

administrators have been leaving these problems to the catalogers. Suddenly they have realized their own responsibilities in this field—responsibilities of making major policies of far-spreading effects—which cannot be delegated to a single department. Along with this realization has come a terrifying feeling of inadequacy because the problems are staggering in their proportions and the administrators have lost the contacts necessary to their solution.

They are having to rely very largely on the advice and experience of those “technicians” whom a few alarmists have urged them to distrust. Hence the recent great concern on the part of some library administrators. If there is a crisis in cataloging it is not a general crisis closely associated with and attributable to the publication of the new edition of the *Rules* but an individual problem to be faced courageously at home.

By FLORA B. LUDINGTON

The New Code and the College Library

Miss Ludington is librarian, Williston Memorial Library, Mount Holyoke College.

Library administrators, in the last few months, have been going to school to the catalogers. The classes have been analogous to those in the medical profession known as refresher courses. Their success has been in proportion to the knowledge and interest of the administrator. I have been attending such a seminar, and for much that follows I am indebted to the catalogers of the Mount Holyoke College library who were my teachers. These discussions served to sharpen my realization of cataloging minutiae and of changes that have crept into its procedures in the years since I profited by the teaching of Jennie Dorcas Fellows. In spite of Dr. Bishop's warning that I should never try to do reference work without having had cataloging experience, I did serve as a reference librarian for a number of years.

My administrative experience is of shorter duration, but in the past few years I have become sharply aware of the administrative problems related to cataloging. These problems all relate to making material promptly and readily available and the costs in so doing. The library catalog, key to the accessibility of this material, is newly related to these problems in the light of the revised code of cataloging.

This preliminary American second edition very largely codifies existing practice. It arranges in a form which is readily consulted cataloging procedures of the Library of Congress developed in the past forty years. Needless to say, they have changed during this period. They have changed since the 1908 code was published and they will continue to change. Aside from the need to codify Library of Congress practice, it was especially desirable to clarify many points for libraries doing cooperative cataloging and for those listing their holdings in union catalogs. The

new code is a finely comprehensive piece of work. It provides for practically every contingency as a court of appeal in every type of cataloging. It has definite value in codifying rules which Mount Holyoke, for one, has been trying to work out for itself through study of Library of Congress rules and their application to its cards. The time spent in cataloging should be reduced, for by having definite rules in a manual and by accepting such rules as authoritative, unnecessary discussion and indecision can be avoided. The committee has done a distinct service to the profession in making the material in the new code available for consultation. Judgment and discrimination will still be needed in the application of the rules and in adapting them for use in a particular situation.

Dependent upon L.C. Cards

During the years that the Library of Congress has been making its cards available, all libraries have become increasingly dependent upon these printed cards. Mount Holyoke was the eighth library to avail itself of the new service which was established forty years ago this month. During the first year, out of 7035 cards filed in the catalog 3½ per cent were printed Library of Congress cards. In the last year for which figures are available (1936-37) out of 14,400 cards filed, they had risen to 70 per cent. The percentage has increased not only because more cards were issued, but also because by using them, a more satisfactory and uniform catalog would result and at a cost which would be less than if we were to do all the work ourselves. Naturally the percentage of Library of Congress cards used is lower for the universities because of wider curricular spread and a

larger proportion of foreign titles. But both college and university libraries would welcome a further increase in this percentage.

How can this be done? First, by speeding up and streamlining Library of Congress cataloging and the issuing of printed cards. Progress in this regard is already apparent, but books reported as having been received in January 1939 are still being held in December 1941. Titles reported as "on" (books ordered in North America, cards can be expected in twelve weeks) often wait for months.

Second, as we are well aware, the Library of Congress needs to catch up in its arrearage. Ample evidence of this can be found by examination of titles reported as "R" (book has been received, cards may be expected in seven weeks) and of still older vintage are those reported as "Rd" (book received, cataloging delayed, perhaps a year) and "Rdl" (book received, but cataloging will be delayed a long time, possibly five years). In these latter categories can be found such titles, important to college and university libraries, as Lüdtké's *Deutscher Kulturatlas* (waiting since 1935), Furtwängler's *Griechische Vasenmälerei* (since 1937), over twenty volumes issued for the International Geological Congress held in Leningrad in 1937, etc. These are all titles which will be found in many college and university libraries. As things stand, many of us are handling these items for ourselves.

Budget for Noncopyright Books

Third, still another way to increase the use of printed cards would be the provision of a more generous budget for the Library of Congress itself for noncopyright books, largely ones published in

England and outside the United States. New English titles are now being included in cooperative cataloging and cards are thus made available, but many an "np" book is one which should be found in our national library.

