



Research in Cataloging and Classification

RU DOLPH GJELSNESS

THE PROSPECTIVE REVISION of the A.L.A. *Catalog Rules* opens up many opportunities for investigations and research studies in library schools and in libraries. Another revision of this important tool should have the support of the entire profession and should enlist the aid of all who are qualified to make constructive contribution to it. It is basic to all library services and can lead the way to a more fruitful cooperation among our own libraries and cooperation with libraries of other countries as well.

It is rather remarkable that the 1908 Code should have remained unrevised until 1941 when the preliminary second edition was published. During this period of thirty-three years, when it was reprinted by the American Library Association again and again without change, libraries were growing rapidly, were developing dictionary catalogs with Library of Congress cards, were reclassifying and recataloging, and to meet the needs created by large and complex collections were forced to turn more and more to the Library of Congress for answers to cataloging problems. Only the Library of Congress, not the American Library Association, was keeping somewhat abreast of the times with the publication of supplementary rules on cards and rules in monograph form for special classes of materials, such as periodicals and the publications of corporate bodies. Catalogers were compelled to consult these various sources, and in cases where no rulings were available, to attempt to deduce what was Library of Congress practice from the printed cards. Standardization with Library of Congress cards had come rapidly and libraries were anxious to take full advantage of it by adapting their cataloging to that of the Library of Congress.

The problem became acute when cooperative cataloging was extended in the 1930's and many libraries began for the first time to provide copy for cards to be printed by the Library of Congress. It was this dilemma which finally led to the decision by the American Library Association to prepare a new edition of the rules, to be based

The author is Chairman, Department of Library Science, University of Michigan.

on the 1908 Code but to incorporate the supplementary rules of the Library of Congress. While the latter was not officially involved in the work on the 1941 edition, there was considerable cooperation, and the Library of Congress permitted the A.L.A. Code Revision Committee to engage one of its senior catalogers, Nella Martin, to prepare the material for the preliminary edition. The 1941 Code attempted to bring into one volume what was in effect the current practices of the Library of Congress, codified and fitted into the general pattern of the 1908 edition. It was intentionally a full document, with much detail, and, obeying an insistent demand from catalogers, was generous in its provision of examples to illustrate specific rules. In addition to incorporating Library of Congress rules, there were rules covering special materials, such as music, prepared by appointed committees and individuals in the profession, often the result of considerable investigation and research.

The 1941 edition was divided into two parts: "Part I. Entry and Heading" and "Part II. Description of Book." Part I underwent revision in the light of the criticism received and was published in a final second edition in 1949 by the American Library Association. Part II was omitted from the second edition in view of the intention of the Library of Congress to prepare a revision of its own rules, and when the Library of Congress published its *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging* in 1949, they were adopted by the American Library Association as its official rules as well. In the next edition of the Code, these two parts will be brought together again, as they should be, under the imprint of the American Library Association.

If there is a lesson to be learned from the foregoing, it is that a catalog code must be continuously revised and be given periodic critical examination to assure an orderly and useful development. Its editors, contributors, and critics must be in touch with the cataloging problems raised by the incoming flow of material in a large library in order that new requirements may be met with new or revised rulings. There must be an effective way to utilize the experiments carried out in individual libraries, to promote needed studies and investigations. The relations which have been established between the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification and the Library of Congress give promise of an effective partnership to accomplish all these things. Proposed changes and additions by the Library of Congress are reviewed by the appropriate body of the American Library Association and there is opportunity to change and amend in the light of professional opinion.

An example of the kind of cooperation which has developed is the

Research in Cataloging and Classification

critical analysis of the A.L.A. rules for entry prepared by Seymour Lubetzky¹ of the Library of Congress, for the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification. This publication, which lays the groundwork for the next edition, was published by the Library of Congress as a contribution to the discussion of the problem.

