

zens will benefit enormously. Every city can and should have such a library as Dr. Martin envisions for Chicago, a "nerve center . . . for contemporary information, in substance functioning as the fact bank, information switchboard, and special library for the general populace."—*Edwin Castagna, Enoch Pratt Free Library.*

**Library Automation; a State of the Art Review.** Ed. by Stephen R. Salmon. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969. 175p. \$7.50. (73-77283).

The papers presented at the ALA Pre-conference Institute on Library Automation at San Francisco in June 1967 constitute this volume. The purpose of the institute was to inform ALA members of the state of the art of library automation. It achieved its purpose, and with the principal exception of on-line applications described since 1967, it still constitutes an informative review for librarians not directly involved in research and development.

Separate sections of the report are devoted to acquisitions, cataloging, serials, and circulation, but the publication lacks an adequate review of information retrieval. Necessarily lacking are descriptions of on-line systems in acquisitions, serials, and circulation that have been activated since 1967.

Other sections discuss the MARC Project at the Library of Congress, networks, system analysis and design, and buildings. The MARC Project has had major developments since 1967, which of course are not in *Library Automation*. On the other hand, system analysis and design is a timeless topic. One of the most interesting sections is that by Robert H. Rohlf entitled "Building-Planning Implications of Automation." This section does not give cookbook answers to those who wish detailed replies to the question "How will library automation affect the building I am planning?" but it does give a valuable basis from which effective planning can proceed.

*Library Automation* will be a useful and informative publication for some years to come.—*Frederick G. Kilgour, The Ohio College Library Center.*

**Cataloging U.S.A.** By Paul S. Dunkin. Chi-

cago: American Library Association, 1969. 159p. \$5.00. (69-17830).

Paul Dunkin has given us a brief survey of cataloging theory in the United States. He prefaces his book with an annotated list of the most influential writings on cataloging; after which he summarizes the cataloging codes from Cutter's on. Then, under each problem area—entry, description, subject, classification, the catalog—he discusses the major points of view and their theoretical bases. His expressed intention is to show why we catalog as we do.

The categories, assumptions, and objectives of the transcendent theories are presented with clarity. We see how we arrived at our current practices, that they do not form a coherent whole and reflect historical not logical development. They are largely "the accumulation of what has been done in LC" (p. 143), a compromise of conflicting bibliographical objectives, particularly of conflicting theories on "the public's needs and/or wants. (They are not necessarily the same.)"

We index the book collection both to locate a work and to relate it to other works. That is our first principle. Cataloging attempts to do this systematically, and parts of Cutter's coherent but expensive system still stand. Parts have fallen under attack. But no matter how cogent or inviting later theories have been, the system has remained closed to any but peripheral and compromised changes, adopted usually for economic reasons and tending to make the system a less coherent whole. Mr. Dunkin shows us why we have arrived at our current practices. We all know what they are and what problems they raise in application and comprehension. Thus we enter works on "principles of authorship," not according to the title page statement the author and publisher have agreed on. Our forms of entry reflect wave after wave of opinion. We relate some types of material by added entries, others by uniform titles, and still others by form headings. Our subject headings reflect a number of views on the uses of language, and a continual reduction of attempts to apply them systematically or to relate them fully. MARC finds it necessary to bolster our descrip-

tions with explicit statements on such points as language of text, country of origin, and index. Even the paging statement, shown to be most important in establishing editions, has gone wild with the acceptance of Title II descriptions. The catalog gets larger and more confusing.

The attempt to tie cataloging at least physically to books was dismissed ten years ago in the Library of Congress' *The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment*. This report, called by Dunkin "an amazing document," is one still deeply resented by catalogers outside the Library of Congress, who did not feel the experimenter's pressures. Nothing since has promised immediate practical relief. Attempts to tie cataloging more logically or even more simply to books have added to the cost or to the confusion or to both.

Mr. Dunkin has tried to limit himself to descriptive rather than critical analysis. The reader will be grateful to have the history laid out concisely. This is an important book, intelligently done; if it emerges as a kind of epitaph to cataloging theory as we have known it, perhaps machines will someday release us and give us a chance at theories again.—Lois Hacker, *Cornell University Libraries*.

#### ***Prolegomena to Library Classification.***

3d ed. By S. R. Ranganathan, assisted by M. A. Gopinath. New York: Asia Publishing House, 1967. 640p. (73-427373).

It is with deep gratitude that I remember my first encounter with the *Prolegomena*. It (then in its second edition) opened my eyes with its clear statements of the problems of classification, as well as with its amazing revelation that anyone had gone so far toward their solution. This third edition is not a revision in the usual sense, but rather a development of those parts of the second edition of the greatest generality, excluding much of the historical, speculative, and practical discussions which (the author informs us) are being developed in two other books: *Classification: Retrospective and Prospective*, and *Depth Classification and Its Design*. Thus the new *Prolegomena* consists, in a way, of three separate titles. Libraries with the

second edition should not retire it to inactive storage unless they acquire all three new titles.

If there is a work in which is concentrated (and the word must be taken in a very strong sense) all that is most germinal in the theory of classification, it is the *Prolegomena*. Nothing else can rank with it except the 1876 Dewey and Cutter works, and perhaps the Gardin team's *L'Automatisation des Recherches Documentaires*. In this new incarnation it has become more than ever nothing but what-must-be-considered-before . . . , less a survey that includes prolegomenal matter. No one (except the beginning student, who would in all but a very few cases be quite put off by the unaccustomed rigor of the mode of exposition and who would be in principle unaware of the *aporia* in the *praxis* that have led to this *theoria*) who is serious about understanding, constructing, applying, or using any classification or system of indexing can afford to be uninformed about what Ranganathan works through here.

The new edition would better have been (like the second) printed in England; there are misprints in abundance, though most are not too serious—just irritating. But there are a few weaknesses of a more serious sort. Interpolation (internal hospitality) in chain (§LG) is not really explained, though Ranganathan along with everyone else assumes that Dewey's radix-fractional principle makes it possible. But it may instead be that only a faceted notation does—and then only in a somewhat weak sense. Dichotomy is discussed in the proper pejorative light (§PG), but its real function (positive/negative = enumeration/"others") is not mentioned. Figure 16 (p. 367) is intended to show the complexity of "the tree of knowledge"; it is so complex as to confuse, and the lack of explanatory text makes it not a help but a hindrance to the reader. UDC is made to seem to have Anteriorising Common Isolates (p. 448-449), which would assuredly surprise most of its adherents; the lack of phase-relational flexibility in UDC (p. 462) is largely true, but the pioneer efforts of Kervègant have led at least to an official test of a relator-schema of my own