learn shelf location of a particular subject or to select a few books on a subject; and (5) there was no significant difference in the amount of use made of the author catalog, as compared with the use made of the subject catalog.

All those who have divided catalogs have divided them on the assumption that the use of the catalog would thereby be facilitated. One of the
prime aims was to reduce the bulk of the catalog. One type of divided catalog, that is, author-title and subject, increases the total size of the catalog. Added cross references and duplication of entry account for this increase. One report estimated that the increase amounted to about five percent.

Secondly, the dividers of the catalog have tried to meet the criticism that filing arrangements are complicated and not readily explained to users of the catalog. Ruth Erlandson, reporting on the experience at Brooklyn College, says that the divided catalog simplified filing but the user of the subject catalog has lost the subject value of titles, annual reports, autobiographical reports, etc.

The advocates of the divided catalog are aiming, perhaps sometimes unconsciously, at devising an instrument which would make teaching the use of the catalog easier. The studies of the use of the catalog indicate that more and better instruction in its use is needed. I think that when we discuss the arrangement of our catalogs, we should think less in terms of a catalog anyone can use without help and more about a catalog anyone can learn to use with help. The best arrangement for any given library is the one devised with the needs of its own readers and its own local services in mind.

METHODS AND EFFICIENCY

\textit{Anne S. Flannery}

The decision to divide the catalog was based on the belief that this would simplify the catalog to the public, particularly the undergraduate students. It was felt that there is great confusion on the part of the public concerning the difference between subject and title entries. The belief of advocates of the dictionary catalog that instruction in author, title and subject entries, as used in a dictionary catalog, would take care of this situation was contrary to the speaker's experience as Reference Librarian at Duke, where it seemed harder for the user to make the distinction each time he looked for subject or title than to have it already made for him by the division of the catalog.

Other factors under consideration included: (1) desirable space and layout for the divided catalog; (2) reduction of number of cards which must be searched in locating a known item; (3) the lessening of congestion in the author-title section.

Duplicate entries for autobiography, biography, and critical works were eliminated because layout of the divided catalog would permit easy consultation on one table of works about an author and works by an author. Duplicate entries were also eliminated for art books in which the artist may be regarded as either author or subject. The division of the catalog would be the first thing that the Reference Department would point out to students in their instruction in use of the library, and the example of works by an author and works about an author would be the most effective to point up the difference between the two catalogs. Duplicate entries for autobiographical publications of governments, societies,
institutions, and such organizations as scientific expeditions, ships, firms, exhibitions, and presses were eliminated because the reference librarians decided to make a special effort to get over to the students the fact that an author is not necessarily a personal author. Added entries for titles which duplicate subject headings could be eliminated without causing confusion, because Lehigh was already eliminating non-distinctive titles. It was felt that duplication of any entries tends to make the function of the two catalogs less clear.

Two debatable decisions in regard to duplication were made. Name cross-references were to be used in, and only in, the author-title section. However, if the name to which it referred was used only in the Subject Catalog, the reference would be specifically to the name in the Subject Catalog. If the name is later used in author-title section, the direction to the Subject Catalog is removed from the cross-reference card. Since the public catalog at Lehigh serves also as the authority file, this practice saves cataloging time. It does not seem to have caused any trouble on the part of the users—no doubt in the past due to an alert reference staff. The Library instruction handbook and signs over the card catalog urge users to consult the reference librarians if they are unable to find what they want. Another debatable decision is that form and conventional headings such as U. S. Laws, statutes, etc. have been eliminated from the Subject Catalog when they duplicate author entries, even though no library instruction has been given about them. It is admitted that something is needed, and Lehigh will probably use general cross references from the subject to the author-title section when that point is reached in re-editing the catalog. The result of all of the above is elimination of all duplicate entries.

The actual division of the catalog was done during a vacation. Measurements and rough estimates of points of division were taken, signs were made for the new catalogs, and an announcement for the school paper was prepared in advance. With the entire cataloging staff (four professional and three clerical) the division of 1,250,000 cards was completed in four and one half days. The labels were completed the following week by one professional and two clerical staff members working full time.

Thus the time spent in considering the change and making decisions for it proved to be the major cost, but this was in relation to a more inclusive program regarding filing rules, descriptive information, library instruction, and re-editing, through which Reference (now Readers' Service) and Cataloging (Technical Processes) have achieved more effective co-ordination.

No one on the staff has expressed a desire to go back to a dictionary catalog. Impressions and interviews conducted for the A.L.A. Catalog Use Study indicated less trouble on the part of users. In the sample of 165 library patrons interviewed in our survey, only one student was suspected of not knowing the difference between the two catalogs. There was also only one student who did not find a known item because the filing arrangement was not clear. Ninety per cent have found catalog cards on
their subject either by locating the subject or a see reference to it.

It must be kept in mind that the results are due both to the catalog and to the program of instruction of students carried on by Readers' Service which reaches ninety per cent of the student body.

Brother Edmund Joseph

Seven years ago the library was housed in much smaller quarters not designed for library functions. The arrangement necessitated a closed-stack system. Hence the call slips presented and the discussions at the charging desk mirrored the students' understanding of the catalog. It was found that many undergraduates did not understand it; the most common error being an inability to distinguish title and subject entries.

The prime reason for dividing was to aid in the use of the catalog by making this distinction more obvious. It was also hoped that the preliminary filing, done by student assistants, would be simplified.

A short time after the division, more space was obtained and later a new building. These made an open-shelf arrangement possible. This so changed the factors involved that a direct comparison of catalog comprehension before and after dividing is not possible. The following general observations have been made by the library staff:

Students find the catalog easier to use when searching for a single item. More extensive work, such as gathering material for term papers, is more difficult. This is particularly true in the areas of literature and philosophy. Listings of material by and about an author are now separated. Students who scarcely understood the use of the catalog continue to be confused.

Preliminary filing is more accurate, but revision seems to involve more walking about. The cataloger further reports that there is a need for a few more cards. Reports of corporate bodies, autobiographies, books with similar title and subject entries call for additional subject cards. The number of such books, however, is relatively small: eight out of six hundred according to a recent check.

The Reference Department reports that the arrangement relieves congestion at the public catalog. They do not find that it helps students locate materials more easily.

The Circulation Department feels that the divided catalog is clearer and more useful to the students. (Possibly Circulation deals more with those seeking specific items; Reference, with those studying larger problems.) Frequently, however, students consult the wrong catalog. Clear signs in understandable terms must be used to make the divided catalog effective. (Since this talk was given, experiments with signs without technical jargon have considerably reduced confusion. A sign over the subject catalog reading "Topical Index" with a note comparing it to a "classified" telephone directory has been very effective.)

Our general conclusions are: (1) that the problem of instruction in the use of the catalog is antecedent to the problems of dividing; (2) in this particular undergraduate installation the advantages of the divided catalog outweigh the disadvantages sufficiently to justify its continuation; and
(3) there is a need for controlled studies in situations where comparison of catalog comprehension before and after dividing can be made.

**Gilmore Warner**

The question of whether to divide or not depends first upon whether certain gains in use can be expected from the separate parts, and secondly upon whether the resultant losses can be mitigated by certain devices which will compensate for the loss of unity. In general, the relation between titles and subjects is not particularly close. On the other hand the relation between names as author entry and as subject is recognizably more intimate. Hence, when we divided the Lock Haven catalog in 1949, we compiled a list of all proper names, personal, corporate, and geographical, which appeared as subject entries, and later inserted reference cards in the author-title section, at the points where the subject cards had been removed, reading "For material about the above subject consult the subject catalog." These references really convert the author-title catalog into a complete name catalog and seem to be quite useful both to the staff and to the general users. We considered entering corresponding cards in the subject catalog referring to authors whose books have a relatively high autobiographical element, but decided against it on two grounds: that this autobiographical element is relative, nearly every book being to some extent a revelation of its author (and yet, conversely, many so-called autobiographies are not primarily about their authors); and secondly, that this seemed to us a problem better met by education in the use of the catalog. Virginia Close, reference librarian at Dartmouth, who has kindly shared with me her experiences with the divided catalogs, tells me that since the time of their division they have been making subject cards quite regularly for autobiographes.

There is one type of material for which we do regularly enter reference cards in the subject catalog, namely, for all conventionally-assigned main entries such as Bible, Arabian Nights, Nibelungenlied, and the like. These cards read "Texts and translations of the above work are entered in the author-title catalog."

My own experience, and one corroborated by Ralph McComb of Pennsylvania State University, is that the division of the catalog is accepted by its users with little or no confusion or protest. Clear directive signs, of course, are essential. Evelyn Hensel, of Penn State, tells me that the division of their catalog in 1940 was carried out first within all the trays, the subject cards being moved to the rear of each tray behind a prominent divider. At the Chicago Natural History Museum, where I supervised the dividing of the catalog in 1948, we carried the work out tray by tray over several weeks, running a continuous band of author-title trays in the upper half of each case and the corresponding subject trays in the lower half. A different color of labels was used for the subject section and a sign posted on each case as it was finished reading "Authors and Titles above, Subjects below."
Most libraries which have divided have not then taken what seems to me to be the next logical step—to specialize and improve each part. I have already mentioned the converting of the author-title catalog into a comprehensive name catalog. When I left the Chicago Natural History Museum, the proposal to interfile the large depository of the John Crerar Library's printed cards was being favorably considered. Since the user of an author-title catalog is trying to locate a particular title or author, there is little inconvenience and much gain in treating this part of the catalog as a sort of comprehensive authority file and as a union catalog.

On the other hand, the primary function of the subject catalog is to reveal information, not to answer the question, "Where can I get such-and-such a book?" but rather, the question, "What material is available on such-and-such a question?" Now information of all sorts is more closely related to chronology than to alphabet; and once the subject part of the catalog is freed, so to speak, from the alphabetical straight-jacket of authors and titles, it is easy to arrange the cards under each subject in chronologically order from latest publication back to earliest. Such a revision was carried out in Lock Haven in connection with the process of dividing and has met with very general approval from faculty, students, and library staff.

The relation between the subject part of a film catalog is also very close to the subject part of a book catalog, much less so between film titles and book titles. By means of some 1800 reference cards interfiled in the subject catalog of books the Lock Haven user is now directed to the subject part of the film catalog, thus revealing to him at a glance all available information, whether in printed form or on film. Parenthetically, it seems to me regrettable that the Library of Congress in 1953 divided its subjects by form, so that one must now search separately for films, maps, and music—the volume of these important materials is so small that one wonders why the inclusive subject catalog could not be maintained. I find the separate catalogs useful, to be sure, but why couldn't we have the entries in both places?

The underlying fact is that the divided catalog opens the way to further consideration of the whole problem of the library's control of its materials. Says Pepys in one of his many delightful bibliographical notes (his wife at the theatre) "Spent the evening in fitting my books . . . in order to my having an alphabet of my whole, which will be of great ease to me."