The chairman of the Catalog Code Revision Committee for the third edition, W. E. Wright, has presented in broad outline many of the changes and improvements which are contemplated.² A reading of this article will raise questions which might be answered by special studies and research investigations. Probably the most far-reaching change contemplated is the elimination of the distinction in the rules between societies and institutions as authors. It is proposed that both types of corporate bodies be entered under their names if they are individual or distinctive. This change, if it proves feasible, should substantially reduce the number of rules and exceptions to rules, and eliminate the necessity of deciding before determining an entry if a particular corporate body is a society or an institution. Further study of this proposal should reveal what new problems will be created by the change and the probable effect on existing records and shelf locations. This is not to suggest that changes in the rules should not be made if they necessitate recataloging in libraries. If the changes are desirable, libraries should be prepared to make changes in their catalogs but they should have some guidance on the most effective way of making the required adjustments. Libraries should face the fact that a basic tool such as the catalog code must be receptive to change, and that the resulting changes in catalogs must be provided for as a part of the maintenance budget of libraries. The specific statement of the Catalog Code Revision Committee on this point appears in Wright's article and reads as follows: "In preparing the revision, the amount of recataloging which may be involved in changes in the rules should not be considered if the change is otherwise desirable."

Wright indicates that the new code will incorporate rules for special materials, such as films, manuscripts, maps, music, phono-records, prints, and photographs. Rules for some of these groups have already been developed but others remain to be done. Here there will be opportunity for those with knowledge of these materials to make a contribution. Other groups of rules, such as those for religious organizations, will profit from the study and criticism of the librarians who through education and experience have acquired a specialist's knowledge of the literature of the subject.

It is expected that the new edition of the cataloging rules will be

an Anglo-American edition just as the 1908 Code was. This is an objective to be sought and should be attainable. The [British] Library Association has appointed a Cataloguing Rules Subcommittee which is prepared to work with the American Committee. This subcommittee has already considered the rules on which agreement was not reached in 1908 and has decided tentatively to follow the American rules of the 1949 edition.³ The possibility that the British Museum will change some of its rules is an encouraging development. This is particularly to be noted in the rules for anonymous and pseudonymous works and for certain categories of material such as dictionaries and encyclopedias. While bibliographers and catalogers have often been guided to the identification of difficult items through the unusual approaches which the British Museum *Catalogue of Printed Books* offers, it is probably also true that entries are frequently overlooked completely because the user is not aware of the rules governing these special categories.⁴ With the cooperation of the [British] Library Association and possibly other library associations in countries where English is the native tongue, it should be possible to achieve a high degree of agreement on all the rules for author and title entry. Whether an identical text will serve for both editions presumably awaits decision.

There should be an effort to extend agreement to other parts of the world as well, although language differences dictate variations, many of which are probably necessary. Standardization of entries through uniform rules will do much to facilitate the exchange of information regarding publications, as well as expediting the acquisition and recording of foreign materials in libraries all over the world. The resulting influence on bibliographical publications in all languages will result in economies in bibliographical activities and a fuller use of contributions made to bibliography by all nations.

The time seems ripe to begin planning an attack on this problem of international agreements. One of the needs is a study and analysis of the chief differences which now prevail in codes in various countries and an identification of basic principles where agreement can be expected. Any international agreement should minimize or eliminate the variations dictated by language differences as far as possible. In personal name entries, for example, preference should be given to the vernacular form and in the case of classical authors to the Latin form. In the entries for corporate authors, again the vernacular should be preferred. Is it possible that consideration might be given even to the use of geographic headings in the vernacular for official

Research in Cataloging and Classification

documents as is done in some foreign codes such as the Belgian?⁵ It might be noted here that some foreign libraries incorporate directly into their catalogs the Library of Congress printed cards for United States documents, without change of entry, although in the same dictionary catalog subject headings for the United States are translated into the language of the country. However, even if uniformity cannot always be attained to such an extent that catalog entries can be incorporated without change into the catalogs of countries using different languages, agreements on the principles governing the choice and form of entry would be an attainable objective and a distinct contribution to bibliographical progress. If national bibliographies would follow standard principles on entry form and bibliographical description, bibliographies in various languages could be used more effectively by workers in all languages.

