

Review Articles

A.L.A. Cataloging Rules

A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. 2d ed. Edited by Clara Beetle. Chicago, American Library Association, 1949, xxi, 265p. \$5.00.

The new division of the *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules* is a welcome successor to the preliminary American second edition of 1941. It is improved in arrangement and organization of material. Reference to the text has been made easy by putting rule numbers at top corners and page numbers at the foot of pages. Capitalization in the illustrative examples has been revised to conform to the new library of Congress usage. Excellent typographical form has made the pages clear, well balanced and legible. The proofreading and indexing seem to be flawless.

Comparison of this edition with the preliminary second edition shows that the conspicuous omissions are: (1) Part 2, Description of Book; (2) the authority card; (3) the simplified rules for incunabula. For the first of these we now look to the Library of Congress *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging*. No explanation is given for leaving out the others. The only omission found by this reviewer which seemed accidental is the rule for "atlases which accompany another work."

There is considerable rearrangement of the rules, making on the whole for logical and comprehensible sequence of topics. The numbering has been altered so that there are now 158 instead of 224 rules for entry and heading. This has been accomplished not by omission, but by grouping and subordinating topics in such a way as to show their relation to each other and to the principle that establishes the entry. There is no longer a general section on Title Entry, but there is a new grouping under Works of Doubtful or Unknown Authorship.

Rules for Maps and for Music, much shortened, and stripped of everything not pertaining to choice of entry and form of heading, are to be found in the main body of the text instead of in separate appendixes. It would seem as though it would be more convenient for catalogers who work with special types of material like music, maps or periodicals,

to have together all the rules they need for their special work. One wonders whether rules for entry in one place and rules for imprint, collation and notes in another will hang together happily, but the decision to separate them was not made lightly and experience will prove how it works.

The preface says that the number of alternate rules has been reduced, but this seems to have been done reluctantly. We find them shortened and relegated to footnotes on p.10 (periodicals) and p.63 (anonymous classics). In a few other cases, alternatives have been suggested in the rules. A simpler treatment of Bible headings might well have been included.

Special commendation should be given to certain new, interesting and useful explanatory paragraphs, such as those under Rule 1: General Rule for Authorship; Rule 5: Collections and Serials; Rule 36: Author's Name; Rule 157: Added Entries.

One real error crops up in the Glossary and perhaps also in the text. The meaning of *entry* and *heading* is stated to be the same (cf., Entry; Added Entry; Author Entry; Corporate Entry; Title Entry). Every cataloger knows that many *entries* may be made under one *heading*.

The situation with regard to definitions is confused. There is a glossary (p.229-235), but definitions of terms are also given both in the text of the rules and in footnotes, and explicit page references to them are not given. Most of the definitions are taken from the *A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms* (1943), but some of them (Collection, Composite Work, Periodical) are altered from the phrasing there given. Not all the cataloging terms, of course, are brought over from the *A.L.A. Glossary*, for those belonging to subject cataloging and descriptive cataloging are not pertinent here. Some cataloging terms are defined in the Library of Congress *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging* (1947), but that also refers to the *A.L.A. Glossary* for the more ordinary terms used in imprint and collation. There are now, therefore, three sources for definitions of cataloging terms. These not only

overlap but disagree: there are three definitions of "periodical." None is complete.

More editorial pruning could have been done in a few places. A footnote could have taken care of Ranganathan's information on Indic names (p.124-125) as well as Gosnell's on Spanish names (p.83 and 93), thus eliminating a whole page of fine print. Perhaps the same thing could have been done for Masonic Bodies (p. 160-164), referring to G. M. Churchill's chapter in the Library of Congress *Guide to the Cataloguing of Serial Publications of Societies and Institutions*. In this case there would be the advantage of finding subject headings treated together with author headings.

The code is still bulky and complex, over-weighted with words and details. We have lost, perhaps forever, the simplicity and lucidness of the 1908 code. This no doubt is due in part to the reluctance of catalogers to omit any of the hard-earned store of knowledge they have gathered in 40 years of experience. This code has been through many hands, many eminent authorities have contributed to it, and no one wants any of this work to be wasted. But it needs to be brought into proportion. Greater boldness of editorial policy might have done something, but there is no denying the difficulties involved in cutting down a text like this, especially since it was prepared in response to urgent requests for expansion of the old rules.

This is, however, another thing to consider. Much of the phrasing of the 1908 code was done by C. A. Cutter. There are few members of our profession writing now who can handle the English language with his skill and felicity. We have forgotten to search for simple ways of saying what we mean, and are all too willing to talk about "nonserial monographs" or "monographic publications" when Cutter would have said "books." Examples of labored and clumsy wording abound in current library literature as well as here in our code.

"Divisions, regional offices and other units of departments, bureaus, commissions etc., subordinate to these departments, bureaus, commissions, etc., are usually entered, if required, as subheadings to the departments, bureaus, commissions, etc."—Rule 75B

This may be more explicit, but it is certainly no clearer than:

"Minor divisions and offices are usually to be subordinated to the bureaus or departments of which they form a part."—1908 code, Rule 59.