**Administrative Contemplation of the Neurosis-Producing Potential of Our Catalog**

**Robert E. Kingery**

My assignment is to talk, theoretically, about divided catalogs. My approach is inevitably that of a technical processes administrator, functioning in a research library that is fast approaching four million volumes, and concerned with the administration of a general catalog that contains
some nine million cards, along with about twenty-five lesser, special catalogs, to all of which we add a total of approximately a half million new cards each year, based on the cataloging of from eighty to ninety thousand different titles.

The first general consideration is the vast increase in the sheer quantity of materials. Next, there is the proliferation in forms of material. We are currently struggling with the multiform problems of the microcard. Then there is the constant increase in the unit costs of cataloging. Clearly, a piece of print, as it comes into our libraries, is but a bit of raw material. And it is the job of catalogers to create out of this material a library. It seems clear that the bigger the collection gets, the more it will cost to add another bit to it. I am more than a little tired of having cataloging singled out; as libraries grow, the cost of everything appears to go up. There are things that we can do to slow down the rate of increase in cost such as work simplification, cooperative approaches to cataloging, and perhaps even division of our catalogs. But we must face the fact that over the long range, unit costs will rise, and we must “help” our general administrators to face it, too.

Another of our problems is lack of knowledge of the different research needs and patterns of the several subject disciplines. If we knew more about the various approaches and needs, it might well be that we would discover that we now do a lot of things that are unnecessary and don’t do other things that are very important. Not to be overlooked is the increasing evidence that what the research worker wants is the indexing of what can be called information units as distinguished from the cataloging of the physical carrier, that is, the book, the pamphlet, the periodical. Equally important is the increase in the amount of inter-disciplinary writing and publishing. For instance, I have stumbled on much useful information on the future development of library catalogs in the literature of wire communication.

One administrative lesson I hope I have really learned is the importance of assuring future flexibility. Frequently, when we curse our predecessors, it is because some action they took in the past restricts our present choice. I must confess to a liking for the card catalog for just this reason. You can put it together and you can take it apart, and some day in the future it can be done another way.

Among the more obvious problems is the sheer size of our catalogs. I spend a fair amount of time worrying about the problem of filing errors. There is solace in the wire-communication law which says that if you increase the message load over a communication system, the amount of “noise” or disorder inevitably increases. We cannot afford to revise all filing for that would add another thirty thousand dollars to our annual filing costs. Then there is “rehabilitation.” Much of our catalog is very dirty and most of it smells. We could spend $150,000 simply replacing cards, with an annual charge of $15,000 for this purpose.

Related to some of the things already mentioned is the growing inadequacy of subject heading lists and systems of classification. Are there
a limited number of basic concepts? Are we plagued with a variety of
terms for what are really duplicating concepts? We must not overlook
"specificity." If a catalog has grown to eighteen million cards, and the
catalog is built on the idea of specific entries, what do you do about
locomoting the user? Do you provide skates?

I find it helpful to turn back to the two functions of all catalogs
which are, I believe, initially to list what is in the collection in terms of
how the material is apt to be cited or remembered, and then to provide
subject approaches to what is in the collection. The argument for division
of the catalogs presumably starts with a hard look at these two basic func­
tions. The literature on the divided catalog suggests that once the catalog
is de-homogenized, we can discover appropriate ways of solving problems
related to each part.

I would like to suggest that division produces an immediate reduction
in the size of each part and thus in what might be called the neurosis­
producing-potential of the catalog. True, there may be some duplication
of entries, but when you are concerned with catalogs that number mil­
lions of cards, such a duplication is indeed minor. I assume the telephone
company has already done some training for us, and that most of our
users would welcome such a reduction in the complexity of the instru­
ment we ask them to learn to use. The benefits of such a split in relation
to reducing the cost of filing and in simplifying the guiding problems are
obvious. So, too, in the realm of specificity.

Division allows us to consider the possible application of different
techniques to the two parts. In the "subject" part there may very well
be a tenable time basis for a printed catalog. We should, with our present
resources, be able to meet the needs that are less than research needs,
through the development of reading lists. I would argue for separation
on the score that it allows for, but, of course, does not assure unless we
make it happen, the opportunity for the careful integration of cataloging
with the whole bibliographical apparatus and with the needs of the vari­
ous subject disciplines. Certainly, the isolation of the parts will facilitate
the study of the parts. It appears not to reduce flexibility and thus not to
invite the curses of those who come after us. In fact, I would argue that
it is a step toward preparing for the future.

LITERATURE SEARCH AVAILABLE

Preliminary to consideration of division of the catalogs of the New York
Public Library, excellent abstracts of articles on the subject were made by Miss
Grosser of the staff. Mr. Kingery has offered to make this bibliography available
to other libraries considering division.
Arabic Cataloging;  
A Criticism of the Present Rules  

Labib Zuwiyya,  
Chief, Arabic Section and Head of Technical Services, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

The cataloging problems of Arabic materials seem to leave even the most experienced cataloger in utter dismay. The main problem is to determine which part of a conglomeration of names and epithets to choose as the main entry. Ordinarily, a book by John Jones is entered under Jones, John, but the perplexing thing about Arabic names is the lack of a last name.

For centuries, in fact since the inception of their history, Arabs seem to have taken pride in being known chiefly as sons of their fathers or fathers of their sons. Even today a man may be known as Abu Ahmad or Abu Abdullah where Abu stands for “father of.” In addition to this section of the name, an Arab writer may have a few of his ancestors’ names and some adjectives which usually refer to professions, home towns, or sometimes nicknames, e.g., al-Watwat (the bat), al-Tabrizi (the man from Tabriz). To this series one should add the different lakabs (titles) and kunyas (nicknames) by which the author may be known, e.g., Jamal-Din (the beauty of religion), Shihab-al-Din (the spark of religion), Abu Fakhu (the father of pride).

To take one example, here is the “full” name of one great Arab biographer: Abu al-`Abbas Shams al-Din Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ibrahim ibn Abi Bakr ibn Khallikan al Barmaki al-`Irbi li al-Shafi`i. In this name there are ten elements. Abu al-`Abbas is the kunya or nickname; Shams al-Din is the lakab or title; Ahmad is the given name; Muhammad is his father’s name; Ibrahim is his grandfather’s name; Abu Bakr is his great grandfather’s name; al Barmaki is a nisbah (adjective) referring to Barmak*; al-`Irbi li is also a nisbah referring to Irbil, a town near Mosul in Iraq; and al-Shafi`i is an adjective derived from the sect to which the author belonged.

According to the ALA rule, this author would be entered under “his given name compounded with the patronymic ... as well as with the surname and nickname.” The name would then be entered under Ahmad with a series of other names following it. To a user of the Arabic catalog this is like filing entries under John in the Western catalog. There are also annoying exceptions to this rule. Authors who are known under some Western forms are entered under these forms, e.g., Avicenna; others who are well known to the Western world under one Arabic form are

---

* Barmak—A Persian name which denoted the rank of hereditary chief priest in the temple of Naw bahar in Balkh.
entered under that, even though it is not the given name, e.g. al-Ghazzâli. The Library of Congress, while following the ALA general rule, varies from it in still a different form: Some authors are entered under some other part of the name than the given name, e.g. Ibn Yamin, Fakhr al-Din Mahmud.

All this points to the lack of consistency in the application of the rule. But this inconsistency is nonetheless necessary because of the nature of the Arabic name. Here lies the crux of the matter. If inconsistency in the application of the rule is necessary so that some names may yet be entered correctly and found easily, it is all the more reason why it is necessary to revise this rule with a view to cutting exceptions to a bare minimum. There is no doubt that it is confusing to the user to have to look under the given name, foreign or Western forms of the name, and other parts of the name every time he uses the catalog. Needless to say with the present system, the catalog becomes crowded with unnecessary cross references which confuse more than help the reader. If it is possible to devise a rule adequate enough to cope with the nuances and idiocyncracies of oriental names, I feel that it certainly should be adopted and universalized.

It is evident from the space devoted in the ALA rules to Arab authors that no great interest has been shown in studying Arabic names. The percentage of Arabic publications in American libraries is so scant that it never warranted a detailed study. But this is changing now. More and more interest is being taken in Islamic and Middle Eastern studies, as evidenced by the growing number of centers of such studies. This alone should be sufficient to enhance a revision of the already established rules with a view to coping with the cataloging of the growing collections. Our cataloging rules work well concerning Western names. Is it not possible to devise a scheme for Arabic names which will prove more satisfactory than the present system?

Let me examine in detail the defects of the present system for the cataloging of Arabic names.

Some of the difficulties in the application of the ALA rule stem from the inconsistency in ascertaining which elements of the name should be included. As evidenced by LC, some names contain four and others five or six elements. Some are entered under given names, like Muhammad ibn Yûsuf, Abû 'Umar, al Kindî; others under a patronymic like Ibn Yamin Fakhr al-Din Mahmud; and some are entered under a nickname like Abu al-Ala'. There are also some examples in LC where an author is entered under two forms with cross references from one form to the other.*

Let us also suppose for the sake of argument that Arab authors prior to 1900 were entered under the given name. Immediately we will be faced with the most staggering difficulty of filing the cards and later on of locating them. One look at Brockelmann's author index is sufficient evi-

* See entry under ibn Batutah and Muhammad ibn Abd Allah, called ibn Batutah.
dence that it is most improbable for a filer to file adequately a card bearing such a name as Muhammad ibn Muhammad, Abu al-Kasim, called al-Hamawi. It is even more improbable that a user of the catalog can find it easily, especially when the user happens to know the author under some other part of his name, his nickname, for instance, or his nisbah. Arabic names abound in Muhammands—indeed almost every Moslem has the name Muhammad added to his full name just as a Catholic might have the name of a saint added to his. For a library with a fairly good-sized collection of Arabic and Islamic works, it is extremely difficult to locate the work of some authors whose name begins with Muhammad, Ahmad, Ali, or Mahmud to mention only a few of the commonest given names. I am speaking from the point of view of the Arab reader as well as the Arab scholar. It is also my firm opinion based on experience in Arabic cataloging that many, if not all, Arab scholars, as well as Arabists, hardly, if ever, refer to an Arab author of the classical period or of any period prior to 1900, by his first name. Abu 'Umar Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi is never referred to as Muhammad, but as al-Kindi; and Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Hazm is always referred to as Ibn Hazm and never as Ali.

It is therefore very confusing to enter such authors under their first names. Apart from the difficulties outlined above, there is the problem of cross references. If for each of these names some four or five cross references are to be made (the number would, of course, vary directly with the elements in each name) the catalog will be burdened with copious cross references, which will be an added difficulty to both catalogers and users.