A Comparative Study of Cataloging Codes by J. C. M. Hanson⁶ can be a point of departure for an attack on the extension of international agreements. This was published eighteen years ago, however, and should be brought up to date, with fuller details. In a more recent work, covering five catalog codes, S. R. Ranganathan⁷ examines the validity of individual rules with the aid of certain fundamental principles or canons. This is a helpful and penetrating analysis. In many countries, library associations are considering revisions of their rules and the trends in these revisions should be taken into account. In Europe, for example, the division which has existed between the countries following Anglo-American rules and those following the Prussian *Instructions* may be eliminated to some extent since the German groups are considering the adoption of corporate entry and the entry of anonymous publications under the first word of the title. Contributions to a comparative study of catalog rules can be made by foreign students in library schools through studies of the rules and practices of their own countries. Such investigations would prepare them also to take the initiative on these problems in their own countries. After the necessary preliminary investigations have been made, international agreements should be sought with the assistance of international groups such as the International Federation of Library Associations and Unesco.

The cataloging of materials in non-European languages can present great difficulties for libraries because catalogers with the required language equipment are not available and because the rules designed for materials in European languages are not adequate. This is an area where the fullest cooperation among libraries can improve the cata-

logs and take some of the burden of preparation of materials from the individual libraries. The Special Committee on Cataloging Oriental Materials, established by the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification in 1954 (G. Raymond Nunn, chairman), has worked with the Library of Congress and other libraries having Far Eastern collections, on amendments to A.L.A. cataloging rules which would standardize cataloging practices for Chinese, Japanese, and Korean publications. The resulting decisions will permit the production of cards for these materials which can be incorporated into the catalogs of all the libraries involved. This committee expects to extend its investigations also to subject headings and classification. The work of this committee represents a cooperative attack on common problems which should bring advantages, including economies, to all the libraries concerned. It should be emphasized also that the effort of the committee is not to create special tools but to adapt the general tools to the needs of these special materials.

For libraries of a general character in the United States, the problems in classification are likely to be concerned with two classification systems, the *Decimal Classification* (D.C.) and the classification of the Library of Congress (L.C.). The survival of these two systems in our libraries is clearly established by Thelma Eaton in her study of classification in college and university libraries,⁸ where she concludes that only 1.5% of the libraries covered by her survey used other classification systems. It is probable that the D.C. is used by at least 95% of the public libraries, and according to the Eaton figures it is used by 84.6% of the college and university libraries. Each year records the decision of some of the libraries which have used other systems to change to one of these two. Cutter's *Expansive Classification*, for example, with its many excellent features, and once a favored classification, is now used in very few libraries. It seems unlikely that any new system can compete with these two in the near future. They have the advantage of assured support to provide new editions as needed and the further substantial advantage of having their classification numbers printed on Library of Congress cards. The D.C. numbers have appeared on the printed cards since 1930; the editorial work on the various D.C. editions has been done at the Library of Congress since 1927, and since 1954 under the administration of the Library of Congress. To a considerable extent the two systems are assured of a parallel growth.

The D.C. has often been criticized for over-expansion in some sections, for failure to keep up with the advance of knowledge, and