There is still need for a shorter and simpler set of rules for beginners in cataloging and bibliography, and for libraries which do not make cards for the Library of Congress. A person untrained in cataloging may well be appalled by the amount of detail here presented for personal names, corporate names or anonymous classics, though the essential basic rules are simple, logical and easily understood. (It is not true as stated under Rule 33 for Anonymous Classics that "a series of studies applying the rules to special literary groups is essential before basic principles of entry can be considered standardized and necessary exceptions can be formulated." The basic principles of entry for anonymous classics are simple, and were established for us long ago by the British Museum. It is the literature itself that is complex.)

Perhaps what we need next is two separate compilations. It would be possible to skim off from this edition a simple code of basic rules, no longer than that of 1908. Then it might be a good idea to have a manual dealing separately with the treatment of names, both personal and corporate. The simple principles would be in the short code of rules. A mass of information could be detached—detailed, expert, authoritative information about ancient and Oriental and other names not often encountered, and about specialized complicated organizations, religious, governmental, etc. To this could be added instructions for recording the results of name research in an authority record. The sample authority cards given in the preliminary second edition have been dropped, but better ones are to be found in the Library of Congress *Cooperative Cataloging Manual* (1944). In that manual also is the nearest thing we have to the list of catalogers' reference books which has been needed so long, and which might appropriately go with the rules for difficult names.

With this equipment we would have the present revised A.L.A. code for libraries which catalog for the Library of Congress, or on that scale; a simple, easily understood manual of rules for beginners in cataloging and for libraries which do not need to do

elaborate cataloging, and a manual for reference for catalogers confronted occasionally

with difficult cases.—*Isabella K. Rhodes, Columbia University.*

Bibliographical Papers

Papers of the Bibliographical Society, University of Virginia. Vol. I, 1948-1949. Edited by Fredson Bowers. Charlottesville, Va., 1948, ii, 204, [3]p. \$3.50.

Wherever students and scholars in the fields of descriptive and analytical bibliography gather for off-the-record discussions, the need for additional resources for publishing the results of their research is a favorite topic. The rumblings have grown plainer of late, as investigators have picked up the strands of projects that were deferred perforce during the war years. For obvious reasons (other than the usual one of inertia) not a great deal has been done even yet to relieve the situation, what with printing costs at their present levels. Students of bibliography and of textual criticism will therefore be glad to hear of the decision of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia to publish a series of its "papers." The first volume has just appeared under the editorship of Fredson Bowers, associate professor of English at the University of Virginia, himself an able tiller of bibliographical fields, being at present engaged in writing a descriptive bibliography of the post-Restoration English drama, 1660-1700. The new publication is to appear annually.

Although the first issue has a strong local representation, with the results of work by members of the faculty and graduate student body of the University of Virginia predominating, important contributions have been drawn from scholars working at a distance, and even more general participation is invited for future issues, without reference to membership in the sponsoring organization. This fact sets the venture apart from the majority of such journals, which tend to devote themselves to the publication of studies performed at, or by the members of, a given institution. It is to be hoped that this policy will be continued and further emphasized, so that the scholar who is not working under the aegis of a specific institution, or whose institution does not have a medium suited to the publica-

tion of his investigations, will have one more source of help.

In the present issue appear 11 major articles and six notes. Of the articles, several concern themselves with various phases of the history of printing and publishing, others relate to technicalities of printing procedure which have been applied to particular bibliographical problems (often with wider implications), and one deals entirely with a specific problem in textual genealogy. In the first category are articles by Joseph M. Carrière, of the university faculty: "The Manuscript of Jefferson's Unpublished Errata List for Abbé Morellet's Translation of the *Notes on Virginia*"; by Jessie R. Lucke, a graduate student: "Some Correspondence with Thomas Jefferson Concerning the Public Printers"; by C. William Miller, of the faculty of Temple University: "*In the Savoy: A Study in Post-Restoration Imprints*"; by James G. McManaway of the Folger Library: "The First Five Bookes of Ovids Metamorphosis, 1621" (an account of a hitherto unrecorded edition); and by Rudolf Hirsch of the Library of the University of Pennsylvania: "The Art of Selling Books: Notes on Three Aldus Catalogues, 1586-1592." An article by Giles E. Dawson of the Folger Library: "Three Shakespearian Piracies, 1723-1729," should also perhaps be included in this category, as it identifies the true nature of the pamphlets under discussion and makes a fair case against William Feales as the probable pirate.

New lines of approach to bibliographical problems are supplied in articles by Philip Williams, graduate student: "The Compositor of the Pied-Bull Lear"; by Curt F. Bühlér of the Morgan Library: "The Headlines in William de Machlinia's *Year-Book, 37 Henry VI*"; by Gerald E. Eberle of Loyola University of the South: "*Nosce Teipsum* (1599) by Sir John Davies: a Bibliographical Puzzle"; and by Allan H. Stevenson of the Illinois Institute of Technology: "New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence." A paper by George B. Pace of the university