To posit the problem again, Arabic cataloging, especially establishment of the form of the main entry, has lagged behind its Western counterpart because of lack of sufficient interest in its problems. If there were no need in the past to revise the rules, there certainly is one now. All over the Arab world there has been a marked interest in librarianship. Libraries are still few, but interest is surging. Already there is a library school in Turkey, and courses in Library Science are given in Egypt. A number of Arab students have already received professional training in the West and are back to implement their new ideas and apply their training to the various problems of library organization. To all this must be added the marked and rapid increase in the number of centers of Islamic and oriental studies in the United States, Canada, England, and Europe. The response to this challenge must be a revision of the ALA rules for author entry as applied to oriental names in general, and Arab and Islamic names in particular.

The American University of Beirut (AUB) Library has devised a method whereby the difficulties arising from the application of the ALA rules have been surmounted. The method is based on singling out the distinctive part of the author's name. This means discriminating between the different elements in the full name. As we have mentioned above, the Arabic name is composed of a series of names and adjectives. It is thus very important to sort these parts out with a view to determining the
“true” name of the author. For instance, any adjectives referring to the sect of the author are not an integral part of his name. In some cases the nisbah, an appellation derived from the author's hometown, profession or physical peculiarities, is not important either. In other cases it may be the most distinctive part of the name. Thus Ibn Hisham al-Ansari is known under the patronymic ibn Hisham and not under the nisbah al-Ansari. Whereas Abd al-Wahid al-Marrakushi is known under al-Marrakushi, a nisbah derived from Marrakush in North Africa.

The purpose of this procedure is to shorten the name by deleting what is not integral to it. This process, however, has another purpose—that of establishing the distinctive element in the name, what we have come to call the “entry catch word” of the name. A similar procedure is followed by the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill University where a “double entry system secures the establishment of the entry of complicated Islamic names.” Here at the AUB Library we have devised the following arrangement: the distinctive part of the name (or entry catch word) followed by a comma, then by the kunya (nickname) or in very few cases by the lakab (title), followed by the given name and then the father's name preceded by Ibn. Thus we insure uniformity in the form of entry—one thing that is very essential to a catalog arrangement. A name like Ibn Khallikan's (see above) is entered as follows: Ibn Khallikan, Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad ibn Muhammad, where Ibn Khallikan is the most distinctive element in the name, Abu al-'Abbas is the kunya or nickname, Ahmad is the given name, and Muhammad is the father's name. This name is then filed under Ibn Khallikan and cross references are made from the elements of the name that have not been included, to the established form, thus insuring the user against pitfalls in looking up the name in the catalog.

Now that I have outlined the procedure of entering names of Arab and Islamic authors who lived prior to 1900, the question that remains to be answered is how to find the distinctive element in the name. This, of course, is a matter of searching, as is the case with all non-established and new names. The cataloger has to go beyond the title page. The Arabic classical bibliographies, such as Kashf al-Zunun and bio-bibliographies, such as Yakut are musts for the Arabic cataloger. Alongside these he must have Brockelmann's Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur and the Encyclopaedia of Islam, either the European or Turkish edition, preferably the former. The elements in Italics in Brockelmann and in bold-face type in the Encyclopaedia of Islam are the cataloger's first guide to the distinctive element in the name. Once the cataloger formulates an idea about the name, he can refer to the Arabic bibliographical tools to verify

* On a single line is first given what the Institute calls "the entry name key" which is an arbitrary abstraction from the full name by which the entry is determined. Underneath the first form and on a separate line is given the full name of the author with all titles, nicknames, etc., including dates. Filing is governed by the first and not the second form. (from an unpublished memorandum by the McGill Institute of Islamic Studies)
his entry. If, on the other hand, he is conversant with the tools, he can immediately turn to them and end his search there. But a thorough search must combine Brockelmann with the basic Arabic bibliographical tools. To enumerate only a few: Hajji Khalifah, *Kashf al-Zunun*, Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat al-A'ayan*, and Ibn al-Nadim, *Al-Fihrist*.

Most of these tools have been edited by Orientalists and therefore contain lengthy introductions which explain their contents, as well as excellently arranged indexes. Without some of these Arabic bibliographies on hand, I cannot see how an Arabic cataloger can do justice to any of the classical authors whose names he must establish.

It goes without saying that a cataloger of Arabic materials has to maintain an authority file for all the names he establishes, showing where he has located the author’s name and the title of the book. He will have to make sure that the book he is cataloging is not also known under a variant form, as this happens rather frequently with Arabic books, especially of the classical period. The authority file helps the cataloger in maintaining consistency in form of entry all through the catalog. It also has all the cross references that are inserted in the catalog, thus eliminating their duplication.

The procedure outlined above has been in operation at the AUB Library for better than two years without any major problems. It has eliminated “conflict cataloging” and standardized the form of entry. With filing under first names eliminated, readers have found the catalog much easier to use. Cross references are copious when needed, but they do not clutter up the catalog. At the AUB Library the authors’ dates are not included on all the catalog cards, but they are listed on the Arabic authority cards.

In explaining this procedure, I have tried to point out the main difficulties that arise from following the ALA rule for Arabic authors of the pre-1900 era with the hope that some form of standardized entry can be formulated. It is my belief that there is enough interest in the problems of Arabic cataloging to warrant some serious thinking on the subject.

---

**Cooperative Cataloging in Brazil**

**Maria Jose Theresa de Amorim,**

*Biblioteca Pública do Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil.*

*THE Brazilian cataloging exchange service is known by librarians all over Brazil as SIC, after the initials of its Portuguese name, Serviço de Intercâmbio de Catalogação. It was established in 1942 by the Library of the Administrative Department of Public Service (DASP), under the direction of its Librarian, Lydia de Queiroz Sambaquy.*
Brazilian libraries had experienced, up to that time, difficulties in cataloging and classifying their books. There were no cataloging codes and no classification tables in Portuguese. These difficulties were overcome to some extent by the translation of the Vatican code of rules and by the manuals of library science published by the Brazilian Institute of the Book. However, the work of cataloging done by each library was needlessly repeated by the others. The purpose of the SIC was to help the libraries with the difficulties in cataloging and classification. It aimed at a reduction of the cost of cataloging and at the improvement of its quality. Other goals were the encouragement of library cooperation, the compilation of a union catalog and the increase of facilities for bibliographical research at all levels.¹

There was no appropriation for the SIC; experts from the DASP edited the copy submitted by cooperating libraries, and the National Department of Printing printed and distributed the cards. Later the Getulio Vargas Foundation helped to support it. The Brazilian Institute for Bibliography and Documentation was created in April, 1954, with Lydia Queiroz Sambaquy as its President; the SIC became one of its departments, on which approximately 2 million cruzeiros are spent yearly. (The Brazilian monetary unit, the cruzeiro, is worth slightly more than one cent in American money. There are one hundred centavos in the cruzeiro.)

Six libraries submitted copy to the SIC initially: the Machado de Assis Library and the governmental libraries of the Administrative Department of Public Service, of the then Ministry of Health, Education and Welfare, of the National Museum, of the General Treasury Office, and of the National Department of Printing. The task of the SIC consisted of revising uniformly the cards which were sent to it for printing by the libraries participating in the scheme.

This pioneer enterprise of cooperative cataloging in South America was faced with many difficulties and obstacles. Trained catalogers and revisers were difficult to obtain. Libraries and documentation services did not understand or appreciate the services. The delays in printing the cards threatened to annul the advantages of the exchange system.²

The SIC administrators were successively Lydia de Queiroz Sambaquy and, at present, Alice Reis Principe Barbosa. Both of them came to the United States on inspection tours, during which they observed the cataloging done by the Library of Congress. Under able direction the cooperative effort gradually won the favor of Brazilian libraries. The current number of cooperating libraries is 120. The names of some 100 among these appear in the 1954 report of the Brazilian Institute for Bibliography and Documentation. SIC cards are purchased by 286 libraries throughout Brazil. Any library willing to do so can participate in the cooperating scheme.

From 1942 to 1952 the cooperating libraries received fifteen free copies of the cards printed from copy submitted by them; in 1953 the SIC began to provide free only a complete set of author, subject, series
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and title entries. In 1955, due to financial pressure, the cooperating libraries were required to pay 60 centavos per printed card. Cooperating libraries may purchase cards for other titles than those which they sent for printing. The first card costs 80 centavos when ordered by number, or one cruzeiro when ordered by author's name, subject, or series. Each additional card of a set costs 70 centavos. Non-cooperating libraries pay the same prices.

Libraries can also subscribe to a complete collection of printed cards comprising 58,000 titles, for 23,240 cruzeiros. Yearly subscriptions for 10,000 titles, as well as subscriptions of cards for all works of a given author, subject, or series, comprising about 200 cards each, can also be secured. Up to 1955 the SIC had issued cards for 68,000 titles; their printing is still being done by the National Department of Printing.

Due to financial limitations and to the current demand for cards for certain titles in preference to others, there is a category of descending priority for titles of:

1. Current national bibliography
2. Retrospective national bibliography
3. Foreign technical and scientific books published since 1945
4. Reference books and the classics of literature, science and history.

No cards are printed for maps, music, filmstrips, motion pictures, or children's books.

An alphabetical catalog of the printed cards, under author entry, giving title, edition, and card number, was issued in 1948. It was published under the editorship of the National Department of Printing and comprised cards printed from September, 1942, to September, 1948. The first supplement, printed by the same Department, but edited by the Getúlio Vargas Foundation, comprised cards printed from October, 1946, to December, 1949, and was edited by the DASP. It is now being multilithed by the Brazilian Institute for Bibliography and Documentation, under author, title, series, and subject entries. The SIC's union catalog is composed of the existing 68,100 titles in printed cards.

SIC cards look very much like the Library of Congress cards, with the obvious difference that the language used is Portuguese. Library of Congress classification numbers are not given, as this system of classification is not adopted in Brazil. The cataloging rules adopted are those of the Vatican code in the Portuguese translation and adaptation; they are supplemented by the A.L.A. rules. Subject heading lists in Portuguese were nonexistent at the time the SIC was established; many divergencies occurred in the headings assigned by the different co-operating libraries. The classification numbers assigned to the titles cataloged are Dewey Decimal Classification numbers and here, too, problems were encountered in the task of providing short, workable numbers for Brazilian literature and for geographical subdivisions. Numbers from some special classifications are used on the cards besides the DC numbers. The accepted classification for books on law is that adopted by the Library of the...
Ministry of Finance. It is printed on the cards in parentheses, to show that it is not a Dewey number, being an adaptation of the Brussels system. Another adaptation is that used for Administration. As it has happened to most libraries adopting the Dewey Decimal Classification, both the 14th and the 15th standard edition are used. Numbers taken from the 15th edition are marked with an asterisk by the classifier and are thus printed on the cards.

