

idea of a "union catalogue" even made its appearance about 1400 when an English Franciscan conceived the idea of making one for all the libraries of the Franciscan order in England.

The range of intellectual interests in the Middle Ages is reflected by an arrangement frequently found in the larger libraries in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By this arrangement the material was divided into seven classes: (1) archives, (2) scriptural texts and commentaries, (3) constitutions, (4) council and synodal proceedings, (5) homilies and epistles of the fathers, (6) lectionaries, (7) legends of martyrdom. This took care of the religious and ecclesiastical material. Secular literature was placed by itself and divided on the basis of the seven liberal arts: grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. The titles in these subdivisions (if the joint contents of various libraries be included) comprised the whole range of Latin literature as we have it today; by 1200, all the works of Aristotle in Latin translation, several books in Greek, and grammars of Greek and Hebrew; also Justinian's Code, Digest, and Institutes.

These few examples must suffice to indicate the varied contents of this invaluable work of reference. No brief review can hope to give more than a suggestion of the wealth of interesting material that it contains.—*Curtis H. Walker, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.*

A Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules Based on the Anglo-American Code of 1908, with Comments on the Rules and on the Prospects for a Further Extension of International Agreement and Co-operation. J. C. M. Hanson. University of Chicago Press, [c1939] 144p.

\$2. (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science.)

WHEN bookmen find at last the long desired "time to write" we are apt to look for the reminiscent fruits of observation and experience. From no librarian would such a book be more welcome than from James Christian Meinich Hanson, professor emeritus of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School, and dean of catalogers. Characteristically, however, the first book which Dr. Hanson issues from his well earned leisure is not leisurely, but a workmanly canvas of the technical basis for increased cooperation among librarians and bibliographers.

Taking from the *Anglo-American Catalog Rules* of 1908, the first 135 rules which deal with the choice of main entry forms, the author digests each in turn in the order made familiar to catalogers by long usefulness. Then systematically he summarizes the practice prescribed by the eighteen major cataloging codes of America and Europe. These codes are listed in the opening pages in full bibliographic detail. For citation in the text a shortened characteristic symbol is used for each. Thus, BM refers to the *British Museum Rules*, FR to the *Règles et usages* of the *Association des Bibliothécaires Français*. Included are two English codes (*British Museum, Cambridge University*), two German codes (*Munich, Prussian Instruktionen*), two Swiss codes (*Basel, Zurich*), two Italian (*Italian government, Vatican*), and one each *Belgian, Danish, Dutch, French, Norwegian, Spanish, and Swedish*. Of these Dr. Hanson cites the *Prussian the Anglo-American, and the Vatican codes* as the most influential. Dates of issue vary from *Cutter, 1904*, to the *Vatican Norme, 1931*. The latter is now in process of revision and reissue and

the new edition was available to Dr. Hanson in proofsheets form.

The author says in the closing chapter:

It is believed that the comparison of the Anglo-American Rules 1-135 with the corresponding rules in the other eighteen codes has served to demonstrate how much remains to be done before we can claim any approximation to a general agreement on headings and entry word. Here, as in so many other fields . . . progress toward an international agreement and consequent cooperation has been, and will no doubt continue to be, slow and arduous.

With a steady and rapid improvement in travel facilities and the consequent increase in the number of scholars and investigators who come to rely on the libraries and book resources not only of their own countries but of the world, it has become obvious that it is the duty of librarians to seek for more uniformity in bibliographic records and methods of administration, in order that students shall not be obliged to learn a new system whenever they pass from one country to another.

The study was initiated by Professor Hanson as a project for Margarethe Brandt, when she was a student at the graduate library school. Her untimely death made its continuation impossible. Since his retirement from active teaching, Dr. Hanson has brought it to completion. As chairman of the American committee which compiled the Anglo-American *Catalog Rules* of 1908 of which he was editor, Dr. Hanson has a unique and intimate understanding of them and of the basic reasons for the form they took. As a member of the committee charged with their revision and expansion, now in progress, he has compiled a working basis, a frame of reference, for the new committee's procedure which may justly be rated as invaluable. That the committee's deliberations are to be founded upon this mature consideration of world-wide practice

will add many cubits to the stature of their decisions. Without Dr. Hanson's painstaking, discerning analysis of these eighteen widely varying sets of rules, in nine languages, comparative consideration would be much more difficult and almost certainly less thorough.

