

## Filing Rules for a University Library

*Rules for Filing Cards in the Catalogs of Columbia University Libraries.* Compiled by a Committee of the Cataloging Department. New York, Columbia University Libraries, 1946. vi, 72 numb. leaves.

Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* set the general filing practice for the libraries of the country in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Since then a number of leading public libraries have published their filing codes. The most influential of these, as well as the first, was the one compiled by Margaret Mann for the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. When the public libraries of Cincinnati, Cleveland, New York, and Queens published their filing rules, they all showed the influence of Miss Mann's modifications of Cutter. The trend away from Cutter was still further noticeable in the A.L.A. filing code published in 1942, which might have gone still further in the direction of simple alphabetical filing if it had not attempted to give instead a cross section of then current practice.

During this long period of evolution, college and university libraries published little to compare with the work of their public library colleagues. Now the Cataloging Department of Columbia University Libraries has provided the first full-fledged code of university library practice. As such it is very welcome, for it enables college and university

libraries to compare their practice with that of one of the most important university libraries. This is the distinct value of the compilation, which does not aim at being definitive as can be seen from the facts that it is issued in mimeographed form and that it follows the A.L.A. filing code very closely for the most part.

Work was started on the Columbia rules in 1940. The compilers were able to use the A.L.A. code throughout the various stages of its preparation. They adopted the numbering of rules in that code to facilitate reference and they took over the wording of individual rules verbatim whenever Columbia practice proved to be the same. This was all very wise.

In the debate over classed or alphabetical filing, Columbia sometimes sides with one and sometimes with the other party. Books of the Bible are arranged alphabetically, but the general statement in Rule 24 specifically prefers the classed arrangement based on Cutter. As a consequence Rule 25 prefers to retain the older practice of separating in the catalog the works that an author has written from those he has edited.

The new illustrations in the code will be studied with interest, as well as the general introductory statements, particularly the one on the function of the filer.—*Andrew D. Osborn.*