Adaptations on the printed cards are made by libraries in much the same way as they are made on Library of Congress cards by libraries in the United States. Headings are accepted, modified, scored, added to, simplified, or disregarded.

The SIC carries on a revision of its older cards, especially some printed before 1948 or 1949, while the cataloging practices were still being established.

One of the largest public libraries in Brazil, the municipal library of São Paulo (Biblioteca Municipal de São Paulo), does not cooperate with the SIC. It was founded in the same year that the SIC started, and it established a different form of entry for compound names. The Biblioteca Municipal de São Paulo makes the entry under the author's last surname, whereas the SIC follows the rule for compound surnames which abound in Portuguese. Thus the name of Brazil's foremost novelist of the nineteenth century, Joaquim Maria Machado de Assis, is entered as "Machado de Assis, Joaquim Maria," by the SIC, and as "Assis, Joaquim Maria Machado de," by the municipal library of São Paulo. In 1954, at the first national library conference held in the city of Recife, the representatives from the São Paulo library agreed to study the means of which difficulties could be eliminated, so that they could become a cooperating library.

The National Library of Rio de Janeiro also studied with the SIC the means for cataloging its backlog, but, the cost being prohibitive, it had to resort to doing its own duplication of cards by mimeograph.

What is the work of cataloging like, in a library that contributes copy to the SIC? It may be of interest to offer an account of the cooperating cataloging as done in the public library of the state of Paraná, created by the state government in 1953. The organization of the new library began in 1952, with work on books left from the extinct Municipal Library of Curitiba, and since then the library has joined the SIC cooperative system.

The Biblioteca Pública do Paraná has a depository set of SIC cards which are later to comprise the union catalog of the University of Paraná. Whenever a book must be cataloged, preliminary searching is done in this depository set. If there are no cards for it, or if existing cards cannot be adapted, the book is assigned for cooperative cataloging, provided that it falls within the categories of priorities delineated by the SIC. The catalogers type the copy directly with three carbons on stout paper slips cut in the standard 7½ by 12½ cm. size and punched. The library's number for the card, as well as the date the cataloging was done, is written in...
pencil on the back of the slips. This number is taken from a register where the date of cataloging, author, brief title, are recorded in chronological order and numbered continuously.

The original of the catalog card prepared in the library is then sent to the SIC together with the routine slip on which all the searching done for the book has been recorded. The three copies of the catalog card are filed respectively in the official catalog, the public catalog, and the departmental catalogs for the corresponding collection, such as Fine Arts collection, juvenile books, books on Paraná, etc. They will record the existence of the book in the library by author entry only, until the printed cards arrive and the secondary entries are added to them.

From time to time the register is checked for delays in the printing of the cards. If the SIC reports that it is not going to print certain of the cards contributed by the library, these are duplicated in the catalog department.

There is some delay in getting the cards printed, and some explanation for it lies in the fact that the SIC sends the edited, typed proof sheet to the cooperating library which submitted the copy. Because the SIC has more bibliographical and reference tools from which to complete the searching done by the library, it can add valuable information to the cards. The slips are sent back to the library, however, for the SIC does not have the actual book being cataloged and it is necessary to check whether, after the editing, the card still fits the book in hand. Subject headings and classification especially, are the items checked. The public library of Paraná possesses a typewritten copy of the subject headings used by the SIC up to 1951, with very few cross references added. Subject headings used on the cards submitted by the library are therefore taken from this list and also from the 5th edition of the Library of Congress subject headings and its supplements, currently received by the library. They are chosen by the classifier and translated into Portuguese. Sometimes the proof slip returned by the SIC has different subject headings from those assigned by the library; the classification may also have been altered. Both have to be checked in order to verify whether they conform with the library's policies in subject cataloging. This, naturally, takes time and, frequently, an exchange of correspondence between the library and the SIC. But it has proven to be a very useful procedure in bringing about uniformity and in establishing cooperation in cataloging in a much deeper sense than the mere physical presentation of the copy.

SIC hopes in the future to make a subject heading list in Portuguese and to publish a simplified revision of the Vatican rules, through the Committee on Cataloging Studies of the Brazilian Institute for Bibliography and Documentation.
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BRANDEIS, being a very young university, has had to meet and attempt to solve problems other institutions have not worried about for years. Among these is our particular “growing pain,” a mass of uncataloged books confronting a small staff and an incomplete plant.

The Library has been fortunate in having numerous friends donate large gifts of fine and useful books. With these gifts and the ones purchased, the Library has accessioned over 100,000 volumes in seven years and continues to add about 18,000 per year. In these seven years the Cataloging Department consisted of one professional and one part-time subprofessional (who had her Master’s degree in history and eleven years of library experience) plus student help. This small group has fought a stout rear-guard action in keeping abreast of the avalanche of incoming books, and even managed to catalog 1,200 books per month, plus a total of 1,600 records, 2,345 scores, and an uncounted number of microcards. To do this, every possible device was used which would fulfill the demand for a large daily output and yet meet adequate cataloging standards for a university library. Even so, the stock of uncataloged books continued to grow and has now reached the 12,000 mark. It appeared a hopeless situation, for the catalog department seemed to be doing the impossible and there were no funds to hire more catalogers. And, even if there had been, there was no more room in the 203 square-foot space of the cataloging department which occupied the basement of the temporary library. “Temporary library” is a euphemism which describes the present architectural mélange, a contemporary structure added to the former stable of the old Middlesex University. Fortunately, it was a large stable. Horses and pioneers seem to be inseparable even on so civilized a frontier.

As the number of titles cataloged increased, the time needed to catalog each title also increased. Hereupon it was decided to make available for circulation every book accessioned by the library, cataloged or not. The following is an account of how Brandeis attempted to serve its library users by temporary cataloging:

1 In her table for a university library of 100,000 volumes adding 12,000 per year, Margaret Mann says the staff required is nine people of whom four are professional. Mann, Margaret, Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books. 2d ed. Chicago, ALA, 1943. Table, p. 268.

2 Usually, at least four students plus the two librarians were working at one time in space which equalled less than 34 square feet per person, plus shelf-list, cabinets, desks, chairs, book trucks, typewriters, etc.
When a book is stamped with the accession number, it is also stamped with the Brandeis University Library stamp on the edges. It is then pasted with book pocket and book plates. Next it is given to a student to search the "Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards . . ." If the student finds the same book here, his job is simple. He orders LC cards by the LC card order number; types a temporary card (on a buff practice card) with the LC entry, short title and imprint; and a book card with the correct entry and short title. The entry is indicated on the title page of the book. The "temp" card is then filed in the main catalog, the book is shelved alphabetically by entry with the other uncataloged books, and the LC order sent to LC for cards. When the cards arrive, they are arranged alphabetically by entry with all other cards for uncataloged books on hand.

If the student finds a similar book in the LC Catalog, the same process is used, except full information is typed on the LC order slip at the same time the "temp" card and book card are typed. If the student cannot find similar material, so is doubtful of an entry, he consults with the order librarian to decide upon one. LC cards are ordered by this entry. If LC sends cards and the entry LC selected differs from the one selected by Brandeis, the temporary card, book card and title page of the book are changed to correspond to LC cards. If there are no cards, the LC order slip is interfiled with the cards for uncataloged books.

This is a condensed account of what Brandeis has found to be a necessary expedient for providing book services. With this method, a book is available to a graduate student or instructor for doctoral work, or an undergraduate student for a term paper within twenty-four hours after being received by the Library. Before a cataloger sees the book, it may have circulated dozens of times, been on reserves, or used in the library reading room.

Everyone is aware that this is an inadequate answer to a unique problem. None of these books can be put to use for the student who wants all the material in the library on a given subject. Also, those who use the open stacks to find books by classification number will miss the uncataloged books on related subjects. Some of the staff have worried that it might add to our loss of books by theft, but since the book is stamped on the three edges with the Library's name, it does not appear much easier to appropriate these than it would be for a book with the call number lettered on the spine.

Temporary cataloging is an additional operation which should be avoided whenever possible. It really means cataloging a book twice, but since students can do all the temporary cataloging, it has been feasible here.

The faculty, graduate students and others like this system because the majority of their requests are by author and title. Thus the book is available to them as soon as it is accessioned. No one has the need to come to the catalog department to have certain books rushed. This relief of pressure from the outside helps the morale of an overworked staff.
The cataloger can plan to do a book truckload of one subject and know he can go to the end without having to stop to rush out several titles on other subjects for the faculty or student. This increases the overall speed in which books can be cataloged.

The wheels turn fast at Brandeis, and already these first seven years are referred to as the "pioneer era." We are now eight years old and going into our second seven-year period with a new library building promised and funds for another cataloger in the budget. So, someday we hope to have our book stock cataloged. The present writer has been with Brandeis only since August, 1955, so can take no credit for the achievement of the past, but hopes to keep alive the willingness to improvise and experiment in what is too often the unadventurous field of cataloging.

The Availability of Library of Congress Catalog Cards

FOR over half a century the Library of Congress has served, to a considerable extent, as the central cataloging agency for the United States. During this time it has sold (in addition to other millions otherwise distributed) 566,137,332 cards which has served to catalog library collections, not only in the United States, but in almost all the countries of the world. This activity on the part of LC has been of immense service to librarianship in its struggle to maintain bibliographical control over the ever-increasing amounts of published materials. It has been said, however, that "the most urgent cataloging problem in the United States presently is that of finding a way by which LC can increase its coverage, so that all or nearly all of the titles received in other American libraries will have been cataloged and their printed cards available by the time other libraries want them."

In September, 1951, the Committee on Administration of the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification sent a questionnaire to 112 libraries representing different types and sizes of institutions scattered throughout the United States to study the performance record of the LC Card Division. The questionnaire requested pertinent data on various aspects of card distribution service, and the results were published in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification of June, 1953. In order to determine the current picture regarding the availability of catalog cards, the Library of Congress "surveyed the orders for printed cards placed during a two month period by 32 libraries selected as representative of different types and sizes of such institutions throughout the United States." This survey was conducted between January 11 and March 25, 1955, and a
The Library of Congress made the complete tables available to the writer, and it is the purpose of this paper to make an analysis of the tables as they pertain to "College and University" libraries. Before doing so, however, it became necessary to obtain clarification for some of the terms used in the survey, and LC has furnished the information. The term "cards" as used in the LC Survey is synonymous with "titles" and will be used interchangeably in this paper. The phrase "in process" was interpreted to mean books the Library of Congress expected to get, books being cataloged, card copy requested, and card copy actually in hand or in the Printing Office. Therefore, the length of time for the availability of cards varied considerably. For those books not yet received, LC expected the time to be two or three months; books being cataloged and card copy in hand, two to three weeks; and card copy in hand or in the Printing Office, one to four days. "Printed cards out of stock" are cards temporarily out of print. The Handbook of Card Distribution explains that "the order slip is being held in our file and cards will be sent without further action, probably within four weeks." "Material published during the past three years is designated 'current' and earlier material 'non-current'." (The LC Survey was conducted in 1955.) Finally, the statistics in the LC tables were based on the first order or attempt to obtain cards for the titles by the libraries in the sample.

