

## An Enquiry into the Role of the Cataloger

### カタローガーの任務の探究

*Ruth French Strout*

ルース・フレンチ・ストラウト

#### 要 旨

図書館史の全時期を通じて、書物を収集し、使えるように組織することは一つのプロセスと考えられてきた。ところが、今世紀の初め頃から、図書館の諸活動を機能によって分けようとする傾向があらわれ、カタローギングとレファレンスというように区別されはじめ、分離の傾向は次第にその度を強め、互いに重なりあい、依存しあっている機能を無理にわけへだてるに至った。相関連している領域を切り離してしまったことは、図書館の運営上よい結果をもたらさず、逆に深刻な障害となった。同一の目標を目指し、密接につながっているべき機能をばらばらに離し、書誌的資料を使う上に不利益となる考え方を植え付け、更にカタローガーのイメージを不幸なものにしてしまった。



1900年以来図書館の規模は非常に大きくなったので、仕事のある程度分担するようになったことは理解できるが、その分け方は主題分野によるというような合理的なものでなく、奇妙な歎かわしい方法で分離されたのである。

図書館の規模が大きくなると同時に、個々の利用者を助けるということに関心が高まったことが、このような傾向を起させた一つの原因であるとも考えられるが、利用者に援助を与えることに関心が高まったということは、レファレンス・ライブラリアンを分離させるべき意味を持っていたのではなく、むしろカタローギングの分野の啓発にこそ意味を持っていたと考えられる。

Louis Kaplan はレファレンスの歴史を書いた際、Poole の雑誌記事索引、ALA の目録、Dewey の分類表等はレファレンス史上顕著な業績であり、Justin Winsor は米国最初の解題つき図書目録を作ってレファレンス・サービスに貢献したと述べている。これらの業績は、もしカタローギングとレファレンスの分離を認めるとすれば、目録作業の過程における産物である。それをレファレンス運動の産物としてとりあげたことは、両者を切り離すことの不当さを示す一つの証拠である。しかるに米国の図書館思想には、レファレンスをカタローギングから切り離すことには最大の注意を払いながら、目録活動はレファレンスであると規定する矛盾がある。

更にもう一つ奇妙な現象は、カード目録だけが目録であると見なして、それ以外の形態の目録は「図書」

Ruth French Strout, Associate Professor, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago. 1953-54 Visiting Professor, Japan Library School. ルース・フレンチ・ストラウト：シカゴ大学図書館学校準教授，1953-54年度図書館学科訪問教授。

として扱い、印刷目録と索引はレファレンス・ブックと呼んでレファレンス・ルームにおき、カード目録を他の書誌的資料と切り離したことである。このようにしてカタローガーも亦孤立させられて舞台裏で働く人間となり、自分達の作り出した作品から遠ざけられて利用者の反応を知ることができなくなった。この不幸な状態は悪化して、1956年には Pierce Butler をして、カタローガーは図書館界における最下級民でアンタッチャブルである云々、と言わしめるまでに至った。

この傾向は早くから一部の識者には憂慮され、Bishop, Shera, Egan, Ulveling, Lundy, Carnovsky 等の発言は、今世紀に入ってから、図書館の最も大切な機能についての見識、洞察力が失われたためにどのようなことが起ったかを指摘している。さらに彼等は、当時の館界が社会一般の動きに影響され、成人教育とか図書館を民衆の大学にしようという情熱にかられ、目録分類は単に機械的に規則に従うことであるとし、図書館の真の機能である書誌的センターとしての役割を回避し、その結果図書館がその学術的機能を喪失するに至ったことを憂えている。

かつてライブラリアンシップの主要な運動や動機づけが図書館の外部から起った事実があるが、今世紀の半ばにドキュメンテーションと呼ばれる運動と共にまた同様のことが起った。Bradford はドキュメンテーションを、“あらゆる知的活動の記録を収集し、分類し、利用に供すること”と定義したが、これは図書館の主要任務と同じである。ドキュメンタリストは、図書館員がその任務の大事な部分を抛棄したその部分、即ち書誌組織の仕事を拾いあげて発展させた。図書館員は目録とレファレンスを切り離す運動によって始められた討論会とか読書推進運動のような益々常軌を逸する方向へ努力を集中した。しかしドキュメンテーション運動の発展と、資料の量の爆発的増大とに刺戟されて、図書館員はその第一の任務がインフォメーションを得られるようにすることであることを再認識しはじめた。書誌的サービスに機械力の利用を考えねばならぬことを悟り、ドキュメンテーション運動に対する態度もかわって来て、自らオートメーションの可能性を研究すべく立ち上った。オートメーションで解決しようとする問題は、長年の間カタローガーの問題として知られていたものであるが、しかし新しく立ち上った図書館員の態度には、前とは違って威信がみられる。その推進力は図書館界の内から働いたか外から起ったかはともかくとして、図書館員の立場から問題を解決しようとする毅然たる態度がある。その中でカタローガーは重要な役割を果さなければならない。図書館のオートメーションは目録のオートメーションから始まらなければならない。目録をとり、分類し、図書館を組織する仕事は、これまで決してなかった程重要で有意義な仕事になるであろう。