Fourth, prompt reporting to the union catalog for all items reported by the Library of Congress as "np," or not printed, should be incumbent on all of us and as a corollary a provision for automatic searching in the union catalog for all titles lacking in the Library of Congress depository. This service is, I believe, now available to libraries doing cooperative cataloging. I wish it might be extended to all libraries, and that the formulae for Library of Congress card orders could be changed so that libraries electing the service could have all "np" titles automatically searched and a report made of other libraries that had already cataloged the volumes. Photostatic copies of the cards could then be secured from those libraries.

One further point before I leave the subject of the Library of Congress and its cataloging, and that is the very great desirability of the printing of the Library of Congress depository catalog at the earliest possible date. This would help all of us to establish author entries and in deciding the number of cards to order when older titles are being handled. Keeping the catalog up to date is still another matter which will engage the A.L.A. committee concerned with the project.

You may very well ask what bearing have these observations of the Library of Congress card service on the new cataloging code. My categorical answer is, a great deal indeed. The code which we now have before us is a record of past Library of

Congress practices which have resulted in vast arrearage in cataloging in our great national library. It has resulted in provoking serious delay in issuing cards for books which are now in Washington waiting cataloging for weeks, months, and even years. If this arrearage is to continue to snowball, then something must be done about it. The Descriptive Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress is already pointing the way; we as college librarians should give it our support. The intelligent leadership which has long been the tradition of the Library of Congress, as evidenced by the publication of the first printed cards, is again to the fore. In advocating changes which, at first glance, may seem to be radical but which retain the essential features of good cataloging practice, the Library of Congress promises to be in a position to accelerate its service to our libraries, large and small, popular and scholarly alike.

New Code Based on Established Practice

At this point let us examine the new code, which is based on established practice, and see what portions of it warrant retention by the Library of Congress and what portions can be modified in the interests of economy and efficiency of the card service.

The committee was most wise in its decision to issue the code in two parts. This was logical not only for ease of consultation but also for the possibility of simplification. Part I of the code is very properly legalistic in its approach to the problem of main entries. By codifying already established rules, the committee has been scholarly in its grasp and solution of problems. It is here that there should be a fair degree of uniformity, not only in a single library but among libraries in gen-

eral. With the increase of union catalogs this is of primary importance for if filing problems are not solved at their source by adequate and accurate entries, the cost is simply passed on to another agency.

There are, however, special classes of entries which merit comment. The first of these is the perplexing problem of the corporate entry. Here the rules are hard to follow and occasionally tend to pass over the sound bibliographical principle of describing the physical object in hand. In our, perhaps commendable, zeal to bring all entries of an issuing agency together, we frequently force the users of our catalogs to shuttle back and forth from one section of the alphabet to another and to cope with drawers of cards listing publications of a single governmental agency or a learned society. The human mind and memory are so constituted that a book is most apt to be remembered by subject or according to information found on the title page. Would stricter adherence to the data given on the title pages of these books help to break up the long files which will continue to result from our present practice? Books issued by societies or governmental agencies are notoriously difficult to locate. The problems involved are not easy of solution. J. C. M. Hanson has stated the difficulties more clearly than I can in his article "Corporate Authorship versus Title Entry."¹ In this article Mr. Hanson records his doubt concerning practices which have been followed for forty years and makes a number of concrete suggestions. The new rules boldly attack many of the problems involved; they will help to solve some of them, but it is my belief that further thought and study are indicated. For example, the rules (no. 71-102) do not state which authorities to pre-

¹ *Library Quarterly* 5:455-66, Oct. 1935.

fer in establishing the headings if there is a conflict among those consulted. On the authority card used as an illustration in Appendix V (p. 340) we find an entry for Massachusetts. "Special Commission on Security Laws." (Created by Chapter 37 of the Resolves of 1937.) Cross references are given from two other possible forms and from the title page wording "Massachusetts special commission on study of laws regulating promotion and sale of securities." Not one of these wordings actually appears in Chapter 37 of the Resolves of 1937, though the title page form comes close to agreeing with the entry selected. It is evident from a study of the wording of a number of resolves creating commissions that a simplified wording has to be adopted for the author entry. But no special rule covers the following:

Massachusetts. *Special commission to study and revise laws relating to public welfare.*
Report. 1936. [36-27943]

T-p reads. Special commission established to study and revise the laws relating to public welfare.

Chap. 56, Resolves of 1935. Uses same wording.

Massachusetts. *Special commission to investigate the laws relative to dependent delinquent and neglected children.*

Report. 1931. [35-89]

T-p reads. Special commission established to investigate . . .

Massachusetts. *Special commission on public health laws and policies.*

Report. 1936. [37-27570]

T-p reads. Special commission to study and investigate public health . . .

Chap. 11, Resolves of 1935.

Chap. 32, Resolves of 1936.

Wording in these includes phrase to study and investigate.