A second purpose of this paper is to determine by questionnaire whether the orders received by LC from the libraries in the sample represent their total needs, and, if not, what percentage they do represent. A comparison may show the coverage of the LC cataloging in relation to the needs of college and university libraries. It may also be possible to determine if it is true that "some libraries, particularly in the academic and special research group, are said not to be able to obtain printed cards for more than approximately 60% of their acquisitions at the time they catalog their materials." In selecting the libraries for the LC Survey, the first consideration was "type of library," and then location entered the picture. The following libraries were included in the "College and University" group: University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Los Angeles, Columbia University, University of Illinois, University of Kansas, University of Minnesota, University of Notre Dame, Princeton University, University of Washington (Seattle), and University of Wisconsin.

These ten libraries show similarities in activities that influence their acquisitions and cataloging activities in a comparable manner, and these similarities, in turn, affect their need for LC cards. Eight libraries participate in the Farmington Plan and thereby adhere to the provisions of that cooperative project; nine are members of the Association of Research Libraries. Finally, all ten cooperate with LC in the Cooperative Cataloging Project and submit cataloging copy when requested to do so by
LC. As far as location is concerned, the ten libraries are well distributed across the country; however, contrary to the labeling of the LC Survey, no college libraries, in the accepted meaning of that term, were included in the sample. Furthermore, there is no real homogeneity with regard to the size of the holdings. One library has less than 500,000 volumes, three have less than one million but more than 500,000 volumes, three have over one million volumes, and three have over two million volumes.15

A study of the LC tables demonstrates the immensity of the task that LC is performing when it is considered that during the survey period—January 11 to March 25, 1955—ten libraries placed orders for 30,285 titles in a total of 155 orders. Multiplied many times the total is staggering.

From LC Table II the conclusion may be drawn that the libraries in the sample are emphasizing the building up of their research collections by adding older materials. They ordered 12% more cards for "noncurrent" titles than for "current" titles. The libraries also have a greater demand for material in English than in foreign languages. They ordered cards for 71% "current" and "noncurrent" English titles during the survey period as compared with only 29% "current" and "noncurrent" foreign language titles.

LC Table III substantiates the statement that the most urgent problem in cataloging is increasing the coverage by LC. The orders received by LC do not represent the number of titles cataloged by the libraries, as the replies to the questionnaire—to be discussed later—indicate, yet cards were immediately available for only 66% of the titles ordered, whereas for 20% there was a delay, and for 14% no cards were available.

A comparison of LC Tables II and V shows that in the very area of greatest demand, that of "noncurrent" titles, fall the greatest number of "Printed cards out of stock." LC Table V shows that 79% of the "outs" fall into the "noncurrent" category, whereas only 21% of the titles ordered fall into the "current" category. The same table also show that out of the total number of "Printed cards out of stock" 58% are "noncurrent" English titles and 18% "current" English titles. This fact makes the situation more unfavorable since the libraries, in general, emphasize titles in the English language. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that even though these titles were out of stock when LC received the orders, they were sent after a delay of about four weeks without further action on the part of the ordering library, and they represent only 10% of the total number of orders received by LC during the survey period. It is nevertheless true that, from the point of view of these libraries and the patrons they must serve, this delay in receiving cards is a hindrance to prompt and effective cataloging and service.

As far as the 14% NP's (no prospect) are concerned, this seems to be a large segment of unavailable cards. No statistics were kept to indicate how many were "current" or "noncurrent," English or foreign. To remedy this situation, it may be possible to expand the cooperative cataloging program as far as materials published before 1956 are concerned. It is to
be hoped that the new policy of including in the new National Union Catalog the catalog cards prepared by other American libraries as well as LC will have the positive results that are anticipated from it.

In order to complete the picture of card availability as presented by the LC Survey, the ten libraries were asked to complete four statements sent to them in a letter. The information requested was to be taken from the last complete fiscal year since it would be simpler for all the libraries to supply those figures than the statistics covering the period identical with that of the LC Survey. These statements were formulated in order (1) to determine what percentage of their card needs the libraries ordered from LC so that a comparison could be made with the percentage of titles for which LC was able to supply cards; (2) to indicate what success the libraries had in response to their orders; (3) to determine how much original cataloging the libraries in the sample performed; and (4) to indicate how many titles are sent to LC out of the total number originally cataloged as a contribution to cooperative cataloging.

Of the ten libraries in the sample, seven replied. One library replied that it did not have adequate data upon which to base answers to the questions; two libraries did not reply. Since there were only four statements to be completed and a small sample, the individual replies are listed with the libraries' comments.

All of the libraries stated that their fiscal year ran from July, 1954, to June, 1955.

1. This library ordered cards for ---% of the total number of titles cataloged during the last complete fiscal year, representing --- titles.

Univ. of California, Berkeley

"In October, 1953 we installed XEROX and discontinued the ordering of Library of Congress cards... We have continued standing orders for some analytics but have ordered only a few other cards in exceptional cases." Letter dated April 27, 1956.

Univ. of California, Los Angeles 90 % 24,200
Columbia University 36.2 % 14,223
University of Kansas 100 % 11,733
University of Minnesota ? 13,918

"We ordered 13,918 titles from LC. Since this figure includes "new added" copies (books new to a library department but not to the system) and other miscellaneous orders which would not be reflected in the new titles cataloged figure, I do not think that you can draw any valid conclusions as to the percentage of titles cataloged for which we ordered cards." Letter dated April 20, 1956.

*Princeton University 85 % ?

"An estimate, we have no exact figures." Card dated May 7, 1956.

University of Washington (Seattle) 100 % 13,495

2. This library cataloged —% with LC cards during the same period, representing —— titles. (Include all titles that were cataloged by using information from LC proofsheets, card depositories or copied from the LC Author Catalog and reproduced locally)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>16,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>12,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Princeton University</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Represent actual LC cards used. When copying from LC Author Catalog, we record as typed card." Card dated May 7, 1956.

University of Washington (Seattle) 59% 8,075

3. This library originally cataloged —% of all titles cataloged during the last fiscal year, representing —— titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Some cataloging was done with Wilson cards." Card dated April 24, 1956.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>22,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>8,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Princeton University</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Includes original work, and also titles typed from LC Author Catalog." Card dated May 7, 1956.

University of Washington (Seattle) 41% 5,420

4. Of the total number of titles originally cataloged, this library sent —% to LC as cooperative cataloging copy, representing —— titles. (Same fiscal period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"No separate record kept. Our figures for this go in with #3." Card dated May 7, 1956.

University of Washington (Seattle) .017% 97

The variations in the keeping of statistics and interpretation of the statements in the questionnaire by the libraries has made it imprudent to use all the statistics received in answer to each statement. Therefore, in constructing Table A, the answers that were not comparable within each statement were omitted. For statement 1 there were five comparable per-
percentages given. Although the University of Minnesota furnished the number of orders sent to LC, no attempt was made to calculate what the percentage would be for the reasons stated in the reply. The estimate given by Princeton University, however, was included in the table because it is based on their past experience. For statements 2 and 3 there were six comparable replies received. The statistics from Princeton University were omitted because they were not considered comparable to the other replies. For statement 4 there were five comparable percentages received.

**TABLE A**

**REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Ordered LC Cards</th>
<th>(2) Cat. with LC Cards</th>
<th>(3) Original Cataloging</th>
<th>(4) Cooperative cat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Titles</td>
<td>% Titles</td>
<td>% Titles</td>
<td>% Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Berkeley *</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11,942</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California, Los Angeles 90</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University 36.2</td>
<td>14,223</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>16,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas 100</td>
<td>11,733</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota *</td>
<td>(13,918)*</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>12,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University 85</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington (Seattle) 100</td>
<td>13,495</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63,651</td>
<td>72,421</td>
<td>65,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average percentages | 82.2 | 56.3 | 43.1 | 3.4 |

* For explanatory statements see libraries' comments in replies previously quoted.

The average arrived at for statement 1, 82.2%, indicates that these libraries make a substantial attempt to obtain and use LC cards for their cataloging activities. The only exception is Columbia University. (Information has been received that since the fiscal year 1954-55 the policy has been changed and currently cards are ordered for over 90% of their total needs.) However, a comparison between the average percentage of titles ordered, 82.2%—which does not represent the total needs of the libraries—and the percentage of titles immediately available out of the total number of orders sent to the Library of Congress, 66%, further confirms the statement regarding the need to increase the cataloging coverage of LC. Apparently the libraries decide before sending their card orders that no cards would be available for an average of 17.8% titles and do not attempt to obtain cards for them.

The replies to statements 2 and 3 show that after attempts have been made to obtain cards, an average of 56.3% titles are cataloged with LC cards and original cataloging is done for an average of 43.1% of the titles. These averages tend to confirm the statement that academic li-
Libraries can obtain LC cards for no more than about 60% of their needs at the time that they catalog their materials. The fact is that the libraries in this sample obtained even less.

The compilation of statistics in answer to statement 4 indicates that the solution to increased coverage could possibly be found in an increased acceptance by LC of cooperative cataloging copy. All the libraries that replied contribute cooperative cataloging copy and therefore no new agreements would have to be made. Out of 62,763 titles originally cataloged by the five libraries that submitted cooperative cataloging statistics, only 2,222 were sent to LC as cooperative cataloging copy. LC accepts this copy in response to a CDP (Copy desired for printing) request which is initiated by LC. It is not within the scope of this paper to determine why not more cooperative cataloging copy is requested or accepted by LC; however, it may be assumed that more of the original cataloging done by libraries could be used by other libraries. The average percentage of cooperative cataloging copy sent to LC during the fiscal year 1954-55 was 3.4%, a small number indeed when it is remembered that these libraries do original cataloging for an average of 43.1% of their needs.