機械はカタローガーの仕事のもっとも特徴的な部分を代行することはできない。しかし退屈な繰り返しの仕事は図書館員よりは能率よくできるので、人間の才能と機械力を組み合わせれば素晴らしい結果が得られるであろう。機械化された組織の中で、カタローガーが自己の責任を果すならば、再び重要な地位につき、影響力を持つようになるであろう。再びカタローガーは創造的な最善の努力を尽すことを要求されるようになるであろう。彼は書誌的な問題をレファレンス・ライブラリアンが考えるよりも狭い意味で考えることは許されなくなるであろう。印刷機から流出する資料の量の尨大さと、最近の研究の緊急性とは、図書館をしてその主目的は世界的規模における書誌の組織であることを忘れることを許さないであろう。

(I. H.)

In the historical perspective of librarianship the chief concerns of the librarian have been the collecting of books and manuscripts, and the organization of them for use. Through

the centuries the administration of a library was looked upon as one process encompassing whatever tasks were necessary for achieving that general purpose. Not until the turn of

the present century was there an attempt to divide the various activities in a library into different functions, and not before the 20th century was there any desire to separate librarians into such categories as "catalogers" and "reference librarians." As William Warner Bishop pointed out,

The reference librarian has always existed. It is only of recent years that division of labor has given him a name—without his knowledge or consent, as for the most part names are want to be bestowed.<sup>1)</sup>

Throughout the entire history of libraries, from the little that is known about ancient and mediaeval libraries through all the succeeding centuries, the various duties within the library were not thus distinguished. The librarian was concerned with the total task of building up his collection and organizing it advantageously. By the 20th century, however, a cleavage seemed to have made its appearance between analogous functions, and the areas designated as "cataloging" on the one hand, and "reference" on the other have been made increasingly discrete. The break gradually widened and at the same time won more and more general acceptance. That this continued has been evidenced in more recent years by the appearance of even more differentiating terms for the same categories, such as "public services" and "preparations" or "technical processes." Plainly these names attest to the widening gaps which have occurred within the functioning of library organization, among functions which are overlapping, and in fact, interdependent.

Such separation of related areas has not achieved a desirable result. On the contrary, the division of labor between "cataloging" and "reference" or "public services" has carried with it serious handicaps for the operation of a library. It has been responsible for separating functions which are aimed at the same purpose and should be closely allied; it has built up disadvantageous concepts in regard to the use of bibliographical works; and finally, has been responsible for creating the unfortunate image of the cataloger which has over a period

of time proved a disservice to librarianship as a vocation.

It is understandable that some division of responsibilities should have occurred during the present century because of the enormous growth in the size of libraries since 1900. The curious—and indeed deplorable—phenomenon is not the fact that specializations developed, but that they developed along the lines they did rather than according to some more functional division such as that of subject areas.

One of the reasons for what happened might possibly be traced to the coincidence of a rising interest in offering individual help to readers at the same time as the size of libraries was burgeoning, yet of course this coincidence does not at all account for the wasteful isolation of certain of the processes which became affected.

The great upsurge of interest in giving help to readers should not have been the cause of setting the reference librarian apart. Quite to the contrary, the greatest achievements which this very movement inspired were actually in the field of cataloging. When writing about the history of reference work, Louis Kaplan mentioned as outstanding accomplishments the production of such works as Poole's *Index to Periodicals*, the *ALA Catalog*, and Dewey's *Decimal Classification and Subject Index*.<sup>2)</sup> All of these, if one is to make a distinction, are products of the cataloging process, and the fact that Kaplan refers to them as products of the reference movement is only further evidence of the incongruity of isolating those two categories.