Research in Cataloging and Classification

for retaining out-moded relationships. The history of its vicissitudes in the last thirty years and the developing relationships with the American Library Association and the Library of Congress has been presented in an informative article by V. W. Clapp, chairman of the D.C. Editorial Policy Committee.⁹ It is clear that the D.C. finds it difficult to satisfy all its users, that some libraries hold firmly with its long-standing principle of "integrity of numbers" while others demand a reconstructed classification which will reflect changes in subject relationships promptly. The probable cost of reclassification is a determining factor restricting the amount of change, other than expansion of existing numbers. This may be a necessary and practical choice, but points to the possibility that at some time the issue of adequately adapting the classification to modern needs will have to be met. Here again, should not libraries expect to have to make changes with each new edition in order to keep the system up to date? The eventual alternative may be a large-scale reclassification project at great cost and inconvenience. In spite of the efforts of the D.C. editors to secure suggestions from its users to guide them, it is undoubtedly true that they have only incomplete knowledge of how libraries use the classification. To what extent libraries follow the schedules faithfully and to what extent they depart from them would be valuable information for future planning. Careful studies of use among similar types of libraries or libraries of comparable size are to be encouraged. The D.C. serves so many types of libraries, more specific information on how it is used might answer some long-standing questions on this classification, particularly relating to the fullness of editions and such questions as the continuance of a "standard" edition like the 15th. A scholarly attack on what would be required to modernize the D.C. in terms of present-day needs should help to chart the future.

The L.C. classification has not yet been subjected to pressure from its users for substantial changes. The schedules are revised with some frequency and subscribers are kept currently informed about changes and additions. It is a younger classification than the D.C. and was set up at the outset for a large research collection and has a better basic structure for that purpose. Its use has been chiefly in university libraries and specialized research collections and will probably continue to be so. Typical of the many adaptations made in libraries are the reports from two libraries on the use of the literature classification scheme.^{10, 11} A doctoral dissertation now in progress by Annette Hoage should throw further light on the extent and nature of its use

in libraries.¹² In contrast to the D.C., it is not dependent for its continuance on use by other libraries and changes in its schedules will presumably be determined by the requirements of the collections of the Library of Congress. This may tend to make the classification less responsive to the needs of other libraries, unless its needs correspond with those libraries using it. An abridged L.C. has sometimes been suggested but this would in effect be a new classification since the structure of the schedules does not permit abridgment without change of numbers. The advantage of having the classification number on the printed cards would also be lost to libraries using the abridgment. Some simplifications have been made in libraries but rather little is known about them. They are likely to involve particularly the reduction or elimination of some of the long tables which are characteristic of each schedule. Studies of how the L.C. is used in libraries would be of value to the libraries using the scheme as well as those engaged in changing over to it.

While these two classifications are likely to predominate in general libraries, there are other classification schemes which merit study and which have advanced the theory and practice of classification. The classification of the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration is one of these and demonstrates well the functional approach in classification. In addition to form and country tables it also has an industries list which may be applied throughout the classification, or used as the main classification. It also differentiates the forms and provides for two separate tables, one for material forms and one for subject forms. It is a good classification to use in teaching classification and particularly to follow a study of the L.C. and D.C., since it exemplifies the needs of the special library as opposed to the general. It can also be used to introduce a study of some features of the *Universal Decimal Classification* and the Colon classification with its greater flexibility and adaptability for documentation work.¹³ There are a number of other special classifications which merit study and comparison with general schemes and among the general ones the Bliss *System of Bibliographic Classification* offers different relationships of subjects and some distinctive features. Since the development of information retrieval systems will have to draw on the theory and practice of classification and subject heading, special subject schemes will be important and are likely to multiply. A central agency to collect these schemes and to make them available for study has been provided by the School of Library Science of Western Reserve University, where the Special Libraries Association has

Research in Cataloging and Classification

placed on deposit its loan collection of special schemes and lists.¹⁴

In recent years, subject headings have been under considerable discussion and fundamental questions have been raised regarding the structure of subject heading lists and the effectiveness of subject headings in the catalogs of different types of libraries.^{15, 16} For general libraries, it would appear that the two basic lists supply the need of standard headings: *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress* and *Sears' List of Subject Headings for Small Libraries*, the one for the large public library and for research libraries, the other for the smaller libraries, particularly the public and school libraries. These are indispensable aids to libraries and while they have served well for many years, no doubt there is room for improvement. Several important basic works have been added to the literature of subject headings in recent years, by Julia Pettee,¹⁷ David Haykin¹⁸ and J. H. Shera,¹⁹ covering both theory and practice. These lay the groundwork for further investigations, and suggest lines to be followed. Dissatisfaction seems to stem from two principal causes: (1) the suspicion that subject cataloging may be more expensive than use warrants and (2) the growth of card catalogs has been so great as to repel and impede use.