The small number of libraries included in the sample and their diversity permit few general conclusions to be drawn that would be applicable to the entire population of university libraries; however, it is interesting to compare the results of the Ladenson study made in 1951. At that time it was found that:

"In the case of university libraries, the percentage of titles supplied on a typical order ranged from 16.4% to 88.8% in the initial shipment. On 50% of the orders examined, however, the percentage of titles supplied ranged from 71.4% to 88.8% in the first shipment. After thirty days from date of order, the percentage of titles still outstanding ranged from 1.9% to 38.1%; after sixty days, from nine percent to 35.1%. If all orders from university libraries that were reviewed in the questionnaires were to be combined, the percentage of titles supplied in the initial shipment would be 64.7%."\(^{16}\)

The results of the questionnaire for this paper show that the orders sent to LC represent an average of 82.2% of the total needs of these libraries. An average of 56.3% titles were cataloged with LC cards, and for 43.1% of the titles the libraries had to do original cataloging. The LC survey shows that 66% of the orders can be filled immediately. Cards for an additional 10% become available with some delay because they are "out" at the time the order is received, but no reorder is necessary. For another 10%, cards are available in the future, however, a re-order is necessary unless the library indicates that it wants the order held until the cards become available. For 14% of the orders there is "no prospect".

From the statistics, as presented in this paper, it is evident that some libraries are more successful in obtaining cards than others. In all likelihood the nature of the materials for which cards are ordered is the de-
terminating factor here and it may be said that the larger the library, the more comprehensive the research programs supported, the more obscure the materials acquired to support this research, the less success there will be in obtaining LC cards. There are other factors involved, such as finances of the institution, goals and policies of the parent institution and its library, the size and variety of the collections, the energy, resourcefulness and aims of the library’s acquisition policies, etc., that influence the ultimate need for LC cards with which to catalog and control, for use, the materials acquired.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES


16. Ladenson, op.cit., p. 52.

REVISED CATALOGING RULE

A revision of ALA rule 70 has been approved by the Committee on Descriptive Cataloging. This revision, proposed by the Library of Congress, is primarily a rearrangement of the old rule. However, provision has been made for entry under the form of name used by the author if he has adopted in a Western language a form that differs from the literal translation.

The text of revised ALA rule 70 will be published by the Library of Congress in Cataloging Service.—Marian Sanner, Chairman, Committee on Descriptive Cataloging.
A Library for Organists

THE Rocky Mountain Chapter of the American Guild of Organists has for several years received complimentary copies of anthems and organ music from publishers. It became necessary to form this unwieldy mass into a useful tool, namely a one-subject library requiring a special system of classification. The purpose of the Library is to permit organists and choir directors to see new music from which orders may be made.

With the advice of specialists at the University of Colorado and the Denver Public Library, I have evolved a new system of classification. And, since Library of Congress subject headings did not meet our need, I prepared a list to identify the music for special occasions. I based the list on the Liturgical Year plus some national holidays.

Two card forms are used: a main entry, and a subject card. The main entry conforms to ALA and LC standards down through the collation. Two spaces below the collation is added a line showing voices—SAB, SATB, TTBB, etc., noting also solos, descants, etc. Two spaces below this is the shelflist entry, showing the number of copies and price. And, again two spaces below this, is my own evaluation of the difficulty of the music, A meaning easy, B medium, C difficult. If the publication is a collection, the list of contents is entered below the note on voices, and the other two notes are dropped below contents. Thus, on the main card the organist or choir director finds all the information he requires for ordering. The subject file brings together all music for any occasion, and that is the first place usually sought. The subject card gives the subject (in red), the author, the title, and the voices, and serves as an index to the main entry or shelflist record.

The music itself carries a call number on a red-edged label in the upper left hand corner. The red edge keeps it distinct from other people’s music.

The classification is based on Dewey, and I use a two-figure Cutter table. All music is stamped when it is received, and I am planning a bookplate for the books. The library is housed in my apartment, and the Guild pays the few expenses from the general treasury.

Approximately an hour a day is devoted to the work of keeping up the collection, which is now about 1,000 anthems, with collected works for organ, organ solos, instruction and pedal books to 100. We hope in time to be able to have anthems for loan for services.

The library is open to the organists and choir directors on the first Sunday of each month from 2:00 to 6:00 p.m. and the third evening from 7:00 to 8:30. The first afternoon one organist brought her soprano and choir director and chose a fifty dollar order. Music is ordered through the
local music stores. Another organist wanted material on Nativities for an article for publication. She did most of her script while here.

With regard to the files, most organists do not look at the author file except for information for ordering. They go directly to the subject file where they seek the next season's music, such as Advent.

The Classification system is based on Dewey. The 000 is the place for our recital programs, our roster and some miscellany. 100 is theory, with the usual breakdown. Catalogs always appear under 3 in all the categories, 103 being general catalogs, 303 those of anthems, 603 those of organ music. 200 is dramatic music which includes acted cantatas. Costumes for these and for pageants are in the section of Art-700, where we have places for cover designs for music, bookplates and other related topics. 300 is for anthems and here the usual country division is shown, as 334-French anthems, etc. 400 is for song, with 403 as catalogs for vocal music. Although it will be little used, 500 is reserved for piano. In Organ, 600, we have places for registration, structure and building of organs, pedal books, chime books, and all the instruments that accompany the organ, including orchestra. I have mentioned Art as 700. 800 is literature, and we are hoping to add some good biographies, our own writings and other. 900 is for recordings, TV and radio programs.

My subject headings are the few national days from LC, and the Liturgical Year, as, Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter, Trinity, Descants, Reformation Sunday, Thanksgiving, Junior Choir etc. The music on the shelf is grouped thus as I have explained. Periodicals are few but will be many, and will be grouped alphabetically on the shelf by title.

I have an ordinary expandable correspondence file for catalogs, with a small index attached to the front of the file.

We are really very happy in our adventure and believe that it will meet our special needs adequately.

---

**Serials Clearinghouse No. 6**

**HARRY DEWEY, Librarian and Associate Professor, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia and WALLACE C. OLSEN, Assistant Librarian, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin**

(The Serials Clearinghouse exists to bring to the attention of its readers articles, books, pamphlets, serials and news about the servicing of serials in libraries. The Clearinghouse does not attempt to list new serials individually, nor indexes to single periodicals. It does not list subject bibliographies except when these take the form of important indexes to or lists of the serials of a subject field.)

**ACQUISITIONS**

CATALOGING


EQUIPMENT

"[A New Type of Newspaper Display Rack]" Librarian and Book World, 45:100 (illus.). May-June, 1956.
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Drumwright, C. M. Periodical Publishing in Texas, 1900-1925. Research in progress, University of Texas.
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DCC Board on Cataloging Policy and Research

MINUTES OF MEETING

September 21, 1956, New York City

THE DCC Board on Cataloging Policy and Research met at 10 a.m., September 21, 1956, at Columbia University, New York City. The meeting was attended by: Members of the Board: Katharine Ball, Margaret C. Brown, Bella E. Shachtman, Maurice F. Tauber and John W. Cronin, Chairman; Guest: Sidney L. Jackson.

The Board noted with deep regret and sorrow the death of Dorothy Charles who had been appointed as a member, effective June, 1956. Although the members had worked with Miss Charles in other capacities, the opportunity to work with her on the Board was not afforded them. It is a deep disappointment that her keen and scholarly mind and rich personality will not be present on the Board. She will be missed both professionally and personally.

The Board welcomed Katharine Ball, Library School, University of Toronto, who replaces Miss Charles.

The first item on the agenda was a discussion of Dr. Jackson’s progress report #5 on the Catalog Use Study. On September 15, 1956, Dr. Jackson mailed to the members of the Board his progress report #5, together with a sample chapter of the latest revision of the report of the Catalog Use Study. Dr. Jackson indicated that, in accordance with comments and criticisms made of the first draft, he had eliminated abbreviations and transferred detailed tables to a new appendix, including in the text only
the general tables. Dr. Jackson also said that eight case studies were being prepared and probably would be finished by late October, in time for inclusion in the final published report.

After examining this latest draft, members of the Board recommended further cutting of the text, some changes in organization, and minor editorial revisions. It was suggested, for example, that major findings, conclusions and recommendations appear together in one place, preferably at the end. It was also proposed that the research method be discussed in one chapter rather than at present in Chapter 1 and Chapter 7. It was urged that there be as little repetition as possible between text and tables. In Chapter 3, which is scheduled to include a discussion of patron location and use of catalog cards, it was suggested that “A. The incidence of failure in patron searches for catalog cards” and “B. Patron use of the catalog cards” be presented in reverse order. In Chapter 4 it was proposed that “A. Size, structure and relation to the shelves” be incorporated with “C. Interpretation devices.” It was agreed that the headings for Chapters 4 and 5 should be revised to read: “Problems arising from use: The Catalog” and “Problems arising from use: The Human Element.”

Minor editorial revisions were discussed, such as the elimination of all personal pronouns, the judicious use of adjectives, and the deletion of detailed explanations of corollary points when such explanations could be found elsewhere in the professional literature.

Discussion next centered around the tables presented in the study. Critics of the first draft had indicated an interest in absolute figures, much less interest in percentages. It was suggested, for instance, that in Table 1 only total figures be supplied; percentages could be used in the text whenever they appeared to be significant. It was recommended that Table 2 also be revised so that all the raw data could be examined together at a glance. No percentage figures would be included in Table 2. Critics of the first draft of the report had indicated a distaste for the system adopted for the coding of library categories and patron categories. Considerable discussion centered around the use of such terms as “large campus” and “middling small campus.” It was agreed that whatever terms were finally used each term should be clearly defined in terms of the number of volumes in the library and the number of cards in the catalog.

It was the opinion of the Board that the Catalog Use Study was likely to be basic to future studies in the field. Consequently, it was considered essential that the report be prepared as carefully as possible. It now appears that the final report of the draft will be available by mid-December. The Board expressed the hope that the report could be published by ALA. Authorization for publishing will be sought from the DCC Committee on Publications. The final report is expected to be between 100 and 150 pages in length. It was also decided that the Chairman would request $100.00 to cover the cost of reproducing the final draft.

Dr. Jackson mentioned earlier that the interview reports themselves contained information that could be further exploited beyond anything
related directly to the present study. It was not considered advisable to return the interview reports to the originating libraries until the questions regarding further use of these reports could be settled. Dr. Jackson suggested that the interview reports which contain comments on the reverse of the form—these would number about 500—might be photographed, at one-third reduction in size, so that the notes on the back could be placed on the front of the reproduced copy. It was suggested that Vaclav Mostecky might be interested in analyzing these 500 reports. Dr. Jackson asked that the Board consider the possibility of using the interview reports to develop a case book which could serve as a teaching instrument. Dr. Tauber suggested that the idea of the case book be presented to Robert D. Leigh and, if he approves, to the Editorial Board of the Columbia School of Library Service, to be considered for offset publication. Permission to publish would be sought from the DCC Committee on Publications and the DCC Executive Board. It was further suggested that the 5500 punched cards should also be preserved for the present.