The same point is made even more dramatically when Kaplan writes of Charles Jewett as follows:

Indicative of his reference instinct were his catalogs of the library, the very first in the United States to employ assigned subject headings in contrast to the earlier method of depending exclusively upon key words in titles.<sup>3)</sup>

Again, speaking of William Poole, Kaplan says that he was

during his entire career interested in providing reference service, of which the various editions of his index to periodicals are evidence enough.<sup>4)</sup>

Likewise, when he mentions Justin Winsor as having contributed to "reference" services, he points for evidence to the fact that he "was responsible for the first annotated catalog of an American library."<sup>5)</sup> Certainly it is true that such activities are of the greatest importance for carrying on reference service—this is indeed the very point of the present argument—but what a strange contradiction is here uncovered in American library thought when, although great care is taken to set off "reference" from "cataloging," yet "cataloging" activities are defined as "reference."

There is some evidence here of another strange phenomenon, namely, that only *card* catalogs are catalogs. When card catalogs came into general use, a tendency seems to have arisen to consider "cataloging" as pertaining only to the compilation of a *card* catalog. It seems that the division in library functions was carried to such an extreme and developed along such illogical lines that a catalog was only a *card* catalog, while a catalog in any other form became for some reason a "book." Further evidence of this attitude is the fact that libraries came to shelve printed catalogs and indexes in a "reference" room, calling them "reference" books while the card catalog was located somewhere else, a tool isolated from the other bibliographical works.

Gradually as this situation developed, the cataloger, too, became isolated, a worker behind the scenes, separated from the people to whom he could be most useful and out of touch with the people who used his product and who, therefore, could be of value to him for devising standards and setting up routines.

This unfortunate situation deteriorated until in 1952 it was possible for Pierce Butler to say:

Nobody loves a cataloger. Catalogers are the pariahs, the untouchables, in the caste system of librarianship. Everyone seems to loathe or pity them. Their fellow workers regard them as psychotic or sub-normal, grubbers in detail, dabblers in trifles, sticklers for convention, idolaters of conformity, dull, obstinate people, literal minded and humorless.<sup>6)</sup>

Much earlier than this, of course, one finds numerous manifestations that at least some librarians were beginning to be aware of the cataloger's role as a sorry tale of talent hidden beneath a bushel, and this at the very time the library world stood in need of that talent.

In 1914 the observation was made that, "It seems the fashion of late to say derogatory or mirth-provoking things of the catalog and catalogers."<sup>7)</sup> At about the same time William Warner Bishop generalized on the situation in an address he gave at the New York State Library School:

The library world has had its shifting fashions ... In the earlier years of the public library movement, those days before the Centennial and the *Library Journal*, the art of cataloging and the making of catalogs in book form was much honored and much practised. In fact it stood second only to the art and practice of advantageous book-buying... The earlier meetings of the Library Association, the earlier volumes of the *Library Journal* are full of discussions of cataloging practice... In the early nineties it was very evident that there had come to pass a great change in the thought of librarians about their work.<sup>8)</sup>

In the same address, Mr. Bishop goes on to say:

Catalogs and catalogers are not in the forefront of library thought. In fact, a certain impatience with them and their wares is to be detected in many quarters. Shallow folk are inclined to belittle the whole cataloging business, and there have not been wanting persons to sit in the seat of the scornful.<sup>9)</sup>

Such trends as these were also observed by Spera and Egan:

Such library pioneers as Edwards and Panizzi in Britain and Jewett, Winsor, Cutter and Poole in the United States had seen in the provision of the bibliographic machinery necessary to provide both physical and subject access to printed records, the real social purpose of the library. It remained for their successors to reject a considerable part of this primary responsibility and to take up, in a futile attempt to rehabilitate their professional prestige, aims

and objectives which were quite incompatible with the very nature of the library.<sup>10)</sup>

These authors attributed the basic cause of this rejection of responsibility to the fact that librarians became caught up in the social movements of the time, such as adult education and the education of the masses in general, making the library a people's university rather than a bibliographical center which is its true and basic function.