In most discussions of subject headings where questions have been raised regarding present practices, an attempt has been made to solve these problems on the basis of the needs of the user, that is, the reader in the library. The reader in the general library, however, varies greatly in his approach, and the nature and extent of his dependence on the catalog is difficult to fix with certainty. However, a number of useful studies have been made, which taken together throw some light on the problem. C. J. Frarey²⁰ has made an analysis of twenty-seven such studies which have been completed since 1930. He has pointed to some conclusions which may be derived from the studies, at the same time calling attention to the fact that they have been based largely on quantitative data and cannot necessarily establish what may be essential needs from the qualitative standpoint. O. L. Lilley emphasizes this point also but urges more studies and that they be coordinated.²¹ In a provocative article on cataloging costs R. C. Swank²² strongly recommends a particular kind of investigation which would be "case studies of the experience of readers in using the entire range of a library's bibliographical services—studies that could then be related to analyses of the costs of the entire range of services." A study of catalog use by S. L. Jackson is now under way in forty libraries in the New York area, under the supervision of

the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification.

Among the suggestions for changes which have emerged from the studies covered by Frarey is that there be limitations on subject coverage in the general catalog to be determined on the basis of frequency of use. A chronological limitation has been suggested which might arbitrarily eliminate subject analysis for materials published before a certain date, e.g. 1800. A limitation on subject analysis for books in foreign languages has also been suggested. The possibility of removing large blocks of specialized subjects from the catalog and printing the entries in a book catalog as a special bibliography is seriously considered by some of the large libraries. In the large university, the effect of undergraduate libraries with their own collections and catalogs should be studied in relation to the future of the general catalog. Likewise, the great growth of the special libraries within the university family with their own special catalogs may suggest the limitation of subject analysis in many fields in the general catalog. Many of these problems, including the development of standard lists, point to the need of studies directed toward special subject areas. Competent analysis of subject headings in special fields will help to define the scope of headings and their relationships to other subjects. Such studies will be most useful if they build on current standard lists as was done by C. E. Pettus²³ in education and M. J. Voigt²⁴ in physics.

It is an encouraging development that some of our largest libraries are recognizing the need of continuous planning in the development of their catalogs. It is clear that this planning is best done by a staff which is not involved in the day-to-day work of processing materials. Harvard's decision to create the position of associate librarian for Catalogue Planning is a step in this direction. This was done "in order to permit a top-ranking officer of the Library, relieved of administrative responsibilities, to devote full time to planning for the future of the catalogues."²⁵ One of the recommendations of the management survey of the Preparation Division of the New York Public Library²⁶ was the appointment of four staff assistants to the chief of the division, one of whom would be "an editor of the catalogs to revise and establish subject and classification systems, to develop plans for weeding and revising the catalogs, and to plan 'consumer surveys' of the catalogs." K. D. Metcalf²⁷ in his *Report on the Harvard University Library* has identified many of the catalog problems to be faced at Harvard and suggests some solutions. The printing of sections of

Research in Cataloging and Classification

the catalog in book form is one proposal advanced. This would provide important bibliographies in special categories and at the same time remove long files of cards concentrated under single entries, such as voluminous authors, from the catalog. With Harvard as with many older libraries the catalog problems have been allowed to accumulate until they have become too serious to be ignored any longer.