Dr. Jackson in his progress report had also asked the Board to consider the possibility of building a file which might be used in relation to semantics studies on subject heading development, studies such as have been made by Jay E. Daily and Oliver Lilley. Past studies treat of this problem in an abstract way, while the findings from the present study produce a different kind of evidence related to the same field. Dr. Jackson recommended that the institution which housed the interview reports and was interested in the case study project should also be granted the privilege of developing the semantics study. This proposal will also be presented to Dr. Leigh.

Velva Jeanne Osborn’s study on the Midwest Inter-Library Center was mentioned, and the Chairman was instructed to write Harold Lancour to inquire about the publication of the Osborn report which was to have appeared in the Spring of 1956 as a number of the University of Illinois Occasional Papers.

The next item of business was the budget estimate for 1957 which the Executive Secretary of DCC had asked the Chairman to submit. The Board on Cataloging Policy and Research has never submitted a budget estimate. Operating expenses, which include travel expenses for Board members for the two meetings held in the Spring and Fall, are estimated to run about $200.00 a year. A letter from the Chairman of DCC indicated that an estimate was also desired for the program budget. The role of the Board is a crucial question in any consideration of budget estimates. If the Board is an adjunct of the Executive Board and designed to discuss matters of policy and research which are routed to it for consideration, no program budget as such would seem to be required. The proposals made by the Board ultimately affect the budget requirements of other committees of DCC, but the effect would not be felt until specific recommendations were scheduled to be incorporated into an activities program. In discussing the role of the Board it was brought out that it would be helpful to the Chairman of the Board if he could receive the
reports of other DCC Chairmen. The Board also indicated that it would like to have the Chairman plan with Mrs. Mahoney a joint meeting of the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research and the DCC Executive Board at the Midwinter meeting in Chicago.

The Board noted the proposals made for an ALA monograph series which would be designed to incorporate into one series the material presently being published in *ACRL Monographs* and the *Public Library Reporter*. The Board heartily endorsed the recommendations that there be one monograph series for all ALA divisions.

The question of how the Board could best be kept informed of the progress of the code revision program was next discussed, and it was suggested that Wyliss E. Wright advise the Chairman about the availability of copies of progress reports. Several Board members will receive these copies in their capacities as members of the Advisory Committee to the Catalog Code Revision Committee.

The Chairman reported on the action taken by the National Library of Medicine and the Library of Congress in response to a suggestion by the Board that a study be made of the use of book catalogs as substitutes for card catalogs. John L. Nolan and Estelle Brodman had delayed work on this project awaiting the results of the Catalog Use Study. The Board suggested that there was no necessary relationship and recommended that the study be made as soon as possible.

The Chairman reported that the President of DCC had written to him concerning the proposed program for the Kansas City meeting. In view of the fact that there may be a joint division of cataloging and acquisitions by January 1, 1957, the program of the Kansas City meeting may undergo revision. It is expected that code revision will be the topic for one program in Kansas City, but it is not possible at this time to say whether the plans for a program on documentation can be carried through. The Board questioned whether, considering the material already in print on the question of documentation, anything meaningful could be contributed by a discussion of the subject at Kansas City. Documentation is essentially concerned with access to subject material and therefore is not necessarily closely related to code revision problems. It was suggested that catalogers must first be convinced that the subject catalog can be drastically changed with benefit to all before they take seriously some of the developments in the field of documentation.

David J. Haykin has requested that Board members assist him "in setting up a list of persons with special competence and interest in subject headings" who would be able to assist him in the work of compiling a subject heading code, through reading and criticising drafts of sections of the code as they are prepared. Members of the Board were instructed by the Chairman to send their recommendations directly to Mr. Haykin.

The Board noted with great interest the establishment of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., made possible by a five million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation and described in the *New York Times* as a "major new effort to cope with the growing size and complexity of li-
The Board questioned whether there was any way in which it could offer its services to this new organization. The consensus was that such groups usually sought the advice of interested persons in determining the relative merits of suggested proposals. It was agreed that a letter should go to Mrs. Mahoney with the suggestion that DCC on its own initiative or through ALA bring to the attention of the Council the role the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research plays within the DCC and the manner in which the Board considers projects brought before it. It was further recommended that DCC consider the possibility of hiring someone for a stipulated period of time to work up projects suggested in the past, with the object of developing studies of submission to the Council on Library Resources, Inc.

It was agreed that the Chairman of the Board would suggest to Mrs. Mahoney that two Board meetings be scheduled during the Midwinter conference of ALA, one of these meetings to be a joint meeting with the Executive Board.—Prepared by Margaret C. Brown.

REGIONAL GROUPS

Now that ALA reorganization is in actual progress, leaving some measure of uncertainty as to the future character and scope of regional group activity, it seems a proper time to stop and consider our present position and to think what direction we would like to take from here.

Geographically, we have groups in every section of the United States and one in Canada. Some individuals belong to both state and interstate groups; some to city, state and interstate groups, and some to two interstate groups. This is not the apparent excess in organization that appears at first glance, since the nature of each group differs, and one is not a substitute for another. We live in a large and heterogeneous land, and regional groups reflect that. Heavily populated library areas with easy lines of communication can afford and profit by a much higher degree of organization than more sparsely populated regions. But wherever there are libraries there should be some regional group organization through which cataloging and related problems can be discussed and if need be channeled to some phase of Division organization.

How far have we realized that ideal? In terms of the larger areas, we have groups for the Pacific Northwest, the Mountain Plains, the Southeast, the Ohio Valley, and the Maryland, Virginia, District of Columbia area. This leaves the Northeast, the Southwest, and parts of the Middle Western and East Central states not covered by an interstate group. The Middle West and the Northeast are fairly adequately represented by state and/or local groups. There are two state groups in the Southwest, the remaining states being without a regional catalog group although belonging to a regional library association, which makes communication facilities available. Some of the more densely populated areas have local groups but no state group. For example, Philadelphia has a regional group; but neither the state of Pennsylvania nor its other metropolitan centers have an organization. New York City has a large group, the rest of the Empire State does not. In Canada, Ontario has a group, and part of the provinces are included in the Pacific Northwest group. Looking over the map of regional groups, then, we can conclude that, although there are...
a few possibilities for further groups to organize, the English speaking area is pretty well organized as far as cataloging is concerned. There remains the challenge of what we can do for our Latin American neighbors.

So we have the geographical organization. How well does it function?

Regional groups meet anywhere from quarterly to biennially. They vary in membership and attendance from ten or fifteen to over one hundred, and the personnel of that membership runs the gamut from sparsely populated agrarian areas with small general libraries to highly sophisticated metropolitan areas dominated by large research libraries. In short, regional catalog groups are an adequate cross section of the library world and have adjusted themselves accordingly. A biennial meeting may settle for a guest speaker or a panel discussion, whereas a group that meets quarterly can devote itself to a comprehensive series of studies on one special topic; as did the Philadelphia Group with its study of the divided catalog this past year; or, it can set itself up as a service group for the community as have the Miami Catalogers, who are making cataloging history by establishing their regional group as the cataloging service experts of the area and thereby accomplishing a unique job in public relations. The Ohio Valley Group at their annual meeting offered a special consultation service for the "one man library" group, giving overworked librarians an opportunity to talk over their cataloging problems with the professionals. Groups as a whole have discussed the new edition of Dewey and the proposals for the new cataloging code.

It is your Chairman's opinion that the broad regional representation and the varied character of individual regional groups constitute a background for dynamic organizational activity that can be put to a much more effective use than at present exists. Regional group officers know the leaders in their groups and are in position to give sound help to DCC in selecting committee members and officer candidates and thus helping to keep the national organization alive with new blood. Regional groups can provide a superb sampling for anything from a public opinion poll to a pilot study. At the present time we are not functioning to the highest advantage on these levels but tend to function primarily at an isolated level of individuality. Geographically we have almost reached the saturation point. Professionally we should be reaching maturity and sophistication as catalogers. The time for the next big step forward is here. Our type of organization is unique in ALA. We have the machinery, set up and working, to provide a dynamic new concept for the new cataloging division of the new ALA. What part are we as a Council of Regional Groups willing to play in building this new world of librarianship?

* * * *

The 1955 annual meeting of the Catalogers and Classifiers Section of the Connecticut Library Association took place in Washington, Conn. Donald G. Wing, Yale University Library, spoke on the "Three-Pronged Approach" (gifts, exchanges, purchases). His talk emphasized Yale's way of handling little-used books in a special "w" collection. These books are described briefly and shelved by size. No money is spent in rebinding; a book in poor condition is boxed. This practice has an important place in freeing the library shelves of minor works, unused duplicates, books in bad condition, etc. Then the duplicates are available for substitution of worn out copies of much used books. This collection is cataloged very briefly.

The 1956 meeting was held in Darien. Bernice Merritt, Darien librarian, outlined the development, purpose, plan and present status of the Westchester Union Catalog. The second
speaker, Donald Engley, Librarian at Trinity College, Hartford, described the Watkinson Library now located at the College.

The MOUNTAIN PLAINS REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS met in Logan, Utah, September 14, with Irene Bogan, Chairman, presiding. Mrs. Bogan reported on her attendance at the Graduate Library School Conference at Chicago, which had for a topic "Toward a Better Cataloging Code." She then introduced the guest speaker, Orcena Mahoney, who spoke on recent developments in the cataloging field, emphasizing code revision. She also included other current cataloging topics: The 16th edition of the DDC, The 6th edition of the LC subject heading list, The subject heading code which David Haykin is writing, and some of the problems of reorganization which face DCC in the light of the Management Survey.

The NEW YORK REGIONAL CATALOG GROUP’s spring meeting in San Francisco. The theme was "Work Simplification." Margaret Uridge and Joseph Ryus, University of California, held a joint discussion, with Mrs. Uridge presenting the theory, and Mr. Ryus the practical application. Carl Cox, Chief of Technical Services, California State Library, described simplifications and speed-up methods that he had found effective.—Henrietta Howell, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups.

REVIEWS


Two essential facts about the classification scheme are omitted from the title page: 1) it is, for all its deviations, a version of the Dewey Decimal Classification and 2) is in a direct line of succession to the L. N. Tropovskii abridgment of Dewey, the second edition of which was issued posthumously. In spite of the generous use

in this scheme of letters as a device for giving primacy to the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin literature, to the Soviet Union, and to the countries within its orbit, there is no escaping the fact that the scheme is based on Dewey. While Tropovskii in his introduction (p. 5-6) unequivocally states that his schedules are taken from Dewey (a fact clearly shown by the schedules themselves), the present scheme nowhere mentions Dewey, although it is based on Tropovskii.

The scheme presents two important changes from Tropovskii’s "short schedules." The use of special devices for giving primacy to the classics of communism and books about the USSR and the "people’s republics" has been considerably extended. In fact, hardly a class or division is free of letter symbols, the use of which, incidentally, the Dewey Decimal Classification is chary in recommending at all. Thus, in order to put dialectical materialism ahead of all other topics in philosophy
a letter M is appended to the class symbol, i.e., 1M. Since historical materialism must according to the scheme follow 1M, another letter symbol, the Russian initial for "historical," is added. Primacy for Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party of the USSR is secured by adding to the class number for the social science the letters K (for "Communism") and the Russian letters for KP ("Communist Party") respectively.