Massachusetts. *Special commission on activities within this commonwealth of communistic, fascist, Nazi and other subversive organizations.*

Report. 1938. [32-28436]

T-p reads. Special commission *to investigate the activities* . . .

Chap. 32, Resolves of 1937 reads.

Special commission relative to the activities . . .

In some cases the words "to study," "to investigate," "to revise" have been retained, in other instances they have been dropped so it is necessary to make numerous cross references or to force the students to go through endless cards under Massachusetts. Would it not be less confusing to follow the title page form since it is most surely the one which will be used by the bibliographer citing the item in a bibliography? The code does not help us with the perplexing problem as to what to do when a new governmental agency is set up, especially if it has formerly been a division of an old one. When is a new bureau really a new entity? The Library of Congress can help us if it will explain the principles underlying its procedures in setting up main headings and subheadings.

Series Entry Rules

The rules relating to series entries may also be debated, especially the one (219c) which instructs the cataloger to "give imprint for a current series as for an open entry, and in collation line leave space for volumes but indicate size. Do not attempt to keep imprint and collation up to date as later volumes are added." (p. 216) The simpler rule in the 1908 code (no. 128) is easier to follow in that imprint and collation are omitted. Since the analytical cards which will be made under the separate volumes of the series will give the imprint and collation, would it not be possible to return to the earlier and simpler form?

Rule 220c provides for the use of the

unit card for analytical entries where contents or partial contents are shown. My own experience in showing students how to use the catalog leads me to believe that the use of unit cards for analytics, especially if the volume contains a number of items and the contents note extends to a second or even a third card, is confusing. A simpler typed form will save the time of the reference department and the user of the catalog.

The rules for added entries also warrant close study. Particular attention should be paid to rule 223b5. "For all works of any character bearing a distinctive or striking title; make partial entry in cases where a subtitle, alternative title, or some striking part of the title (catchword title) is likely to be remembered, but prefer a subject heading, or a reference to a subject heading, where the title heading would be the same." (p. 232) Use of title entries should be avoided as much as possible for nondistinctive titles beginning with "One act plays," "Essays of," "Life of," "Short history of," "Principles of," "Textbook on," "Outline of," etc. This quoted rule is of such great importance that I wish some telling examples had been given.

Another point can be made in regard to serials which through the vicissitudes of time and editorships have changed their titles. Our practice is to enter under the latest form of the title, even though it may represent the last desperate act of an editor who hopes to revive a waning journal. The result is that a student armed with an *Education Index* reference to the *Social Frontier* is sent to the drawer containing the card for *Frontiers of Democracy*. How many of you using the old *Poole's Index* (1870-81)? From *Scribners Monthly* you were sent to the *Century Illustrated Monthly Maga-*

zine from 1881 to 1930 when *Century* merged with *The Forum*. Would it not be less wasteful of the patron's time if he were given the call number and the library's holdings as to date and volumes on each card with a reference to the latest entry for the full genealogy of the journal?

While still speaking of serials, I have a suggestion to make to the committee. I wish they would consider drawing together all of the rules for serials, noting particular instances where notes relating to editors, illustrations, etc., may be simplified. I wish also that the rules for handling processed material could be drawn together, at least in the index.

Part 1 of the code is concerned with forms of entries and headings. It represents careful and scholarly work. It deserves our endorsement and our pledge to conform to it.

Description of the Book

Part 2 of the code is devoted to the description of the book. The committee warns us that "From the rules in Part 2, however, it is expected that there may be variation in practice not only in small libraries as opposed to large but in the treatment of different classes of material. . . . Close adherence to these rules is not so essential as in the case of author entry." (p. xiii) This statement should not be overlooked or forgotten. Every library will have at least a few rare books and a few special collections the cataloging of which will involve close application of the rules in Part 2 of the code. Unique material in our own college or local history collections should be carefully and meticulously described. It is my hope that Part 2 of the code will be retained and followed in describing special collections. On the other hand, the bulk of our materials,

books purchased for curricular use by undergraduate students, can be described in less detail and still be effective educational tools.

That the Library of Congress is aware of the possibilities of simplification is shown by the revision of its rules now being undertaken and of which Miss Morsch, the chief of its Descriptive Cataloging Division, has told us. It is my hope that in setting up its new manual the Library of Congress will continue its detailed cataloging for rare and unusual items, not only books that will be considered rare by the Library of Congress but also those which may seem to be of intermediate value but which to the college library will certainly border on rarity. If the Library of Congress seeks advice as to the course it should take, I trust that it will include on its committee not only representatives of the larger libraries but also of the 823 college and university libraries with less than two thousand students that subscribe to its card service.