Serial publications present a complex of problems for libraries, particularly in the research libraries where they may constitute a major part of the collections. A. D. Osborn²⁸ has made a comprehensive study of this type of publication; he has identified the nature of the basic problems connected with serials, and has indicated the trend of current practice and thinking. Serials have their own separate and distinct characteristics which require special treatment and yet they involve also all the processes concerned with books—entry, classification, and subject heading. However, the approach to serial content by the reader is so largely through printed indexes and other printed sources that the library's primary function in many areas becomes that of providing a record of holdings. Because serials include many publications of government units and of societies and institutions, the determination of entry involves all the rules for title and corporate entry. Any improvement in the rules for these types of entries will be an improvement in serial processing. An attack on some of the problems involving serial entries as well as other cataloging problems may be found in the *Manual of Principles on Limited Cataloging for the Air University Library*, prepared by O. T. Field.²⁹ Changes in the names of corporate bodies and in the titles of periodicals have long necessitated expensive changes in records and in the relocation of sets, in order to bring files under the latest title in the catalog and on the shelves. An innovation which is gaining considerable attention is to enter serials under the form of author and title used at time of publication. To what extent this is to be carried out as a general rule needs to be determined. It has been adopted by the National Library of Medicine, where, however, provision is made to keep serials with continuous volume numbering together on the shelves.³⁰ The Library of Congress has recently made a study of its serial cataloging under the direction of C. S. Spalding, chief of the Serial Record Division. Libraries await the results of this study with much interest, since it may lead to important changes in serial cataloging. The main issue for research libraries is how to provide a serial record adequate for the needs of public and staff and requiring a minimum of changes and

additions. It is generally agreed that a single record should be maintained for current receipts of all serials, but there is no unanimity on the extent to which other records should duplicate or complement this basic record.

The benefits derived by libraries through the use of Library of Congress printed cards and those of the H. W. Wilson company have been so great that any extension of that type of service will have enthusiastic support. At present research libraries may get no more than sixty per cent of printed cards for their current cataloging. Studies are needed to suggest how the coverage can be extended. The amount of duplication of materials in libraries is of course the crucial issue here. J. M. Dawson,³¹ in a dissertation dealing with the current acquisitions and cataloging of research libraries, sought to determine the extent to which Library of Congress printed cards were available for the material acquired by research libraries and the extent to which the cards were used. Dawson found that half of the cards were used without change, and that some libraries made more changes than others, raising the question whether a higher degree of conformity should not be sought in the interests of economy. Classification changes accounted for one-third of all changes with more than twice as many in D.C. numbers as in L.C. numbers. The author recommends further study of the extent of duplication of materials currently acquired by research libraries and the time span involved. He also recommends that similar studies be made of the smaller university libraries, the college libraries, and the medium-sized public libraries. The expansion of the *Library of Congress Catalog—Books; Authors*, to include cards reported to the National Union Catalog is a further aid to cooperation in cataloging. This expansion began January, 1956.

The smaller libraries, public, college, and school, have much to gain from the extension of centralized or cooperative processing wherever it is feasible. In some situations this might begin with cooperative book selection and take the book through all the processes until it is on the shelves, relieving the librarian in the small library for work with the public. There are several types of these arrangements in operation now and they are increasing. Planning and research are needed to lead the way, to identify the patterns suitable for different situations, to determine how time and money may be saved through cooperation. Centralized processing in a school system is not unusual, but it is not common as yet for independent libraries to join together to have their processing done in one center. The experience of libraries such as Wayne County in Michigan, Erie County in New York state, and the regional center in Watertown, New York, demonstrates the advantages

Research in Cataloging and Classification

to be gained. Many of the problems incidental to the establishment of such a service are identified in an article by Thera P. Cavender.³²

On the operational side of the technical processes, libraries are continually seeking the most effective organizational plan under which to place personnel, to distribute the work load and provide for an efficient procedure. The variations which exist are numerous and no plan as yet can be considered a standard or best plan. Only careful and thorough comparative studies could result in an evaluation which might provide a reliable guide for libraries.

There was apparent in the 1940's a marked tendency to combine the technical processes into one department under an assistant library director. Such departments ordinarily included acquisitions, serials, binding, cataloging, classification, and preparation for the shelves. One result to be gained from this combination was expected to be a more effective coordination of all the technical processes, and the elimination of duplicating activities and records. It has been pointed out, however, that cooperation can be achieved without such a union, and many libraries retain the two traditional departments, acquisitions and cataloging.³³ The principal overlap in acquisitions and cataloging occurs in bibliographical searching, in the records for books in process, and frequently in the handling of serials. These activities need to be coordinated whatever the organizational plan may be.