The other important change consists in the interpolation of letters to secure a desired order or grouping of subjects, as in the 6's (the 600's of Dewey), e.g., 6 T for the transportation industries, 6C (Russian S) for the construction industries (including roads and sanitation). In the substitution of a letter for the figure 2 in 62 (620 in Dewey) very little is actually achieved, since the judicious insertion of the letter would have accomplished at least as much and left intact both Tropovskii's and the official version of the Decimal Classification. There is, in fact, on all sides, evidence of a studied attempt to substitute a mixed notation for a pure one.

Paralleling the removal, in American libraries, of fiction from the literature classification, the scheme creates a simple letter-class R (Russian "P") for Russian literature with RF for Russian folklore, R1 for Russian literature before "the Great October socialist revolution" and R2 for Soviet Russian literature. However, it goes further by withdrawing literary works of all other literature and, by similar means, making separate provision for 1) the literatures of the "people's democracies and democratic republics," 2) the literatures of foreign countries, and 3) ancient literatures. It should be noted that letters are used here, as in other parts of the scheme, without regard to normal Russian alphabetic order, e.g., ND for the literatures of the "democracies" and "republics" follows R for Russian literature and S for the literatures of the other peoples of the USSR.

Twenty pages of prefatory matter preceding the 52 of the schedules consist of "general instructions on the use of the use of the scheme" (in effect no more than an explanation of its structure and notation) and "brief methodological instructions on classifying printed works." The latter include guidance on the treatment of the "classics of Marxism-Leninism" and the decisions of the Communist party and the Soviet government. It is interesting to note that the heading of this section refers simply to "the party and the government."

While the scheme is to a degree an expansion of the second edition of Tropovskii's work, it does not gain anything substantial by replacing his numbers with an arbitrary, presumably mnemonic, mixed notation of figures and letters. Its placing of Communist philosophy and theory and of the USSR in a position of primacy is understandable. However, to a librarian in the Western World, the failure to provide for a large body of subject matter commonly found in libraries outside the USSR, such as religion, and the distortion of subject relationships in many parts of the system of classification are past comprehension. They point to the deliberate omission of part of the record of civilization as a prelude to denying its existence.—David J. Haykin, Specialist in Subject Cataloging and Classification, Library of Congress.


New methods for analyzing and indexing are necessary if we are to make use of the magnificent array of machines that are now available for automatic searching, and James Perry and his associates have been working for many years on this problem. Just how complex it is can be seen from the papers they present in this volume.

To the librarian who hopes for a quick solution to the handling of the vast quantities of scientific and technical literature which have been produced in recent years, this book will be discouraging. It is obvious that even after years of work, these researchers feel the solution is not yet at hand. The machines are here, but the methods for using them must still be developed.

As the authors very justly point out, "In developing new tools and methods for coping with this problem, it is particularly important to avoid the 'panacea' philosophy. The uncontrolled or careless use of terminology is a particularly dangerous pitfall. No device, simple or complicated, can compensate for thoughtlessness in the analysis of information, or for sloppiness in the use of terminology."

The warnings about the problems encountered in using conventional subject indexes that do not utilize machines are also very well worth noting. Synonyms, near synonyms, and homonyms cause unexpected difficulties. The section on "Human Limitations and Knowledge" is full of alarming evidence of our weaknesses.

(For the past year, the Naval Ordnance Test Station at Pasadena has been using the IBM 701 calculator for searching its coordinate index (the subject index of its report collection). From this operation, I am very much aware of the importance of the problems that Dr. Perry and his associates emphasize. Successful teamwork between indexer, index user, encoder, and the person who is assigned the task of retrieving needed information is of prime importance. In the failures that we have encountered, automatic searching failed to produce an answer, and a second visual search of the same material showed that information was available. Very carefully controlled searches would be necessary to show whether the error were in indexing, encoding, framing of the question, or the capability of the retrieval assistant.)

In "A Look into the Future" the authors mention that greater effectiveness and economy can be achieved by coordination of centralized processing and specialized use of materials in specific fields. They emphasize that careful thought should be devoted to establishing an appropriate division of labor between centralized processing of graphic records on a 'wholesale' basis and utilization of such processing on a 'retail' basis." It would be hard to overemphasize the importance of such work. Certainly every librarian now working in this field must be aware of the terrible duplication of effort in cataloging, analyzing, and indexing that exists today.

Of special interest will be the subject heading lists and classification schemes, the dictionaries and glossaries of terms, and the annotated bibliography, "Automation in the Library," by Helen E. Loftus, included in the volume.—Marguerite L. Seager, Head, Pasadena Annex Technical Library, USNOTS, Pasadena, California
It is the writer's opinion that in all of these papers there is too much emphasis on scientific principles and not enough stress on practice work. Granted that the daily drill in cataloging classes leaves only little time to study for other courses, but is not the same true of reference courses? There cannot be any substitute for practice work in cataloging courses, because that is what the actual job situation asks for. There may be local differences as to cataloging policies according to the type and size of the library, but it should not be too difficult for a student with a thorough practice in cataloging procedures to adjust to minor variations.

The student first has to gain some control of the intellectual skill of cataloging before he will be able to see the cataloging specialty in the whole range of library services. An integrated and coherent view of the relationship of the various library activities will develop gradually through working experience and through continued interest in new developments and current progress in the field of library science. In the final analysis, it is ideas that allow us to see the interconnection between the "separated" library departments and even to envisage new ways and methods of library organization—and these ideas cannot stand at the beginning of a library career. —Lucy Selig, Cataloger, Dayton (Ohio) Public Library.

COMMENT ON ROGERS REVIEW

Cyril Barnard comments concerning Colonel Rogers' review of his classification scheme (cf. Journal of Cataloging and Classification 12:116, April, 1956): "In discussing the example of notation, JC.RRS.D.394, Col. Rogers writes '... difficulties may arise as to the order of priority in which tables should be used'. This question is fully discussed on p. 13 of the Introduction. He continues '... there is also the outside possibility of confusing symbols from the various tables'. If the instructions at the head of each table are followed, this possibility is not even 'outside'! While it is true that RS in Table 7 means Repair, in Table 10 it means Spleen, and in Table 11 it means Scitamineae, .RRS can only mean "Injection including artificial pneumothorax", the use of Tables 10 and 11 being definitely excluded after .R without employing some special device such as parentheses.

"Later on Colonel Rogers seems to assume that the scheme is for use only in the library of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. If this were so there would have been no need to publish it at all! His criticism that there is an average of 5 pigeon-holes for each book is therefore entirely beside the point. The scheme has been published so that it may be used for all kinds of medical libraries and no two libraries will require exactly the same 'pigeon-holes'. Moreover it is intended for use in classifying reprints, and even bibliographical references in current indexes to periodicals, as well as for books. As I said in my paper at the First International Congress on Medical Librarianship, to which Colonel Rogers refers, 'the majority of books in fact needs no more than two or
three' letters of the notation. This is certainly true of the library of the
library of the London School of Hygiene. The reviewer's little joke about
crossword puzzles need not therefore be taken very seriously."

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION GRANT

The Rockefeller Foundation has made a grant of $6,000 to the Library
of Congress to permit the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials to
develop a new union-list program. The aim is a permanent and self-
sustaining union list of serials.

Wyllis E. Wright, who is librarian of Williams College and who for
fifteen years was chairman of the Joint Committee, will spend the next
three months, largely at the Library of Congress, carrying out the basic
investigations. The new program is necessary because editing and pub­
lishing costs, plus the expense libraries must face in periodically checking
their holdings, make further editions of the Union List of Serials along
traditional lines almost prohibitive. Also the Joint Committee is aware
that other union-list activities deserve attention especially in those areas
in which some publication has already taken place (foreign government
publications, international congresses, American newspapers).

The general goal is to establish at the Library of Congress a Union
Catalog of Serials. From this catalog union list of various kinds—alpha­
betical, subject, country or region, etc.—could be produced systematically.
The work would dovetail with New Serial Titles whose first five-year
cumulation, published last year, represents a stage in the union-list pro­
gram. At the same time the Joint Committee is exploring ways of keeping
the Union List of Serials as such in print in some form or another, pre­
ferably with some changes and additions.

INTERNSHIP IN DOCUMENTATION

A work-study program to aid students in preparing for library service
in the physical sciences has just been announced by Ethyl Corp. Research
Laboratories of Detroit, Michigan, and the School of Library Science of
Western Reserve University in Cleveland.

The program is open to college graduates with an undergraduate ma­
jor in chemistry or chemical engineering who will be candidates for either
the master's degree or the doctorate in library science. One such award is
available for the 1957/58 academic year.

The general plan is as follows: the recipient will alternate study at
the School and work in the Information Service Division of Ethyl Corp.
Research Laboratories until he completes the work for his degree. While
at the Ethyl Corp. he will be employed in professional work in technical
documentation, will be considered a temporary employee of the Corpora­
tion, and will be paid an initial stipend of $415-$470 per month, depend­
ing on previous education.

Inquiries should be addressed to Dr. Jesse H. Shera, Dean of the
School of Library Science, Western Reserve University, Cleveland 6, Ohio.
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EDITOR RECOMMENDS:


The two surveyors of the results of the three-year trial of Cooperative services make recommendations for enlarging the area of cooperation and for improving the techniques. These are principally in the areas of book selection, acquisitions and cataloging.


Paul Keabian applies the principles from the Lubetzky report to the practices of the New York Public Library and M. Ruth MacDonald applies them to the Armed Forces Medical Library. F. Bernice Field comments on the two other papers, disagreeing with them sharply. These discussions are most important in the revision of the Catalog Code.


This story typifies that of many older libraries—changing policies reflecting those of the period have resulted in inconsistency and incompatibility of entries.


The theme of this report is "The Book" and, in addition to summarizing the collections and selection policies of the libraries, is a fine essay on the book in the library.


A series of papers which either describe various developments in cataloging or discuss concepts and rules. The papers are concerned with the following topics: (1) [Cutter and Lubetzky], (2) Corporate authorship, (3) Thoughts on cataloging examinations, (4) Public v. cataloger, (5) The dictionary subject approach, (6) "What price the main entry?", (7) The Winter 1955 Examinations, (8) Practical examination cataloging, (9) Technical Libraries and the subject approach, (10) The super cataloger, and (11) The near future. These papers contain provocative ideas on current problems in cataloging as well as proposals for cooperative action for the future. (*Contributed by M. F. Tauber*)