The greatest variation in major practice is found in the matters of corporate authors and in the emphasis on catchwords, in contrast to the Anglo-American use of the first word not an article in title entries. The summary of the history of usage in regard to societies, governments, and organizations (Part III) is particularly interesting because of Dr. Hanson's participation in the events which led to the crystallization of the American rules. They were based largely on the precedents established by Charles A. Cutter and the Library of Congress, where Dr. Hanson was chief of the catalog division from 1897 to 1910. He traces the German preference for title entry for such materials, which to American catalogers seems strangely indefinite, partially to "tradition and innate conservatism," and suspects "both academic and economic considerations" for its retention.

The far greater prevalence abroad of chief entry under title is rather appalling to the cataloger familiar chiefly with the Anglo-American code. Dr. Hanson translates and summarizes in detail the rules of the Basel University Library *Katalog-Instruktion* on this point. It prescribes an elaborate system of catchword entries, providing seemingly for every possible variant. Numerous changes of case, order, and form are directed in order to bring together similar entries. Here are endless problems for the codifiers and those who would establish uniform entry practice, in addition to many lesser points

of variance, each supported by long usage and arguments worthy of consideration.

Dr. Hanson's concluding statement pointing out the latitude in details and the agreement in entry form essential to true cooperation is worthy of profound consideration by catalogers, administrators, and teachers of cataloging whose tithing of mint and cumin too often has defeated their own admirable purposes.

It is to be sincerely hoped that Dr. Hanson's remoter purpose, increasing harmony of catalog practice throughout the world, may be served as well as the revision of the American *Rules*. So modestly presented and so scholarly a contribution will surely invite the favorable consideration of foreign bibliographers.—*Jeannette Murphy Lynn, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.*

Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook. No.

8. American Library Association. Catalog Section. American Library Association, 1940. 152p. \$2.25.

THOUGH THE articles included in the eighth *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* are too numerous to mention individually, the sketch of Charles H. Hastings and his work in the Library of Congress card division, and the two articles, one by and one about the late Dorcas Fellows, will be of particular interest.

Two groups of articles, one on the question of union catalogs and one on the division of the catalog, are particularly timely. Are union catalogs really answering a felt need; are there additional services which union catalogs should perform; are union catalogs demanding an amount of effort in their mere physical upkeep disproportionate to their value? These questions are discussed in two articles, the general conclusion being that

those who have union catalogs should endeavor continually to improve and utilize all of their potential services, and that those contemplating installing new ones should consider every angle carefully before deciding the scope and essential functions of their tool.

Ablly discussed in four articles are the questions: Shall the catalog, which in many large institutions is fast outgrowing its quarters or taking on such gargantuan proportions as to frighten the timid, uninitiated user, be divided into two or three parts? In the catalog divided into two or three parts, is there not danger, due to the necessary duplication of many entries, of each part becoming in turn an unmanageable dictionary catalog? Shall the catalog be divided by dates? Shall it be greatly simplified and kept together? That the day of reckoning has come for the large catalog, and that its fate rests with the future and individual institutions are the conclusions reached.

The papers presented indicate within the ranks of catalogers a resourcefulness and initiative which speaks well for the future. Far from being an unimaginative, routine-minded group, the unenviable reputation which catalogers have in the past held with some other branches of the library profession, they seem to be about to take on the characteristics of the ancient Athenians who "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." Concerning these "new things," catalogers are showing not only a willingness but an eagerness to make changes in routines which have become stumbling blocks and to undertake any task no matter how grueling the details, so long as it will bear as its fruit a better service to the library public.—*Frances L. Yocom, Fisk University, Nashville.*