Simplifications

Certain simplifications seem practical for many items of imprint, collation, and notes. The first place of publication and the first publisher is usually enough to identify an item. I doubt if the extended forms are often needed even in the large library. My own instinct is to translate all dates of publication into arabic figures. If the book is an early one, say before 1600 for European books and 1800 for American ones, and the title page date given in Roman numerals, could that not be recognized in a note thus informing the unusual student but clarifying for others.

The physical book is not static, it changes with use and rebinding. Collation rules which give directions for record-

ing preliminary leaves and end paper maps, exact size to one half centimeter, etc., should be given for rare books and limited editions but are not essential for the ordinary trade book which will be read and worn out at least to the extent of re-binding. When rebound the preliminary leaves will disappear and the actual size will change. The chief concern of students and faculty members is with the intellectual book, i.e., the text and the illustrative material which amplifies and explains the text. It is sufficient to give the numbered pages, for the introduction, prefaces, and text proper. If, however, an introduction or preface extends over two or three pages and is not numbered, it should be counted and noted. Information regarding illustrations should be retained but not necessarily in detail. The rule (304) to "separate the illustrative material included in the paging from that not included by a period and a perceptively longer space than is used after a comma" (p. 289) adds little if anything to the value of the catalog or to faculty members' respect for our scholarship.

Notes

As to notes, which are rarely read by students, there are some which are valuable and which would be more apt to be noticed if we indulged ourselves in fewer of them. The bibliography note is one which should always be given especially if reference can be made to specific pages.

Faculty members are not appreciative of our zeal in recording title pages with decorative borders, title page vignettes, or title in black and red and "at the head of title" notes. The merit of the first edition note can be debated. Many publishers of trade books are indicating edition or printing by use of symbols. The phrase "first

edition" by no means guarantees the first issue of the first edition, the one which is valued by the collector. My own instinct is to omit the first edition note unless the edition is a limited one but retain the note for later editions. When it is possible to describe a book accurately on a single card, this should be done. By reducing the collation and notes without loss of meaning, we would be avoiding cards containing continued stories that are rarely read!

The appendices contain much that is valuable and worth while. This is especially true of the rules for incunabula (though they do not follow the injunction given in rule 229 to indicate line endings). The rules for handling music are concise and helpful. The note regarding conventional or standard titles of music should have been emphasized by examples as is done in the *Music Library Association Code for Cataloging Music* (p. 371). The rules for capitalization go back to those established by Cutter, but it is still hard to explain why we capitalize Scotland Yard because it has lost its original meaning but do not capitalize the H in White house! With the present complicated rules, more time is spent in deciding whether to capitalize or not than would be spent in typing capital letters. True, we may gain in consistency but the filing is the same whatever we do. Would it not be easier in the long run if all names of buildings, government offices and officers, geographic names, and titles of honor, whether before or after a name were capitalized in full?

What Do We Want for Our Catalogs?

If time permitted, there are other details in the code which might be mentioned, but the trend of my thinking has been indicated. This is the time when we might well ask ourselves what do we want

for our catalogs? The catalog in its simplest form is an author list of materials. But in order to make the knowledge contained in our books more readily accessible, we in America developed classed and dictionary catalogs. In this way we created bibliographical tools which our patrons are now taking for granted and in all probability will continue to demand. The catalogs in our largest libraries have reached terrifying proportions, so great that some libraries have divided their catalogs in order to break up the huge files. Do we want more added entries and more analytics or would the greater alphabets created by this extension only confound our faculty members and students? Are the details of collation represented in forty-two new rules all essential ones? Are they essential to the great bulk of our collections or can we restrict bibliographical description to our special collections, rare and semirare items? That some libraries are willing to dispense with certain details can be deduced from the fact that 181 college and university libraries are using the H. W. Wilson cards. These cards are exceedingly simple and direct, possibly too simple,

but they are restricted to the somewhat popular titles represented in the *Standard Catalog*.

Several Paths Open

Several paths are open to the committee sponsoring the new code. My belief is that the first part should be retained with slight modification. Ways and means by which the injunction given in the preface to modify and simplify can be carried out could be indicated by illustration. This might be done either by examples in the text, differentiating them typographically or by issuing a supplementary style manual. In making available to the cataloger the scholarly and detailed fashion by which books may be described, we have at last a comprehensive and effective manual. There are few, if any, rules that will not be used and valued by some library. Let us not pass over them hastily or in the interests of what may now seem to be economy. If we simplify too much, the pendulum will surely swing in the other direction later, and the costs which we should be shouldering now will be passed on to those who will follow us.

By MARGARET I. SMITH

The Code and the University Reference Librarian

Miss Smith is superintendent of the reading room, General Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

I might confess at the beginning that this is the first cataloging code that I have ever read straight through. I found it

more interesting than I anticipated and I was so impressed with the wealth of reference material it contains that I am going to speak first of the code as a reference book in itself. It has been said many times before that the catalog is the reference librarian's most important tool but I think