In 1949 Ralph Ulveling commented:

...catalogers generally have been tagged with an unenviable reputation. More than any other group of our profession, they seem to be thought of as living apart from the world ... since the turn of the century or thereabouts ... they are assumed to be ultra-conservative and unreceptive to change... to be enslaved by rules to such an extent that there is no scope within their field of service for the exercise of intelligence and judgment.<sup>11)</sup>

By 1955 the attitude had evidently not been entirely changed when Frank Lundy wrote:

A serious and basic dilemma confronts... librarianship today. It concerns catalogers and reference librarians and the many conflicts which have arisen between them in their separate camps... Why does reference work carry a halo in the eyes of the novice? Why is cataloging regarded by these same people as employment of the last resort? What has happened to the concept of librarianship that has been lost sight of in the face of this conflict? Since when is it more important to become a "reference librarian" and to avoid becoming a "cataloger," than it is simply to become a "librarian"? <sup>12)</sup>

Even as late as 1964 an outstanding library educator reflected a similar attitude toward the role of the cataloger, showing what may be a not uncommon misconception still existing within certain segments of the profession. In a paper written for the Graduate Library School's conference on The Intellectual Foundations of Library Education, Leon Carnovsky says in part:

I have in mind the whole panoply of activities subsumed under the cataloging, classifying,

and shelving of books... if these activities consist only of mechanically following a set of rules, it is difficult to justify them as intellectual... Knowledge of existing codes is important and must be gained somewhere if not in the library school, but I should regard such knowledge alone as insufficient to the recognition of cataloging and classification as truly intellectual disciplines.<sup>13)</sup>

Perhaps these few scattered examples from the literature are sufficient to show what has happened during this century by way of loss of perspective regarding the most important function of libraries. When cataloging and classification can be considered the mechanical following of a set of rules, then the entire concept of the scholastic function of libraries has in some part, at least, disappeared from the profession.

It has been observed before that some of the major movements and motivations in librarianship have been imposed from outside the profession.<sup>14)</sup> Now once again during the middle years of the present century something like this happened with the movement called "documentation." This term, defined by Bradford, as "the art of collecting, classifying and making readily accessible the records of all kinds of intellectual activity."<sup>15)</sup> is synonymous with the definition of the chief duty of the librarian, yet this was an independent movement and arose outside the profession of librarianship. The needs which brought forth this movement were, however, rooted in the library field, and all the deficiencies mentioned above, namely, the general lack of perspective which had blurred the proper relationship between "cataloging" and "reference" functions, which had down graded the office of the cataloger, and which had transferred printed indexes, catalogs, and bibliographies to the realm of "reference" and away from the catalog proper. Shera and Egan refer to this situation as an "abandonment of an important and previously well-recognized part of professional responsibility" and state that "that segment of librarianship which had thus been sloughed off was picked up and developed by the growing group of

documentalists."<sup>16)</sup>

It is true that the documentation movement would have had its beginning in more capable hands if it had been started by librarians, but eventually it made its way and did a great service to librarianship. It "picked up the tasks of bibliographic organization at the point where librarians had left them."<sup>17)</sup> It reinstated the cataloger's province, elevated his sphere of interest, and put in clear perspective the great importance of his responsibilities. It is true that the term "cataloger" was not used, in fact, most certainly avoided in order to shake off old connotations of restrictive duties and narrow point of view. The "documentalist" became what the "cataloger" should never have ceased to be.

Other terms had to be replaced, also, and old problems had to be introduced as new ones. This was necessary in order to gain understanding and support, in order to describe the acute need for getting at information—to such low repute had librarians relegated their most important duties. Subject cataloging, analytical entries, and choice of main and added entries resumed their importance under new names and in new hands. Librarians were off concentrating on other things farther afield such as discussion groups and advertising methods for selling interest in reading—so far did the harmful effects extend which were initially caused by the movement to separate cataloging from reference functions. At first these effects could be observed in changes of attitude toward certain aspects of librarianship, then in turn the attitudes wielded their influence until they impaired library objectives and operations. Finally, goaded by the documentation movement and by what is known as the "information explosion," librarians started to make a recovery and some of them, at least, began to see once more that the library's first responsibility is to apply itself to the problems of making information accessible.

More recently this task has been seen anew and in its true light as an immensely overwhelming undertaking. It is no longer considered a meticulous little job for someone who

for one reason or another is appointed to sit "behind the scenes." More than ever the concept that "cataloging" functions are unrelated to those of "reference" and "public services" prevents a library from operating at its best. Planning systems for the informational and bibliographical services of a library can not be worked out efficiently or realistically as long as this division by function is maintained or as long as the idea of it persists. Before a bibliographical or information system can be planned the point of view must become ingrained that printed catalogs, bibliographies, and indexes are to be considered and used as part of the "catalog." The old cleavage must be wiped out.