The division of work within a university catalog department has tended in recent years to be according to subject areas, with each cataloging unit responsible for descriptive cataloging, classification, and subject cataloging for books within the area. This is in contrast to division according to form of material, i.e., government publications, or function, i.e., classification. The reorganization in the Preparation Division of the New York Public Library provides for such subject divisions and combines classification and subject analysis with descriptive cataloging for the original cataloging.³⁴ Differentiation of materials on the basis of difficulty has resulted in the provision of units in some libraries to catalog items which require no original cataloging and which can be cared for by non-professional staff. Other ways are being sought to make the most effective use of the training and experience of the professional cataloger. The Committee on Administration of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification undertook an extensive study of technical services in the operations of large libraries. The detailed report of this committee was published in 1955, and included recommendations of areas where the committee felt more detailed studies were required.³⁵

Cataloging costs have frequently been under investigation and the

literature on the subject is impressive.³⁶ It has not been possible to arrive at a standard norm of cataloging output applicable even to a given type of library, but cost studies have yielded data which has been useful to individual libraries in considering changes in organization and procedure. Studies which would help to identify where unnecessary costs occur are needed. The relation of library growth and centralization to cataloging costs, the effect of variations in cataloging practices in the general library and particularly in special collections and departmental libraries, including the use of special classification schemes and special lists of subject headings, are possible problems to be studied.

At the request of the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification, a report on processing for the Midwest Inter-Library Center has recently been completed by Velva J. Osborn.³⁷ This report is of special interest because many of the problems discussed had no precedents and there was no established practice to provide guidance. The nature of the records which must be maintained in such a center as well as in the participating libraries is indicated by Miss Osborn. It is expected that an analysis of costs will be made later.

From the Editorial Committee of the American Library Association has come a suggestion that the history of cataloging and cataloging methods is an area for research projects which might be undertaken by students in library schools. It is pointed out that there is no history of cataloging beyond 1850, the terminal date of Dorothy M. Norris's *A History of Cataloguing and Cataloguing Methods*.³⁸ This is an important suggestion not only for students of cataloging but also for students of library history in general. The history of individual library catalogs and catalog departments, of persons who have contributed significantly to bibliography and cataloging, will provide material for the general history of library development. It will also demonstrate the extent to which we are indebted to our predecessors of past eras for our present practices and accomplishments.

References

1. Lubetzky, Seymour: *Cataloging Rules and Principles; a Critique of the A.L.A. Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for Their Revision*. Washington, D. C., Library of Congress Processing Department, 1953.
2. Wright, W. E.: A Report of Progress on Catalog Code Revision in the United States. *Library Quarterly*, 26:331-336, Oct. 1956.
3. Sharp, H. A.: Current Research in Cataloguing. In: London University.

Research in Cataloging and Classification

School of Librarianship and Archives. *Cataloguing Principles and Practice: an Inquiry*. Edited by Mary Piggott. London, Library Association, 1954, pp. 15-25.

4. Chaplin, A. H.: A Reconsideration of the British Museum Rules for Compiling the Catalogues of Printed Books—II. In: London University. School of Librarianship and Archives. *Cataloguing Principles and Practice: an Inquiry*. Edited by Mary Piggott. London, Library Association, 1954, pp. 37-49.

5. Association des Bibliothécaires et du Personnel des Bibliothèques des Ministères de Belgique. *Règles Catalographiques pour les Publications Officielles*. Bruxelles, 1955.

6. Hanson, J. C. M.: *A Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules Based on the Anglo-American Code of 1908*. (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.

7. Ranganathan, S. R.: *Heading and Canons; Comparative Study of Five Catalogue Codes*. Madras, S. Viswanathan, 1955.

8. Eaton, Thelma: Classification in College and University Libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 16:168-176, April 1955.

