

## Letters

To the Editor:

RE: "Cutting Cataloging Costs: Accepting LC Classification Call Numbers from OCLC Cataloging Copy" by Susan A. Massey and S. Michael Malinconico, *LRTS* January 1997.

I hope *LRTS* will accept a non-scholarly letter from a non-scholar. The following caught my eye.

"While not diminishing the importance of shelf browsing, catalog departments must weigh the cost of shelflisting and reviewing classification carefully against its perceived benefits."

This seems to be an example of Dewey's Law (Harry Dewey): "What saves the librarian's time frequently costs the reader his."

As a librarian who labored before the widespread use of OPACs, my information may be dated, but it is my understanding that most books in public and academic libraries are selected by browsing.

If this is true, one of the most important tasks librarians perform is to place a book where a browser might find it.

To my mind it's a user's use of a book that justifies the cost of classification.

A study needs to be done to determine if a book's circulation is affected one way or another by local shelflisting.

Herb White wrote, as I recall, if his library had two copies of the same book, he would use different classification numbers to "tap" different browsers.

If cutting catalog costs is paramount,

perhaps we should close the stacks and shelve books by size and save space as well.—*Marvin H. Scilken, M.L.S., editor, The Unabashed Librarian*

To the Editor:

I would first like to thank Crystal Graham for her correction of my error regarding serials records. I am guilty indeed. My statement regarding added entries for earlier and later titles for serials was justified, incorrectly, as follows. AACR2 rule 21.30G for added entries for related works directs the cataloger to make added entries for works closely related to the work being cataloged. Rule 21.30G refers to rule 21.28 (Related works) for guidance. Because rule 21.28 includes "continuations and sequels," I assumed that serials would also require added entries for title changes.

Second, please note that an important reference is missing in the published article:

Tillett, Barbara B. 1991a. A taxonomy of bibliographic relationships. *Library resources & technical services* 35: 150-58.

This reference should follow the reference to Svenonius. Thanks are due to John M. Cys, Moffett Library, Midwestern State University, for pointing out this omission.—*Allyson Carlyle, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Washington*