The same persistent needs which inspired the documentation movement have now given rise to the consideration of the use of automation for providing bibliographical services. Librarians at last seem to be awakened to the fact that the immensity of the problem demands their chief attention. As different from their initial attitude toward the documentation movement and probably thanks to it, librarians themselves have become involved in studying the possibilities of automation.

The problem that automation is attempting to solve is of course what has been known through the years as the cataloging problem. But there is a great difference as far as the attitude of the library profession is concerned: the task of dealing with that issue now carries prestige. Whether or not the impetus comes from within or without the profession, it is the librarians who are taking on the responsibility of attempting to solve the problem from the library point of view, and catalogers must necessarily play an important part in this. The automation of the library starts with the automation of catalogs, and "cataloging" decisions are all important in the initial stages. For the continuing process, as well, the task of catalogers will carry heavy responsibility. It will be a far more significant task than ever before to catalog, classify, and organize the library.<sup>18)</sup>

The machine can not take over the characteristic activities of the cataloger. As Ralph

Parker has put it.

There can be no question who will be the eventual master... Machines have erroneously been endowed with the power of thinking... the machine cannot do intellectual tasks... but [it] can do repetitive ones and do them far more effectively than can the librarian.<sup>19)</sup>

Mr. Parker further observes, admirably using the designation "librarian" rather than "cataloger":

What can machines do in libraries, and what of the librarians themselves? In spite of the predictions of some, computers will perform dull repetitive jobs in libraries... When mixed with ingenuity of human beings, the results may well be marvelous.

The books of which libraries are composed are rather mobile... Records, on the other hand, are viscous. The bibliographic organization of a library is far more durable than its books or the building which houses them. Librarians may not have analyzed the problem in this light, but this viscosity is primarily responsible for their being called narrow-minded, unresponsive to the needs of the user, and even obstructive to culture and enlightenment... The newer technology which is now emerging will free the record; it will be possible to reorganize collections for short term use as well as for long term repose. The distinction between the circulation file, the catalog, bibliographies, and indexes will largely disappear.<sup>20)</sup>

Under a mechanized system the cataloger, provided he meets his responsibilities, will again hold a place of influence and importance. Once more there will be demanded of him his best and most creative effort. He will not be permitted to think narrowly about bibliographical problems any more than the reference librarian will be allowed to, and the entire profession will not find it possible to let its interest flag. The overwhelming bulk of material coming from the presses and the urgency of current research will surely not soon allow libraries to forget that their chief purpose will continue to be the development of world-wide bibliographic organization.

- 1) William Warner Bishop, *The Backs of Books* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1926) p. 152.
- 2) Louis Kaplan, *The Growth of Reference Service in the United States from 1876 to 1893*. ("ACRL Monograph Series, no. 2" Chicago: Publication Committee of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1952), p. 1 ff.
- 3) *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- 4) *Ibid.*
- 5) *Ibid.*
- 6) Pierce Butler, "The Bibliographical Function of the Library," *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* IX (1953), 3.
- 7) Agnes Van Valkenburgh, "A Plea for the Cataloger," *Library Journal* XXXIX (1914), 679.
- 8) William Warner Bishop, *The Backs of Books* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1926), p. 127-128.
- 9) *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- 10) Jesse H. Shera and Margaret E. Egan's introduction to S.C. Bradford's *Documentation* (2d ed.; London: Crosby Lockwood, 1953), p. 17.
- 11) Ralph A. Ulveling, "Catalogers Can Stop 'Cold War'," *Library Journal*, LXXIV (1949), 10.
- 12) Frank A. Lundy, "Reference vs. Catalog," *Library Journal*, LXXX (1955), 19.
- 13) Leon Carnovsky, "Role of the Public Library; Implications for Library Education," *Library Quarterly*, XXXIV (1964), 317.
- 14) Ruth French Strout, "The Development of the Catalog and Cataloging Codes," in her (ed.) *Toward a Better Cataloging Code* ("21st Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago," Chicago: 1957), p. 12-14.
- 15) S.C. Bradford, *Documentation* (2d ed.; London: Crosby Lockwood, 1953), p. 49.
- 16) *Op. cit.*
- 17) *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 18) Don R. Swanson, "Design Requirements for a Future Library" in *Conference on Libraries and Automation, Airlie Foundation* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1964), p. 21, 25.
- 19) Ralph H. Parker, "The Machine and the Librarian," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, IX (1965), 100, 102.
- 20) *Ibid.*, p. 101, 102.