9. Clapp, V. W.: Progress Towards the 16th Edition of Dewey. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 12:196-208, Oct. 1956.

10. Sullens, Elsie D.: The Literature Classification Scheme Used at the University of Southern California. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 12:73-80, April 1956.

11. Tobin, Alice: Literature Classification [Worcester Free Public Library] *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 12:81-83, April 1956.

12. Association of American Library Schools, Research in Progress in Librarianship. *Association of American Library Schools Newsletter*, 8:45, Jan. 1956.

13. Ranganathan, S. R.: *Colon Classification*. 3d ed. Madras, Madras Library Association, 1950.

14. Special Libraries Association. *Loan Collection of Classification Schemes and Subject Heading Lists*. Cleveland, Western Reserve University School of Library Science, [1956].

15. Tauber, M. F., ed.: *The Subject Analysis of Library Materials*. New York, Columbia University School of Library Service, [1953].

16. Tauber, M. F., and Associates: *Technical Services in Libraries*. (Columbia University Studies in Library Service) New York, Columbia University Press, 1954, pp. 150-176.

17. Pettee, Julia, E.: *Subject Headings; the History and Theory of the Alphabetical Subject Approach to Books*. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1946.

18. Haykin, D. J.: *Subject Headings; a Practical Guide*. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

19. Shera, J. H., and Egan, Margaret E.: *The Classified Catalog; Basic Principles and Practices*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1956.

20. Frarey, C. J.: Studies of Use of the Subject Catalog; Summary and Evaluation. In: Tauber, M. F., ed.: *The Subject Analysis of Library Materials*. New York, Columbia University School of Library Service, [1953], pp. 147-166.

21. Lilley, O. L.: The Problems of Measuring Catalog Use. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 10:122-131, July 1954.

22. Swank, R. C.: Cataloging Cost Factors. *Library Quarterly*, 26:303-317, Oct. 1956.

RUDOLPH GJELSNESS

23. Pettus, C. E.: *Subject Headings in Education*. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1938.
24. Voigt, M. J.: *Subject Headings in Physics*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1944.
25. Reorganization of the Harvard College Library. *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 10:406-410, Autumn 1956.
26. Kingery, R. E.: A Management Engineering Look at Cataloging. *College and Research Libraries*, 14:52-56, Jan. 1953.
27. Metcalf, K. D.: *Report on the Harvard University Library; a Study of Present and Prospective Problems*. Cambridge, Harvard University Library, 1955.
28. Osborn, A. D.: *Serial Publications; Their Place and Treatment in Libraries*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1955.
29. U. S. Air University Library: *Manual of Principles on Limited Cataloging for the Air University Library*. Fourth draft, rev. April 1957.
30. MacDonald, M. Ruth: Cataloging at the Armed Forces Medical Library, 1945-1952. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 9:58-78, June 1953.
31. Dawson, J. M.: The Acquisitions and Cataloging of Research Libraries; a Study of the Possibilities for Centralized Processing. *Library Quarterly*, 27:1-22, Jan. 1957.
32. Cavender, Thera P.: Regional Processing. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 11:208-211, Oct. 1955.
33. Swank, R. C.: The Catalog Department in the Library Organization. *Library Quarterly*, 18:24-32, Jan. 1948.
34. Kingery, *op. cit.*
35. American Library Association. Division of Cataloging and Classification. Committee on Administration. *Technical Services: Policy, Organization, and Coordination*. Edited by Bella E. Schachtman. Chicago, The Association, 1955.
36. Reichmann, Felix: Costs of Cataloging. *Library Trends*, 2:290-317, Oct. 1953.
37. Osborn, Velva J.: *Early Developments in Storage Library Processing*. (University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers no. 47) Urbana, University of Illinois Library School, 1957.
38. Norris, Dorothy M.: *A History of Cataloguing and Cataloguing Methods, 1100-1850*. London, Grafton and Co., 1939.